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Bridging the Golden Gate: A Photo Essay
When they met, it changed the world

It was November 1936 when the two sections of the main span of the Golden Gate Bridge came together, and things would never be the same.

This step towards the completion of the bridge meant that the people of San Francisco and Marin County were connected to each other and the world in a way they had never been before.

Today, the Golden Gate Bridge stands as a mighty testament to the ingenuity and determination of the many men and women who fought opposition and braved the elements to make it a reality.

As Bay Area icons, both the bridge and Wells Fargo have a history of providing vital links between people, communities, and businesses around the country and the world. We are honored to help bring the celebrations of the Golden Gate Bridge 75th anniversary to life. Please visit ggb75.wellsfargo.com for news and updates on 75th anniversary events.

The Golden Gate Bridge and Wells Fargo — built in the Bay Area

wellsfargo.com
(BUILDING) A BETTER MOUSETRAP

You’ve heard the adage: “If you build a better mousetrap, the world will beat a path to your door.” Widely employed as a metaphor for invention and innovation, the mousetrap grabs hold of the truth.

Building one thing or another is human nature. The phrase “building bridges” evokes increasing understanding between people of differing outlooks, while “building castles in the air” refers to daydreaming or making plans that may never come true. Though building—whether mousetraps, bridges, or castles—signifies constructing an edifice, it first requires all the processes of designing, permissions, materials, and financing the mousetrap of the moment.

Essays in this issue display the art, craft, talent, acumen, genius, and tenacity essential to building structural and cultural icons of change, innovation, modernization, and originality in California, while our Collections feature uncovers attempts to record California’s significant architectural landscape.

In “Bridging the Golden Gate: A Photo Essay,” we endeavor to encapsulate stories behind the completion of the Golden Gate Bridge seventy-five years ago through images relating to history of place, urban growth, social and economic challenges to what some called “a wild flight of the imagination,” the Great Depression, and the “practical proposition” that propelled the bridge’s construction. The utility and efficiency, as well as the art, of the bridge—its revolutionary design, modernist profile, and noble stature—gave rise to perhaps California’s most widely beloved icon.

In “‘Women Who Build’: Julia Morgan & Women’s Institutions,” Karen McNeill delves into the early twentieth century to unveil “the most expansive body of architecture designed of, by, and for women, resulting in a rich source base for exploring feminism from a spatial perspective.” The model of a modern woman, Morgan brought fame and creative professionalism to women’s club buildings, leaving “a permanent record of (women’s) changing place in society and of the many causes they championed throughout the Progressive Era.” Although these buildings are relatively unknown compared to her über-fabulous Hearst Castle, examining Morgan’s women’s residences, clubs, YWCA complexes, and orphanages generates a call to investigate further connections between physical spaces and those who use them.

Julia Morgan and builders of the Golden Gate Bridge built real castles in the air and they built real bridges.

Definitely, they built better mousetraps.

JANET FIREMAN
In a tribute to the state’s built environment, this issue spans nearly one hundred years of California’s history—from the end of the Mexican era (the Monterey adobe of Francisco Garcia, ca. 1840s, below) to the first years of the twentieth century (the Mills College bell tower, 1904, left) to the Depression-era design and construction of the Golden Gate Bridge (opposite).

Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) Records, MS 3980.Casa Garcia.001.tif (below); Julia Morgan Collection, Environmental Design Archives, University of California, Berkeley (left); Architectural Archives, University of Pennsylvania by the Gift of Drew Eberson, 1984 (opposite)
The Great Depression, like the contemporary economic crisis, struck a grievous blow to the building trades and professions in the United States, arresting construction projects throughout the country and leaving laborers and architects alike jobless. In response, architect Charles E. Peterson of the National Park Service proposed an innovative New Deal program that would relieve unemployment among architects, draftsmen, and photographers while documenting the nation’s threatened architectural heritage.

Inaugurated in 1933, the Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) would be administered by the National Park Service, with professional support from the American Institute of Architects (AIA) and funding from the Works Progress Administration (WPA). Since 1934, the Library of Congress has preserved HABS’s rich documentary legacy in hundreds of thousands of photographs, drawings, and other materials.

In 1973, CHS became the designated repository for copies of California HABS documentation, acquiring a large trove of records from the San Francisco offices of the National Park Service, Western Region. The bulk of this collection—which continues to expand with regular deposits—consists of duplicate HABS records for California and the Western Region, some of which are not part of the Library of Congress’s extensive holdings.

Francisco Garcia House, Monterey County, ca. 1916, view from the east

Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) Records, MS 3980. Casa Garcia.004.tif
The CHS collection contains the exhaustive and methodically prepared photographic prints, negatives, photographic pages, inventory work sheets, photograph-data book reports, and measured drawings that constitute the HABS program’s official documentation. These are enriched by administrative files, correspondence, survey notes, sketches, field notebooks, ephemera, newspaper clippings, and other published data: working documents and research materials, often original, that offer contextual insight into the day-to-day administration of the program as well as a specific and narrative sense of a HABS surveyor’s actual work.

A vital and expansive resource for architectural research, these materials hold special interest in the fields of documentary photography, historic preservation, public planning, and the New Deal. From administrative files that document the 1960s historic preservation battles in Sacramento to poignant photographs of a nineteenth-century Jewish cemetery in Sonora, the documents tell the story, in words and images, of California’s vanishing, evolving, and emerging landscapes.

The sketches, records, and photographs on these pages illustrate a HABS team’s efforts to document the Francisco Garcia House in Monterey. With their sketches, HABS surveyors attempted to verify the house’s original appearance, its history, and its past inhabitants. With their photographs, they captured the adobe’s gradual decay. In their letters, they expressed dismay at its eventual destruction, which brought to a close the documentation of one of the region’s prominent historic and cultural landmarks.
This handwritten survey card accompanying the 1916 photograph details the adobe’s history and description. It was built by a German carpenter for the landowner and judge Francisco Garcia for $18,000 and later was owned by Andres J. Molera and his heirs. In 1868, it became a hotel called Bay View House.

HABS Records, MS 3980. Casa Garcia.004 [verso].tif
In his December 14, 1939 letter to Mary Green of the Custom House, HABS’s Marion Cowen requested that she conduct a second interview with a local resident, Mrs. Mary A. Dutra. Mrs. Dutra was familiar with the house’s history and some of its inhabitants, including “the only woman bull fighter of California and another woman who died of grief from having to marry a man she did not love.” Part of Mr. Cowen’s request was that Mrs. Green show sketches to Mrs. Dutra “for comment as to the way the house looked before it fell into decay.” He wrote, “She may make corrections right on the sketch.”

HABS Records, MS 3980. Casa Garcia-002.tif

In her response just a month later, Mrs. Green reported the unsuccessful results of her interview: Mrs. Dutra’s recollections about the back of the house were “not at all borne out by the foundations that were found on the site.” Nevertheless, Mrs. Green expressed her determination to “contact any one who can remember the house.” She ended her letter with an account of an illness made all the worse by news of the adobe’s complete destruction, which “would have made any one sick.”

HABS Records, MS 3980. Casa Garcia-003.tif
Two photographs, showing the same eastern view as the 1916 photograph, document the home’s rapid decay from May 1936 (above) to August 1939 (below) prior to its demolition in 1940.

HABS Records, MS 3980.
Casa Garcia.005.tif (above);
Casa Garcia.006.tif (below)
BRIDGING THE GOLDEN GATE
A PHOTO ESSAY
The Mouth of the Bay

Long before the Golden Gate Bridge became part of the iconography of California and the West, the narrow strait that it spans between San Francisco and the Marin headlands was a place of legend, seafaring, migration, and industry. To Spanish explorers it was elusive and formidable. But always it held the promise of new life in a new land.

For more than two hundred years following Juan Rodríguez Cabrillo’s journey up the Pacific Coast from Mexico in 1542–43, word of a huge estuary in Alta California beckoned Spanish mariners seeking a port of call. But the narrow opening to San Francisco Bay eluded them: hidden by fog; protected by dangerous,
wave-swept rocks, swirling tides, and treacherous currents; and
masked by the appearance of the islands in the bay and the hills
beyond as a solid landmass.

Members of Gaspar de Portolá’s land expedition first sighted the
bay from atop hills south of present-day San Francisco in October
1769 as part of the first Spanish colonization expedition to Alta
California. Pedro Fages observed the quantiosa vacana de estero
(large mouth of the estuary) in 1770. Two years later, in March
1772, he and Father Juan Crespí viewed the estero from the Berke-
ley hills, describing it as la bocana, the mouth, of the bay.1

It was not until 1775 that Juan Manuel de Ayala, aboard the San
Carlos, made the first entrada to the bay. From the sea, avoiding
the treacherous Farallones (“rocks jutting out of the sea”),
and overcoming perilous oceanic forces, he sailed through the
imposing cleft between the San Francisco and Marin peninsulas
and anchored at Fort Point. This feat opened the bay to further
Spanish shipping and settlement, as well as to the development of
its port and village, Yerba Buena, and eventually the world.
In June 1846, John Charles Frémont, the explorer and a lieutenant colonel in the Mexican-American War, sailed across the bay to San Francisco from what today is Sausalito. In an account of his western excursions, he described the opening to “the great bay” as “a single gap, resembling a mountain pass.” Reminded of the entrance from Turkey’s narrow Bosphorus Strait into Chrysoceras—or Golden Horn, a deep, natural harbor in modern-day Istanbul—he named the opening to the bay Chrysopylae, or Golden Gate.

The name was prescient. Soon U.S. frigates were joined by other vessels sailing through the Golden Gate with eager passengers from all over the world following the discovery of gold in 1848. Ferries, sailing ships, and steamships crowded the burgeoning port in the bay as mining, fishing, and shipping industries took hold. Once sought after as a portal inward leading to a safe harbor, now the narrow opening beckoned outward, a gateway for the new state’s commerce and prosperity.

Even with all this activity—including the familiar recurrence of shipwrecks—the Golden Gate, approximately three miles long, one mile wide, and more than three hundred feet deep, continued to inspire. Nineteenth-century artists, lithographers, photographers, and poets captured its spirit, celebrated its symbolism, and initiated a fascination that would be anchored in the next century by designers of a landmark structure: the Golden Gate Bridge.

More than 300 vessels sank in the waters along the entrance to the San Francisco Bay. Renowned photographer Carleton Watkins documented the shipwrecked Viscata following its March 7, 1868 broadside grounding on the sands of Baker Beach. Carrying a cargo of wheat en route to Liverpool, the British ship lost its anchor hold off Fort Point. On April 30, the Daily Alta California described the scene as “magnificent—the huge rollers, coming in with military precision and regularity, lifting their crests with a mighty roar and hurling themselves upon the fated ship, as if determined to destroy her utterly.” Watkins set up a white tent (right, middle ground) to house his darkroom, where over the course of a few days he documented the ship’s disintegration.

Courtesy of the California History Room, California State Library, Sacramento, California
Following the discovery of gold at Sutter’s Mill, thousands of adventurers entered San Francisco Bay through the Golden Gate. William Titus Birdsall’s leather-bound diary (detail, right) records his six-month voyage aboard the Loo Choo from New York to San Francisco via Cape Horn. On September 16, 1849, the ship entered into the strait besieged by fog: “We have been sailing along the land all this morning and are now at eleven PM standing in for the huge bluff at the entrance of the bay. Although the fog is still thick the huge bleak rock loomed up as if to warn us of its dignity but the old ship drives on, the wind holds sure and we have weathered it nicely.”

California Historical Society, Vault MS 44, CHS2012.862.tif
below: In this 1869 lithograph, *Bird’s Eye View of the Bay of San Francisco and Adjacent Country*, the artist has tilted the picture plane toward us as if to exaggerate the idea of the water of the bay rushing out through the comparatively small opening of the Golden Gate. Pure water from snow and rainfall in the Sierra flows into the bay and then out into the Pacific Ocean. At the same time, waves bring seawater back through the Golden Gate—a collision creating tumultuous and violent currents that make this portal an extremely challenging and difficult channel to navigate.

*Courtesy of The Bancroft Library*
Representations of the Golden Gate proliferated in the artistic, literary, and commercial spheres as painters, poets, and lithographers revealed a new landscape populated by ships, a growing port city, abundant waters, and golden sunsets.

As a staff artist for the San Francisco Call, William Coulter (1849–1936) illustrated scenes of sailing ships and steam vessels along the waterfront in pen and ink. He also made numerous paintings of ships and ferryboats in San Francisco Bay, including this 1885 work, San Francisco Bay to Fort Point. One of his paintings depicting the Golden Gate inspired the design of a 1923 commemorative U.S. postage stamp.

California Historical Society Collections at the Autry National Center, 60-1-17-2.tif

About 1890, the entrepreneurial brothers John and Charles Arbuckle of New York commissioned Donaldson Lithograph Co. of Cincinnati—acclaimed for circus, minstrel, movie, and theatrical posters—to produce one of their coffee company’s most popular promotional campaigns: a series of fifty colorful trading cards. Inserted into each package of Arbuckles’ Coffee, the cards illustrated “the peculiar industries and scenery of the States and Territories.” The California card—number 74 in the series—includes a view of the Golden Gate, with the Civil War-era Fort Point in the foreground.

California Historical Society, Business Ephemera Collection, CHS2012.878.tif
Nineteenth-century aerial perspectives—or bird’s-eye views—were made popular by the invention of color lithography. Many of these renderings of cities and towns across the country were commissioned by businesses, civic organizations, and land speculators. This 1878 lithograph by C. R. Parsons for the printmaking firm Currier & Ives is part of the pictorial record of San Francisco’s rapid growth in the decades following the Gold Rush. Looking west and southwest, it details wharves, streets, churches, homes, prominent buildings, and ships entering and leaving the Golden Gate (upper right).

Library of Congress
The Golden Gate, an 1869 poem by Scottish-born poet and bookbinder James Linen (1808–1873), dramatically narrates the bay’s history. Placing particular emphasis on beauty and majesty, the poem confirms the landmark’s prominent place in the human experience. The poem’s opening illustration, “Seal Rocks,” by J. B. Wandesforde, gives particular credence to a descriptive stanza: “So dreadfully wild, so terribly grand, / Is the Golden Gate of the golden land.”

California Historical Society, Kemble Collections, CHS2012.485a.tif (above, left) and CHS2012.485c.tif (above, right)

Carl Adolf Von Perbandt (1832–1911) painted this 1893 panoramic, San Francisco Bay, during sunset, when the Golden Gate is most golden. Like many nineteenth-century landscape artists, he was drawn to the Bay Area’s natural beauty. He kept studios in San Francisco and the northern counties of Humboldt, Sonoma, and Mendocino and exhibited paintings he made in these locations. In an 1894 interview published on March 11 in the San Francisco Call, he offered this insight: “Many a night and morning I sat upon the rocks for study, as without constant impression from the sea you cannot reproduce marine effects.”

California Historical Society Collections at the Autry National Center, 68-35-1-2.tif
CLOSING THE GAP

Visions of integrating San Francisco with surrounding communities and the entire region were conceived and developed in time and in tune with the expanding age of the automobile. Despite the Great Depression, the city was still dynamic and had grown rapidly. In 1930, at 634,782, the population was twice its size in 1900, and the same growth spurt dominated the entire Bay Area, which had more than doubled since the turn of the century to 1,578,009.3

As automobiles grew in popularity, auto ferries proliferated. Weekenders fled the city for the East Bay and Marin County hills, while residents from those surrounding counties poured into San Francisco to enjoy urban delights and charm.4 By the end of the twenties and into the early thirties, with ferries choked by traffic, travelers’ frustrations mounted over their hours-long lineups to board for bay crossings. Motorist pressure, combined with developers’ interest in Marin’s rural areas and impetus to provide jobs for the growing unemployed, pushed the bridge project forward. On November 4, 1930, voters approved a $35 million bond measure to fund the administration, engineering, and building of the Golden Gate Bridge, though litigation concerning financial arrangements delayed the start of construction.5
With the growing popularity of travel by automobile, demand dramatically increased for auto ferry service across the bay, with 1.8 million vehicles crossing in 1922—more than 300,000 of them across the Golden Gate alone. Some motorists were business commuters, and many were tourists destined across the Golden Gate for the picturesque landscapes of Marin and Sonoma Counties. Enjoying the new freedoms that the automobile offered, they were aided by timetables and road maps, such as this 1928 Southern Pacific brochure advertising its four auto ferry routes.

California Historical Society, Brandt Collection, FN-20034/CHS2012.813.tif (above); California Historical Society, Business Ephemera Collection, CHS2012.884.tif (right)
Initially, the U.S. War Department (today the Department of Defense) objected to the idea of building the bridge, fearing that during times of war it might hamper access to and from San Francisco Bay, the most important Pacific Coast port and home to many important military bases. One condition of the department's eventual approval was the guarantee of wartime control of bridge operations. San Francisco Mayor James Rolph was in Washington, D.C., when the War Department gave its final authorization. Rolph's secretary, Ed Rainey, sent him this telegram on December 29, 1924, delivering the good news.

California Historical Society, James Rolph, Jr. Papers, MS 1818, CHS2011.772.tif
The magnificent Golden Gate Bridge was erected against the Great Depression’s dark and foreboding backdrop. Who would have thought that such an ingenious and much-needed transportation connection, engineering marvel, and spectacular regional symbol could or would be brought forth at such a bleak historical moment?

With various motivations, some people claimed that the bridge shouldn’t—maybe couldn’t—be built. Times were grim. Difficulties were everywhere: Dramatic and crippling labor strife climaxed in the 1934 Waterfront and General Strike, closing the Port of San Francisco for more than two months and shutting down the city for several fearful days in July; 20 percent of the state’s population was on the relief rolls; political disarray and wrangling were rife; and widespread nativism and xenophobia plagued the region. Dust Bowl migrants, refugees from even worse situations, joined other Californians suffering through hard times in paradise.
Nevertheless, the bridge was going to be built, and for many good reasons. The bridge was a vital component in the environmental reconfiguration of California by grand public works including the Bay Bridge, the Central Valley Project, Shasta Dam, and Stockton’s deep-water port—all integral to an elaborate infrastructural base of modernity that the state has relied on for almost a century.\(^6\)

Dorothea Lange (1895–1965) was a portrait photographer when in 1932—at the height of the Depression—she observed the dehumanizing conditions in the streets of San Francisco. Leaving her studio, she captured images of despair, including this iconic photograph of a man with a tin cup at White Angel Jungle, a soup kitchen on the Embarcadero near Filbert Street that was run by Lois Jordan, the “White Angel.” In a 1964 interview, Lange spoke about *White Angel Breadline*, which launched her career as a documentary photographer: “I made that on the first day I ever went out in an area where people said, ‘Oh, don’t go there.’ It was the first day that I ever made a photograph on the street.”

Courtesy, Scott Nichols Gallery
A bridge across the Golden Gate, heretofore considered a wild flight of the imagination has ... become a practical proposition.” So wrote Joseph B. Strauss, the bridge’s Chicago-based chief engineer, and San Francisco’s city engineer Michael O’Shaughnessy in their 1922 pamphlet Bridging “The Golden Gate.” Presenting the feasibility of erecting an unprecedented 4,000-plus-foot span across the Golden Gate, the booklet featured Strauss’s original design for a hybrid cantilever-suspension bridge, as well as projected costs and earnings.

Fifteen years later, on May 27, 1937, the Golden Gate Bridge opened to exuberant fanfare with a weeklong celebration. A good deal had changed since Strauss’s initial plans, such as a new dynamic Art Deco design and numerous technological and architectural innovations. The bridge’s orange vermilion color and dramatic illumination seemed to intensify its size and scale, enhancing its majesty. “Spectacular in its setting, graceful and artistic in design, magnificent in its mighty sweep across the Golden Gate, the Bridge is the outstanding suspension bridge of the world,” boasted the Bethlehem Steel Company, the project’s largest single contractor, in a 1937 promotional pamphlet.

Celebrated as a triumph of engineering, the new bridge—then the world’s longest single-span suspension bridge—produced an immediate and widespread impact on the city and region. During its first year, more than 400,000 pedestrians and nearly four million motor vehicles carrying more than eight million passengers crossed its span. A year after the bridge opened, ferries that had transported goods and people across the bay since the early 1850s—and cars after the turn of the century—had reduced services or suspended operations. The growth of the city, once a cause for the bridge’s construction, now was its effect. As the permanent link with communities around the bay—enlarged further by recent completion of the Oakland Bay Bridge—the Golden Gate Bridge fostered a regional identity and economy, symbolized today by soaring orange towers of inspiration.
Joseph Strauss’s original 1921 design was published a year later in a pamphlet intended to garner support for the bridge project that “will represent a crowning achievement of American endeavor.” Mechanical and laborious, with steel-girded sections on either end and a suspension span in the middle, the design was abandoned after 1925 in favor of a pure suspension bridge of sleek and modern expression.

California Historical Society, OV PAM 7820, FN-24587/CHS2011.734.tif

Designing the Bridge

Studies leading to the bridge’s new design were orchestrated by a team of specialists whom Joseph Strauss (standing) hired as consultants: (seated, left to right) Charles A. Ellis, design engineer for the Chicago-based Strauss Engineering Corporation; Leon S. Moisseiff, leading bridge theoretician; Othman Hermann Ammann, designer of New York City’s George Washington Bridge; and Charles Derleth, Jr., dean of engineering at the University of California, Berkeley.

San Francisco History Center, San Francisco Public Library
In 1929, the renowned Chicago-based theatre architect John Eberson (1875–1964) introduced Art Deco to the bridge’s design, contributing to its final elegant form. The vertical drawing of Eberson’s plan for the towers very much resembles the built structure. However, his concepts for an ornate Beaux Arts-style colonnaded approach to the bridge depicting a monumental plaza with a triumphal gateway were replaced by designs reflecting an updated Art Deco sensibility.

The Architectural Archives, University of Pennsylvania by the gift of Drew Eberson, 1984
In 1930, Strauss replaced Eberson with the local architectural firm Morrow & Morrow, whose principals, Irving Foster Morrow (1884–1952) and his wife, Gertrude Comfort Morrow (1888–1983), created new drawings. Irving Morrow finalized the bridge's iconic features and stylized architectural elements, including the type font for signage.

Environmental Design Archives, University of California, Berkeley
CONSTRUCTING THE BRIDGE
In 1931, the Bethlehem Steel Company purchased a steel complex from the McClintick-Marshall Corporation of Pittsburgh. Located in Pottstown, Pennsylvania, a center of iron and steel production, Pottstown Industrial Complex was a major fabricator for the Golden Gate Bridge. In a 1937 brochure (opposite, below), Bethlehem Steel proudly summarized its role as contractor for the fabrication and erection of the bridge’s towers and steel superstructure.

California Historical Society, F-PAM 9054, CHS2012.880.tif

That story is also told in an album of photographs documenting the bridge’s fabrication from 1933 to 1936 at Pottstown. These examples from the album illustrate a section of steelwork loaded for shipment to California in April 1933 (below); the trial assembly at the railway of the base sections for the Marin tower’s east leg in July 1933 (left); and the plant assembly of two sections of stiffening trusses—designed to eliminate the twisting effects of high winds—in March 1936 (opposite, above).

California Historical Society, Photo Album No. 222, PA222.001.tif (below); PA222.004.tif (left); PA222.003.tif (opposite, above)
Oil companies naturally were interested in the bridge project. Anticipating the expected demand for gasoline to drive along northern county roads, they employed photographers and writers to tout the bridge in publications and advertising. Ted Huggins (1892–1989), a public relations representative for Standard Oil Company of California, photographed the bridge’s construction from 1934 to 1937. A sample of his images (pages 30–33) draw our attention to the bridge, bridge workers, and even everyday activities.

California Historical Society, Huggins Collection, FN-09309/CHS.Huggins.012.tif (left); CHS.Huggins.022.tif (opposite)
Associated Oil Company commissioned nearly 100 photographs by Charles M. Hiller between 1933 and 1936. Many capture rarely seen moments during construction. Others depict aspects of the bridge’s often dangerous assembly process, which—along with fog, high winds, and the dizzying height—generated the idea to install a suspended safety net.

Labor Archives & Research Center, San Francisco State University, from the holdings of the Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District, used with permission.
Upon completion of the bridge, engineering facts and data were widely available to the curious public. This 1935 booklet offering “a technical description in ordinary language” described the project through text, diagrams, and drawings by architectural renderer Chesley Bonestell (1888–1986), who also drew the cover illustration (above left). The world’s longest suspension bridge in its day, the Golden Gate Bridge also boasted the world’s highest and largest bridge towers, tallest cable masts, and greatest navigational clearance.

California Historical Society, PAM 979.461H.M52G, CHS2012.887A.tif (above left); CHS2012.887B.tif (above right); CHS2012.887C.tif (left)
Landscape painter Ray Strong (1905–2006) was living in San Francisco in the 1930s when he participated in the Roosevelt administration’s Public Works of Art Project, the first federal government program to employ artists. Encouraged to depict “the American scene”—the landscape and ordinary people working—Strong chose to portray the bridge under early construction. He made this study of the towers in progress (above) in 1934. The completed painting, which President Franklin Roosevelt selected to hang in the White House, is now in the collection of the Smithsonian American Art Museum. The photograph (left) shows Strong at work on what is likely the study shown above from his vantage point in San Francisco.

Collection of Frederick Baker (above); Archives of American Art (left)

FACING PAGE: San Francisco artist Chesley Bonestell, himself a trained architect, joined Joseph Strauss’s team in 1932 to illustrate the bridge during various stages of construction. His paintings, including Ft. Point Base, helped the public to visualize the bridge.

© Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District, used with permission

ART OF THE BRIDGE
Even before the bridge was completed, Standard Oil (now Chevron) and other regional booster publishers began to use its image in promotional and informational materials. Well-known artists were commissioned for illustrations, including Maurice Logan (1886-1977), one of San Francisco’s best-known commercial illustrators and poster designers. He created this bold and striking image of the bridge under construction for the February 1935 cover of the Standard Oil Bulletin.

California Historical Society, Taylor & Taylor Records, Kemble Collections, CHS2012.881.tif

OPPOSITE: The official guide to the bridge’s opening celebrations offered a full program of events. The booklet also boasted that the bridge “will distinguish San Francisco’s great harbor entrance to a larger degree than the Statue of Liberty does New York harbor.” In the program’s cover illustration by Irving Sinclair (1895-1969), the orange towers’ eye-catching brilliance frames a scene symbolically forecasting a bright future: lively waves, a ship passing underneath the bridge, wildflowers in full bloom, and the golden hills of Marin County.

California Historical Society, San Francisco Ephemera Collection, CHS2012.879.tif
Official Program
GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE
FIESTA
SAN FRANCISCO
MAY 27 -- JUNE 2
1937
25¢
Chesley Bonestell’s artwork appeared on the cover of this promotional brochure, extolling the bridge as a statewide phenomenon. “Not only will the Golden Gate Bridge benefit San Francisco and the North Bay Redwood Empire counties but it will serve the entire Pacific Coast,” the pamphlet explained.

California Historical Society, PAM 4454, CHS2012.888.tif

Janet Fireman is Editor of California History. Shelly Kale is Managing Editor of California History.

ESSAY COVER: San Francisco Bay (detail), by Carl Von Perbandt, 1893, oil on canvas, California Historical Collections at the Autry National Center, 68-35-1-2.tif; “Golden Gate Bridge spanning San Francisco’s ‘Golden Gate’ toward the Marin shore,” ca. 1950 [82], postcard (detail), Stanley A. Piltz Company, San Francisco, Calif., California Historical Society, Kemble Collections, CHS2011.573.tif

NOTES


2 John Charles Frémon, Geographical Memoir upon upper California in Illustration of His Map of Oregon and California (Washington, D.C.: Wendell and Van Benthuysen, Printers, 1848), 32. In a footnote to his account of the bay entrance’s sighting, Frémont explained that the strait was “called Chrysopylae (golden gate) . . . on the same principle that the harbor of Byzantium (Constantinople afterwards) was called Chrysoceras (golden horn).” The Geographical Memoir, which he addressed to the U.S. Senate, is the first published account of the name of the strait as the Golden Gate.


5 Bridge tolls earned enough by 1971 to retire the bonds and provide almost $39 million in interest earnings. Golden Gate Bridge Highway & Transportation District, http://golden-gatebridge.org/research/BondMeasure.php.


7 M. M. O’Shaughnessy and Joseph Strauss, Bridging “The Golden Gate” (San Francisco, n.p., ca. 1922), 1.

8 The Golden Gate Bridge (Bethlehem, PA: Bethlehem Steel Company, 1937), 12.

This essay grew out of the exhibition A Wild Flight of the Imagination: The Story of the Golden Gate Bridge—commemorating the bridge’s 75th anniversary—at the California Historical Society in San Francisco, February 26, 2012 to October 14, 2012, under the creative leadership of CHS Executive Director Anthea Hartig, and curated by Jessica Hough, with Anne Lansdowne Rees, Robert David, Erin Garcia, and Trubec Schock. A multimedia book based on the exhibition and developed with Wild Blue Studios will be available on iTunes; check www.californiahistoricalsociety.org for details.

The California Historical Society is a proud sponsor of the Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy’s 75th Anniversary Community Tributes Program.
n 1922, Elsa Black, president of the Woman’s Athletic Club of San Francisco, declared that her club’s building stood as a testament to the “courage, valor, determination, business ability, integrity, optimism . . . romance . . . [and] feminine foresight” of “women who build.”¹ Since the late nineteenth century, California women had been shaping the built environment and using it as a path to power.² This network of generally affluent white women was instrumental in creating urban parks, schools, hospitals, orphanages, and charitable organizations that particularly targeted underprivileged women and children.

The same women also founded exclusive social and cultural clubs that provided extradomestic opportunities for women. As with similar organizations throughout the country, these institutions served as sites of female empowerment and gender consciousness; as places where class, ethnic, and racial conflicts played out; or as mechanisms through which some women generated power in numbers and, consequently, acquired an influential voice in City Hall or the Chamber of Commerce. All of these institutions allowed women to reimagine their place in the urban landscape and forge public roles in society.

For the most part, women built this nineteenth-century landscape incrementally; they bought property with preexisting structures—often domestic buildings of various sizes—then adapted the structures to new uses. By the turn of the century, many of these accommodations proved too small and inadequate for their intended purposes. Frequently, their quarters were relocated or expanded, either through additions or by occupying multiple buildings, often creating an inefficient, decentralized network. The transitory nature of this situation lent an air of impermanence, however highly respected the institution might be. As the Progressive Era dawned, interest in centralized organization, efficiency, urban planning, and architecture took hold in the state and around the country. Women increasingly looked to modernize and expand their buildings and claim a permanent presence in the landscape. They engaged in both relatively large- and small-scale architectural developments. They became “women who build.”³
Often referred to as Julia Morgan’s “little castle,” the Berkeley Women’s City Club (1929) was one of the last and most complex buildings that the architect designed for the California women’s movement. Through its height, mass, and Mediterranean Gothic style, the reinforced concrete building exudes strength and power, while its combined function as a residential, social, recreational, cultural, and commercial space attests to the monumental influence women had achieved in shaping the urban landscape of the Progressive Era.

Courtesy of Landmark Heritage Foundation/Berkeley City Club Archives
Between 1900 and 1930, many women’s organizations in California and elsewhere created new buildings to serve their causes. This relatively brief foray into a traditionally masculine activity addressed several goals of the women’s movement—broadly defined as organized efforts to redefine the boundaries of feminine propriety and women’s rights; raise awareness for concerns that particularly affected women; assert women’s influence across a wide spectrum of social, political, economic, cultural, and intellectual issues; and achieve a greater level of independence from and equality with men. Suffrage was the most popular cause that women espoused, but they also promoted public education for children, higher education for women, job training and access, and addressed such issues as child welfare and juvenile delinquency, health and sanitation, environmentalism, public space and urban development, and labor reform.

Elite white women dominate this particular story of the California women’s movement. By and large, they did not question the class and racial hierarchy in California or the nation, but as their buildings reveal, shifting relations of power allowed some ethnic minorities to assert their own goals, values, and cultural identities by the late 1920s. The long building campaigns (fundraising drives) and high level of publicity that these projects necessitated accelerated the ability of women’s organizations to redefine their contributions to society beyond the maternalist rhetoric that dominated this era. In form and style, the buildings reinforced these modern notions of womanhood and subtly critiqued dominant gender expectations. Most still stand, leaving—as this essay suggests—a permanent imprint in the urban landscape thus far undervalued by historians as a rich resource for exploring the complexity and legacy of Progressive Era women’s activism.

California women were not alone in their building programs, but the built environment they created stands out for one singular reason: the architect Julia Morgan. Born in San Francisco and raised in Oakland, she was one of the first female graduates in civil engineering from the University of California, Berkeley (1894), the first woman to gain admission to and earn a certificate from the architecture program at the École des Beaux-Arts in Paris (1898–1902), the first woman to acquire an architectural license in California (1904), one of few women in the country to head her own architectural practice, and the nation’s most prolific woman architect. She was an icon of the New Woman: a highly educated, independent, and single woman successfully pursuing a traditionally masculine career.

It was this reputation that led Marion Ransome, a dean at Mills College, to favor Morgan as architect of the college’s alumnae house. “Being a woman’s movement,” she explained to Aurelia Reinhardt, president of that East Bay women’s institution, “Miss Morgan, the best woman architect in the state, should do the work.” And while Morgan was not the only woman who designed buildings for women’s organizations (nor did only women design such buildings), she likely designed more buildings for women’s organizations (nor did only women design such buildings), she likely designed more buildings for women’s organizations than any other architect in the country. Her oeuvre thus provides the most expansive body of architecture designed of, by, and for women, resulting in a rich source base for exploring feminism from a spatial perspective.

THE ARCHITECT

Julia Morgan was born in San Francisco in 1872 and raised across the bay in Oakland. Her parents, Charles Bill and Eliza Parmelee Morgan, descended from prominent East Coast families. War heroes, wealthy business leaders, and powerful politicians dominated Charles’s family tree. Strapped with the burden of this legacy,
he arrived in California in 1865 to seek his own fortune in oil speculation. He failed. It was Eliza who secured the family fortune. Her father, a self-made millionaire, provided financial assistance to make sure his daughter lived more than comfortably. Upon his death in 1880, Eliza used her substantial inheritance to build the finest Queen Anne house on one of Oakland’s finest streets in one of the city’s best neighborhoods. Her mother and her mother’s fortune soon moved in with the family. Thus, while Charles remained the public figurehead of patriarchal authority according to Victorian gender codes, his daughter grew up in a household where social status was essential and women provided the means to achieve it.

College introduced Morgan to the California women's network. She enrolled at UC Berkeley in 1890 to study civil engineering and graduated in 1894. She and her cohort established the university’s first real women’s culture. They founded a chapter of the Young Women’s Christian Association (YWCA), organized several sports teams, and successfully fought for access to the gymnasium. Most importantly for Morgan, they chartered the Kappa Alpha Theta sorority. Characterized by academic excellence and exclusivity, it attracted a group of women who were particularly supportive of intellectual pursuits and who were affluent, well-connected members of society. The sorority hosted social events, including teas with professors’ wives and influential society women. Phoebe Apperson Hearst, the wealthy philanthropist and widow of Senator George Hearst who invested heavily in women and higher education at the University of California in particular, may have attended some of these events. She later became one of Morgan’s most important clients. The sorority also built a house, where Morgan lived. While most university women resided at home, dividing their attention between familial matters and academic work, Morgan had the opportunity to focus almost exclusively on her academic work. At Berkeley, she gained an education in engineering as well as social networking and institution building. She also broke away from the confines of Victorian domesticity toward a more independent life.

In 1896, Morgan sailed for France to study at the École des Beaux-Arts, then considered the most prestigious art and architectural school in the world. Her education encompassed far more than the art and science of designing and constructing buildings. Thanks to the efforts of a unionized
group of women artists, with whom Morgan associated and referred to as “bohemian,” the École opened courses to women during the summer of 1896. Degree programs, however, remained inaccessible. That changed in 1897, when the institution finally offered its highly competitive entrance examinations to women. Morgan failed the examinations three times, at least once for legitimate errors and once, she was told, because she was a woman. In the face of such injustice, she vowed to compete in the examinations every time they were held before her thirtieth birthday, when all students were required to leave the École, or until she passed, whichever came first. She now understood her personal quest to be educated as part of a much larger contest for women’s rights, and she would not be discouraged.

Unfortunately, no architectural atelier would accept Morgan into its masculine world of design, debate, and revelry. During the summer of 1898, however, François-Benjamin Chaussémiche, recipient of the École’s highest honor, the Grand Prix de Rome, became Morgan’s mentor. A few months later, Morgan passed the examinations. She was nearly twenty-seven years old, leaving just over three years to complete a curriculum that took the average student twice as long. Evidence suggests that the École’s administration prevented Morgan from pursuing a diplôme, the highest degree awarded to international students, but she secured a certificat d’architecture, the second highest degree, before the doors closed on her in February 1902. In Paris, Morgan received formal architectural training, discovered a feminist consciousness, and endured constant reminders of the formidable challenges she faced as a woman entering a steadfastly male-dominated profession.10

Later that year, Morgan launched her pathbreaking architectural career. Her reputation had preceded her. Newspapers in Paris, London, and the United States—especially the Bay Area—had followed her progress in Paris closely, and friends and family lined up to hire her to design their homes. Within weeks of her return to California, she accepted a position in the offices of John Galen Howard, architect for the new Berkeley campus, a Beaux-Arts masterpiece. Under Howard’s tutelage, she worked on the Hearst Mining Building, was almost solely responsible for the Greek Theatre, and created the preliminary designs for Sather Gate, which demarcated the university’s southern entrance. She also quickly surmised that she would be underpaid and officially unrecognized for her work, which would become increasingly narrow in focus, if she remained in Howard’s office.11

In 1904, after saving enough money from her work in Howard’s office and generating publicity through a few key side projects, Morgan acquired her California architectural license and opened an atelier of her own. She immediately won the patronage of Phoebe Hearst and Mills College. The San Francisco earthquake and fires of 1906 further presented her with opportunities to build a prolific and prestigious practice, particularly when she received the commission to rebuild the Fairmont, a luxury hotel on Nob Hill designed by James and Merritt Reid, a prominent San Francisco architecture firm. She soon developed a reputation for listening intently to her clients’ needs and desires. She was generous to her employees and mentored them closely (though some would say suffocated them). Laborers and artisans had only respect for her. She paid close attention to detail, employed the most modern building technologies, and always demanded high-quality work. These attributes sustained her practice for the next forty years.
Over the course of her career, Morgan designed nearly 100 buildings for women’s organizations in California and beyond. In 1903, Mills College offered Morgan her first commission for a women’s organization and retained her as its unofficial architect for twenty years. In 1929, the Berkeley Women’s City Club hired her for one of her last commissions for a women’s organization. In between, she designed dozens of cultural, social, and civic clubs for women; social, academic, residential, and recreational buildings for college and university women and unmarried working women; primary schools and orphanages for boys and girls; and hospitals, sanitariums, and nursing residences. And between 1912 and 1930, she designed more than thirty buildings in at least seventeen locations for the YWCA, one of the nation’s largest and most influential women’s organizations.12

Morgan lost money on many of these projects, but she kept accepting them. In 1918, for example, the national board of the YWCA donated $20,000 from its War Work Council funds to build a recreation center in Vallejo. Members of the Vallejo YWCA approved plans for a building that cost $24,655 but did not organize a building campaign, leaving the project short of funds. To keep the commission, and despite a contracting debacle, Morgan pared down the building costs as much as she could and charged a lower commission, which she agreed to base on the $20,000 budget rather than on the actual cost of the building. She lost the modern equivalent of over $10,000. For many women’s commissions, she donated her labor altogether. She also regularly contributed decorative objects. Morgan never explained her motives, but such anecdotes suggest that she was not simply a passive beneficiary of a niche market. Like so many of her clients, she was an activist, engaged in designing a new landscape that helped at least some women to redefine the boundaries of propriety and to lead a number of campaigns for Progressive Era causes.13
Building campaigns of the early twentieth century required a level of capital expenditure that drew women’s organizations into the public arena more prominently than ever before. Building campaigns were the means through which women’s organizations raised the money for their projects, but they also provided an opportunity for the women to redefine and modernize their place in the public sphere. Efforts to educate the public about their building programs, combined with a bit of pageantry, a lot of ambition, and persuasive use of booster rhetoric and the media, were not simply useful to these women’s causes; they were essential to the vitality of the women’s movement.

Since membership dues and privately solicited donations, which traditionally sustained the budgets of most women’s organizations, could not generate the revenue necessary to construct a building, women’s organizations engaged in a number of highly publicized activities to raise capital—sometimes for the first time. Throughout the state, they offered moonlight rides, sold
chocolates, olive oil, and handmade arts and crafts items, hosted breakfasts, staged fashion shows, held raffles, organized dances, earned proceeds from local circus and minstrel shows, and planned automobile trips and picnics. They mailed circulars with self-addressed return envelopes and a token thank-you gift and by the 1920s offered stock certificates, the newest entry in the fundraising repertoire.\(^\text{14}\)

Building campaigns often occurred over the course of several years and always appeared in local newspapers, assuring a steady stream of free publicity. They also fostered a sense of inclusiveness, for an organization could boast contributions of hundreds and sometimes thousands of individuals—both rich and poor—in the creation of a new building. Thus women’s organizations were not only constructing buildings, they also were building communities. This democratic approach to fundraising, steeped in nineteenth-century precedent, allowed women to retain their image as selfless activists for social causes and differentiated their investment in the urban landscape from the sheer capitalist enterprises of most building programs spearheaded by men.\(^\text{15}\)

At the same time, organized women of California presented their building activities as entirely modern. Most commonly, they used building campaigns as an opportunity to explain women’s contributions to urban growth, economic prosperity, and city beautification. Touted as “one of the largest association buildings in the west,” for example, Oakland’s Italian Renaissance–style YWCA building would be a “triumph of art” and could help the city in its efforts to emerge from the shadow of San Francisco. Publicity articles for the building also emphasized its cost, underscoring both the property value it would add to the city and—with a required a labor force of fifty men as well as thirty contracts to various companies in the building trades—its contribution to job creation and business growth.\(^\text{16}\)

For their building campaign, leaders of the Berkeley Women’s City Club similarly emphasized their club’s long-term role in boosting the local economy. With its dining room, auditorium, theater, leisure facilities, hair salon, and retail spaces, the building would entice Berkeley women to shop locally while attracting women from outside Berkeley to shop in the city. In addition, the club’s day-to-day maintenance and operation would require a significant workforce, which would generate jobs and create a demand for more consumer products, including food, clothing, and local housing.\(^\text{17}\) Such arguments appealed to major donors; while hundreds or thousands of individuals did, indeed, contribute to building campaigns, realization of the new buildings more often than not depended on the generosity of a few wealthy individuals who were deeply invested in local, regional, and state economic and political affairs.

Morgan brought “star power” and expertise to these all-female building enterprises. With the press documenting her achievements from the moment she boarded the ship for France, organizations that hired her—and most were quick to note in early press releases that Morgan was their architect—thus associated themselves with a model of modern womanhood. But Morgan was more than an icon. She was a respected professional. Newspapers published elevations of buildings that she designed, an editorial decision usually reserved for those projects and architects deemed particularly noteworthy for their contributions to the built environment. Such media attention was a boon to any building campaign. It elevated the project’s prestige and facilitated fundraising efforts.

The importance of these building campaigns becomes particularly clear when examining the future of groups that did not embark upon them, including the aforementioned Vallejo YWCA. Lacking the educational experience of conduct-
ing a building campaign, the Vallejo YWCA had difficulty getting off the ground, let alone expanding its program. Despite lengthy negotiations among the stakeholders, Morgan’s commission fees still “came as a total surprise” to the local association, and the bill was paid by the Pacific Coast Field Committee, the regional branch of the national organization.18

Similarly, the San Pedro YWCA, designed by Morgan and built in 1918, was denied a loan to expand its buildings and activities in 1926. A representative from the board of the national organization—the YWCA of the United States of America (YWCA of the USA)—reported on this subject, noting specifically that “there is little education of the community on giving to the Association.” Because the women of San Pedro did not implement a building campaign and benefit from its accompanying publicity, banks perceived their building as a gift, not as a testament to the association’s financial solvency or a manifestation of the important contribution women’s work made to the city.19

Having begun as Hostess Houses during World War I—which provided food, shelter, and recreational facilities for the rapidly increasing number of women employed in industrial jobs that had been abandoned by men who enlisted in the military, or for those who found work on or near military bases—both the Vallejo and San Pedro associations failed to acquire the expertise necessary to demonstrate community support of their work to investors and donors. Subsequently, they could not grow their facilities and activities.20

BUILDING THE CALIFORNIA WOMEN’S MOVEMENT

With funds in hand, architect secured, and design agreed upon, organizations finally could set about constructing their new buildings. The buildings varied in style, size, and plan according to location, site, function, and budget. In keeping with public and commercial architecture norms of the day, the buildings were generally wood-frame or reinforced concrete structures in the Mission, Renaissance, Spanish Colonial, Tudor, Gothic, or Classical Revival styles. Morgan often combined elements from several of these traditions, creating a more generic Italianate or Mediterranean style. Particularly if budgets were tight, she worked in the Bay Tradition style, a regional variation on the Arts and Crafts aesthetic characterized by wood-shingle roofs with wide-eave overhangs, unpainted wood exteriors and interiors, klinker brick or stone elements (such as chimneys or porch columns), and minimal ornamentation. Subtly critical of the status quo in their design, Morgan’s buildings celebrated women’s changing roles in the twentieth-century landscape.

Of the many buildings Morgan designed for women’s organizations, three—the Mills College campanile, the Riverside YWCA, and the Berkeley Women’s City Club—illustrate how white women defined modern womanhood and infused the built environment with feminine, if not always feminist, values.

MILLS COLLEGE

Mills College presented Morgan with one of her first and most important commissions: a campanile sensitive to the college’s history, yet signaling the institution’s transition from an almost obsolete frontier finishing school to a leading women’s college of the twentieth century. Mills College was founded as the Young Ladies’ Seminary in Benicia in 1852, during the height of California’s unsettled Gold Rush years. Cyrus and Susan Mills, East Coast–educated missionaries who had served in Sri Lanka and Hawaii, took over the seminary in 1871 and moved it five miles outside of incorporated Oakland. From the outset, they sought to build a college that rivaled East Coast women’s colleges, and in 1885 the
The state of California granted the seminary a college charter, making it the only women’s college on the Pacific Coast.21

Mills College gained significant prestige, but by the turn of the century the school found itself vulnerable to the rapid rise of coeducation in the Bay Area. The University of California, just a few miles north in Berkeley, and Stanford University, about forty miles south near Palo Alto, were building grand campuses and prestigious departments, offering low-cost or free tuition, and attracting young women in unprecedented numbers.22 In response, Mills College embarked on its own building program, beginning with the country’s first freestanding campanile.

Morgan designed a 72-foot-tall Spanish Mission–style tower among the California oaks at the southeastern edge of the oval driveway in front of Seminary Hall, the original campus building. The front and back measured twice as wide as the sides, and a series of low-pitched red tile roofs created colorful contrast to the drab concrete. The award-winning bronze bells, cast originally for the 1893 World’s Columbian Exposition in Chicago and rung a year later at San Francisco’s California Midwinter International Exposition, were housed in seven arched openings that pierced the concrete walls. On the primary facade of the campanile, surrounded by the chimes, hung a blue-and-gold clock. A massive wooden door, whose nails and lock came from an old Spanish church in Mexico, created an imposing entrance. Morgan also designed twenty-eight earthenware jars fashioned after those at the Alhambra in Granada, Spain. Home for southern California flora such as cacti and yucca, these jars sat atop a low wall at the edge of a broad walk surrounding the tower.23 In April 1904, El Campanil, as the tower was named, was unveiled with more fanfare, praise, and public attention than any Mills campus structure in its history.

The campanile’s Mission style distinguished Mills clearly from its competition. Unlike Berkeley’s Beaux-Arts architecture or Stanford’s Richardsonian Romanesque buildings, it reflected only California and Mills College history. Alluding to the state’s religious origins, it celebrated the school’s half-century commitment to a Christian education on the Pacific Coast. And the style recalled the institution’s early days, when the Spanish missions offered some of the state’s only permanent architecture; by selecting it for the campanile, Mills College symbolically reinforced its status as one of the oldest educational institutions on the West Coast.

Housed individually and in plain view, the ten bells marked the passage of every hour with the familiar Westminster chime, offering a note of Anglo-Saxon continuity and tradition to the majority of people who populated the region. Susan Mills further emphasized the institution’s Christian mission—and her conservative values—by naming the bells after the graces of the spirit, as written in Saint Paul’s letter to the Galatians. Faith, Hope, Peace, and Joy chimed above:

El Campanil, the country’s first free-standing bell tower, was one of Morgan’s earliest commissions (1904). Her design for the reinforced concrete Spanish Mission-style structure gave recognition to Mills College—the East Bay women’s college founded in 1852—as an advocate of both traditional and progressive values. Critics universally praised the tower, and its unscathed survival of the 1906 earthquake helped catapult Morgan to the top tier of the state’s architects.

Julia Morgan Collection, Environmental Design Archives, University of California, Berkeley
El Campanil was the first of six buildings that Morgan designed for Mills College, followed by the Margaret Carnegie Library (1906); a gymnasium and outdoor sports facilities (1909, 1922); Kapiolani Cottage, an infirmary (1910); Alumni House (1916); and the Ethel Moore Dormitory (1920, not built). The campanile’s unqualified success cemented Morgan’s reputation as an ideal architect for California women’s organizations and causes.
every hour, thus becoming the most regular sentiments emanating from the campus to its East Bay neighbors. Love was the largest bell; Meekness, the smallest and least often rung; Gentleness, Self Control, Longing, and Suffering completed the set. These names also typified nineteenth-century notions of femininity, assuaging any fears that Mills College would plant the seeds for social rupture by offering young women access to higher education. On the contrary, in its education of women, Mills College would help preserve the moral stability of a rapidly urbanizing region.

As much as El Campanil stood as a nostalgic emblem to the college’s long history and Christian foundations, so too did it signal the institution’s commitment to twentieth-century progress and change. With its choice of architect, Mills could boast that it stood at the cutting edge of regional expressionism in architecture and employed only the best-trained architects. Morgan’s selection suggested that the school no longer aimed simply to provide young women with “good home training, teaching them to care for the wardrobes, their rooms, to wait upon themselves—in short training them as daughters should be in a good home,” as Susan Mills had written to Phoebe Hearst; it also clearly supported women pioneers in male-dominated professions.

Additionally, the campanile’s design touted the college’s embrace of California’s role in the new empire. Though the missions had been part of the architecture of the Spanish empire in North America, by appropriating their design Mills joined its Bay Area neighbors in suggesting that Europe’s old imperial powers must give way to America’s manifest destiny. The lock and nails acquired from a Mexican Spanish church literally linked the school to the old empire, reiterated the transfer of power to America, and prepared Mills to play a key role in building the new empire further. Using architecture to emphasize its role in shaping the California landscape, the college demonstrated that it would not define itself by East Coast or European standards of excellence.

One speaker at the dedication ceremonies proclaimed, “So perfectly does [the campanile] blend in line and color with the surrounding trees and lawn that we already feel as if somehow the tower had always stood here and was today but rediscovered.” This bell tower symbolized the school’s permanent presence in the California landscape. And through the southern California flora that grew in its earthenware jars, it proclaimed that the college’s influence reached far beyond the boundaries of the Bay Area and ensured a space for Mills at the center of the Golden State’s intellectual leadership. In the collaboration between the college and Julia Morgan, this single structure spoke volumes about the past, present, and future role(s) of women in California.

RIVERSIDE YWCA

By the time the board women of the Riverside YWCA embarked on a building campaign in the late 1920s, the YWCA was a well-known and highly respected institution in the state and in national and international landscapes. Begun in England in 1855, the YWCA established its presence in United States with the founding of the Ladies’ Christian Association in New York City in 1858. Boston became the first city to adopt the YWCA moniker in 1866, and the organization arrived in California in 1876 when Frank Browne founded the Oakland YWCA.

From the outset, the YWCA embraced a Christian mission: to provide shelter and moral uplift for single working women arriving in the city from the country, abroad, or the familial home. As the nineteenth century gave way to the twentieth, the organization’s moral and evangelical tone became more secular. Job training and placement programs, language courses, cafeteria services, and sports and recreation dominated its modern
Determined that their 1928 club building would be designed not only for women but by a woman, Riverside YWCA directors rebutted local business leader Frank Miller’s contradictory demands for the building’s style, plan, and architect. Morgan’s building—an eclectic mix of Spanish Colonial and Renaissance styles—served as the local YWCA chapter for nearly forty years. Today it houses the Riverside Art Museum.

Courtesy of the California History Section, California State Library, Sacramento, California

agenda. So vast had the YWCA’s network become by the twentieth century that a national organization, the YWCA of the USA, was formed in New York City in 1906 to standardize programs across the country, oversee their proper implementation, and manage allocation of certain funds. The national board ran this umbrella organization, while regional field committees monitored the local associations to assure they conformed to the national organization’s rules, regulations, and mission. California’s local associations fell under the authority of the Pacific Coast Field Committee. In some cases, as in San Francisco, a metropolitan region hosted multiple local associations, which came under the purview of a citywide central board.

While in reality YWCAs were contested and dynamic sites of power, class, and ethnic relations, they symbolized the increasingly diverse roles that women played in the urban landscape as workers, policy developers, and educators in the public sphere. In fact, YWCA buildings became one of the most commonly recognized urban spaces for women in the country, including California cities, and the buildings stood as idealized monuments to noble womanhood. In their copious publicity for the new YWCA building at Seventh and Lime Streets, Riverside women were quick to build on these ideas. They
remarked that the new building would be an important asset to the city’s Civic Center because of the services it would provide and because it was designed by the national expert in YWCA buildings, who was also the architect of media mogul William Randolph Hearst’s lavish estate near San Simeon. They also linked the project to a transnational movement that aimed to unite all women in a common effort to create a more abundant life for their gender. And, above all, the building was a manifestation of women’s leadership, defined by the association as “the modern trend of the time. . . . [Every woman] must choose her way and have conviction which will help her to form a platform for progress with other women.”

This emphasis on leadership and making choices is all the more significant given the organization’s contentious dealings with prominent businessman Frank Miller, whom one local historian described as “having the power to make or mar any civic or private enterprise.” Miller envisioned a city unified aesthetically by Mission Revival architecture, showcased by his ornate and sprawling Mission Inn. Recognizing potential value in the YWCA building toward this urban development scheme, he persuaded the organization to build on a large parcel adjacent to the recently completed Municipal Auditorium and Soldiers’ Memorial Hall and offered to subsidize its purchase. Miller specified that the design follow the modified Mission Revival style of the Municipal Auditorium—which featured a monumental staircase leading to arched doorways separated by Corinthian pilasters, a star-shaped window at the center of the facade, a shaped parapet topped by an eagle perched on a shield, towers with tiled dome roofs, and a sheltered colonnade that ran the length of the northwest side of the building. He also proposed that the building connect directly to the auditorium to facilitate YWCA women in their roles as hostesses at auditorium events. Miller disapproved of Morgan and her plan to include a pool in the building’s design.

Within this context, the Riverside YWCA gains significance as a manifestation of women’s leadership and rejection of male authority. Built of reinforced concrete, it fits harmoniously into the landscape but is stark and modern compared with the eclectic Mission Inn down the street or the adjacent Municipal Auditorium. It combines Italianate and Spanish Colonial styles in simple forms: rectangular in plan with asymmetrical massing, multiple gables, and a terra-cotta tile
roof. The entrance, located off center, features simple, wood-frame, multi-lite glass doors flanked on either side by plain pilasters and topped by a broken arched pediment with a finial in the center. Large urns top the balustrades on either side of the entrance steps. Multi-lite arched windows with keystones puncture the ground-floor walls, while two open loggia with slanted tile-clad roofs supported by simple rounded columns occupy the second story. Other decorative elements include medallions in the gables, a wrought-iron balcony, quoins, and finials.

From its single-story, flat-roofed northwest end in the shadow of the Municipal Auditorium, the Riverside YWCA grows progressively higher as it moves farther from the auditorium, culminating in the massive three-story gable that housed the swimming pool Frank Miller opposed but which a membership survey revealed to be among the building’s most important attributes. The pool’s inclusion assured that the building conformed to members’ programmatic needs and aesthetic preferences rather than the visions of male business and political leaders. While Morgan’s design created balance with the auditorium, it also clearly differentiated the women’s building from its neighbors, helping Riverside women to assert an independent voice in local urban development.

BERKELEY WOMEN’S CITY CLUB

One of Morgan’s last commissions for the California women’s movement, the Berkeley Women’s City Club, was created in response to challenges that women’s clubs faced by the late 1920s. Collecting funds for the construction of club houses was one issue that many organizations skillfully had surmounted, but taxes, upkeep, service, repairs, and incidental expenses created constant financial difficulties that membership dues alone could not remedy. As their buildings proliferated, moreover, competition increased among clubs, which further strained financial resources. The buildings that had brought so much attention to women’s activities and had created the geographical and spatial landscape for modern womanhood to flourish now were cash drains. In response to these developments, and to the successful rise of women’s city clubs in other parts of the state and country, Olga Beebe, chief accountant of the American Trust Company in Berkeley, devised a plan in 1925 for a modern women’s club in Berkeley that would provide facilities for numerous individual clubs; housing for single women; and social, cultural, recreational, and retail spaces. The new club was to be “financed and operated on a sound business basis.” With fiscal matters managed by professionals, individual clubs once again could concentrate on their intended interests.32

The Berkeley Women’s City Club opened its doors in 1930. Like many of Morgan’s commissions, it made a bold statement about the status of women. The club directors purchased two adjacent lots on the largely residential Durant Street one block south of the University of California’s track and baseball fields. As Julian C. Mesic, a model maker and architect who often worked for Morgan at the time, noted, the location was appropriate for a partly residential facility.33 It reflected conservative ideas about women’s domestic roles and kept them separated from the world of politics and commerce, even as women were claiming new spaces in these two arenas. With two sizable churches on the
block and Berkeley’s First Congregational Church across the street, the site evoked traditional values and women’s moral virtue.

Like the Riverside YWCA, Morgan’s Romanesque and Gothic design complemented the surrounding built environment. It drew upon castles, cathedrals, cloisters, and skyscrapers: the quatrefoils in the towers and the arched entryway, with its tendrils, rosettes, shields, and flowered capitals; the vaulted ceiling and archways of the front hall and main staircase; gargoyles holding shields; the open loggia flanking the interior courts; and the machicolations and corbels above the entrance and below the top floor. At six stories, the City Club was the tallest building on the block—hardly a skyscraper but tending toward tall building construction. Yet despite these old-world architectural elements, rebar doubles as structural reinforcement and decoration in the arches over the pool, literally exposing the modern technology that made the building possible. Indeed, the architect and engineer Walter Steilberg, who worked with Morgan, cited this building—which Mesic called “symbolic of the changed status of women and their broadening outlook”—as the most complicated engineering problem of his long career and, as of 1976, probably “the most complicated concrete structure in this part of the country.”

Morgan and the City Club women explicitly appropriated the historic architecture of religious, political, and financial institutions—the architecture of male power. But the building also included such details as rosettes in the entrance archway and a bas relief for the fuchsia court of three dancing young women with bobbed hair (designed by divorcée and railroad heiress Clara Huntington Perkins), consciously feminizing the building types and claiming the space as one for modern women.
DIVERSITY WITHIN THE CALIFORNIA WOMEN’S MOVEMENT

Morgan’s work for Chinese communities in the Bay Area has left a particularly rich record for exploring some of the ethnic tensions in the women’s movement. Five projects are directly and indirectly related to the Chinese: a house for Rose and Joseph Shoong, the founder of the National Dollar Stores and once among the wealthiest Chinese Americans in the country; the Methodist Chinese Mission in San Francisco, or Gum Moon; and several buildings for Angel Island Immigration Station, a site now synonymous with loneliness, isolation, and devastating hardship experienced by Chinese immigrants during the era of the Chinese Exclusion Act. The remaining two projects—the Ming Quong Home for Girls near Mills College and the Chinatown YWCA in San Francisco—expose very different stories about ethnic relations within the California women’s movement of the Progressive Era.

Ming Quong Home for Girls

That racial tension was manifest in the creation of the Ming Quong Home for Girls in Oakland, near Mills College, is evident in the contrasting goals of Donaldina Cameron and Aurelia Reinhardt, leaders of influential and celebrated institutions. Raised in southern California, Cameron broke off her marriage engagement to pursue her life’s work: In 1899, she commenced her long tenure as leader of the Presbyterian Mission House in San Francisco’s Chinatown, becoming a local legend and sometimes controversial figure for her crusade against the exploitation of women and children in brothels and opium dens. The mission sheltered women and children; schooled them in English, Victorian morality, Christianity, and job skills; offered marriage counseling; and intervened in immigration issues. Reinhardt, who was born in San Francisco and graduated from the University of California before pursuing a doctorate in English from Yale University, found success in academia before marrying and raising children. Widowhood compelled her to return to academia in 1914. Two years later, she was elected president of Mills College and introduced ambitious plans to transform it into a rival of Vassar, Wellesley, and other prestigious East Coast women’s colleges and universities.

Reinhardt, also a member and eventual chair of Oakland’s Chamber of Commerce City Planning Committee, tied her ambitions for Mills College to those of the city of Oakland and its development. Wanting to build a world-class campus, she persuaded Phoebe Hearst to commission Bernard Maybeck to design a grand new scheme for the women’s college. His vision included several monumental, Classical-style buildings as well as a boulevard along the East Bay hills, from the Claremont Hotel at the Oakland–Berkeley border to the eastern edge of the campus. Members of the City Council and Chamber of Commerce were also interested in rezoning the area immediately surrounding the college for a business district and in reconfiguring the streets to showcase the college’s entrance. All of these plans were intended to make Mills College for Oakland what the University of California was for Berkeley: a destination along the local tourist circuit and an intellectual and cultural anchor for a neighborhood that attracted the most desirable residents, businesses, and merchants.

Meanwhile, Cameron and the mission board were looking for a suitable location to build a new orphanage. The building at 920 Sacramento Street (now the Donaldina Cameron House) suffered from chronic overcrowding, and Cameron had never been satisfied with what she described as its cell-like quality. In 1915, the Tooker Memorial Home for Chinese Girls and Children opened in Oakland’s Chinatown to relieve the San Francisco quarters of its youngest inhabitants, but it also proved too small and dilapidated.
When shipping magnate Robert Dollar, who had a longtime interest in the mission, donated land adjacent to Mills College to the mission board in 1918, a permanent home devoted solely to children finally was built. The $125,000 building for sixty-five girls opened in December 1925. It was named Ming Quong, or “radiant light.”

As with her other projects, Morgan's creation addressed her client's needs while responding to the preexisting environment. She designed a U-shaped, painted reinforced concrete building of two stories plus a basement, with a red-clay tile gable roof and teal-blue wide-eave overhangs. Multi-lite, wood-frame casement windows abound on every elevation, allowing natural light to flood all the rooms. The building features many Chinese cultural references, including a pailu, or traditional Chinese gateway, which lends monumentality to the structure. Chinese Foo dogs sit atop the pailu, guarding the entrance and courtyard and flanking a large lotus flower leaf, a symbol of purity. A low balustrade with raised panels and Chinese finials partially encloses the courtyard. The north and south elevations also have decorative molded archways that echo the main pailu. Other cultural references include glazed blue, brown, and green punched tiles from China, which break up the monotony of the frieze. Large flower boxes with decorative raised panels, carved brackets, and Chinese finials hang below the second-story windows overlooking the courtyard and part of the north and south elevations.

Despite these explicit Chinese references, the building fits harmoniously with the adjacent Mills College campus and its variety of Mediterranean-style buildings, many of which Morgan also designed. As such, an alumnus who visited the campus during the fall of 1925 mistook Ming Quong for a long-awaited memorial hall dedicated to education activist Ethel Moore, which Morgan also designed and whose funding Aurelia Reinhardt struggled to raise.38

Publicly and professionally, Reinhardt applauded Cameron and her new building. She even attended events at Ming Quong in support of improving Chinese and Anglo-Saxon American relations. Behind the scenes, however, she had engaged in vigorous efforts to stop the construction of the orphanage. Believing that the “Chinese Institute” would sink the district immediately adjacent to Mills College to “the lowest class possible,” she requested to speak to the Board of Health about issues that adversely affected Mills in the nearby development, considered submitting a petition to zone the land to bar the orphanage, tried to persuade the mission board that the site would not suit its purposes, and sought to convince the college to purchase the land from the mission board. These efforts (concurrent with attempts to remove an African American school from the vicinity and “whiten” the community for development) ultimately failed, but Reinhardt did secure one mitigating measure to minimize the orphanage’s perceived adverse effects: a row of pine trees that still stand along MacArthur Boulevard.39 The trees hid the orphanage from visitors as they approached the college, which was careful to place its gates to the east of the orphanage’s entrance.

Cameron and Reinhardt represent two elements of the movement to enhance women’s place in

Opposite: In creating the Ming Quong home for orphaned Chinese girls (1925), Morgan resolved conflicting racial tensions between her clients Aurelia Reinhardt, president of the adjacent Mills College, and the famed missionary Donaldina Cameron. She included Chinese motifs in the building but made sure the structure fit harmoniously with the Mediterranean-style architecture of Mills College, which purchased the building ten years later. In 1999, the building’s original purpose as a haven for young girls came full circle with its establishment as a middle school inspired by its namesake, the Julia Morgan School for Girls.

Courtesy of The Bancroft Library
California and broaden their opportunities outside the home. The stories behind Ming Quong and Mills College, however, reveal the continued racism and elitism that marked the women’s movement, assuring affluent white women the greatest opportunity to pursue higher education, professional development, and a role in policy making or other fields across an increasingly broad spectrum of causes.

**Chinatown YWCA**

Three years after Ming Quong opened, the San Francisco YWCA initiated a building program that resulted in one of Julia Morgan’s masterpieces and that foreshadowed an entirely different spatial politics of ethnicity and gender. The new building for the Chinatown YWCA was built concurrently with and adjacent to an eight-story residence for the San Francisco association. The relationship between the two buildings suggests the changing dynamics between white and Chinese women in San Francisco. As Peggy Pascoe and subsequent historians have noted, Chinatown women did not passively submit to the authority of the white women who ran institutions such as the rescue missions or the YWCA. But the white women who sought moral authority through charitable and social welfare work were not immutable to change, either. And whereas affluent white women dominated the fundraising, design, and operations of charities and welfare organizations that Morgan had designed previously for Chinese communities, women of Chinese heritage largely controlled the creation and operations of the Chinatown YWCA. Thus, while Morgan’s earlier buildings like Ming Quong reflect an educated and sensitive curatorship of Asian art and objects, the Chinatown YWCA stands as an expression of Chinese American cultural identity.40

Founded in 1916, the Chinatown YWCA faced challenging variables while developing its program according to the prescribed goals of the national organization. As the central board of the San Francisco YWCA noted, the nature of most Chinese women’s employment—in factories and tea rooms and as stock girls and domestic servants—required long and irregular hours that made scheduling YWCA recreational and educational activities difficult. Language barriers persisted, complicating the translation of YWCA goals and exacerbating generational differences within the Chinatown community. And the traditional social organization of Chinatown families, clans, and district associations intensified cliques or limited the activities that young women were permitted. While the Americanizing influence of the YWCA and other Christian organizations was notable and loosened the bonds of restrictive patriarchal power, the majority of Chinatown women still lived according to traditional gender codes and faced limited opportunities.41

Despite these challenges, the Chinatown YWCA quickly established itself as a vital neighborhood institution. By the mid-1920s, it counted over 700 members and served over 15,000 women and girls every year. A number of factors contributed to this success. Although a white woman managed the Chinatown YWCA until 1932, most of its board and employees were Chinese and especially sensitive to community needs. Its English-language courses and interpretation services were particularly important for dealing with labor and legal issues. The Chinatown association also offered assistance with immigration issues; job training for a social landscape in which women increasingly worked; and health, hygiene, and well-baby programs that improved infant mortality rates. Use of the Chinese-language press and devotion to inclusiveness assured that a wide cross section of the population learned about an ever-growing list of services. With such programs, the Chinatown YWCA also found significant support among white and Chinese business, political, and reform
leaders who wanted to rebuild from the ashes of the earthquake and fires of 1906 a Chinatown that dispelled nineteenth-century myths of an unsanitary, immoral neighborhood of people that could not be assimilated and therefore deserved little in the way of commercial, political, social, or charitable services and support.42

By 1926, the Chinatown YWCA had outgrown its facilities and its board members requested new quarters for recreation, education, and housing. Recognizing the Chinatown YWCA as a model in surmounting obstacles to build an important local institution, the central board of the San Francisco YWCA decided in 1928 not only to find new quarters for the Chinese association but also authorize a building campaign for its construction.43

The central board first addressed location. It decided to purchase three adjacent lots on Powell and Clay Streets, the former technically in the affluent Nob Hill neighborhood and the latter just inside Chinatown, still a panoply of mostly negative stereotypes. This decision was risky. The board recognized the trend among young city women toward apartment living rather than group residences but felt that Chinatown’s stigma could hamper efforts to populate the new building, making it a dangerously costly investment. However, convinced that Morgan’s Italian Renaissance Revival design for the residence building—along with such amenities as laundry facilities, a beauty parlor, kitchenettes, and private social spaces—was so “exciting and attractive” that it would appeal to enough women to ensure occupancy near full capacity, the board decided to take the risk. This decision signaled the YWCA’s movement toward ethnic integration, one that accelerated significantly after World War II.44

The development of two adjoining YWCA buildings—the YWCA residence and the Chinatown YWCA (1932)—tells a tale of shifting power dynamics of ethnic groups within the California women’s movement, and particularly in San Francisco. Morgan’s L-shaped residence building straddled the affluent neighborhood of Nob Hill and Chinatown, blurring the traditional boundaries between white and Chinese communities. Her design for the Chinatown YWCA (above) rejected Chinese building stereotypes that emerged after the 1906 earthquake and fires and integrated Chinese motifs within the framework of Western architecture. Suitably, today the building is home to the Chinese Historical Society of America.
Choosing the architect came next. This decision also fell to the central board, which chose Julia Morgan. Her affiliation with the San Francisco YWCA began in 1927 with alterations and additions to the organization’s headquarters on Sutter Street. Although she was the third architect the board had consulted in two years, Morgan proved the most adept at addressing its needs. By this time, Morgan had fifteen years of experience designing buildings for the YWCA in California, Hawaii, Washington, and Utah. As the women of the San Francisco YWCA quickly discovered, she knew better than any other architect—male or female—the organization’s program requirements and how to translate them into spatial and aesthetic realities. Thus in January 1929, the central board hired Morgan to design the residence on Powell Street as well as new buildings for the Japanese and Chinese YWCA associations.

The residence and the Chinese YWCA buildings provide material and spatial evidence of an ongoing process of multiculturalism and intercultural cooperation. Morgan presented a design for the residence in which white and Chinese women shared the same building but not the same entrance. The women of both the central board and the Chinatown YWCA board considered this plan too radical at first but eventually accepted Morgan’s scheme. A retractable partition separates the white members’ section of the residence, which opens onto Powell Street, from the Chinese section, which has a separate entrance on Clay Street. Though the entire building is designed in an Italian Renaissance style, the ground-floor Chinese wing opens onto a courtyard featuring windows with a Chinese cloud lift detail. Three Chinese-style towers overlook the courtyard, two of which belong to the Chinese YWCA building and the tallest of which occurs where the white and Chinese wings of the residence building meet. The courtyard’s south wall, which is part of the white members’ residence wing, features punched glazed tiles with Chinese motifs. Morgan’s plan acknowledges that racism was by no means dead, even at the relatively liberal San Francisco YWCA (ethnic minority staff members, for example, earned lower pay for years to come), but the infusion of an Eastern aesthetic underscores a dialectic, rather than sheer dominance or oppression, between hegemonic and minority cultures.

Morgan worked closely with the all-Chinese board of the Chinese YWCA to create an association building adjacent to the Chinese wing of the residence. Meeting in the library of her financial district office, they discussed programmatic needs and aesthetic preferences. The building’s most dominant feature was the gymnasium, with its monumental arched ceiling and roof. Though it featured Chinese details, particularly in the screen that frames the stage, it is a decidedly American space. Like American educators who since the late nineteenth century embraced athletics as vital to the healthy development of young women and who made sports part of the high school and college curricula, the YWCA also focused increasingly on physical health. Basketball courts, tennis courts, and swimming pools were as important in YWCA facilities as were classrooms and even more important than large halls that served evangelical purposes. Similarly, the Chinatown YWCA building committee deemed a gymnasium of paramount importance and allotted it a full three-quarters of the construction budget. Morgan had to persuade the central board, which still controlled the finances, to release an extra $10,000 for classrooms. If, as Judy Yung has suggested, the traditional Chinese practice of foot binding can be considered a metaphor for the changing place of Chinese American women from the mid-nineteenth century through the twentieth, no space better captures the idea of “unbound feet” and a definitive rejection of the traditional Chinese gender system than the Chinatown YWCA gymnasium.
Americanization programs were common to the YWCA’s national goals, and although the women of the Chinatown YWCA embraced Western values, they also embraced their ethnic culture. Thus, presumably at her client’s request, Morgan infused the building with many decorative Chinese details. Molded concrete panels with Chinese dragons in the center break the plane of the red brick exterior cladding, and the roof is covered with handmade green tiles imported from China. Inside, Morgan applied a traditional Chinese color scheme, with red posts, a red-and-green ceiling, and blue-and-gold stencils. A Chinese dragon painted into the concrete floor of a hallway looks out onto a meditation patio and koi pond; this dragon motif continues subtly in the curvature of a stairway behind the entrance desk, which features a gold screen. Although the rooms of the main floor are small—apart from the gymnasium—interior windows, decorated cupboards, and ornamental panels abound, resulting in an intimate and sumptuous space.

In her 1937 survey of the San Francisco association, national board representative Myra Smith declared the Chinatown building beautiful but “inadequate for YWCA purposes.” She did not elaborate on how the building failed to serve the national organization’s purposes. Instead, she critiqued at length the San Francisco YWCA’s decentralized hierarchy. Her interviews with members of the Chinese YWCA board reveal that they did not know much about the YWCA program, that the necessity to work long hours...
prevented virtually all the women from attending meetings with the central board, and that when they did attend, the issues discussed remained remote to their needs.49

That the Chinatown YWCA did not conform to the national program reinforces the reality that however strong the national organization’s Americanization efforts, Chinatown women drew from them only those that best suited the local community. Thus, though both Chinese and American ideas and ideals shaped the local association’s program, the building at 965 Clay Street symbolizes a California women’s movement in transition: neither unified and monolithic nor integrated, but beginning to embrace multiculturalism.

WOMEN’S EMPOWERMENT AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE STATE: ASILOMAR

One project stands out as a monument to the California women’s movement: Asilomar, the YWCA’s western conference grounds. Between 1912 and 1928, Morgan designed sixteen buildings, ten tent houses, a forty-car garage, and recreational facilities on a rolling landscape of sand dunes, cypress trees, and California native plants within earshot of the crashing waves of the Pacific Ocean and the soft sands of Moss Beach, as the beach beyond the conference grounds was named. She created a deceptively informal landscape, grading only the land immediately under each building, but carefully organized the buildings in a Beaux-Arts fashion around a series of circles connected by winding pathways.

The buildings, too, were informal. One or two stories high, they are designed in the Bay Tradition style with local materials. The unpainted shingled buildings blend into the largely untamed landscape, which serves as exterior ornamentation. And with the exception of the large auditorium’s stenciled frieze, the buildings feature little or no interior ornamentation. Redwood clads the walls. Exposed trusses and beams create visual interest and a sense of spaciousness, while large fireplaces in common spaces draw visitors to a central space. Merrill Hall, the auditorium, looms over the central circle of buildings. Its pointed-arch windows evoke Gothic architecture, underscoring the YWCA’s Christian mission. Though the lodge, with its Beaux Arts–style grand stairway, appealed to the wealthy board members who resided there, the dusty paths approaching the building’s off-center entrance undermine the building’s formality and contribute to the democratic message that the YWCA hoped to convey to its members.

From the outset, Asilomar’s creation linked YWCA women to powerful business interests and the broader development of the state. The Pacific Improvement Company, a holding company founded in 1869 by the “Big Four” of the Southern Pacific Railroad (Collis Huntington, Leland Stanford, Charles Crocker, and Mark Hopkins), owned the land on which the conference grounds were built. The company’s purpose was to manage the railroad’s extensive landholdings and develop the land to increase ridership. The most famous and successful experiment to that end during the nineteenth century was the construction of Monterey’s luxurious Hotel Del Monte, which transformed that quiet fishing village into a popular seaside resort.50

In 1913, the Pacific Improvement Company agreed to offer the national board between twenty and thirty-five acres of land at Moss Beach, near the Christian resort town of Pacific Grove just south of Monterey. The board had to pay one dollar per acre per year, with the stipulation that $20,000–$35,000 worth of capital improvements (dependent on the size of land) be made over the course of ten years. If the YWCA accomplished this feat, it would own the deed to the land.51
While the company did not demand a significant outlay, it was not in the business of charity; development of Asilomar potentially could quadruple the property value for its Monterey-area landholdings and entice further development.\textsuperscript{52} The offer challenged the YWCA to engage in property development on an unprecedented scale for women. And the women of the YWCA’s Pacific Coast branch embraced the challenge.

Funding the project presented a monumental task. It brought together thousands of women from throughout the state for a common purpose. Despite regional rivalries that inhibited cooperation and civility between local associations, YWCA members from San Diego to Oakland engaged in creative and usually small-scale fundraising events. Nineteenth-century-style fundraising, however, was not enough to build Asilomar. The national board appointed Ella Schooley to manage the financial affairs for the new conference site. She had owned a large business in Kansas City, Missouri, before serving as general secretary of the St. Louis YWCA, where she had orchestrated the funding drives and worked closely with the architect in the erection of a $500,000 building.\textsuperscript{53} Schooley pursued a number of funding resources, including gifts from southern California’s wealthiest and most powerful business leaders and discarded silverware and dishes from the railroad companies. She also organized visits for potential donors to experience for themselves the site’s natural beauty and the aesthetic appeal of Morgan’s designs.\textsuperscript{54}

Most importantly, Schooley linked Asilomar to California’s significant tourism industry. She launched a statewide campaign to advertise the grounds as a vacation camp for women, distributing 1,000 posters to Southern Pacific Railroad depots, information bureaus, YWCA buildings, and churches and 3,000 informational booklets to libraries, stores, Sunday schools, and women’s clubs.\textsuperscript{55} Located just north of Carmel and south of Monterey, Asilomar was connected to two other popular tourist attractions: El Camino Real, a romanticized automobile excursion roughly following the mission trail of Junipero Serra from San Diego to Sonoma, and the Seventeen Mile Drive, a scenic tour of the coast from the former Mexican California capital of Monterey to the bohemian arts town Carmel-by-the-Sea, including Pebble Beach and the jewel in the center of this drive, the new Pebble Beach Lodge. According to Schooley’s discussions with a local builder, however, Asilomar’s administration building was far superior to the lodge.\textsuperscript{56} By 1918, Schooley could report to Phoebe Hearst—a member of the Pacific Coast Field Committee—over $5,000 in profit, 93 percent coming from room and board, an indication of how popular the site had become in just five years. Indeed, so solid were the conference center’s finances that the national board decided to purchase an additional twenty acres.\textsuperscript{57}

A popular tourist destination in its own right, Asilomar also was an empowering women’s space. It raised the profile of organized womanhood in California to a national level at a time when the importance of the state itself was reaching national attention. California had figured little in the minutes of national board meetings, but as YWCA women worked toward the creation of the first conference center designed and built by and for women, their activities began to fill pages. The ability to claim a space as the organization’s own served as a declaration of independence, for it relieved the YWCA from the time-consuming task of securing rental spaces for conferences every year. Instead, other organizations sought to rent Asilomar.\textsuperscript{58}

YWCA conferences at Asilomar not only trained college women in Christian leadership but also provided job opportunities and networking possibilities that placed young women at an advantage in the search to find work after graduation. One of the most striking features of the conference grounds and individual buildings is the emphasis
Morgan first worked with the YWCA in 1912, when she designed a temporary conference site on the grounds of La Hacienda del Pozo de Verona, Phoebe Hearst’s estate in eastern Alameda County. The platform tent structures (above) were then moved to Asilomar, the country’s first YWCA conference center, when it opened in Pacific Grove in 1913. They provided simple, but adequate accommodations for conference-goers and tourists until the 1960s. The first permanent building constructed at Asilomar was the Phoebe A. Hearst Social Hall (opposite), which brought the activities of California’s YWCAs to the attention of national leaders. Designed in the Bay Tradition style, Asilomar buildings celebrate California’s natural landscape; features such as unpainted woodwork, local river stone, exposed structural elements, and expansive windows appear to absorb the outdoors.

Courtesy of the California History Section, California State Library, Sacramento, California (above); Phoebe Hearst Social Hall, California Historical Society, CHS2012.867.tif (opposite)

on communal spaces, which facilitated the expansion of feminine discourse. As Asilomar women socialized, recreated, and learned in large numbers, they also engaged in serious discussions about current issues, from suffrage to war and world peace.

Even Asilomar’s aesthetic generated an empowering image of California womanhood. As one writer observed, “Now, there are camps and camps. This one would satisfy alike John Burroughs and John Ruskin; Thoreau and Roosevelt would be equally at home here.” Like this writer, virtually all scholars on Arts and Crafts architecture equate it with masculinity, an attempt by white, middle-class, and affluent men to counter the effeminate effects of white-collar work and a modern industrial society or to make the hearth more appealing to men and entice them to spend more time at home. The rustic aesthetic functioned in the opposite way for women. It evoked images of women unbound by domestic walls, getting dirty, perhaps, in skirts that rose well above the ankles. Through Morgan’s design, California’s women asserted strength and independence.
The YWCA’s function shifted significantly in the post–World War II era, rendering Asilomar redundant and a financial drain. The YWCA sold the facility to the state in 1956 and, to this day, it remains one of the two most profitable state parks (the other is Hearst Castle, another Julia Morgan creation). To echo Elsa Black’s sentiments, it stands as a testament to the bold determination, optimism, and foresight of “women who build.”

THE END OF THE BUILDING ERA

The 1930s marked the end of building for the California women’s movement. A number of reasons can explain the demise of this political style and path to power and influence. Funding for the maintenance of old buildings and construction of new ones disappeared with the onset of the Great Depression. Large donations from wealthy philanthropists, membership dues, or special event proceeds—on which most women’s organizations heavily depended for their nonprofit or charity status—diminished dramatically in the sour economy.

Generational differences also rendered residential club life obsolete. As Estelle Freedman first argued, women’s groups since the late nineteenth century espoused separatism as a strategy for creating opportunities in education, professions,
politics, and reform in order to achieve access to many of the same privileges as men without having to compete ferociously against them.\textsuperscript{62} Their efforts resulted in a transformed landscape, particularly in urban areas, that drew women into more heterosocial spaces; created jobs, particularly for educated women who previously found very few places they could apply their knowledge; and fostered a general desire to live independently. Now the social, educational, economic, and political structures that had brought women together were no longer as firmly entrenched. Suffrage, the one cause that long united women across class, race, and region, also had been won. These changes made the need for women’s clubs and institutions less important and their building programs less viable. With increased governmental oversight of and expenditure on health, social welfare, and educational programs—the mainstay of private organizations for decades—women’s influence in the continual development of these landscapes was curtailed.

As the period of building came to a close, California’s organized women could point to an impressive array of buildings—more designed by Morgan than by any other architect—that left a permanent record of their changing place in society and of the many causes they championed throughout the Progressive Era. That the buildings were completed at all testifies to the importance that Californians placed on the issues these women claimed as their own, for thousands of both wealthy and working-class people financed their construction. Though the stories behind these buildings confirm that privileged white women created the greatest opportunities for themselves and imposed their beliefs on the less privileged and on ethnic minorities, they also reveal that this hierarchy gradually gave way to a more democratic and inclusive movement.

Morgan generally refused to talk about her buildings, declaring that they speak for themselves. To this writer, they scream out that the architect was a devout women’s activist. This essay only scratches the surface of the role buildings played in the California women’s movement. Their study—which draws a link between the process of creation and the meanings behind aesthetic expression—is an invitation to future historians to peek inside and explore the interconnection between these spaces and the people who used them.

Karen McNeill is an independent scholar currently writing the first intellectual biography of Julia Morgan. She lives in the San Francisco Bay Area, where she teaches history and works in historic preservation and public history.
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35 Huntington’s marble sculpture is called “Youth” and was unveiled to hundreds of guests on the first anniversary of the club building’s opening. Mesic, “Berkeley Women’s City Club”; “Clara Huntington Bas Relief Unveiled at Berkeley City Club,” Oakland Tribune, Nov. 21, 1931.


38 Julia Morgan designed Ethel Moore Memorial Hall, a residence hall, but not the one that was finally built. Walter Ratcliff designed the actual dormitory in 1926. Reinhardt to Morgan, Oct. 24, 1925, folder 111, RG IID, Reinhardt Papers; Woodruff Minor and Kiran Singh, The Architecture of Ratcliff (Berkeley, CA: Heyday Books, 2006), 73.
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40 In her book Relations of Rescue, Peggy Pascoe illustrates how Chinese women who lived at San Francisco’s Presbyterian Chinese Mission acculturated to the Americanization program and Victorian womanhood insomuch as they benefitted them materially and financially but retained aspects of their cultural heritage. In Pascoe’s study, white women, particularly as represented by Donaldina Cameron, remain static figures in their quest to achieve moral authority, unchanged by their constant interactions with women of different social and ethnic backgrounds. While Jensen does not suggest that white women tried to change racial hierarchies, she does argue that the popular act of collecting Asian art and material or
wearing traditional Asian clothes was less an act of cultural exploitation than a studied exercise and one through which many women expressed their identification with exploitative patriarchal domination. See Joan Jensen, “Women on the Pacific Rim: Some Thoughts on Border Crossing,” Pacific Historical Review 67, no. 1 (February 1998): 3–38.


43 Annual Report of the President of the YWCA, Jan. 1926–1927 (hereafter cited as Annual Report) and minutes of SFYWCA board meeting, Oct. 15, 1928, SFYWCA.

44 The central board calculated correctly; the San Francisco residence ran at 98.5 percent capacity from the day it opened its doors through at least World War II. Annual Report and San Francisco YWCA board minutes, May 19, 1930, July 2, 1931, SFYWCA; “A Delightful Place to Live,” brochure for the Residence Club, San Francisco YWCA, reel 165, and Questionnaire, 1946, YWCA Record Files.

45 Minutes, San Francisco YWCA, Nov. 19, 1926, Sept. 23, Oct. 28, and Nov. 18, 1927, and Jan. 25, 1929, SFYWCA; Annual Report, SFYWCA.


49 Ibid., 2, 6.


51 Pacific Grove was founded as Pacific Grove Retreat Association in 1875. It was a Methodist seaside resort and campground, and within its first year a dozen cottages and several tents were constructed to accommodate 400 guests. With the construction of Hotel del Monte in 1880 and the infusion of Pacific Improvement Company funds into the development of the peninsula, the Monterey area gained popularity. People of no particular religious affiliation began to settle in Pacific Grove, more or less closing its brief history as a Chataqua of the West. Minutes, national board, May 29 and Oct. 2, 1912, reel 25, YWCA Record Files; Quachia, Julia Morgan, 116–18.

52 Quachia, Julia Morgan, 127.

53 Harriet Taylor to Phoebe Hearst, Oct. 7, 1912, Hearst Papers; Minutes, Feb. 5, 1913, reel 25, YWCA Record Files.

54 Schooley to Hearst, May 12, 1913, and July 16, 1913, box 50, folder 24, Hearst Papers.

55 Schooley to Hearst, Apr. 23, 1914, box 24, folder 50, and Pacific Coast Field Committee Minutes, May 25, 1914, box 51, folder 6, Hearst Papers.

56 Schooley to Hearst, May 19, 1913, box 50, folder 24, Hearst Papers.

57 Notably, the invention of El Camino Real, which appealed to modern interest in automobile touring and nostalgia for California’s Spanish past, originated with women. See Phoebe S. Kropf, California Vieja: Culture and Memory in a Modern American Place (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006), 47–102. Chairman (Conference Grounds Committee) to Mrs. F. E. Shine, (President YWCA, Bisbee, AZ), Mar. 14, 1917, box 50, folder 21, and Schooley to Hearst, July 20, 1916, Apr. 1, 1918, box 50, folder 24, Hearst Papers.

58 News of the Pacific Coast Field Committee first appeared in the minutes of the national board meetings in Oct. 1911 with the announcement that Phoebe A. Hearst would hold the 1912 regional conference at her estate in Pleasanton, where the topic of most importance would be purchasing a permanent site for the Pacific Coast Conference. Executive Minutes, National Board of the YWCA of the USA, Oct. 19, 1911, 2, reel 25, YWCA Record Files.


61 Lyons and Wilson, Who’s Who among the Women of California, 47.

Americans love to contemplate lost things—gold mines, airplanes, ships, and people—then go looking for them. In the case of Everett Ruess, this young man became a symbol of the starry-eyed wanderer and poster child for wilderness advocates, receiving a good share of his notoriety due to two things—poignant letters that chronicle inner turmoil mixed with spirited elation and his disappearance in southeastern Utah, never to be found.

Roughly a third of this book dwells on Ruess’s “astonishing afterlife” and the people who unsuccessfully pursued the mystery of his demise.

Fradkin has created a work that surpasses all others written about Ruess. Heavily documented, it provides a rich context in historical fact and social analysis, daring to go where others have not trod. Controversial topics such as the possibility of Ruess having a manic depressive disorder, questions of sexual preference, his inability to maintain normal relationships, and academia’s debacle in the DNA testing of skeletal remains give the writing an “edgy” quality. The author, backed by expert opinion, argues a point of view that removes any halo and grounds his subject in reality. Weaving Ruess’s words throughout the text blends the familiar (with those who have read his writings) with a new awareness of his complexity. Fradkin achieves balance in portraying an unbalanced soul.

For the reader of California history, particularly pertinent are the chapters about Ruess’s early years in this, his birth state, which he later explored at age nineteen (1933). Both his mother and father were comfortable in privileged society and so, not surprisingly, Everett chummed with a number of California luminaries such as Maynard Dixon, Dorothea Lange, Ansel Adams, and others in the art community, as he worked on block prints and dabbled in poetry. Flirtation with formal schooling failed, society evoked claustrophobia, and sustained personal interaction was elusive. The open spaces—in both land and relationship—brought peace to his soul, if any was to be found. His letters provide the greatest insight into why he felt this way; the landscape that fostered this mood, and with which he is most often identified, was in the Four Corners region.

Ruess’s disappearance, while tragic, seemed fitting for one wishing to be alone and at one with the universe. In life he only required a couple of burros, a dog, and some basic equipment to be generally happy, while the Great Depression encouraged others to seek material security. Only with departure and death did complexity find its way to his footsteps. From search parties to memorial services, from eyewitness interviews to DNA, and from the humblest Navajo to university professors, the interest in his disappearance catapulted him to fame; he remains an unsolved mystery. His “short life, mysterious death, and astonishing afterlife” says as much about society then and now as it does about the man. Fradkin triumphs in telling this story.
Empires, Nations & Families lives up to the promise of its title, placing families firmly in the context of empire and nation building in the American West. And Anne F. Hyde manages to do this in authoritative yet unstuffy writing and command of the broad sweep of relevant historiography. It is the second of six projected books in the “History of the American West” series.

Hyde synthesizes Western historiography to show how “vying empires”—French, Spanish, English, Russian, and American—were built by “family connections across national and ethnic lines” (5), which expanded global trade networks based on the fur trade and Indian nations of the Great Plains and the Pacific Coast. The “family connections” started with white men and American Indian or Mexican women. Hyde examines these mixed-race families by tracing the fur trade in a number of regions and, for each region, one or two families. These include the Chouteau-Laclede family, founders of St. Louis; the Wilson family in Los Angeles; and the Vallejos in Sonoma.

But the promise of the West as a place of flourishing “kinship across national and racial borders” (496), ended with the arrival of racist and land-hungry American settlers. They ushered in the “Indian wars” of the 1850s–1870s, along with anti-Mexican laws and attitudes. The 1860s saw “conquest of one people by another” by “extermination and erasure” (496).

Hyde’s analysis of California succeeds when focused on the big picture—the interactions of international, national, regional, community and family relations—but is weaker when the focus is local. There are mistakes and misinterpretations, some coming from the secondary sources, but a number of the author’s own creation. For example, Hyde confuses the Native peoples of southern California with those of central and northern California during the Gold Rush.

Empires, Nations & Families contributes persuasive arguments to the historiography of the American West. The author offers intriguing insights, such as the argument that “stability over time” (29), rather than change, characterized the growth of the fur trade in the first half of the nineteenth century. Hyde also reminds readers that without women—as spouses and co-managers—the fur trade would not have succeeded. Read this book for its sweeping analysis and impressive integration of family history with world history.
Sarah Elkind’s superb book explores the politics of natural resource management in Los Angeles between 1920 and 1950. This transitional period in American politics bridged the Progressive Era’s use of government authority to check the power of business and the Cold War’s suspicion of centralized government. As such, the period gave rise to some characteristic features of today’s national political landscape. Los Angeles is a paradigmatic location for studying those origins.

Elkind answers two vitally important questions. First, how did business come to be equated with the public interest? Historians have long recognized the decisive political power that local business interests such as railroads, newspapers, and chambers of commerce wielded in early twentieth-century southern California. This power, however, has generally been taken as a given. Elkind, in contrast, explains how it emerged. In three chapters on environmental controversies—beach access, air pollution, and flood control—she recounts the processes by which local business groups cast themselves as the voice of the public interest, and reinforced this claim by conducting studies, formulating proposals, and placing them before local officials stamped with the imprimatur of apparent public approval. Thus, these groups performed the important governmental function of vetting and prioritizing policy options while also providing officials effective political cover of appearing to advance the public interest. A powerful and enduring partnership ensued in which local officials accepted business interests as the voice of the people and business enjoyed considerable ability to influence policy in its favor.

That influence did not remain solely local. Elkind’s second important question is what consequences did such arrangements have for federal policy? The flood-control chapter, along with those on Hoover Dam’s hydroelectric power and Harry Truman’s Water Resources Policy Commission, demonstrate that because federal agencies relied on local government to set policy priorities and generate local support, local business agendas consistently found their way into federal policymaking. In fact, as the national crisis mentality of the Great Depression and Second World War gave way to Cold War fears of centralized power, the partnership between local government and local business came to be seen as the antidote to the threat of big government and the hallmark of good policy. This set the stage for the antifederal government rhetoric that has shaped American politics ever since.

Today’s acrimonious debates over the proper relationship between government, business, and the public render the history of how business came to be seen as a bulwark against public institutions particularly salient. Elkind’s book, which is clearly written, meticulously researched, and extraordinarily balanced in assessing historical players’ motives and actions, offers a fine treatment of the subject and beckons additional inquiry into case studies beyond Los Angeles.
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A SHORT HISTORY OF LAKE TAHOE

By Michael J. Makley (Reno and Las Vegas: University of Nevada Press, 2011, 192 pp., $21.95 paper)

Reviewed by Patricia Ann Owens, Professor of History, Wabash Valley College, Mount Carmel, Illinois

Lake Tahoe is known for its stunning beauty and its plethora of recreational opportunities, but without a doubt many of the lake’s admirers do not know much about its history. Michael J. Makley, author of several regional histories, offers a succinct, readable account of the sapphire-jewel lake and its surrounding localities.

Divided into twelve chapters, each richly illustrated with black-and-white photographs, the author commences with the Washoe Indians who inhabited the lakeshore for hundreds of years. Providing substance to the people, the Washoe revered the lake. This was not true of Anglo Americans, who first entered the region in 1844 when John C. Frémont viewed Lake Tahoe from atop Red Lake Peak. Settlers soon followed, harvesting timber and cutting roads to such mining regions as the Comstock Lode, all in total disregard of the region’s ecosystem: their emphasis was on making money from the bountiful natural resources.

By the late 1850s, a new source of revenue was available from tourists who came to take in the scenery while staying at the guest hotels that had sprung up around the lakeshore. “Resorting” became a thriving enterprise and the post–World War II years saw an influx of visitors with cars and money to spend at the gambling resorts that opened on the Nevada side of the lake. By the 1960s, the lake’s ski areas were attracting even more tourists. Hikers and rock climbers discovered a locale rich in natural history, geology and adventure.

Increasing visitation places a strain on all those special natural areas that we love and the same is true for Lake Tahoe. Today there is renewed interest in preserving the ecosystem and the fragile environment while making the area accessible to visitors.

Makley presents a fascinating account of the people who have traversed through the region and those who stayed, of geology and nature at its best, and of the Native Americans who first recognized the sacredness of this scenic wonder that Mark Twain called “the masterpiece of the Creation.”

COVINA VALLEY CITRUS INDUSTRY


Reviewed by Paul J. P. Sandul, Assistant Professor of History, Stephen F. Austin State University

“Covina Valley Citrus Industry tells the story of how 25,000 acres of dry, rocky land covered with cactus and sagebrush were turned into a garden paradise by settlers who came from all over the United States.” This opening sentence to Barbara Ann Hall’s introduction for Arcadia Publishers’ Images of America Series gets immediately to the heart of the book’s interpretive thrust. “These men and women developed a successful commercial citrus industry that flourished for 70 years” (7). And this is a story that Hall describes well. The people of Covina Valley in southern California, from Azusa to Glendora, are literally the face of the story. What is most meaningful for those with an interest in citiculture, southern California, labor, boosterism, and nascent metropolitan growth is the social history that Hall provides, which is also conscious of top-down forces such as transportation, technology, and architecture.
The main critique that can be made about this work is not aimed at Hall per se, but is rather endemic of Arcadia’s Image of America series broadly. For example, when looking at the images of the packinghouse employees, among others, it is quite noticeable that women fill out the ranks. Familiarity with the history of labor in California already provided me with much of the context I needed to appreciate the images. But, I suspect, many who pick up the book might not be as familiar. The story of why these women comprised the packinghouse labor pool in such large numbers is untold. Again, my intention here is not to throw the book at Hall, but to recognize that the medium through which the story is told is both a proverbial blessing and curse. Having authored two Arcadia books myself, I am painfully aware of the role that limited pages, and image, word, and caption counts play in the decision-making process concerning how and what to tell. So rather than complaining about what Hall did not do, I again return to what she did so well. That is, the images and the faces are the blessings we should focus on in Arcadia books, particularly Hall’s. They are often a picture window, not the Hubbell Telescope, into a time and place that furthers our understanding of, and appreciation for, the history of any given place.

The social history of Covina Valley Citrus Industry is Hall writing at her best. Thought of as the “bottom up” approach, Hall does just that by making sure she goes all the way up. Mixed in with the faces of those who toiled the fields, worked the packinghouses, and labored in the service sectors are the faces of the middle and upper classes: the “community builders,” entrepreneurs, land owners, and railroad barons. For these people, Hall unpacks a family history, workers’ daily routines, and even seemingly mundane activities. Courting, marriage, leisure, and entertainment fill the pages, too. One cannot help but feel the activities as lived by those who are featured in this story.
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Ms. Mary Ann McNicholas, Alameda
Ms. Rachel Metzger, San Francisco
Mr. & Mrs. Burnett Miller, Sacramento
Mr. & Mrs. O’Malley Miller, Pasadena
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Mr. & Mrs. Joe W. Morganti, Berkeley
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Mr. & Mrs. Richard C. Otter, Belvedere-Tiburon
Ms. Mary J. Parrish, San Francisco
Mr. Warren Perry, San Francisco
James Brice & Carole Peterson, Pleasanton
Dr. & Mrs. John O. Pohlmann, Seal Beach
Ms. Bonnie J. Portnoy, San Rafael
Mr. Herbert C. Puffer, Folsom
Ms. Janice Ransley, San Francisco
Mr. Richard W. Reinhardt, San Francisco
Mr. Terence Riddle, San Francisco
Mr. Daimar Robinson, Salt Lake City, UT
Mr. Robert E. Ronus, Los Angeles
Jeanne Rose, San Francisco
CORPORATE, FOUNDATION & GOVERNMENT SUPPORT

$200,000 and above

$50,000 to $199,000
San Francisco Foundation, San Francisco
The S.D. Bechtel, Jr. Foundation, San Francisco

$10,000 to $49,999
Bland Family Foundation, Saint Louis, MO
Grants for the Arts, San Francisco
Sherwin-Williams, Richardson, TX
The Berkley Fund, Menlo Park
The Bernard Osher Foundation, San Francisco
Union Bank of California Foundation, Los Angeles

$1,000 to $9,999
Cal Humanities, San Francisco
Derry Casey Construction, Inc., San Francisco
Dodge & Cox, San Francisco
Gordon & Betty Moore Foundation, Palo Alto
Hearst Corporation, San Francisco
John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken, NJ
Louise M. Davies Foundation, San Francisco
Moore Dry Dock Foundation, San Francisco
Sansome Street Advisors, San Francisco
Silicon Valley Community Foundation, Mountain View
The Alice Ross Carey Fund for Conservation, San Francisco
The Chrysopolae Foundation, San Francisco
The Consulate General of Switzerland in San Francisco, San Francisco

$250 to $999
Band of Angels, LLC, Menlo Park
Chevron Texaco Matching Gift Program, Princeton, NJ
Cypress Lawn Memorial Park, Daly City
ht Lehman Consulting, Sausalito
JRP Historical Consulting LLC, Davis
Leona & Donald Davis Fund, Greenbrae
Limonene Company, Santa Paula
Raymond K. & Natha Ostby Foundation, Saratoga
Stanley Stairs, Esq., New York, NY
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Amyx Photography, San Francisco
Anchor Brewing Company, San Francisco
Anchor Distilling Company, San Francisco
Apertifs Bar Management, Santa Rosa
Barbary Coast Conservancy of the American Cocktail, San Francisco
Belfor Property Restoration, Hayward
David Burkhart, San Bruno
John Burton, Santa Rosa
David Burkhart, San Francisco
Cavallo Point, Sausalito
Chandon, Yountville
Hafner Vineyard, Alexander Valley
H. Joseph Ehrmann, San Francisco
Drakes Bay Oyster Company, Inverness
Evvy Eisen, Point Reyes Station
Elixir Cocktail Catering, San Francisco
Elixir Saloon, San Francisco
Hearst Ranch Winery, Simeon
Kappa, Daly City
Katzgraphics, San Francisco
Lagunitas Brewing Company, Petaluma
Loyola Marymount University, Los Angeles
Luxardo, San Francisco
Kevin & Nancy Luny, Inverness
Richard Ramos, San Mateo
Safeway, San Francisco
Sentinel, San Francisco
St. Regis, San Francisco
Square One Organic Spirits, San Francisco
The Candy Store, San Francisco
Trader Joe’s, San Francisco
United States Bartenders Guild
Whitehead & Porter LLP, San Francisco
Working Girls Café, San Francisco
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North Baker, Tiburon
Elise Eilers Elliot, Marin County
Muriel T. French, San Francisco
J. Lowell Groves, San Francisco
Louis H. Heilbron, San Francisco
Arthur Mejia, San Francisco
Ms. Mary K. Ryan, San Francisco

Mrs. Benjamin H. Rose III, San Francisco
Mr. Rudolfo Ruibal, Riverside
Ms. Mona Rusk & Mr. Thomas E. Farr, Lafayette
Ms. Susan Sesn Salt, Borrego Spring
Mrs. A. Sawyer, Atherton
Mr. Bernard Schulte, Jr., Orinda
Mr. Jacob Gould Schurman, IV, San Francisco
Rev. Thomas L. Seagrave, San Mateo
Mr. & Mrs. Frederic Shearer, Essex, UK
Mr. David Sheldon, Menlo Park
Mr. John B. & Mrs. Lucretia Sias, San Francisco
Ms. Jan Sinnicks, Petaluma
Mr. Keith Skinner, Berkeley
Ms. Harriet Sollod, San Francisco
Mr. Martin & Mrs. Sherrill A. Spellman, Fremont
Mr. Robert & Mrs. Susan Spjut, San Francisco
Mr. & Mrs. Moreland L. Stevens, Newcastle
Mr. Daniel E. Stone, San Francisco
Mr. & Mrs. Stephen L. Taber, San Francisco
Mr. Arnold Thackray, Menlo Park
Ms. Lynne Tondorf, Daly City
Mr. Richard L. Tower, San Francisco
Mr. Thomas Tragarth, San Francisco
Ms. Marilyn Tragoutsis, San Mateo
Mr. Gerald F. Uelmen, Saratoga
Mr. Christopher VerPlanck, San Francisco
Mr. Paul A. Violich, San Francisco
Ms. Barbara J. Webb, San Francisco
Josh Weinstein & Lisa Simmons, Santa Monica
Miss Nancy P. Weston, Scotts Valley
Walter & Ann Weybright, San Francisco
Kathleen W. Whalen, Sacramento
Mr. Warren R. White, San Francisco
Mr. Thomas J. White, Oakland
Mr. Ed & Mrs. Patti White, Los Altos
Mrs. J. Wiest, Riverside
Mrs. Edwin Woods, Santa Maria
Ms. Nancy C. Woodward, Carmichael
Mr. Robert A. Young, Los Angeles
Ms. Deborah Zepnick, Calabasas
Join the California Legacy Circle

We invite you to make your legacy California’s legacy

Planned gifts—through a bequest, charitable trust, or other estate giving vehicle—will ensure that your passion for California history will continue to be expressed long into the future by becoming a member of the California Legacy Circle.

California Historical Society supporters become members of the California Legacy Circle when they communicate to CHS that they have included CHS in their estate plans. Once we receive this information, your name will be listed prominently as a member of the California Legacy Circle in our membership publication, California History.

For more information please contact 415.357.1848 x215 or email legacy@calhist.org

San Francisco School of Design, ca. 1896, Silver gelatin print
California Historical Society, FN-16648/CHS2009.104.tif
Join the California Historical Society

By becoming a member, you help the California Historical Society collect, preserve, and share our state’s fascinating stories. Your membership supports educational programming and our collection, which includes treasures, such as manuscripts of early settlers, maps, fine art, and over 500,000 images that vividly portray life in California. Join today to support continued and increased public access to the rich resources of the California Historical Society.

Two Easy Ways to Join:
Call 888.247.4733 x229 or go to www.californiahistoricalsociety.org


California Historical Society
678 Mission Street, San Francisco, California 94105

Membership Benefits

Basic $60
- One year subscription to California History magazine
- One year subscription to California Chronicle newsletter
- Free admission to the California Historical Society’s San Francisco gallery for member and three guests
- Reciprocity with the Autry National Center in Los Angeles for member plus one guest

Plus $75
- All of the above and –
  - Passport to History through the Time Travelers Reciprocal program, offering free or reduced price admission to CHS member plus a guest
  - In Southern California, at San Diego Historical Society, Pasadena Museum of History, Heritage Square Museum in Los Angeles, Santa Barbara Trust for Historic Preservation & others
  - In Northern California, at the California Museum for History, Women, and the Arts; History San Jose; Oakland Aviation Museum & others
  - Across the country, at over 250 historical museums

Friend $125
- All of the above and –
  - Golden Passport to Art through the North American Reciprocal Museum program, offering free or reduced admission and discounts on store purchases
  - In California, at Asian Art Museum (SF), Museum of Contemporary Art (LA), de Young Museum (SF), Oakland Museum of California, Legion of Honor (SF), Crocker Art Museum (Sacramento), Skirball (LA) & others
  - Across the United States, Canada, Bermuda and El Salvador at over 300 fine art museums

Contributor $250
- All of the above and –
  - Recognition in California History magazine
  - 2 passes to a History Walkabout tour

Benefactor $500
- All of the above and –
  - Invitation to a private event and exhibition

Silver Circle $1000
- All of the above and –
  - Choice of California Historical Society Press book
  - Special behind-the-scenes tour for ten people
In this absorbing exhibition of nearly 300 items, rarely seen works of art, personal letters, architectural drawings, photographs, and artifacts bring to life the history of the Golden Gate and the ambitious vision and determination to span it. Objects on loan from more than a dozen cultural and public institutions and private lenders join highlights from the California Historical Society's collections in this celebration of the 75th anniversary of the bridge's completion.

LOCATION
California Historical Society
678 Mission Street
San Francisco CA 94105
415-357-1848

DATES AND HOURS
February 26-October 14, 2012;
Tuesday-Sunday; 12:00pm-5:00pm

ADMISSION
Suggested Donation: $5

GUEST CURATOR
Jessica Hough

www.californiahistoricalsociety.org

This exhibition has been generously supported by S. D. Bechtel, Jr. Foundation, Sherwin-Williams, The Bernard Osher Foundation, Cal Humanities, Hearst Corporation, Derry Casey Construction, Inc, Stephen LeSieur and Consulate General of Switzerland in San Francisco.

Images: Raymond Dobb Yolland, Ferry Boat on San Francisco Bay (detail), 1890, California Historical Society, acc #68-73-12; Chesley Bonesell, Ft. Point Base (detail), Collection of GGBH&T; Bridge worker on concrete pillar (detail), ca. 1935-36, CHS:Huggins 015; Golden Gate Bridge opening celebration (detail), May 1937, CHS:Huggins 008.
Photographer Ted Huggins, a public relations representative for Standard Oil Company of California, captured this image of a Golden Gate Bridge worker sitting atop the bridge’s South Tower at a dizzying height during the cable-spinning process. Huggins photographed construction of the bridge from 1934 to 1937. Some of the images he made for Standard Oil are featured in “Bridging the Golden Gate: A Photo Essay” (pages 9–40).

California Historical Society, Huggins Collection, CHS.Huggins.021.tif
A very pleased and proud Mrs. George Genilere stands next to her catch of tuna at Avalon, Santa Catalina Island. One of her game fish weighed in at a robust thirty-three pounds and the other at twenty-nine pounds. Catalina, with its sublime climate and proximity to Los Angeles, was a sea angler’s paradise. At the turn of the last century, the island’s population swelled to eight thousand during fair-weather months.

Catalina’s popularity led to the establishment of the famed Tuna Club in 1898 by noted outdoorsman and naturalist Charles Frederick Holder. This photo, however, clearly demonstrates that piscatorial adventure was not for men only. Mrs. Genilere’s dainty hat, crocheted bertha, and lace-trimmed dress disguised a lady of strength and athleticism who could handle a man-sized rod and reel. One can only imagine her pride as she reeled in the struggling tuna. Holder described the tuna as the pièce de résistance of game fish “on account of its uncertainty.” According to Arturo Bandini, the author of entertaining books on early California and Catalina sport fishing, the spotting of tuna would cause a mad dash for all available boats.

Taken by an unidentified photographer, the print has its caption written into the dry plate negative. The weight of each tuna is carefully written over their tail fins. It is professionally and elegantly mounted on an 11 x 8-inch beveled board, indicating that this sportswoman may have planned to have it framed or placed in a prominent spot in her parlor or dining room.

Gary F. Kurutz

Photographer
Unknown

Location
Avalon, Santa Catalina Island

Caught with Rod & Reel
Avalon, Santa Catalina Island, 1902
Gelatin silver print
California History Section, California State Library
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