

A MECHANISM OF AMERICAN MUSEUM-BUILDING PHILANTHROPY,
1925-1970

Brittany L. Miller

Submitted to the faculty of the University Graduate School
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree
Master of Arts
in the Departments of History and Philanthropic Studies,
Indiana University

August 2010

Accepted by the Faculty of Indiana University, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

Elizabeth Brand Monroe, Ph.D., J.D., Chair

Dwight F. Burlingame, Ph.D.

Master's Thesis
Committee

Philip V. Scarpino, Ph.D.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In the same way that the philanthropists discussed in my paper depended upon a community of experienced agents to help them create their museums, I would not have been able to produce this work without the assistance of many individuals and institutions.

First, I would like to express my thanks to my thesis committee: Dr. Elizabeth Monroe (chair), Dr. Dwight Burlingame, and Dr. Philip Scarpino. After writing and editing for months, I no longer have the necessary words to describe my appreciation for their support and flexibility, which has been vital to the success of this project.

To Historic Deerfield, Inc. of Deerfield, Massachusetts, and its Summer Fellowship Program in Early American History and Material Culture, under the direction of Joshua Lane. My Summer Fellowship during 2007 encapsulated many of my early encounters with the institutional histories and sources necessary to produce this thesis. I am grateful to the staff of Historic Deerfield and the thirty other museums included during the fellowship trips for their willingness to discuss their institutional histories and philanthropic challenges.

To the staff of the Benson Ford Research Center at The Henry Ford in Dearborn, Michigan, who introduced me to W.W. Taylor, H.F. Morton, and F.C. Campsall's accounts of their acquisitions for Henry Ford's museum projects. I could not have completed my archival research during my one-week vacation without their valuable guidance through their extensive collections. Special thanks to Mr. Seth W. Miller for his assistance in procuring rare biographical information on W.W. Taylor.

To the faculty, staff, and students of the Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University and the Department of History (IUPUI) for their encouragement and support. I would like to thank the History H750 class (Spring 2010) for their critiques and insights on early drafts of this thesis. Special thanks to James Kienker for his encouragement and valuable editing on the first full draft of this thesis.

Lastly, I would like to thank my family for their constant support and motivational conversations. They continue to teach me the value of history and philanthropy as essential characteristics of a well-rounded human being. I especially thank my sister, Crystal, for her endless patience, inspiration, and assistance. She has been essential for midnight brainstorming sessions and editing toward the completion of this thesis. I wish her the greatest success in her own graduate endeavors.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Key Terms.....	3
Henry Ford’s Museums.....	5
Methodology.....	8
Scope.....	9
Results.....	12
Applied Research Opportunities.....	14
CHAPTER TWO: A SPARK OF IMAGINATION.....	17
History of American Museums.....	17
Institutional History.....	20
Individual Biographies.....	25
Group Biographies.....	28
Philanthropic History.....	32
Architectural History.....	34
Ideological History.....	36
Historiographical Connections.....	37
CHAPTER THREE: AN ENGINE OF PHILANTHROPY.....	44
Industrial Elite Philanthropy.....	45
Motivations for Supporting Museums.....	48
Philanthropists’ Exhibition of Ideals.....	56

The Common Museum-Building Experience	60
Conclusion	77
CHAPTER FOUR: A MECHANISM OF MUSEUM BUILDING	79
Mechanics of Museum Building.....	80
Acquisition of Artifacts.....	87
The Challenges of Museum Building	96
Conclusion	100
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSIONS	102
APPENDICES	106
Appendix A: Institutional References.....	106
Appendix B: Biographical References.....	108
Appendix C: Select Museum Builders and Their Affiliations.....	121
Appendix D: Presenters for Colonial Williamsburg Antiques Forums	124
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	130
CURRICULUM VITAE	

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

In a letter to the executive director of the Edison Institute, E.I. Allston Boyer of Colonial Williamsburg wrote: “One trouble you have at present . . . is that the Museum is trying to accomplish too much. You are trying to be an industrial museum as well as a fine arts museum. The two collections do not mix very well and I think they should be completely divorced.”¹ Henry Ford’s museum collections combined enormous industrial machinery with exquisite furniture and glass. However, these objects did not constitute two separate and divergent collections. Within the context of the period, Ford’s museums made perfect sense. Ford and his contemporaries perceived industry and art as inherently connected by the presence of intentional design.² The term “industrial art” was applied to these objects.³

Evidence of unifying concepts, such as “industrial art,” lies hidden in museum archives and publications produced between 1925 and 1970. One must consider these sources to comprehend how philanthropists developed American museums based on a system of ideas and a culture of giving. Archival records demonstrate how hundreds of people collaborated under the unifying vision of American industrial philanthropists to form their museums. Although individuals’ contributions rarely received widespread credit, records reveal their activity as part of a national culture of philanthropic giving.

¹ Consultant Report to A.K. Mills (Executive Director, Edison Institute) from E.I. Allston Boyer (Assistant to the President, Colonial Williamsburg), 3 Apr 1951. Consultant Reports, Box 1, Series 175, Edison Institute Collection, Benson Ford Research Center, The Henry Ford, 20900 Oakwood Blvd., Dearborn, Michigan 48124-5020 (Hereafter E.I. #175.)

² Charles R. Richards, *Industrial Art and the Museum* (New York: Macmillan Company, 1927), v-vi, 3, and 51-70.

³ *Ibid.*

Donors worked with members of the industrial elite to form a multi-directional system of philanthropy, shaping American museum growth for future generations.

This thesis investigates why twentieth-century philanthropists, such as Henry Ford,* John and Abby Rockefeller,* Henry du Pont,* and Henry and Helen Flynt,* developed American museums between 1925 and 1970.⁴ These individuals shared similar beliefs and ideological perspectives of American history, which shaped their museum-building efforts. Additionally, philanthropists had financial resources, social networks, and access to agents. The combination of these elements assisted in the establishment of their institutions. Over two generations, these museum builders established an American museum ideal through the implementation of their philanthropy. Philanthropists' extensive financial resources, combined with philanthropic and museum-oriented ideas of the time, provided the impetus for the creation of new museums and collections.

Furthermore, this work investigates Henry Ford as a case study of the philanthropic system used to establish these institutions. Ford's agents mediated an exchange of artifacts and resources between Ford and average people, who were willing to give buildings, furnishings, and industrial machinery to the museum. This multi-directional system of philanthropy exemplifies the relationship between Ford as the philanthropist, his agents, and potential donors, to create his museums. Other philanthropists and institutions are referenced to further illustrate the museum building process and the role of philanthropy established at this time.

In 1927, Charles R. Richards, Vice-President of the American Association of Museums, wrote *Industrial Art and the Museum*. Richards discussed the success of

⁴ Asterisks in text signify inclusion of the noted individual's biographical entry in Appendix B.

European museums in the collection and display of industrial (or applied) art, specifically artistic examples of hand- and machine-made goods.⁵ Richards referred to only three American institutions in this book, indicating a general lack of industrial art exhibitions and departments in American museums.⁶ However, he offered a plan for the appropriate collection and display of these useful objects.⁷ During a major era of museum development, wealthy philanthropists modified Richards' and other templates for their own museum planning. Henry Ford and Julius Rosenwald* exhibited industrial art and artifacts in their museums, while Henry du Pont and Henry and Helen Flynt produced extensive displays of decorative art. Abby Rockefeller collaborated with her friends to produce the Museum of Modern Art, in addition to her work with John D. Rockefeller, Jr., on decorative and industrial art as part of the Colonial Williamsburg restoration.⁸

Key Terms

During the early twentieth century, industrialists formed many new museums throughout the United States. Industrial philanthropists represented the extremely wealthy individuals who benefited from America's industry and manufacturing during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. These individuals participated in museum building as a major philanthropic activity. Industrial philanthropists participated in a distinctive kind of museum-building activity, in which they developed collections for

⁵ Richards, *Industrial Art and the Museum*, v-vi, 3, and 51-70.

⁶ Ibid. Richards specifically refers to the Metropolitan Museum of Art; the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston; and the Philadelphia Museum.

⁷ Ibid., v.

⁸ By industrial art, I mean that Colonial Williamsburg exhibited artifacts intended to be useful that integrate artistic elements within their design. These items are not simply meant to be decorative with minimal use, as is the case with most examples of decorative art. See Ibid., 6.

their own organizations. They established these museums to fulfill their vision for the institution's collections and exhibits.

American philanthropists of the early-twentieth century believed in the concept of scientific philanthropy. Scholars attribute this idea in part to Andrew Carnegie's* *Gospel of Wealth*. Carnegie claimed that modern philanthropists should minimize the wealth gifted to future generations by giving their money away prior to death. Proper charity, in his view, enabled the non-wealthy to improve themselves, primarily through education. Carnegie believed that the wealthy, while alive, should give to institutions that would help others through the redistribution of wealth.⁹ Philanthropists interpreted this to mean that scientific principles, such as research, should be incorporated into philanthropic projects.¹⁰ In the case of John D. Rockefeller's initiatives, scientists and experts collected data to determine the most effective means to improve particular aspects of society.¹¹

Museum-based scientific philanthropy involved the participation of agents, who used their knowledge of museum methodology to improve the efficiency of the collecting and museum-building process. Some agents brought expertise as museum professionals, curators, businessmen, engineers, and researchers.¹² These individuals helped to professionalize their fields and streamline philanthropic initiatives according to the philanthropists' larger visions.

⁹ Andrew Carnegie, "The Gospel of Wealth," in *The Perfect Gift: The Philanthropic Imagination in Poetry and Prose*, ed. Amy A. Kass (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2002), 230-244.

¹⁰ George W. Stocking, Jr., "Philanthropoids and Vanishing Cultures: Rockefeller Funding and the End of the Museum Era in Anglo-American Anthropology," in *Objects and Others: Essays on Museums and Material Culture*. Vol. III, *History of Anthropology*, ed. George W. Jr. Stocking (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1985), 116.

¹¹ Richard Handler and Eric Gable, *The New History in an Old Museum: Creating the Past at Colonial Williamsburg* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1997), 33.

¹² Stanley Coben, *Rebellion against Victorianism: The Impetus for Cultural Change in 1920s America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 43, 60.

Agents mediated a system of philanthropy that utilized the multi-directional exchange of museum artifacts, industrial-age machinery, and financial resources between philanthropists and average citizens. This system connected the industrial elite's philanthropic missions for their institutions with smaller-scale giving to these museums by less-wealthy individuals. While some of these people exchanged money for artifacts, they are still considered "donors" within this study due to the underlying philanthropic purpose of their contributions to support and build museum collections. Agents served as intermediaries, building relationships and opportunities for philanthropists and less-wealthy individuals to contribute to museums through complex exchanges with one another.

Henry Ford's Museums

In 1863, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow published *Tales of a Wayside Inn* based on his friends' experiences visiting the Red Horse Tavern in Sudbury, Massachusetts.¹³ Henry Ford purchased the inn, commonly known as Wayside Inn, in June of 1923. He intended the property to showcase early New England life, serving as a preliminary model for his acquisitions and museum-building projects in Dearborn, Michigan.¹⁴ The property eventually extended over 2,667 acres and included the Inn, a farm, a reconstructed colonial grist mill, a saw mill, a blacksmith shop, and a vocational school.

¹³ Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, *Tales of a Wayside Inn* (Sudbury, Massachusetts: Longfellow's Wayside Inn, 1995), viii-ix.

¹⁴ Wendell Garrett, "Henry Ford the Collector," in *A Home for Our Heritage: The Building and Growth of Greenfield Village and Henry Ford Museum, 1929-1979*, ed. Geoffrey C. Upward (Dearborn, MI: The Henry Ford Museum Press, 1979), vii.

Ford reconstructed colonial buildings at the site and transported structures from other sites to develop the Wayside Inn property.¹⁵

Originally, Henry Ford used the term “Edison Institute” to refer to both his museum and Greenfield Village in Dearborn, Michigan. The village expanded Ford’s earlier Wayside Inn project. Ford began his work with restoring buildings in Dearborn when he relocated his childhood home to the property in 1919.¹⁶ The site eventually incorporated structures from all over the United States and England, including Thomas Edison’s Menlo Park laboratory from New Jersey; Luther Burbank’s office from California; the Clinton Inn of Clinton, Michigan; Sir John Bennett’s watchmaker shop of London, England; and other buildings important to Ford’s own childhood.¹⁷ Henry Ford’s museum, as part of the Edison Institute, included his collection of “something of everything” through which he could “reproduce the life of the country in its every age.”¹⁸ The Edison Institute was criticized as being “an Old Curiosity Shop,” due to its lack of cohesive displays and its sheer volume of collections.¹⁹ Henry Ford dedicated the Edison Institute on October 21, 1929, although it did not open to the public until June 12, 1933.²⁰

During the late 1950s, the complex was officially called “The Henry Ford Museum,” although locals typically referred to the site as “Greenfield Village.”²¹ Over time, guests have visited these relocated structures with the assistance of tour guides, as

¹⁵ Allan Nevins and Frank Ernest Hill, *Ford: Expansion and Challenge, 1915-1933*, Vol. II (New York: Arno Press, A New York Times Company, 1976. Reprint of 1957 book.), 498-499.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 497.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 500-501.

¹⁸ As quoted in Upward, *A Home for Our Heritage*, 3.

¹⁹ As quoted in Nevins, *Ford: Expansion and Challenge*, 505.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 503-504.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 500; and Consultant Report to A.K. Mills (Executive Director, Edison Institute) from E.I. Allston Boyer (Assistant to the President, Colonial Williamsburg), 3 Apr 1951. Consultant Reports, Box 1, E.I. #175.

well as modern first- and third-person interpreters.²² Greenfield Village encapsulates eighty-three historic buildings located on eighty acres adjacent to the Ford Motor Company property in Dearborn, while the Henry Ford Museum exhibits its collection within its nine-acre, single-floor building.²³

By 2001, the organization faced a growing identity crisis under the name “Henry Ford Museum and Greenfield Village,” as additional components were added to the institution. With the implementation of a new strategic plan that year, the museum’s administration rebranded the complex as “The Henry Ford.” Henry Ford Museum continues Henry Ford’s acquisition of artifacts related to agriculture, manufacture, and transportation, as well as other technologies related to American everyday life.²⁴ The Henry Ford’s most recent mission statement specifies the organization’s intent to provide “unique educational experiences based on authentic objects, stories and lives from America’s traditions of ingenuity, resourcefulness and innovation.”²⁵ The organization administers Greenfield Village, Henry Ford Museum, Benson Ford Research Center, Ford Rouge Factory Tour, and IMAX Theatre. The museum also serves as the site of the Henry Ford Academy, a modern charter school that is in keeping with the legacy of Henry Ford’s Edison Institute Schools, Edison Institute of Technology, and Greenfield Village Schools that operated on the property from 1929 to 1969.²⁶

²² Consultant Report to A.K. Mills from E.I. Allston Boyer, 3 Apr 1951. Consultant Reports, Box 1, E.I. #175.

²³ “About,” *Greenfield Village*, The Henry Ford, <http://www.thehenryford.org/village/about.aspx>; and “About,” *Henry Ford Museum*. The Henry Ford. <http://www.thehenryford.org/museum/about.aspx>.

²⁴ Upward, *A Home for Our Heritage*, 4.

²⁵ The Henry Ford, “2008 Annual Report,” <http://www.thehenryford.org/images/AnnualReport08.pdf>.

²⁶ The Henry Ford, “2001 Annual Report,” <http://www.thehenryford.org/images/AnnualReport01.pdf>; The Henry Ford, “2002 Annual

Methodology

The initial research for this project began with the simple question of why American philanthropists developed so many museums in the early twentieth century. Preliminary investigation indicated that these institutions shared similar histories, collections, policies, and challenges.

As a scholar of philanthropy and public history, I use modern philanthropic research techniques to analyze historical situations and discover new details, which provide a clearer and more complete picture of the motivations and reasoning of the various philanthropic actors in this paper. For example, I use the concept of “industrial art” to connect the philanthropists’ collections, although the 1951 consultant report claims that there is no common link between industrial and art-oriented artifacts.²⁷ This analysis is based on the combination of period sources with contextual research from philanthropic studies.

The manuscript collection of the Benson Ford Research Center at The Henry Ford in Dearborn, Michigan provided most of the primary source materials for this study. I examined the Edison Institute Collection and Henry Ford’s Office Papers, concentrating on consultant reports related to the acquisition of Ford’s museum collection. I found the reports of W.W. Taylor* to be an invaluable resource as a daily record of Ford’s collecting activity in New England, the planning of the Wayside Inn project, and the arrangement of the museum and village in Dearborn. H.F. Morton’s* *Strange*

Report,” <http://www.thehenryford.org/images/AnnualReport02.pdf>; and The Henry Ford, “2008 Annual Report,” <http://www.thehenryford.org/images/AnnualReport08.pdf>.

²⁷ Consultant Report to A.K. Mills (Executive Director, Edison Institute) from E.I. Allston Boyer (Assistant to the President, Colonial Williamsburg), 3 Apr 1951. Consultant Reports, Box 1, E.I. #175.

Commissions for Henry Ford also served as a significant source regarding the acquisition of artifacts and Ford's strategy for his manufacturing exhibits.

I used biographies of American industrialists and institutional histories to build context, as well as fill in the gaps for related organizations. IUPUI professors in the History Department and Center on Philanthropy, as well as James Allen Smith of the Rockefeller Archive Center, suggested key works for contextual resources.²⁸ Many of these sources are included in the historiography chapter, while some of the works are referenced in later chapters.

In order to develop a study at the junction of history, museums, and philanthropy, I address several sub-topics regarding industrial philanthropists and their museum-building activity. Chapter three addresses the individuals who participated in this philanthropic activity, their similarities, and the reasons they involved themselves in museum building and collecting. Chapter four includes a case study of the philanthropic system developed under Henry Ford; his agents and members of the public who were responsible for the daily workings of Ford's projects; and the challenges that several philanthropists and their agents encountered as part of their museum-building activity.

Scope

I have focused my research on the period between 1925 and 1970. The year 1925 marks the beginning of the activities of the two generations of American philanthropists who were instrumental in the development of major museum and collecting projects.

²⁸ During a phone conversation in November 2009, James Allen Smith (Vice President and Director of Research and Education of the Rockefeller Archive Center in Sleepy Hollow, New York) recommended that I look at Bernice Kert, *Abby Aldrich Rockefeller: The Woman in the Family*, (New York: Random House, Inc., 1993) as an essential source for the Rockefeller's philanthropic activities.

These individuals shared similar ideas, experiences, and social associations. The period ends in 1970, by which time many members of the two generations of philanthropists had died, ending an era of museum-building philanthropy.

I have limited the scope of my research by excluding philanthropists' politics, opinions on industry and labor, businesses, and other philanthropic activities. Instead, I concentrate on their collecting and museum-based philanthropy. This material directs my interpretation of the philanthropists and those individuals who assisted them with museum-targeted philanthropy, examining the similarities in their museum-building activity. In this way, I focus on why twentieth-century philanthropists built museums during this period and how they established their institutions.

According to a survey conducted by the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS), American museums numbered approximately 18,410 institutions in 2003.²⁹ These "museums" include everything from historic houses to nature centers, and science museums to aquariums and zoos.³⁰ This subsector of philanthropic organizations has grown significantly since the early twentieth century. In 1938, Laurence Vail Coleman, director of the American Association of Museums, noted that American museums only numbered 2,489 institutions.³¹ Coleman's investigation of American museums did not include a convenient categorization of museums by the type of philanthropic support they received. Instead, his categories included public art museums, college and university

²⁹ American Association of Museums, *2006 Museum Financial Information*, ed. Elizabeth E. Merritt (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Museums), 4, 34-35.

³⁰ *Ibid.*

³¹ Laurence Vail Coleman, *The Museum in America*, Vol. 3 (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Museums, 1939), 663. Coleman did not include aquariums, zoos, or botanical gardens in his study unless they also included a distinct museum. His categorizations indicate a changing notion of "museums." See *Ibid.*, 473.

museums, historic house museums, public history museums, public industry (applied science) museums, and general museums, in addition to several other categories.³²

The museums included within my investigation do not fall neatly within Coleman's categorization. As of 1938, Coleman classified the following institutions in his study: College and university museums included both the Cooper Union for the Advancement of Science and Art's Museum for the Arts of Decoration and the Yale University Art Gallery.³³ Public art museums included the Detroit Institute of Arts, Metropolitan Museum of Art, and Museum of Modern Art.³⁴ Public history museums included the Essex Institute and the Edison Institute, while the Edison Institute's Greenfield Village and Wayside Inn were categorized as historic house museums.³⁵ Public industry (applied science) museums included the Museum of Science and Industry in Chicago; public general museums encompassed the Peabody Museum; and national museums incorporated the Smithsonian Institution's National Gallery of Art.³⁶

The institutions investigated in this study share a similar system of philanthropic support that was in the development stage during Coleman's 1938-39 study of American museums. Following the publication of Coleman's *The Museum in America*, philanthropists continued to implement their complex system of philanthropy in order to build museums throughout the United States. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., restored Colonial Williamsburg, Henry and Helen Flynt preserved Historic Deerfield, Henry du Pont created Winterthur Museum, and other philanthropists contributed to the exponential growth of other museum collections. A full list of institutions, philanthropists, and agents

³² Ibid., 583.

³³ Ibid., 591, 634.

³⁴ Ibid., 621, 635.

³⁵ Ibid., 617, 618, and 621.

³⁶ Ibid., 594, 597, and 617.

has been included in the appendices of this thesis. Appendix A details institutions, locations, affiliated philanthropists, and many of the agents cited within this work. Appendix B presents additional biographical information on many of the referenced philanthropists and agents. Appendix C compiles lists of philanthropists, agents, and known associates who shared similar affiliations with dealers, forums, committees, and other collecting groups. Appendix D lists presenters for the Colonial Williamsburg Antiques Forums, specifically philanthropists, agents, and known associates who made presentations from the Forum's inaugural year to 1970.

Results

These twentieth-century museums have been studied individually since their inception. However, few scholars have studied these institutions as a group. The details of organizational development indicate a common pattern of museum-building activity. In most of these cases, a philanthropist used his or her money and influence to create a unique and eclectic collection that eventually became part of a present-day museum. At some point, either before or after the philanthropist's death, the institution became an independent nonprofit organization or foundation.

In the present day, these museums face unique challenges, as they confront dilemmas innate to organizations throughout the nonprofit sector. Institutions that were "built" by a key philanthropist labor under the limits of the museum's initial mission and collecting policy. Although administrators over the past few decades have worked to change these documents, they continue to struggle against the institution's historical precedent. Within each museum's history, the whim of a wealthy collector became the

guiding policy for millions of dollars' worth of donations. When the collector died, his organization became the responsibility of museum staff and boards of directors. Trained staff and well-meaning directors were unprepared for the task of refocusing museums and collections to fit the reality of constricted budgets when subsequent donors could not sustain the donation level of the founding philanthropist. Over the last several decades, museum personnel have worked to fit their organizations within the guidelines of best practices by developing new mission statements, collecting policies, annual giving campaigns, corporate sponsorship programs, and endowments.

In order to investigate the history of modern museums, I have combined mid-twentieth-century sources with recent scholarship. I have expanded definitions and concepts from philanthropic and museum literature to incorporate the industrialists' museum building as a structured philanthropic initiative. The proposition of a philanthropic process innate to the industrial elites' development of American museums between 1925 and 1970 serves as this thesis' most significant contribution to the fields of history and philanthropic studies. The work reveals philanthropy as more inclusive than the activities of a select group of industrial elite. Philanthropists, in this case, include anyone who gives of their time, talent, and treasure to educational causes that help the broader public. I incorporate this view of multi-directional philanthropy, in which many individuals participate, in a culture of giving that is responsible for the creation and perpetuation of well-known American museums.

Applied Research Opportunities

Historically, American philanthropists have shared an interest in helping the public through educational institutions. Andrew Carnegie supported libraries, Julius Rosenwald developed schools, and many equally wealthy philanthropists built museums and related collections. These philanthropists chose to participate in similar projects and shared comparable experiences in the development of their respective institutions.

A common narrative among these museums resulted in the investigation of this shared and intersecting museum-building experience. However, archival sources presented a deeper and more complex story. Between 1925 and 1970, American philanthropists shared a connection to the nation's industrial success, resulting in the formation of an industrial elite. As a distinguishable social set, individuals experienced similarities as business peers and fellow philanthropists. They held a common belief in scientific philanthropy, as articulated by Andrew Carnegie. The complexity of their projects necessitated that they utilize experts, who could help run their philanthropic projects efficiently. These agents, working as museum staff and collection gatherers, united the philanthropists and their visions with members of the general public, who supplied artifacts and the primary materials for museum collections. This multi-directional system of philanthropy united thousands of individuals through the philanthropists' original mission. Only through one's understanding of the large number of individual donors involved in the museum-building process can one see their roles in the formation of these modern-day institutions.

The industrial elite's system of philanthropy reveals the existence of a multi-directional culture of giving. Philanthropists, agents, and the general public each gave

and received within the system, developing a set of expectations for the benefits associated with philanthropic activity in museums. Modern donations to museums have similar expectations. Name plates, donor recognition, financial incentives, and membership benefits all result from earlier periods of museums' philanthropic history. While museums design their exhibit content to fit the needs of incoming audiences, these institutions are continuously shaped by the reciprocal relationships between staff, donors, and visitors.

Historical accounts of the development of American museums set a precedent for modern interpretation within these institutions. Museum builders established the preliminary arrangement for the administration, policy, and funding of these organizations. Future research regarding organizational identity and philanthropic methodology depends upon the development of this foundational research. Scholarship regarding how founders initially designed and implemented museums presents the context for mid-twentieth-century consultant reports and present-day analysis. Early museum-building methods addressed some contemporary problems, but did not necessarily anticipate future needs.³⁷ A consultant report from 1951 shows that museum staff at Colonial Williamsburg and Ford's museum had already identified major problems in the years following Ford's death.³⁸ Similarly, scholars of the period regarded the early actions of Ford's museum staff as amateur, lacking modern professionalized approaches.³⁹ Ironically, modern study of The Henry Ford and similar museums reveals

³⁷ Consultant Report to A.K. Mills (Executive Director, Edison Institute) from E.I. Allston Boyer (Assistant to the President, Colonial Williamsburg), 3 Apr 1951. Consultant Reports, Box 1, E.I. # 175.

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ J.G. de Roulhac Hamilton, "The Ford Museum," *The American Historical Review* 36, no. 4 (Jul 1931): 772-775.

that many of the same financial, interpretive, and organizational challenges continue nearly sixty years later.

Looking forward, scholars will need to continue analyzing core administrative and philanthropic issues in American museums. By linking historical actions with modern philanthropic research, they may articulate potential solutions that will assist these organizations. Future scholarship will need to address issues of organizational identity and development in conjunction with philanthropic and fundraising methods, in order to refine how museums interact with other nonprofit institutions.

CHAPTER TWO: A SPARK OF IMAGINATION

Any creative idea, no matter how far outside of the box, is informed by the world around it. Twentieth-century industrial philanthropists recognized that past generations of businessmen, collectors, and philanthropists set the stage for contemporary museum-building projects. Philanthropists' museums displayed a spark of the American imagination and catalogued the evolution of industry and the arts over time. Scholars have developed contextual material related to these institutions from a myriad of academic and professional fields, such as biography and institutional history, anthropology, historic preservation, philanthropy, museum studies, economic history, decorative arts, social history, and history of technology. While few works specifically examine why and how American philanthropists developed museums in the twentieth century, a combination of sources addresses scholarly issues related to the development and sustainability of these institutions. Comparative examination of these works reveals distinctive patterns of scholarship within the study of twentieth-century American museums as philanthropic institutions.

History of American Museums

In 1919, the General Education Board presented a grant to the National Society of Vocational Education, for the study of the application of art in industries. This research resulted in the publication of two volumes by the American Association of Museums regarding both industrial museums and industrial art museums.⁴⁰ In 1925, Charles R. Richards, Vice-President of the American Association of Museums, wrote the first of

⁴⁰ Charles R. Richards, *The Industrial Museum* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1925), v.

these volumes, entitled *The Industrial Museum*.⁴¹ He thoroughly examined the administration of European museums focused on the study of the history of agriculture, industry, science, and transportation.⁴² Richards called for the establishment of industrial museums so that the American people could study the United States' evolution into "one of the foremost industrial countries of the world."⁴³ Prior to the establishment of Julius Rosenwald's* Museum of Science and Industry in Chicago and Henry Ford's* Museum and Greenfield Village near Detroit, Richards stated that cities such as Chicago and New York needed "comprehensive" museums to display multiple industries, while Detroit would require a more specialized museum to exhibit its industrial characteristics.⁴⁴

Charles R. Richards concluded the second installment of the 1919 National Society of Vocational Education study in *Industrial Art and the Museum* (1927).⁴⁵ This work, in comparison to Richards' earlier publication on industrial museums, incorporated those institutions responsible for the collection and display of industrial or applied art, including artistic examples of hand- and machine-made goods. Within his work, Richards laments the general lack of industrial and decorative art exhibitions and departments in art museums, commending the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York City for their exhibition of a rare American collection of this kind.⁴⁶ *Industrial Art* includes a plan for American museums to build their collections and display industrial art

⁴¹ Ibid.

⁴² Ibid., v, 48, 51, 54.

⁴³ Ibid., 48.

⁴⁴ Ibid. Asterisks in text signify inclusion of the noted individual's biographical entry in Appendix B.

⁴⁵ Charles R. Richards, *Industrial Art and the Museum* (New York: Macmillan Company, 1927).

⁴⁶ Ibid., v-vi, 3, 51-70. Decorative arts exhibits included period rooms and artistic cultural products, whereas the industrial arts featured useful objects that included an "element of beauty." See Ibid., v; and Laurence Vail Coleman, *The Museum in America*, Vol. 1 (Washington D.C.: American Association of Museums, 1939), 82-83.

appropriately. As a publication from 1927, *Industrial Art* presents the concept of “industrial art” as a period-specific term for the application of art in the production of hand- and machine-made goods.⁴⁷

In 1939, Laurence Vail Coleman, the director of the American Association of Museums, wrote *The Museum in America*, a three-volume set based on his visits to over two thousand museums.⁴⁸ Similar to Richards’, Coleman’s analysis draws early connections between diverse American institutions as part of a national social movement of museum work. However, Coleman uses his own statistical data. He indicates that the rise of the automobile, as well as the growth of educational and research activity within museums, drove the rapid growth of the field. Writing at the end of the Great Depression and during a period of museum growth, Coleman suggests that financial problems plague many museums, including those with private benefactors. Coleman provides a professional analysis of these institutions within the decade of their formation. *The Museum in America* includes extensive appendices in which Coleman categorizes the major museums of the period. He specifically notes that the Edison Institute (later known as the Henry Ford Museum) exhibits ideas found in industrial museums. However, the Edison Institute differed from other industrial museums due to its focus on historical progression rather than contemporary processes.⁴⁹

Steven Conn’s *Museums and American Intellectual Life, 1876-1926* stands at the forefront of modern scholarly works on the history of museums in America.⁵⁰ Written in 1998, Conn’s book combines intellectual and cultural history perspectives as he examines

⁴⁷ Richards, *Industrial Art and the Museum*, v-vi, 3, 51-70.

⁴⁸ Coleman, *The Museum in America*, iii-iv, 3-6.

⁴⁹ Ibid.

⁵⁰ Steven Conn, *Museums and American Intellectual Life, 1876-1926* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998).

American museums as visual representations of the world. The presence of objects in museums placed professional, academic historians outside of these institutions. Within this system, Ford's museum encapsulated the exhibition of "everyday" historical subjects rather than academic history. Conn emphasizes the development of museums into the "authority" of object-oriented history, allowing amateur historians and collectors to greatly influence the development of America's museums.⁵¹

Continuing scholarly studies of American museums, Russell Douglass Jones' dissertation, "Engineering History: The Foundation of Industrial Museums in the United States," connects the history of technology with the rise of American industrial museums.⁵² He argues that the Smithsonian Institution, Ford's Museum in Dearborn, and the Museum of Science and Industry in Chicago exhibited the inevitable evolution of technology, limiting public debate through a logical presentation of progress. In addition to archival materials, Jones builds his argument based on institutional and technological histories, revealing the role of engineers and industrialists in the building of American culture and museums. This dissertation supplies source material related to social influences and implications associated with these museums as part of the history of industry and technology.⁵³

Institutional History

Institutional histories within this study specifically focus on the development of individual museums. J.G. de Roulhac Hamilton's analysis of "The Ford Museum" in the

⁵¹ Ibid., 4-6, 151-152, 182-183

⁵² Russell Douglass Jones, "Engineering History: The Foundation of Industrial Museums in the United States," (Ph.D. diss., Case Western Reserve University, 2001).

⁵³ Ibid., 1-3, 39-41, 133-137.

July 1931 issue of *The American Historical Review* presents an early perspective of one particular institution, Henry Ford's Museum.⁵⁴ A professional historian at the University of North Carolina, Hamilton provides a first-person, primary source account that notes the initial arrangement of Ford's museum in Dearborn, Michigan. Hamilton's review indicates Ford's vision for his museum, collection, and its arrangement within the institution's building. As a scholarly review, "The Ford Museum" illustrates the challenges Ford's agents faced regarding the organization and exhibition of Ford's early collections, as well as the common perception of the time concerning the need for professionals to assist in this activity.⁵⁵

Brooke Wortham wrote, "Mythologies of an American Everyday Landscape: Henry Ford at the Wayside Inn," as a modern analysis of Henry Ford's historic preservation activities.⁵⁶ She develops the case study on Henry Ford's Wayside Inn preservation project and the changing motivations behind the development of this site in light of collective memory, cultural landscape, and twentieth-century American ideals. The architectural and historic preservation perspective of the dissertation incorporates Henry Ford's Wayside Inn as part of New England cultural memory. Wortham's research comprises one of the most extensive scholarly investigations of the Wayside Inn project and its context as related to Ford's Museum and Greenfield Village in Dearborn, Michigan. In addition to archival materials, Wortham utilizes historic preservation,

⁵⁴ J.G. de Roulhac Hamilton, "The Ford Museum," *The American Historical Review* 36, no. 4 (Jul 1931): 772-775.

⁵⁵ Ibid.

⁵⁶ Brooke D. Wortham, "Mythologies of an American Everyday Landscape: Henry Ford at the Wayside Inn," (Ph.D. diss., Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2006).

cultural landscape, and biographical works related to Henry Ford, the Wayside Inn, and New England during the early twentieth century.⁵⁷

During the decades of active museum building, museum founders and their amateur historian friends wrote works to communicate the histories of Historic Deerfield, Old Sturbridge Village, and other museums to an audience of visitors and enthusiasts. Henry Flynt* co-wrote *Frontier of Freedom* with Samuel Chamberlain in 1952 (currently published as *Historic Deerfield: Houses and Interiors*).⁵⁸ These works, as well as Chamberlain's *Tour of Old Sturbridge Village*, present a celebratory history of their respective institutions, arguing that these museums represent a glorious time in America's past.⁵⁹ The language used by both Flynt and Chamberlain is patriotic, suggesting the direct influence of literature from the recent American victory in World War II. *Frontier of Freedom* illustrates this patriotic perspective as an important motivation for museum building during this time, as it appears in scholarship regarding several other museum founders.⁶⁰ Both works rely heavily on photographs to assist in telling the story of these towns through examinations of the primary structures and unique collections of these museums. These institutional biographies primarily focus on the history of the museums' surrounding landscape and exhibited buildings, rather than the history of the organization.⁶¹

⁵⁷ Ibid., 1-18, 74-76.

⁵⁸ Samuel Chamberlain and Henry N. Flynt, *Frontier of Freedom: The Soul and Substance of America Portrayed in One Extraordinary Village, Old Deerfield, Massachusetts* (New York: Hastings House Publishers, 1952). Later published as Samuel Chamberlain and Henry N. Flynt, *Historic Deerfield: Houses and Interiors* (New York: Hastings House Publishers, 1965).

⁵⁹ Samuel Chamberlain, *Tour of Old Sturbridge Village* (New York: Hastings House Publishers, 1972).

⁶⁰ Chamberlain and Flynt, *Frontier of Freedom*, 1.

⁶¹ Ibid., 1, 21, 107, 128; Chamberlain, *Tour of Old Sturbridge Village*, 3-6, 40-43, 60-63; and Chamberlain and Flynt, *Historic Deerfield: Houses and Interiors*, 1, 3-5, 21, 42, 94-95.

In addition to his work on *Frontier of Freedom*, Henry Flynt also wrote multiple articles about the history and preservation of Deerfield for publications about antiques. Some of these works include Flynt's "Notes of a Collector" for the 1956 *East Side House Winter Antiques Show Catalog*, "Old Deerfield" for the 1953 *Connecticut Antiquarian* bulletin of the Antiquarian and Landmarks Society of Connecticut, and "Deerfield Massachusetts: Its Meaning" for the 1963 *Ellis Memorial Antiques Show Catalog*.⁶² These articles continue the celebratory and patriotic history found in other institutional biographies of the time. However, these works more clearly illustrate superlative history, in which the interpretation emphasizes the "first," "biggest," and "best" within the community's history. Flynt uses early amateur history methodologies, rather than the scholarly analysis techniques found in other publications of the same period. His work perpetuates methodologies used by museum builders and their associates, including Alice Winchester, who edited *The Magazine Antiques* and featured Flynt's work at Deerfield in a 1956 issue.⁶³ Henry Flynt's writings continued in his 1963 *To Collect or Not to Collect: Notes about Old Deerfield and Its Collections* for the Walpole Society.⁶⁴ Within this work, Flynt discusses the history of Deerfield and the objects located within its museums in reference to the Walpole Society members' mutual interests in American antiquities.⁶⁵

⁶² Henry Flynt, "Notes of a Collector," *East Side House Winter Antiques Show Catalog* (1956): 72-73; Henry Needham Flynt, "Old Deerfield," *Connecticut Antiquarian: The Bulletin of the Antiquarian and Landmarks Society, Inc. of Connecticut* 5, no. 1 (June 1953): 19-25; and Henry Flynt, "Deerfield, Massachusetts: Its Meaning," *Ellis Memorial Antiques Show Catalog* (1963): 35-39.

⁶³ *Ibid.*; and Elizabeth Stillinger, *Historic Deerfield: A Portrait of Early America* (New York: Dutton Studio Books, 1992), 194.

⁶⁴ Henry Flynt, *To Collect or Not to Collect: Notes About Old Deerfield and Its Collections*, Walpole Society *Note Book*, (Deerfield, Massachusetts: John Wilson Printing House, 1963).

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 1-18.

Institutional biographies conveniently provide comprehensive material regarding the history and development of organizations. In 1980, Donald Friary presented material later published in “The Noncollectors: Henry and Helen Flynt in Historic Deerfield” as a speech to the Colonial Williamsburg Antiques Forum.⁶⁶ Friary’s history of Henry and Helen Flynt’s involvement at Historic Deerfield supplied the basis and inspiration for a more extensive history of the institution in Elizabeth Stillinger’s *Historic Deerfield: A Portrait of Early America*.⁶⁷ Stillinger’s 1992 work offers a history of the museum’s development and the preservation of its individual houses. Intended for institutional and visitor reference, *Historic Deerfield* lacks scholarly analysis and distance from the subject matter, although it details Henry and Helen Flynt’s roles in institutionalizing the museum, their activities in Deerfield, and their relationships with other American collectors. Through interviews of individuals associated with the Flynts and Historic Deerfield, related correspondence, and archival material, Stillinger successfully interweaves the individual house histories with the larger story of Historic Deerfield and the Flynts’ association with the town.⁶⁸

Jay Pridmore’s commissioned *Inventive Genius: The History of the Museum of Science and Industry* was published by the institution.⁶⁹ *Inventive Genius* follows the growth of the Museum of Science and Industry in Chicago and its affiliation with American science education. Similar to Stillinger’s *Historic Deerfield*, this institutional biography celebrates the institution but lacks the scholarly analysis expected from a late-

⁶⁶ Donald R. Friary, “The Noncollectors: Henry and Helen Flynt in Historic Deerfield,” *The Magazine Antiques*, January 1982, 250-257.

⁶⁷ Stillinger, *Historic Deerfield*.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, vi, 41, 48, 70, 194; and Friary, “The Noncollectors,” 250-257.

⁶⁹ Jay Pridmore, *Inventive Genius: The History of the Museum of Science and Industry Chicago* (Chicago: Museum of Science and Industry, 1996).

twentieth century institutional history. Pridmore's work continues the trend of institutional histories that supply important details for the study of American museum development between 1925 and 1970.⁷⁰

In the case of *Creating Colonial Williamsburg*, Anders Greenspan uses his history background and affiliation with the Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University to develop a philanthropically-motivated institutional history of Colonial Williamsburg.⁷¹ He argues that the museum was originally designed to be a national shrine to American values. The scholarly perspective of this work results in the historical examination of the political, social, and cultural aspects of the museum, including the philanthropic influence of the Rockefeller family. The vast network of personal relationships and institutional projects within Colonial Williamsburg are analyzed based on a distinct chronology tied to political and social history. The work incorporates archival material from Colonial Williamsburg and the Rockefeller family, with a basis of secondary sources related to the Revolutionary era and early twentieth century, museum philanthropy, cultural history, interpretation, and development.⁷²

Individual Biographies

Similar to institutional histories, biographies of individuals establish a basis for the investigation of why and how philanthropists built American museums between 1925 and 1970. Bernice Kert's *Abby Aldrich Rockefeller: The Woman in the Family*, serves as

⁷⁰ Ibid., xi-xii, 11-13, 63-64, 179.

⁷¹ Anders Greenspan, *Creating Colonial Williamsburg* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 2002).

⁷² Ibid., ix, 1, 7, 10-18, 73, 148.

an essential source for the Rockefellers' philanthropic activities.⁷³ This biography includes necessary details required to investigate similarities among philanthropists and their institutions. For example, this work provides precise names necessary to examine Mrs. Rockefeller's* co-founding of the Museum of Modern Art. While some sources skim over the names of her colleagues, Kert's work specifies that in the days following the stock market crash of 1929 Mrs. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., Miss Lizzie P. Bliss, and Mrs. Mary Quinn Sullivan established their museum to exhibit the latest modern works of the era.⁷⁴ Kert examines the social relationships responsible for Mrs. Rockefeller's role in the family's philanthropic activities, relying on extensive archival materials from the Rockefeller Archive Center in Sleepy Hollow, New York.⁷⁵

An analysis of philanthropists' biographies written during the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries reveals a level of informality in these "scholarly" texts. Several of the authors offer a personal or journalistic perspective of the subject, rather than the professional distance expected from historians. However, many of these authors offer unique viewpoints and sources that would otherwise be neglected. Such is the case for Ruth Lord, Henry du Pont's* daughter, who wrote *Henry F. du Pont and Winterthur: A Daughter's Portrait* for Yale University Press.⁷⁶ Lord's personal connection to the biographical subject provides the reader with an inside perspective on source material inaccessible to earlier scholars. She assembles this biography of du Pont with a focus on his family life and activities at Winterthur, including the family history and Henry's

⁷³ Bernice Kert, *Abby Aldrich Rockefeller: The Woman in the Family*, (New York: Random House, Inc., 1993).

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 267-273.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*

⁷⁶ Ruth Lord, *Henry F. du Pont and Winterthur: A Daughter's Portrait* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999).

relationship with the house and property. His collecting and transformation of the house into a museum comprises a small portion of the overall work. However, Lord's description of Winterthur is highly detailed in terms of the motivations and idiosyncrasies involved in the project. Lord relies upon family documents and memories for her presentation, in addition to biographical research on the individuals affiliated with du Pont and Winterthur and earlier texts regarding antique collecting during the 1950s and 1960s.⁷⁷

Peter Ascoli, a faculty member of the Spertus Institute of Jewish Studies in Chicago and grandson of Julius Rosenwald, wrote *Julius Rosenwald: The Man Who Built Sears, Roebuck and Advanced the Cause of Black Education in the American South* to establish a full philanthropic account of Rosenwald's activities.⁷⁸ As both a trained historian and a Rosenwald descendent, Ascoli epitomizes the conflicting traits of this group of biographies, as modern scholarship and personal interests have the potential to conflict. His distaste for past Rosenwald biographies led him to focus this work on his grandfather's philanthropy, prominently presenting Rosenwald's support of African-American education in the American South. The work includes an overarching view of Rosenwald's life and work that downplays his support of the Museum of Science and Industry. However, Ascoli incorporates a strong contextual analysis for the museum's development throughout Rosenwald's lifetime and the settling of his estate. The author utilizes the archival collections of the family, company, and institutions affiliated with Rosenwald, offering an insider's point of view into his subject's life and influence.⁷⁹

⁷⁷ Ibid., ix-x, 11, 184-194, 197.

⁷⁸ Peter M. Ascoli, *Julius Rosenwald: The Man Who Built Sears, Roebuck and Advanced the Cause of Black Education in the American South* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2006).

⁷⁹ Ibid., 265-273, 327-334, 376-379, 408, 437.

In 2008, Peggy Earle wrote *Legacy: Walter Chrysler Jr. and the Untold Story of Norfolk's Chrysler Museum of Art* as a biographical study of both Chrysler* and his museum in Norfolk, Virginia.⁸⁰ Although the work begins with Chrysler's early life, the narrative primarily follows his collecting, social networking, and events that directly impacted the Chrysler Museum at Norfolk. The work serves as an institutional biography of the museum as it relates to its main benefactor. *Legacy* concentrates on the museum's growth during the 1960s and 1970s, offering a perspective of a later period than is included in many museum institutional histories. As a book review editor and news librarian, Earle presents a more journalistic approach to the subject matter, never achieving the scholarly distance one would expect in a university publication. She utilizes oral history interviews, private collections, newspapers, and biographies of Chrysler and his friends. The work is challenging to categorize, as it combines traits of personal and institutional biography; however, Earle's emphasis on Chrysler's collecting is most closely aligned with the other personal biographical works of this period.⁸¹

Group Biographies

Over the years, multiple authors have written group biographies of American philanthropists and collectors, through which similarities and idiosyncrasies of museum building may be examined. In 1958, Aline Saarinen wrote *The Proud Possessors: The Lives, Times and Tastes of Some Adventurous American Art Collectors*.⁸² Her work explores the unique tastes of key art collectors and philanthropists, as they represent

⁸⁰ Peggy Earle, *Legacy: Walter Chrysler Jr. and the Untold Story of Norfolk's Chrysler Museum of Art* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2008).

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, vii-viii, 37-40, 65-69, 88-91.

⁸² Aline B. Saarinen, *The Proud Possessors: The Lives, Times and Tastes of Some Adventurous American Art Collectors* (New York: Random House, 1958).

cultural attitudes within America's many geographic regions and artistic interests. In the description of each collector, Saarinen indicates the presence of "taste-makers," borrowing the term from Russell Lynes's *The Tastemakers* to describe collectors' essential counterparts who brought expertise to the acquisition of art and technology.⁸³ American museums benefited from extensive art collections that were given during or after the collectors' lifetimes for the education and enjoyment of the public. This work presents each biographical subject separately, rather than indicating shared traits among twentieth-century collectors. Saarinen's presentation of a set of individuals and the identity traits associated with them provides a basis for a history of museum builders. However, her analysis does not present comparative analysis between these biographies, offering an opportunity for further investigation within this thesis.⁸⁴

Kathleen D. McCarthy wrote *Women's Culture: American Philanthropy and Art, 1830-1930*, another collection of biographies.⁸⁵ With layers of social, cultural, gender, and philanthropic history, McCarthy examines the leadership roles of women philanthropists as they promoted female artists and improved the overall quality of American culture. McCarthy found that, during the early part of the twentieth century, women legitimized modern art. Abby Aldrich Rockefeller and her acquaintances developed the Museum of Modern Art in 1929 based on their shared interest in the art form. Through gender and philanthropic history, McCarthy examines the social and cultural norms associated with art collecting and museum building during this period,

⁸³ Russell Lynes, *The Tastemakers* (New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1954), 4-5; see Saarinen's discussion, xix-xx, xxiii-xiv, 91, 287-295.

⁸⁴ Ibid.

⁸⁵ Kathleen D. McCarthy, *Women's Culture: American Philanthropy and Art, 1830-1930* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991).

suggesting essential trends in the relationship between a philanthropist and her/his institution.⁸⁶

In the late 2000s, authors continue to write group biographies, to examine multiple individuals using a biographical lens. Applying earlier social and cultural history scholarship and primary research, the authors of these works investigate biographical subjects based on their social relationships and influences on one another. Nicholas Fox Weber's *The Clarks of Cooperstown: Their Singer Sewing Machine Fortune, Their Great and Influential Art Collections, Their Forty-Year Feud* reveals a halfway point between the typical biography and the true "group biography."⁸⁷ It focuses on one family, rather than a group of unrelated individuals who are connected by an institution, hobby, or ideals. Weber examines the influence of the Clark family as a group of major philanthropists and art collectors, tracking both the family relationships and the museum and collecting interactions of each individual. Stephen and Robert Clark* distributed their art collections between the Yale University Art Gallery, the Museum of Modern Art, and others, in addition to Stephen's contributions to the museums of Cooperstown, New York.⁸⁸ The compound biographical analysis found in Weber's work permits one to study and compare unique collecting and museum support characteristics vital to this family's overall philanthropic activities.

Dianne Sachko Macleod's *Enchanted Lives, Enchanted Objects: American Women Collectors and the Making of Culture, 1800-1940* maintained the group

⁸⁶ Ibid., xii, xvi, 179-184, 196-212.

⁸⁷ Nicholas Fox Weber, *The Clarks of Cooperstown: Their Singer Sewing Machine Fortune, Their Great and Influential Art Collections, Their Forty-Year Feud* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2007).

⁸⁸ Ibid., 6-10, 127, 271.

biography format, while adding the women's studies angle to an art history topic.⁸⁹ Through the study of groups of women collectors, Macleod compares individual collecting preferences over time, revealing their impact on the public sphere and American culture. The chapter on modern museums, as influenced by Eleanor and Sarah Hewitt, Abby Rockefeller, Gertrude Vanderbilt Whitney,* and others, demonstrates how women and their philanthropy influenced the growth of arts organizations and the collecting of modern art.⁹⁰ Although these women conceptualized collections and museums, Macleod argues that men administered and directed these institutions either with permission from women or after forcing them to relinquish control.⁹¹

Shortly after the publication of Macleod's work, a popular publisher released Michael Gross' *Rogues' Gallery: The Secret History of the Moguls and the Money That Made the Metropolitan Museum*.⁹² This work continues Macleod's themes of art history, collecting, museum building, and eras of influence, but studies these subjects within the context of a single institution over time. Multiple chapter-long biographies of the Metropolitan Museum of Art's most influential supporters and leaders provide an unorthodox narrative of the institution's development. Gross examines John D. Rockefeller* and other philanthropists through the relationships and motivations of these private contributors within the museum.⁹³

⁸⁹ Dianne Sachko Macleod, *Enchanted Lives, Enchanted Objects: American Women Collectors and the Making of Culture, 1800-1940* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008).

⁹⁰ See Appendix A for a list of philanthropists and their museums, including those institutions founded by these women.

⁹¹ Macleod, *Enchanted Lives*, 1-19, 134-141.

⁹² Michael Gross, *Rogues' Gallery: The Secret History of the Moguls and the Money that Made the Metropolitan Museum* (New York: Broadway Books, 2009).

⁹³ *Ibid.*, 3-14, 137-138.

Philanthropic History

Philanthropic histories incorporate ideas from many fields of study. During the rise of social and cultural history, George W. Stocking, Jr., edited *Objects and Others: Essays on Museums and Material Culture* as an anthropological study of museums.⁹⁴ This work includes the histories of the eight institutions that incorporated anthropological collections prior to the mid-twentieth century. Stocking's "Philanthropoids and Vanishing Cultures: Rockefeller Funding and the End of the Museum Era in Anglo-American Anthropology" examines the role of John D. Rockefeller, Jr., in redirecting financial support from museum collections to university-based cultural anthropology research. Rockefeller and his staff members directly influenced the anthropological activities through their grants, which supported social scientific research. Stocking's essay presents the role of experts in scientific philanthropy projects during the early twentieth century.⁹⁵

Although works throughout the twentieth century include the word "philanthropy" as part of the title or theme, most of the acclaimed books on early twentieth-century philanthropy that are referenced in this thesis were developed during the 2000s. These works provide common reference for scholars interested in philanthropic studies as an interdisciplinary and applied field, which includes historical philanthropic trends. Lawrence Friedman and Mark D. McGarvie edited *Charity, Philanthropy, and Civility in American History*, an essential secondary source for the

⁹⁴ George W. Stocking, Jr., ed., *Objects and Others: Essays on Museums and Material Culture*. Vol. III, *History of Anthropology* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1985).

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 3-4, 6-7, 112-113, 116-121, 133.

study of philanthropy in American history.⁹⁶ The essays contained within *Charity* supply a philanthropic perspective of key events, groups, and movements that have directly impacted modern American philanthropy. David C. Hammack's "Failure and Resilience: Pushing the Limits in Depression and Wartime" and Judith Sealander's "Curing Evils at Their Source: The Arrival of Scientific Giving," specifically examine scientific philanthropy during the early twentieth century, contextualizing museum building projects of the same era.⁹⁷ American museums and collecting became the major projects of American philanthropists during the 1920s and 1930s, reflecting their unique interests and agendas. The initiatives and individuals indicated in this work comprise some of the most commonly recognized historical examples of American philanthropy, providing the necessary basis for further research in the fields of history and philanthropic studies.⁹⁸

Thomas Adam's *Buying Respectability: Philanthropy and Urban Society in Transnational Perspective, 1840s to 1930s* is one of the most recent (2009) historical publications on philanthropy.⁹⁹ The work incorporates weaker analysis of philanthropic principles than Friedman's *Charity*. However, it offers the reader the most recent perspective and examination of historical philanthropy. Adam, an associate professor of history at the University of Texas at Arlington, argues that old and new elites used philanthropy in a cultural competition throughout Canada, Germany, Great Britain, and

⁹⁶ Lawrence J. Friedman and Mark D. McGarvie, eds., *Charity, Philanthropy, and Civility in American History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

⁹⁷ David C. Hammack, "Failure and Resilience: Pushing the Limits in Depression and Wartime," in., *Charity, Philanthropy, and Civility in American History*, 263-280; and Judith Sealander, "Curing Evils at Their Source: The Arrival of Scientific Giving," in *Charity, Philanthropy, and Civility in American History*, 217-239.

⁹⁸ Friedman, ed., *Charity, Philanthropy, and Civility in American History*, 6, 9, 217-218, 277-279, 438.

⁹⁹ Thomas Adam, *Buying Respectability: Philanthropy and Urban Society in Transnational Perspective, 1840s to 1930s* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2009).

the United States. The development of museums and other cultural institutions by industrialists and entrepreneurs supplied these individuals with social capital in a world of economically-influenced power and prestige. Although Adam emphasizes the intercultural exchange of ideas, his work is most relevant for its investigation of urban cultural models and institutional forms located within these cities.¹⁰⁰

Architectural History

In 1976, William Rhoads wrote “The Colonial Revival and American Nationalism” for the Society of Architectural Historians.¹⁰¹ Similar to Flynt’s patriotism-inspired history of Deerfield, Rhoads’ analysis of the Colonial Revival reveals that those who designed and commissioned buildings in this style held a common fascination with American heroes of the late 1700s. Scholars claim that “American nationalism,” as described by Rhoads, was the primary influence for Rockefeller’s Colonial Williamsburg, Ford’s Museum and Greenfield Village, and other preservation projects of the early twentieth century. Rhoads’ analysis follows colonial influences from the 1780s through 1921, ending before the years in which Rockefeller and Ford developed their museum villages. Based on Rhoads’ architectural history, the historical context for museum building of the 1920s and beyond suggests that these preservation projects continued a multi-century trend of colonial period influences rather than indicating an independent revival of American nationalism.¹⁰²

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., 5-9, 26-31, 181.

¹⁰¹ William B. Rhoads, “The Colonial Revival and American Nationalism,” *The Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 35, no. 4 (Dec 1976): 239-250.

¹⁰² Ibid., 239-245, 247-250.

David Gebhard wrote “The American Colonial Revival in the 1930s” a decade after Rhoads’ 1976 article.¹⁰³ Gebhard’s analysis provides scholarly insight into this architectural period, reaching an academic and professional audience through its publication in the *Winterthur Portfolio*, the primary decorative arts publication of Winterthur Museum. Although Gebhard references Rhoads’ work from 1976, “American Colonial Revival” extends beyond nationalistic themes. According to Gebhard, the expansion of colonial influences resulted from the incorporation of these architectural patterns in professional architectural journals and popular magazines, such as *Good Housekeeping*, *Better Homes and Gardens*, and *Ladies’ Home Journal*. National architectural competitions, affiliated with both publications and international expositions, awarded house designs that were primarily based on colonial features. Floor plans and facades utilized colonial characteristics, providing a continuation of traditional forms throughout the American landscape.¹⁰⁴

Interweaving architectural and social histories with application-based historic preservation topics, Richard Guy Wilson, Shaun Eyring, and Kenny Marotta edited *Recreating the American Past: Essays on the Colonial Revival*.¹⁰⁵ This compilation of essays presents the papers of an affiliated conference on the use of colonial references in American culture and design. The Colonial Revival peaked between 1880 and 1940, although the editors argue that it contributed to the American identity, culture, and art since the 1820s and still shapes the interpretation of the American past and the presentation of its ideals. Relying on architectural, cultural, and landscape history, the

¹⁰³ David Gebhard, “The American Colonial Revival in the 1930s,” *Winterthur Portfolio* 22, no. 2/3 (Summer-Autumn, 1987), 109-148.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 109-111, 113, 131, 145.

¹⁰⁵ Richard Guy Wilson, Shaun Eyring, and Kenny Marotta, eds., *Recreating the American Past: Essays on the Colonial Revival* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2006).

essays provide context for the historic preservation activities of the American museum building period.¹⁰⁶

Ideological History

Several modern social histories focused on the era between 1925 and 1970 present an ideological context for the period. Edwin T. Layton, Jr., wrote one such work related to the history of technology, *The Revolt of the Engineers: Social Responsibility and the American Engineering Profession*.¹⁰⁷ Layton analyzes engineers' social responsibility to remedy society's problems through innovation. Layton's historical analysis of the professionalization of American engineering provides a useful perspective to understand the rise of early twentieth-century museums as related to the application of industrial engineering.¹⁰⁸

In 1995 and 1997, two social histories of technology examined the construction of technologies for American purposes. The rise of industrial museums during the twentieth century has been studied through its relation to either business history or, as in this case, the history of technology. Both Carroll Pursell in *The Machine in America: A Social History of Technology* and Ruth Schwartz Cowan in *A Social History of American Technology* show technological progress as a process of transferring and modifying ideas.¹⁰⁹ These works, as survey texts, provide a vocabulary and analytical framework for studying the evolution of technology within museum exhibits. Cowan specifically

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., 1-10, 13-19, 237.

¹⁰⁷ Edwin T. Layton Jr., *The Revolt of the Engineers: Social Responsibility and the American Engineering Profession* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986).

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., viii, xiv, 1, 71.

¹⁰⁹ Carroll Pursell, *The Machine in America: A Social History of Technology* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995); and Ruth Schwartz Cowan, *A Social History of American Technology* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997).

draws connections between the methodologies of social history and the constructed objects that are the essence of a period's progress, to show technology as the means for humans to control and manipulate the social environment.¹¹⁰

Social history offered historians, like Kathleen McCarthy, the opportunity to study the ideology of women, minorities, and intellectuals. In *Rebellion against Victorianism: The Impetus for Cultural Change in 1920s America*, Stanley Coben argues that movements for reforming Victorian ideals united intellectuals, minorities, and women at the beginning of philanthropically-motivated museum growth.¹¹¹ Financial support for universities, philanthropic foundations, and related intellectual pursuits grew during this period. Victorians emphasized middle-class character and respectability, as well as naturalism, social sciences, and literary realism. However, the intellectual pursuit of truth replaced these earlier moral, racial, and ethnic beliefs. The examination of evidence and criticism of past theories supplied 1920s intellectuals with a clean scale to weigh the Victorian ideas against the new "truth."¹¹² Coben's examination through the lens of social and cultural history underscores key components of this period's direct effects on the establishment of the museum-building period in the 1920s.

Historiographical Connections

The concept of groups of philanthropists involved in museum building originated from discussions and readings during my Historic Deerfield Summer Fellowship. These ideas are most clearly represented within Elizabeth Stillinger's *Historic Deerfield: A*

¹¹⁰ Cowan, *A Social History of American Technology*, 2-3, 130-131; and Pursell, *The Machine in America*, xii, 9-10, 251-254.

¹¹¹ Stanley Coben, *Rebellion against Victorianism: The Impetus for Cultural Change in 1920s America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991).

¹¹² *Ibid.*, xii-xiii, 3-4, 36-37, 43-44, 48-49.

Portrait of Early America. Her work encapsulates the oral histories of Peter Spang, providing a published version of the stories he conveyed to the Fellows concerning the development of Historic Deerfield and the concurrent founding of other museums and collections during that time.¹¹³

Russell Lynes' *The Tastemakers*, Aline Saarinen's *The Proud Possessors: The Lives, Times and Tastes of Some Adventurous American Art Collectors*, Dianne Sachko Macleod's *Enchanted Lives, Enchanted Objects: American Women Collectors and the Making of Culture, 1800-1940*, and Kathleen D. McCarthy's *Women's Culture: American Philanthropy and Art, 1830-1930* offered useful methodologies for the study of multiple museum-building philanthropists. Each of these works studies a combination of collectors with an emphasis on their unique characteristics. However, my thesis uses these distinct traits to study the commonalities among philanthropists and the philanthropic system in which they participated.

Implementing philanthropic concepts within historical analysis has presented one of the greatest methodological challenges within this thesis. George W. Stocking, Jr.'s, "Philanthropoids and Vanishing Cultures: Rockefeller Funding and the End of the Museum Era in Anglo-American Anthropology," established a model argument and methodology, as it includes the examination of experts involved in Rockefeller's anthropological projects. This method suggested similar implementations of scientific

¹¹³ My understanding of Historic Deerfield's history and its relationship with other museums during its history is based on professional and dinner conversations with Philip Zea (President, Historic Deerfield), Joshua Lane (Curator of Furniture and Educational Programs, Historic Deerfield), Peter Spang (former Curator, Historic Deerfield), Abbott Lowell Cummings (former Director, Society for the Preservation of New England Antiquities; and retired Professor of American Decorative Arts, Yale University), Donald Friary (former Executive Director, Historic Deerfield), and Historic Deerfield's staff and volunteers during my Historic Deerfield Summer Fellowship (June-August 2007).

philanthropy concepts within Henry Ford's and other philanthropists' projects. David C. Hammack's "Failure and Resilience: Pushing the Limits in Depression and Wartime" and Judith Sealander's "Curing Evils at Their Source: The Arrival of Scientific Giving" contextualize museum building projects of the era and provide a model for examining scientific philanthropy. Thomas Adam's *Buying Respectability: Philanthropy and Urban Society in Transnational Perspective, 1840s to 1930s* supplied another methodology for the historical study of philanthropy.

Steven Conn's *Museums and American Intellectual Life, 1876-1926* offered an additional methodology for studying the history of American museums. Within the work, Conn utilizes both intellectual and cultural history to examine the museum experience. Although Conn's work ends in 1926 and this thesis begins in 1925, he establishes a useful vocabulary for museum exhibits and staff that informs my analysis of why and how philanthropists formed a generation of American museums.

Recent dissertations provide some of the most relevant methodologies and sources for this thesis, as they study combinations of institutions and fields of study. Russell Douglass Jones' "Engineering History: The Foundation of Industrial Museums in the United States," compares the development of the Smithsonian, Ford's Museum, and Rosenwald's Museum of Science and Industry in Chicago. Although he analyzes a subset of museums mentioned within this thesis, his overall argument excludes reference to the philanthropic system utilized within these institutions. Similarly, Brooke Wortham's "Mythologies of an American Everyday Landscape: Henry Ford at the Wayside Inn," does not consider Ford's philanthropy in her comparative analysis of

Ford's Wayside Inn, Greenfield Village, and Museum, however, she identified many useful sources.

The case study regarding Henry Ford's museums resulted from the widespread availability of source material on his activities. Although few works directly cited the activities of H.F. Morton* or W.W. Taylor,* several publications offered important information on the development of Ford's museums. J.G. de Roulhac Hamilton's "The Ford Museum" in the July 1931 issue of *The American Historical Review* established a baseline account of Ford's early collection, while Laurence Vail Coleman's *The Museum in America* placed Wayside Inn, Greenfield Village, and the Museum within categories of other American institutions.

The perspective of philanthropists, including their opinions, activities, and philanthropic motivations, was voiced through a combination of works. Henry Flynt and Samuel Chamberlain's *Frontier of Freedom* (currently published as *Historic Deerfield: Houses and Interiors*), Flynt's "Notes of a Collector" for the 1956 *East Side House Winter Antiques Show Catalog*, "Old Deerfield" for the 1953 *Connecticut Antiquarian* bulletin of the Antiquarian and Landmarks Society of Connecticut, "Deerfield Massachusetts: Its Meaning" for the 1963 *Ellis Memorial Antiques Show Catalog*, and *To Collect or Not to Collect: Notes about Old Deerfield and Its Collections* for the Walpole Society supply Henry Flynt's perception of Deerfield and the personal meaning of his preservation efforts in the town. The extent of Flynt's writings establish a clear viewpoint of Historic Deerfield's development amongst the less-documented histories of similar institutions.

Biographies of individuals and institutions further informed my analysis of American museum development during the twentieth century. Jay Pridmore's *Inventive Genius: The History of the Museum of Science and Industry* augmented Peter Ascoli's *Julius Rosenwald: The Man Who Built Sears, Roebuck and Advanced the Cause of Black Education in the American South* for my analysis of Julius Rosenwald's founding of the Museum of Science and Industry in Chicago. Likewise, Bernice Kert's *Abby Aldrich Rockefeller: The Woman in the Family* and Michael Gross' *Rogues' Gallery: The Secret History of the Moguls and the Money That Made the Metropolitan Museum* supplied additional details to Anders Greenspan's *Creating Colonial Williamsburg*. Ruth Lord's *Henry F. du Pont and Winterthur: A Daughter's Portrait*, Peggy Earle's *Legacy: Walter Chrysler Jr. and the Untold Story of Norfolk's Chrysler Museum of Art*, and Nicholas Fox Weber's *The Clarks of Cooperstown: Their Singer Sewing Machine Fortune, Their Great and Influential Art Collections, Their Forty-Year Feud* offer similar information on the activity of American collectors and museums during this period. Combining sources for many of the philanthropists established a more complete foundation of sources than I could have accessed within the limitations of my primary research.

Peter Ascoli's *Julius Rosenwald: The Man Who Built Sears, Roebuck and Advanced the Cause of Black Education in the American South* and Anders Greenspan's *Creating Colonial Williamsburg* present the most similar philanthropic arguments for the development of museums during this era. Both authors illustrated arguments and methodologies to combine biographical information within the scope of philanthropic studies.

Charles R. Richards' works for the American Association of Museums present important context for American philanthropists' common museum building experience. His *The Industrial Museum* and *Industrial Art and the Museum* articulated opportunities for cities to establish or grow both industrial and industrial art exhibitions during the mid 1920s. Although Richards does not mention either Henry Ford or Julius Rosenwald by name, the parallels between their museums and Richards' recommendations suggests that period ideology assisted in the establishment of American museums.

Scholarly literature regarding architecture and historic preservation reveals the importance of patriotism during the period of museum building between 1925 and 1970. William Rhoads' "The Colonial Revival and American Nationalism," David Gebhard's "The American Colonial Revival in the 1930s," and Richard Guy Wilson, Shaun Eyring, and Kenny Marotta's *Recreating the American Past: Essays on the Colonial Revival* each illustrated cultural perspectives of early American history and twentieth-century patriotism. These works provided further context for my argument, augmenting sources regarding individual philanthropists and their museums.

Due to philanthropists' activities and proximity to America's industry, history of technology and social history works offer important connections between the period's social problems and the role of museums in solving social ills. Edwin T. Layton, Jr.'s *The Revolt of the Engineers: Social Responsibility and the American Engineering Profession* presented the concept of industry's social responsibilities. Likewise, Stanley Coben's *Rebellion against Victorianism: The Impetus for Cultural Change in 1920s America* reveals how financial and moral ideology changed in the 1920s, suggesting a changing attitude toward philanthropic and intellectual pursuits from earlier decades.

Carroll Pursell's *The Machine in America: A Social History of Technology* and Ruth Schwartz Cowan's *A Social History of American Technology* offer an additional ideological basis for the establishment of industrial museums, showing technological progress as a means to transfer ideas within the social environment.

A combination of works influenced the argument, methodologies, and sources utilized within this thesis. The composite of sources results in a thesis that fills gaps in the literature, by examining why and how philanthropists built American museums between 1925 and 1970. By integrating historical and philanthropic sources, I analyzed the commonalities found among philanthropists during this time period. These works inform my understanding of the period studied within this thesis, as well as the integral resources, ideas, and methods that assisted in the establishment of multiple institutions throughout the country.

CHAPTER THREE: AN ENGINE OF PHILANTHROPY

What child would not build castles in the air, dreaming impossible dreams? Who would not wish to be “as rich as Henry Ford,” especially in a time of worldwide depression?¹¹⁴ Such wealth would hold the key to achieving dreams and making the impossible a reality. In early-twentieth-century America, one group held this wealth. Industrial philanthropists’ influence and resources enabled their wildest imaginings to take shape in the form of extensive collections, large museum buildings, and institutions that rivaled museums abroad. The combination of their individual ideologies and museum-building aspirations sparked the imagination in an engine of scientific philanthropy.

Philanthropists such as Henry Ford,* John D. Rockefeller, Jr.,* Abby Aldrich Rockefeller,* Henry du Pont,* Julius Rosenwald,* Louise du Pont Crowninshield,* Stephen Clark,* Ima Hogg,* Henry and Helen Flynt,* and others developed American museums between 1925 and 1970.¹¹⁵ John and Abby Rockefeller, Henry Ford, and Julius Rosenwald formed a first generation of museum-building philanthropists, while Henry du Pont, Louise du Pont Crowninshield, Ima Hogg, Stephen Clark, Henry and Helen Flynt, Electra Havemeyer Webb,* Walter Chrysler, Jr.,* Edsel and Eleanor Ford,* and their colleagues established a distinctive second generation. These individuals shared similar beliefs and ideological perspectives of American history, which shaped their museum-building efforts. Additionally, philanthropists had financial resources, social networks,

¹¹⁴ H.F. Morton, *Strange Commissions for Henry Ford* (York, England: Herald Printing Works, 1934), 1.

¹¹⁵ See Appendix A for a list of institutions, philanthropists, and agents mentioned within this chapter. Asterisks in text signify inclusion of the noted individual’s biographical entry in Appendix B.

and access to agents. The combination of these elements assisted in the establishment of their institutions. Over two generations, these museum builders established an American museum ideal through the implementation of their philanthropy. Philanthropists' extensive financial resources, combined with philanthropic and museum-oriented ideas of the time, provided the impetus for the creation of new museums and collections.

Industrial Elite Philanthropy

As extraordinarily wealthy individuals who benefited from American industry, this elite group held common beliefs regarding “good philanthropy.” The first generation of museum-building philanthropists believed that the finest examples of charity were those that offered useful education to improve their workforces.¹¹⁶ They agreed that the best way to achieve this form of charitable activity depended upon industrialists following the parameters set by the concept of scientific philanthropy.¹¹⁷ Philanthropists gave resources, money, and time to organizations and causes that they preferred. Their charity did not typically include almsgiving, but corresponded with their individual “philosophy of life.”¹¹⁸ For example, Henry Ford donated over \$36,929,875 to charitable causes between 1917 and 1947, with over \$10,418,000 directed toward his Greenfield Village project.¹¹⁹ In addition to individual causes, philanthropists donated to family causes, such as hospitals, museums, and schools. In the case of Greenfield Village, Clara

¹¹⁶ Allan Nevins and Frank Ernest Hill, *Ford: Expansion and Challenge, 1915-1933*, Vol. II (New York: Arno Press, A New York Times Company, 1976. Reprint of 1957 book.), 506.

¹¹⁷ Ibid; and Andrew Carnegie, “The Gospel of Wealth,” in *The Perfect Gift: The Philanthropic Imagination in Poetry and Prose*, ed. Amy A. Kass (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2002), 230-244.

¹¹⁸ Nevins, *Ford: Expansion and Challenge*, 506.

¹¹⁹ Ibid.

and Edsel Ford aided Henry's project with hundreds of thousands of dollars of additional philanthropic support.¹²⁰

Education served as one of the most common philanthropic initiatives attempted by the American industrial elite. During this period, Henry Ford, Julius Rosenwald, and others supported multiple schools and educational systems throughout the United States. Henry Ford supported schools on the site of his Wayside Inn and Greenfield Village projects, Andrew Carnegie* donated \$600,000 to Tuskegee Institute, and Rosenwald also supported Tuskegee and other schools for African Americans throughout the South.¹²¹ They believed that education was the ideal means to improve American society. One supporter of Ford's schools stated that Ford's program of practical education, if implemented nationally, would ". . . result in the abolition of crime and poverty, both of which are a disgrace to civilization."¹²² Industrial philanthropists were keenly interested in the intersection of education and their work forces.¹²³ Ford and others incorporated vocational instruction into school curricula, preparing their future workforces and consumers for inevitable industrial modernization.¹²⁴ Good business sense required these philanthropists to involve themselves in the initiation of vocational instruction for the public.

Biographers of industrial philanthropists have debated whether or not the American elite used charity to address public relations or "impression management."¹²⁵

¹²⁰ Ibid.

¹²¹ Ibid., 505, 507; and Peter M. Ascoli, *Julius Rosenwald: The Man Who Built Sears, Roebuck and Advanced the Cause of Black Education in the American South* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2006), 78-79, 92-93.

¹²² As quoted in Nevins, *Ford: Expansion and Challenge*, 505.

¹²³ Ibid., 505, 507; and Ascoli, *Julius Rosenwald*, 78-79, 92-93.

¹²⁴ Nevins, *Ford: Expansion and Challenge*, 505, 507.

¹²⁵ Russell Lynes, *The Tastemakers* (New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1954), 288-293.

However, historical evidence clearly indicates that their collective role as stewards of social wealth reveals a more accurate perspective of their charity. For John D. Rockefeller and his son, giving was religiously motivated.¹²⁶ Though not all members of the industrial elite shared the Rockefellers' religious principles, philanthropists held themselves accountable for the improvement of American society.¹²⁷ Their understanding of philanthropy reflected their collective roles as stewards and trustees of the wealth they had gained from America's industrial success.

John D. Rockefeller, Jr., Henry Ford, and their contemporaries, the first generation of elite philanthropists active between 1925 and 1970, pioneered philanthropic museum building. They sought a scientific approach to charity, using rational, calculated, and systematic methods.¹²⁸ For his Williamsburg restoration, Rockefeller recruited highly trained experts and consultants to assist him.¹²⁹ Similarly, many philanthropists and collectors of this era relied on experts and agents to assist them with their complex charitable projects.¹³⁰ These agents impacted the interpretation of "philanthropy" and how it was accomplished within museum-building projects of the era.

¹²⁶ Richard Handler and Eric Gable, *The New History in an Old Museum: Creating the Past at Colonial Williamsburg* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1997), 32.

¹²⁷ Ibid.

¹²⁸ Judith Sealander, "Curing Evils at Their Source: The Arrival of Scientific Giving," in *Charity, Philanthropy, and Civility in American History*, eds. Lawrence J. Friedman and Mark D. McGarvie (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 217-218.

¹²⁹ Handler, *The New History in an Old Museum*, 32-33.

¹³⁰ George W. Stocking, Jr., "Philanthropoids and Vanishing Cultures: Rockefeller Funding and the End of the Museum Era in Anglo-American Anthropology," in *Objects and Others: Essays on Museums and Material Culture*. Vol. III, *History of Anthropology*, ed. George W. Jr. Stocking (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1985), 133-134.

Agents' records show their influence on philanthropists and the resulting institutions that they developed.¹³¹

Although philanthropists were deeply involved in giving, they understood that charity could have detrimental effects if applied incorrectly. For example, Henry Ford believed that philanthropy could impede the recipient's self reliance.¹³² Scientific philanthropists preferred to "teach a man to fish" as opposed to giving him fish. Such intentional acts of charity involved conscious thought and business-like analysis that were only possible through a system of "scientific philanthropy."¹³³ As the industrial elite, these philanthropists believed that business was essential to the economic well being of American society and charity, as almsgiving could result in the degradation of industrial ideals. They depended upon the imagination, creativity, and initiative of their workforces, and worried that the wrong form of charity would detract from the workers' innovations.¹³⁴ The industrial elite used scientific philanthropy as an effective business strategy to improve society and education.

Motivations for Supporting Museums

Because of their shared conviction regarding the effectiveness of scientific philanthropy, the American industrial elite invested their time and money in collecting and museum building. Philanthropists' charitable and educational purposes shaped their institutions, creating a patriotic restoration of the past that corresponded with their own

¹³¹ Researchers may find agents' records within the repositories of the institutions for which they worked. For example, the records of Henry Ford's agents are located at the archives of The Henry Ford in Dearborn, Michigan, and Wayside Inn of Sudbury, Massachusetts.

¹³² Nevins, *Ford: Expansion and Challenge*, 494.

¹³³ Sealander, "Curing Evils at Their Source," 217-218.

¹³⁴ Nevins, *Ford: Expansion and Challenge*, 493.

view of America. They exhibited collections of industrial artifacts, decorative and industrial art, and architecture based on their individual interests and similar ideologies. The first generation of industrial philanthropists surveyed in the following investigation, specifically John D. Rockefeller, Henry Ford, and Julius Rosenwald, focused on education as the core concept in their philanthropy. Their projects administered training in what Henry Ford termed “practical living” as opposed to industry-focused learning.¹³⁵ Ford’s use of such initiatives applied efficiency models from the workplace to improve individual productivity. He believed that education produced more productive employees, who worked hard and lived comfortably as a result of their “exceptional effort.”¹³⁶

Even before America’s industrial elite established their museum-building projects, Europeans set the stage for the construction and administration of similar institutions. Industrial and industrial art museums were particularly popular enterprises in the last few decades of the nineteenth century, when Europe’s industries thrived and sought to educate their workforces through exhibitions of industrial products and production methods. However, World War I and the years following left these European institutions struggling to regain their educational impact on an uncertain industrial marketplace.¹³⁷

Americans faced additional challenges. National questions regarding race and immigration plagued American society during the nineteenth century and into the

¹³⁵ Ibid., 496

¹³⁶ Ibid., 496-497.

¹³⁷ Charles R. Richards, *The Industrial Museum* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1925), 1-6, 21; and Charles R. Richards, *Industrial Art and the Museum* (New York: Macmillan Company, 1927), v-vi, 6, 9-12.

twentieth century, shaping America's industry and philanthropy.¹³⁸ In the years following World War I and the first Red Scare, America experienced a revival of patriotism. This spirit became especially prevalent during an antiques craze that spanned the early- to mid-twentieth century. In the 1920s, collectors, including the museum builders, sought out early American furnishings and art work that demonstrated their colonial ideals.¹³⁹ This antiques craze continued into the 1940s and 1950s due to the patriotic culture of the period that included World War I, World War II, the Korean War, the Cold War, and McCarthyism.¹⁴⁰

Escaping Europe's widespread destruction during World War I and World War II, American museums experienced growth during times of economic and political uncertainty. These institutions exhibited American values and workmanship during the decades of the Great Depression and the Red Scare, in which the nation questioned the extent of one's Americanism.¹⁴¹ During World War II, the U.S. military used Colonial Williamsburg to train its men in American history and values.¹⁴² Henry Ford, a man whom many question in terms of his politics and practices, understood the importance of collecting and exhibiting examples of American life and material culture.¹⁴³ Similar to Julius Rosenwald, Henry Ford depended upon "American inventive genius" and an

¹³⁸ Peter Dobkin Hall, "A Historical Overview of Philanthropy, Voluntary Associations, and Nonprofit Organizations in the United States, 1600-2000," in *The Non-Profit Sector: Research Handbook*, 2nd ed., ed. Walter W. Powell and Richard Steinberg (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006), 43.

¹³⁹ Lynes, *The Tastemakers*, 186, 238-241.

¹⁴⁰ Elizabeth Stillinger, *Historic Deerfield: A Portrait of Early America* (New York: Dutton Studio Books, 1992), 44, 46-47.

¹⁴¹ Anders Greenspan, *Creating Colonial Williamsburg* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 2002), 8, 11, 58-59.

¹⁴² *Ibid.*, 13-14, 67-72.

¹⁴³ Nevins, *Ford: Expansion and Challenge*, 500-501; and Geoffrey C. Upward, ed., *A Home for Our Heritage: The Building and Growth of Greenfield Village and Henry Ford Museum, 1929-1979* (Dearborn, MI: The Henry Ford Museum Press, 1979), 3.

efficient workforce during times of political upheaval, economic uncertainty, and relative peace.¹⁴⁴ Philanthropists' collecting and museum-building continued amidst industrial growth and the permeation of patriotic spirit throughout American society.

Henry Ford and others believed that museums were the most effective method to instruct the American public.¹⁴⁵ Henry Ford created his museum to illustrate what he believed was “real history.”¹⁴⁶ John D. Rockefeller, Jr., designed Colonial Williamsburg to be an “educational landmark” that used visual learning techniques to subtly express the philanthropist's ideals.¹⁴⁷ Similarly, Julius Rosenwald's Museum of Science and Industry exhibited “working models illustrative . . . of the mechanical processes of production and of manufacture” to stimulate “American inventive genius.”¹⁴⁸ Henry du Pont, a member of the second generation of museum-building philanthropists, continued this educational focus when he stipulated that his Chestertown House Museum be dedicated to the “education and enjoyment of the public.”¹⁴⁹ These museums enabled their benefactors to educate Americans based on philanthropists' personal views and values.

The period from 1925 through 1970 included multiple wars and a world-wide depression. Museum philanthropists believed that museums and collections of American material culture and architecture would promote much-needed patriotism. Both John D. Rockefeller, Jr., and Henry Ford believed that the recreation of the past, specifically

¹⁴⁴ As quoted in Ascoli, *Julius Rosenwald*, 267. See also Nevins, *Ford: Expansion and Challenge*, 499-501, 504-505.

¹⁴⁵ Nevins, *Ford: Expansion and Challenge*, 499-501, 504-505.

¹⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 497.

¹⁴⁷ Greenspan, *Creating Colonial Williamsburg*, 13.

¹⁴⁸ As quoted in Ascoli, *Julius Rosenwald*, 265, 267.

¹⁴⁹ Ruth Lord, *Henry F. du Pont and Winterthur: A Daughter's Portrait* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999), 195.

histories of America's founding fathers, would help twentieth-century Americans adopt early American virtues, including patriotism, devotion, courage, democracy, and republican government.¹⁵⁰ Patriotic history within these institutions focused on the lives of great men. Reconstructing the conditions under which American revolutionaries lived created an experiential world in which mid-twentieth-century Americans, whether native or foreign born, could learn the core values of the nation's fight for independence and freedom.¹⁵¹ The philanthropists educated visitors concerning patriotism by "transporting" them back to a time when other generations fought for "freedom, liberty, and democracy."¹⁵²

Philanthropists' collecting of American buildings and artifacts served as a patriotic celebration of what philanthropists and their associates termed the "glorious pioneer spirit."¹⁵³ Earlier generations of American elite families focused on their European roots and the importance of European-based art. During the 1920s and 1930s, when Americans sought to recapture their past, both Henry Ford and John D. Rockefeller, Jr., used their museums to connect twentieth-century audiences with the American spirit and ideals of their forefathers.¹⁵⁴ Henry Ford, for instance, created his Museum and Greenfield Village to exhibit industrialists and inventors in the roles of industrial-age pioneers, whose innovations and accomplishments counted among the most recognizable American achievements of the century. He included his personal collection of "old American Pioneer Buildings," alongside his own birthplace within Greenfield Village.

¹⁵⁰ Nevins, *Ford: Expansion and Challenge*, 499; and Greenspan, *Creating Colonial Williamsburg*, 13, 53.

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*

¹⁵² As quoted in Greenspan, *Creating Colonial Williamsburg*, 13, 58.

¹⁵³ *Ibid.*, 54.

¹⁵⁴ *Ibid.*

The Ford Motor Company, Ford's museum, and his historical village would eventually reside within his extensive industrial complex, tying Ford's modern engineering feats to those of American pioneers.¹⁵⁵

Museum builders initiated multiple historical projects between 1925 and 1970. Henry Ford's Greenfield Village and Rockefeller's Colonial Williamsburg serve as two large-scale examples. Industrial philanthropists used museums as mechanisms not only to preserve America's past, but to create a training ground for the study of American accomplishments. Rockefeller and his associates intentionally designed Colonial Williamsburg for the study of American patriots of the eighteenth century, while Ford's projects exhibited a broader, though less defined, range of American achievements.¹⁵⁶

Smaller projects, such as Historic Deerfield in Massachusetts, continued the trend of patriotic preservation. Originally, Henry and Helen Flynt began their preservation project because of their connection with the local Deerfield Academy. However, by the early 1950s, Henry Flynt and Samuel Chamberlain marketed Deerfield's history based on its role as a stalwart New England village that had survived legendary Indian attacks. The townspeople of Deerfield later demonstrated remarkable patriotism, courage, and industriousness during the American Revolution. Within the introduction to *Frontier of Freedom*, Samuel Chamberlain and Henry N. Flynt advocated that similar values were needed in the "war" against Korea.¹⁵⁷ Philanthropists created and preserved villages during the mid-twentieth century as great American symbols in a time of international competition and war.

¹⁵⁵ Morton, *Strange Commissions for Henry Ford*, 3.

¹⁵⁶ Greenspan, *Creating Colonial Williamsburg*, 11-12.

¹⁵⁷ Samuel Chamberlain and Henry N. Flynt, *Frontier of Freedom: The Soul and Substance of America Portrayed in One Extraordinary Village, Old Deerfield, Massachusetts* (New York: Hastings House Publishers, 1952), 1.

Philanthropists used their museums to exhibit America's recurring narrative of war and peace in order to promote the nation's historical achievements and modern industrial progress. During this period of modern industry, Americans believed that the world had both benefitted and suffered from recent innovation.¹⁵⁸ Although Americans perceived industrial gains as great and the losses small, philanthropists further shaped American opinion of industry through their museums.¹⁵⁹ Museums could preserve old technology from being lost amidst the visual exhibition of new innovations. Combining collections of recent machinery alongside exhibitions of antique technologies, Henry Ford used his museums to visually "reproduce life of the country in its every age."¹⁶⁰ Ford's efforts exhibited a context for modern industrial growth through the historical display of technological evolution. Ford's museum showed human achievement as rooted in progress in the areas of "agriculture, manufacture, and transportation."¹⁶¹ While Rosenwald and Ford chose to exhibit industrial artifacts, Colonial Williamsburg portrayed American industriousness in the eighteenth century. Period buildings exhibited the technologies used during the time, as well as the decorative and industrial arts.¹⁶² Similarly, exhibitions of modern and industrial art illustrated the intersection of industrial materials and ideas as the next step in the march of artistic progress.¹⁶³ Unique collections of decorative, modern, and industrial art and artifacts perpetuated philanthropists' beliefs concerning the ongoing progression of American achievements.

¹⁵⁸ Nevins, *Ford: Expansion and Challenge*, 499-500; and Ruth Schwartz Cowan, *A Social History of American Technology* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 213-215.

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁶⁰ Upward, *A Home for Our Heritage*, 3.

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 4.

¹⁶² Greenspan, *Creating Colonial Williamsburg*, 48-49, 55.

¹⁶³ Nicholas Fox Weber, *The Clarks of Cooperstown: Their Singer Sewing Machine Fortune, Their Great and Influential Art Collections, Their Forty-Year Feud* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2007), 284; and Cowan, *A Social History of American Technology*, 213-215.

The industrial elites' involvement in museums and collecting served as unconventional investments. Philanthropists enlisted in collecting and museum building because these projects involved their investment of time, as opposed to money. Philanthropists felt that time was the greatest gift they could give, since time and involvement were priceless commodities whereas monetary requests could be satisfied with a large check.¹⁶⁴ The industrial elite participated directly in museum-building projects, interacting with staff and cultivating their own interests in museum-quality collections. Similar to Henry Ford's interaction with his staff, Stephen Clark and Julius Rosenwald shared their ideas, contributing to museums through their philanthropic influence.¹⁶⁵ The investment of time cultivated a larger culture of "hands-on" philanthropy, which necessitated the involvement of additional individuals to enact the donors' ideas and contribute to the larger cause.¹⁶⁶ Philanthropists' museum building utilized their time, money, and common interests as resources for the successful completion of American museums and collections.

Museum building also supplied a unique investment opportunity for philanthropists. During the 1920s and 1930s, taxes were a major problem for individuals with large taxable incomes. In 1935, Sterling Clark, an heir of the Singer Sewing Machine Company, claimed that he was one of only four people in the country to pay over a million dollars in taxes.¹⁶⁷ After federal and state taxes, he was left with approximately twenty percent of his gross income from 1936.¹⁶⁸ Museums offered a way

¹⁶⁴ Samuel S. Marquis, *Henry Ford: An Interpretation* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2007. Reprint of 1923 book), 107-108; and Weber, *The Clarks of Cooperstown*, 285.

¹⁶⁵ Morton, *Strange Commissions for Henry Ford*, 59-60.

¹⁶⁶ Ascoli, *Julius Rosenwald*, 408.

¹⁶⁷ Weber, *The Clarks of Cooperstown*, 210-211.

¹⁶⁸ *Ibid.*

to decrease this loss considerably. Beginning in 1924, the U.S. government gave tax exemptions to individuals who had given to charity ninety percent or more of their gross income over the previous ten years. In the case of Henry du Pont, this exemption presented him the opportunity to give millions of dollars' worth of objects to Winterthur Museum. Tax laws during this period presented the industrial elite with the opportunity to create and fund museums for both personal and public gain.¹⁶⁹

Philanthropists' Exhibition of Ideals

Each philanthropist built his museum to perpetuate his own ideals concerning America, its past, and its needs for the future. Scholars credit the inspiration for Henry Ford's museum in Dearborn to his famous "history is bunk" quote.¹⁷⁰ However, the development and purposes behind his preservation projects portray a more complex story. Ford set out to "gather specimens of nearly all the articles that have been used in this country since its settling" for his museum and relocate buildings related to important figures in the nation's history for his Greenfield Village.¹⁷¹ His preservation projects began at the Wayside Inn of Sudbury, Massachusetts prior to the establishment of the Dearborn projects. Wayside Inn served as a prototype for Ford's collecting policy in terms of the exhibition of architecture and artifacts in an artificial village setting. While Wayside Inn focused on New England life and material culture, Ford's Greenfield Village included multiple periods and geographic regions.¹⁷² The size and scope of the Museum and Village facilities in Dearborn also permitted the display of artifacts from

¹⁶⁹ Lord, *Henry F. du Pont and Winterthur*, 182; and Lynes, *The Tastemakers*, 287-309.

¹⁷⁰ Nevins, *Ford: Expansion and Challenge*, 497.

¹⁷¹ As quoted in *Ibid.*, 500-501.

¹⁷² Curtis F. Garfield and Alison R. Ridley, *As Ancient is this Hostelry: The Story of the Wayside Inn* (Sudbury, Massachusetts: Porcupine Enterprises, 1988), 195-251.

multiple eras. Ford collected everyday items common to multiple generations of Americans.¹⁷³ In 1931, he stated that visitors “may review the common household articles from the handicraft stage, through the hand and machine stage, to the machine stage, and then through the progress of machine work.”¹⁷⁴ Ford designed his museums to display his view of American history, including the achievements of his own generation.

Henry du Pont also created an experimental preservation project before attempting his major museum. In 1930, he established Chestertown House Museum in Southampton, Delaware. In a memorandum, du Pont stipulated that his institution should provide for the “education and enjoyment of the public,” with open access for visitors to roam the house.¹⁷⁵ He indicated that he wanted his facility to feel like a lived-in home, rather than a high-security museum.¹⁷⁶ du Pont established Winterthur Museum at approximately the same time as Chestertown House, although Winterthur opened to the general public many years later.¹⁷⁷ Winterthur's purposes at the time of its incorporation specified that it would improve the “physical, mental and moral condition of humanity” and promote “departments of knowledge” through the use of the Winterthur property as a museum.¹⁷⁸ du Pont’s museum evolved over time, transforming Winterthur from a general museum into a world-renowned collection of decorative art.¹⁷⁹

Julius Rosenwald’s plan for the Museum of Science and Industry in Chicago evolved over several decades. Rosenwald first publically shared his idea for the museum

¹⁷³ J.G. de Roulhac Hamilton, “The Ford Museum,” *The American Historical Review* 36, no. 4 (Jul 1931): 772-775.

¹⁷⁴ Nevins, *Ford: Expansion and Challenge*, 501.

¹⁷⁵ Lord, *Henry F. du Pont and Winterthur*, 195.

¹⁷⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷⁷ Ibid., 195-196.

¹⁷⁸ As quoted in Ibid., 196.

¹⁷⁹ Ibid.

during a survey conducted by the Commercial Club of Chicago in 1921. He responded suggesting that the most worthwhile project that the club could engage in for the betterment of the city would be the creation of an industrial museum. The museum would be useful for the public, as it would house, “for permanent display, machinery and working models illustrative of as many as possible of the mechanical processes of production and of manufacture.”¹⁸⁰ Essentially, his ideal museum would serve in the same capacity as the World’s Fair exhibitions, with the added benefit of permanence. Rosenwald’s trips to Europe prior to World War I and during the winter of 1926 further shaped his view of industrial museums.¹⁸¹ American travelers oftentimes visited the famous museums of London, Munich, Paris, and Vienna, and Rosenwald believed that Chicago deserved such an institution. He wanted to assemble remarkable examples of industrial technologies and processes within one museum, in order to inspire America’s “inventive genius.”¹⁸² Rosenwald was less involved in the creation of the Museum of Science and Industry than many other industrial philanthropists were in their respective museums. However, his ideas and funding contributed the framework for the museum that he preferred not be named in his honor.¹⁸³

John D. Rockefeller, Jr., combined his ideals with those of Reverend W. A. R. Goodwin to develop Colonial Williamsburg as an educational organization.¹⁸⁴ They restored the town of Williamsburg, Virginia, producing a museum of its eighteenth-

¹⁸⁰ Ascoli, *Julius Rosenwald*, 265.

¹⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 267.

¹⁸² *Ibid.*

¹⁸³ Jay Pridmore, *Inventive Genius: The History of the Museum of Science and Industry, Chicago* (Chicago: Museum of Science and Industry, 1996), 11, 63.

¹⁸⁴ Anders Greenspan, “How Philanthropy Can Alter Our View of the Past: A Look at Colonial Williamsburg,” *Voluntas* 5, no. 2 (1994): 194.

century history that taught Americans “that the future may learn from the past.”¹⁸⁵ The organization specifically focused on the American Revolutionary era, the founding fathers, and the patriotic values affiliated with America’s independence.¹⁸⁶ In addition to recreating Williamsburg’s history, Rockefeller’s restoration project shaped visitors’ understanding of American history through exhibitions of the town’s architecture, industries, and households. Like other philanthropists of the period, Rockefeller used Colonial Williamsburg to promote American values.¹⁸⁷

In 1952, Henry and Helen Flynt founded Historic Deerfield, Inc. (originally known as the Heritage Foundation) to carry out the ideas of Deerfield Academy’s headmaster, Frank Boyden.¹⁸⁸ Initially, the Flynts hoped to preserve several of the town’s old houses.¹⁸⁹ The preservation project expanded as they became convinced that the village of Deerfield represented the values of the free world.¹⁹⁰ As a symbol of the American republic, the Flynts founded Historic Deerfield to educate and inspire Americans concerning the nation’s values and enterprise, preserve New England buildings and material culture, and promote additional philanthropy to the museum.¹⁹¹ Historic Deerfield contains multiple historic houses established on a mile-long street, with an arrangement of collections and exhibits influenced by the expertise of Henry du Pont’s Winterthur Museum, John D. Rockefeller’s Colonial Williamsburg, and other institutions developed by the Flynts’ fellow collectors and friends. Staff from Colonial Williamsburg travelled to Deerfield at Mr. Flynt’s request to assist in developing a plan

¹⁸⁵ Greenspan, *Creating Colonial Williamsburg*, 73.

¹⁸⁶ Ibid.

¹⁸⁷ Greenspan, “How Philanthropy Can Alter Our View of the Past:” 194-195.

¹⁸⁸ Stillinger, *Historic Deerfield*, 38-39.

¹⁸⁹ Ibid.

¹⁹⁰ Ibid., 22; and Chamberlain, *Frontier of Freedom*, 1.

¹⁹¹ Stillinger, *Historic Deerfield*, 22, 38-39.

for preserving the buildings of the town, establishing a smaller-scale restoration project than that attempted by Rockefeller.¹⁹² Henry du Pont influenced the arrangement of several period rooms at Deerfield, while Joseph Downs* and Vincent Andrus of the Metropolitan Museum of Art's American Wing assisted the Flynts in establishing authentic collections. The Flynts' relationships with museum builders and collectors improved the level of professionalism of their Deerfield project.¹⁹³

Henry and Helen Flynt, as part of the second generation of museum-building philanthropists, benefitted from the expertise and philanthropic structure developed by the earlier generation (Henry Ford, John D. Rockefeller, Jr., and Julius Rosenwald) of museum builders and from the expertise of staff and professionals trained at first-generation institutions, such as Colonial Williamsburg.¹⁹⁴ For the second-generation of museum builders, Colonial Williamsburg became the preferred model for an ideal museum, as opposed to European models.¹⁹⁵ Although the specific objectives of museum builders varied, these philanthropists shared a similar dedication to educate the public in American patriotism and values through museums focused on American material culture and architecture.

The Common Museum-Building Experience

The collecting and museum-building activity of benefactors between 1925 and 1970 resulted in the widespread cultivation of American museums. Philanthropists'

¹⁹² Ibid., 1925.

¹⁹³ Ibid., 50, 53, 73.

¹⁹⁴ Henry du Pont fits more neatly within the second generation of museum builders due to his widespread activity with later collectors and affiliated associations. However, his early collecting at Winterthur established him as an influential expert for the second generation of museum builders. Ibid., 46, 73.

¹⁹⁵ Ibid., 47-49.

similar experiences due to their financial resources, social network, and collective interest in the preservation of American achievements assisted in the establishment of their museums. Few museums in the mid-twentieth century achieved the size and influence of those produced by the industrial elite. The difference between “dreamer[s]” and those able “to project . . . dreams into reality” was the common experience of industrial philanthropists and the methods through which they carried out their philanthropy.¹⁹⁶ Museum builders’ similar experiences and interests in museum building powered an engine of scientific philanthropy, through which their individual ideas could be realized.

In *The Industrial Museum* (1925), Charles R. Richards recommended the establishment of American industrial museums similar to those found in Europe. He estimated that recreating the Technical Museum of Vienna in New York City would require \$4.5 million.¹⁹⁷ Based on his calculations, another \$500,000 would be required for such an organization’s annual budget.¹⁹⁸ While Richards anticipated that these museums would be supported by local governments, American industrialists implemented a system of scientific philanthropy to support their institutions.¹⁹⁹ In the case of the Museum of Science and Industry in Chicago, Julius Rosenwald never wished to be the sole means of support for the museum.²⁰⁰ Rosenwald battled with the institution’s board to prevent the museum from being called the “Rosenwald Museum,” to ensure that his family would not be solely responsible for its financial support.²⁰¹ He stated “. . . I have always contended that my name in the title of the Museum would be a

¹⁹⁶ From Leo Wormser’s January 1931 report to Julius Rosenwald, as quoted in Ascoli, *Julius Rosenwald*, 377.

¹⁹⁷ Richards, *The Industrial Museum*, 51.

¹⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 54.

¹⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 51.

²⁰⁰ Ascoli, *Julius Rosenwald*, 328-329; and Pridmore, *Inventive Genius*, 63.

²⁰¹ Ascoli, *Julius Rosenwald*, 328.

handicap.”²⁰² Instead, Rosenwald encouraged others to give, form partnerships, and become involved through challenge grants. Individuals gave money, artifacts, and other resources to philanthropists’ projects through systems similar to Rosenwald’s challenge grants.²⁰³ Private philanthropy, rather than government support, provided a distinctive feature for the industrial elite’s museum-building activity.

Philanthropists could create museums due to their extraordinary wealth. Comparatively, municipal governments and private organizations usually did not fund such museum-building projects during this era. Henry Ford preserved multiple steam engines from Birmingham, England in his Dearborn museum, since local governments and organizations did not have the funding or interest to keep them.²⁰⁴ In 1934, during the first fundraising efforts for the Museum of Modern Art, the Rockefeller, Warburg, and Carnegie families made donations of over \$100,000 each.²⁰⁵

Some philanthropists had both unprecedented monetary influence and widespread business connections and resources at their disposal to devote to museum-building projects. For example, Henry Ford used Ford Motor Company branches in New England as “bases” where his staff could work and store his collection of artifacts.²⁰⁶ His local relationships connected staff to the historical source material needed for his projects.²⁰⁷ Ford’s executive staff, managers, and dealers assisted Ford with his collecting efforts, forming an army of workers dedicated to the preservation and collection of interesting

²⁰² As quoted in *Ibid.*, 328.

²⁰³ *Ibid.*, 408.

²⁰⁴ Morton, *Strange Commissions for Henry Ford*, 27.

²⁰⁵ Weber, *The Clarks of Cooperstown*, 285.

²⁰⁶ W.W. Taylor’s January 2, 1925 entry, W.W. Taylor Report ending Jan. 3. 1925, Vol. III (1924-1925), Folder 1-3, Box 1, Accession # 175, Edison Institute Collection, Benson Ford Research Center, The Henry Ford, 20900 Oakwood Blvd., Dearborn, Michigan 48124-5029. (Hereafter E.I. #175.)

²⁰⁷ *Ibid.*

Americana for his museums.²⁰⁸ As an active member of the business community, Ford used his corporate resources within his museum-building strategy.

Philanthropists' personal and family collections presented similar opportunities for artifacts to donate and strategies to pursue. Established museums sought out philanthropists for board membership and their collections for future donations. For example, Stephen Clark served as a founding trustee of the Museum of Modern Art (MoMA). However, both the Metropolitan Museum of Art and the MoMA hoped to obtain valuable paintings from his personal collection.²⁰⁹ According to Nicholas Fox Weber in *The Clarks of Cooperstown*, Albert Barr of the Museum of Modern Art especially hoped to obtain Georges Seurat's *Circus Sideshow* for the museum, due to Clark's position as a founding trustee of the institution. The work had been included in early temporary exhibits at the Museum of Modern Art, and Barr believed it to be one of the most valuable works owned by any of the museum trustees. However, Clark chose to donate his *Circus Sideshow* to the Metropolitan Museum of Art.²¹⁰

Some philanthropists shared similar experiences in regards to family collections, honoring their family history through specific donations to museums. Louise du Pont Crowninshield donated Crowninshield family decorative art to the Peabody Museum of Salem, Massachusetts in honor of her husband's ancestors.²¹¹ Industrial philanthropists exhibited American history and its material culture to include their local and family history. Henry Flynt, the son of a quarry owner and co-founder of Historic Deerfield,

²⁰⁸ November 1, 1924 entry in W.W. Taylor Report ending Nov. 1, 1924, Vol. II (1924), Folder 1-2, Box 1, E.I. #175; and Nevins, *Ford: Expansion and Challenge*, 501.

²⁰⁹ Weber, *The Clarks of Cooperstown*, 6-7.

²¹⁰ Weber cites this account from Alfred H. Barr, Jr., *The Museum of Modern Art First Loan Exhibition* (New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1929), 23, 25, 26. See Weber, *The Clarks of Cooperstown*, 317-321, 396.

²¹¹ Lord, *Henry F. du Pont and Winterthur*, 147.

claimed that he came from a “family of gatherers.”²¹² In this way, several philanthropists experienced antique collecting as a cultural activity in which they and their families took part.

Philanthropists had similar friendships based on collecting interests and preservation projects. Louise du Pont Crowninshield, Henry du Pont, and Bertha Benkard* shared a common interest in historic preservation and decorative arts.²¹³ Their collaboration resulted in joint donations of several period rooms to the Museum of the City of New York and the Metropolitan Museum of Art’s American Wing.²¹⁴ Some of the philanthropists shared similar goals for their projects, brainstorming and working alongside their associates. The Flynts contacted staff at John D. Rockefeller, Jr.’s Colonial Williamsburg for suggestions on how to begin preserving the houses of Deerfield. These associates in turn connected the Flynts to experts and information that they required to succeed in their projects.²¹⁵ The Flynts corresponded with Henry Ford, Henry du Pont, Israel Sack,* Ima Hogg, Alice Winchester, and others from both generations of museum builders to discuss collecting and restoration projects at Deerfield.²¹⁶

Philanthropists shared similar experiences making donations and serving on museum boards. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Museum of Modern Art, and others recruited influential collectors who shared interests in valuable art. In the 1930s, John D. Rockefeller, Jr., donated the Cloisters to the Metropolitan Museum of Art, although he

²¹² Stillinger, *Historic Deerfield*, 13.

²¹³ Lord, *Henry F. du Pont and Winterthur*, 151.

²¹⁴ *Ibid.*

²¹⁵ Stillinger, *Historic Deerfield*, 17.

²¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 17, 195-197.

never served on its board.²¹⁷ Stephen Clark served as a trustee of the Museum of Modern Art, while both Henry and Helen Flynt held positions on the board of the Pocumtuck Valley Memorial Association in Deerfield, Massachusetts.²¹⁸ These similar experiences integrated philanthropists within American collecting and museum building activity during the twentieth century.

Early- to mid-twentieth-century American society permitted both men and women of the industrial elite to engage in philanthropic activities. Culturally, women could participate in collecting, while philanthropic efforts afforded them suitable public roles.²¹⁹ During this period, women collectors created both the Museum of Modern Art and the Shelburne Museum, shaping these institutions of collection and display.²²⁰ Philanthropy, inclusive of women, offered a way to directly influence large groups of individuals. The townspeople of Deerfield, Massachusetts heralded both Henry and Helen Flynt as the “fairy godparents” of Deerfield due to their preservation accomplishments throughout the town. Although they were not as rich as the Rockefellers, the Flynts’ cooperation with the townspeople resulted in their earning the town’s appreciation.²²¹

Similarities among the industrial elites’ social experiences extended beyond their individual collecting interests. Stephen and Sterling Clark, along with other collectors of the period, defied the economic challenges of the Great Depression by purchasing art in a

²¹⁷ Michael Gross, *Rogues’ Gallery: The Secret History of the Moguls and the Money that Made the Metropolitan Museum* (New York: Broadway Books, 2009), 3, 5.

²¹⁸ Weber, *The Clarks of Cooperstown*, 6-7; and Stillinger, *Historic Deerfield*, 34.

²¹⁹ Kathleen D. McCarthy, *Women’s Culture: American Philanthropy and Art, 1830-1930* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991), xii.

²²⁰ *Ibid.* See Appendix B for a biographical entry on Electra Havemeyer Webb, founder of Shelburne Museum.

²²¹ Stillinger, *Historic Deerfield*, 19, 25.

buyer's market.²²² The group shared a common interest in American business and society, but their collections were predominantly influenced by their singular passion for material culture, in the form of decorative, industrial, and modern art. Mrs. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., Miss Lizzie P. Bliss, and Mrs. Mary Quinn Sullivan, the three founders of the Museum of Modern Art, met during Mrs. John D. Rockefeller, Jr.'s, trip to and from Egypt.²²³ In the days following the stock market crash of 1929, these three women established their museum to exhibit the latest modern works of the era.²²⁴ Collecting was an ongoing activity, which philanthropists could engage in regardless of age. While studying at Harvard, Henry du Pont first assisted his sister, Louise Crowninshield, with the furnishing of her Boston apartment with American antiques. Decades later, they continued to form museum collections, assisted in refurbishing the White House, and developed du Pont's Winterthur Museum.²²⁵

Industrial philanthropists shared a common interest in scientific philanthropy and related projects. Rockefeller used his philanthropy to support research "as the best means of promoting human welfare."²²⁶ This focus on research and higher learning extended to the art world, as the scientific philanthropy of Rockefeller, Ford, and Rosenwald became increasingly integrated into their collecting and museum building. First generation museum-building philanthropists supported the training of a new generation of scholars, who sought out a universal, rather than moral, version of "truth" that relied on academic

²²² Weber, *The Clarks of Cooperstown*, 297

²²³ *Ibid.*, 271

²²⁴ *Ibid.*; and Bernice Kert, *Abby Aldrich Rockefeller: The Woman in the Family*, (New York: Random House, Inc., 1993), 267-273.

²²⁵ Lord, *Henry F. du Pont and Winterthur*, 146-147.

²²⁶ Stocking, "Philanthropoids and Vanishing Cultures," 116.

and scientific research.²²⁷ The 1920s marked the philanthropists' early use of researchers and other experts as agents to carry out large-scale projects through scientific methods. New philanthropic ideals among this generation of philanthropists shaped the future growth of research centers and the educational objectives of the museums they helped to create.²²⁸

Many members of the American industrial elite shared common experiences travelling abroad, which shaped their opinions concerning representative and ideal museum types, methods, and collections. As experienced travelers, philanthropists established museums that competed with European institutions. H.F. Morton's* initial discussions with Henry Ford concerning Ford's plans for the museum in Dearborn referenced the creation of an institution similar to the British Science Museum at South Kensington.²²⁹ Although Ford's concept differed from that articulated at South Kensington, Ford recognized that Morton, as a British engineer of Ford Motor Company, and other agents would understand the similarities between South Kensington and his vision.²³⁰ Likewise, Rosenwald's idea for the Museum of Science and Industry in Chicago originated from his visits in 1911 to the Deutsches Museum in Munich.²³¹ Within this museum, Rosenwald first experienced hands-on learning, through which visitors could "push buttons and pull levers."²³² Henry du Pont also visited Europe in order to study horticulture and interior design, an experience which later shaped the

²²⁷ Stanley Coben, *Rebellion against Victorianism: The Impetus for Cultural Change in 1920s America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 43.

²²⁸ *Ibid.*, 43, 60.

²²⁹ Morton, *Strange Commissions for Henry Ford*, 1.

²³⁰ *Ibid.*

²³¹ Ascoli, *Julius Rosenwald*, 265.

²³² *Ibid.*

development of the gardens and decorative arts exhibits at his Winterthur Museum.²³³

This group's travel abroad supplied the inspiration for their ideas regarding design and museum exhibition.

The 1920s and 1930s marked a time of great activity among America's industrial elite, as they attempted to compete with the government-supported collections of Europe.²³⁴ Donations of art and artifacts from the industrial elite further expanded America's museum collections. American organizations depended upon industrialists' unique form of private philanthropy, rather than government support, to form museums comparable to European institutions. In the 1930s, some philanthropists began to transfer their collections, created in the 1920s, to the new museums.²³⁵ In addition to the establishment of Julius Rosenwald's Museum of Science and Industry, John D. Rockefeller, Jr.'s, Colonial Williamsburg, Henry Ford's Museum and Greenfield Village, and Abby Aldrich Rockefeller's Museum of Modern Art, other major philanthropists donated significant collections. Within a ten-year span, Julius Rosenwald's son, Lessing Rosenwald,* donated his unprecedented print collection to the National Gallery of Art, while Gertrude Vanderbilt Whitney* created the Whitney Museum of American Art. In addition, John D. Rockefeller, Jr., donated the Cloisters to the Metropolitan Museum of Art and Hilla Rebay started the Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum.²³⁶

Museum builders participated in a similar culture of philanthropic museum building. In some cases, philanthropists visited one another's museums. A letter to

²³³ Lord, *Henry F. du Pont and Winterthur*, 185.

²³⁴ Thomas Adam, *Buying Respectability: Philanthropy and Urban Society in Transnational Perspective, 1840s to 1930s* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2009), 5-6.

²³⁵ David C. Hammack, "Failure and Resilience: Pushing the Limits in Depression and Wartime," in *Charity, Philanthropy, and Civility in American History*, 277.

²³⁶ *Ibid.*

Henry Ford from a staff member of Colonial Williamsburg demonstrates how Henry Ford, John D. Rockefeller, Jr., and their respective staffs visited between their museums. Kenneth Chorley wrote, “Perhaps you recall that on the occasion of your last visit to Williamsburg, Virginia, I had the pleasure of showing you the Restoration work which Mr. Rockefeller, Jr. has been carrying out there [Y]ou remarked . . . that you would be glad to have us come out [to Dearborn].”²³⁷ Similarly, the Flynts traveled to Winterthur in 1946 and to the Metropolitan Museum of Art’s American Wing in 1947 to learn more about the appropriate display of decorative art and how to develop their own museum in Deerfield, Massachusetts.²³⁸ Their travels presented opportunities to study similar institutions of the time.

As part of the industrial elite’s unique system of scientific philanthropy, museum builders implemented common practices in hiring agents. Philanthropists’ agents, as key staff members, assisted with the necessary exchange of ideas and methodologies for museum building. Agents offered expertise as dealers, curators, and museum professionals, advising philanthropists on best practices.²³⁹ George Stocking, Jr., described the role of agents from another Rockefeller project as “a rather small group of reform-minded academically oriented foundation bureaucrats, whom some in foundation circles jokingly referred to as ‘philanthropoids’ . . . and the succession of [experts] who advised them.”²⁴⁰ Agents had the time and flexibility to travel and correspond with philanthropists’ staffs on specific topics. Kenneth Chorley, president of Colonial

²³⁷ Letter from Kenneth Chorley to Henry Ford dated February 5, 1935, Folder 959- Rock-Rocz, Box 1823, Accession # 285, Henry Ford Office Papers, Ford Motor Company Records Collection, Benson Ford Research Center, The Henry Ford, 20900 Oakwood Blvd., Dearborn, Michigan 48124-5029.

²³⁸ Stillinger, *Historic Deerfield*, 25.

²³⁹ Stocking, “Philanthropoids and Vanishing Cultures,” 133.

²⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 134

Williamsburg, and A. E. Kendrew, Colonial Williamsburg's head of architecture, traveled to Deerfield to discuss proposed preservation projects with Henry Flynt.²⁴¹ Similarly, Joseph Downs, the curator of the Metropolitan Museum of Art's American Wing, met separately with the Flynts and Henry du Pont to advise them on their respective museum projects.²⁴² He later assisted with the Colonial Williamsburg Antiques Forum, which trained collectors and museum builders on topics concerning material culture.²⁴³ Another museum professional, Paul J. Sachs* served on the board of the Museum of Modern Art, in addition to working for Harvard's Fogg Museum.²⁴⁴ Sachs was also responsible for shaping Julius Rosenwald's philanthropic perspective on the importance of education.²⁴⁵ Agents shared common knowledge of museum practices from their own training and experience as dealers and curators, in order to connect philanthropists with the resources, dealers, and other experts needed for successful projects.

Several industrial philanthropists displayed their collections within their homes. Their private homes exhibited many classical and modern works of art, indicative of their respective collecting interests. Walter Chrysler, Jr.'s, home contained a Picasso, accompanied by works of other well-known artists.²⁴⁶ Edsel and Eleanor Ford's estate in Grosse Point Shores, Michigan, presents a well-preserved example of how major art

²⁴¹ Stillinger, *Historic Deerfield*, 19.

²⁴² *Ibid.*, 25.

²⁴³ *Ibid.* See Appendix C for a list of known attendees of the Colonial Williamsburg Antiques Forums, starting in 1949. See also Appendix D for a list of philanthropists, agents, and known associates who presented at the Colonial Williamsburg Antiques Forums.

²⁴⁴ McCarthy, *Women's Culture*, 205.

²⁴⁵ *Ibid.*; Pridmore, *Inventive Genius*, 15; and Ascoli, *Julius Rosenwald*, 78-79. Paul J. Sachs served as junior partner and eventual head of the investment bank, Goldman, Sachs, and Company.

²⁴⁶ Peggy Earle, *Legacy: Walter Chrysler, Jr. and the Untold Story of Norfolk's Chrysler Museum of Art* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2008), 40.

works were incorporated into these philanthropists' homes.²⁴⁷ Collecting became an integral part of the decoration of the Ford home, incorporating modern art into its Cotswold design.²⁴⁸ Likewise, Stephen Clark exhibited his collection of modern art works by lending pieces to museums and displaying them within his home, opening it for viewings to benefit charitable organizations.²⁴⁹ Personal collections eventually enhanced local museum collections. Chrysler gave his personal collection to his museum in Norfolk, while Ford gifted several works from his home to the Detroit Institute of Arts.²⁵⁰

A combination of similar experiences led philanthropists to establish their museums. Over two generations, members of the industrial elite established an American museum ideal based on the implementation of their scientific philanthropy. Multiple organizations educated benefactors regarding the philanthropic and museum ideas of the time, impacting the formation of philanthropists' institutions.

Ford, Rockefeller, and Rosenwald's museums constituted only one type of philanthropy in which they were involved.²⁵¹ Henry Ford, Julius Rosenwald, and John D. Rockefeller shared common viewpoints of American industry, as they each served in executive roles of large corporations. President Herbert Hoover invited Rosenwald, Ford, and other influential business to a conference in November 1929 to discuss the nation's

²⁴⁷ For additional information on the collecting activity of Edsel and Eleanor Ford and the display of their collection at the Edsel and Eleanor Ford House and the Detroit Institute of Arts, see <http://www.fordhouse.org/>. I conducted site tours regarding the display of these works at both the Edsel and Eleanor Ford House and the Detroit Institute of Arts on December 29, 2009.

²⁴⁸ Ibid.

²⁴⁹ One such exhibition of Clark's collection took place in 1954 to benefit the Fresh Air Association of St. John. This event exhibited over twenty-four of Clark's collected art works, including several by Rembrandt, Manet, Degas, Renoirs, and Cezannes. See Weber, *The Clarks of Cooperstown*, 6-8.

²⁵⁰ Ibid; and Earle, *Legacy*, 40.

²⁵¹ Nevins, *Ford: Expansion and Challenge*, 503; and Letter from Kenneth Chorley to Henry Ford dated February 5, 1935, Folder 959- Rock-Rocz, Box 1823, Accession # 285.

economic situation.²⁵² As the first-generation of museum builders, Rockefeller, Rosenwald, and Ford interacted as fellow businessmen and philanthropists. In 1918, both Rosenwald and John D. Rockefeller, Jr., offered to support the same project at the University of Chicago following a meeting between the university, Rosenwald, and the Rockefeller Foundation Board.²⁵³ Both men also supported the same capital campaigns for the Tuskegee and Hampton Institutes in 1924, due to their shared interest in improving black education in America.²⁵⁴ In 1928, John D. Rockefeller, Jr., gave \$500,000 to assist in the development of Russian colonies for Jews, in honor of Julius Rosenwald and another leader of the project.²⁵⁵ Ford, Rockefeller, and Rosenwald's museums constituted only one type of philanthropy in which they were involved.²⁵⁶

The second generation of museum builders, including Henry du Pont, Louise du Pont Crowninshield, Ima Hogg, Stephen Clark, Henry and Helen Flynt, Electra Havemeyer Webb, Walter Chrysler, Jr., Edsel and Eleanor Ford, and others, was more single-minded in their philanthropic support. The Walpole Society, National Trust for Historic Preservation, Colonial Williamsburg Antiques Forum, Fine Arts Committee for the White House, and similar organized activities presented museum builders with the opportunity to learn about collecting and museum building of the time.

Formed in 1910, the Walpole Society served as a social opportunity for male collectors of American antiquities, particularly those who focused on New England material culture. This philanthropic organization was dedicated to "the appreciation and

²⁵² Ibid.

²⁵³ Ascoli, *Julius Rosenwald*, 283-284.

²⁵⁴ Ibid., 293-294.

²⁵⁵ Ibid., 335-337.

²⁵⁶ Letter from Kenneth Chorley to Henry Ford dated February 5, 1935, Folder 959- Rock-Rocz, Box 1823, Accession # 285.

study of American decorative art, architecture, and history.”²⁵⁷ Members had to meet entrance requirements, including “distinction in the collecting of early American objects of the decorative arts and other arts, attainment through study or experience in the knowledge of these arts; and the social qualifications essential to the well-being of a group of like-minded persons.”²⁵⁸ Joseph Downs, whose career included curatorial positions at the Philadelphia Art Museum, the Winterthur Museum, and the American Wing at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, belonged to the Walpole Society.²⁵⁹ The society also elected Henry du Pont as a member in 1932 and Henry Flynt in 1951. Members of this organization included select philanthropists, collectors, and agents, whose association with the Walpole Society offered them the opportunity to meet at each others’ museums and homes to discuss their shared interests in local history and material culture.²⁶⁰

Several philanthropists informally corresponded concerning their similar interests in collecting and museum building. In the late 1930s and early 1940s, Henry Flynt wrote letters to Colonial Williamsburg and Henry Ford’s Greenfield Village to establish relations and discuss his plans for a similar historical town in Deerfield, Massachusetts.²⁶¹ Flynt also corresponded with Henry du Pont of Winterthur Museum, Ima Hogg of Bayou Bend, and Alice Winchester of *The Magazine Antiques*, as well as antique dealers Israel Sack, John Kenneth Byard, and Bernard Levy.²⁶²

²⁵⁷ As quoted in “The Walpole Society Papers,” *The Joseph Downs Collection of Manuscripts and Printed Ephemera, The Winterthur Library*, Henry Francis du Pont Winterthur Museum, http://findingaid.winterthur.org/html/HTML_Finding_Aids/COL0386.htm.

²⁵⁸ As quoted in Lord, *Henry F. du Pont and Winterthur*, 198.

²⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 192.

²⁶⁰ *Ibid.*; and Stillinger, *Historic Deerfield*, 48, 53.

²⁶¹ Stillinger, *Historic Deerfield*, 17, 195.

²⁶² *Ibid.*, 41, 46-47, 196-197.

Bernard Levy co-owned Ginsburg & Levy, Inc.,²⁶³ an antique shop based in New York City. Other owners of the shop included John Ginsburg, Benjamin Ginsburg, and Isaac Levy. The dealership operated for over seven decades and served members of both generations of museum-building collectors.²⁶⁴ Ginsburg & Levy supplied important antiques to the Metropolitan Museum of Art, Henry Ford, and John D. Rockefeller, Jr. In addition, Ginsburg & Levy sold to Henry du Pont, Henry and Helen Flynt, Ima Hogg, and Electra Havemeyer Webb, serving as a common supplier of American decorative and industrial art.²⁶⁵

National interest in American material culture and architecture increased during the 1940s and 1950s, resulting in the concurrent founding of museums, including Old Sturbridge Village, Historic Deerfield, Winterthur Museum, Shelburne Museum, and others.²⁶⁶ Louise Crowninshield and her contemporaries served as charter members and trustees for the National Trust for Historic Preservation, which worked to preserve and restore historic buildings and sites throughout the country.²⁶⁷ The National Trust provided its members with the opportunity to share ideas concerning the preservation of America's historic places.²⁶⁸ Ralph E. Carpenter, Jr., served as trustee of both the National Trust and Henry Ford's Wayside Inn. On July 15, 1957, the National Trust,

²⁶³ See Appendix C for a list of known philanthropists who utilized the services of Ginsburg & Levy, Inc.

²⁶⁴ "Ginsburg & Levy, Inc. (New York, N.Y.)," *Archives Directory for the History of Collecting in America*, The Frick Collection, <http://research.frick.org/directoryweb/browserecord.php?action=browse&-recid=7421>; and Stillinger, *Historic Deerfield*, 44, 46-47.

²⁶⁵ *Ibid.*

²⁶⁶ Stillinger, *Historic Deerfield*, 44, 46-47.

²⁶⁷ The National Trust for Historic Preservation was founded in 1949. Its current mission is "The National Trust for Historic Preservation provides leadership, education, advocacy, and resources to save America's diverse historic places and revitalize our communities." See "About the National Trust for Historic Preservation," National Trust for Historic Preservation, <http://www.preservationnation.org/about-us/>. See also Lord, *Henry F. du Pont and Winterthur*, 147.

²⁶⁸ Stillinger, *Historic Deerfield*, 48.

under the presidency of Louise Crowninshield, took over management of Wayside Inn from the Ford Foundation. This exchange placed Ford's early preservation project into the hands of the second generation of museum-building philanthropists.²⁶⁹ The National Trust created the Louise du Pont Crowninshield Award to honor those who made significant contributions to American historic preservation. In 1969, the Trust presented the award to Mr. and Mrs. Flynt for their work at Deerfield, honoring their contributions to the field.²⁷⁰

The Flynts, Henry du Pont, Electra Havemeyer Webb, and Ima Hogg formed a second generation of museum builders who worked during the later part of the period between 1925 and 1970. This group could rely on the framework established by the previous generation of industrial philanthropists. Starting in 1949, select collectors and scholars of Americana shared expertise through the annual Antiques Forum at Colonial Williamsburg.²⁷¹ John M. Graham II, curator of Colonial Williamsburg, and Alice Winchester, editor of *The Magazine Antiques*, presided over the Forum as co-sponsors of the event.²⁷² Participants included Mr. and Mrs. Henry Flynt of Historic Deerfield; Electra Havemeyer Webb of Shelburne Museum; Miss Ima Hogg of Bayou Bend in Houston, Texas; Joseph Downs, curator of Winterthur Museum; and others.²⁷³ The Antiques Forum served as a relatively small event for curators, dealers, collectors, and scholars, with approximately 310 participants in 1953.²⁷⁴ Presentations educated these participants on topics related to the collection and study of antiques, as well as the

²⁶⁹ Garfield, *As Ancient is this Hostelry*, 268, 270.

²⁷⁰ Stillinger, *Historic Deerfield*, 57.

²⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 47-49.

²⁷² Sanka Knox, "Antiques Experts Trace Influences: Forum in Williamsburg is Told Chippendale Gets Too Much Credit for His Designs," *New York Times*, January 21, 1953.

²⁷³ *Ibid.*; and Stillinger, *Historic Deerfield*, 47-49.

²⁷⁴ *Ibid.*

formation of museum collections.²⁷⁵ J. A. Hyde formed a more intimate group of collectors from the larger group of Forum Attendees including Mr. and Mrs. Henry Flynt, Ima Hogg, Alice Winchester, John Graham II, Electra Havemeyer Webb, Maxim Karolik, Ralph Carpenter, and a few others.²⁷⁶ The group met at each others' homes throughout the year to discuss their similar experiences from building collections.²⁷⁷ The Colonial Williamsburg Antiques Forum served as an important educational opportunity for collectors and philanthropists concerning the museum and collecting ideas that could impact their museum building.²⁷⁸

Additionally, Ima Hogg invited Mr. and Mrs. Flynt and Ralph Carpenter to present lectures at a similar forum in Houston, Texas. The 1956 Fine Arts Forum served as the first of its kind in the city. The event also honored Henry du Pont with the Texas Heritage Scroll for his museum-building achievements.²⁷⁹ Collectors' experiences at Colonial Williamsburg and similar meetings educated them in best practices for the formation of their own collections.²⁸⁰

In 1961, Mrs. John F. Kennedy invited select philanthropists and agents from both first- and second-generation museums to refurbish the White House. Mrs. Kennedy served as honorary chairman of the Fine Arts Committee for the White House, with

²⁷⁵ See Appendix C for a list of known attendees of the Colonial Williamsburg Antiques Forums, starting in 1949. See also Appendix D for a list of philanthropists, agents, and known associates who presented at the Colonial Williamsburg Antiques Forums.

²⁷⁶ Stillinger, *Historic Deerfield*, 47-49. See Appendix C for a list of members of "J.A. Lloyd Hyde's Casual Group of Collectors." J.A. Lloyd Hyde, a dealer of decorative arts; Maxim Karolik, a collector of American Art and donor to the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston; and Ralph Carpenter, a collector of Rhode Island furniture, also presented at the Colonial Williamsburg Antiques Forums. See Appendix D; and Deborah Chapman, The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, e-mail message to author, May 13, 2010.

²⁷⁷ Stillinger, *Historic Deerfield*, 47-49.

²⁷⁸ Ibid.

²⁷⁹ Ibid., 49.

²⁸⁰ Ibid., 47-49.

Henry F. du Pont of Winterthur Museum as committee chairman.²⁸¹ The committee merged their shared interests in American furnishings to establish the White House as “a museum of our country’s heritage and a testimonial to American fine arts and cabinet-making.”²⁸² A panel of advisers, including Miss Ima Hogg of Bayou Bend, Gerald G. Gibson of the Henry Ford Museum, John M. Graham II of Colonial Williamsburg, and James Biddle of the Metropolitan Museum of Art’s American Wing, assisted Mrs. Kennedy, Henry du Pont, and the committee in carrying out their mission.²⁸³ The Fine Arts Committee and its advisory board provided an additional opportunity for generations of museum-building philanthropists and agents to combine their similar interests in collecting to form a White House collection of nationally-significant artifacts.

In a growing world of American collecting, this second generation of museum builders gained precedence for their expertise and accomplishments. These individuals shared similar expertise due to their access to methods of institutions created by the first generation of museum builders, while expanding American museums through their own implementation of a similar system of scientific philanthropy.

Conclusion

Collectors and museum builders formed a culture by which they transformed charitably-inspired visions into successful institutions. The museum builders shared a combination of similar experiences, which resulted in the establishment of their institutions. Industrial philanthropists of this era believed scientific philanthropy, through

²⁸¹ Lord, *Henry F. du Pont and Winterthur*, 248-249; and “First Lady Names a Fine Arts Group,” *New York Times*, April 19, 1961.

²⁸² As quoted in “Mrs. Kennedy’s Fine-Arts Hunt Enriches White House Treasure,” *New York Times*, July 4, 1961.

²⁸³ *Ibid.*; and Lord, *Henry F. du Pont and Winterthur*, 248-249.

useful education, would enable workers to be successful in their vocations. Investment of museum builders' time and money within their institutions furthered philanthropists' educational missions and patriotic recreations of the past. Philanthropists built their museums to perpetuate their individual ideals concerning America, its past, and its needs for the future.

Members of the industrial elite formed museums due to their similar beliefs, wealth, social networks, and unified interest in the preservation of American achievements. This group of men and women shared a belief in the importance of both collecting and scientific philanthropy. As experienced travelers, these philanthropists sought to establish museums that could compete with those they found in Europe. However, their similar circumstances and experiences led to the formation of new philanthropically-supported, American museums.

CHAPTER FOUR: A MECHANISM OF MUSEUM BUILDING

If one could not be “as rich as Henry Ford,” a close second might be the management of projects using Ford’s seemingly unlimited resources. H.F. Morton* and others had such an opportunity.²⁸⁴ Under orders from Henry Ford, these agents set in motion enormous museum-building projects. They recruited assistance from hundreds of people, ranging from farmers to collectors, housewives to engineers, and craftsmen to shopkeepers. Agents mediated an exchange of artifacts and resources between Ford and average people, who were willing to give buildings, furnishings, and industrial machinery to his museums. This multi-directional system of philanthropy exemplified the relationship between Ford as the philanthropist, his agents, and potential donors to create his museums. Ford serves as a case study of the philanthropic system that he utilized to propel a modern mechanism of museum building.

Henry Ford,* John D. Rockefeller, Jr.,* Abby Aldrich Rockefeller,* Henry du Pont,* Julius Rosenwald,* Louise du Pont Crowninshield,* Stephen Clark,* Ima Hogg,* Electra Havemeyer Webb,* Henry and Helen Flynt,* and others developed American museums between 1925 and 1970.²⁸⁵ Museum building entailed the personal involvement of philanthropists in the management of their collections. Due to their interest in scientific philanthropy, some museum builders depended upon agents for assistance in their collecting. Agents served as the unseen force responsible for the efficient day-to-day operations of these philanthropic initiatives. In the case of Henry

²⁸⁴ H.F. Morton, *Strange Commissions for Henry Ford* (York, England: Herald Printing Works, 1934), 1. Asterisks in text signify inclusion of the noted individual’s biographical entry in Appendix B.

²⁸⁵ See Appendix A for a list of institutions, philanthropists, and agents mentioned within this chapter.

Ford's museums, agents established the underlying structure for his vision.²⁸⁶

Furthermore, Ford's agents' records are the most conclusive primary source materials available regarding the creation and evolution of Ford's Wayside Inn, Greenfield Village, and Museum.

Ford's interest in American production led him to collect and exhibit industrial artifacts, decorative and industrial art, and architecture. His collecting agents competed against other museums and businesses for artifacts located throughout America and Europe, which made museum building a challenging occupation. Through his implementation of the museum-building process, Ford serves as a case study of the philanthropic system used by American museum builders.

Mechanics of Museum Building

Between 1925 and 1970, two generations of philanthropists built museums through a multi-directional system of philanthropy, by which agents mediated the exchange of museum artifacts and financial resources between philanthropists and average citizens. Henry Ford's Museum, Greenfield Village, and Wayside Inn; John D. Rockefeller's Colonial Williamsburg; Henry du Pont's Winterthur Museum; and Henry and Helen Flynt's Historic Deerfield demonstrate the mechanical process responsible for these twentieth-century museums. The majority of this chapter presents Henry Ford's agents and their contributions to his museum-building philanthropy. Many parallels can be drawn between Henry Ford's agents and similar activity among the other museum projects. Philanthropists had similar resources and experiences, as well as access to

²⁸⁶ My understanding of agents' roles in museum building and historical interpretation is based on professional and dinner conversations with Peter Spang during my Historic Deerfield Summer Fellowship (June-August 2007).

philanthropic and museum ideas of the time, resulting in their respective museum-building initiatives. Particularly in the case of Henry Ford's projects, agents assisted the philanthropist in propelling a museum-building mechanism forward, contributing expertise and manpower to the acquisition of collections, the design of exhibits, and the administration of his museums. The success of the collecting process depended upon agents' abilities to mediate a multi-directional system of philanthropy, in which amateur collectors and business men offered restricted gifts in support of the philanthropists' vision.

American philanthropists believed in the importance of scientific philanthropy, depending upon experts to collect necessary data and produce results. In their museum-building activities, the industrial elite recruited "collecting agents" to satisfy their need for expertise in American antiques, collecting, museum exhibits, and administration. In regards to his philanthropic projects, John D. Rockefeller, Jr., stated, "All my life I have employed experts. I listen to what they say and then I exercise my own judgment."²⁸⁷ Agents were advisors who carried out the wishes of philanthropists. Russell Lynes referred to these individuals as "taste-makers" within the context of collecting.²⁸⁸ Philanthropists recruited architects, artists, decorators, dealers, and other content experts to fill these roles.²⁸⁹ The responsibilities of agents varied depending on the philanthropist they worked for, but each sought to carry out his activities based on the philanthropist's grand vision for his or her institution.

²⁸⁷ As quoted in Richard Handler and Eric Gable, *The New History in an Old Museum: Creating the Past at Colonial Williamsburg* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1997), 33.

²⁸⁸ Russell Lynes, *The Tastemakers* (New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1954), 4-5.

²⁸⁹ *Ibid*; and Aline B. Saarinen, *The Proud Possessors: The Lives, Times and Tastes of Some Adventurous American Art Collectors* (New York: Random House, 1958), xix-xx.

Beginning in the 1920s, Henry Ford recruited H.F. Morton to assist him with the acquisition of out-of-date steam engines for his museum in Dearborn. Morton, the plant engineer for Ford Motor Company in England, had already procured machinery for Ford's factory in Dagenham before Ford requested him to compile descriptions and photographs of Britain's historic engines.²⁹⁰ Ford explained to Morton that he planned to collect these British steam engines as part of his effort to create an institution similar to the British Science Museum at South Kensington.²⁹¹ With Ford's \$10,000,000 budget, Morton implemented the systematic dismantling, shipment, and re-erection of these industrial giants for Ford's museum.²⁹² During the 1920s and 1930s, Ford traveled to England many times, meeting with Morton and discussing additional projects. This partnership resulted in the acquisition of Birmingham engines and many other industrial artifacts, as well as architectural examples from London and the Cotswold region.²⁹³

In similar fashion, Ford requested the assistance of Frank Vivian* to acquire artifacts in California. At Ford's request, Vivian obtained San Francisco's earliest arc lights from their inventor as one part of a larger museum collection that would display great industrial and mechanical achievements.²⁹⁴ Collecting efforts were also fraught with challenges. Vivian's acquisition of the Wohlbruck Collection of automobiles, carriages, and wagons helped to build Ford's transportation collection. However, Vivian first had to persuade Wohlbruck's widow to give the collection to the museum, since Mr.

²⁹⁰ Morton, *Strange Commissions for Henry Ford*, 1, 7; and "H F Morton: The Ford Motor Company (Britain) Ltd, Trafford Park," *Chetham's Library*, The National Archives, <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/a2a/records.aspx?cat=418-morton&cid=-1#-1>.

²⁹¹ Morton, *Strange Commissions for Henry Ford*, 1, 7.

²⁹² Ibid.

²⁹³ Ibid.

²⁹⁴ Allan Nevins and Frank Ernest Hill, *Ford: Expansion and Challenge, 1915-1933*, Vol. II (New York: Arno Press, A New York Times Company, 1976. Reprint of 1957 book.), 501-502.

Wohlbruck died shortly following Vivian's initial request for the collection. Once Vivian received permission from Mrs. Wohlbruck, his staff organized and stored the collection before shipping it to Dearborn in fifty-six freight cars.²⁹⁵

Ford was a challenging boss, who insisted that his staff carry out his requests to the letter. Vivian successfully acquired the botanist Luther Burbank's office and home, but his failure to obtain Burbank's favorite dog left Ford dissatisfied. Burbank's widow had refused Vivian's request for the dog, since it was buried with its owner.²⁹⁶ The Burbank situation illustrates one of many cases in which philanthropists, including Ford, ignored other peoples' emotions and made impossible demands.

Ford also used a contingent of agents on the East Coast to assist with organization and collection for his Wayside Inn, Greenfield Village, and Museum in Dearborn.

William W. Taylor* worked out of an office at Wayside Inn and traveled to various sites to purchase and trade for antiques. He also coordinated the packing, storage, and shipment of these items to Ford's branch offices or the appropriate museum site.²⁹⁷

Taylor utilized his past museum experiences to assist Ford, since Taylor had already worked with the Phillips Andover Academy's Department of Archaeology, the Society for Preservation of New England Antiquities (SPNEA), the Haverhill Historical Society, and served as curator of the Harrison Gray Otis House in Boston prior to assisting with planning and collecting for Ford's museums.²⁹⁸ In order to investigate Mrs. Ford's

²⁹⁵ Ibid.

²⁹⁶ Ibid.

²⁹⁷ W.W. Taylor's report dated January 2, 1925 in W.W. Taylor Report ending Jan. 3. 1925, Vol. III (1924-1925), Folder 1-3, Box 1, Accession # 175, Edison Institute Collection, Benson Ford Research Center, The Henry Ford, 20900 Oakwood Blvd., Dearborn, Michigan 48124-5029. (Hereafter E.I. #175.)

²⁹⁸ "Former Collector For Ford Dies," *Haverhill Gazette*, August 2, 1949; and Seth W. Miller, e-mail message to author, May 18, 2010.

Bryant ancestors and their antiques, Taylor partnered with Mrs. Gladys M. Salta.²⁹⁹ She assisted in developing the Bryant family genealogy, and acquired heirlooms for Mrs. Ford. The Bryants gave family items to Mrs. Ford because they believed that the objects would be preserved under her care, ensuring that both Mr. and Mrs. Ford's collections would be safeguarded for future generations.³⁰⁰

Philanthropists frequently relied on the opinions and expertise of friends and agents. Mr. and Mrs. Havemeyer, the parents of Electra Havemeyer Webb,* became interested in contemporary artists and their work through the efforts of their mutual friend and famous impressionist painter, Mary Cassatt.³⁰¹ Henry du Pont depended on the advice of Edward Crowninshield, one of the first American dealers of Chinese export porcelain.³⁰² Bertha Benkard,* a fellow philanthropist and collector, also assisted du Pont in collecting and planning for his Winterthur Museum.³⁰³ Benkard and du Pont worked together, sharing their knowledge and opinions over the phone and in person, in order to successfully realize du Pont's vision for his museum.³⁰⁴

Peter Spang assisted in the growth of Henry and Helen Flynt's philanthropic project, presently known as Historic Deerfield. A Harvard graduate and attendee of the first Seminar for Historical Administration at Colonial Williamsburg, Spang was the first

²⁹⁹ W.W. Taylor's report dated January 2, 1925 in W.W. Taylor Report ending Jan. 3. 1925, Vol. III.

³⁰⁰ "Report for Mr. Taylor on Bryant Heirlooms," Report from Mrs. Gladys M. Salta dated November 9, 1925, Vol. III.

³⁰¹ Saarinen, *The Proud Possessors*, 159.

³⁰² Ruth Lord, *Henry F. du Pont and Winterthur: A Daughter's Portrait* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999), 192-193.

³⁰³ Ibid.

³⁰⁴ Ibid.

professional staff person hired at Deerfield.³⁰⁵ His job as Assistant Curator placed him under the direction of the Flynts, who served as curators and collectors of the institution. Spang inventoried the artifacts, produced the historical research, and educated both guides and students.³⁰⁶ Within his role of carrying out the requests of the Flynts, Spang joined the ranks of agents who worked to fulfill the requests of philanthropists.³⁰⁷

Museum building encouraged philanthropists to involve themselves in the administration and management of their collecting activities. Philanthropists' projects adopted the attributes of their businesses. The efficiency and scale of these initiatives provided an opportunity for even the most grandiose dreams to become a reality.

Philanthropists, such as Henry Ford and Stephen Clark, formed collections by using their skills as businessmen. Ford travelled throughout the United States, picking up antiques along the way and storing them in his company warehouses.³⁰⁸ His staff, including Frank Campsall* as Assistant Secretary, engaged in extensive correspondence to keep track of agents and objects.³⁰⁹ W.W. Taylor sent weekly reports, letters, and telegrams to Frank Campsall and Henry Ford from his collecting assignments in New England.³¹⁰ Stephen Clark also used his business knowledge to help museums. As a

³⁰⁵ Elizabeth Stillinger, *Historic Deerfield: A Portrait of Early America* (New York: Dutton Studio Books, 1992), 55.

³⁰⁶ *Ibid.*

³⁰⁷ My understanding of agents' roles in museum building and historical interpretation is based on professional and dinner conversations with Peter Spang during my Historic Deerfield Summer Fellowship (June-August 2007).

³⁰⁸ Nevins, *Ford: Expansion and Challenge*, 497; and W.W. Taylor's report dated November 1, 1924 in W.W. Taylor Report ending Nov. 1, 1924, Vol. II (1924), Folder 1-2, Box 1, E.I. #175.

³⁰⁹ Nevins, *Ford: Expansion and Challenge*, 497; and Letter to W.W. Taylor from Frank Campsall dated July 7, 1926, Vol. IV (1925-1926), Folder 1-4, Box 1, E.I. #175.

³¹⁰ Letter to W.W. Taylor from Frank Campsall dated July 7, 1926, Vol. IV.

trustee of the Museum of Modern Art, Clark worked to develop business procedures for the organization.³¹¹

Ford's influence as a member of the American industrial elite necessitated that he participate in collecting activities from distant locations. He hired levels of management through which his vision could be realized. Ford's Wayside Inn project involved at least four levels of staff, with Ford as absolute dictator of the collecting process. Frank Campsall controlled the correspondence coming to the office in Dearborn, while E.J. Boyer managed the correspondence coming to the Wayside Inn. Boyer received "departmentals" and "memorandums" from Campsall, dictating which artifacts should or should not be collected by W.W. Taylor in the field.³¹² Ford bypassed this system of management when he travelled, working directly with Taylor to examine specific buildings, engines, and other objects of extreme interest.³¹³ Ford either offered immediate answers regarding the acquisition of artifacts or sent memoranda to the Inn upon his return to Dearborn.³¹⁴ Ford's implementation of management layers permitted him to run his philanthropic projects while involving himself as much or as little as he wished.

Regardless of the efficiency, scale, and management system within their collecting, Ford and some of his contemporaries participated in this activity as a diversion from their regular businesses. Ford's passion for collecting prevailed over logistical

³¹¹ Nicholas Fox Weber, *The Clarks of Cooperstown: Their Singer Sewing Machine Fortune, Their Great and Influential Art Collections, Their Forty-Year Feud* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2007), 297.

³¹² Letter to Frank Campsall from E.J. Boyer dated March 29, 1928, W.W. Taylor Reports, Vol. VIII (1928), Folder 1-9, Box 1, E.I. #175.

³¹³ Telegram to E.J. Boyer from Frank Campsall dated December 5, 1928, W.W. Taylor Reports, Vol. IX (1928), Folder 1-9, Box 1, E.I. #175.

³¹⁴ *Ibid*; and Telegram to E.J. Boyer from Frank Campsall dated August 7, 1928, W.W. Taylor Reports, Vol. IX.

problems, as he used his agents to make unlikely feats possible.³¹⁵ H.F. Morton accompanied Ford on many of his antique shopping excursions in England. Upon seeing a steam wagon, “Henry Ford bent forward and looked at it, and before he spoke [Morton] knew what was coming. ‘My!’ [Ford] said, ‘that’s a smart turnout, I’ve never seen one like that, see if you can get one, fitted up just the same.’”³¹⁶ Ford’s wishes were the command for Morton to take action, as he would then have to find the precise object requested, regardless of circumstances.³¹⁷ For example, Morton’s acquisition of the clock on the façade of Sir John Bennett’s watchmaker’s shop in London became a long-term process, as the owner refused to sell.³¹⁸ Only through extensive patience did the property become available. Morton subsequently sent the entire façade to Dearborn.³¹⁹ Collectors, including Henry Ford and Sterling Clark, bought what they liked, specifically those items that evidenced the skills and artistic beauty that they individually valued.³²⁰ Even large-scale, museum building and collecting was merely a hobby for these members of the American industrial elite.

Acquisition of Artifacts

Ford and several of his contemporaries’ interests in American industry led them to become involved in the collection and display of industrial artifacts; decorative, modern, and industrial art; and architecture. Collecting agents found these artifacts in homes, businesses, and museums throughout America and Europe, and competed against other

³¹⁵ Morton, *Strange Commissions for Henry Ford*, 17, 42, 59-60.

³¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 59-60.

³¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 17.

³¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 42

³¹⁹ *Ibid.*

³²⁰ Weber, *The Clarks of Cooperstown*, 220.

philanthropists' and businesses' representatives for the same items. Ford and his agents relied on townspeople, historical societies, companies, inventors, and artists to supply museum artifacts.

Agents were responsible for sorting through letters that Ford received regarding items that individuals and organizations were willing to give or sell.³²¹ Selected opportunities that sounded worthwhile were then the agent's responsibility to pursue.³²² W.W. Taylor admitted to Henry Ford, ". . . I have been looking up the different people who wrote about having antiques to sell, and find that a lot of them just think they have antiques and want a big price for things that are not very old, or not very good."³²³ This problem increased exponentially once word of Ford's museum reached the public. Donors sent individual items and whole collections to Ford, resulting in gifts and purchases of duplicate items, which had to be sorted through and disposed of by his agents.³²⁴

W.W. Taylor visited potential donors throughout New England who had items they wished to give or sell to Ford, while others offered their entire collections for the museum.³²⁵ Taylor then determined which items, from textile machinery to early New England furnishings, to purchase and ship to the museum.³²⁶ Sifting through a conglomeration of industrial artifacts, Ford's collecting agents worked to fulfill his

³²¹ W.W. Taylor Report for October 27, 1925, Vol. III.

³²² Ibid.

³²³ Letter to Henry Ford from W.W. Taylor dated February 23, 1924, Vol. I (1923-1924), Folder 1-1, Box 1, E.I. #175.

³²⁴ Nevins, *Ford: Expansion and Challenge*, 502.

³²⁵ November 17, 1925 entry in W.W. Taylor Report from November 16 to December 5, 1925, Vol. III.

³²⁶ Ibid.

overall vision and find the finest examples of both hand- and machine-made goods. Eventually these items formed a complete exhibit on American industrial progress.

Ford's agents also received letters from organizations that offered objects for the philanthropist's collections. The Northboro Historical Society set a price of \$200 for an old stagecoach.³²⁷ Agents recognized that organizations, such as historical societies, preserved such items from additional deterioration. In his report to Ford, Taylor specifically commented on the good condition of the stagecoach and believed the asking price was reasonable.³²⁸ Likewise, the manager of the Boston, Revere Beach & Lynn Railroad offered an old locomotive to Ford.³²⁹ As the industry replaced old locomotives with the new electric ones, railroad companies took advantage of Ford's offer to purchase examples of old technology.³³⁰ Henry Ford's collecting initiative presented an opportunity for small historical societies and companies to preserve their historical artifacts.

Several other philanthropists sought to procure some artifacts directly from their sources, targeting artists, scientists, and inventors. Stephen and Sterling Clark,* heirs of the Singer Sewing Machine Company, collected art based on their interest in particular artists' styles and work.³³¹ During the 1930s, Stephen Clark contacted the widow of Thomas Eakins in order to purchase some of Eakins' art works. Clark acquired thirteen of Eakins' works for his personal collection and bequeathed some of the paintings to Yale

³²⁷ For Taylor's trip to see Rev. Mr. Pease of the Northboro Historical Society about the Boston and Worcester stage coach, see his March 20, 1926 entry in W.W. Taylor Report for Week ending March 20, 1926, Vol. IV.

³²⁸ Ibid.

³²⁹ Letter to W.W. Taylor from George W. Wells dated November 21, 1928, W.W. Taylor Reports, Vol. IX (1928), Folder 1-9, Box 1, E.I. #175.

³³⁰ Ibid.

³³¹ Weber, *The Clarks of Cooperstown*, 10, 297-298.

University Art Gallery.³³² Julius Rosenwald depended upon inventors and scientists as the primary suppliers of artifacts for his Museum of Science and Industry.³³³ In one of his collecting attempts in 1928, he unsuccessfully solicited Orville Wright for one of the Wright brothers' Flyers, at the time located at London's South Kensington Museum.³³⁴ By directly soliciting sources of industrial and modern art, these philanthropists believed they could acquire the best examples for their collections.

Individuals and institutions donated items to Henry Ford's museums in order to preserve, dispose of, or earn money through their artifacts. While discussing donations with potential patrons, Frank Vivian often argued "If you give it to the Edison Institute it will be there forever and your name will be on it."³³⁵ The preservation of historical artifacts was an important motive for many potential donors to give or sell to museums. One letter to Henry Ford explained, "I am now planning to dispose of a few of these [artifacts] because I feel that objects that have a distinctly historical value ought to be in some historical collection Hence my reason for writing you."³³⁶ Donations included objects that would have been nearly impossible to preserve under any other circumstance. President Clarence Cook Little of the University of Maine offered Ford an old, wood-burning locomotive so that it could be cared for in a "fire proof museum."³³⁷

³³² Ibid.

³³³ Peter M. Ascoli, *Julius Rosenwald: The Man Who Built Sears, Roebuck and Advanced the Cause of Black Education in the American South* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2006), 333.

³³⁴ Ibid.

³³⁵ As quoted in Nevins, *Ford: Expansion and Challenge*, 502.

³³⁶ For Charles Furlong's offer of his items into an "historical collection," see Letter to Henry Ford from Charles Wellington Furlong dated December 14, 1926, W.W. Taylor Reports, Vol. VI (1926-1927) Folder 1-6, Box 1, E.I. #175.

³³⁷ Report to Henry Ford from W.W. Taylor dated February 13, 1924, Vol. I; and "UMaine Presidents," *Office of the President*, The University of Maine, <http://www.umaine.edu/president/umaine-presidents/>.

Ford also received an offer from Mr. Z. Marshall Crane of the Pittsfield Museum in Dalton, Massachusetts, to give Ford a 1905 Wright brothers' airplane since the Pittsfield Museum did not have the "several thousand dollars" needed to restore it according to Orville Wright's specifications.³³⁸ Ford's museum offered the space, funding, and opportunity for the machine to be restored.³³⁹

Individuals also saw the collecting projects of Ford as a means to dispose of extra things that were simply lying around. David C. Williams wrote to Henry Ford offering spare parts from an old grist mill for Ford's Wayside Inn.³⁴⁰ The letter describes the original mill, the parts available, and the invitation for Ford's representative to pick out whichever pieces would be useful for the restoration project.³⁴¹ A "Miss Clemmons" offered the antique furnishings of her summer home in Amherst, New Hampshire upon inspection by W.W. Taylor.³⁴² These individuals considered Henry Ford and his agents as treasure hunters searching through what most citizens considered junk. However, these potential donors recognized the advantages of offering their items to Ford's museums before disposing of them in other ways.

Average citizens offered objects to Henry Ford in order to receive monetary compensation for their "donation." A Mr. Buckley offered his hand-made submarine to W.W. Taylor, since he hoped it would be kept in a museum. He also desperately needed

³³⁸ Telegram to Charles K. Crane from Z. Marshall Crane dated July 30, 1928, W.W. Taylor Reports, Vol. IX; and Letter to Z. Marshall Crane from Orville Wright dated July 21, 1928, W.W. Taylor Reports, Vol. IX.

³³⁹ Ibid.

³⁴⁰ Letter to Henry Ford from David C. Williams dated December 15, 1925, Vol. IV (1925-1926), Folder 1-4, Box 1, E.I. #175.

³⁴¹ Ibid.

³⁴² W.W. Taylor does not reference a first name for Miss Clemmons. His reports vary in terms of the amount of detail given, including location, object descriptions, and first and last names. November 17, 1925 entry in W.W. Taylor Report from November 16 to December 5, 1925, Vol. III.

the money.³⁴³ Taylor rarely described hardship cases in his reports, although he noted a particularly “hard case” during his visit to Gale Village.³⁴⁴ An old woman and her daughter had “. . . nothing in the house to eat – nothing to burn, and nothing to sell that you could call antiques so [Taylor] could do nothing.”³⁴⁵ Agents used budgeted funds to carry out specific orders, rather than acting in the philanthropist’s capacity of “fairy godparents” to communities at large.³⁴⁶

Ford’s agents sought to produce his museums as large-scale philanthropic projects through the charitable donations of artifacts by collectors and businessmen. Some of these individuals presented their artifacts to Ford as gifts, while others sought monetary compensation, and some hoped for a beneficial exchange of their historical treasures for a new engine, car, or building. Ford and his agents were not the only people involved in this system of philanthropy. Building museum collections befitting the philanthropist’s vision required the acquisition of massive quantities of industrial art and artifacts. These items reached Ford through his agents, who were those most likely to interact and correspond with individual donors. The philanthropic vision trickled down from Ford, while artifact contributions were sent back up to him through the management levels.

Henry Ford became the recipient of extraordinary gifts. A Mrs. Washburn of Princeton, Massachusetts gave Ford’s museum “a whole stable full of old carriages, sleighs Etc.”³⁴⁷ According to Taylor, this donation added twelve to fourteen high-quality

³⁴³ W.W. Taylor Report for week ending May 24, 1924, Vol. I.

³⁴⁴ Taylor describes Gale Village as being near “Trickling Falls,” a site located in East Kingston, New Hampshire. November 22, 1928 entry in W.W. Taylor Report for week ending November 24, 1928, Vol. IX (1928), Folder 1-9, Box 1, E.I. #175.

³⁴⁵ Ibid.

³⁴⁶ Stillinger, *Historic Deerfield*, 25.

³⁴⁷ May 10, 1929 entry in W.W. Taylor Report for week ending May 11, 1929, Vol. X (1928-1929), Folder 1-10, Box 1, E.I. #175.

conveyances to Ford's collection. Former President Calvin Coolidge presented Henry Ford with more than a "truck load" of items from his Plymouth, Vermont home following a visit to Wayside Inn.³⁴⁸ The donation of artifacts allowed donors to involve themselves in Ford's museum-building projects.

Some individuals gave artifacts to Henry Ford with the expectation of payment in return. In order to carry out acquisitions involving sales, Ford's agents assessed the value of potential donations to the museum collection. They then offered prices that could reasonably approximate the donors' expectations of the monetary worth of their priceless artifacts and family heirlooms.³⁴⁹ W.W. Taylor was responsible for artifact appraisal for Ford's Wayside Inn, Greenfield Village, and Museum in Dearborn. Any extra-large offers had to be confirmed through the Dearborn offices prior to purchase.³⁵⁰ In some situations, Taylor requested that the donors "set a price" on individual items, which would then be met by a counteroffer from him or an agreed-upon price for an entire lot.³⁵¹ Another philanthropist of the period also encountered complications when purchasing antiques. Henry du Pont used aliases when shopping for antiques. He realized that name recognition would result in an immediate price increase on potential purchases.³⁵²

The purchasing power of Henry du Pont and several other museum builders was extraordinary in the decades around the Great Depression, as they bought furnishings,

³⁴⁸ Report regarding "Coolidge Relics" from E.J. Boyer dated July 2, 1931, Vol. XIV (1931), Folder 2-3, Box 2, E.I. #175.

³⁴⁹ September 16, 1924 entry in W.W. Taylor Report ending September 20, 1924, Vol. II.

³⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

³⁵¹ For Taylor's request of Mrs. Pike to "set a price" and an offer to sell her group of furnishings for a set price, see "Report on trip to Hiram Maine" dated February 17-18, 1925, W.W. Taylor Reports, Vol. III.

³⁵² Lord, *Henry F. du Pont and Winterthur*, 189-190.

houses, facades, and fine examples of household goods. Although du Pont claimed that he did not interfere with other preservation projects during the 1920s, some of the towns from which he removed structures or rooms from structures were less than pleased with his interference.³⁵³ Sadly, du Pont removed a prized doorway from a Deerfield, Massachusetts home for use in his Winterthur Museum years before the preservation projects of that town were started by Henry and Helen Flynt.³⁵⁴

Some individuals who donated objects to Ford's museums hoped to barter with his agents, rather than receive monetary compensation for their gifts. H.F. Morton used the exchange system widely during his collecting trips in England. He stated that the English ". . . thought me some sort of eccentric who was willing to give them a new gas or oil engine or new electric motor for their very ancient steam engine. . . . In fact I was a Twentieth Century Aladdin."³⁵⁵ The steam engines that Morton sought in England were essential energy sources for their towns, necessitating their immediate replacement if removed. The sale of these engines would be detrimental to the town's existence; therefore, replacement with a new model proved to be the ideal solution.³⁵⁶ In much the same way, potential donors requested that their buildings, sheds, rooms, and other structures be replaced with something new in exchange for giving up the old.³⁵⁷ W.W. Taylor reported multiple occasions when such requests were made, as donors needed places to live if Henry Ford dismantled and shipped their homes to a different state.³⁵⁸ In

³⁵³ Ibid., 203.

³⁵⁴ Ibid.

³⁵⁵ Morton, *Strange Commissions for Henry Ford*, 54.

³⁵⁶ Ibid.

³⁵⁷ For one of many instances in which W.W. Taylor considered the replacement of an old building with a new one, see his May 19, 1928 entry in W.W. Taylor Report for week ending May 19, 1928, Vol. VIII.

³⁵⁸ Ibid.

one case, a family wished to trade in an “antique” secretary desk for a brand new Ford car.³⁵⁹ The letter was sent from the Ford dealership manager, who acted as the middle-man in the exchange.³⁶⁰ Individuals who wished to participate in this system of bartering philanthropy found that they could give, sell, or exchange their artifacts to meet their own needs while helping to fulfill Ford’s larger vision. Participation depended upon the agents’ abilities to convince donors of the advantages of preservation, while anticipating the individual’s expectations from the donation.

Henry Ford’s agents competed against other agents and dealers to procure artifacts for Ford’s Museum, Greenfield Village, and Wayside Inn. In some cases, items were bequeathed to traditional repositories, such as the Essex Institute and local historical societies, before Ford’s agents could obtain them.³⁶¹ W.W. Taylor also found himself competing against other institutions with similar collecting policies. In 1928, he heard of the Smithsonian’s plan for a “Museum of Transportation” and expressed the urgency to obtain old vehicles for Ford’s museum.³⁶² Likewise, the 1924 American Wing addition to the Metropolitan Museum of Art provided additional competition for Ford and others.³⁶³ Taylor found himself competing with the Metropolitan Museum of Art as both

³⁵⁹ Letter to E.J. Boyer from J.H. Cavanaugh dated June 18, 1927, W.W. Taylor Reports, Vol. VII (1927) Folder 1-7, Box 1, E.I. #175.

³⁶⁰ Ibid.

³⁶¹ August 11, 1928 entry, W.W. Taylor Report for week ending August 11, 1928, Vol. IX; September 16, 1927 entry, W.W. Taylor Report for week ending September 17, 1927, Vol. VII; and November 17, 1925 entry, W.W. Taylor Report from November 16 to December 5, 1925, Vol. III.

³⁶² July 17, 1928 entry, W.W. Taylor Report for week ending July 21, 1928, Vol. IX.

³⁶³ Michael Gross, *Rogues’ Gallery: The Secret History of the Moguls and the Money that Made the Metropolitan Museum* (New York: Broadway Books, 2009), 5; July 28, 1928 entry, W.W. Taylor Report for week ending July 28, 1928, Vol. IX; and August 9, 1924 entry, W.W. Taylor Report ending August 9, 1924, Vol. II.

institutions sought to preserve industrial artifacts, decorative and industrial art, and architecture throughout New England.

In addition to typical repositories, Taylor contended with business-minded donors for potential museum artifacts. During a trip to York, Maine, Taylor offered \$200 for a stage coach to a couple who had been offered \$400 for the same vehicle by “the movie people.”³⁶⁴ Hollywood may have been searching for props, but Taylor acquired the coach based on his argument for preservation.³⁶⁵ Market value was especially important, when Taylor vied for items against antique and junk dealers.³⁶⁶ These individuals sought objects for resale, rather than to warehouse or exhibit. Old machines were particularly prone to salvage sales, as their donors did not consider them to be “antiques.”³⁶⁷ Taylor depended on his case for preservation in order to compete against junk dealers and salvagers. In the battle for artifacts, Ford’s agents had to win every acquisition over determined opponents.

The Challenges of Museum Building

Philanthropists and their agents quickly realized that museum building was a demanding occupation. They found themselves faced with the challenges of organization

³⁶⁴ W.W. Taylor purchased the “Old Stage Coach” for \$200 from Mr. Mitchell, because “Mrs. Mitchell did not want the coach to go to [the movie people] as they take no care of such things.... They had rather sell it for preservation....” See Taylor’s July 29, 1924 entry, W.W. Taylor Report ending August 2, 1924, Vol. II.

³⁶⁵ Ibid.

³⁶⁶ January 26, 1925 entry, W.W. Taylor Report ending Jan. 31. 1925, Vol. III; July 6, 1928 entry, W.W. Taylor Report for week ending July 7, 1928, Vol. IX; and January 17, 1928 entry, W.W. Taylor Report for week ending January 21, 1928, Vol. VIII.

³⁶⁷ Ibid. Taylor described this phenomenon in his January 17, 1928 entry: “I look at old machines and engines Etc as being quite different from the general run of “Antiques” as there will always be plenty of antiques but the early machines are fast being junked and then NO MORE. I just had a case in point come up in the matter of the famous old gear cutter at Chelmsford they sold it for junk – then the Met people of N.Y. sent a buyer on after it.” See W.W. Taylor Report for week ending January 21, 1928, Vol. VIII.

of countless artifacts, the creation of authoritative exhibits, and the completion of many administrative tasks prior to the opening of their museums. Through the years, Ford's agents acquired thousands of artifacts for his museums. In several cases, philanthropists and agents travelled throughout America and abroad to acquire the best collections available, while packing and shipping freight cars full of objects to museums.

In order to utilize these objects, however, agents first needed to appropriately accession, conserve, and store each collection.³⁶⁸ Ford's collections included an interesting mixture of excellent-quality items and repair parts, as well as countless duplicates.³⁶⁹ W.W. Taylor and H.F. Morton faced the challenge of organizing their acquisitions so groups of objects formed cohesive collections.³⁷⁰ Only through this accessioning, identifying, conservation, and storage process could the resulting exhibits match Ford's vision for his museums.

W.W. Taylor devised systematic plans to organize Ford's collections. He relied on museum scholarship, his past experiences, and suggestions from other institutions to approach challenges, contributing to the ongoing professionalization of museum practice. Taylor used his own weekly reports and other records to identify and accession the collection.³⁷¹ Once objects arrived at the museum, one of his first steps involved the

³⁶⁸ Taylor described his activity working at Ford's museum as "Sorting out the different things of a kind... so that when we want any thing to make up an exhibit we may go to a section and expect to find [it] near what we may want without pawing over ten thousand other things." See January 9, 1931 entry, W.W. Taylor Report for week ending January 10, 1931, Vol. XIII., Folder 2-2, Box 2, E.I. #175.

³⁶⁹ Ibid; and Letter to Henry Ford from W.W. Taylor dated January 19, 1924, W.W. Taylor Reports, Vol. I.

³⁷⁰ Ibid. Keith Sward described Ford's museum as a "hodge-podge . . . [with] the appearance of an Old Curiosity Shop, magnified 10,000-fold." See Nevins, *Ford: Expansion and Challenge*, 504.

³⁷¹ See December 4-5, 1930 entries, W.W. Taylor Report for week ending December 6th, 1930, Vol. XII., Folder 2-1, Box 2, E.I. #175.

development of a numerical system to inscribe on the objects.³⁷² Using this system, he could identify objects in a museum catalog and track it subsequently.³⁷³ The museum catalog established a consistent record in which agents could document the origin and identifying details of each object. W.W. Taylor's report from April 29, 1931 provides his written discourse regarding the dire need for a museum catalog.³⁷⁴ He describes how such a project should be carried out, as well as the benefits of such an undertaking. After spending over eight years collecting objects for Ford, Taylor realized that he could no longer remember all of the details regarding each artifact, and feared his knowledge would be lost without a written record.³⁷⁵

Henry du Pont recognized a similar situation in his Winterthur Museum. In 1948, he ordered his newly-hired staff, Joseph Downs* and Charles F. Montgomery,* to prepare a catalog of his artifacts.³⁷⁶ Although the cataloging process was a time-consuming activity for everyone involved, agents and philanthropists recognized the benefits of this action.

Philanthropists and their agents were not necessarily experts in the areas of historical research and museum building, especially at the scale attempted by Ford and Rockefeller. Greenfield Village contained major misinterpretations of early American

³⁷² Taylor expressed his need for a numerical system and catalog for Ford's museum saying, "When an object once has a number on it and a description in a suitable museum catalog, it is then safe, and can be identified at any time when wanted to make up an exhibit." See November 19, 1927 entry, W.W. Taylor Report for week ending November 19, 1927, Vol. VII.

³⁷³ Ibid.

³⁷⁴ Taylor's full description of how to construct a "Regular Museum Catalog" ends with his lament, "Five years ago ...I could remember a lot more about the things I have sent in to the Museum, then I can now ...and [I] dread the possibility of a part of what we ought to know being forever lost." See April 29, 1931 entry, W.W. Taylor Reports, Vol. XIII.

³⁷⁵ Ibid.

³⁷⁶ For du Pont's request of Joseph Downs and Charles F. Montgomery to develop a collection catalog, see Lord, *Henry F. du Pont and Winterthur*, 203.

buildings.³⁷⁷ Ford's critics found that the renovated "Stephen Foster house" relocated to Greenfield Village was not the songwriter's residence.³⁷⁸ Although W.W. Taylor had previous experience in collecting and museum methodology, some of Ford's other agents qualified for positions with Ford due to their education at Ford's schools at Wayside Inn and Greenfield Village. Ford and his agents had a talent for business, but not necessarily for the administration of museums.³⁷⁹ Likewise, Walter Chrysler, Jr.,* encountered problems during the exhibition of his collection at the National Gallery of Canada. The Art Dealers Association of America reported that nearly half of the displayed pieces from Chrysler's exhibit were counterfeit.³⁸⁰ A shortage of scholarship pertaining to their collecting interests led both Ford and Chrysler to recognize a need for artifact documentation. Rockefeller's advisors recommended that historical research be taken up at Colonial Williamsburg based on a public relations rationale.³⁸¹ Historians' abilities could help philanthropists avoid costly mistakes within their museums and programming. After encountering the costs associated with dismantling buildings, transporting huge artifacts, and conserving towns, philanthropists preferred to avoid visible mistakes.³⁸² To

³⁷⁷ Nevins, *Ford: Expansion and Challenge*, 497, 504-505; and Geoffrey C. Upward, ed., *A Home for Our Heritage: The Building and Growth of Greenfield Village and Henry Ford Museum, 1929-1979* (Dearborn, MI: The Henry Ford Museum Press, 1979), vii.

³⁷⁸ Nevins, *Ford: Expansion and Challenge*, 504-505.

³⁷⁹ Ibid.

³⁸⁰ Jeff Harrison, curator of the Chrysler Museum of Art, claimed that Walter Chrysler's problems with his exhibit "The Controversial Century" were a result of too little documentation and scholarship during the 1940s and 1950s. See Peggy Earle, *Legacy: Walter Chrysler, Jr. and the Untold Story of Norfolk's Chrysler Museum of Art* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2008), 65, 68.

³⁸¹ Handler, *The New History in an Old Museum*, 34. For an extended discussion of the role of public relations in the intersection of business and the arts, see Lynes, *The Tastemakers*, 288-293.

³⁸² Ford's collecting activity involved dismantling and shipping at his expense of buildings and industrial machines throughout America and abroad. Agents also encountered the logistical problems of shipping machines, buildings, and carriages in freight cars to Ford's museum. See Morton, *Strange Commissions for Henry Ford*, 27-28; W.W. Taylor Report for October 27, 1925, Vol. III; and November 8, 1928 entry, W.W. Taylor Report for week ending July 28, 1928, Vol.

philanthropists, the cost of research was a small price to pay to avoid public embarrassment.

Conclusion

Henry Ford's collecting program illustrates how members of the industrial elite used philanthropy to establish their museums. Agents employed by Ford mediated a system of multi-directional philanthropy that connected Ford and everyday citizens to create his Wayside Inn, Greenfield Village, and Museum. Henry Ford and his contemporaries utilized agents as experts in their museum-building activities. Some of these philanthropists participated in collecting as a business activity, which they could manage from afar or delve into with a hobbyist's enthusiasm.

Henry Ford's agents negotiated the exchange of artifacts and resources between Ford and average people who were willing to give buildings, furnishings, and industrial machinery to his museums. However, this philanthropic system depended on individuals and institutions that sought to preserve, dispose of, or earn money through their donations to Ford's museums. Some individuals presented their artifacts to Ford and his agents as gifts, while others sought payment in cash or in kind. Collecting agents competed for artifacts against other museums and dealers, who wanted items for other exhibit purposes and for resale.

Ford, other philanthropists, and their agents faced many challenges: countless artifacts, exhibits, and administrative tasks piled up prior to the opening of their

IX. Both Henry Ford and John D. Rockefeller's projects are referred to as "restorations." See Letter from Kenneth Chorley to Henry Ford dated February 5, 1935, Folder 959- Rock-Rocz, Box 1823, Accession # 285, Henry Ford Office Papers, Ford Motor Company Records Collection, Benson Ford Research Center, The Henry Ford, 20900 Oakwood Blvd., Dearborn, Michigan 48124-5029; and Nevins, *Ford: Expansion and Challenge*, 498, 500.

museums. However, their system of museum building produced enormous institutions. Through the assistance of agents, engineers, antiques dealers, and everyday citizens, Henry Ford successfully implemented a system of multi-directional philanthropy to propel a mechanism of museum building.

CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSIONS

Just as the intersection of industry and art could be exhibited and studied as industrial art, the conjunction of philanthropists' ideas and experiences resulted in the establishment of their collections and museums. This thesis has investigated why twentieth-century philanthropists, such as Henry Ford,* John D. Rockefeller, Jr.,* Abby Aldrich Rockefeller,* Henry du Pont,* Julius Rosenwald,* Stephen Clark,* Henry and Helen Flynt,* and others, developed American museums between 1925 and 1970.³⁸³ These individuals shared similar beliefs about the value of American history and patriotism. Additionally, philanthropists had similar financial resources, social networks, and access to agents. The combination of these elements assisted in the establishment of their institutions. Over two generations, these museum builders established an American museum ideal through the implementation of scientific philanthropy, which shaped their approach to the establishment of museums as efficient, professional, and educational institutions.

Furthermore, this work has investigated Henry Ford's philanthropic system to establish his museums. Ford's agents mediated an exchange of artifacts and resources between Ford and everyday people, who were willing to give buildings, furnishings, and industrial machinery to the museum. These agents presented potential donors with the opportunity to assist Ford in his collecting activity, while receiving benefits from their donations. This multi-directional system of philanthropy between Ford as the philanthropist, his agents, and potential donors, demonstrates the collection activities for Ford's Wayside Inn, Greenfield Village, and Museum. Other philanthropists and

³⁸³ Asterisks in text signify inclusion of the noted individual's biographical entry in Appendix B.

institutions illustrate similar components of the museum-building process. Collectively, Ford and other museum builders encountered challenges related to acquiring, organizing, and establishing a records system for their collections. However, their implementation of museum-building philanthropy resulted in the establishment of several world-class institutions.

This thesis' most significant contribution to the fields of history and philanthropic studies is its proposition of a philanthropic mechanism inherent to the industrial elite's museum building between 1925 and 1970. These individuals had access to similar resources and expertise. However, their greatest achievement may have been the creation of a system of multi-directional philanthropy. In Henry Ford's case, this contribution directly impacted his ability to establish a collection of industrial artifacts, decorative and industrial art, and architecture. Within this system, each donor became a supplier, subject, muse, and audience member for Ford's museum-building projects. The term "philanthropist" applied not only to the industrial elite, but also to the everyday citizens who contributed to the philanthropic, museum-building missions established by museum founders. This thesis investigated the larger process of museum-building philanthropy in which many people, not only the industrial elite, participated.

Future research will establish the extent to which museum builders other than Ford implemented similar philanthropic systems and techniques. This research will offer future scholars the opportunity to investigate two basic conclusions that may be drawn from Ford's philanthropy for consideration in present-day museums.

First, industrial philanthropists did not function independently of outside influences. They established their institutions based on similar sets of circumstances that

led to systematic approaches to museum building. Once the first generation initiated this process, the second generation could reference first-generation institutions as educational centers to learn how to build their own museums. Its success came about as a result of their shared resolve to address core issues. The Colonial Williamsburg Antiques Forums and other collecting associations provided philanthropists with the opportunity to share ideas and learn from other collectors and experts. In the present day, museums have similar opportunities to work in partnership and communicate concerning their philanthropic challenges and successes. In the battle for relevance, this “team-player” approach will increase awareness of museums as vital American cultural icons, worthy of funding in a highly-competitive world of nonprofits.

Second, industrial philanthropists were not the sole means of support for their respective institutions. Rosenwald established his challenge grants in order to purposely involve many individuals in the financial support system of large-scale philanthropic institutions. The Henry Ford continues to counter misconceptions regarding its source of income. Members of the public believe that the Ford family and Ford Motor Company exclusively support it. The involvement of individuals as donors, as well as W.W. Taylor* and H.F. Morton* as agents, has been largely forgotten. Stories of how Henry Ford and his agents built the collections of his Wayside Inn, Greenfield Village, and Museum offer a perspective of philanthropy and museum building that is critical to presenting the important role of individual donors in the museum building process. Through the study of philanthropy within the industrial elite’s museum building, one may conclude that scientific philanthropy and patriotic ideals of the period greatly informed why and how philanthropists established their collections. The promotion of American

values and patriotism, use of agents in the collecting process, and implementation of industrial wealth resulted in a common philanthropic system for the creation of the American industrial elite's museums between 1925 and 1970.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Institutional References

This appendix provides an alphabetical list of museums included in this thesis. Please note that the categories of “philanthropists” and “agents” differ slightly from those in the main text. Within this appendix, philanthropists indicate founders of these institutions, whereas agents include both donors and experts who assisted with the development of select collections and exhibits within these museums.

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Philanthropists</u>	<u>Agents</u>
Bayou Bend	Houston, TX	Ima Hogg	
Chestertown House Museum	Southampton, DE	Henry du Pont	
Chrysler Museum	Norfolk, VA	Walter Chrysler, Jr.	
Colonial Williamsburg	Williamsburg, VA	John D. Rockefeller, Jr., and Abigail Aldrich Rockefeller	E.I. Allston Boyer and John Graham II
Cooper Union Museum for the Arts of Decoration (Cooper-Hewitt, National Design Museum)	New York City, NY	Amy, Eleanor, and Sarah Hewitt	
Detroit Institute of Arts	Detroit, MI		Edsel and Eleanor Ford
Edison Institute (Henry Ford Museum and Greenfield Village/ The Henry Ford)	Dearborn, MI	Henry Ford	Clara Ford, Edsel Ford, William W. Taylor, Herbert F. Morton, Frank Vivian, Gladys M. Salta, and Frank Campsall
Edsel and Eleanor Ford Estate	Grosse Point Shores, MI	Edsel and Eleanor Ford	
Essex Institute	Salem, MA		
Farmers Museum	Cooperstown, NY	Stephen Carlton Clark	
Historic Deerfield, Inc.	Deerfield, MA	Henry and Helen Flynt	Peter Spang, Colonial Williamsburg Staff, and Joseph Downs
Metropolitan Museum of Art-“American Wing”	New York City, NY		John D. Rockefeller, Jr., Louise du Pont Crowninshield, Henry du Pont, Bertha Benkard, and Joseph Downs

Museum of Modern Art	New York City, NY	Abby Aldrich Rockefeller, Miss Lizzie P. Bliss, and Mrs. Mary Quinn	Robert Sterling Clark, Stephen Carlton Clark, Frank Crowninshield, Edsel Ford, and Paul Sachs
Museum of Science and Industry	Chicago, IL	Julius Rosenwald	
National Gallery of Art	Washington, DC		Lessing Rosenwald
Old Sturbridge Village	Sturbridge, MA		
Peabody Museum	Salem, MA		Louise du Pont Crowninshield
Shelburne Museum	Shelburne, VT	Electra Havemeyer Webb	
Smithsonian Institution – “Museum of Transportation”	Washington, DC		
Wayside Inn	South Sudbury, MA	Henry Ford	W.W. Taylor and E.J. Boyer
Whitney Museum of American Art	New York City, NY	Gertrude Vanderbilt Whitney	
Winterthur Museum	Winterthur, DE	Henry du Pont	Louise du Pont Crowninshield, Bertha Benkard, Edward Crowninshield, Joseph Downs, and Charles F. Montgomery
Yale University Art Gallery	New Haven, CT	Stephen Carlton Clark	John Marshall Phillips

Note: This appendix relies on the data included within the chapters of this thesis. All sources are referenced in chapter footnotes and the bibliography. The appendix is not intended to be comprehensive.

Appendix B: Biographical References

Benkard, Bertha King (?-1944)

Collector and friend of Henry du Pont and Louise du Pont Crowninshield.

Unofficial first curator of du Pont's Winterthur Museum. Wife of Harry Horton Benkard.

Louise du Pont Crowninshield met Benkard in New York when Crowninshield was a young girl. Benkard was most distinguished as a collector of Duncan Phyfe furniture. Around 1933, Henry du Pont expressed a wish to make Benkard the curator of Winterthur, a capacity that she unofficially filled until her death. In 1934, Benkard, Crowninshield, and du Pont collaborated on creating a nineteenth-century period room for the Museum of the City of New York. Crowninshield and du Pont contributed two rooms from Benkard's New York home to the Metropolitan Museum of Art's American Wing after Benkard's death.³⁸⁴

Campsall, Frank Charles (January 2, 1884-March 16, 1946)

Private secretary to Mr. and Mrs. Henry Ford and Assistant Secretary for Henry Ford at Ford Motor Company. Son of William Campsall and Susannah Thornton.

From 1922 to 1938, Campsall supervised Ford's restoration of Wayside Inn in South Sudbury, Massachusetts. In addition to arranging travel for Ford to the site, Campsall visited the site and received weekly reports from the staff at Wayside Inn.

³⁸⁴ Material above is condensed from Ruth Lord, *Henry F. du Pont and Winterthur: A Daughter's Portrait* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999), 151, 193, 197.

From the late 1920s to the early 1930s, Wayside Inn also operated as the headquarters for Ford's collecting activity in New England.³⁸⁵

Carnegie, Andrew (1835-1919)

Philanthropist and Collector. Founder of Pittsburgh's Carnegie Steel Company (later known as U.S. Steel).

Carnegie wrote "The Gospel of Wealth" in 1889. This work in part established the basis for scientific philanthropy, a systematic approach to giving one's money away prior to death. In addition, Carnegie corresponded extensively from 1905 to 1915 with Booker T. Washington regarding the Tuskegee Institute, in addition to donating at least \$600,000 to the institution.³⁸⁶

Chrysler, Walter Percy, Jr. (May 27, 1909-September 17, 1988)

Art collector, philanthropist, and director of the Chrysler Corporation. Son of Walter P. Chrysler and Della Viola Forker.

Chrysler's interest in art and collecting came about due to his family's collections and travels. During the 1930s, he supported the Museum of Modern Art as a committee

³⁸⁵ Material above is condensed from Ford R. Bryan, "Frank Charles Campsall," in *Henry's Lieutenants* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2003), 59-65.

³⁸⁶ Material above is condensed from "Carnegie, Andrew, 1835-1919," *Archives Directory for the History of Collecting in America*, The Frick Collection, <http://research.frick.org/directoryweb/browserecord.php?-action=browse&-recid=7114>; and Andrew Carnegie, "The Gospel of Wealth," in *The Perfect Gift: The Philanthropic Imagination in Poetry and Prose*, ed. Amy A. Kass (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2002), 230-244; Peter M. Ascoli, *Julius Rosenwald: The Man Who Built Sears, Roebuck and Advanced the Cause of Black Education in the American South* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2006), 79; and Thelma Queen, Patrick Kerwin, and Joseph Sullivan, "Booker T. Washington Papers: A Finding Aid to the Collection in the Library of Congress," *Library of Congress Finding Aids*, Library of Congress, http://lcweb2.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/D?faid:7:./temp/~faid_6bVM::

member and loaned art works from his personal modern art collection. His personal collections grew, providing the opportunity to develop exhibits for various museums. In 1958, Chrysler started a small museum in Provincetown, Massachusetts. In 1970, he moved the institution to Norfolk, Virginia.³⁸⁷

Clark, Robert Sterling (1877-1956)

Art collector and museum founder. Son of Alfred Corning Clark, executive of Singer Sewing Machine Company, and Elizabeth Scriven.

Clark primarily collected the Old Masters, Impressionists, and French art. In 1955, Clark opened the Sterling and Francine Art Institute in Williamstown, Massachusetts. He also established the Robert Sterling Clark Foundation.³⁸⁸

Clark, Stephen Carlton (1882-September 17, 1960)

Art collector and museum founder. Son of Alfred Corning Clark, executive of Singer Sewing Machine Company, and Elizabeth Scriven.

In 1929, Clark established the Baseball Hall of Fame in Cooperstown, New York. In 1942, he also founded the Farmers Museum in Cooperstown. Clark served as a trustee of the Museum of Modern Art and a director of the Metropolitan Museum of Art. Upon

³⁸⁷ Material above is condensed from Murray M. Horowitz, "Chrysler, Walter Percy, Jr.," in *American National Biography*, vol. 4, ed. John A. Garraty and Mark C. Carnes (New York: Oxford Press, 1999), 861-82. (Hereafter *American National Biography*.)

³⁸⁸ Material above is condensed from Nicholas Fox Weber, *The Clarks of Cooperstown: Their Singer Sewing Machine Fortune, Their Great and Influential Art Collections, Their Forty-Year Feud* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2007), 48, 106, 111, 219, 240-241, 377; and Stephen C. Clark, "Art Patron, Dead," *New York Times*, September 18, 1960, 86.

his death, some of Clark's collection was distributed to the Yale University Art Gallery, Museum of Modern Art, and Metropolitan Museum of Art.³⁸⁹

Crowninshield, Louise du Pont (1877-1958)

Art collector and philanthropist. Daughter of Henry Algernon du Pont, army officer and U.S. Senator, and Mary Pauline Foster. Married to Francis B. Crowninshield.

Crowninshield served as a charter member of the National Trust for Historic Preservation. She collaborated with her brother, Henry F. du Pont, and Bertha Benkard to develop decorative arts exhibits at the Metropolitan Museum of Art. During her lifetime, Crowninshield also assisted du Pont with his Winterthur Museum and Mrs. Harry S. Truman with redecorating the White House.³⁹⁰

Downs, Joseph (1895-1954)

Downs graduated from the Boston Museum School in 1921 before serving as assistant at the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston. He later worked as curator for the Philadelphia Museum of Art (1925-1932), prior to becoming curator of the Metropolitan Museum of Art's American Wing (1932-1948). Downs became the first curator of Henry du Pont's Winterthur Museum in January of 1949.³⁹¹

³⁸⁹ Material above is condensed from Weber, *The Clarks of Cooperstown*, 6-7, 10, 48, 106, 297-298, 317-321; and Stephen C. Clark, "Art Patron, Dead," *New York Times*, September 18, 1960, 86.

³⁹⁰ Material above is condensed from Natalie Zacek, "du Pont, Henry Francis," *American National Biography*, vol. 7, 121; and Lord, *Henry F. du Pont and Winterthur*, 146-147, 151, 258.

³⁹¹ Material above is condensed from E. Richard McKinstry, *Guide to the Winterthur Library: The Joseph Downs Collection and the Winterthur Archives* (Hanover: University Press of New England, 2003), 2.

du Pont, Henry Francis (May 27, 1880-April 11, 1969)

Art collector, horticulturalist, and founder of Winterthur Museum. Son of Henry Algernon du Pont, army officer and U.S. Senator, and Mary Pauline Foster. Member of the du Pont family in charge of the E.I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., a chemical company based in Wilmington, Delaware.

Starting around 1923, du Pont actively collected early American decorative arts. He based his collection at the family home in Winterthur, Delaware, which he inherited in 1927. The Henry Francis du Pont Winterthur Museum opened in 1951, exhibiting American decorative arts from 1640 to 1840 in over one hundred period rooms.

du Pont assisted with the restoration of the White House interiors for the Kennedys in 1961 and for President Lyndon Johnson as part of the Committee for the Preservation of the White House. He also assisted with museum projects at Strawberry Banke in Portsmouth, New Hampshire, and Historic Deerfield in Deerfield, Massachusetts. du Pont served as trustee of the Cooper-Hewitt Museum of Design, the Whitney Museum of American Art, and the Philadelphia Museum of Art.³⁹²

Flynt, Henry Needham (2 July 1893-August 10, 1970)

Collector and preservationist. Son of George Converse Flynt, granite businessman and general store owner, and Helen Neeham. Married to Helen Geier.

The Flynts began their philanthropy and preservation of Deerfield, Massachusetts through their support of the Deerfield Academy. Starting in 1949, the Flynts attended the Williamsburg Antiques Forum. The Flynts formed the Heritage Foundation (later

³⁹² Material above is condensed from Natalie Zacek, "du Pont, Henry Francis," *American National Biography*, vol. 7, 121-123.

Historic Deerfield, Inc.) in November 1952. Flynt served as a trustee of the National Trust for Historic Preservation from 1959 to 1967 and, with his wife, received the Louise du Pont Crowninshield Award in 1969 for their preservation efforts in Deerfield.³⁹³

Ford, Edsel Bryant (November 6, 1893-May 26, 1943)

Executive of Ford Motor Company and philanthropist. Son of Henry Ford and Clara Bryant. Ford insisted on new designs for Lincoln automobiles, implementing aerodynamic and streamlined styles for a new generation of car buyers.

Ford commissioned Diego Rivera to complete murals of the automotive industry at the Detroit Institute of Arts. In addition, Ford and his wife, Clara, accumulated an extensive private art collection and served as patrons of the arts in Detroit, Michigan. Their collection is now housed at the Edsel and Eleanor Ford House in Grosse Point Shores, Michigan, and the Detroit Institute of Arts.³⁹⁴

Ford, Henry (July 30, 1863-April 7, 1947)

Founder and executive of Ford Motor Company. Son of William Ford and Mary Litogot.

Ford started his primary museum-building projects at the Wayside Inn in South Sudbury, Massachusetts. Soon after beginning the “restoration” of Wayside Inn, he

³⁹³ Material above is condensed from Elizabeth Stillinger, *Historic Deerfield: A Portrait of Early America* (New York: Dutton Studio Books, 1992), 11-13, 15, 17, 38-39, 47, 57; and Donald Friary, “The Noncollectors: Henry and Helen Flynt at Historic Deerfield,” *The Magazine Antiques* 121 (January 1982): 250-257.

³⁹⁴ Material above is condensed from James J. Flink, “Ford, Edsel Bryant,” *American National Biography*, vol. 8, 221-222.

began developing more extensive collections of American material culture and architecture for his Museum and Greenfield Village in Dearborn, Michigan.³⁹⁵

Hogg, Ima (July 10, 1882-August 19, 1975)

Philanthropist of Bayou Bend (near Houston, TX). Daughter of James Stephen Hogg, governor of Texas and wealthy oilman, and Sarah Ann Stinson.

Starting in approximately 1920, Hogg began purchasing American antique furniture and continued this activity to furnish Bayou Bend, the family mansion, starting in 1927. Hogg donated Bayou Bend, its contents, and endowment to the Houston Museum of Fine Arts in 1958. Bayou Bend Museum opened in 1966.

Hogg supported other historic preservation projects, including the restoration of the Varner plantation (now Varner-Hogg State Park), the Winedale Inn complex (Winedale, Texas) and MacGregor house (Roundtop, Texas). In addition, she supported the Houston Museum of Fine Arts and the Houston Symphony.³⁹⁶

³⁹⁵ Material above is condensed from James J. Flink, "Ford, Henry," *American National Biography*, vol. 8, 226; Curtis F. Garfield and Alison R. Ridley, *As Ancient is this Hostelry: The Story of the Wayside Inn* (Sudbury, Massachusetts: Porcupine Enterprises, 1988), 195-251; and Allan Nevins and Frank Ernest Hill, *Ford: Expansion and Challenge, 1915-1933*, Vol. II (New York: Arno Press, A New York Times Company, 1976. Reprint of 1957 book.), 497, 501.

³⁹⁶ Material above is condensed from Walter A. Sutton, "Hogg, Ima," *American National Biography*, vol. 11, 13-14.

Montgomery, Charles F. (?-?)

First director of Henry du Pont's Winterthur Museum. Montgomery worked directly with Joseph Downs, Winterthur's first curator, to form a museum catalog.³⁹⁷

Morton, Herbert F. (1890-1966)

Engineer and agent for Henry Ford. Morton worked as an executive engineer for Ford Motor Company (England) Ltd. from 1917 to 1933.

Henry Ford chose Morton to assist with the establishment of a museum in Dearborn, Michigan. In 1928, Morton worked on the procurement of machinery for Ford's factory in Dagenham, and started collecting steam and gas engines for Ford's museum in Michigan. He traveled to the museum to erect approximately sixty engines in 1930, 1931, and 1932. Through 1933, he also worked with Ford to supply European antiques, buildings, and furnishings for the museum.³⁹⁸

Rockefeller, Abby Aldrich (October 26, 1874-April 4, 1948)

Philanthropist and co-founder of the Museum of Modern Art. Daughter of Nelson Wilmarth Aldrich, U.S. Senator from Rhode Island, and Abby Pearce Chapman. Ms. Aldrich married John D. Rockefeller, Jr.

Rockefeller assisted her husband with the restoration of Colonial Williamsburg. She began her collection of modern art in 1924 and was further assisted by William Valentiner, director of the Detroit Museum of Art. Rockefeller, Miss Lillie P. Bliss, and

³⁹⁷ Material above is condensed from McKinstry, *Guide to the Winterthur Library*, 2; and Lord, *Henry F. du Pont and Winterthur*, 203.

³⁹⁸ Material above is condensed from "H F Morton: The Ford Motor Company (Britain) Ltd, Trafford Park," *Chetham's Library*, The National Archives, <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/a2a/records.aspx?cat=418-morton&cid=-1#-1>.

Mrs. Mary Quinn Sullivan founded the Museum of Modern Art in 1929. Rockefeller later donated much of her modern art collection to the Museum of Modern Art and her extensive folk art collection to Colonial Williamsburg.³⁹⁹

Rockefeller, John Davison, Jr. (January 29, 1874-May 11, 1960)

Philanthropist and founder of Colonial Williamsburg. Son of John D.

Rockefeller, Sr., wealthy industrialist, and Laura Celestia Spelman. The family's wealth came from JDR Sr.'s success with the Standard Oil Trust. Rockefeller married Abigail (Abby) Aldrich.

Rockefeller was placed in charge of much of the family's philanthropic endeavors, in addition to some corporate directorships. His participation in the restoration of Williamsburg, Virginia started with his initial visit in 1926 and lasted into the 1950s. His son, John D. Rockefeller III eventually took over the chairmanship of Colonial Williamsburg.⁴⁰⁰

Rosenwald, Julius (August 12, 1862-January 6, 1932)

Executive of Sears & Roebuck and philanthropist. Son of Samuel Rosenwald, a clothing merchant, and Augusta Hammerslough.

³⁹⁹ Material above is condensed from Bernice Kert, "Rockefeller, Abby Aldrich," in *American National Biography*, vol. 18, ed. John A. Garraty and Mark C. Carnes (New York: Oxford Press, 1999), 691-693; and Steven C. Wheatley, "Rockefeller, John Davison, Jr.," in *American National Biography*, vol. 18, 698.

⁴⁰⁰ Material above is condensed from Steven C. Wheatley, "Rockefeller, John Davison, Jr.," *American National Biography*, vol. 18, 697-700.

Rosenwald took part in the development of scientific philanthropy, supporting educational institutions and Jewish causes. In addition, he established the Museum of Science and Industry in Chicago, although it did not officially open until 1933.⁴⁰¹

Rosenwald, Lessing Julius (February 10, 1891-June 24, 1978)

Art and book collector and philanthropist. Son of Julius Rosenwald and Augusta Nusbaum. The family money originated from Julius Rosenwald's involvement with Sears & Roebuck.

Rosenwald began collecting art and books in the 1920s. His collection continued to grow during the 1920s and 1930s. By 1941, Rosenwald had started to donate his art collection to the National Gallery of Art in Washington, D.C. He also donated his unprecedented book collection to the Library of Congress.⁴⁰²

Sachs, Paul Joseph (November 24, 1878-February 17, 1965)

Museum director and art collector. Son of Samuel Sachs, partner of investment firm Goldman, Sachs, and Company, and Louisa Goldman.

Sachs' interest in art began as a child, and he studied the subject at Harvard. Between 1900 and 1915, Sachs worked in the family business, while also collecting art and making several gifts to Harvard's Fogg Art Museum. Sachs became museum director of the Fogg Art Museum (1915-1948) and served as a professor at Harvard starting in 1917. He taught Museum Work and Museum Problems starting in 1922.

⁴⁰¹ Material above is condensed from Milton Goldin, "Rosenwald, Julius," *American National Biography*, vol. 18, 893-895.

⁴⁰² Material above is condensed from Leonard Dinnerstein, "Rosenwald, Lessing Julius," *American National Biography*, vol. 18, 895.

Sachs's students became directors and curators at the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston, the Metropolitan Museum of Art, the National Gallery of Art, and the Museum of Modern Art.⁴⁰³

Sack, Israel (?-1959)

Noted antiques dealer. Sack immigrated to America from Lithuania, where he worked as a cabinetmaker. In 1905, he opened an antiques store in Boston, Massachusetts, specializing in early American furniture and antiquities that would become known as "Americana." Sack later moved his business to New York. He assisted Henry Ford with the furnishing of Wayside Inn and the Henry Ford Museum. In addition, Sack also sold to Henry Francis du Pont, Ima Hogg, the Detroit Institute of Arts, Historic Deerfield, the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston, and the Metropolitan Museum of Art.⁴⁰⁴

Taylor, William W. (August 13, 1874-July 31, 1949)

Director of the Edison Institute and agent for Henry Ford. Son of William W. Taylor and Sally LaFavour.

Taylor began his museum work at the Phillips Andover Academy's Department of Archaeology. He served as an active member of the Society for Preservation of New England Antiquities and the Haverhill Historical Society. By 1915, Taylor had become curator of the Harrison Gray Otis House in Boston, Massachusetts. Through his role at

⁴⁰³ Material above is condensed from Sally Anne Duncan, "Sachs, Paul Joseph," in *American National Biography*, vol. 19, 180-181.

⁴⁰⁴ Material above is condensed from Bryan, *Henry's Lieutenants*, 315; and Wendy Moonan, "Antiques; Burnishing The Lamp Of Americana," *New York Times*, April 3, 1998.

the Otis House, Taylor met Henry Ford and began collaborating on Ford's projects at Wayside Inn in South Sudbury, Massachusetts. Taylor supplied materials for the Wayside Inn, as well as Ford's Museum and Greenfield Village in Dearborn, Michigan.⁴⁰⁵

Vivian, Frank (?-?)

Collecting agent for Henry Ford. Vivian worked for the Ford Motor Company from 1913 to 1952, serving in capacities that included director of the San Francisco-area Ford branch sales office. He also assisted in the acquisition of the Wohlbruck Collection of automobiles, carriages, and wagons, as well as the collection of artifacts from Luther Burbank, for Henry Ford's museum complex in Dearborn, Michigan.⁴⁰⁶

Webb, Electra Havemeyer (August 16, 1888-November 19, 1960)

Founder of Shelburne Museum. Daughter of Henry O. Havemeyer, president and founder of the American Sugar Refining Company, and Louisine Waldon Elder.

Webb's parents collected fine arts for much of her childhood. She primarily collected folk art, starting with her first acquisition at the age of eighteen. Following her marriage to J. Watson Webb, a great-grandson of Commodore Cornelius Vanderbilt, the Webbs moved to one of the Webb family estates in Shelburne, Vermont. Webb founded the Shelburne Museum in 1947 and opened her collection of Americana to the public in 1952. The museum exhibits American structures and folk art, which have been

⁴⁰⁵ Material above is condensed from "Former Collector For Ford Dies," *Haverhill Gazette*, August 2, 1949; and Seth W. Miller, e-mail message to author, May 18, 2010.

⁴⁰⁶ Material above is condensed from Bryan, *Henry's Lieutenants*, 299, 318; and Nevins, *Ford: Expansion and Challenge*, 501-502.

transported to the site. During the 1950s, Webb served as a Vermont trustee to the National Trust for Historic Preservation.⁴⁰⁷

Whitney, Gertrude Vanderbilt (January 9, 1875-April 18, 1942)

Noted sculptor and founder of the Whitney Museum of American Art. Daughter of Cornelius Vanderbilt II and Alice Claypoole Gwynne. Whitney's father was considered the wealthiest American of his time.

Whitney was one of the earliest collectors of American modern art. In 1931, she founded the Whitney Museum of American Art after the Metropolitan Museum of Art refused to accept her collection.⁴⁰⁸

⁴⁰⁷ Material above is condensed from Stephanie A. Carpenter, "Webb, Electra Havemeyer," *American National Biography*, vol. 22, 846-847.

⁴⁰⁸ Material above is condensed from Joan Marter, "Whitney, Gertrude Vanderbilt," *American National Biography*, vol. 23, 300-302.

Appendix C: Select Museum Builders and Their Affiliations

This appendix includes several lists of philanthropists, agents, and known associates who shared similar affiliations with dealers, forums, committees, and other collecting groups. A significant number of these individuals appear in Appendix D, as they presented at the Colonial Williamsburg Antiques Forums between 1949 and 1970.

***Colonial Williamsburg Antiques Forum*⁴⁰⁹**

Helen Comstock, scholar; staff member, *The Magazine Antiques*

Henry and Helen Flynt, founders, Historic Deerfield, Deerfield, Massachusetts

John Graham II, curator, Colonial Williamsburg, Williamsburg, Virginia; co-sponsor,
Colonial Williamsburg Antiques Forum

Miss Ima Hogg, founder and curator, Bayou Bend Collections – Museum of Fine Arts of
Houston

J. A. Lloyd Hyde, dealer

Katharine Prentis Murphy, collector, Westbrook, Connecticut

Electra Havemeyer Webb, Shelburne Museum, Shelburne, Vermont

Alice Winchester, editor, *The Magazine Antiques*; co-sponsor, Colonial Williamsburg
Antiques Forum

Joseph Downs, curator, American Wing, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York

***J.A. Lloyd Hyde's Casual Group of Collectors*⁴¹⁰**

Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Carpenter, collectors, Rhode Island Furniture

Henry and Helen Flynt, founders, Historic Deerfield, Deerfield, Massachusetts

John Graham II, curator, Colonial Williamsburg

Miss Ima Hogg, founder and curator, Bayou Bend Collections – Museum of Fine Arts of
Houston

J.A. Lloyd Hyde, dealer

Maxim Karolik, donor of American art, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston

Katharine Prentis Murphy, collector, Westbrook, Connecticut

Electra Havemeyer Webb, founder, Shelburne Museum, Shelburne, Vermont

***Other Associates of the Henry and Helen Flynt*⁴¹¹**

Kathryn Buhler, silver specialist, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston

John Kenneth Byard, antiques collector and dealer, Norwalk, Connecticut

Charles Montgomery, antique dealer, collector, and curator, New Haven, Connecticut

⁴⁰⁹ Material is condensed from Elizabeth Stillinger, *Historic Deerfield: A Portrait of Early America* (New York: Dutton Studio Books, 1992), 25, 49.

⁴¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 48.

⁴¹¹ *Ibid.*, 41, 46-47.

John Marshall Phillips, curator, Garvan Collection of American Antiques, Yale
University Art Gallery
Israel Sack, dealer, American antiques

Ginsburg & Levy, Inc. Customers⁴¹²

Henry Francis du Pont, founder, Winterthur Museum, Winterthur, Delaware
Henry and Helen Flynt, founders, Historic Deerfield, Deerfield, Massachusetts
Henry Ford, founder, Wayside Inn, Greenfield Village, and Museum, Dearborn,
Michigan
Miss Ima Hogg, founder and curator, Bayou Bend Collections – Museum of Fine Arts of
Houston
Metropolitan Museum of Art
John D. Rockefeller, Jr., founder, Colonial Williamsburg, Williamsburg, Virginia
Electra Havemeyer Webb, Shelburne Museum, Shelburne, Vermont

1956 Fine Arts Forum (Houston, Texas) Attendees⁴¹³

Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Carpenter, collectors, Rhode Island Furniture
Henry Francis du Pont, founder, Winterthur Museum, Winterthur, Delaware
Henry and Helen Flynt, founders, Historic Deerfield, Deerfield, Massachusetts
Miss Ima Hogg, founder and curator, Bayou Bend Collections – Museum of Fine Arts of
Houston

Fine Arts Committee for the White House⁴¹⁴

Henry Francis du Pont, chairman
Charles Francis Adams
Mrs. C. Douglas Dillon
Mrs. Charles W. Engelhard
David E. Finley
Mrs. Albert D. Lasker
John J. Loeb
Mrs. Paul Mellon
Mrs. Henry Parrish II

⁴¹² John Ginsburg, Benjamin Ginsburg, Bernard Levy, and Isaac Levy, owners, Ginsburg & Levy, Inc., antiques dealers. Material is condensed from “Ginsburg & Levy, Inc. (New York, N.Y.),” *Archives Directory for the History of Collecting in America*, The Frick Collection, <http://research.frick.org/directoryweb/browserecord.php?-action=browse&-recid=7421>; and Stillinger, *Historic Deerfield*, 44, 46-47. The Ginsburg & Levy, Inc. papers (1911-1982) are housed at the Winterthur Library, Winterthur, Delaware.

⁴¹³ Material is condensed from Stillinger, *Historic Deerfield*, 49.

⁴¹⁴ Material is condensed from Ruth Lord, *Henry F. du Pont and Winterthur: A Daughter's Portrait* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999), 248-249; and “First Lady Names a Fine Arts Group,” *New York Times*, April 19, 1961.

Gerald Shea
John Walker III
Mrs. George Henry Warren
Mrs. Charles B. Wrightsman

*Advisers to the Fine Arts Committee for the White House*⁴¹⁵

James Biddle, assistant curator in charge of the American Wing, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York

Julian Boyd, editor of the Jefferson Papers, Princeton, New Jersey

Lyman Butterfield, editor of the Adams Papers, Boston

Richard E. Fuller, president and director, Seattle Art Museum

Gerald G. Gibson, assistant curator of decorative arts, Henry Ford Museum, Dearborn, Michigan

John M. Graham II, director and curator of collections, Colonial Williamsburg, Williamsburg, Virginia

Calvin S. Hathaway, director, Cooper Union Museum, New York

Miss Ima Hogg, founder and curator, Bayou Bend Collections – Museum of Fine Arts of Houston

Thomas C. Howe, director, California Palace of the Legion of Honor, San Francisco; president, Association of Art Museum Directors

Sherman E. Lee, director, Cleveland Museum of Art

Jack R. McGregor, administrative assistant, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York

Henry P. McIlhenny, curator of decorative arts, Philadelphia Museum of Art

Richard H. Randall, Jr., assistant curator, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston

Edgar P. Richardson, director, Detroit Institute of Arts; director, Archives of American Art, Detroit

Marvin D. Schwartz, curator of decorative arts, Brooklyn Museum, Brooklyn, New York

John A. H. Sweeney, curator, Henry Francis du Pont Winterthur Museum, Winterthur, Delaware

C. Malcolm Watkins, curator, Division of Cultural History, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

⁴¹⁵ Ibid.

Appendix D: Presenters for Colonial Williamsburg Antiques Forums

Philanthropists, Agents, and Known Associates Who Presented at Colonial Williamsburg Antiques Forums⁴¹⁶

Year	First Name	Last Name	Lecture Title	Role
1949	Joseph	Downs	Regional Characteristics in American Furniture	Curator, American Wing, Metropolitan Museum of Art ⁴¹⁷
1949	Nina Fletcher	Little	English Pottery and Porcelain in Colonial America	Expert on early New England arts, Known acquaintance of Henry and Helen Flynt ⁴¹⁸
1949	Charles F.	Montgomery	English Influences on American Pewter	Pewter dealer and museum professional ⁴¹⁹
1949	John Marshall	Phillips	Regional Characteristics in American Silver	Curator, Garvan Collection of American antiques, Yale University ⁴²⁰
1949	Alice	Winchester	Living With Antiques	Editor, <i>The Magazine Antiques</i>
1950	J. A. Lloyd	Hyde	The Oriental Porcelain Called Lowestoft	Dealer, Chinese Export Porcelain, Known acquaintance of Henry and Helen Flynt ⁴²¹
1950	Nina Fletcher	Little	English China in America After the Revolution	Expert on early New England arts, Known acquaintance of Henry and Helen Flynt ⁴²²
1951	Vincent	Andrus	Masterpieces of American Furniture in Private Collections	Curator, American Wing, Metropolitan Museum of Art ⁴²³
1951	Kathryn C.	Buhler	English and American Silver	Silver specialist, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston ⁴²⁴

⁴¹⁶ Material is condensed from Deborah Chapman, The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, e-mail message to author, May 13, 2010.

⁴¹⁷ Elizabeth Stillinger, *Historic Deerfield: A Portrait of Early America* (New York: Dutton Studio Books, 1992), 26. Attended the first Williamsburg Antiques Forum with the Flynts after having advised them on the development of their collections for Deerfield, Massachusetts starting in 1948. Downs later became curator of Henry du Pont's Winterthur Museum.

⁴¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 47.

⁴¹⁹ *Ibid.*

⁴²⁰ *Ibid.*

⁴²¹ *Ibid.*, 48. Also responsible for bringing together Henry and Helen Flynt, Electra Havemeyer Webb, Maxim Karolik, Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Carpenter, John Graham, Katharine Murphy, and Ima Hogg for informal collection discussions and gatherings at each other's homes.

⁴²² *Ibid.*, 47.

⁴²³ *Ibid.*, 26. Assistant to Joseph Downs and eventual curator of the American Wing at the Metropolitan Museum of Art.

⁴²⁴ *Ibid.*, 47.

1951	John M.	Graham, II	Furnishing Rooms in Period Styles	Curator, Colonial Williamsburg ⁴²⁵
1951	Nina Fletcher	Little	House, Sign and Fancy Painting in Early New England	Expert on early New England arts, Known acquaintance of Henry and Helen Flynt ⁴²⁶
1951	Charles F.	Montgomery	Colonial Lighting	Pewter dealer and museum professional ⁴²⁷
1951	John Marshall	Phillips	English and American Silver	Curator, Garvan Collection of American antiques, Yale University ⁴²⁸
1952	Ralph E.	Carpenter	Building a New Old House	Collector, Rhode Island furniture ⁴²⁹
1952	John M.	Graham, II	Furnishing the Brush-Everard House	Curator, Colonial Williamsburg ⁴³⁰
1952	J. A. Lloyd	Hyde	Sugar and Spice and Everything Nice: The Early West Indies Trade	Dealer, Chinese Export Porcelain, Known acquaintance of Henry and Helen Flynt ⁴³¹
1952	Maxim	Karolik	Why These Collections	Donor of American Art to Museum of Fine Arts, Boston ⁴³²
1952	Nina Fletcher	Little	Historical China for the Early Republic	Expert on early New England arts, Known acquaintance of Henry and Helen Flynt ⁴³³
1952	John Marshall	Phillips	By Hammer, By Wheel	Curator, Garvan Collection of American antiques, Yale University ⁴³⁴
1953	Mrs. Frances B.	Crowninshield	Making Old Houses Bloom Again	President, National Trust for Historic Preservation ⁴³⁵
1953	Abbott Lowell	Cummings	European Influences in American Architecture Up to the American Revolution	Curator, American Wing, Metropolitan Museum of Art ⁴³⁶

⁴²⁵ Ibid., 48.

⁴²⁶ Ibid., 47.

⁴²⁷ Ibid.

⁴²⁸ Ibid.

⁴²⁹ Ibid., 48.

⁴³⁰ Ibid.

⁴³¹ Ibid. Also responsible for bringing together Henry and Helen Flynt, Electra Havemeyer Webb, Maxim Karolik, Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Carpenter, John Graham, Katharine Murphy, and Ima Hogg for informal collection discussions and gatherings at each other's homes.

⁴³² Ibid.

⁴³³ Ibid., 47.

⁴³⁴ Ibid.

⁴³⁵ Curtis F. Garfield and Alison R. Ridley, *As Ancient is this Hostelry: The Story of the Wayside Inn* (Sudbury, Massachusetts: Porcupine Enterprises, 1988), 268, 270.

⁴³⁶ Jessica Neuwirth and others, "Abbott Lowell Cummings and the Preservation of New England," *Public Historian* 29, no. 4 (Fall 2007): 58.

1953	Joseph	Downs	American Queen Anne and Chippendale Furniture	Curator, American Wing, Metropolitan Museum of Art ⁴³⁷
1954	Kathryn C.	Buhler	Silver in the Eighteenth-Century Domestic Life	Silver specialist, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston ⁴³⁸
1954	Ralph E.	Carpenter	Newport Furniture	Collector, Rhode Island furniture ⁴³⁹
1954	Henry N.	Flynt	A Collector's Experiences	Co-founder, Historic Deerfield ⁴⁴⁰
1954	Nina Fletcher	Little	Painted Decoration in the Early American House: New England	Expert on early New England arts, Known acquaintance of Henry and Helen Flynt ⁴⁴¹
1955	Kathryn C.	Buhler	A New Look at Old Silver	Silver specialist, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston ⁴⁴²
1955	Abbott L.	Cummings	The Uses and Arrangements of Colonial Rooms	Society for the Preservation of New England Antiquities ⁴⁴³
1955	Nina Fletcher	Little	The Eighteenth-Century Parlor as It Really Looked	Expert on early New England arts, Known acquaintance of Henry and Helen Flynt
1955	Charles F.	Montgomery	The American Tradition	Pewter dealer and museum professional ⁴⁴⁴
1956	Ralph E.	Carpenter	Spermaceti, Foot-Candles, and Illuminations	Collector, Rhode Island furniture ⁴⁴⁵
1957	Abbott L.	Cummings	First Homes in the Wilderness	Society for the Preservation of New England Antiquities ⁴⁴⁶

⁴³⁷ Stillinger, *Historic Deerfield*, 26. Attended the first Williamsburg Antiques Forum with the Flynts after having advised them on the development of their collections for Deerfield, Massachusetts starting in 1948. Downs later became curator of Henry du Pont's Winterthur Museum.

⁴³⁸ *Ibid.*, 47.

⁴³⁹ *Ibid.*, 48.

⁴⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 38-39.

⁴⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 47.

⁴⁴² *Ibid.*

⁴⁴³ Jessica Neuwirth, "Abbott Lowell Cummings and the Preservation of New England," *Public Historian*: 58. In 1955, Cummings joined the Society for the Preservation of New England Antiquities after working on staff at the American Wing of the Metropolitan Museum of Art.

⁴⁴⁴ Stillinger, *Historic Deerfield*, 47.

⁴⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 48.

⁴⁴⁶ Jessica Neuwirth, "Abbott Lowell Cummings and the Preservation of New England," *Public Historian*: 58.

1957	J. A. Lloyd	Hyde	High Society and the China Trade	Dealer, Chinese Export Porcelain, Known acquaintance of Henry and Helen Flynt ⁴⁴⁷
1957	Nina Fletcher	Little	Antiquarians Shouldn't Go in Such Places	Expert on early New England arts, Known acquaintance of Henry and Helen Flynt ⁴⁴⁸
1957	Charles F.	Montgomery	Furniture in America Before 1725	Pewter dealer and museum professional ⁴⁴⁹
1958	Nina Fletcher	Little	Folk Art: Twenty-Five Years of Rediscovery	Expert on early New England arts, Known acquaintance of Henry and Helen Flynt ⁴⁵⁰
1958	Mrs. J. Watson	Webb	The Shelburne Museum and How It Grew	Founder, Shelburne Museum
1959	Ralph E.	Carpenter	Furniture for the Historic House	Collector, Rhode Island furniture ⁴⁵¹
1960	Kathryn C.	Buhler	Masterpieces of American Silver: The Exhibition at the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts	Silver specialist, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston ⁴⁵²
1960	Henry N.	Flynt	Great American Antiques at Old Deerfield	Co-founder, Historic Deerfield ⁴⁵³
1960	Maxim	Karolik	American Furniture as Works of Art in the Boston Museum	Donor of American Art to Museum of Fine Arts, Boston ⁴⁵⁴
1960	Charles F.	Montgomery	Great American Furniture at Winterthur	Pewter dealer and museum professional ⁴⁵⁵
1961	Abbott L.	Cumming	Curtains for Windows and Beds	Society for the Preservation of New England Antiquities ⁴⁵⁶
1961	John M.	Graham, II	Furnishings for Van Cortlandt Manor	Curator, Colonial Williamsburg ⁴⁵⁷

⁴⁴⁷ Stillinger, *Historic Deerfield*, 48. Also responsible for bringing together Henry and Helen Flynt, Electra Havemeyer Webb, Maxim Karolik, Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Carpenter, John Graham, Katharine Murphy, and Ima Hogg for informal collection discussions and gatherings at each other's homes.

⁴⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 47.

⁴⁴⁹ *Ibid.*

⁴⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

⁴⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 48.

⁴⁵² *Ibid.*, 47.

⁴⁵³ *Ibid.*, 38-39.

⁴⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 48.

⁴⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 47.

⁴⁵⁶ Jessica Neuwirth, "Abbott Lowell Cummings and the Preservation of New England," *Public Historian*: 58.

⁴⁵⁷ Stillinger, *Historic Deerfield*, 48.

1962	John M.	Graham, II	Highlights of the Williamsburg Collection	Curator, Colonial Williamsburg ⁴⁵⁸
1963	J. A. Lloyd	Hyde	Katharine Prentis Murphy's Collections of Americana	Dealer, Chinese Export Porcelain, Known acquaintance of Henry and Helen Flynt ⁴⁵⁹
1964	Henry N.	Flynt	A Fresh Look at Old Deerfield	Co-founder, Historic Deerfield ⁴⁶⁰
1965	Kathryn C.	Buhler	Regional Characteristics of American Silver	Silver specialist, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston ⁴⁶¹
1965	Charles F.	Montgomery	Inlaid Eagles and Paterae -- Regional Characteristics of Early Federal Furniture	Pewter dealer and museum professional ⁴⁶²
1966	Samuel	Chamberlain	The New England House in Pictures: From Early Settlers to Victorians	Co-author with Henry Flynt, <i>Frontier of Freedom: The Soul and Substance of America Portrayed in one Extraordinary Village, Old Deerfield, Massachusetts.</i>
1966	John M.	Graham, II	The Glen-Sanders Collection from Scotia, New York	Curator, Colonial Williamsburg ⁴⁶³
1968	Henry N.	Flynt	The Aura of New England Silversmiths	Co-founder, Historic Deerfield ⁴⁶⁴
1968	Charles F.	Montgomery	Early American Decorative Arts: 1949-1968 in Retrospect	Pewter dealer and museum professional ⁴⁶⁵
1970	Kathryn C.	Buhler	The Campbell Museum Collection	Silver specialist, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston ⁴⁶⁶
1970	Kathryn C.	Buhler	Paul Revere and His Patrons	Silver specialist, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston ⁴⁶⁷
1970	Abbott L.	Cumming	The Architectural Craftsmen of New England	Society for the Preservation of New England Antiquities ⁴⁶⁸

⁴⁵⁸ Ibid., 48.

⁴⁵⁹ Ibid., 48. Also responsible for bringing together Henry and Helen Flynt, Electra Havemeyer Webb, Maxim Karolik, Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Carpenter, John Graham, Katharine Murphy, and Ima Hogg for informal collection discussions and gatherings at each other's homes.

⁴⁶⁰ Ibid., 38-39.

⁴⁶¹ Ibid., 47.

⁴⁶² Ibid., 47.

⁴⁶³ Ibid., 48.

⁴⁶⁴ Ibid., 38-39.

⁴⁶⁵ Ibid., 47.

⁴⁶⁶ Ibid., 47.

⁴⁶⁷ Ibid., 47.

Please note, the following core group of philanthropists and agents regularly attended the early Colonial Williamsburg Antiques Forums:

Joseph Downs, curator of Winterthur Museum
Mr. and Mrs. Henry Flynt of Historic Deerfield
John M. Graham II, curator of Colonial Williamsburg
Miss Ima Hogg of Bayou Bend in Houston, Texas
Electra Havemeyer Webb of Shelburne Museum
Alice Winchester, editor of *The Antiques Magazine*⁴⁶⁹

During the 1954 Antiques Forum, Colonial Williamsburg announced that John D. Rockefeller was building the Abby Aldrich Rockefeller Folk Art Museum to house Mrs. Rockefeller's collection of American folk art from the nineteenth century.⁴⁷⁰

A full list of attendees for the Colonial Williamsburg Antiques Forums is unavailable due to privacy restrictions on the archival material.⁴⁷¹

⁴⁶⁸ Neuwirth, "Abbott Lowell Cummings and the Preservation of New England," *Public Historian*: 58.

⁴⁶⁹ Material above is condensed from Sanka Knox, "Antiques Experts Trace Influences: Forum in Williamsburg is Told Chippendale Gets Too Much Credit for His Designs," *New York Times*, January 21, 1953; and Stillinger, *Historic Deerfield*, 47-49.

⁴⁷⁰ Knox, Sanka. "Antiques Experts Trace Root of Art: Classical Impact Stressed at Williamsburg—Folk Museum Donated by Rockefeller." *New York Times*, January 27, 1954.

⁴⁷¹ Deborah Chapman, The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, e-mail message to author, May 18, 2010.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Manuscript Collections:

Letter from Kenneth Chorley to Henry Ford dated February 5, 1935. Folder 959- Rock-Rocz, Box 1823, Accession # 285, Henry Ford Office Papers, Ford Motor Company Records Collection. Benson Ford Research Center, The Henry Ford, 20900 Oakwood Blvd., Dearborn, Michigan 48124-5029.

Report on E.I. Allston Boyer, 3 Apr 1951. Consultant Reports, Box 1, Series 175, Edison Institute Collection. Benson Ford Research Center, The Henry Ford, 20900 Oakwood Blvd., Dearborn, Michigan 48124-5029.

W.W. Taylor Reports. Vol. I-Vol. XIV (1924-1931), Box 1-Folder1 through Box 2-Folder 3, Accession # 175, Edison Institute Collection. Benson Ford Research Center, The Henry Ford, 20900 Oakwood Blvd., Dearborn, Michigan 48124-5029.

Newspapers:

“First Lady Names a Fine Arts Group,” *New York Times*, April 19, 1961.

“Former Collector for Ford Dies.” *Haverhill Gazette*, August 2, 1949.

Knox, Sanka. “Antiques Experts Trace Influences: Forum in Williamsburg is Told Chippendale Gets Too Much Credit for His Designs.” *New York Times*, January 21, 1953.

____. “Antiques Experts Trace Root of Art: Classical Impact Stressed at Williamsburg—Folk Museum Donated by Rockefeller.” *New York Times*, January 27, 1954.

Moonan, Wendy. "Antiques; Burnishing The Lamp Of Americana." *New York Times*, April 3, 1998.

"Mrs. Kennedy's Fine-Arts Hunt Enriches White House Treasure." *New York Times*, July 4, 1961.

"Stephen C. Clark, Art Patron, Dead." *New York Times*, September 18, 1960, 86.

Published Primary Sources:

Carnegie, Andrew. "The Gospel of Wealth." In *The Perfect Gift: The Philanthropic Imagination in Poetry and Prose*, edited by Amy A. Kass, 230-244. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2002.

Chamberlain, Samuel and Henry N. Flynt. *Frontier of Freedom: The Soul and Substance of America Portrayed in One Extraordinary Village, Old Deerfield, Massachusetts*. New York: Hastings House Publishers, 1952.

Coleman, Laurence Vail. *The Museum in America*. Vol. 1-3. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Museums, 1939.

Flynt, Henry. "Deerfield, Massachusetts: Its Meaning." *Ellis Memorial Antiques Show Catalog* (1963): 35-39.

_____. "Notes of a Collector." *East Side House Winter Antiques Show Catalog* (1956): 72-73.

_____. "Old Deerfield." *Connecticut Antiquarian: The Bulletin of the Antiquarian and Landmarks Society, Inc. of Connecticut* 5, no. 1 (June 1953): 19-25.

_____. *To Collect or Not to Collect: Notes about Old Deerfield and Its Collections*. Walpole Society Note Book. Deerfield, Massachusetts: John Wilson Printing House, 1963.

Hamilton, J.G. de Roulhac. "The Ford Museum." *The American Historical Review* 36,
no. 4 (Jul 1931): 772-775.

Longfellow, Henry Wadsworth. *Tales of a Wayside Inn*. Sudbury, Massachusetts:
Longfellow's Wayside Inn, 1995.

Marquis, Samuel S. *Henry Ford: An Interpretation*. Detroit: Wayne State University
Press, 2007. Reprint of 1923 book.

Morton, H.F. *Strange Commissions for Henry Ford*. York, England: Herald Printing
Works, 1934.

Nevins, Allan and Frank Ernest Hill. *Ford: Expansion and Challenge, 1915-1933*. Vol.
II. New York: Arno Press, A New York Times Company, 1976. Reprint of 1957
book.

Richards, Charles R. *Industrial Art and the Museum*. New York: Macmillan Company,
1927.

_____. *The Industrial Museum*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1925.

Secondary Sources:

Adam, Thomas. *Buying Respectability: Philanthropy and Urban Society in Transnational
Perspective, 1840s to 1930s*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2009.

American Association of Museums. *2006 Museum Financial Information*. Edited by
Elizabeth E. Merritt. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Museums,
2006.

- Ascoli, Peter M. *Julius Rosenwald: The Man Who Built Sears, Roebuck and Advanced the Cause of Black Education in the American South*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2006.
- Bryan, Ford R. *Henry's Lieutenants*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2003.
- Butterfield, Roger. "Henry Ford, the Wayside Inn, and the Problem of 'History is Bunk.'" *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, Third Series, 77 (1965): 53-66.
- Chamberlain, Samuel and Henry N. Flynt. *Historic Deerfield: Houses and Interiors*. New York: Hastings House Publishers, 1965.
- Chamberlain, Samuel. *Tour of Old Sturbridge Village*. New York: Hastings House Publishers, 1972.
- Coben, Stanley. *Rebellion against Victorianism: The Impetus for Cultural Change in 1920s America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Conn, Steven. *Museums and American Intellectual Life, 1876-1926*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998.
- Cowan, Ruth Schwartz. *A Social History of American Technology*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Earle, Peggy. *Legacy: Walter Chrysler Jr. and the Untold Story of Norfolk's Chrysler Museum of Art*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2008.
- Friary, Donald R. "The Noncollectors: Henry and Helen Flynt in Historic Deerfield." *The Magazine Antiques*, January 1982, 250-257.
- Friedman, Lawrence J. and Mark D. McGarvie, eds. *Charity, Philanthropy, and Civility in American History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

- Garfield, Curtis F. and Alison R. Ridley. *As Ancient Is This Hostelry: The Story of the Wayside Inn*. Sudbury, Massachusetts: Porcupine Enterprises, 1988.
- Garraty, John A. and Mark C. Carnes, eds. *American National Biography*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Gebhard, David. "The American Colonial Revival in the 1930s." *Winterthur Portfolio* 22, no. 2/3 (Summer-Autumn, 1987), 109-148.
- Greenspan, Anders. *Creating Colonial Williamsburg*. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 2002.
- _____. "How Philanthropy Can Alter Our View of the Past: A Look at Colonial Williamsburg." *Voluntas* 5, no. 2 (1994): 193-203.
- Gross, Michael. *Rogues' Gallery: The Secret History of the Moguls and the Money that Made the Metropolitan Museum*. New York: Broadway Books, 2009.
- Hall, Peter Dobkin. "A Historical Overview of Philanthropy, Voluntary Associations, and Nonprofit Organizations in the United States, 1600-2000." In *The Non-Profit Sector: Research Handbook*. 2nd ed., edited by Walter W. Powell and Richard Steinberg, 32-65. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006.
- Handler, Richard and Eric Gable. *The New History in an Old Museum: Creating the Past at Colonial Williamsburg*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1997.
- Jones, Russell Douglass. "Engineering History: The Foundation of Industrial Museums in the United States." Ph.D. diss., Case Western Reserve University, 2001.
- Kert, Bernice. *Abby Aldrich Rockefeller: The Woman in the Family*. New York: Random House, Inc., 1993.

- Layton, Edwin T., Jr. *The Revolt of the Engineers: Social Responsibility and the American Engineering Profession*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986.
- Lord, Ruth. *Henry F. du Pont and Winterthur: A Daughter's Portrait*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999.
- Lynes, Russell. *The Tastemakers*. New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1954.
- Macleod, Dianne Sachko. *Enchanted Lives, Enchanted Objects: American Women Collectors and the Making of Culture, 1800-1940*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008.
- McKinstry, E. Richard. *Guide to the Winterthur Library: The Joseph Downs Collection and the Winterthur Archives*. Hanover: University Press of New England, 2003.
- McCarthy, Kathleen D. *Women's Culture: American Philanthropy and Art, 1830-1930*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.
- Neuwirth, Jessica, Robert Paynter, Kevin Sweeney, Braden Paynter, and Abbott Lowell Cummings. "Abbott Lowell Cummings and the Preservation of New England." *Public Historian* 29, no. 4 (Fall 2007): 57-81.
- Pridmore, Jay. *Inventive Genius: The History of the Museum of Science and Industry Chicago*. Chicago: Museum of Science and Industry, 1996.
- Pursell, Carroll. *The Machine in America: A Social History of Technology*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995.
- Rhoads, William B. "The Colonial Revival and American Nationalism." *The Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 35, no. 4 (Dec 1976): 239-254.

- Richardson, Edgar P., John D. Morse, and Milo M. Naeve, eds. *The Winterthur Story: The Henry Francis du Pont Winterthur Museum*. Winterthur, Delaware: Henry Francis du Pont Winterthur Museum, Inc., 1965.
- Rydell, Robert W. *All the World's a Fair: Visions of Empire at American International Expositions, 1876-1916*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984.
- Saarinen, Aline B. *The Proud Possessors: The Lives, Times and Tastes of Some Adventurous American Art Collectors*. New York: Random House, 1958.
- Schwarzer, Marjorie. *Riches, Rivals, and Radicals: 100 Years of Museums in America*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Museums, 2006.
- Stillinger, Elizabeth. *Historic Deerfield: A Portrait of Early America*. New York: Dutton Studio Books, 1992.
- Stocking, George W., Jr., ed. *Objects and Others: Essays on Museums and Material Culture*. Vol. III, *History of Anthropology*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1985.
- The Fundraising School. *Principles and Techniques of Fundraising*. Indianapolis, IN: Indiana University, 2009.
- Upward, Geoffrey C., ed. *A Home for Our Heritage: The Building and Growth of Greenfield Village and Henry Ford Museum, 1929-1979*. Dearborn, MI: The Henry Ford Museum Press, 1979.
- Van Ravenswaay, Charles. *The Story of Old Sturbridge Village*. New York: Newcomen Society in North America, 1965.

Weber, Nicholas Fox. *The Clarks of Cooperstown: Their Singer Sewing Machine Fortune, Their Great and Influential Art Collections, Their Forty-Year Feud.*

New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2007.

Wilson, Richard Guy, Shaun Eyring, and Kenny Marotta, eds. *Recreating the American Past: Essays on the Colonial Revival.* Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2006.

Wortham, Brooke D. "Mythologies of an American Everyday Landscape: Henry Ford at the Wayside Inn." Ph.D. diss., Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2006.

Web-based Sources:

"About." *Henry Ford Museum.* The Henry Ford.

<http://www.thehenryford.org/museum/about.aspx>.

"About." *Greenfield Village.* The Henry Ford.

<http://www.thehenryford.org/village/about.aspx>.

"About the National Trust for Historic Preservation." National Trust for Historic Preservation. <http://www.preservationnation.org/about-us/>.

"Carnegie, Andrew, 1835-1919." *Archives Directory for the History of Collecting in America.* The Frick Collection.

<http://research.frick.org/directoryweb/browserecord.php?-action=browse&-recid=7114>.

“Ginsburg & Levy, Inc. (New York, N.Y).” *Archives Directory for the History of Collecting in America*. The Frick Collection.

<http://research.frick.org/directoryweb/browserecord.php?-action=browse&-recid=7421>.

“H F Morton: The Ford Motor Company (Britain) Ltd, Trafford Park.” *Chetham’s Library*. The National Archives.

<http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/a2a/records.aspx?cat=418-morton&cid=-1#-1>.

Queen, Thelma, Patrick Kerwin, and Joseph Sullivan. “Booker T. Washington Papers: A Finding Aid to the Collection in the Library of Congress.” *Library of Congress Finding Aids*. Library of Congress. http://lcweb2.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/D?faid:7:./temp/~faid_6bVM::

The Henry Ford. “2001 Annual Report.”

<http://www.thehenryford.org/images/AnnualReport01.pdf>.

_____. “2002 Annual Report.” <http://www.thehenryford.org/images/AnnualReport02.pdf>.

_____. “2008 Annual Report.” <http://www.thehenryford.org/images/AnnualReport08.pdf>.

“The Walpole Society Papers.” *The Joseph Downs Collection of Manuscripts and Printed Ephemera, The Winterthur Library*. Henry Francis du Pont Winterthur Museum.

http://findingaid.winterthur.org/html/HTML_Finding_Aids/COL0386.htm.

“UMaine Presidents.” *Office of the President*. The University of Maine.

<http://www.umaine.edu/president/umaine-presidents/>.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Brittany Lynn Miller

Education:

Master of Arts in History, Indiana University, IUPUI, 2010

Master of Arts in Philanthropic Studies, Indiana University, IUPUI, 2010

Bachelor of Arts in Public History, Western Michigan University, 2008

Academic Honors and Fellowships:

University Fellowship, IUPUI, 2008-2010

Dean's List, Western Michigan University, 2005-2008

John and Ramona Bernhard Medallion Scholarship, Western Michigan University, 2005-2008

Professional Experience:

Foundation and Social Responsibility Graduate Assistant

WellPoint, Inc.

Indianapolis, IN

August 2009-April 2010

Development Intern/Associate

St. Mary Mercy Hospital

Livonia, MI

May 2009-August 2009

Experience Design Intern

Conner Prairie Interactive History Park

Fishers, IN

August 2008-May 2009

Education Intern/Project Assistant

The Henry Ford

Dearborn, MI

May 2008-August 2008

Marketing Intern

The Henry Ford
Dearborn, MI
January 2008- April 2008

Summer Fellow

Summer Fellowship Program in Early American History and Material Culture
Historic Deerfield, Inc.
Deerfield, MA
June 2007- August 2007

Papers, Presentations, and Exhibits:

1859 Balloon Voyage Exhibit
Conner Prairie Interactive History Park
Fishers, IN
August 2008- May 2009

Transportation Exhibit-Forthcoming
Henry Ford Museum, The Henry Ford
Dearborn, MI
May 2008- August 2008

Racing Exhibit-Forthcoming
Henry Ford Museum, The Henry Ford
Dearborn, MI
May 2008- August 2008

“Behind the Plexi-glass Partitions: An Intern’s Perspective of American Museums,”
Honors Thesis Academic Presentation,
Lee Honors College, Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, MI
November 26, 2007

“Behind the Plexi-glass Partitions: An Intern’s Perspective of American Museums,”
Honors Thesis Paper
Lee Honors College, Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, MI
June 2007 – November 2007

“Make a Joyful Noise: Singing, Dancing, and the Music of Deerfield,”
Historic Deerfield Summer Fellowship Program Academic Presentation
Historic Deerfield, Inc.
Deerfield, MA
August 3, 2007

“Make a Joyful Noise: Singing, Dancing, and the Music of Deerfield,”
Historic Deerfield Summer Fellowship Program Paper
Student Papers collection at Memorial Libraries of Historic Deerfield
Historic Deerfield, Inc.
Deerfield, MA
June 2007- August 2007

Into the Woods: Crafting Early American Furniture Exhibit,
Flynt Center of Early New England Life, Historic Deerfield, Inc.
Deerfield, MA
June 2007- August 2007