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1. Name of Property

historic name  George Rogers Clark Sculpture

other names/site number

2. Location

street & number Monument Square, bounded by University and Jefferson Park Avenues and Railroad Tracks

city or town Charlottesville

state Virginia code VA county Albemarle code 003 zip code 22908

3. State/Federal Agency Certification

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended, I hereby certify that this nomination request for determination of eligibility meets the documentation standards for registering properties in the National Register of Historic Places and meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60. In my opinion, the property meets does not meet the National Register criteria. I recommend that this property be considered significant

nationally statewide locally. (See continuation sheet for additional comments.)

Signature of certifying official/Title Date

State of Federal agency and bureau

In my opinion, the property meets does not meet the National Register criteria. (See continuation sheet for additional comments.)

Signature of commenting official/Title Date

State of Federal agency and bureau

4. National Park Service Certification

I hereby certify that the property is:

- entered in the National Register. See continuation sheet.
- determined eligible for the National Register. See continuation sheet.
- determined not eligible for the National Register.
- removed from the National Register.
- other (explain):

Signature of the Keeper Date of Action
5. Classification

Ownership of Property  
(Check as many boxes as apply)
- [ ] private
- [ ] public-local
- [x] public-State
- [ ] public-Federal

Category of Property  
(Check only one box)
- [ ] building(s)
- [ ] district
- [ ] site
- [ ] structure
- [ ] object

Number of Resources within Property
(Do not include previously listed resources in the count.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contributions</th>
<th>Noncontributing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>buildings</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sites</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>structures</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>objects</td>
<td>1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name of related multiple property listing
(Enter "N/A" if property is not part of a multiple property listing.)
Four Monumental Figurative Outdoor Sculptures in Charlottesville, VA.

6. Function or Use

Historic Functions  
(Enter categories from instructions)
Recreation and Culture: Work of Art

Current Functions  
(Enter categories from instructions)
Recreation and Culture: Work of Art

7. Description

Architectural Classification  
(Enter categories from instructions)
N/A

Materials  
(Enter categories from instructions)

foundation  Pedestal: Granite
walls
roof
other  Sculpture: Bronze

Narrative Description  
(Describe the historic and current condition of the property on one or more continuation sheets.)
See attached sheet
8. Statement of Significance

Applicable National Register Criteria

(Enter categories from instructions)

| A | Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history. |
| B | Property is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past. |
| C | Property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction. |
| D | Property has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history. |

Criteria Considerations

(Property is:)

- A owned by a religious institution or used for religious purposes.
- B removed from its original location.
- C a birthplace or grave.
- D a cemetery.
- E a reconstructed building, object, or structure.
- F a commemorative property.
- G less than 50 years of age or achieved significance within the past 50 years.

Period of Significance

1919–1924

Significant Dates

1921

Significant Person

(Coplete if Criterion B is marked above)

Cultural Affiliation

N/A

Architect/Builder

Aitken, Robert

9. Major Bibliographical References

Bibliography

(Cite the books, articles, and other sources used in preparing this form on one or more continuation sheets.)

Previous documentation on file (NPS):

- preliminary determination of individual listing (36 CFR 57) has been requested
- previously listed in the National Register
- previously determined eligible by the National Register
- designated a National Historic Landmark
- recorded by Historic American Buildings Survey
- recorded by Historic American Engineering Record

Primary location of additional data:

- State Historic Preservation Office
- Other State agency
- Federal agency
- Local government
- University
- Other

Name of repository:

______________________________
George Rogers Clark Sculpture
Name of Property

10. Geographical Data

Acreage of Property ________________________________

UTM References
(Place additional UTM references on a continuation sheet.)

1 | 11 | 7 | 7 | 1 | 9 | 4 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 0 | Z
Zone Easting Northing
2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Z
Zone Easting Northing
3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Z
Zone Easting Northing
4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Z
Zone Easting Northing

Verbal Boundary Description
(Describe the boundaries of the property on a continuation sheet.)

Boundary Justification
(Explain why the boundaries were selected on a continuation sheet.)

11. Form Prepared By

name/title Betsy Goldes-Baten

organization ____________________________ date April 13, 1996

street & number 2737 Circle Drive telephone (919) 489-6368

city or town Durham state NC zip code 27705

Additional Documentation
Submit the following items with the completed form:

Continuation Sheets

Maps

A USGS map (7.5 or 15 minute series) indicating the property’s location.

A Sketch map for historic districts and properties having large acreage or numerous resources.

Photographs

Representative black and white photographs of the property.

Additional items
(Check with the SHPO or FPO for any additional items)

Property Owner
(Complete this item at the request of SHPO or FPO.)

name University of Virginia

street & number ____________________________ telephone (804) 924-0311

city or town Charlottesville state VA zip code 22908

Paperwork Reduction Act Statement: This information is being collected for applications to the National Register of Historic Places to nominate properties for listing or determine eligibility for listing, to list properties, and to amend existing listings. Response to this request is required to obtain a benefit in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.).

Estimated Burden Statement: Public reporting burden for this form is estimated to average 18.1 hours per response including time for reviewing instructions, gathering and maintaining data, and completing and reviewing the form. Direct comments regarding this burden estimate or any aspect of this form to the Chief, Administrative Services Division, National Park Service, P.O. Box 37127, Washington, DC 20013-7127; and the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Projects (1024-0018), Washington, DC 20503.
Description:

The monumental figurative sculpture of George Rogers Clark is the fourth of four works commissioned from members of the National Sculpture Society by philanthropist Paul Goodloe McIntire during the years 1919 to 1924, and the only one given to the University of Virginia. McIntire commissioned Robert Ingersoll Aitken to create a heroic-sized bronze sculptural group that portrays George Rogers Clark mounted and at the head of three members of his expedition who, with guns ready but pointed down, cautiously look out from behind their leader's horse at an Indian chief and two others of his tribe who stand, sit, and kneel ahead of the party. The group, atop a trapezoidal pedestal of pink granite also of Aitken's design, was erected near the eastern edge of the University of Virginia campus on 3 November 1921 in the center of Monument Square, a triangular park of approximately 4,900 square feet bounded by the intersections of University and Jefferson Park Avenues with the railroad tracks. Within the little park, mature hemlocks, sycamores, and pines create a forest-like surrounding that today obscures the sculpture from all points of view except that along University Avenue.

The George Rogers Clark sculpture is approximately 24 feet in height, 20 feet in length, and eight feet in width. The bronze figures were cast by the Gorham Company of New York, and the pedestal was made from polished pink granite quarried at the Stony Creek quarry in Connecticut. A green patina, the result of over 75 years of exposure, has discolored the bronze figures with streaks and patches that are particularly noticeable on the heads and upper bodies of the men and the horse.

Aitken has emphasized the tall and imposing figure of George Rogers Clark by placing him mounted on a stallion in the center of the sculpture. Clark is at the head of a party of three men, facing west with his torso turned to the proper right as he gestures back to the east with his proper right arm to indicate the origins of his group to the three Indians directly in front of him. He holds the nail-studded reins of his horse in his proper left hand, pulling them up toward his chest to restrain the animal while leveraging himself by extending his legs forward. Clark's dress – a cap, a loose-fitting shirt laced at the sides, and tight breeches – is typical of a frontiersman, but a bear skin cape tied under his chin and worn across his shoulders gives him a regal appearance appropriate to his role as a conqueror and peacemaker.

Clark has just brought the stallion he rides to an abrupt halt. The animal's haunches are tucked in, his hind legs are bent at the hocks, and both front feet are placed forward of his body squarely on the ground. With his neck arched and overbent, the horse holds his head
Aitken has depicted Clark and his men as they encounter three Indians who are in front of them. At the southwest corner of the sculpture, a woman is hidden by a blanket that reveals only her face. She kneels in front of Clark holding a covered cradle board aloft as if to plead for a papoose within. Beside her stands the chief, his tall figure enveloped by a blanket except for his head. His countenance is stern, and he confronts Clark and his men with his proper right elbow extended protectively in front of him beneath the blanket. His long hair is worn in braids that fall across his shoulders. Back of the chief and at the northwest corner of the sculpture, a third Indian is seated. He wears a blanket also, but it is open to reveal his bare back and a loin cloth tied around his waist. His proper left knee is
hidden by the blanket and bent in front of him to conceal a knife held in readiness in his proper right hand at the base of the sculpture. Like the chief, his hair is braided, but he wears a single feather across the top of his head. Oak branches that lie around the Indians show their courage.

The monument’s trapezoidal base is made of rectangular-shaped blocks of polished pink granite set on top of each other. The stone is coarse grained with striations and imperfections that give it a rustic appearance in character with the frontier scene above. The base is unornamented, carrying only the inscription:

GEORGE ROGERS CLARK
CONQUEROR OF THE NORTHWEST

on the north facade facing University Avenue.

Statement of Significance:

The George Rogers Clark Sculpture by Robert Ingersoll Aitken (1878 -1949) is nominated to the National Register as part of a multiple property submission under the historic context “Monumental Figurative Outdoor Sculpture by Members of the National Sculpture Society donated by Paul Goodloe McIntire to the city of Charlottesville, Virginia, and the University of Virginia during the late City Beautiful movement from 1919-1924.” The sculpture meets the registration requirements for this property type, and it retains its historic integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. It is eligible for the National Register at the state level of significance under criterion C as an important art object that exhibits the figurative style of outdoor sculpture produced by members of the National Sculpture Society, a group of masters whose origins are associated with the City Beautiful movement.

Historic Context:

On 19 March 1895, the Charlottesville Daily Progress announced that the University of Virginia was planning to create a small park at its easternmost boundary on the site where the dispensary was located.

The coal bin, blacksmith shop and other encumbrances which have been an eyesore on the grounds occupied in part by the University dispensary will be removed. The coal bins will be placed on the southwest side of the track, just within the University grounds. It is proposed to beautify this little nook and make it something of a park.
Four months later as work on the park was underway, the paper noted:

When the old coal bins near the University are removed and the grounds beautified, the dispensary will look uglier than ever. The out-of-date fence enclosing it is an eyesore. What an excellent site for a park is the little plot on which the University dispensary is built!4

In due course, improvements planned for the little park were completed, but it was not until almost 20 years later that a sculpture was suggested as an appropriate ornament and then it happened as the result of an error in the *Daily Progress*. On 24 May 1913, the newspaper reported that the Charlottesville and Albemarle Railway Company had decided to seek a monument honoring the explorers Lewis and Clark to decorate Midway Park at the other end of Main Street. The Clark to be so honored was incorrectly identified as George Rogers rather than William, his younger brother.

It has been decided to make an effort to secure a monument to the memory of Meriwether Lewis and George Rogers Clark [sic], who won fame in the Lewis and Clark expedition which added so much territory to the United States.5

A week later Waynesboro resident, Charles C. Wertenbaker, assuming that the paper had meant the elder Clark, responded to the announcement and wrote to the newspaper encouraging the erection of a public monument in Charlottesville to recognize his accomplishments.

I was pleased to see your article with regard to placing a monument to the memory of George Rogers Clark in the little park in front of the public school building. I have written several articles for your paper, not only urging the ladies of our county to do this, but also a monument to Lewis and Clark. This last I would like to see placed near the University Hospital, so as to have one at each end of University Avenue. . . . The impression seems to be with a good many persons that the Clark of Lewis and Clark Expedition and George Rogers Clark were one and the same person, but such is not the case. . . . How easy it will be to get the State of Virginia to help put up these two monuments, and we could apply to every state that was brought into the Union by George Rogers Clark and Lewis and Clark! The latter brought in every state from the Missouri River to the Pacific Ocean. I think every one of these states would contribute to the erection of these monuments at the birth places of these men!6

A cousin of Thomas Jefferson, George Rogers Clark was a native of Albemarle County, born in a cabin on the Stony Point Road in 1752. He shortly moved to Caroline County with his
family, and as a young man, studied under George Mason before taking a position in Kentucky as a surveyor. In Kentucky, Clark observed the British enticing the Indians to attack American settlers. He returned to Virginia to ask Governor Patrick Henry for aid and ammunition to drive the British out. After obtaining a military commission and command of 178 men, he won an area composed of what is now Ohio, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, the eastern third of Minnesota, the western half of Kentucky and the western third of Tennessee in two years. Rising to the rank of Brigadier General at the end of the eighteenth century, he was a popular hero often referred to as the "George Washington of the West." 

In the course of his duties, Clark visited St. Louis, where the Spanish government of the Louisiana Territory had its northern headquarters. He was welcomed warmly by Governor Don Francisco de Leyba and fell in love with the Governor's sister, Teresa. It was said to have been love at first sight by both, but the Governor refused to allow them to be married. Teresa entered a convent and Clark remained unmarried all his life. In his later years, he was burdened by debts contracted for the necessities of his men that were never made good by the Commonwealth of Virginia. He spent his last days at his farm near Louisville, Kentucky, crippled and paralyzed by rheumatoid arthritis and drinking hard to alleviate his pain. He died on February 13, 1818, aged 66, and is buried near Louisville.

Wertenbaker's letter likely encouraged others to give the erection of a memorial to George Rogers Clark some thought. Perhaps it inspired Charles Harold Harcourt Thomas, Assistant Bursar at the University of Virginia, who wrote to Paul McIntire three years later, on 19 February 1918, boldly suggesting that the statue of Robert E. Lee, intended for Lee Park, be instead located in the little park that had replaced the University's coal bins:

I noticed with great interest the announcement in the Charlottesville Progress of your intention to donate to the city of Charlottesville a park at the old Venable Place and to place thereon a statue of Lee. Such a park will furnish a pleasure and rest ground the need of which has been long seriously felt, and the statue, too, will add in no small degree to the dignity and beauty of the city. In fact they will, I trust, arouse in our citizens a civic pride, for which I regret to say, they are not particularly noted. While I should be loathe to have you look upon me as in any way interfering with your plans, I trust it will not be considered impertinent in me to suggest that while the park could not be better located than at the place suggested, it will not need the addition of such a statue to enhance its usefulness, and it would seem a pity to place so handsome a statue where so few people would ever see it... I beg to call your attention to another site where the Lee statue would attract the admiring attention of thousands daily and be in full view of every train on the C. & O. Ry [sic]. I refer to the park on Main Street at the meeting of the University and Charlottesville proper and
George Rogers Clark Sculpture
Albemarle County, Virginia

at the intersection of Main Street and Fry's Spring railroads. . . . This park belongs, as a matter of fact, to the University, and while I am in no way speaking on other authority than my own appreciation of the greater value in every way of this location, I doubt not that the authorities would be only too glad to cooperate with Charlottesville and yourself in thus adding so great a charm to an already attractive environment.9

Although Thomas’s letter did not alter plans for the Lee statue, its presence in the records of W. O. Watson, trustee for Paul McIntire in arranging for the business details of the sculptures in Charlottesville, suggests that it influenced the site chosen for McIntire’s gift of the George Rogers Clark sculpture to the University of Virginia. While no record of a response to Thomas was found in Watson’s correspondence, on 18 May of the same year a letter from mural painter Duncan Smith, who frequently advised McIntire about the selection of sculptors, informed Watson that:

Mr. McIntire had Captain Aitken [Robert Ingersoll Aitken] and me to dinner last night in New York. I know you will approve of him as the sculptor for one of the new proposed monuments. He is in the prime of his powers; one of our foremost half-dozen sculptors and a returned hero.10

Three months later, on 9 September 1919, Aitken accepted a contract price of $35,000 to produce a monument to George Rogers Clark that was to portray a group of seven human figures and a horse on an appropriate pedestal. All were to be “as per blue print submitted.” The contract called for a completion date of September 1920 after which installation of the sculpture would take place “at a site in Charlottesville where directed by the owner.” 11

With the George Rogers Clark commission, Sculptor Robert Aitken, recently returned from military service in World War I where he was cited for bravery as Captain of the Army’s 306th Infantry Machine Gun division, resumed a successful career which had begun at the University of California’s Mark Hopkins Institute of Art in San Francisco. Under the tutelage of Arthur F. Matthews and Douglas Tilden, Aitken had been an outstanding student, remaining at the Institute from 1901 to 1904 to teach following his graduation. He then studied in Paris until 1907 when he returned to open a studio in New York. Before joining the Army, he had executed the William McKinley monument at St. Helens, California, and a number of outstanding works in the San Francisco area. These included another monument to McKinley in Golden Gate Park, a monument to Bret Harte, and the Fountain of Earth and the Four Elements at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition for which he won the gold Medal of Honor for Sculpture from the New York Architectural League in 1915.12
During his lifetime, Aitken's work won many awards. Among them, in 1921, was the coveted Watrous Medal from the National Academy of Design for the George Rogers Clark Sculpture in Charlottesville. Other notable works include designs for the $50 gold coin issued by the US mint in commemoration of the Panama-Pacific Exposition; the Missouri Centennial half dollar; busts of Thomas Jefferson, Daniel Webster, Benjamin Franklin, and Henry Clay, all located in the National Hall of Fame; the equestrian statue of General O. O. Howard in Gettysburg National Park, PA; the Dancing Faun in New Britain, CT; the Marine Monument in Parris Island, SC; the Spanish-American War Monument in Binghamton, NY; the colossal bronzes of the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers, the fountains of the arts and sciences at the Missouri State Capitol, and the monument to Robert Burns, all in St. Louis, MO; the Liberty Memorial in Kansas City, MO; the General Hamm Memorial in Arlington National Cemetery, the Gompers Monument, the ornate South Pennsylvania Avenue entrance to the National Archives Building, and the west pediment of the Supreme Court Building, all in Washington, DC and vicinity; and the Flame at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York City. Aitken was a member of, and served as president of, the National Sculpture Society, a member of, and vice president of, the National Academy of Design, and a member of the National Institute of Arts and Letters, Allied Artists of America, and the National Arts Club. He taught also at the National Academy of Art and the Art Student's League.¹³

The contract with McIntire stipulated that Aitken should receive $5,000 on signing, $5,000 on completion of a scale model, $10,000 on completion of a full-sized model, $10,000 when the work was roughed out in stone — a detail that was eliminated — and $5,000 when the sculpture was installed. The terms of the agreement were changed to provide $3,500 on signing the contract, $7,000 on completion of the scale model, $12,250 on completion of the full-sized model and $12,250 at the time the sculpture was installed in Charlottesville.¹⁴ Aitken had initially proposed that the George Rogers Clark Sculpture be a stone relief carving, an idea that apparently did not suit University of Virginia President Edwin A. Alderman. No sooner had the contract for the sculpture's execution been signed, than McIntire received a letter from Duncan Smith who was concerned about Alderman's advisors and his preferences. On 21 October 1919 Smith wrote:

In regard to the G. R. C., I don't know that I can say anything that you have not already heard and perhaps wearied of. I am still of the opinion that a single material of light color (so as to tell the background from the trees) is far preferable, and from inquiry neither white marble nor Tennessee are without danger, and limestone is the only good material that will last. I think Dr. Alderman has resorted to the wrong sources in the cemetery people... I understand that some of the wealthiest
families in NY who erected handsome mausoleums in Woodlawn actually had trouble in getting permission to use limestone because of the liaison between the cemetery association and the granite companies.

Of course if bronze is used again, I suppose Aitken would have to change his conception and do something entirely different, and I hardly think he could strike such an original and impressive idea in an open or free grouping. The present idea does not suggest bronze.

I am mightily interested in the artistic side, in the aesthetic success of the great works you are engaged on, and hope you will pardon my plain speaking and zeal in the premises. I feel that professional advice ought, in every field that I know of, to outweigh that of all laymen however brilliant. I am sure that every artist would agree with me on the points I have brought up.15

In a letter dated the same day as Smith’s, Aitken informed McIntire:

I have been busy studying the Clark Monument sketch with a view to using bronze in its construction and have hit upon what I think you will agree is a most happy solution of our problem. Under separate cover I am sending a colored photograph which shows all the sculptural parts, with the exception of the trees, in bronze [and] the rest of the monument in limestone. I found the cost of marble and granite for a monument of these dimensions prohibitive. All the distinctive features of the scheme are preserved without the misuse of materials. Dr. Alderman was right in feeling that there must be a way of using bronze; yet while the change seems very slight, it took much study to arrive at.

The cost of bronze casting is up so much at present that the best figures I could obtain will make this monument cost complete $45,000. From your remarks I gathered you would be willing to meet this cost of different materials. So if this meets with your approval, I will send you new contract forms and the work can go on. The sketch is now in plaster and I am installed in my new studio. I await your answer.16

Aitken posted a similar letter to Alderman one week later, on 28 October 1919, with estimates for the cost of the monument executed in granite and bronze -- $57,000, and marble and bronze -- $60,000.17

With a difference of opinion developing and hefty cost increases likely, McIntire, no doubt weary from many troubles with the Jackson and Lee sculptures, departed from his usual
custom of allocating details of the business management to W. O. Watson. He, instead, made an outright gift of $35,000 to the University of Virginia to pay to Aitken as the contract called for.\textsuperscript{18} On 4 November 1919, Alderman wrote to Aitken about the new arrangement, asking him to refigure his estimates.

Mr. McIntire with whom we have just been in conference, has informed us – the resident members of the committee on the George Rogers Clark statue – that he desires the committee to take the business management of the whole undertaking into their hands, and that he has informed you of this desire.

In going over your figures for the different materials, we notice that you have increased the price of the monument from $35,000 to $45,000 by making a change of the sculptured figures into bronze. . . . We do feel, in the first place, that $35,000 for the monument entirely in limestone was a little excessive, and, further, that in the change of the sculptured figures from limestone to bronze, an increased charge of $10,000 is, to our minds, somewhat out of proportion. We wish to suggest and beg that you go carefully over your estimates for the materials and work and decide whether you may fairly reduce the named price of $45,000 for the complete statue, which we so much admire and so much desire.\textsuperscript{19}

Aitken’s answer to Alderman is dated 4 November also, though perhaps this was done as a way of identifying the letter to which he was replying rather than the date of his writing.

In answer to yours of the fourth permit me to say that while at first glance the price quoted by me for the Clark Mont. [sic] in limestone and bronze may seem a little expensive, when you take into consideration the following facts, I believe your committee will agree that all considered, the cost is just.

First you will note that the dimensions of the monument have all been increased. . . . This makes a very great difference in the size and in the impressiveness of the whole. Then, too, the change from a carved relief, most of which I would have carved myself, and the casting of seven figures and a horse in bronze makes a very great difference in the cost of production. The following will give your committee an exact understanding of the costs as my estimates show them.

\begin{tabular}{l|c}
Enlargement and casting in plaster & $2000 \\
Casting in standard bronze of horse and rider and six figures & 12,000 \\
Architects fee of 10\% of archt. [sic] cost & 2,100 \\
Limestone carved and set at site & 21,000 \\
Sculptor's fee & 8,000 \\
\hline & 45,000 \\
\end{tabular}
Alderman responded on 13 November, requesting a copy of the proposed design:

Absence from the University has prevented my acknowledging receipt of your itemized estimate of the costs of the George Rogers Clark monument. In the first place, we know very little about such things, but would like for you, if possible, to send us a detailed scaled blueprint of the entire monument.21

Aitken replied, dating his letter 15 November:

Under separate cover I am sending to you the blueprint requested in yours of the 13th. I trust that all will go well from now on and that we will have no further delay. That no time should be lost, I have the scale model started, and the horse is underway. Permit me to explain further, for the benefit of your committee, that the model I must now make for bronze is very different from that to be used for stone, whereon much of the finished detail I would have carved with my own hands, thereby making the cost of production very low. While for bronze, as you know, the plaster model must be complete in every detail. This not only demands a much more studied model, different casting, expensive roman [sic] joints, etc. Then the delicate adjustment of bronze and stone is a long expensive job which would have to be done at the site while the monument is being built, hence great additional expense. I make this explanation because I feel that the committee has not taken these facts into consideration when considering the cost.22

Alderman's response, dated 19 November, indicated his receipt of a blueprint showing front and end elevations, and called for a sketch of the ground plan. He advised that Aitken delay any more work on the scale model until "our committee arrives at a final conclusion." 23

No more correspondence about the subject is to be found, but an examination of blueprints of Aitken's original proposal on file at the Alderman library at the University of Virginia reveals that changes were made to the design in order to stay within the $35,000 budget. The figures were executed in bronze, but a plain trapezoidal base was substituted for what had been planned as a larger and much more elaborate one with relief carving of trees.

By 2 February 1920, the matter was apparently settled, for in his correspondence to W. O. Watson on that date, McIntire notes: "As you probably know the George Rogers Clark contract has been signed by Aitken and the University, and I have paid the University $35,000, so that there will be no delay (in case of my death, etc.)." A letter from McIntire to Watson posted on the following day briefly mentions Aitken: "I have not seen Aitken and do not care to - Lambert [sic] can handle him." 24
There is nothing in the record to indicate that there were any further problems. Simplification of the design and contract negotiations delayed the completion of the sculpture and it was not dedicated until 3 November 1921. On that day, Charlottesville stores were closed from noon to 1:30 P.M. and classes at the University were canceled from Noon to 2 P.M. A large crowd gathered to witness Dr. Albert La Fevre, University of Virginia Professor of Philosophy present the monument on Paul McIntire’s behalf, and President Edwin Alderman receive it for the University of Virginia. The principal address was given by Professor Archibald Henderson of the University of North Carolina after which Mrs. McIntire unveiled the statue.25

The George Rogers Clark Sculpture shortly received national acclaim, earning the prestigious Watrous Medal from the National Academy of Design for Robert Aitken in 1921.26 In a letter to W. O. Watson on 29 December 1921, L. M. Bowman of Lloyd Brothers Memorials Company of Washington, DC commented, “In my recent travels I have heard several flattering comments on Mr. McIntire’s monuments at Charlottesville, and in each case the George Rogers Clark group seems to take the “Blue Ribbon” - however, the others are highly complimented.” 27

Since its installation, however, the location of the sculpture has been controversial. Its final placement reportedly came about after a bitter argument among University officials. The sculpture was designed to be viewed head-on, and the site preferred by some was between the Long Walk and the street flanking the hospital just inside the University's arched entrances. At the last moment, it was decided instead to place the work as the Thomas letter had suggested, and it was installed in the park formed by the intersections of West Main Street, Jefferson Park Avenue, and the railway now called “Monument Square.” 28

Within the past decade, several suggestions have been made about moving or reorienting the sculpture. In 1987, Charlottesville Director of Community Development and Planning Satyendra S. Huja presented a suggestion made by the Urban Design Task Force that the art work be shifted to a point northwest of its present location to make it to more visible to motorists traveling toward the University on West Main Street. At that time Richard Collins of the University’s Master Planning Committee reiterated Huja’s concern about the sculpture’s visibility, stating “The statue is underappreciated [on the present site] and the land could be used much more intensively.” However, James Murray another member of the University Master Planning Committee, pointed out that moving the statue and relandscaping the park would be a major project "costing no less than a quarter of a million dollars." 29

Werner Sensbach, UVA Director of Facilities Planning, later reported that a subcommittee of the University’s Master Planning Committee charged with studying the
recommendations was also unenthusiastic about moving the sculpture, stating it would require the removal of trees which might make the coal silos in front of the University Hospital more visible.

In 1988, a proposal by Margaret Clark presented in the *Daily Progress*, suggested that the Clark sculpture be moved to the Downtown Mall.

Aitken’s beautiful bronze sits at Main St. and Jefferson Park Ave., where it is overshadowed by 100-ft silos (with three more to be added) that give a sawtooth effect to the background. Quick growing trees, suggested to hide the silos, only would imperil a statue considered by the late Charles Keck and other sculptors to be one of the great sculptured bronzes in America. As [George Rogers] Clark was our native son, there are many citizens who would love to see this great work moved to the Downtown Mall near the location proposed as the future home of the Three President’s Museum. This certainly would be a more favorable site, but it also would in a way be home for our hero, as he likely galloped many a day in his perilous times over Three Chopt Road, the way west, now a part of our historic Downtown Mall. And how the bronze would be loved and cherished forever on the Mall by schoolchildren who would make it a living memorial to our native son - General George Rogers Clark.  

Despite these concerns, the George Rogers Clark Sculpture remains today in its original location. At some future time, perhaps landscaping alterations to Monument Square can be made in order to give the art work more prominence and visibility. It deserves no less for it is among the finest monumental figurative outdoor sculptures of the late City Beautiful movement in the state of Virginia.
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Boundary Description:

The boundary for this object is the sculpture. It is approximately 24 feet in height, 20 feet in length, and eight feet in width and is located at the UTM reference point 17/719490/4212240.

Boundary Justification:

The boundary includes all the land historically associated with the George Rogers Clark sculpture.
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All photographs are of:
The George Rogers Clark Sculpture
Albemarle County, Virginia
VDHR File Number:
Betsy Gohdes-Baten, photographer

All negatives are stored with the Department of Historic Resources collection at the
Virginia State Library and Archives.

DATE: August 6, 1995
VIEW OF: George Rogers Clark Sculpture, proper northeast side, view facing southwest.
NEG. NO.: 14798 - 16
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DATE: June 8, 1995
VIEW OF: George Rogers Clark Sculpture, proper southeast side, view facing northwest.
NEG. NO.: 14796 - 25
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DATE: June 8, 1995
VIEW OF: George Rogers Clark Sculpture, proper southwest side, view facing northeast.
NEG. NO.: 14796 - 23
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DATE: June 8, 1995
VIEW OF: George Rogers Clark Sculpture, proper northwest side, view facing southeast.
NEG. NO.: 14796 - 22
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DATE: August 12, 1995
VIEW OF: George Rogers Sculpture, detail of Indians, proper northeast side, view facing southwest.
NEG. NO.: 14795 - 23
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DATE: August 12, 1995
VIEW OF: George Rogers Clark Sculpture, detail of Clark’s men proper east side, view facing west.
NEG. NO.: 14795 - 19
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DATE: August 12, 1995
VIEW OF: George Rogers Clark Sculpture, detail of George Rogers Clark and horse, proper north side, view facing south.
NEG. NO.: 14795 - 20
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Polyconic projection. 1927 North American Datum

10,000-foot grid based on Virginia coordinate system, south zone

1000-meter Universal Transverse Mercator grid ticks, zone 17, shown in blue.

To place on the predicted North American Datum 1983 move the projection lines 10 meters south and

UTM GRID AND 1983 MAGNETIC NORTH DECLINATION AT CENTER OF SHEET