



A SENSE OF TIME AND PLACE: HISTORIC PRESERVATION IN SANTA FE (Part 1)

Description



William Penhallow Henderson, *Pueblo Adobes*, 1918 (PD-US)

### Part 1: The “Campaign of 1912-1913”

For centuries, the appearance of Santa Fe has been defined by its earthen architecture. As one new arrival described Santa Fe in 1852,

the modern town of Santa Fe is built of mud, and the inhabitants, with great truth, can call their houses ‘earthly tabernacles.’ ... It is laid out with considerable regularity in the manner of all Spanish-built towns... The houses, are built of adobe or mud bricks dried in the sun, and are but one story in height; and there are only two two-story houses in the place... The roof is flat, with a slight parapet running around it, which adds somewhat to the appearance of the building; and the water which collects upon it is carried off by means of wooden spouts which extend into the street.<sup>[1]</sup>

This appearance was not to the liking of many Americans. When General William Tecumseh Sherman visited in 1880, he admonished the citizens of Santa Fe:

You must ... get rid of your burros and goats: I hope ten years hence there won't be an adobe house in the Territory. I want to see you learn to make them of brick, with slanting roofs. Yankees don't like flat roofs, nor roofs of dirt.[\[2\]](#)

Santa Fe failed to heed Sherman's directive, however, and by 1887 Territorial Governor Edmund G. Ross had decided that Santa Fe would never become an "American" city like Albuquerque.[\[3\]](#) Santa Fe's stubborn resistance to Americanization earned it the derisive label of "Adobe Town" from the Albuquerque press.[\[4\]](#)

When New Mexico became a state in January 1912, it could still be observed that "Santa Fe is the only city in America that looks much today as it did three hundred years ago."[\[5\]](#) However, a "foreign architectural trend" had developed over the last years of the nineteenth century that "culminated alarmingly" at the beginning of the twentieth century.[\[6\]](#) It was recognized that, whereas Santa Fe had "slowly developed by a process of natural growth during the past three centuries," it had now entered a period of "new and quicker growth."[\[7\]](#) As later described by Jesse Nusbaum of the Museum of New Mexico, Santa Fe was "suffering from growing pains, beginning to sprawl out aimlessly over surrounding terrain, in formless sprawls. Six new subdivisions had recently been authorized by the City Council."[\[8\]](#) In the words of Edgar Lee Hewett, it looked "as though the old Santa Fe, with its charm of antiquity and perfect adaptation to environment, was destined to give way to something altogether mediocre and in every respect as characterless as the towns of the middle west."[\[9\]](#)

Indeed, over the last two decades of the nineteenth century, Santa Fe had been pockmarked by a cacophony of disparate revival styles then in vogue in various parts of the country that were not even compatible with each other, let alone with Santa Fe's traditional architecture. Individual property owners indulged their personal whims to erect houses, hotels, churches, and commercial buildings in such disparate and clashing styles as Romanesque Revival, Gothic Revival, Italianate, French Second Empire-Mansard, Queen Anne, Georgian Revival, Neo-Classical Revival, World's Fair Classic, Prairie Style, and California Bungalow Style.[\[10\]](#)

However, "the community became conscious of the loss that was impending."[\[11\]](#) Nusbaum described the resulting battle lines as follows:

This threat to the future preservation of the traditional Spanish-Colonial atmosphere of Santa Fe became a matter of increasing concern to a limited, far-seeing segment of Santa Fe residents, and of vigorous public protest. Opposing progressives were equally vigorous in promoting a far more extensive modernization of Santa Fe, streets and housing in particular. As a result, two definite schools of opposing civic thought developed, and as is customary in Santa Fe, the issue between those who wished to preserve and perpetuate historic streets and buildings and adapt regional architecture to modern needs, and those who wanted to forget past mud-hut and narrow-street traditions and pursue modern trends, soon became a matter of major city-wide discussion and concern.[\[12\]](#)

And thus began, in Nusbaum's words, the "Campaign of 1912-13" for the preservation of the historic character of Santa Fe.[\[13\]](#) According to Nusbaum, this campaign was "largely comprised of artists, writers, historians, archaeologists, conservative business leaders, and citizens who were interested in preserving and perpetuating the cultural and architectural traditions of the past."[\[14\]](#) The campaign's first sally came through the City Planning

Board. This board was originally created in January 1912 by Mayor Arthur Seligman to develop a plan to guide the future growth and development of the city, including “the platting of new streets, parks, and play grounds, a sewer system, an orderly method of paving and sidewalk construction, grade crossing and right of way protection, restriction of industrial plants to a suitable district, control of bill board advertising and other factors that disfigure the streets” In April, his successor, Celso Lopez, increased the scope of the board’s mandate to also include the “preservation so far as possible of the adobe houses and historic land marks which give Santa Fe its chief interest.”[\[15\]](#) In addition, the board was expanded to include Edgar Lee Hewett and Sylvanus G. Morley.

Hewett had originally been hired as the first Director of the School of American Archaeology, to be headquartered in Santa Fe. When the territorial legislature authorized the establishment of a Museum for the Territory of New Mexico in 1909, arrangements were made for Hewett to also serve as Director of the Museum, and for the Museum to be housed at the Palace of the Governors. Hewett hired Nusbaum, a professor of science and the manual arts at Las Vegas Normal University (later Highlands University), and Morley, a Harvard-trained archaeologist and Mayan scholar, to be on the staff of the School of American Archaeology. Kenneth Chapman, another faculty member from Las Vegas, was hired by Hewett to serve on the staff of the Museum of New Mexico. The primary benefactor and supporter of Hewett’s efforts was Cimarron attorney and paleontologist Frank Springer. Together, these individuals in Hewett’s entourage would form the leadership of the preservationist campaign.

The planning board was headed by H. H. Dorman. It is sometimes suggested that the planning board’s efforts were part of the “City Beautiful” planning movement.[\[16\]](#) That movement, whose heyday was the decade between 1900 and 1910, “saw middle- and upper-middle-class Americans attempt to refashion their cities into beautiful, functional entities. Their effort involved a cultural agenda, a middle-class environmentalism, and aesthetics expressed as beauty, order, system, and harmony.”[\[17\]](#) However, by 1912, fundamental aspects of that movement had already been discredited by proponents of a “city practical” approach to urban planning.[\[18\]](#) This approach retained some of the emphasis on beauty and the environment, but with a heightened concern for rational planning and a disdain for the City Beautiful’s excessive concern with “monumentality, empty aesthetics, grand effects for the well-to-do, and general impracticality.”[\[19\]](#)

The planning board communicated with the leading proponents of this new approach, John Nolen and Frederick Olmstead, Jr., as well as with J. Horace MacFarland, who was an early proponent of the City Beautiful movement but who by 1912 had “capitulated” to the city practical camp.[\[20\]](#) Dorman made clear his allegiance to the city practical approach in a speech he made to the Santa Fe Woman’s Club titled “The Meaning of City Planning,” in which he said:

Many regard City Planning as having chiefly to do with the work of artists, architects, and gardeners; that it means the adorning of Cities, the construction of a City Beautiful rather than a City Practical. Many think the result obtained will be something foreign to the legitimate purposes of city planning, something outside the sphere of a convenient, healthy and scientifically built city. This is a great mistake. The results to be obtained are practical in the extreme.[\[21\]](#)

Having thus aligned himself with the city practical approach over the City Beautiful movement, Dorman went on to define the goal of city planning as “to devise a rational scheme by which the physical characteristics of a city are adjusted to the best needs of its people.”[\[22\]](#) Such planning, he concluded, “has very little to do with fancy lamp posts, and a great deal to do with healthy children.”[\[23\]](#)

Thus, this board was one of the early adopters of the more scientific, pragmatic, and rational school of urban planning as it had evolved under Olmstead and Nolen. The views of these planners would later be adapted by the

“New Urbanist” school of sustainable urban planning that arose in the 1980s.<sup>[24]</sup>

The planning board presented its report to the city council on December 3, 1912. In that report, the board recited that its scope included “[s]ewers, streets, parks and play grounds, river and river bank improvements, railroad rights of way, and industrial district and the preservation by the city of such streets and properties as will be needed to preserve its character as the most ancient city of America.”<sup>[25]</sup> With respect to the city’s “ancient streets and structures,” the board reported as follows:

It is the opinion of this board that the preservation of the ancient streets, roads and structures in and about the city is of the first importance and that these monuments of the first Americans should be preserved intact at almost any cost, that neither climate, healthfulness, prehistoric ruins nor scenery compare in value as an asset to Santa Fe, with these relics of a romantic history and that it should be the duty of all city officials to guard the old streets against any change that will affect their appearance or alter their character such as widening or straightening. We further recommend that no building permits be issued to any person intending to build on any of the streets listed hereafter and indicated on the map as old or ancient streets until proper assurance is given that the architecture will conform exteriorally [sic] to the Santa Fe style.”<sup>[26]</sup>

This report thus conveys the board’s strong desire to preserve the existing historic character of the city; indeed, in Dorman’s opinion, this was the plan’s most important contribution. “The chief interest in the plan,” Dorman wrote to one correspondent, “is that it emphasizes the necessity for the preservation of the old streets and structures of the most ancient city in America and does not attempt as most other American City Planning Boards have done, the opening up of new streets, planning a civic center, etc.”<sup>[27]</sup> J. Horace McFarland was impressed with the board’s report and wrote to Dorman: “Particularly do I commend your action in respect to preserving as nearly as possible the ancient streets and structures and the characteristic architecture of Santa Fe.”<sup>[28]</sup>

In addition to the preservation of existing streets and structures, the plan also proposed the perpetuation of regional forms of architecture in new construction by requiring that new construction “conform exteriorally to the Santa Fe style.” Frederick Law Olmstead, Jr. wrote to Dorman that he was “particularly interested” in this aspect of the report’s recommendations. “I am prepared to assume that the end in view is desirable and worth attaining,” he wrote, “but I very much doubt whether the courts would hold it to be within the power of the legislature or of any creature of the legislature, such as City Council, to impose such an obligation upon the owners of private property under the police power of the state, and without provisions for the payment of damages.”<sup>[29]</sup> It may have been due to just such concerns that this recommendation was not adopted into law.<sup>[30]</sup>

The report does not define what is meant by “Santa Fe style,” but Morley wrote an influential article on “Santa Fe Architecture” that was later published in the January 1915 issue of *Old Santa Fe: A Magazine of History, Archaeology, Genealogy, and Biography*.<sup>[31]</sup> In that article, Morley set forth the history and a description of the “new type of architecture” developed when the Spaniards came to New Mexico, which he referred to as the “Santa Fe Style.” He defined the style in brief as “the blending of sixteenth century Spanish and Indian building practices in an environment, the physical demands of which are exceedingly coercive.” The “chief Indian contribution,” he wrote, was the use of adobe as the principal building material.” The “Spanish contributions,” he continued, included the “breaking up of the great four and five story communal houses into smaller and less cumbersome units, and the lightening of the native principles of construction.” Morley then enumerated what he identified as “the more important characteristics of Santa Fe Architecture”:

1<sup>st</sup>. The general effect is low and long. One story is the rule, two stories the exception, and three,



save in church towers, unheard of. This makes for stability. The buildings appear to cling to mother earth and do not rear themselves in ineffectual competition with natural elevations. 2<sup>nd</sup>. All prominent façade lines are horizontal. Gable or pointed roofs are never seen. Drainage is effected by a slight pitch, but the ridge of the roof never appears above the top of the fire-wall. The uniform use of flat or very slightly sloping roofs not visible above the fire-wall, is one of the most distinctive characteristics of Santa Fe Architecture, and greatly enhances the low and long effect mentioned above. A further application of this same principle is seen in the complete elimination of the Roman arch and semi-circular outlines so common in California Mission Architecture. This is never used in Santa Fe façades, and constitutes the chief point of difference with the California Mission Style. 3d. The façade is broken by a number of architectural devices which relieve the monotony of the otherwise blank adobe walls, such as: inset porches (*portales*), balconies (*balcones*), projecting roof-beams and water-spouts (*vigas* and *canales*), fire-walls *pretiles*, fire-wall apertures, and flanking buttresses. These are disposed both symmetrically and asymmetrically, and give Santa Fe façades an infinite variety. 4<sup>th</sup>. The color preferably should be one of the numerous shades of adobe. These vary from a pale buff or cream to a fairly dark brown; and even pink and red are not unknown colors in the New Mexico soil. By extension however, any light color is permissible. Strong and vivid tones are taboo, particularly blues and greens. This 'protective coloration' of the Santa Fe Style harmonizes admirably with its environment, and is one of its chief charms. 5<sup>th</sup>. Carved wood members are extensively and effectively utilized in façade decoration. Here may be mentioned carved wood capitals, columns, architraves, balustrades, cornices, and doors."

The planning board's report was received enthusiastically. Speeches in its favor were made by Mayor Lopez, house speaker R. L. Baca, alderman George Lopez, and former mayor Jose D. Sena. All the speakers "asserted that Old and New Santa Fe was proud of the ancient city's historic past." Alderman Alarid promised that he "would always be found at the front when it came to doing anything for historic Santa Fe," and former mayor Sena declared that "the name of the Sena family is linked with the ancient capital and so long as I live, it shall always stand for the advancement of the historic old city along all lines."

The *New Mexican* initially reported that the planning board's report was "adopted" by the city council at the December 3, 1912 meeting. [32] In fact, however, as the *New Mexican* subsequently made clear, the only action taken by the city council was to appoint a committee "for the purpose of conferring with a like committee from the City Planning Board, in regard to the consideration of the above report in its entirety, to name streets or make necessary changes, if they deem it necessary." [33] None of the recommendations made in the report ever became law. Thus, the common assertion that Santa Fe style architecture was "codified" in this period [34] is misleading. Nothing in the report was adopted as official policy either formally through an ordinance or informally through other channels. Every property owner remained legally free to build in whatever style they wished.

While the planning board was working on its report, Dorman and Morley undertook a related effort to organize the "New-Old Santa Fe Exhibition" to be installed at the Palace of the Governors. Morley was the instigator and prime organizer of this undertaking. [35] The purposes of the exhibition were:

By means of maps, plans, models, photographs, lectures, and talks, educate the people of Santa Fe to an understanding and appreciation of the aesthetic and economic values of modern civic planning to (1) preserve the essential identity of its unique heritage of historic streets and structures; (2) perpetuate regional forms of architecture in new construction; (3) provide for systematic development of new streets, subdivisions, and sanitary facilities; and (4) promote the development of a principal parkway bordering both sides of Santa Fe river and a city-wide system of parks and playgrounds."

[36]

As with the report of the planning board, we can see clearly here the intent to preserve the historic character of Santa Fe through two related efforts: the preservation of existing historic streets and structures, and the perpetuation of regional forms of architecture in new construction. This intent was confirmed by Morley in a letter to Fred Harvey, in which he wrote that “[t]he exhibition is for the purpose of awakening public sentiment in the preservation of our historic buildings and for the education of the public to the appreciation of the Santa Fe style of architecture.”[37] The same sentiment was expressed by Dorman in a letter to the Board of Regents of the Museum of New Mexico: “It is proposed to give an Exhibition on the 18<sup>th</sup> of November next, consisting of maps, plans, architectural designs, models, photographs, etc., intended to awaken an interest in what is characteristic of Old Santa Fe and to preserve the unique character of our city.”[38]

In searching for examples of how to combine traditional architecture with modern needs and construction methods, Morley and Dorman were particularly taken with two recent buildings. The first was the El Ortiz Hotel in Lamy, built in 1910 by the Fred Harvey company. Morley wrote to the architect seeking renderings and models for the upcoming exhibit, conveying that “this Exhibition Management is unanimous in regarding El Ortiz as the best exponent of Santa Fe Style as applied to modern construction.”[39] The second was the 1910 Colorado Supply Company Warehouse in Morley, Colorado, designed by Isaac Hamilton Rapp pursuant to the owner’s request that he model the building after the San Esteban del Rey mission church at Acoma Pueblo. Morley wrote to Rapp extolling the warehouse as “so absolutely in the spirit of the ‘The Santa Fe Style,’” and concluding, “[t]he extension of the native architecture to all kinds of buildings is, I believe possible; and your success in adapting an old church to the highly specialized needs of a commercial house confirms me in my belief.”[40]

The “New-Old Santa Fe” exhibit was opened in November 1912 and was described by the *Albuquerque Herald* as “consisting of models showing the contrast between the Ancient City of the Holy Faith of St. Francis and the new, pushing, aggressive, modern city of business.”[41] According to Nusbaum, the “immediate result” of the exhibition was “generally favorable. Planning for certain new California bungalows and other modern non-conforming structures was temporarily deferred, and some builders idled until the roiled up waters began to clear.”[42]

During this same period, Morley purchased and restored the Roque Lobato house to show how traditional architecture could be preserved and adapted. Wrote Nusbaum:

To give meaning and expression to what he preached, Vay Morley promptly purchased the very old adobe home on the point opposite the Scottish Rite Cathedral, and proceeded at once to rehabilitate it to his own living needs, preserving the existing front portal, wall, and roof lines. Several staunch Old Santa Fe advocates followed comparable procedures, practically to demonstrate the merits and the economy of preserving and adapting Old Santa Fe style to current needs.”[43]

Then in the Fall of 1913, Nusbaum completed the restoration of the Palace of the Governors which he had begun in 1909. In Nusbaum’s judgment, this restoration resulted in “the first definite public swing towards preserving and perpetuating the old traditions.”[44]

Shortly thereafter, Morley organized an architectural contest and solicited designs for modern residential houses in “the Santa Fe style.” According to Nusbaum, the contest “attracted large attendance; it enhanced the public’s interest in preserving and perpetuating the old Santa Fe style and adapting it in its several forms to modern needs.”[45] Kenneth Chapman won first prize as well as honorable mention, and Carlos Vierra was awarded the

second prize. Nusbaum remarked on the fact that artists won all the prizes, and that the designs submitted by contractors and architects “indicated negligible comprehension of what constituted the Santa Fe style.”<sup>[46]</sup>

Chapman himself felt that despite the fact that “[t]he many designs showed how adaptable the style was to modern dwellings,” the project to preserve and perpetuate the Santa Fe style continued to compete “with the bungalow and other styles that prevailed in the rapidly developing portion of Santa Fe to the south of the state capitol.”<sup>[47]</sup> Nonetheless, for Nusbaum, the “net result” of the exhibition “was that the pendulum of public opinion started to swing more favorably toward the perpetuation and preservation of traditional Santa Fe architecture.”<sup>[48]</sup>

The “Campaign of 1912-1913” paused as the proponents returned to their professional careers. Morley was away for much of 1914 leading an archaeological expedition to Guatemala and British Honduras (now Belize). He was gone for much of 1915 as well, doing archaeological work at the Mayan ruins in La Honradez and Cancuén in Guatemala, and Copan in Honduras.<sup>[49]</sup> Hewett and Nusbaum spent most of 1914 in California after New Mexico received an invitation to participate in the Panama-California Exposition at Balboa Park in San Diego.

Hewett was appointed as Director of Exhibits and the state legislature was persuaded to appropriate funds to erect a building. Under the leadership of historian Ralph E. Twitchell, the state built for their exhibition a structure inspired by Acoma’s Franciscan Mission church. I. H. Rapp designed the building from paintings by Carlos Vierra of the mission churches in New Mexico, most specifically the Acoma mission church. Nusbaum supervised the construction.

The New Mexico building was so successful that permission was sought and received to construct a near replica in Santa Fe to serve as the New Mexico Museum of Art. The building was authorized to be constructed at the site of the old Fort Marcy military headquarters. Nusbaum returned to Santa Fe in 1915 to supervise the construction of the new building.

When Hewett returned to Santa Fe in 1916, the city remained at a crossroads between those who wanted to preserve the “Adobe Town” of the past, and those who wanted to modernize the city. The pendulum had perhaps shifted, but no laws had been enacted. Property owners and builders remained free to do what they wanted with historic properties, and to build in whatever style they wanted in new construction. Hewett gave a speech to the New Mexico Association for Science at Santa Fe entitled “Santa Fe in 1926,” which imagined how Santa Fe might look ten years later, depending on which path it took. “The Spanish town, La Villa Real de Santa Fe de San Francisco, founded 1606, remains,” Hewett said. “The town of three hundred years ago actually survives.” However, he continued, it remained to be seen whether the “old Santa Fe, with its charm of antiquity and perfect adaptation to environment” would be saved or lost. “It is safe to say,” he concluded, “that the next ten years will tell the story. Whatever the city is to be for all time, as to architectural character, will be determined during this decade.”<sup>[50]</sup>

Next: [Part 2: The “Myth of Santa Fe”](#)

---

<sup>[1]</sup> W. W. H. Davis, *El Gringo*, quoted in Ralph Emerson Twitchell, *Old Santa Fe: The Story of New Mexico’s Ancient Capital* (Santa Fe: Santa Fe New Mexican Publishing Corporation, 1925), 328n583.

<sup>[2]</sup> Paul Weideman, *Architecture Santa Fe: A Guidebook* (Santa Fe: Running Lizard Press, 2019), 5.



[3] *Santa Fe New Mexican*, July 12, 1887, quoted in Oliver La Farge, *Santa Fe: The Autobiography of a Southwestern Town* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1959), 132-133.

[4] “Adobe Town,” *Santa Fe New Mexican*, April 19, 1889, quoted in La Farge, 138.

[5] “Wake Up Santa Fe,” *Santa Fe New Mexican*, November 15, 1912.

[6] Jesse L. Nusbaum, “Vay Morley and the Santa Fe Style,” in *Morleyana: A Collection of Writings in Memoriam Sylvanus Griswold Morley – 1883 – 1948* (Santa Fe: The School of American Research and the Museum of New Mexico, 1950), 163.

[7] “Planning a City Beautiful,” *Santa Fe New Mexican*, April 24, 1912.

[8] Nusbaum, “Vay Morley,” 163.

[9] Edgar L. Hewett, “Santa Fe in 1926,” *El Palacio* 4, no. 1 (1917), 24.

[10] John P. Conron and R. Patrick Christopher, “The Architecture of Santa Fe: A Survey of Styles,” *New Mexico Architect*, September-October 1978, 16-24. This eclecticism of styles was common in America between 1820 and 1880, the era of “Romantic Houses,” featuring competing architectural fashions including Greek Revival, Gothic Revival, Italianate and Exotic Revivals; eclecticism continued in the following era (1860-1900) as additional fashions came into vogue including Second Empire, Stick, Queen Anne, Shingle, Romanesque and Folk Victorian, along with Prairie and Craftsman styles beginning around 1900. See, Virginia Savage McAlester, *A Field Guide to American Houses: The Definitive Guide to Identifying and Understanding America’s Domestic Architecture*, rev. ed. (New York: Knopf, 2022), 242-243, 314-315, 547.

[11] Ibid.

[12] Nusbaum, “Vay Morley,” 163.

[13] Nusbaum, “Vay Morley,” 173.

[14] Nusbaum, “Vay Morley,” 165.

[15] Chamber of Commerce letter (copy for New Mexican), 22 April 1912, Santa Fe City Planning Board Records, Fray Angelico Chavez History Library, Santa Fe, New Mexico (hereafter cited as Planning Board Records); “Planning a Santa Fe Beautiful,” *Santa Fe New Mexican*, April 24, 1912.

[16] See, e.g., Nicholas C. Markovich, “Santa Fe Renaissance: City Planning and Stylistic Preservation, 1912,” in *Regional Style and Regional Architecture*, ed. Nicholas C. Markovich, Wolfgang F. E. Preiser and Fred G. Sturm (New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1990), 200; Harry Moul and Linda Tigges, “The Santa Fe 1912 City Plan: A ‘City Beautiful’ and City Planning Document,” *New Mexico Historical Review*, April 1996, 135.

[17] William H. Wilson, *The City Beautiful Movement*, Johns Hopkins Paperbacks ed., 1994 (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press 1989), 1.

[18] Ibid., 2.

[19] Ibid., 285.

[20] Ibid., 288.

[21] H. H. Dorman, "Meaning of City Planning" (read before the Santa Fe Woman's Club), Planning Board Records.

[22] Ibid.

[23] Ibid.

[24] Peter Hall, *Cities of Tomorrow: An Intellectual History of Urban Planning and Design Since 1880*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed. (Wiley Blackwell, 2014), 466.

[25] "Proceedings of the City Council," *Santa Fe New Mexican*, December 24, 1912.

[26] Ibid.; see also, Report of the Planning Commission, Santa Fe Planning Board Records.

[27] H. H. Dorman to R. E. Grant, 2 June 1913, Planning Board Records.

[28] J. Horace McFarland to H.H. Dorman, 23 February 1913, Planning Board Records.

[29] Frederick Law Olmstead to H.H. Dorman, 7 July 1913, Planning Board Records.

[30] The planning board had in its possession the Prussian Act of July 15, 1907, a law establishing the right of historic preservation in Germany and providing for the enactment of local ordinances restricting new buildings or alterations of old buildings "in certain streets or places of historical or artistic interest, when such building operations would materially detract from the characteristic features of such streets or places." However, the U.S. State Department did not provide a translation of this act to the committee until 1913, after the board's report was issued. See "Measures Taken in German For the Preservation Of Historic Buildings, Plazas and Streets," prepared by the American Consulate-General (Berlin, Germany, January 16, 1913), Planning Board Records.

[31] Sylvanus Griswold Morley, "Santa Fe Architecture," *Old Santa Fe: A Magazine of History, Archaeology, Genealogy, and Biography* 2, no. 3 (January 15, 1915), 278-301. It seems likely that this article was originally prepared for the planning board and is the "report on Santa Fe architecture by Mr. S. G. Morley" that was approved by the planning board and attached to its report, as indicated in "Proceedings of the City Council," *Santa Fe New Mexican*, December 24, 1912.

[32] "Mayor and Council Strong for City Planning Project, *Santa Fe New Mexican*, December 4, 1912.

[33] "Proceedings of the City Council," *Santa Fe New Mexican*, December 24, 1912.

[34] See e.g., Chris Wilson, *The Myth of Santa Fe: Creating a Regional Tradition* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press 1997), 7.

[35] Nusbaum, "Vay Morley," 166.

[36] Nusbaum, "Vay Morley," 166-167.

[37] H. H. Dorman to Fred Harvey, 9 September 1912, Planning Board Records.

[38] H. H. Dorman to the Board of Regents of the Museum of New Mexico, 16 October 1912, Planning Board Records.

[39] Carl D Sheppard, *Creator of the Santa Fe Style: Isaac Hamilton Rapp, Architect* (University of New Mexico Press, 1988), 77.

[40] *Ibid.*, 77.

[41] “A Handsome Tribute to Old Santa Fe,” *Santa Fe New Mexican*, November 21, 1912.

[42] Nusbaum, “Vay Morley,” 170.

[43] Nusbaum, “Vay Morley,” 170.

[44] Nusbaum, “Vay Morley,” 171.

[45] Nusbaum, “Vay Morley,” 171.

[46] Nusbaum, “Vay Morley,” 172.

[47] Marit K. Munson, ed., *Kenneth Chapman’s Santa Fe: Artists and Archaeologists, 1907-1931* (Santa Fe: School for Advanced Research Press, 2007), 61.

[48] Nusbaum, “Vay Morley,” 172.

[49] Prudence M. Rice and Christopher Ward, *The Archaeological Field Diaries of Sylvanus Griswold Morley, 1914-1916* (2021), [http://www.mesoweb.com/publications/Morley/Morley\\_Diaries\\_1914-1916.pdf](http://www.mesoweb.com/publications/Morley/Morley_Diaries_1914-1916.pdf).

[50] Hewett, “Santa Fe in 1926,” 24.