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The monument to the USS Maine and her crew is in Arlington National Cemetery, in Arlington, Arlington County, Virginia, just across the Potomac River from Washington, D.C. Access to the USS Maine Memorial is via Sigsbee Drive, a loop off of Farragut Drive, within the cemetery grounds. Sigsbee Drive takes its name from the Commanding Officer, Charles D. Sigsbee, of the USS Maine when she “was blown up” at 9:40 p.m. in Havana, Cuba, on February 15, 1898.1

Present Owner, Present Occupant, Present Use: The USS Maine Memorial is unoccupied in the traditional understanding of the term, however, the men who perished as a result of the ship’s explosion and destruction live there in memory through their names and rank etched into the sides of the structure.2 The United States Government technically owns the memorial; its army maintains the grounds and the monuments to those who died in the service of their country. The USS Maine Memorial is accessible to the general public, all visitors on official business or private pilgrimages, including citizens of the United States and international residents or guests.

Significance: “Remember the Maine” was the popular call of the “yellow” or sensational press, Congress, and private citizens throughout the United States as they rallied around the tragedy of 1898. The sinking of the Maine in Havana propelled America into the Spanish-American War and into the imperialist politics of the last decades of the nineteenth century that set the stage for the Great War of 1914. To remember the Maine, Americans enthusiastically mustered for war against Spain and temporarily suspended regional differences in the name of a common cause. Their battle-cry was for retribution for the USS Maine disaster, as well as a

---

1 Charles D. Sigsbee, CO, USS Maine, Havana, Cuba, to the Secretary of the Navy [John D. Long], Washington, D.C., Telegraph Cable, 16 February 1898.


There are discrepancies in both the number of casualties and in the number of those interred in Arlington. The memorial inscription placed nearby the anchor states that the remains of 163 men are buried there; the Annual Report of 1900 accounts for 165. After the second burial in March of 1912, 229 of the Maine’s dead were interred in Arlington. Officials still could not account for nine of the crew members. However, many more died; 261 names are etched into the sides of the memorial itself. The web-site for the Naval Historical Center accounts for 266 sailors and marines who died; a Cuban news report on the 100th anniversary of the explosion stated that 267 men died. As a result, most secondary sources simply report that two-thirds of the Maine’s 355-member crew died. Moreover, the memorial itself is dedicated to the men who gave up their lives, no numbers required.
common belief in America's manifest destiny that gave her the right to covet Spanish holdings in the western hemisphere.\(^3\)

The *USS Maine* was not memorialized nationally until May of 1910 when, again due to public pressure, Congress turned its attention to the ship. From 1910 to 1912, the remains of the ship were re-examined, the ship towed to sea and given a proper burial in international waters, and the last of her deceased crew interred in Arlington National Cemetery. The monument, made of the main mast, was a product of this new effort to "remember" the *Maine* without the bias of greed and racism. It recognizes that those less than idyllic forces propelling America into war with Spain do not diminish the travesty that was the 1898 explosion, a disaster in its time of the magnitude of the bombing of Pearl Harbor in December of 1941.

**PART I: HISTORICAL INFORMATION**

A. Physical History

Prelude: Construction of the *USS Maine* began in the late 1880s. The hull was complete in 1890. At that time, the ship was launched -- a ceremonial affair involving the sponsor smashing a bottle of champagne against the bow -- and it was then taken to a dock for the fitting out of the superstructure and operation systems. In 1895 the *USS Maine* was commissioned into service and joined the North Atlantic fleet as a second-class battleship.

As political tensions mounted between Spain, Cuba, and the United States in 1897 and early in 1898, the *Maine* hovered near Key West, Florida, in case the U.S. diplomatic representative in Havana called for help. The U.S. Consul-General Fitzhugh Lee sent for the ship and the *Maine* immediately set a course for Havana. It has been claimed that Lee later rescinded his signal and that, at the very least, his messenger set sail for the Keys before the time of the *Maine*'s departure and impending arrival in Havana could be established. Regardless, the *Maine* went to Havana and remained there until February 15, 1898, when she blew up. The ship sank and two-thirds of her crew were killed as a result of the explosion. Although initially buried in Havana, 163 to 165 of the *Maine*'s dead were re-interred in Arlington National Cemetery in December of 1899.

\(^3\) "Manifest Destiny" was a justification of the westward expansion of the United States in the 1840s leading up to the Mexican War of 1848. It was a policy based in the belief in the superiority of democratic institutions and the ability of whites, thereby making any addition of territory -- if the U.S. had the will and power to obtain it -- all right in moral terms. See, for example, *American Imperialism in 1898* (\(^1\)) *The Quest for National Fulfillment*, ed. Richard H. Miller, the Wiley Problems in American History Series (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1970).
However, it was not until 1910 that efforts were made by the United States to remove the wreck of the Maine from Havana. Also in 1910, efforts were made to reassess the cause of the fatal explosion, to locate the remains of the missing sailors and marines who died inside the ship, and to erect a suitable memorial in the Maine section of Arlington National Cemetery. To the last objective, Congress appropriated money and a design competition was held, although the results were later discarded in favor of the Secretary of War’s choice of architect Nathan C. Wyeth. Wyeth then worked with the War Department and the Commission of Fine Arts to provide the memorial. As for the ship, the wreck was towed to sea and sunk in international waters in March of 1912.

1. Date: The USS Maine Memorial was dedicated on February 15, 1915.

Between 1899 and 1910, public opinion within the United States and abroad called for the U.S. to do something about the USS Maine, then lying on the bottom of Havana harbor. Cuban Governor Charles E. Magoon, for example, expressed his country’s concern; the remains of the Maine had caused a shoal to form around it. As a result, the harbor was filling up. The change in depth hindered shipping coming and going from Havana. Besides the environmental and economic issues at stake in the well-being of Havana harbor, Magoon also said that he was shocked that the Americans could forget their ship and men so quickly. In the United States, popular opinion echoed the Cuban government’s sentiments. Families wanted their sons back for a proper burial. Memorial associations civilian and military alike desired relics. Others hoped the question of what caused the fatal explosion could be answered once and for all. In response, Congress allocated $100,000.00 for the raising or removal of the wreck of the U.S. battleship Maine from the harbor of Havana, Cuba, and for proper interment of the bodies therein in Arlington Cemetery; and the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to remove the mast of the wreck of the said battleship Maine and place the same upon a proper foundation in Arlington National Cemetery, at or near the spot where the bodies of those who died through such wreck are interred.


5 Congress, Senate, Committee on Naval Affairs, Raising of Battleship Maine, 61st Cong., 2nd sess., 1910, S. 633, CIS/Index vol. 5584, to accompany Congress, House 1910, HR 23012; Records of the Office of the Chief of Engineers, [U.S. Army], Record Group 77, General Correspondence 1894-1923, Document files No. 52736. In its appropriation for the Maine, Congress dedicated $11,000.00 to removal and transportation of the mast from Havana to Arlington National Cemetery. It was estimated that recovery and removal of the remains would cost about $4000.00. However in January of 1900, the Quartermaster General asked the Secretary of War for only $1386.60 in reimbursements for the burials ($216.20 for ceremony expenses and $1170.40 cost of interment). See Records of the Office of the Quartermaster General, [U.S. Army], Record Group 92, Correspondence 1890-1914, Document files No. 144513.
Although the third component of the statute authorized by Congress on May 9, 1910 for the raising of the USS Maine called for a “proper foundation” for the main mast in Arlington, no specifications were outlined by the legislature for the construction of the monument. First a cofferdam would have to be built around the wreck. Only after the cofferdam was complete, and the un-watering of the USS Maine within it began, could the main mast be removed from the ship at all.

In August of 1911, a plea came from the Corps of Engineers for additional money -- about $250,000 -- to complete the cofferdam project. Until the $250,000 came through, the Corps meant to spend the ear-marked monument funds ($11,000 of the initial $100,000) on the cofferdam project. If successful, than the Corps would then retrieve the mast and store it until the following session of Congress made the project solvent again. At this time, some concern was expressed over what to do with the mast once it was detached from the wreck. W.H. Bixby, of the Corps of Engineers, recommended that the Quartermaster General receive the mast; he did so because the Quartermaster Corps’ jurisdiction included Arlington National Cemetery where the mast was ultimately to go. Bixby said the Quartermaster could then oversee the cleaning and storage of the mast in preparation for the its final placement in Arlington. Allowing for contingencies, such as if the Quartermaster General did not want to do so, Bixby committed the Corps of Engineers to continuing to look after the mast.

---

6 Administrative Procedure Act, Statutes at Large, (1910). In his (1913) endorsement of the final designs for the Maine Memorial, Secretary of War H.E. Stimson stated that the Congressional act allowed his office the discretion to decide which design is a “proper foundation” for the recovered main mast. See Records of the Commission of Fine Arts, Record Group 66, Project files 1910-1952, Arlington National Cemetery, Maine, USS, Memorial.

7 Records of the Office of the Chief of Engineers, [U.S. Army], Record Group 77, General Correspondence 1894-1923, Document files No. 52736.

In old sailing ships, there were three masts. (See design for the USS Maine with three masts & sails in the field notes for this report and at the National Archives in College Park, MD). The main mast was the one in the center and the foremast was the one in the front, toward the bow. The nomenclature persisted even after the Navy moved into steam-powered ships. As built, on the USS Maine there were two masts: a foremast and a main mast. The foremast was the large mast just behind the bridge. Unnecessary to power the Maine, the foremast held the ship’s signaling hoists; similarly, later ships would use their foremasts as a base for radio antennas and other, more modern communication equipment. The foremast of the USS Maine is now at the Naval Academy in Annapolis, Maryland. The smaller one of the Maine’s masts was positioned further astern; this was the main mast. Often the national ensign was flown from the main mast, otherwise in the age of steam, it had little practical use. After the explosion, the main mast was still attached to the Maine. It is this mast that the U.S. government wanted to use for the memorial in Arlington National Cemetery. Personal Communication, John P. Cann, III, Ph.D., Associate Professor, U.S. Marine Corps College, Quantico, Virginia, September 1999.

8 Records of the Office of the Chief of Engineers, [U.S. Army], Record Group 77, General Correspondence 1894-1923, Document files No. 52736. See also the Annual Report, Chief of Engineers, 1912; and Records of the Office of the Quartermaster General, [U.S. Army], Record Group 92, Correspondence 1890-1914, Document files No. 452664.

The $250,000.00 was granted by the second session of the sixty-second Congress; see also, Records of the Office of the Quartermaster General, [U.S. Army], Record Group 92, Correspondence 1890-1914, Document files No. 331315.
By October of 1911 the Quartermaster General, J.B. Aleshire, of Fort Myer had agreed to store the mast until Congress appropriated more funds for the erection of a monument. Aleshire solicited bids for the transportation of the mast. In the process, Aleshire discovered it was more cost efficient to ship the mast within the military than by commercial vessel. Shortly thereafter an American collier, the *Leonidas*, left Cuba for the Washington Naval Yard with the mast and other relics from the *Maine* on board. In anticipation of its arrival, the Collector of Customs was directed to give the *Maine* relics free entry into the United States.

With the main mast safely stored in the Washington, D.C., area, designs could be solicited for the memorial. By February of 1912, the War Department received four entries. Military officials asked the newly established Commission of Fine Arts to review the proposals; they did so at the urging of the Executive Branch. The Commission's mandate included such architectural review sessions to ensure the appropriate development of the capital's public buildings and construction projects. It, therefore, seemed fitting to ask the Commission's opinion.

Before the Commission became involved, the War Department expressed its preference for the most elaborate model ($15,000) over the three simpler, and less expensive, designs (fig. 1). The design cost was based on hauling and erecting the mast on a suitable reinforced concrete foundation, including the as-needed grading and finish coats of paint. The price tag omitted cleaning the metal, removing the search light platform, and reinforcing the mast; these tasks could be done by authorities working in the Naval Yard but the estimate could not be given sight unseen. The Quartermaster General concurred with the selection of the $15,000 model. Quartermaster General Aleshire arranged for the Navy to rid the mast of rust and its search light platform as well as its gooseneck cargo boom. Reinforcing collars were added after its erection in the cemetery.

---


10. Records of the Office of the Quartermaster General, [U.S. Army], Record Group 92, Correspondence 1890-1914, Document files No. 320660.

11. Records of the Commission of Fine Arts, Record Group 66, Project files 1910-1952, Arlington National Cemetery, *Maine, USS*, Memorial; see also, Records of the Office of the Quartermaster General, [U.S. Army], Record Group 92, Correspondence 1890-1914, Document files No. 479284. Unfortunately the entries were not signed; nor could I find a circular advertising the competition. The entries were identified by the cost only and then numbered in order of preference.

12. Records of the Office of the Chief of Engineers, [U.S. Army], Record Group 77, General Correspondence 1894-1923, Document files No. 52736; Records of the Office of the Quartermaster General, [U.S. Army], Record Group 92, Correspondence 1890-1914, Document files Nos. 456340 & 452664.
In March of 1912 the Public Works Officer estimated costs to remove rust, the search light, and gooseneck cargo boom and to paint one coat of red lead on the mast at $329.98; the reduced maintenance of rust removal and one coat of the red lead paint tallied $45.53. This effort would take about eighteen days and would be done by the Naval Gun Factory.\textsuperscript{13} In May of 1913, after the job was done, the Quartermaster requested that the Secretary of War forward an additional sum ($335.89) to the Navy department. This was to reimburse the Navy for the labor and materials expended in the cleaning of the mast and the removal of the cargo boom and searchlight platform. The extra funds covered the latest two bills of $305.97 and $29.92 for the Navy department’s services.\textsuperscript{14}

The records in the Corps of Engineers papers regarding the main mast specifically end around April of 1912; this is because the \textit{Maine} and the last of her deceased crew were buried in March of 1912. The Corps of Engineers’ job was done. In its \textit{Final Report} to Congress regarding raising the \textit{Maine}, the Corps cited that the distribution of relics from the ship and the erection of a memorial monument in Arlington were still “in progress” under joint direction of the Secretaries of War and Navy. This report to Congress was made on April 17, 1913.\textsuperscript{15}

Although the Corps of Engineers completed its work in 1912, the task of raising the mast on an appropriate foundation remained. To this end, conversations between the Quartermaster General’s office and the Commission of Fine Arts begin. The topic of those conversations was the approval of a final design; the consultations with the Commission took place between May of 1912 and September of 1913. During this interval, the results of the design competition were put aside and an architect was selected to produce a new scheme for the memorial. The final design specifications date from July of 1913 as do the elevation, plan, and section drawings by the chosen architect, Nathan C. Wyeth.\textsuperscript{16}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{13}Records of the Office of the Chief of Engineers, [U.S. Army], Record Group 77, General Correspondence 1894-1923, Document files No. 52736. See especially, folder 19.

\textsuperscript{14}Records of the Office of the Quartermaster General, [U.S. Army], Correspondence 1890-1914, Document files No. 456340.


\end{flushright}
In the 1914 Annual Report to the Secretary of War, the Quartermaster General remarked that the "contract for the erection of mast of the battleship Maine and placing it on a proper foundation in Arlington National Cemetery, after the design approved by the Secretary of War was awarded to Norcross Brothers, Co., at $44,697.00." The Quartermaster commented that "the work is now in progress." 17 In the 1915 Annual Report, the Quartermaster General announced, at last, that the Maine Memorial was complete. The total cost of constructing the memorial reached $56,147.94. The price tag included "scraping and painting the main mast of the battleship Maine, its removal to Arlington National Cemetery, preparation of the site, erection of the memorial, and grading and paving around the structure." 18


Nathan Corwith Wyeth was born in Chicago, Illinois, in 1870. He attended several schools in pursuit of an education in art and architecture, including institutions in Wisconsin and in New York, before going to Europe to study watercolor painting. He stayed in Belgium and Switzerland for a year (1888) and then returned to the United States. Once home Wyeth enrolled in the Michigan Military Academy; however, he finished with a fine arts degree at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York City. In 1890, Wyeth received an award for the best architectural drawings, presumably in his graduating class, at the Metropolitan Museum. From New York City, Wyeth returned to Europe, this time to Paris and the Ecole des Beaux Arts. Wyeth studied in France for a decade. 19

In 1899, Wyeth joined the architectural firm Carrere and Hastings of New York as an architectural designer for the (old) Senate and House office buildings in Washington, D.C. Later that year, Wyeth won an appointment to the Architect of the Treasury office, also as a designer. Wyeth worked for the Treasury through 1903. In 1904, Wyeth's records indicate he was in the office of the Architect of the Capitol but around that time he went into the private sector. Wyeth

17Records of the Office of the Quartermaster General, [U.S. Army], Record Group 92, Annual Reports, 1894-1920, Annual Report 1914, p. 8. Actually, Norcross Brothers was one of several bids. The lowest bidder was Frank L. Wagner's estimate for $29,500.00. Others varied between $32,300.00 to $68,109.00. The difference was the choice of marble and granite quarries. See Records of the Office of the Quartermaster General, [U.S. Army], Record Group 92, Correspondence 1890-1914, Document files No. 479284.


practiced architecture with William Penn Cresson, a partnership venture lasting about four years, until 1908.20

Out on his own, Wyeth received commissions for the British embassy, the Tidal Basin Bridge, the Francis Scott Key Bridge, The House of Mercy, the Columbia Hospital for Women, the Emergency Hospital, and in 1909, the addition to the west wing executive offices of the White House. Wyeth gave the White House its “Oval Office,” a room that became the President’s working office. In addition to the public building projects, Wyeth designed a significant number of private houses on or near Sixteenth Street, Massachusetts and Connecticut Avenues, and R Street in northwest Washington, D.C. These domestic structures predominantly house embassies today.21 Examples are the Russian (Sixteenth Street), Canadian, Chilean, Mexican, Afghanistan, and Vietnamese embassies. Around this time, in 1912, Wyeth received the appointment to design the base for the USS Maine Memorial in Arlington National Cemetery. It was probably Wyeth’s work at the White House that contributed to his selection as the project designer responsible for producing an appropriate setting for the main mast of the USS Maine in Arlington National Cemetery. Recognition of his architectural contributions among his peers came in 1914 when Wyeth was made a fellow of the American Institute of Architects.22

During World War I, Wyeth -- although beyond subscription age -- served his country, and indirectly his beloved France, by designing a number of hospitals under the auspices of the construction division of the Office of the Surgeon General. Unfortunately, his efforts cost Wyeth his health and employment and so he convalesced in Switzerland for seven years. Wyeth came back to Washington, D.C., and opened a practice with Francis P. Sullivan. Between 1924 and 1934, Wyeth and Sullivan designed several large houses, as well as the east wing of the Senate Office Building, the Longworth Building for the House side, and the Children’s Country Home. The cumulative effects of the Great Depression brought an end to Wyeth and Sullivan’s firm in 1934. Wyeth rebounded quickly; he became the municipal architect for the District of Columbia and remained at that post until his retirement in 1946. For the city, Wyeth designed the Municipal Center, fire houses, schools, libraries, court buildings, the Recorder of Deeds building, and the Armory.23


22Biographic file, Library, American Institute of Architects, Washington, D.C.

While in Washington, D.C., Wyeth met Dorothy Lawson, a young socialite visiting her aunt who lived in the Blair House. They married in 1911, had two children, and shared a fondness for things French, ice skating, and climbing. Professionally, Wyeth belonged to a number of organizations including the American Institute of Architects, the Society of Beaux Arts Architects, the American Legion, the Military Order of the World War, and several art, fine art, and preservation associations. Nathan Wyeth died in 1963. His legacy remains in the architectural landscape of the capital, in its monumental structures and memorials like that of the Maine in Arlington.

3. Original and subsequent owners: The Maine Memorial always has been a province of the American public, although the United States government technically owns it as part of Arlington National Cemetery.

4. Builder, contractor, suppliers: In order to raise the USS Maine from Havana harbor, the Cuban government lent at no cost to the United States a dredge, drill scow, pile driver, derrick, tug, lighter, power launch, two deck pump scows, bottom dump scows, boring outfit, anchors, chains, and the use of its Public Works Department Machine Shop. Those enlisted to assist were:

- Foreman: W.F. Goodson was employed in connection to the raising of the Maine.25
- Steel for the Cofferdam (steel sheet pilings): Lackawanna Steel Co., New York.26

---


25 Records of the Office of the Quartermaster General, [U.S. Army], Record Group 92, Correspondence 1890-1914, Document files No. 324029.

• Electrical equipment: Mr. D. Lombillo Clark and Mr. Arturo Primelles, of Havana.27

• Removal of Remains: Mr. D.H. Rhodes, a landscape gardener, (formerly Superintendent of Disinterring Corps, Burial in Cuba and the Philippines) was spared from his regular assignment. He was sent to Cuba to oversee the preparation and encasement of the remains as well as the shipment of the mast to Arlington.28 Also, Oliver B. Jenkins was given a three-month appointment in Havana; he was to serve as an Undertaker and was to be paid $300.00 a month for his services.29 Likewise, in May of 1911 Captain James D. Tilford was assigned duty in Havana; he was to oversee operations around the remains and caskets.30 At this time, officials estimated that approximately $4000.00 would be needed for the preparation and interment of the remains.31

The USS Maine Memorial was constructed under the auspices of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and Quartermaster General, J.B. Aleshire. Others in the military included the Secretary of War H.E. Stimson, Assistant and Chief Clerk to the Secretary of War John C. Scofield,32 R.P. Hugh, the Superintendent of Construction for Fort Myer who was re-assigned to the Maine Memorial in 1913,33 Depot Quartermaster Lt. Colonel J.B. Houston, as well as Henry G. Sharpe, G.F. Downey, Jno. L. Clem, and Colonel Spencer Cosby of the Quartermaster Corps.

Planning for the memorial involved the President William Howard Taft, the Commission of Fine Arts particularly Frederick L. Olmsted, Jr. and Daniel C. French, and landscape architect Charles A. Platt of New York City in an advisory capacity. The Commission of Fine Arts was

27 Records of the Office of the Chief of Engineers, [U.S. Army], Record Group 77, General Correspondence 1894-1923, Document files No. 52736; here, Capt. F.A. Pope of the Corps of Engineers requests payment to reimbursement these men for a loan of a dynamo and switchboard that was lost. Pope writes in 1913 and cites no knowledge of the equipment because he was not assigned to the project until after the fact.

28 Records of the Office of the Quartermaster General, [U.S. Army], Record Group 92, Correspondence 1890-1914, Document files No. 144513. (Letter, 4 April 1910)

29 Records of the Office of the Quartermaster General, [U.S. Army], Record Group 92, Correspondence 1890-1914, Document files No. 330890.

30 Records of the Office of the Quartermaster General, [U.S. Army], Record Group 92, Correspondence 1890-1914, Document files Nos. 308571 & 330890.

31 Records of the Office of the Quartermaster General, [U.S. Army], Record Group 92, Correspondence 1890-1914, Document files No. 311291.

32 Scofield's position is identified in Records of the Office of the Quartermaster General, [U.S. Army], Record Group 92, Correspondence 1890-1914, Document files No. 359850.

33 Regarding R.P. Hugh, see Records of the Office of the Quartermaster General, [U.S. Army], Record Group 92, Correspondence 1890-1914, Document files No. 479284.
brought into the design process at the urging of the Executive Office, which had in turn been
pressed to suggest such a course by Dr. Joseph K. Dixon of Wanamaker Stores in Philadelphia
and the Honorable Boise Penrose of Washington, D.C. 34

- General Contractor: The Norcross Brothers, Company, of Worchester, Massachusetts.
  Norcross Brothers was bound by the National Sureties Company of New York, secured
  by a $22,400.00 bond.
- Troy White Granite, Troy, New Hampshire.
- Vermont Marble Company, Dorset, Vermont.
- Companies inquiring about bidding: Federal Brass and Bronze Works, Washington, D.C.,
  and Impervious Products Company (re: roof).
- A local carver recommended for lettering: E.C. Blairstow; he was the architect's choice. 35
- Cleaning, removal of rust, painting, etc.: Naval Gun Factory, Washington Naval Yard,
  Washington, D.C.
- Making shrouds (rigging) and the necessary shackles and turnbuckles to connect the
  shrouds to the mast and to the anchors in masonry: Navy Department, Washington, D.C. 36

5. Original plans and construction:

In February of 1912, the mast of the USS Maine was in the Washington Naval Yard;
there, the searchlight platform and gooseneck cargo boom were removed. 37 At this time, the War
Department had four design proposals for the setting of the recovered main mast (fig. 1). The
most elaborate proposal cost $15,000.00; the other three hovered around $7,000.00 in price.
Officials in the War Department approved the $15,000.00 model. Having both the mast and
several designs for its setting in hand prompted discussions within the department regarding

34 Records of the Commission of Fine Arts, Record Group 66, Project files 1910-1952, Arlington National Cemetery,
Maine, USS, Memorial.
35 Records of the Office of the Quartermaster General, [U.S. Army], Record Group 92, Correspondence 1890-1914,
Document files No. 479284.
36 Records of the Office of the Quartermaster General, [U.S. Army], Record Group 92, Correspondence 1890-1914,
Document files No. 479284.
37 Records of the Office of the Quartermaster General, [U.S. Army], Record Group 92, Correspondence 1890-1914,
Document files No. 452664.
available funds. The Corps of Engineers, winding down the operation in Havana, maintained the only money available for the memorial was the initial allotment of $11,000.00. The $11,000.00 was included in the original $100,000.00 appropriation from Congress to raise the wreck, to bury the remains in Arlington, and to place the mast on a proper foundation in Arlington. Colonel Black, of the Corps of Engineers in Havana, was reluctant to transfer any additional money into the memorial account, namely the $4,000.00 surplus that had been earmarked for the burial of the remaining sixty-five sailors to the construction of the monument; he refused to do so until the removal of the cofferdam was complete. W.H. Bixby, also of the Corps of Engineers, agreed with Black's limitation of the memorial funding to $11,000.00. The cofferdam project, and its expenses, had to be satisfied before the appropriated funds could be shifted. Black, however, added an editorial comment; he confessed to Bixby that he disliked the four design proposals because the base in each was too small. Black enclosed sketches by a Mr. Newton as an alternative. 38

In April of 1912, the Commission of Fine Arts joined in the effort to create a monumental setting for the main mast of the battleship Maine. By May of 1912, the four designs submitted to the War Department were given to the Commission of Fine Arts for review. Unfortunately for the War Department's selection, the Commission "disproved all of them." 39 Instead the Commission offered to consult with the architect, once a candidate was chosen. The Commission recommended that the architect be hired outright and not as the winning entry of a design competition. It offered to advise the architect on the "preparation of his plans and [to] pass upon those finally submitted." What the Commission urged, then, was hiring someone "of recognized experience and reputation in monumental work" rather than holding a public design competition. The Commission of Fine Arts was to present names of candidates to the War Department, but it could only agree on two architects whom it considered worthy of the job. The Commission's choices were Nathan C. Wyeth, architect, and Edward W. Donn of the firm Wood, Donn, and Dunning. Both architects were local. Because the Commission was to present six alternatives to the Secretary of War, Colonel Spencer Cosby of the Quartermaster Corps improvised. Cosby added Mr. James Rush Marshall of Hornblower and Marshall, and Mr. Glenn Brown, both of Washington, D.C., as well as Paul P. Cret of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and the firm Tracy, Swartwout and Litchfield of New York. The Secretary of War selected Nathan C. Wyeth. 40 With Wyeth's appointment, the four entries of the design competition were cast aside.


Regarding the memorial, the Commission suggested that the main mast stand alone as “an isolated relic, complete in itself, a detached fragment of the wreck of the Maine, supported in the simplest possible manner and accompanied by some dignified and beautiful separate means of marking its memorial character.” It did not encourage incorporating the main mast “into a composite memorial structure.”41 Also in May of 1912, the Navy Department offered its own requirements for the format of the memorial. The Navy expressed its desire to have the name and rank of the Maine’s dead etched into the memorial. This deviated from the department’s initial hope to have a bronze tablet inscribed.42

On June 21, 1912, the Secretary of War authorized Nathan C. Wyeth to prepare suitable designs. Wyeth was to be paid according to the rate of compensation determined by the American Institute of Architects, at approximately eight percent.43 On August 9, 1912, Wyeth met with the Commission of Fine Arts about his two principal designs. Wyeth agreed, according to the minutes, to do some additional studies.44 By the time of the next Commission meeting, Wyeth’s design scheme was complete and ready for approval. The Commission accepted Wyeth’s final two designs and asked him to prepare an estimate of costs. The Commission expressed the hope that “the parapet shown in the [accepted] sketch” could be installed, depending on the monetary resources available for the project.45

In December of 1912, after the Havana office was closed, W.M. Black of the Corps of Engineers said there was approximately $90,000.00, including the original $11,000.00, left for the memorial project. Black’s timing was fortuitous. In February of 1913, Wyeth submitted his two proposals to the Secretary of War. The proposals included watercolor sketches, blueprints, a rough draft of the specifications, and a cost estimate. The highest figure quoted was $55,613.00. The costs could be brought down by eliminating features of the first design, as shown in second proposal. For example, costs could be lowered by $8,000.00 if the allegorical figures were omitted from the scheme. The second proposal lacked the allegorical figures and the exedra; its


42 Records of the Office of the Quartermaster General, [U.S. Army], Record Group 92, Correspondence 1890-1914, Document files No. 452664.


price tag was $38,590.00. If cheaper materials were substituted, such as using enameled brick inside, then the memorial could be constructed for $18,600.00. The Secretary of War chose the first design; his selection was endorsed by the Commission of Fine Arts and the Corps of Engineers.\(^{46}\)

To save money on the memorial, it was suggested that, rather than contract the work, the Navy reinforce the mast and that the Quartermaster Corps raise the memorial once the architect was finished with the working drawings. With those options in mind, the Secretary of War asked Congress for the funds ($55,613.00) from the appropriation for the Maine to design and build the Maine Memorial.\(^{47}\)

Wyeth’s initial specifications stipulated that the exterior consist of a white granite veneer 2'0" thick. The interior was to be a plain white marble ashlar, rubbed. The doors, frame, urns, and circular stair to the deck were all to be made of cast bronze. Similarly, bronze rings were to connect the shrouds. The foundation had to extend 3'0" below grade, while the painted (four coats) mast rested in a cast iron base bolted to the concrete foundation. Wyeth’s design idea was questioned by Colonel Spencer Cosby; he worried that the use of the stair to the deck was out of place. Cosby could not reconcile the public use of the space represented by the stair with the interpretation of a receiving vault. Wyeth explained that his idea was “for the massive base to recall in a measure the turret-like effect of the superstructure of the old Maine and being in keeping with the rugged appearance of the mast. The exedra at the back forms a retaining wall for the road which encircles the monument and offers a resting place from which an excellent view may be obtained.” The bronze circular stair led to a marble deck with bronze inlay; this would be used only on special occasions and so not typically in opposition to the receiving vault interpretation of the space.\(^{48}\) In the execution of Wyeth’s design, however, the controversial circular stair was left out.

In May of 1913, the Quartermaster and the Secretary of War arranged for the transportation of the mast from the Naval Yard to Arlington and determined how best to transfer funds that would pay for the operation. The Quartermaster also forwarded a proposed site location for the Commission of Fine Arts review. Although the Commission wanted a general landscape plan drawn up, they conceded the location of the memorial. The Maine did not have to wait for the amphitheater or other large projects in the planning stages any longer; the


Commission's approval was confirmed in early June of 1913. In the interim, Wyeth requested a survey of the Maine section that illustrated the ground levels so that he could determine where the memorial foundations were to go.

In July of 1913, Wyeth outlined his specifications for the "labor and materials required for the erection and completion of a setting for the recovered main mast of the USS Maine in Arlington, Virginia." These included concrete, sand, gravel, stone, steel, marble, granite, and mortar as well as the carving, models, and landscape details. These were revised slightly in August. At this time, the Depot Quartermaster requested that the Secretary of War grant his office the authority to solicit bids for construction.

In September of 1913, the Commission and the Secretary of War discussed a request by the Daughters of the American Revolution to re-attach a bronze plaque to the main mast. The Havana chapter had placed the plaque on the mast in 1910. The Commission and the architect both objected, the former for aesthetic reasons and Wyeth because the DAR inscription clashed with the text provided to him for the monument specifically.

In November of 1913, the Quartermaster accepted a bid from The Norcross Brothers Company, of Worcester, Massachusetts. The bid was for $44,697.00; Norcross Brothers estimated it would take eight months to build the memorial. Reports on the work-in-place were given in January, August, and December. Construction then progressed throughout the year, with only a mild dispute occurring between April and June concerning the lettering required for the inscription. In April of 1914, the Depot Quartermaster objected to Wyeth's choice of

---
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54 Records of the Office of the Quartermaster General, [U.S. Army], Record Group 92, Correspondence 1890-1914, Document files Nos. 479284 & 452664.

55 Records of the Office of the Quartermaster General, [U.S. Army], Record Group 92, Correspondence 1890-1914, Document files No. 479284.
lettering when Wyeth submitted a sample to illustrate the spacing. Wyeth in turn rejected the samples submitted by Norcross Brothers, reiterating that the letters should follow the form shown in drawing 106. He recommended that a local carver be hired; his candidate was E.C. Blairstow. Wyeth also fretted that the names and ranks had not been checked; he feared there would be an error. The Quartermaster verified the list of 261 names and returned it to him.\footnote{Records of the Office of the Quartermaster General, [U.S. Army], Record Group 92, Correspondence 1890-1914, Document files No. 452664; Records of the Commission of Fine Arts, Record Group 66, Project files 1910-1952, Arlington National Cemetery, \textit{Maine}, USS, Memorial.}

Although it was the more elaborate, and most expensive, design selected by the Secretary of War and the Commission of Fine Arts in June of 1912, it was the simpler of the designs that was built. The \textit{Maine} Memorial was made of marble and granite but its exedra, allegorical figures, circular stair, and marble deck with bronze inlay were omitted (fig. 2).

6. Alterations and additions: One year after the drawings were accepted, several small changes were proposed. In November of 1914 the cemetery had plans made for the re-building of the concrete pad beneath the anchor and mortars, which are small canon-like weapons, on line with the granite sidewalk. At this time, new catch basins and lead piping were installed.\footnote{"Proposed Changes in Approach to the Maine Memorial," drawing, 10 November 1914, architectural flat files, Administration Building, Arlington National Cemetery, Arlington, Virginia.}

In 1962, cemetery officials again fussed with the concrete slab when it addressed the overlook area which they wanted to finish in bluestone flagging. This time, the concrete slab was chiseled and roughened so that it would become a satisfactory mortar bed for the flag stones. Plans also included construction of a brick headwall and replacing the existing mortar bases of brick with granite.\footnote{"Overlook Platform," drawing, 25 October 1962, architectural flat files, Administration Building, Arlington National Cemetery, Arlington, Virginia.}

Since then, there have been no significant alterations or additions to the memorial, with the possible exception of the tablet stored there in honor of the Polish statesman and musician, Ignace Jan Paderewski. The study by the Historic American Buildings Survey (1999) is in preparation for some restoration work, but again, no plans for additions to the monument are known at this writing.

B. Historical Context

The mysterious explosion of the former battleship \textit{Maine} on the night of February 15, 1898, provided the United States with the opportunity that Assistant Secretary of the Navy
Theodore Roosevelt, and many others anxious for war sought. The circumstances created by the ship’s destruction presented a nation already primed for war with its immediate “cause.” The U.S. public had worked itself up to a readiness for battle in political and economic spheres even before the Maine went to Havana in January of 1898. Her politicians preached expansionist diplomacy. Other Americans talked up their fears for regional stability if the Cuban-Spanish conflict went unchecked. Having the Maine blown up in Havana, then, provided a necessary catalyst for the Spanish-American War.

“Take Up the White Man’s Burden”

While Rudyard Kipling wrote of the political relations between the United States and the Philippines in 1899, his evocation of the “white man’s burden” rings true for the years between the American Civil War and the sinking of the USS Maine in Havana harbor, Cuba. Like the Philippine Islands, Cuba belonged -- whether she liked it or not -- to the Spanish colonial system. Contemporaneous to America’s southern blacks and their struggle for equality in their daily life in the U.S., Cubans rebelled against Spanish authorities and sought to become citizens with rights. The Cuban resistance resumed its fight, this time for total freedom from Spain, with new energy in the mid 1890s. One leader of the Cuban movement was a mulatto, Antonio Maceo. As Maceo fought against the Spanish General, Valeriano “the Butcher” Wyler, his popularity and that of the Cuban cause rose among American blacks. Both the Cubans and the African Americans wanted the white man to let go of his “burden.” Despite parallel struggles of the non-whites against disenfranchisement, however, some of the leaders of the African-American community urged Americans to settle problems at home before intervening in the Cuban fight. Issues facing Americans included the 1896 Supreme Court decision regarding Plessy versus Ferguson, essentially legalizing the “separate but ‘equal’” practice of segregation.

While not all white Americans endorsed a policy of intervention in Cuba, many business interests eyed Cuba as a potential market or already had invested in the island; these financial concerns favored ousting Spain and claiming a role in Cuba. Their voices were heard above those slower to rally for war. The latter were, primarily, southerners whose own recent


experience within the union was that of a colony deemed unfit for self-government. This region reiterated the immorality of imperialist policies. Although a southerner, the U.S. Consul-General to Cuba Fitzhugh Lee echoed the entrepreneurial sentiment. Consul-General Lee agitated in Havana and called for a show of force. Lee, as did the majority, dreamed of an American empire. 62

Perhaps America turned its sights to the Caribbean because it reached the Pacific, symbolically and manifestly closing the western frontier. 63 Frederick Jackson Turner said as much during the 1893 Columbian Exposition in Chicago, Illinois, which was an exhibition to show off American success in technology and in her recognition of an appropriate architectural landscape as well as in her ability to create it. As thousands flocked to the “White City,” they celebrated the American democratic and egalitarian ideals represented in the classical building forms. 64

The buildings temporarily erected for display in Chicago generated a resurgence of enthusiasm for, and interest in, classical architecture and the republican values the founding fathers interpreted in them. As did the eighteenth-century politicians, this 1890s-generation faced the discrepancy between law and reality, democratic idea and dis-enfranchised experience. The United States stretched from the Atlantic to Pacific Oceans, but the land was not unpopulated and those living in the way of the white man’s manifest destiny suffered. Ironically, it was African-American soldiers who were shipped out west to keep the peace in the aftermath of America’s territorial expansion. Through heralds of their achievements, these men were chosen to be among the first sent to Cuba, a reward for a job well-done tempered by the belief that the Negro physiognomy made them better suited for fighting in the tropics. 65

Early in the war against Spain (1898-99) fought on Cuban soil, the African-American soldiers represented the U.S. well. They earned twenty-six certificates of merit and five


63 Frederick Jackson Turner, The Frontier in American History (New York, NY: Henry Holt, 1920); see also, Musicant, pp. 3-16, passim. Because land was no available, many questioned America’s future role. For example: As a result of the war with Spain, an imperialist power, America gained a colonial empire and became the kind of institution she revolted against in the 1770s. William Graham Sumner said that the United States had, in fact, been conquered by Spain by adopting Spanish ideas and colonial policies. See Donald Pickens, “William Graham Sumner as a Critic of the Spanish American War,” Continuity 11 (1987): 85.


65 Ayers, pp. 328-334, passim; and Kaplan, pp. 219-236, passim. See also, Gianakos, pp. 34-35, re: the irony of the African-Americans’ position at home and abroad.
congressional Medals of Honor in June of 1898. As a result of their success and the hopes of those at home for an opportunity for equality on the battlefield and after, 10,000 more African-Americans enlisted. The Cuban conflict presented them with a chance to display patriotism and manliness necessary for acceptance into the white system of self-government. Unfortunately, white Americans reacted strongly against the African-American soldiers for they were threatened more so by the heroic soldier than their stereotype of a black person. The former was suited for self-government while the latter was a lesser being in need of guidance and discipline. 66

Luckily for white Americans in favor of regional rapprochement, the first causality in Cuba was a soldier named Worth Bagley, a white southern boy. The South gave up her son to the United States' war, and those in the North and South rallied around the common cause claiming all men were Bagley's countrymen. Nationalistic rhetoric soared. The Cuban crisis facilitated sectional reconciliation, but sadly, united white Americans in the North and South against the black man. 67 Race relations declined sharply. Violence escalated. Fear of social change caused white American ("nativists") to subject immigrants and African-Americans to discriminatory policies while launching a crusade, with its incipient moral overtones, to punish another white nation for mistreating its non-white -- in this instance, Cuban -- colony. 68 As people, the Cubans mattered little; the Spanish-American War was a contest between whites of different nationalities. Cuba happened to be the site of their clash; its close proximity to the U.S. made the island important geographically but not, so much, its inhabitants.

The Cuban conflict reconnected northern and southern white men by providing a common ground -- or enemy -- upon which to focus. 69 It promised, moreover, to leave the American landscape untouched. America's opportunity to champion the underdog, on foreign soil, led John Hay to describe the Spanish American War to Colonel Theodore Roosevelt in

---

66 The stereotype of African-Americans needing discipline, guidance, and governance by whites was part and parcel of the southern antebellum myth that recalled the benevolence of slavery. Sadly, the material life of many former slaves declined after the end of slavery because they were suddenly on their own in a war-impoverished region. This, however, is another story.


67 Ayers, pp. 328-334.

68Kammen, pp. 93-296, generally.

summer 1898 as "a splendid little war; begun with the highest motives, carried on with magnificent intelligence and spirit, favored by that fortune which loves the brave."\(^70\)

The conflict was "splendid" only if you were safe in the United States. However, the war was so popularly endorsed that no draft was required to muster troops for battle. States offered their units of the national guard; volunteers formed their own regiments.\(^71\) When the public and troops approved the war with Spain, they subconsciously linked the fate of the Cuban populace politically to that of the Negro. White America deemed both groups unsuited for self-government, a condition described by W.E.B. Dubois as "the problem of the color-line" or relations between darker to white. An irony of the war is that African-American soldiers defended America. These soldiers represented American ideals -- personifying them -- in a place thought to be inhabited by non-white people unfit for democracy. The Cubans, perceived by white Americans as not ready to govern themselves, needed discipline and direction from the U.S. before they would be able to participate in a democratic system. At the time, American democracy was represented in uniform by her black and white citizens while politically it was only open to whites. This left the African-American and the Cuban to fight for a system that excluded them.\(^72\)

The discrepancies between rhetoric and experience -- or the United States as a champion of liberty protecting the western hemisphere and the actual conditions of non-white residents' life in America -- that characterize the Spanish-American War were passed over at the time largely because of the advent of sensational journalism. Coupled with a thirst for its own triumphal history, the press found an audience willing to believe almost anything in print. This was partially the by-product of the painful and devastating experience of the Civil War, which did not end sectional decisiveness or racial discrimination. The increasing urbanization of America, moreover, made for unsettling times of social flux. Working conditions in factories as well as labor unions, tariffs and trade deals, anti-trust laws, migration to the cities and immigration to the country, all personified by the railroad and the Pullman strike of 1894 made for an industrial nation that was decidedly more cosmopolitan and strife-ridden than the founding fathers imagined.

Because of the rapid socio-economic changes and the depression of 1893, late nineteenth-century (white) Americans anxiously looked for what was good in their past. They found it in


the Monroe Doctrine and channeled their energies toward righting the wrongs in nearby Cuba. At the same time, American memories were sustained self-consciously by memorial associations, physical objects, and sites. Together these created a collective awareness and recalled human sacrifices made during the struggle for worthy causes. America went to war to "remember the Maine," and afterwards clamored for pieces of her to ensure that the memory of a wrong righted would not fade. One such example, the Military Service Institution established on Governor's Island in 1878, would be foremost in requesting a relic from the USS Maine for permanent display. 

The USS Maine

In May of 1890, Captain Alfred Thayer Mahan published The Influence of Sea Power upon History, 1660-1783. In the book, Mahan argued that the pathway to becoming a successful nation on a worldwide stage included strategic geography as well as a physical geography such as harbors and coastlines and a large merchant marine for trading possibilities. A successful nation also reflected the will of its people. It should be shamelessly engaged in the pursuit of economic gain. Mahan's descriptions suited America at the end of the nineteenth century as it did fifteenth-century Spain and eighteenth-century England. America, however, lacked the colonial outposts of Spain and England. This deficiency could be corrected if the United States turned to the ever-present frontier, the sea, for there she could peddle her wares and find new boundaries. Historian Frederick Jackson Turner supported Mahan's idea to turn outward; Turner (and the 1890 Census) proclaimed the loss of the landed frontier. The continental United States was settled.

Simultaneous to the recognition that the landed frontier was closed, Secretary of the Navy Benjamin Franklin Tracy called for a fighting force to defend the United States, or in Mahan's words, its physical geography. Tracy, in his 1889 Annual Report, requested armored battleships to command the open sea and to protect the coastlines. Tracy's pleas were heard. Between 1888 and 1890, Congress authorized one billion dollars on defense -- the first appropriation of its size authorized in peace. The "Billion Dollar Congress" granted Secretary Tracy three armored battleships. Those would join the USS Texas and the USS Maine already under construction. The latter was intended to be the first armored vessel of the new Navy. As such, she was to be designed and built using only U.S. technology and heavy industries, a military-industrial policy initiated by President Garfield's Secretary of Navy William C. Whitney. With new battleships in

---


74 See below.
the making, the once degenerate Navy was primed to win the U.S. strategic outposts -- at least the proponents of Mahan's book hoped it could.\(^{75}\)

After given the go-ahead by Congress in August of 1886, the Navy's Bureau of Construction and Repair began the design process for the USS Maine. Unfortunately, a fire destroyed the initial plans and working drawings. As a result, construction on the Maine was delayed until 1888. Work began in the New York Naval Yard, in Brooklyn, New York, once plans were completed. Her keel was laid in October of 1888. She was made according to Navy department designs and by the hands of naval yard workmen. There was only one bid for the engine construction; Quintard Iron Works was awarded the contract for $735,000.00. In all, creating the Maine cost the U.S. two and one half million dollars.\(^{76}\)

Due to the infancy of American industries and understanding of the developing technologies, forging the USS Maine took nine years (1886-95). By the time she was completed, the Maine was outdated and referred to by the Navy as "a second-class battleship." The Maine was 319 feet long. Her main armament consisted of four ten-inch guns, six six-inch guns, and four torpedo tubes. Her secondary armament added seven six-pound rapid fire guns, eight one-pound rapid fire guns, and four Gatling guns to the artillery. Along the length of amidship, the armor belt was twelve inches thick. The Maine carried 896 tons of coal. Her designed speed was seventeen knots and normal displacement of 6682 tons. Sponsored by Tracy's granddaughter, Miss Alice Tracy Wilmerding, the Navy launched the USS Maine on November 18, 1890. However, it was not until September of 1895 that the USS Maine finally was commissioned into service and the first watch set. At that time, the Maine joined the North American fleet.\(^{77}\)

Between 1895 and 1898, the USS Maine was in active service along the east coast and in the Caribbean area. In December of 1897, the United States representative in Havana, Consul-General Fitzhugh Lee, called for a warship to protect American interests in Cuba. In mid-January, the civil disturbances connected to the Cubans' on-going struggle for independence from Spain escalated into riots. Lee, now fearful an American military presence could spark

---
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more unrest, waffled on his request for a warship. However, his indecision was overruled. Washington sent the USS Maine to Havana; she arrived on January 28, 1898. The Maine was to leave Havana for Mobile and New Orleans on February 17; she was scheduled to participate in Mardi Gras.78

The order of the USS Maine to Havana was the first port of call by an American ship to Cuba in a number of years. The hostilities between Spain and Cuba caused the U.S. to reconsider such acts of friendly diplomacy. The Maine’s presence in Havana was described as one of those diplomatic visits but the official explanation fooled no one. The haste of her assignment to Cuba prevented Sigsbee from obtaining the proper health papers; Cuban authorities did not place the ship under quarantine either. This oversight occurred, most likely, because of the strained relations between Cuba, Spain, and the United States. Instead a native harbor pilot took the Maine to buoy number four. The night of February 15, the winds in the harbor shifted and the Maine swung around to face the city. It was then that she exploded. The blast sank the Maine and killed two-thirds of her crew.79

Captain Charles D. Sigsbee first thought his ship was under attack, although Spanish and Cubans risked their lives in a rescue effort. Soon after, Spain was anxious to have the Maine question settled in arbitration. Spain called for a joint investigation of the ship, with outside officials participating. General Blanco, the Spanish official in Cuba, asked the United States not to blow up the wrecked ship until the investigation could occur. Spain claimed her innocence and wanted equal opportunity to demonstrate she had nothing to do with the explosion. After all, Spain had the most to lose: its Caribbean colony.80 The United States, on the other hand, gave little credence to Spanish wishes. Two separate investigations were conducted; unfortunately each was predisposed as to the cause of the explosion. Spain said it was triggered internally, most likely by accident; other officials, mostly British, concurred. The American Court of Inquiry came to the opposite verdict on March 21. A mine caused the explosion. The court stopped short of placing the blame for the mine on any person or country. They did not have to

---


do so because the yellow press did it for them. As a result, the United States and Spain moved closer to war.  

Aware of the impending war with Spain, the Court of Inquiry was under pressure from Washington officials to hurry its work. The court, led by Captain William T. Sampson a senior Navy official, did the best it could under the circumstances. The submerged wreck was difficult to examine. The muddy waters of the harbor made for unsatisfactory visibility for the divers; unable to see, they had to rely on their sense of touch when examining the ship's condition. The way the keel and bottom plating were driven upward to form an inverted “v” visible above the water led the court to its decision that a mine detonated under the ship. This evidence was combined with the divers’ testimonies, and the witnesses’ statements. Criticisms of the court focus on its failure to ask for outside technical advice, to inquire about the ship’s log and contents of the magazines, to follow up statements regarding how often the mooring was used (seldom); and a court procedure that allowed Captain Sigsbee to question witnesses.

In June of 1910 interest in the wreck of the USS Maine was as a memorial, not as cause for war. Still questions about the origin of the explosion -- inside or outside, accident or malicious intent -- persisted. The act of Congress sponsoring the removal of the wreck, the burial of the remains therein, and the raising of the main mast in Arlington was part of the burgeoning movement to preserve a past that was particularly American and not divided by sectionalism. Sons of the North and South died on the Maine; America wanted to bring them home. Spain, too, wanted the matter reopened. She persisted in her claims of innocence in the disaster. However before the wreck could be re-examined, the largest cofferdam ever built had to be engineered and constructed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Once complete, the underwatering of the Maine started in June of 1911. By the following November, the second investigation was underway. Led by Rear Admiral Charles E. Vreeland, the board re-read the testimonies of 1898, examined the photographs and the wreck, and came to the same conclusion as the 1898 Court of Inquiry. An external explosion destroyed the Maine.
The difference in the 1898 and 1911 reports lies in where each board determined the mine was. In 1898, the court said the mine was placed under frame eighteen toward the port side -- where the inverted "v" was -- and that mine's explosion was the cause of the damage to the keel and bottom plating. In 1911, the board had access to parts of ship hidden from the 1898 divers. Because of the cofferdam, the Maine was visible further astern. The mine, said the board, was placed under the ship between frames twenty-eight and thirty-one or approximately forty-five feet aft of the inverted "v." The mine then triggered the explosion in the reserve, six-inch magazine causing the inverted "v" shape. Between frames twenty-eight and thirty-one, the bottom plating was bent inward, not out as would be expected if the explosion happened inside.84

Criticisms of the 1911 board return to questions raised by Spain initially, such as the absence of a geyser and dead fish, and to questions of technological expertise. In 1898, spontaneous combustion of coal in storage was a problem. Such fires caused several accidents on American ships and the total loss of other vessels, such as the Jena a French ship in dry-dock in France. Similarly, the dynamics of a ship sinking could have caused the plates to bend inward as water rushed inside. The board did not address these possibilities.85 Moreover, the wreck of the USS Maine was towed out to sea and sunk in international waters in March of 1912; while this gave the ship a proper burial, it also prevented any further investigation of the physical evidence.

Memorializing the USS Maine

Regardless of what triggered the explosion in the forward magazine, creating a memorial to those who lost their lives in service to their country was part and parcel of the 1910 Congressional mandate to raise the wreck of the battleship Maine. Requests for pieces of the Maine inundated the Navy department almost immediately.86 One of the earliest letters came from the President of Cuba, Jose M. Gomez; he wanted a part of the ship for a memorial in Havana.87 Similarly, the Military Service Institute in Governor's Island, New York, asked for the

---
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mast. Although the foremost went to Governor's Island initially, it stayed on the docks until a final decision was made. In the end, the Navy took back the foremost for the Naval Academy (fig. 3). By December of 1911, the Navy department formally agreed to donate pieces of the ship to municipalities, to naval associations, and to former officers and crew or their heirs. However, the authorization to donate pieces of the Maine did not include funding for the memorials. This point was reiterated in February of 1912, when it was acknowledged that Congressional appropriation did not include donating money for the individual mementoes.

In spite of the lack of federal funding, memorials with pieces of the Maine appeared across the country. In October of 1912, the bow section of the Maine, with the shield scroll, accompanied one six-inch gun and two six-inch mounts to Key West. However, the bow section is now in Bangor, Maine. The bow anchor is in Reading, Pennsylvania; the conning tower base in Canton, Ohio; the capstan in Battery Park, Charleston, South Carolina; the ventilator cowl in Woburn, Massachusetts; the steam whistle in Larchmont, New York; the engine room funnel in Pompton Lakes, New Jersey; and Captain Sigsbee's bathtub is in the Hancock Historical Museum, in Ohio. The ten-inch turret sighting hood is in Key West, Florida, along with souvenirs for sale. Also in Key West, the U.S. Battleship Maine Centennial Commission (1898 to 1998) put together an exhibition and a general store where logo pins, embroidered logo hats, t-shirts, and books were sold. In Washington, D.C., pieces of the ship are located in Arlington National Cemetery, the Museum of American History, and the Naval Historical Center in the Washington Naval Yard.

Official souvenirs of the Maine included a medallion with a picture of Admiral Dewey on them; they were made of steel from the Maine. Other relics included bronze bells fashioned out


89 Records of the Office of the Chief of Engineers, [U.S. Army], Record Group 77, Correspondence 1894-1923, Document files No. 52736/2705. See also, the Records of the Quartermaster General, [U.S. Army], Record Group 92, Correspondence 1890-1914, Document files No. 331315, to accompany HR 15930. The bill was called an "urgent deficiency bill" and was passed to cover expenses for the raising of the wreck; this bill also authorized giving away relics.

90 Records of the Office of the Chief of Engineers, [U.S. Army], Record Group 77, Correspondence 1894-1923, Document files No. 52736/2581.
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of materials salvaged from the Maine. Decorated in red, white, and blue ribbons, each bell sold for one dollar at the Pan-American Exposition of 1901, and came with three certificates of authenticity. Also issued were a memorial coin and memorial stamp.\(^94\)

Unfortunately, some efforts to remember the Maine were erroneous. For example, in 1908, Ordnance Sergeant Robert E. Pate discovered a post card illustrating a cemetery in St. Augustine, Florida, with a caption reporting that it was where the Maine dead were buried. When officials contacted the publisher, E.C. Kropp of Milwaukee, the company claimed ignorance. Kropp said that the card was done by “someone in the South” and that no cards were left on the premises. The company did agree to strike the plate so that no more cards could be ordered.\(^95\)

In February of 1912, W.H. Bixby of the Corps of Engineers wrote to the Secretary of War regarding a bronze tablet for the Maine. Bixby suggested a tablet be created from the bronze used in the Maine and that it be inscribed.\(^96\) Later that year, Acting Secretary of the Navy Beekman Winthrop authorized the creation of bronze tablets from the Maine to memorialize the ship and her crew.\(^97\) At the same time, the Corps of Engineers contacted the Commission of Fine Arts about the design of such a tablet. The Commission Chairman, Daniel C. French, endorsed the selection of Henry Bacon as the designer. However, the Corps wanted a design competition; participants in the competition had to be both designer and sculptor. French admitted that this requirement excluded Bacon because he was not a sculptor.\(^98\)

In September of 1912, French recommended six artisans qualified to prepare designs. They were James E. Fraser, Sherry E. Fry, Carl A. Heber, Charles Keck, A. Piccirilli, and Evelyn B. Longman, all of the New York. In October, Colonel Spencer Cosby of the Quartermaster’s office identified the specifics of the tablet design. It was to be made in a local naval yard, therefore they needed one stock design. About 1200 tablets were planned; each was to be 12” x

---
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\(^97\)It remains unclear at this writing, however, where these tablets were to go, where any of them are now, and who was eligible to receive them.

24" x ½". The cost would fall between $1.35 and $1.50 a piece. The following month, Cosby notified Winthrop of the design selection. They chose Charles Keck’s entry (fig. 4). The text inscribed on Keck’s prototype was “IN MEMORY OF THE MAINE DESTROYED, AT HAVANA MDCCCXCIX VIII THIS TABLET WAS CAST IN MATERIAL TAKEN FROM THE WRECK OF THE MAINE.” He also suggested three companies that could cast the design; they were The Roman Bronze Works, The Gorham Company, and John Williams.99 The process was underway by February of 1913 when the Secretary of the Navy asked the Secretary of War for a dollar amount that would be available for producing the tablets. By the end of the year, the Commission of Fine Arts requested permission to use a photograph of the tablet in its Annual Report and a tablet to put on display; the Commission’s wishes were granted.100 At this writing, no other evidence of this commemorative plaque has been found, nor any of them located.

Requests for permission to memorialize the Maine by adding something to it, however, were categorically denied. In January of 1911, the United Spanish War veterans asked if they could put a bronze tablet on the mast. Their offer was declined by the Corps of Engineers.101 Somehow the Havana chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution (DAR) attached a bronze plaque to the ship’s mast in 1910. After the mast was extracted from the ship, the plaque was removed. The DAR faced the task of getting their memorial re-installed. In October of 1913, the Regent of the Havana chapter Mary E. Springer wrote to Henry Breckenridge, the Acting Secretary of War,

do not cast aside this evidence of their countrywomen’s remembrance -- which like a beacon shone on the mast in tropic sunlight, and dark tempestuous days, while the ill-fated wreck was lashed by the waves and shaken by tropical tempests -- there the tablet marked the watery graves of our countrymen, -- a living evidence that the Maine was not forgotten.102

99 Records of the Office of the Quartermaster General, [U.S. Army], Record Group 92, Correspondence 1890-1914, Document files No._


101 Records of the Office of the Chief of Engineers, [U.S. Army], Record Group 77, Correspondence 1894-1923, Document files No. 52736/560.

102 Records of the Office of the Quartermaster General, [U.S. Army], Record Group 92, Correspondence 1890-1914, Document files No. 479284.
Despite her pleas, the Quartermaster's department attached the DAR plaque to an oak panel, which went to the Arlington mansion for display. Springer was notified in February of 1914. Sometime later the plaque was reinstalled on the mast, where it can be seen today.

By the last quarter of the twentieth century, the Maine's dead were all buried and the memorials established. Looking back to the beginning of the American Century, past the four wars in which the United States fought, to the 1898 disaster, Admiral Rickover asked two experts to re-examine the evidence of the Maine. They were Ib S. Hansen and Robert S. Price. Hansen and Price used modern scientific knowledge as well as the information compiled by the 1898 court and the 1911 board to determine a cause of the disaster. Hansen and Price also turned to the construction and ammunition plans of the Maine. Figuratively speaking, they raised the Maine again only this time without the encumbrances of the 1898 and 1911 investigations. Hansen and Price could look at the Maine without feeling compelled to justify political ambition as in 1898 and without the need to assuage doubts about America's call to arms against Spain and her acquisition of an Empire that surfaced a decade later, in the 1910s.

The technical experts disagreed with the verdict drawn from the 1898 and 1911 investigations. Hansen and Price determined that the 1898 court located the explosion incorrectly at frame eighteen. Although the 1911 board pinpointed the source to frames twenty-eight and thirty-one, it too fell back on the mine theory. The 1911 board did not explain how the mine got under the ship or charge any group for doing so. Therefore, Hansen and Price suggested that the spontaneous combustion of bituminous coal, a fire, in the bunker next to the reserve six-inch magazine caused the explosion that sank the Maine. They based their conclusion on the physical evidence, reporting that the damage on the bottom plating was inconsistent with an external explosion. There was no scarring, that is to say, no evidence of tearing or distortion expected from an external underwater explosion. Because the internal plate appeared to be more mangled than the exterior, Hansen and Price proposed that the explosion came from within. This puts their analysis in conflict with the previous U.S. Navy investigations, but in concurrence with the Spanish report. The most likely source of the

---

103 Records of the Commission of Fine Arts, Record Group 66, Project files 1910-1952, Arlington National Cemetery, Maine, USS, Memorial; Records of the Office of the Quartermaster General, [U.S. Army], Record Group 92, Correspondence 1890-1914, Document files No. 479284. The DAR did get their plaque reattached at a later date for it is now in place near the top of the main mast and visible -- but not legible -- from the ground.

104 See the measured drawings that accompany this report.

105 See below.

106 Rickover, p. 94; "Destruction of the USS Maine," Naval Historical Center, Department of the Navy, website, accessed March 12, 1999, p. 3.
internal blast was a fire in the coal bunker (A-16) but other scenarios include crew sabotage, a small arms accident, or a bomb.\textsuperscript{107}

However, Hansen and Price did not rule out the possibility of an external explosion. Although the likelihood a mine was placed under the \textit{Maine} was slim, Hansen and Price admitted that a Spanish contact mine would have been strong enough to trigger the explosion. The question remained, then, how did a mine get beneath the ship, if it was there at all? Equally troubling was the unlikely event that a coal bunker fire would go unnoticed by the \textit{Maine} crew and officers. As if to explain this oversight, Rickover questioned the competency of Captain Sigsbee's naval career. Rickover argued that Sigsbee's comments to the 1898 Court of Inquiry revealed he was unfamiliar with the ship routine. Sigsbee, it appeared, left the management of the ship to Lieutenant Commander Wainwright. Rickover then pointed to two other ships commanded by Sigsbee; both the \textit{Kearsarge} (1885-86) and the \textit{Texas} were found dirty when inspected. Sigsbee countered the charges at the time by citing the age of the vessels and the recent bad weather. In spite of Rickover's later-day emphasis on the inspections, Sigsbee was held in high esteem by the Navy.\textsuperscript{108} In the end the circumstances of the ship's destruction remain mysterious, but today most attribute the explosion to accidental causes.

\section*{PART II: ARCHITECTURAL INFORMATION}

\subsection*{A. General Statement}

\subsubsection*{1. Architectural character:}

The \textit{USS Maine} Memorial consists of the ship's main mast anchored in a granite-faced concrete base that is reminiscent of a battleship gun turret. To the un-initiated, however, the form of the monument base is familiar not for its association with battleship parts but for its shared characteristics with shrine architecture in general. It is fitting that the \textit{USS Maine} Memorial imitates the essential nature of the tholos, a round drum-like structure. Early examples of this building type are found in Greek architecture, Mycenaen tombs, and Roman martyrria. The tholos recurred over and over in the landscape; its circular body existed in Antiquity through to the Renaissance and persists today. Because this form endured irrespective of time, place, and materials of construction, the tholos shape speaks to a universal need or commonality that cuts across cultural differences. As material object, the tholos is both the idea and image of an appropriate place for veneration interpreted in specific contexts; examples of the purpose the

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{107}] Rickover, pp. 125-128.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
tholos is built again and again to serve include tombs, baptistries, and shrines. In each, reverence is expressed. 109

The tholos is an ideal building type for quiet, almost introspective devotion. Used as a memorial, it is a manifestation of human, occupied space. Here, America acknowledged her fallen sons and marked their place of burial with honor through the creation of the monument. While the very existence of the Maine Memorial is tied to human aims and has human meanings, it also evokes a certain spirituality. The act of pilgrimage to the site makes it a tourist attraction and simultaneously lends it sanctity through the spiritual journey that (potentially) occurs during the physical trip. Once there, the main mast draws the eyes upward toward the heavens, providing a strong visual link between the geo-physical location and the cosmos. 110

The symbolism of the USS Maine Memorial includes its immediate, familial associations for descendants of the deceased as well as its more ambiguous and encompassing role as a link between our world and beyond. As a shrine, the Maine Memorial provides a point of orientation between this world and the next; visiting requires traveling to Arlington, Virginia, and once there, a connection exists between here and there, of past and present. It is this purposive shifting that allows the Maine Memorial to become almost spiritual. The intensification of meaning, characteristic of this and other holy places, remains a touching human symbol of a great travesty in American history. 111

2. Condition of fabric: The base of the memorial, the gun turret, has significant joint failure which allows water to enter the structure. As a result of the water infiltration, the paint is peeling and rust is forming, particularly at the base where the liquid collects, as well as around the entrance. Also, the guywires supporting the mast are unraveling near the turnbuckles. There is general rust on the crow’s nest as well. 112

B. Description of Exterior:


110 See below.


1. Overall dimensions: The monument is essentially a large circular base that supports the main mast of the former battleship USS Maine. The radius of the memorial from the mast to the exterior at floor level is approximately 16'9" and the radius at cornice level is just over 16'. The circumference at the base of the seat is just under 130' and at the cornice level is approximately 102'. These dimensions suggest that the walls of the monument, the gun turret, slope inward gradually; they then pop back out at the spring line of dome. The height of the memorial base is about seven feet. (This is easily counted on the inside as each marble block measures 1'1" and there are seven from floor to spring line of the dome).113 The seat running around the monument base is just over 1' tall and almost 2' in depth. The overall height of the memorial, including the mast, is about 62'.

2. Foundations: Beneath the Maine Memorial is about 3' of concrete. This foundation layer is protected, in turn, by a layer of waterproofing material.

3. Walls: The exterior walls of the gun turret are made of concrete and faced with granite, and are 3' to 3 7/8' thick.

4. Porches, stoops, porticoes, bulkheads: There are no porches or porticoes in the conventional sense attached to the memorial, however, there is a seat or bench projecting from the wall, also made of granite, that runs continuously around the structure. The two tripods flanking the entrance work with the tilted overhang to create an impression of a vestibule, or small porch. Each component is made from a single piece of granite and surrounds the visitor as he or she pauses in the gated doorway, making a liminal space between the cemetery landscape with its bright white tombstones and the immediate, human space of the shrine-like receiving vault.

6. Openings:

   a. Doorways and doors: There is one entrance into the memorial, demarcated by the tripods which are reminiscent of those found at Roman altars, and the inscription. The doorframe itself is a trapezoid, canted inward at the top as does the monument base on a larger scale. Barring access, but allowing for glimpses inside, is a metal gate ornamented with nautical elements. The gate is about three feet across, as is the door. The actual door is constructed out of bronze, and embellished with one half of a bell from the USS Maine that is set into the central panel. The bell’s inscription suggests it was made in the New York Naval Yard in 1894, as the ship was being constructed. The door handle is inset and shaped like a ring.

---

113 On the 1913 drawing by Nathan C. Wyeth, the height from the finished floor line to the top of the inscription above the entrance is ten feet exactly. See Maine Memorial, drawings, 1913, architectural flat files, Administration Building, Arlington National Cemetery, Arlington, Virginia.
b. Windows and shutters: There are eleven openings lighting the Maine Memorial. In lieu of glazed lights, each has a bronze grille designed by the architect Nathan Wyeth. These are inset into the granite walls and consist of ornamental metalwork in an open pattern enabling light to shine through to the inside.

8. Roof:

   a. Shape, covering: The roof of the monument is a low, stepped dome rising in four stages to the mast. The shaft projects through the would be oculus of the dome and is connected to the roof by a bronze collar and lead caulking. The roof is faced in granite; beneath the stone masonry steps is concrete and five 1" rods made of steel. Also running through the concrete portions is the lead piping that connects the copper gutter around the mast to that around the roof perimeter and both to the down-spouts.

   b. Cornice, eaves: The cornice is made from granite and rises up in front of the copper gutters. Attached to the cornice are the four (per side) bronze rings that anchor the guywires to the gun turret base that in turn run up to the crow’s nest to help steady the main mast. The cornice is grander above the doorway; in it is an inscription identifying the monument and the persons to whom it is dedicated:

   ERECTED IN MEMORY OF THE OFFICERS AND MEN WHO LOST THEIR LIVES IN THE DESTRUCTION OF THE USS MAINE HAVANA CUBA FEBRUARY FIFTEENTH MDCCCXCVII

   On either side of the inscription is a laurel wreath.

   c. Dormers, cupolas, towers: The main mast of the former USS Maine rises above its representative gun turret, standing as it did in Havana harbor, to remind on-lookers of the ship and her crew. It is painted white, patched, and anchored into a granite block that extends two feet below the marble floor inside the structure. Covering the juncture of floor and mast is a bronze ring; in order to secure the mast into the foundation, rivets were used and the bottom was squared off.114

C. Description of Interior

   1. Floor plans: The interior of the cylindrical memorial is a receiving drum. The large circular space remains open, unobstructed by furnishings or partition walls. The shaft of the USS

---

Maine main mast is in the center, rising through the space to the outside. Temporarily stored inside is a monument commemorating the life of a Polish statesman and musician Ignace Jan Paderewski who wished to be buried in Arlington National Cemetery until his homeland was free. While his mortal remains have been returned to Poland, as he requested, the tablet has not. It clearly was not intended for the interior of Maine Memorial, and its presence there only emphasizes that the inside was to be left open and uncluttered.

2. Flooring: The floor is laid in 3/4" square black and white marble tiles, arranged to make a mosaic (fig. 5). Around the main mast or central point of the memorial, the tiles create a fretwork pattern that has in turn a double border of colored marble. This central portion stretches just over a foot from the mast, creating a larger circular focal point around the shaft.

3. Wall and ceiling finish: The interior of the Maine Memorial is capped by a shallow, saucer-like dome assembled out of concrete and faced with marble. The distance from the spring line of the dome to the center or highest point is about 13'2" (the radius). Piercing the center of the dome is the main mast of the ship, which acts as both a central post and a symbolic point of orientation. The main mast is painted white and a bronze collar covers the joint linking it to the ceiling. Similar to the ceiling, the interior walls are faced with marble, and consist of seven of the approximately 1' tall stones stacked on top of one another.

4. Windows: There are eleven windows, or openings, each marked by a metallic grille, that is narrow and rectangular in shape. There is no interior treatment and the opening is flush to the wall. The grilles cant slightly, in keeping with the shift in the line of the exterior face. Inside, the window openings are larger, which creates a tunnel effect and causes the openings to appear volumetric and trapezoidal. The distance between the inside wall and the grille surface is almost two feet on average, or the thickness of the wall itself. The window openings typically begin at 3'6" from the floor line and are about 1'2" wide.

5. Decorative features and trim:

a. Maine Memorial: The decorative components of the memorial consist of metallic accents and structural ornamentation. The metallic elements include the bronze grilles at the exterior edge of the window openings, the bronze collars masking the points where the mast penetrates the floor and ceiling, and the bell attached to the bronze door. It, too, is bronze and salvaged from the wreckage. The gate, while serving a practical function of protecting the door, is quite ornamental. It is covered with naval motifs, such as anchors and mooring lines.

---

Also notable is the floor, a mosaic made of colored marble. This, like the metallic components, represents structural decoration often seen in the colorful interiors of pagan and early Christian shrines as well as Moorish religious buildings. Such a reference would be relevant here for the sanctity inherent in a memorial to the *Maine* dead, for it is a human space with otherworldly associations.

Finally, the body of the *Maine* memorial hosts carved fronds that are placed alternatively with the window openings between the panels of names etched into the sides of the structure as well as the two carved laurel wreathes that flank the inscription over the door.

b. Mast: During the design process the decorative feature generating the most controversy was a bronze plaque. In 1910, the Havana chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution (DAR) placed a plaque on the mast. At this time, the chapter began sponsoring prayers at the wreck on the anniversary of the explosion. After the *Maine* was un-watered and the mast taken to the Washington Naval Yard, the plaque was removed. As a precautionary measure the Navy had a drawing made of the plaque and mounted the original to an oak panel.\(^\text{116}\) The DAR wanted the plaque reattached to the mast, however, the Commission and architect objected, citing the aesthetic changes the plaque would bring. The architect, Wyeth, also warned the army about potential cost overruns that would be incurred by its inclusion. Wyeth’s primary concern was the inscription of plaque. He said that the text clashed with that already required for the memorial. The Quartermaster upheld Wyeth’s point of view and notified the DAR accordingly. The plaque was put in Arlington House for display near the book of autographs from the guard of honor in Havana and the glass figures.\(^\text{117}\)

The inscription on the DAR plaque read:

```
```
Sometime later, the plaque was reattached to the mast, where it remains today.\(^{118}\)

6. Hardware: Securing the interior bronze door is a modern Yale lock, with requisite key, escutcheon, and handle.

7. Mechanical Equipment: There is no heating, ventilation, or air conditioning system installed inside the memorial. Nor is there an electrical system. There is, however, a drain located in the floor to mitigate against water leaks.\(^{119}\)

D. Site

In November of 1899, the Quartermaster General asked the Depot Quartermaster to recommend an appropriate location for the *USS Maine* section in Arlington National Cemetery. He presented two options to the Quartermaster on December 11, 1899. The first was a triangular piece of level ground located south of the Spanish War section. It was near a fork in the road leading to Fort McPherson and to the McClellan Gate. The second option, located north of the Spanish War section, was a “gently rounded knoll just large enough to receive 150 to two hundred interments with space for monumental erections.” The Depot Quartermaster favored the second place.\(^{120}\) Once a choice was made, the Depot Quartermaster needed to lay out lines and dig the graves.\(^{121}\) The matter was of some urgency as the War Department wanted to bury the remains before Christmas and Cuban quarantine regulations allowed bodies to be removed from Cuba only in December and January.\(^{122}\) Therefore, the Depot Quartermaster asked for permission to spend the $1200.00 earmarked for the interment so that the section would be ready

---

\(^{118}\) See measured drawings for HABS No. VA-1348-D that accompany this report.

\(^{119}\) In the drawings by Nathan Wyeth in 1913, this drain connects to the lead pipe system that routes water away from the copper gutters by way of down-spouts, etc. See Nathan C. Wyeth, “Maine Memorial,” drawings, 25 July 1913, architectural flat files, Administration Building, Arlington National Cemetery, Arlington, Virginia. See also, Records of the Office of the Quartermaster General, [U.S. Army], Record Group 92, Correspondence 1890-1914, Document files No. 479284.

\(^{120}\) Records of the Office of the Quartermaster General, [U.S. Army], Record Group 92, Correspondence 1890-1914, Document files No. 144513. (Letter of Depot Quartermaster to Quartermaster General, 9 December 1899 included the sketch and two proposals).

\(^{121}\) See “Section - Maine (/) Arlington National Cemetery, VA,” Map, December 28, 1899, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland; see also, Records of the Office of the Quartermaster General, [U.S. Army], Record Group 92, Correspondence 1890-1914, Document files No. 85160.

\(^{122}\) Records of the Office of the Quartermaster General, [U.S. Army], Record Group 92, Correspondence 1890-1914, Document files No. 144513.
for the burial and the grounds prepared in the same manner as was done for the Spanish War section.\footnote{123}{Records of the Office of the Quartermaster General, [U.S. Army], Record Group 92, Correspondence 1890-1914, Document files No. 144513.}

The Maine section was laid out in time for the remains of the sailors and marines who died from the explosion to be buried as planned. The bodies were exhumed from Colon Cemetery in Havana. Captain Sigsbee, then in command of the USS Texas, took the battleship to Havana to receive the bodies. Sixty-three were identified; 102 remained unknown. The remains were placed in 150 caskets, escorted to Washington, D.C., and brought to Arlington for burial with military honors.\footnote{124}{Records of the Office of the Quartermaster General, [U.S. Army], Record Group 92, Correspondence 1890-1914, Document files Nos. 144513 & 109032; see also Arlington National Cemetery, website accessed December 12, 1998, p. 8.} Each plot measures 8' x 12'. Within that allotment, the individual graves were each 2 1/2' x 7 1/2'.\footnote{125}{See “Section - Maine (/) Arlington National Cemetery, VA,” Map, December 28, 1899, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland; see also, Records of the Office of the Quartermaster General, [U.S. Army], Record Group 92, Correspondence 1890-1914, Document files Nos. 85160 & 360813.}

The costs incurred by the Quartermaster General’s department for the ceremonies in Washington, D.C., and Arlington reached $216.50; expenses itemized were

- $33.10 To pay the teams to transport the remain from cars at Rosslyn to Arlington
- $30.00 To remove the remains from the cars to wagons
- $59.60 To erect a large stand at the cemetery
- $15.00 To decorate the stand
- $64.00 To construct small stand for clergymen and flooring the same, erecting canopies, flooring the three guard tents, and putting down a walk
- $14.50 To hire chairs for use in the stands

In addition, the actual cost of the interment was $1170.40, an amount just under the $1200.00 allocated. The figure was that high only because the cemetery officials were preparing for the burial of 175 individual remains.\footnote{126}{Records of the Office of the Quartermaster General, [U.S. Army], Record Group 92, Correspondence 1890-1914, Document files No. 144513: Depot Quartermaster to the Quartermaster General of the U.S. Army, Letter, 5 January 1900, Quartermaster general of the U.S. Army to Depot Quartermaster, Letter, 23 December 1899, Quartermaster General of the U.S. Army to Depot Quartermaster, Letter, 13 December 1899, and Depot Quartermaster to Quartermaster General of the U.S. Army, Letter, 11 December 1899.}
In February of 1900, the Depot Quartermaster proposed improving the plot of ground reserved for the Maine victims and requested $2160.00 (approximately) to do the work. The items included in that figure were:

- $10.50: 7 granite boundary stones to mark the plot (6" x 6" x 18" dressed on top)
- $225.00: 900 cubic yards earthwork @25 cents
- $357.00: 238 cubic yards broken cobble foundation of roadway
- $60.00: 120 cubic yards common gravel
- $210.00: 120 cubic yards screened river gravel
- $303.75: 135 square yards granolithic walk
- $148.00: drainage, including catch basins, header, and pipe
- $195.00: 260 square yards cobble gutters
- $150.00: contingencies

The estimate for the work “contemplates the construction of a graveled road around the entire plot, [...], about 720 feet long and 22 feet wide, including gutters, also a granolithic walk through the center, from the main road to the circle at southern end of plot.” An additional $500.00 was requested for grubbing and clearing, the hauling and spreading of soil and manure, plowing, harrowing, rolling, grading, and seeding. In addition to the landscaping efforts, the $500.00 was to pay for the mounting of the “trophy guns” and anchor if the Navy Department supplied them. The estimate was approved with the exception of the granolithic walk ($303.75). Of the $500.00, only the $150.00 allocated for the mounting of the trophy guns -- the mortars -- and anchor was not allowed because the Navy had not transferred the items to the cemetery for use as a memorial.127

The walkway and trophies from the Spanish-American War were put on hold because of the negotiations taking place within the War and Navy departments. Concurrent to the improvements request to the Quartermaster’s office, the Depot Quartermaster requested that the Navy furnish two Spanish “canon” as well as an anchor and “other trophies characteristic of naval service” for use in the ornamentation of the Maine section in Arlington National Cemetery. The Navy offered two 877 bronze M.L. S.B. mortars and a large anchor. The mortars are said to have been brought back by Dewey from Manilla, while the anchor -- no longer suitable for service -- was in the Boston Naval Yard. These three items would be transferred to the War Department once that department released the eight guns assigned to the Navy. The transfer of equipment must have happened fairly quickly because the Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance reported on February 17, 1900, that the mortars were assigned to Arlington National Cemetery as requested. By March 3, 1900, the Quartermaster General endorsed the transport of the two

127 Records of the Office of the Quartermaster General, [U.S. Army], Record Group 92, Correspondence 1890-1914, Document files No. 85160. (Letters, 5 February 1900, 24 February 1900, 7 May 1900)
mortars and the anchor to Arlington. In May, the Depot Quartermaster requested permission to spend $310.00 dollars on the mounting of the mortars and the anchor in the Maine section. The large size of the anchor provided by the Navy increased the costs over the estimate presented in February for $150.00. This expenditure was approved the next day.

In 1900, the site of the Maine section was complete. In the Annual Report made to the Secretary of War, the Quartermaster General of the U.S. Army reported that “two howitzers and a large anchor” were placed in the section “in which the remains of 165 sailors and marines, victims of the disaster to the U.S. battleship Maine in the harbor of Havana, Cuba, February 15, 1898, were buried in December of 1899, with appropriate ceremony.” A plaque placed near the anchor reads:

USS MAINE (/) BLOWN UP (/) FEBRUARY FIFTEENTH (/) 1898 (/) HERE LIE THE REMAINS (/) OF (/) ONE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-THREE (/) MEN OF THE MAINE’S CREW (/) BROUGHT FROM HAVANA CUBA (/) REINTERRED AT ARLINGTON (/) DECEMBER TWENTY-EIGHTH (/) 1899.

No further mention of the Maine section is made until the 1910-12 period. It was then that the ship’s explosion was reinvestigated and all but nine of the missing crew members brought home for burial.

After the un-watering of the USS Maine took place, investigators working under Major Ferguson of the Corps of Engineers found the remains of many of the missing sailors. Only one was identifiable; he was Darwin R. Merritt, Assistant Engineer. Merritt’s body was sent home to his family in Iowa for burial. The remains of the other crew members were put in thirty-four caskets. The USS North Carolina took the human remains out of Havana as she and the USS Birmingham escorted the USS Maine out to sea for a proper burial on March 16, 1912. The remains were then transferred to the USS Birmingham and brought home for burial with military

128 Records of the Office of the Quartermaster General, [U.S. Army], Record Group 92, Correspondence 1890-1914, Document files No. 144513.

129 Records of the Office of the Quartermaster General, [U.S. Army], Record Group 92, Correspondence 1890-1914, Document files No. 85160.

130 Records of the Office of the Quartermaster General, [U.S. Army], Record Group 92, Annual Reports, 1894-1920, Annual Report 1900, p. 81.

131 Although the memorial plaque placed near the anchor laments the loss of 163 men, the Annual Report stated that the remains of 165 were brought home (63 identified, 102 unknown) for burial in December of 1899. See footnote above.
 honors on March 23, 1912. They were to be met by a department hearse and escorted to Arlington National Cemetery where a trumpeter and firing party would give them a proper military funeral. Plans were expanded to include a memorial service held in front of the State, War, and Navy Departments building. President Taft and the chaplain from the USS Maine, Father John Chidwick, spoke. Captain Sigsbee attended.

Also in March of 1912, the Cuban government transferred the book of autographs to the United States. The book was kept while a guard of honor watched over the remains of the Maine dead in Havana's City Hall. President Taft wanted the book put on display in Arlington Cemetery to demonstrate the Cuban people's interest in, and sympathy for, the disaster and the memorial of its victims. Shortly thereafter, the Depot Quartermaster requested exhibit cases, at a cost of $400.00. The cases were needed for the display of the glass flowers and fourteen pieces set in the shape of wreaths, anchors, and crosses made of glass and framed in "frail frames of metal." These were gifts in memory of the Maine.

By spring 1913, the designs for the Maine Memorial had been selected and working drawings were in progress. It was left for the Commission of Fine Arts to decide where in Arlington National Cemetery to put the memorial. The question of the memorial's site brought up planning concerns for the cemetery as a whole and so a decision was delayed. The Commission, under the guidance of Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr. and Daniel C. French, recommended that the Quartermaster Corps hire an expert to draw up a comprehensive plan for

132 Records of the Office of the Quartermaster General, [U.S. Army], Record Group 92, Correspondence 1890-1914, Document files Nos. 360813 & 324029. Also note that Coggins Marble of Canton, Georgia, applied for the contract to make the memorial for the sixty-five (i.e., the grave markers); it is not evident from the materials in this file if Coggins Marble received the contract or not.

Of the 355 member crew on board the USS Maine in February of 1898, the remains of nine are unaccounted for; there are 229 buried in Arlington (167 unknown, 62 known); and there are ninety-four survivors. See Records of the Office of the Quartermaster General, [U.S. Army], Record Group 92, Correspondence 1890-1914, Document files No. 479284; and Records of the Office of the Quartermaster General, [U.S. Army], Record Group 92, Annual Reports, 1894-1920, Annual Report 1912.

133 Records of the Office of the Quartermaster General, [U.S. Army], Record Group 92, Correspondence 1890-1914, Document files No. 324029; this includes newspaper clippings and copies of the Congressional resolutions regarding the Maine. See also, Congress, Senate, Memorial Services for Dead of USS Maine, 62nd Cong., 2nd sess., S. resolution 253, (19 March 1912), and Congress, House, Memorial Services for Dead of USS Maine, 62nd Cong., 2nd sess., H. doc. 630, CIS/Index (1909-15), vol. 6322.

134 Records of the Office of the Quartermaster General, [U.S. Army], Record Group 92, Correspondence 1890-1914, Document files No. 324029. This file includes blueprints for the exhibit cases, and an estimated cost to build them ($400.00) but unfortunately does not include any further description of the glass figures. The files also includes an acknowledgment of the receipt of the book of autographs. See Secretary of War to Hon. Julip de Cardenas, Havana, Cuba, Letter, 25 March 1912.
the cemetery. Placement of the Maine Memorial raised issues regarding the location of the new amphitheater as well as the planning of a new bridge.\textsuperscript{135}

The man solicited by the Commission of Fine Arts to produce the plan was Charles A. Platt of New York. Platt came to Washington, D.C., in May of 1913, to meet with the Commission of Fine Arts and U.S. Army officials. Platt's services were not retained (his fee was $10,000) because the necessary appropriation from Congress had not been requested. In communications between Platt and Colonel Spencer Cosby of the U.S. Army Quartermaster Corps, however, it is revealed that not only did Arlington National Cemetery have no comprehensive plan for development, it did not employ a landscape designer, nor did it have restrictions or guidelines governing the placement or appearance of monuments other than head and foot stones for the individual graves. The cemetery had only a landscape gardener for plants.\textsuperscript{136}

Although no comprehensive plan had been drawn for the cemetery and the amphitheater had not yet been built, the Commission of Fine Arts approved the proposed site in the Maine section in May of 1913. Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr. verified the Commission's approval of a site in June of 1913.\textsuperscript{137} The site chosen was inside the circular drive nearby the mortars and large anchor put in place in 1900. By so doing, the memorial met the 1910 Congressional stipulation that the mast be "at or near the spot where the bodies of those who died through such wreck are interred."

PART III: SOURCES OF INFORMATION

A. Architectural drawings

Arlington National Cemetery, Arlington, Virginia

In the Administration Building of Arlington National Cemetery, the architectural flat files contain Nathan C. Wyeth's four drawings (ink on linen) from 25 July 1913 for the USS Maine Memorial; these include a general plan, front elevation, two sections, and quarter plan with details. Also in the Arlington files are the 1914 and 1962 proposed changes to the monument.

\textsuperscript{135}Records of the Commission of Fine Arts, Record Group 66, Project files 1910-1952, Arlington National Cemetery, Maine, USS, Memorial.

\textsuperscript{136}Records of the Office of the Quartermaster General, [U.S. Army], Record Group 92, Correspondence 1890-1914, Document files Nos. 308571 & 336852; Records of the Commission of Fine Arts, Record Group 66, Project files 1910-1952, Arlington National Cemetery, Maine, USS, Memorial.

\textsuperscript{137}Records of the Commission of the Fine Arts, Record Group 66, Project files 1910-1952, Arlington National Cemetery, Maine, USS, Memorial.
National Archives @ College Park, Maryland

The records of the Bureau of Ships include several drawings of the *USS Maine* that were done between 1885 and 1895. Also, in the records for public buildings and public parks, there are several plans for Arlington National Cemetery that show the *Maine* burial section.

National Archives @ Washington, D.C.

Blueprint sketches of the four designs received by the War Department for the *Maine* Memorial as well as the two designs submitted by Nathan C. Wyeth are in the project file of the Commission of Fine Arts. Similarly, the Commission of Fine Arts’ file includes Charles Keck’s winning sketch for the memorial tablet, a sketch of the plaque placed on the main mast in 1910 by the Havana Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution, a pencil-sketch design proposal on tracing paper, and copies of the watercolor sketches by Wyeth.

B. Early views

Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland

In the Naval Academy museum, pieces of the *USS Maine* are displayed as well as a diorama of its explosion in the Havana Harbor. Outside, along the seawall is a memorial to the *Maine*; this includes her foremast, a relic of the 1911 investigation of the ship’s remains. A photograph of the foremast as it is pulled from the water is included in the final report to Congress, on the construction of the cofferdam and the board’s findings.138

National Archives, Washington, D.C., and College Park, Maryland

All photographs associated with the *USS Maine* and her last port of call in Havana are stored in the National Archives, College Park, Maryland, facility. These include the images from the 1898-99 and 1910-13 operations in Havana, Cuba, after the ship mysteriously exploded. Likewise, several drawings of the ship are housed in the archives as well as plans for Arlington National Cemetery that show the *Maine* burial section in its context. However, the designs for the *Maine* memorial are stored in the Commission of Fine Arts project files; these currently are in the downtown branch of the archives.

138 See Congress, House, *Final Report on Removing Wreck of Battleship Maine*, 63rd Cong., 2nd sess., H. doc. 480, *CIS/Index* (1909-15), vol. 6754. The Navy Department decided it wanted the foremast for the Naval Academy in 1912, although it had been shipped to the Military Service Institute for their use. In exchange the Military Service Institute was offered the name plate and the boat or derrick booms or the protective tube leading to the coning tower. See Records of the Office of the Chief of Engineers, [U.S. Army], Record Group 77, General Correspondence 1894-1923, Document files No. 52736. This particular entry is No. 52736/2581 and was written in March of 1912.
Washington Navy Yard, Washington, D.C.

The Operational Archives at the Navy Yard has some images of the USS Maine, primarily copies of the drawings of the Maine in section found in Admiral Rickover’s book, How the Battleship Maine Was Destroyed, and copies of photographs associated with raising the wreck of the former battleship.
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Secondary Sources:


D. Likely sources not yet investigated
- Potential Archives in Havana, Cuba
- Potential Archives in Key West, Florida
- Records of the Marine Naval Yard, New York

E. Supplemental material

1. *USS Maine*: Time line

17 October 1888 Keel laid, New York Naval Yard

1890 *USS Maine* launched from Brooklyn, NY (hull completed; sponsor smacked a bottle of champagne on the bow; and ship then pulled along side a pier for interior and superstructure fittings)
1895  
*USS Maine* commissioned into service and first watch set

February 1896  
Run aground

6 February 1897  
Five men washed overboard in storm; two recovered

10 April 1897  
Captain Charles D. Sigsbee given command

25 January 1898  
Arrived in Havana Harbor

15 February 1898  
Ship exploded, 9:40 p.m.

December 1899  
First burial of *USS Maine* dead in Arlington National Cemetery (remains of 163 to 165 sailors and marines)

13 February 1912  
Cofferdam flooded, *USS Maine* floated

12 March 1912  
Second burial -- of the remains of additional crew members -- in Arlington National Cemetery (brings total to 229 crew members buried there)

16 March 1912  
*USS Maine* sunk in international waters

20 December 1912  
Havana office of the *Maine* board closed

**PART IV: PROJECT INFORMATION**

This project, to record the *USS Maine* Memorial at Arlington National Cemetery, was sponsored jointly by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Historic American Buildings Survey/Historic American Engineering Record (HABS/HAER) division of the National Park Service. Documentation was undertaken in Winter 1999 by the Washington, D.C., office of HABS, under the direction of E. Blaine Cliver, Chief, HABS/HAER, Paul D. Dolinsky, Chief, HABS, and Horace Foxall, Jr., Manager, Technical Center of Expertise for Preservation of Structures and Buildings, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The *USS Maine* Memorial project was initiated by Dolinsky and by Catherine C. Lavoie, Supervisory Historian for HABS. The field measurements were completed by Mark S. Schara, Project Leader, and by J. Raul Vazquez, HABS Architect. The project historian was Virginia B. Price. Large format photography was produced by Jack E. Boucher, HABS Photographer.

The *USS Maine* Memorial project would not have come to fruition without the assistance of Richard Hayes, formerly of the Department of the Navy and now with the American Institute of Architects; and Joseph Bunton, Engineer, Arlington National Cemetery. Research was
facilitated by John P. Cann, III, Ph.D., Associate Professor, U.S. Marine Corps College, Quantico, Virginia; Sue A. Kohler, Historian, The Commission of Fine Arts, Washington, D.C., as well as the staff in charge of Army and Navy records at the National Archives, Washington, D.C., and College Park, Maryland.
Four sketch designs for the monumental setting of the mast of the battleship Maine & an enlargement of the preferred design scheme. These were the results of the design competition; the Commission of Fine Arts jettisoned all four proposals. (RG 66, NARA)
The two design proposals for a monumental setting of the mast of the battleship *Maine* by Nathan C. Wyeth, architect. (RG 66, NARA)
Figure 3. The foremast of the battleship Maine in its current location, the Naval Academy in Annapolis, Maryland. A plaque attached to the mast reads, "Foremast of the U.S.S. Maine (/) – (/) Ship blown up. Havana 15. Feb. 1898. (/) Mast recovered 6. Oct. 1910. (/) Erected here 5. May. 1913." (Photo by author)
Figure 4. Accepted design for the memorial tablet; design by Charles Keck, New York. (RG 66, NARA).
Figure 5. Approved border design for the floor mosaic. (RG 92, NARA).
ADDENDUM TO:
ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY, USS MAINE MEMORIAL
Arlington
Virginia

HABS VA-1348-D
HABS VA,7-ARL,11D-

WRITTEN HISTORICAL AND DESCRIPTIVE DATA

HISTORIC AMERICAN BUILDINGS SURVEY
National Park Service
U.S. Department of the Interior
1849 C Street NW
Washington, DC 20240-0001
This is an addendum to a 56-page report previously transmitted to the Library of Congress.

**Location:** The monument to the USS Maine and her crew is in Arlington National Cemetery, in Arlington, Arlington County, Virginia, just across the Potomac River from Washington, D.C. Access to the USS Maine Memorial is via Sigsbee Drive, a loop off of Farragut Drive, within the cemetery grounds. The memorial is located at latitude: 38.876505, longitude: -77.074711. The coordinate was obtained on October 13, 2017 using Google Earth (WGS84). There is no restriction to the public.

**Significance:** The USS Maine monument was dedicated in 1915 and constructed using the salvaged main mast of the ship, as its primary character-defining feature, following its sinking in 1898. Recently discovered carved into the brass ring at the interior of the crow’s nest bracing are the names of individuals assumed to be associated with the ship at some time. It does not appear they were crew members at the time of the sinking.

**Description:** A recent restoration of the mast’s crow’s nest revealed names carved into the exposed top surface of the brass ring feature.

**History:** Historians from Arlington National Cemetery concluded this is graffiti likely placed on the crow’s nest when the mast sat at the Washington, D.C. Navy Yard prior to the construction of the memorial (between 1912 and 1915) and not the work of sailors aboard the USS Maine.

**Historian:** Thomas A. Vitanza, Senior Historical Architect, Historic Preservation Training Center, National Park Service, summer 2017.

**Project Information:** This addendum was created in order to include as part of the existing HABS documentation of the USS Maine.

The following photographs were taken by Kari Grabinski, National Park Service, Historic Preservation Training Center, Exhibits Specialist, August 1, 2017.
Figure 1: Overview of U.S.S. Maine Memorial, showing mast from U.S.S. Maine and the crow’s nest position, while restoration project is underway, August 2017.
Figure 2: U.S.S. Maine Memorial crow’s nest overview showing location of brass ring feature at the midway position on the interior face of the wall. Likely part of a rotating derrick this ring was inscribed with the documented graffiti on both its top and inside vertical faces.
Figure 3: Crow’s nest overview showing brass ring inside vertical wall structure.

Figure 4: Crow’s nest scale orientation.
Figure 5: East edge, no scale. U.S.S. PHILA.

Figure 6: East edge with detail scale. U.S.S. PHILA.
Figure 7: East edge with scale. U.S.S. PHILA.

Figure 8: North edge, no scale. C.D. GOULD.
Figure 9: North edge, no scale. H.E. WOOD. TEXAS.

Figure 10: North edge, no scale. H.E. WOOD. TEXAS.
Figure 11: North edge with detail scale. C.D. GOULD (l) and H.E. WOOD (r).

Figure 12: North/northeast edge, no scale.
Figure 13: North/northeast edge with detail scale.
Figure 14: North/northeast edge with detail scale.

Figure 15: Northwest detail, no scale. C.B.M.
Figure 16: Northwest edge with detail scale. C.B.M.

Figure 17: Northwest edge with scale.
Figure 18: South/southeast edge, no scale. E.L. BAGS.

Figure 19: South/southeast edge, no scale detail. E.L. BAGS.
Figure 20: South/southeast edge with detail. E.L. BAGS.
Figure 21: Southeast edge with scale.
Figure 22: West edge, no scale. M.J. BERSOLF.

Figure 23: West edge detail, no scale. M.J. BERSOLF.