Art Meets Politics: Peter Norbeck, Frank Lloyd Wright, and the Sylvan Lake Hotel Commission
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On the last day of June 1935, a fire broke out near a chimney at the Sylvan Lake Hotel, located in Custer State Park in the Black Hills of South Dakota. Forty guests fled the building, and it burned to the ground.¹ For eight months after the fire, the Custer State Park Board struggled to decide who would design the new hotel and where it would be located. The political rivalries and divergent aesthetic views of the board members might have been expected and routine but for the involvement of an internationally known architect, Frank Lloyd Wright, in the process. The persistent efforts of Senator Peter Norbeck, chairman of the board, to champion Wright's candidacy for the commission met with limited success, as he found both his health and his political power declining. The board's ultimate resolution to the conflict gave the park a good replacement for the old hotel but denied South Dakotans and visitors to the Black Hills an architectural masterpiece.

The developers of the artificial Sylvan Lake built the original three-and-a-half-story hotel in front of the lakeshore's dramatic granite formations in 1893. The hotel, a wood-frame building with a two-level porch trimmed in "gingerbread" ornamentation, catered to local residents and Black Hills travelers. The Custer State Park Board acquired the forested lands around the lake in 1919 and purchased the Sylvan Lake Resort in 1920. Myra K. Peters assumed management of the

¹ The preparation of this article was made possible in part by a grant from the South Dakota Humanities Council.

hotel in that year, instituted a decorating scheme with an American Indian motif, and organized social and recreational events to draw patrons. Sylvan Lake became one of the most popular attractions in the rapidly expanding Black Hills tourist industry. The destruction of the hotel constituted a major loss to the infrastructure of Custer State Park but also presented an opportunity to improve this important park amenity.

With that opportunity, however, came controversy, which began with an editorial in the *Evening Huronite* on 2 July 1935. Robert D. Lusk, managing editor of the Huron, South Dakota, newspaper and vice-president of the South Dakota Planning Board, called the old hotel “a sore thumb” and urged the construction of a new structure that harmonized with its setting. Lusk suggested two talented designers: Gutzon Borglum, the sculptor then carving the Mount Rushmore National Memorial, and Frank Lloyd Wright, the famous architect from Wisconsin. Wright, Lusk declared, could design a building that would bring worldwide attention to Sylvan Lake and the Black Hills.

“Every one in South Dakota and every one who visits the Black Hills,” he concluded, “has a stake in their beauty and a desire to make them even more attractive than they are.” Lusk echoed Senator Norbeck’s belief that human hands could enhance natural beauty.

Peter Norbeck had been instrumental in establishing Custer State Park, first as a game reserve in 1913 and then as a state park in 1919. The son of Scandinavian immigrants, Norbeck had little formal education, but he was a successful businessman and Republican politician. He was also a voracious reader with a deep appreciation for art. Norbeck once told a friend he would rather be remembered as an artist than a senator, and for more than a decade Custer State Park served as his canvas. Norbeck led the planning and development of the scenic Needles Highway and Iron Mountain Road and closely monitored the design and location of buildings, signs, and other features. He carried out most of this work under the auspices of the three-person Custer State Park Board, established by the South Dakota Legislature in 1919 to develop, manage, and administer the park. Norbeck was a member of or an advisor to the board from its inception until his death in 1936.

By 1935, however, Norbeck’s power on the park board had waned. Declining health sapped some of his normal energy, but there were political reasons, as well, for his diminishing influence. A deep split existed within the state’s Republican party, and, after the election of Republican Warren E. Green to the governor’s office in 1930, Norbeck’s political foes controlled most of the state administration. In 1932, the year Democrat Tom Berry won the governor’s office, Norbeck was the only Republican to win election or reelection to a major state office in South Dakota. Even so, the interparty conflict continued, exacerbated by Norbeck’s refusal to campaign for Herbert Hoover in his presidential bid. Norbeck found himself still popular among his constituents but lacking the political base he had enjoyed in the past.


The ascendancy of the Democrats also changed the makeup of the park board when Governor Berry appointed R. D. Cook, a businessman from Martin, and Harry Gandy of Rapid City, both Democrats, to replace former members. Gandy had been elected as the representative from South Dakota's third congressional district in 1911, serving until 1921. In the mid-1930s, he was president of the Sheridan-Wyoming Coal Company. The board named Democrat Ray E. Milliken of Martin as park superintendent in 1933; he also served as the body's secretary. By 1935, the split among the Republicans and dominance of the Democrats in the state had so weakened Norbeck's position on the board that even he acknowledged Gandy as its most powerful member.  

As Norbeck perceived, Harry Gandy had become the board member with whom Superintendent Milliken most often conferred. Milliken's appointment had irritated Norbeck, who was weary of orienting new park superintendents and resented the political implications inherent in the choice. By state law, the Custer State Park Board held the authority to hire the park administrators, but in reality the post was filled through political patronage. Norbeck was the only board member to vote against Milliken's appointment. He later wrote to Gandy that he feared the new superintendent was easily led, prompting Gandy to send a cautionary memorandum to Milliken.

The relationship between the senator and the superintendent did not improve appreciably. During and following a long hospitalization at the Mayo Clinic in 1934, Norbeck complained bitterly that
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Milliken did not keep him informed of park matters; he also objected when the superintendent ignored his directions. Milliken, on the other hand, told Cook and Gandy that Norbeck interfered inappropriately with his responsibilities. Gandy tried to mediate between the two and attempted to protect the superintendent. He wrote to Milliken and to Governor Berry, asking them to consider Norbeck's annoyance as illness-induced. The tension between Norbeck and Milliken further weakened Norbeck's power and strengthened Gandy's role.

Despite his somewhat tenuous position, Norbeck took the initiative in addressing the hotel issue. After reading Lusk's editorial, Norbeck discussed the matter with Gutzon Borglum, and the sculptor contacted Wright, a personal friend. Wright then wrote to Norbeck, indicating he would be interested in designing and supervising the con-
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struction of the new hotel under the authority of a committee made up of Borglum, Norbeck, and others of the senator's choosing. In explaining this proposal, Wright said, "There is not much hope of ever doing a sensible building under political conditions unless there is somebody who is somebody to refer to and look to correctly aim and protect the progress of the effort." Norbeck had been instrumental in the establishment of Mount Rushmore and often served as an intermediary between the mercurial Borglum and parties with whom he was feuding. The artist may have shared his experiences to encourage Wright to gain Norbeck's backing.  

Political issues necessarily included financial considerations, and finances were a crucial element in the Sylvan Lake Hotel project. During the 1930s, South Dakota suffered the effects of the agricultural depression and drought that began in the state during the 1920s, as well as those of the national economic depression that started in 1929. State funds were low, and taxpayers were leery of expending them. The development of Custer State Park in the 1930s depended heavily on New Deal programs such as the Public Works Administration (PWA), the Works Progress Administration (WPA), and Emergency Conservation Work (ECW), which encompassed the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC). The National Park Service directed the ECW/CCC work in state parks through its Branch of Planning and State Cooperation. These federal programs emphasized comprehensive planning and recreational development, policies encouraged by the Roosevelt administration, and utilized reviews by National Park Service professionals. By 1935, Custer State Park had three CCC camps conducting conservation, park-development, and drought-relief work.

Initially, Norbeck assumed architects and landscapers from these programs would design the new hotel, but the head of the National Park Service told Norbeck that park-service architects would not be

10. Wright to Norbeck (draft of telegram), 15 July 1935, MF NO13, FLWF. For a discussion of the relationship between Borglum and Norbeck, see Fite, Mount Rushmore, pp. 145-61.
available for more than consultation, at least not without reimbursement. Still eager for federal assistance, Superintendent Milliken asked Herbert Maier of the ECW to provide a sketch and suggestions, and Governor Berry speculated that architects from the Rural Rehabilitation Service might be available. In spite of their efforts, and influenced by Wright's interest and the encouragement from Borglum and Lusk, Norbeck began to pursue a Wright commission as a way to obtain a significant and appropriate building for the park.

His intentions were reinforced by his hope that the architect would undertake such a commission for artistic rather than financial reasons. At Wright's suggestion, Norbeck visited a Washington, D.C., exhibit featuring the architect's model of Broadacre City. Norbeck was impressed by Wright's concept of a futuristic urban society that combined practicality, art, and economy. Lusk underscored Wright's artistic commitment when he wrote Norbeck that the architect had designed an exceptionally modest project in Minneapolis because he was taken with the setting. Norbeck also anticipated that Wright's relationship with Borglum and the public nature of the project might induce him to participate despite financial constraints. In mid-July 1935, Norbeck wired the architect that although funding was limited, he believed the park board would support a Wright commission under the right circumstances. Norbeck’s telegram subtly conveyed the situation to Wright, hinting that the architect's willingness to work for a modest fee would help sell the idea. Wright, however, missed or ignored Norbeck's diplomatic signals and made his boundaries clear. He wired back that he supported himself by his profession and observed, “Why Custer is unable to do justice to an architect if an architect does justice to Custer [is] not clear.”

The architect used another telegram to express his opinion on the possibility that federal professionals could do the work: “A Government architect is an employee therefore can create nothing and should
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not be allowed to destroy works of art in the womb of a nation[.] Government has starved great work but always because great work was proud[,] [W]ould like to visit your state but not as a prospector for a job[,]" Norbeck immediately replied, "Truthful and well said but I am looking for a way out[,] When can you visit South Dakota?" Norbeck’s "way out" involved convincing Wright of the project’s value and persuading decision-makers to recognize the benefits of a Wright-designed building.

In response to Norbeck’s urgings, Wright replied, "Glad to drop work here and go to South Dakota whenever assured expenses of trip and that I am wanted to do the Sylvan work on living wage."  

16. Wright to Norbeck (draft of telegram), [23 July 1935], MF NO14, FLWF. The date is derived from a copy of the sent telegram in the Lusk Papers.  

Although over sixty years old when he posed for this 1931 portrait, Frank Lloyd Wright was poised to begin one of the most innovative periods of his long career.
Norbeck quickly assured Wright that he would pay the trip expenses out of his own pocket if the board would not cover them, but he expressed his personal frustrations about the situation in a letter to Lusk. "It is different to talk business to great artists," Norbeck wrote. "I tried to get the idea over to him that I was without authority but wanted to cooperate and be helpful to him, but he does not seem to understand my language." Indeed, Norbeck spoke the language of politics, but Wright's commitment to his profession made it clear that he had no intention of lowering his professional standards or his expectations for reasonable compensation.

Those expectations were based on a long and colorful career. In 1935, Frank Lloyd Wright was sixty-eight years old. His career in architecture had begun in 1887 in Chicago. Despite a lack of formal training, he became well known for his innovative designs of residential and commercial buildings and, particularly, for his influence in the development of the Prairie School of architecture. Wright's commissions dwindled during the 1920s and early 1930s, due in part to the state of the economy and in part to a complicated and controversial personal life. He wrote, exhibited, lectured widely, developed an apprentice program, and received many professional honors but found little paid work. He was on the verge of a new stage in his career, however, one in which he would design some of his most innovative and most famous buildings.

After meeting Wright in person late in August, Norbeck urged him to plan an immediate visit to South Dakota to see the site and meet Gandy. Unable to accompany the architect personally, Norbeck enlisted the aid of Paul Bellamy, owner of the Black Hills Transportation Company, who was leaving for the East Coast on 3 September 1935 and planned to return to the Black Hills about ten days later with Wright in tow. When Bellamy telephoned Wright from Chicago to make arrangements, however, the architect insisted the trip could not wait and asked Bellamy to come to his home in Spring Green, Wisconsin, immediately. Bellamy did so, only to find that Wright had other commitments and was not ready to leave. After waiting for a
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day, Bellamy convinced the architect to embark on the South Dakota trip. When they reached the railroad station, Wright informed Bellamy that he had no money; the businessman paid for his train ticket and gave him cash for expenses.

Wright arrived with Bellamy in the Black Hills on 9 September. He visited Sylvan Lake the next day in the company of Bellamy, Lusk, and Harold Spitznagel, a young Sioux Falls architect who also served as supervising architect for the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) in the state. Spitznagel had designed Custer State Park’s new museum building, constructed with federal funds and CCC labor. At Sylvan Lake, Wright identified what he considered an ideal spot for the hotel on the rocks and across a road behind and above the former hotel site. On 11 September, Spitznagel drove Wright through Spearfish Canyon. That evening, Gutzon Borglum hosted them at a dinner where Wright finally met Harry Gandy.

After returning to Spring Green, Wright wrote an eight-page description of his trip and his reactions to the Black Hills and the Badlands. He remarked on the Black Hills in general, expressing hope that “the noble inheritance—for that is what it is—won’t be exploited and spoiled as lesser beauty spots in our country have been spoiled and will continue to be marred by the nature imitator with his ‘rustic’ effects, piled boulders, peeled logs—and imitation camp-style of primitive gabled buildings. Nature needs from man not imitation but interpretation.”

References to “peeled log and boulder” architecture punctuate the architect’s correspondence about the Sylvan Lake project. That phrase, and many of his remarks in the Black Hills essay, almost certainly refer
to the rustic style of architecture that developed within the National Park Service after its establishment in 1916. Practitioners of “park rustic” incorporated local materials and attempted to blend and even meld buildings with the landscape. They tried to convey a rugged, primitive, handcrafted quality by adapting historical traditions in style and craftsmanship and avoiding refined techniques or finishing. In forested national and state parks, buildings made of logs from which the bark had been removed to reveal their texture, set on foundations of minimally altered rocks in random patterns, typified park rustic. The style began to give way to more modern designs by the late 1930s, but it dominated for two decades, particularly during the Great Depression, when New Deal programs provided funds and workers to build park structures.25

Wright's organic architecture also incorporated indigenous materials, and his designs were intimately associated with their natural settings. Rather than appearing to be part of the landscape, however, his buildings were intended to interpret and enhance their environment. Wright believed that structures should express harmony, unity, and individuality; he opposed imitative elements or historical references in design.26 Discussing the Sylvan Lake site in his essay, Wright mused, “Here a sweeping mountain resort with the lake as a vignette seen below could be a masterful thing of the kind... another and higher kind of nature[,] understanding well and loving the earth from which it springing, loving it too much to imitate it.”27 While rustic architecture tried to give the impression that buildings had “sprung from the soil,”28 Wright refused to have his creations copy nature, aiming instead for an equally respectful but more sophisticated and finished interpretation. He envisioned such a building at Sylvan Lake.

The architect’s opposition to “peeled log and boulder” architecture, however, contradicted expectations for the new hotel. Norbeck himself had assumed that logs and native stone would be used; Bellamy had given Wright detailed suggestions for designing a rustic structure; and Ray Milliken and National Park Service professionals agreed with each other that the typical park architecture would be appropriate. Wright’s vision of a different kind of building at Sylvan Lake and his opinion of the established architectural style represented departures from the norm.29

Despite the architect's outspoken opinions, his trip to South Dakota seemed successful in terms of Norbeck's efforts to manage the situation. Wright admired the setting of Sylvan Lake and was enthusiastic about the prospects of designing a hotel there. He had met Harry Gandy, whom Norbeck knew would be most influential in the
decision-making process. His trip had also attracted regional attention. John K. Sherman editorialized in the *Minneapolis Star* that a Wright-designed resort hotel would be a "coup" for South Dakota's tourist industry comparable to the creation of Mount Rushmore and Calvin Coolidge's establishment of a summer White House in the Black Hills in 1927. A Wright building would give the state another "scoop" on Minnesota's own lake-resort industry.  

Almost immediately, however, issues surfaced that ultimately doomed the Wright candidacy. Primarily, they involved the architect-


---

Wright's house at Fallingwater, Pennsylvania, was in the conceptual stage at the time the architect was considering the Sylvan Lake Hotel commission. It is now considered a classic example of his organic style.
From the outset, park board member Harry Gandy opposed Norbeck's preference for Wright as architect of the new Sylvan Lake Hotel.

selection process and the choice of a building site, reflecting Gandy's opposition to Wright and support for his stance by Milliken and Cook. Norbeck's advocacy of Wright and Gandy's resistance to him became a pivot around which decisions about the hotel revolved. The issue of selecting the architect had arisen soon after Wright's visit to the Black Hills, which coincided with a park board meeting in Rapid City. Norbeck could not attend, but Lusk appeared at the 11 September meeting and recommended Wright to Gandy, Cook, and Milliken. The next day, the same board members and the superintendent toured the Sylvan Lake site. On 13 September, they met with Governor Tom Berry in Pierre. At that time, the governor agreed with the board's intention to "proceed cautiously" in choosing a site and a design.31

Although the meeting minutes do not discuss how the body intended to proceed, within a few days Gandy wrote to Norbeck and

Wright, indicating that the board had decided to ask architects to submit preliminary sketches of proposed buildings. The board would then choose a design and ask its architect to proceed with more detailed plans. Gandy informed Wright that he could expect to receive a topographical map of the site and that once the board had Wright's rendering, it would make a selection from the drawings that had been submitted.\(^{32}\)

Wright was taken by surprise at the news that other architects were being considered for the job. He replied to Gandy, explaining his professional standards and his terms for taking on the Sylvan Lake commission:

```
I find myself in an awkward situation. I went to the Black Hills (to meet you primarily) at the request of Senator Norbeck who was willing to bear the expenses if I could come. The Senator told me frankly nothing could be done to employ me as an architect unless you moved in that direction.

I supposed the field, otherwise, open but your letter informs me that several architects (designs gratis) are in the field and that I and my designs would merely take a place beside them for general consideration. I don't know that you know the professed ethics of a pretentiously ethical profession.

But I, at heart, have lived up to them for thirty five [sic] years. I have never yet submitted a design in competition nor have I before gone so far as I did in your case before being retained for advice. The reason for this should be clear to a lawyer. He doesn't hawk his wares either if he is a good lawyer.

My position as an architect—whatever it is—has been won by individual performance according to direct employment and so my energies have not been wasted upon the politics of job-getting juries or committees and it is too late now to backslide from principles I believe are so needed by architects.\(^{33}\)
```
Wright outlined to Gandy the terms by which he would accept the commission. The architect would provide preliminary sketches for 3 percent of the estimated project cost, plus travel expenses. If these studies proved satisfactory, he would produce plans and specifications and assume general supervision of the work, including that of the furnishings and landscaping, for an additional 7 percent of the completed project cost. Wright’s refusal to cooperate with the Custer State Park Board’s selection process hampered Norbeck’s attempts to manage the situation. Wright, the artist, was fighting politics.

Norbeck believed that going along with the board would be politically wise and might win Wright the commission. The senator diplomatically chided Wright for his response to Gandy, hinting that it gave the board grounds to choose someone else. “I don’t know whether there is any chance for you to get this job,” he wrote, “but when I read your letter to Gandy I was afraid that arguments might easily be developed for following some other course. . . . But really I wish you had submitted some preliminary sketch, giving your idea about it, for I think your idea was correct, though no one seems able to visualize it.”

As architects in the state learned of the board’s selection process, some expressed interest in participating, while others voiced objections similar to Wright’s. One architectural firm wrote Gandy that the process was out of date, as well as “contrary to the Ethics of the American Institute of Architects and unfair to the architects themselves.” Norbeck told Myra K. Peters, manager of the old Sylvan Lake Hotel, “We find that the better class of architects will not enter into that kind of a competition.” South Dakota architect Harold Spitznagel declined an invitation to submit a sketch. He agreed with Wright’s stance and reviewed for the board the standards of competition for architectural commissions, including payment for requested drawings and evaluation by experienced architects. The immediate participants in the controversy, however, recognized that the process and the professional standards were not the most important obstacles to a Wright building; overcoming Gandy’s objections was the crucial step.
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Those objections were clear to many of the parties interested in the issue. Harold Spitznagel strongly supported Wright, and his supervisor, the regional director of the FHA, wrote Gandy that Spitznagel’s championing of Wright was “purely unselfish and for the good of the state and the good of the party.” Gandy replied that he did not want to go into the matter in a letter. He did, however, say that Wright had “arbitrarily” picked a site that Gandy deemed impractical, and that the limited amount of money available hindered “many visions of grandeur.” Gandy’s reservations about Wright also affected local opinion. A Rapid City newspaperman told Robert Lusk that the city’s chamber of commerce was reluctant to support Wright because it had other interests with Harry Gandy and did not want to alienate him.
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His role in the Sylvan Lake Hotel project helped to launch the career of architect Harold Spitznagel, pictured here in his later years.
Gandy made his concerns known to the Custer State Park Board. After a board meeting on 18 October, Norbeck informed Lusk that Wright apparently had criticized everything “except the scenery and Borglum” during his Black Hills visit and that Gandy feared the architect would be “a thousand times harder to get along with than Borglum.” Gandy had also raised his objection to Wright’s refusal to consider more than one site. Determined by this point to avoid turning the project over to a government professional, Norbeck himself insisted upon the need for competitive sketches from private architects. After the meeting, he suggested Lusk contact Wright and ask him if he intended to make a submission.

Lusk immediately wrote to the architect to let him know that while most of the state’s newspapers favored Wright, Gandy’s control of the Custer State Park Board and the failure of Governor Berry “and others” to envision what a Wright building could mean to the park and to the state were the most significant impediments to his getting the job. Underscoring Norbeck’s position, Lusk suggested that a preliminary sketch might help the doubters, who did not know his work and therefore could not “appreciate the difference between the run-of-the-mine architect [sic] and a Frank Lloyd Wright.” Lusk acknowledged that while it might be “nervy” to continue to press Wright, he hated “to give up in anything that means so much to my state.”

The entreaties had little effect. Wright refused to moderate his stance, adhering not only to his professional standards but also to his belief that political issues would impede the creative process. “Of course I am sorry to see the Sylvan project go in to more piled-boulder and peeled-log extravaganza. I hoped otherwise,” he wrote Norbeck. “But when the potential architect drifts into the hands of politics and local jealousies there is no chance for the ultimate building. History proves this. That is why any pushing on my part would get nowhere and would only exasperate everyone.”

Wright wrote in a similar vein to Gandy, expressing regret at losing the opportunity to develop a “fine example of modern building” at Sylvan Lake. He further looked “for an end to the piled-boulder
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and peeled-log extravaganzas” and the beginning of “rational build-
ing“ in the Black Hills. In an even franker communication with
Robert Lusk, whom he addressed as “My dear Bob,” the architect
wrote, “Let’s know when we are licked.” Wright told Lusk that the
project had offered him a chance “to do something fine,” but he
observed that South Dakota appeared “committed to piled-boulder
and peeled-log extravaganza, for this generation at least.” He con-
cluded, “To hell with the ‘politician’ where culture ought to thrive!”

Despite the political complications and Wright’s undiplomatic state-
ments, Norbeck continued to urge the architect to reconsider his
position, saying he thought there was “a fairly good chance” for
Wright to receive the commission if he would comply with the board’s
plan. Meanwhile, Gandy also wrote to Wright and again invited him
to submit a sketch. In reply, Wright repeated his objections to the
selection process, contending that it eliminated any “architect of con-
sequence” and would “automatically limit the field to young men
who have not yet made good.” In concluding, however, Wright made
it clear that he badly wanted the commission: “If ‘authority’ were to
give me a chance to work on a decent basis I would be only too glad
to work my head off to please because I hate to see so wonderful an
opportunity lost either to me or to you. . . . So please Mr. Gandy don’t
think me high-hat or unreasonable. I want to work with you all but
the free-for-all that politics asks me to join in puts me out of the
running completely. If you do not get what you want in ‘the run of
the pack’ and reject their plans—inclined to choose your own man—
in that case why not choose me?”

Perhaps feeling pressured to accept Wright, Gandy finally asked
for Norbeck’s opinion regarding the situation in a memorandum
dated 13 November. Their exchange illuminates the differences in
views about park development, tourism, and aesthetics between the
two men. Gandy wrote that he was “at a loss” about how to proceed,
given Wright’s continued refusal to submit a preliminary sketch. He
compared the process underway to the one used in his company’s
construction of a building in Boston, for which he had solicited

47. Wright to Gandy, 25 Oct. 1935, MF GO26, FLWF.
50. Gandy to Wright, 3 Nov. 1935, ibid.
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plans from a number of engineers. Norbeck replied, "I can not [sic] compare this with any of my business undertakings, and I do not think you should compare it with yours. The Park can not [sic] be handled as a coal mine. The Sylvan Lake feature has no comparison with utilitarian architecture in Boston or elsewhere. [sic] Art is possible at Sylvan Lake: you are limited in Boston."

Gandy also questioned the practicality of Wright's choice of location, believing access to be problematical and adjacent parking impossible. Norbeck dismissed these misgivings, saying that parking could be managed by "a man or a boy part of the day" and that access to the site was not an issue the board had to concern itself with. "The architect knows how to work out that, and this particular architect is a genius," he concluded.

Arguing that a hotel stay was merely an "incident" in a tourist trip and that the traveler's main concern was the cost of a room, Gandy expressed doubt that a Wright-designed hotel would attract tourists. In response, Norbeck insisted that the park needed to accommodate those tourists "who appreciate a beautiful setting, good accommodations and are willing to pay for same. That element is not large but it is the most important element in our tourist business." Norbeck drew a comparison with the Needles Highway, the road he had helped design in the early 1920s to take motorists through the park's unique rock formations. Not only did the highway make "a very favorable impression on the tourists" in comparison with other parks, but it also encouraged state pride, making "boosters of our own people." According to the senator, "art" appealed to "at least ninety per cent of our tourists, but in various degrees. It is, however, the magnet that draws."

Finally, Norbeck reminded Gandy of other risks taken that had paid off for the region's tourism industry:
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When we decided on the Mount Rushmore undertaking, we might have called for competitive sketches—and gotten none or gotten some, and made a bad guess on which was best, because we did not have enough talent on the Commission to understand. We made no mistake in turning the job over to the famous sculptor, with all his peculiarities. We are getting somewhere; we are going over big. The world is coming to look us over. This is possible only by ignoring the conventional which becomes necessary when we do an unconventional thing. . . . I think the opportunity at Sylvan Lake is something unusual.
and it is too good to miss. I know of no other man equal to Wright in this line of work, and I also recognize that no artist can tell us beforehand just how he is going to do the thing—not even a political artist employed to run a campaign can tell us what he is going to do; you have to trust to his statement and tie to him. The important thing is to make the best selection possible. I am willing to take the chance because I think the opportunity is great. . . . I am thinking that Mr. Wright could give us an unusual work of art in the hotel at Sylvan if given a free hand—that the harmony would be striking, that beauty would dominate, and that there would be no waste of money in connection with it.58

Outside of the commission itself, the choice of site was the most contentious issue between the two men. Norbeck and Gandy had initially agreed, at least nominally, that the hotel should be built near the lake, probably at the site of the former structure. Wright’s choice of a site behind and above the location of the old hotel seemed unsuitable to Gandy, who thought the only reasonable places for the new structure were either the location of the former hotel or on a ledge above and south of the lake, which had a wide view, enough room for suitable parking, and convenient access to an all-weather road.59

To Gandy’s concerns, Norbeck replied that he had given much thought to the location but also realized “how incompetent I am in passing judgment on something so new to me as a combined problem of architecture and landscaping.” The solution to that problem, he expounded, should be left to the artist. “Frankly, I am not going to set my judgment up against Mr. Wright’s,” he wrote. At the same time, however, the senator did not hesitate to pass judgment on the upper site Gandy now preferred. From that spot, Norbeck said, “Sylvan Lake does not look like a lake—it looks like a pond.”60
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Norbeck's letter to Gandy also suggests that government professionals had expressed opinions about the site and design of the hotel. Howard W. Baker, a National Park Service landscape architect, examined the potential locations and advised against the former hotel site in a report written in October 1935. He suggested instead the location on top of the hill south of the lake or one at the opposite end of the lake from the old hotel site. Norbeck may have been aware that professional opinion gave some support to Gandy's choice, but that opinion did not necessarily impress the senator. Norbeck differentiated between artistically talented men like Wright and Borglum and the government architects and engineers who displayed more technical and practical expertise. The senator informed Gandy that landscape architects were trained in plot or garden design, not what he termed "scenic landscaping." Landscape architects at the CCC camps, Norbeck contended, could provide assistance in those types of situations, but "they have no more understanding of a large scenic landscape problem than they have of the Wall Street market or the Mormon creed. We would have had no Needles Highway and no Iron Mountain Road if we had looked to the 'diploma boys' for a plan."

The location of the new hotel was debated throughout the decision-making process. At its 18 October meeting, the board narrowed the site choices to two: one at or near the former hotel, and the other at Gandy's preferred site on the mountaintop. Cook joined Gandy in supporting the upper site. In a subsequent letter to Wright, Gandy related that the board had "rather eliminated" all sites except that of the old hotel and the one on the hill. When Norbeck saw the letter he feared that Gandy's phrasing was designed to exclude Wright's choice.

Although he had previously discouraged Robert Lusk from addressing the controversy in his newspaper, Norbeck now suggested, "I think it might be well to have a little publicity on the matter, if it did
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65. Norbeck to Lusk, 9 Nov. 1935, ibid.
not lead to bitterness.” He knew his efforts to see Wright commissioned for the project might fail, but he also believed there was “more than one danger” in the situation, perhaps the worst of which was “Gandy’s determination to take the hotel away from the lake and put it on top of the hill.” A Wright commission would not only result in a significant building; it would keep the hotel near the water, where Norbeck wanted it.

The senator's continued support of Wright may have pushed Gandy to ask him again to submit a sketch in competition. Writing to the architect in mid-January 1936, Gandy advised him that the state had received PWA funds to cover part of the cost of the building. He told Wright the board wished “to erect the very best hotel” it could with the resources at hand, creating a structure of the most appropriate design for “the locality and the patronage to be served.” In the same letter, Gandy relayed the state attorney general's opinion that under state law, once an architect was selected and had produced plans and specifications, “the State Purchasing Agent will let the contract and the State Engineer will become the Superintendent of construction.” Although both the attorney general and the state engineer later assured Gandy that the park board would have a great deal of control in the process, Gandy seemed to be telling Wright that the architect would have very little.

Wright sent a copy of the letter to Lusk and asked incredulously, “What the hell?,” evidently referring to either the attorney general's statement or the fact that Gandy was requesting sketches yet again with no acknowledgment of Wright's objections to the process. “I am at my wit's end,” the architect responded to Gandy. He then went on to suggest something of a compromise in regard to the board's selection procedure: “It is not unusual—however—in similar circumstances

68. Gandy to Wright, 15 Jan. 1936, Folder Sylvan Lake Hotel, Rebuilding of, Box 70, Norbeck Papers.
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[involving political procedure]—for the authorities entrusted with the selection of an architect to especially invite one or more to submit plans on the regular basis fixed for such submission by the American Institute of Architects leaving others free to submit plans if and as they may desire. Would that be out of line with policy?"\(^{71}\)

Wright's somewhat obsequious reply to Gandy indicates that he had absorbed the messages Norbeck, Borglum, and Lusk had conveyed. Like it or not, if he wanted the Sylvan Lake commission, he had to be more realistic about the role politics played in the decision-making process, and he had to avoid alienating the person with the greatest power. Wright was willing to cooperate to a point, but he would not submit a sketch without remuneration. In response, Gandy, speaking for himself and not the board, admitted that he was "not as familiar as I might be with the type of work that you do." He remained firm, however, that candidates comply with the board's process, saying the state could not afford "two fees for architects."\(^{72}\)

Wright dropped his attempts to bow to politics in his reply. The architect indicated that Gandy had expressed a desire to build "the very best hotel possible with funds available" but noted, "If you will pardon me for saying so the procedure of your board in that direction is wholly incompatible with any such desire, certainly unlikely to achieve any such result." He minced no words in adding, "I should say your present situation and proceeding could not produce the best building even by accident. And I am sure the enlightened body of my profession would give you like assurance. I hope you will not consider this impertinent because if I did not believe you were sincere in your statement I would [not] say what I have said."\(^{73}\) Gandy made no more requests to Wright for submissions.

Early in January 1936, Governor Berry had begun to urge the process along. Gandy told him that sketches for both the upper and lower sites were arriving, and the board planned to select the location as well as the designs from the drawings. Norbeck, however, had no intention of considering a structure on the upper location.\(^ {74}\)

---
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When Gandy brought Norbeck some of the submitted sketches, the senator would not even look at those for the upper site, considering it "a crazy thought." Gandy's frustration and Norbeck's intractability may have increased the governor's desire to bring the matter to a close.

At the end of February, Governor Berry wired Norbeck and Gandy that the state engineer had to select an architect immediately because of deadlines for letting the contract. After receiving Berry's telegram, Norbeck wired back, reiterating his hope to hire Wright "in order to have something magnificently outstanding to harmonize with marvelous setting." To Robert Lusk, however, to whom he sent a copy of the telegram, Norbeck wrote, "You must not take the enclosed too seriously. I think the gates have been entirely closed on Frank Lloyd Wright." Wright, meanwhile, saw a newspaper story about the need to choose an architect for the Sylvan Lake Hotel and wrote Lusk on 10 March, saying, "Perhaps now is our time?" It was not. On the same day, area newspapers carried State Engineer Charles Trimmer's announcement that Harold Spitznagel had been selected to design the new building, which would be constructed on the site of the old hotel. Trimmer had reportedly made his decision after conferring with Ray Milliken and R. D. Cook.

After being notified of his selection, Spitznagel wrote to Wright to describe how he had received the commission. He explained that he had supported Wright strongly, especially to Milliken, "so much so that most of the architects in the state were in the mood to have me drawn and quartered." In December, Spitznagel said, Milliken in-
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formed him that the board wanted a South Dakota architect to design the hotel and asked him to submit a sketch. Not until the end of February, however, when he "was given to understand that my chances would be good," did he begin work on a design. Before he could complete it, he was called to the state capitol and given the commission. Spitznagel did not want Wright to think he had "obtained [the commission] by double-crossing you." In fact, the young architect believed his support of Wright had alienated some of the decision-makers.

An exchange of letters between Spitznagel and Milliken suggests a slightly different scenario. In mid-January, Spitznagel wrote to Milliken, saying he understood that Wright was no longer under consideration and that the board intended to choose "a South Dakota architect." He stated that under these circumstances, he be-
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lieved it “advisable” to submit a sketch and asked for a topographical map and additional information. Milliken replied that he had no knowledge of the board limiting the field to a South Dakota architect, and that if Wright were out of the running for the competition, he had “eliminated himself.” Milliken sent Spitznagel the topographical map, as well as information on proposed size and cost of the hotel, and specified that the “structure should be in keeping with the surrounding ruggedness.” Whichever account is more accurate, the designation of Spitznagel despite the fact that he had submitted no preliminary sketch is proof that the board’s process had failed, just as Wright had predicted.

Norbeck’s choice of architect had been defeated; his preference for a lakeside hotel met the same fate. On 13 May 1936, the Custer State Park Board, with Gandy, Cook and Milliken present, and with Spitznagel’s recommendation, decided to change the location of the new hotel to the elevation south of the lake. Spitznagel stated the upper site had good views, good light, room for parking and expansion, and presented no need for rock removal, as did the lakeside location. The site was officially changed by a resolution at the 28 July meeting.

The change of location came on the heels of a report written at Milliken’s request by the National Park Service/ECW landscape architect and architects connected with the CCC camps in Custer State Park. Submitted on Custer State Park Board stationery on 4 April, the report reflected National Park Service policies that promoted recreation and comprehensive planning. It criticized the old site, which, even though it presented “an ideal photographic setting of scenic value,” did not provide for adequate traffic flow or parking, or room for features such as swimming pools, tennis courts, and stables. The
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government architects suggested the selection of “a more spacious setting which would allow full unified development not as a picture, a bus depot, a lunch room, or hotel, but as a complete and conveniently organized unit dedicated to recreation.”

These comments summed up the aesthetic split between the Norbeck/Wright proponents, who envisioned a work of art at the lake, and the Gandy/Milliken group, who preferred a practical structure. With the change in site, the latter faction achieved its goal. The choice of Spitznagel, who had already designed a public-works project in Custer State Park, gave them an architect more likely to be amenable to National Park Service standards.

Soon after receiving the commission, Harold Spitznagel had told Robert Lusk that if the board agreed with his design, “I do not be-
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lieve that you will have to suffer the pangs of peeled log and boulder architecture.”** Completed in 1937, the structure was a departure from the usual rustic style, using no logs. It did, however, incorporate local rock and knotty pine and integrate historical references through the use of American Indian motifs. The commission helped establish the young architect as a prominent professional.

Peter Norbeck did not live to see the completion of the new hotel. He had been suffering from mouth cancer for several years and died on 20 December 1936. His brother Enoch was appointed to his seat on the Custer State Park Board. In 1936, Republican Leslie Jensen of Hot Springs defeated Governor Tom Berry in his reelection bid, and in August 1937, Claude Gray and W. C. Allen replaced Harry Gandy and R. D. Cook on the park board. The new board named Garret L. Owens of Viewfield to be park superintendent, with Enoch Norbeck
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voting against the appointment. The board asked Milliken, who was deeply involved in the building of the hotel, to remain on as foreman for the new superintendent. As a Democrat in a Republican administration, Milliken had anticipated his removal as park superintendent and had already contacted A. W. Powell, state chairman of the Democratic party, asking to be appointed to another position. "That," he wrote to a correspondent, "is the way of politics."

Thus, the political nature of the Custer State Park Board continued to determine the leadership and management of the park. For more than a decade, Peter Norbeck had been one of the most important forces in that management and, indeed, in developing tourism throughout the Black Hills. With the waning of both his health and political power, his influence declined until death removed it entirely. Frank Lloyd Wright, in contrast, was entering a most productive phase of his career, one that would reveal innovation and fresh creativity and produce some of his most famous buildings. He began conceiving one of his best-known structures at the same time he was attempting to obtain the Sylvan Lake Hotel commission. Wright's cantilevered design for a weekend home in rural Pennsylvania incorporated the rugged rocks surrounding it as well as the waterfall that gave the home its name. Fallingwater provides a dramatic example of Wright's organic architecture and ability to interpret landscape. It is considered one of the major architectural accomplishments of the twentieth century.

Wright's candidacy for the Sylvan Lake Hotel commission illuminates the political nature of the Custer State Park Board and superintendency in the 1930s. It also reveals the differences between his artistic vision and the views of park-service professionals. Norbeck believed that Wright would take the new hotel beyond the standard rustic style to a fresh interpretation of the landscape and establish a significant cultural landmark, one that would offer a new level of attraction to residents and tourists alike. Gandy, Milliken, and the government architects saw the most important factors as consistency,
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practicality, and opportunity for expansion, not the creation of a picture-perfect structure and setting. Wright's vision, rather than stimulating a fresh outlook in these men, helped align them against him. As Wright wrote to Gandy, “Great work does not know politics. Nor can politics make great work.” When art met politics in the Black Hills, art lost.
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