

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 16, 1961]

**STILL FAVORS WILDLIFE SANCTUARY—CULTURAL CENTER AS MEMORIAL TO T.R.
REJECTED EMPHATICALLY BY DAUGHTER**

(By Constance Feeley)

A new proposal for a Theodore Roosevelt memorial came to light yesterday, but it got a shadowy reception from T.R.'s daughter, Alice Roosevelt Longworth. The proposal was made by Neill Phillips, chairman of the influential Committee of One Hundred on the Federal City, who thinks part of Washington's planned \$75 million cultural center could be dedicated as a living memorial to the late President.

Informed of the idea, Mrs. Longworth, 76, indicated she has scant interest in massive cultural projects.

"The hell with the cultural center as a memorial," she said. "I flee from thinking about things like that. It has nothing to do with a memorial to my father."

By act of Congress, the surviving children of Theodore Roosevelt have the right to approve any design for a memorial.

The act was passed last year when Congress killed a proposal for a huge celestial sphere on Roosevelt Island in the Potomac. It died a day after Mrs. Longworth called it, with characteristic verve, a globular jungle gym.

She thinks Roosevelt Island should be preserved as a wildlife sanctuary, with only a modest type of memorial to her father.

Phillips, a retired rear admiral, agrees that parks and open spaces in Washington have reached the saturation point in monuments, and he said as much in a recent letter to conservationist Horace M. Albright, member of the Theodore Roosevelt Association which is considering designs for the memorial.

Noting that living memorials are becoming more and more popular, Phillips pointed to the cultural center as a most important example of a living memorial and suggested one of the center's units be named in honor of T.R.

In his letter, Phillips made passing reference to a proposed memorial for another Roosevelt, the late President Franklin D. That structure would consist of 8 concrete tablets ranging up to 165 feet in height. Phillips said it has caused widespread consternation.

Mrs. Longworth said she had nothing particular to say about the F.D.R. monument, because she is not involved in approving it.

"It's a strange and curious thing," she remarked. "Enormous, isn't it?"

[From the Sunday Star, Washington, D.C., May 14, 1961]

CITIES AND PEOPLE—MORE OR FEWER WORKS OF ART?

(By Robert J. Lewis)

Two thousand years ago, the debate over monuments and memorials was a hot one, too.

Long before Secretary Udall, the philosophers were wondering whether such reminders of men and events had any value.

Some of the loftiest commentators pretended to scorn the whole idea.

"I would rather have men ask, after I am dead, why I have no monument, than why I have one," said Marcus Cato.

A couple of hundred years later, Pliny the Younger called monuments "superfluous."

"If our lives deserve it, our memories will endure," said he.

Euripedes agreed.

"The monuments of noble men are their virtues," he said.

Such views have a plausible ring. But they all come from writers who hoped their works would live, be read, and serve as memorials, on paper, to their lives and thought.

"The most lasting monuments are the paper monuments," Thomas Fuller said. Writers, especially, seem to think this.

One writer who felt differently was William Shakespeare.

It was his opinion that a man should think about arranging his own memorial.