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The purpose of this project is to establish the historical significance and integrity of TB-9 (temporary building #9), within its historical context of association with an art movement and renowned ceramic artist, in order to determine its eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places. TB-9 is the location of the classrooms and studios used by the first sculptural ceramics program at the University of California Davis, and it continues to function in this capacity. Robert Arneson and his students started a novel figurative ceramics movement at this site that acquired the name “Funk” ceramics.

Sources of data used in this project include art history and biographical texts, exhibition catalogs, masters theses, journal articles, newspaper clippings, current art exhibitions, interviews, archival and contemporary photographs, maps, building records and architectural plans.
TB-9 is eligible for the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion A because the building is associated with the establishment of an original ceramic arts movement that influenced the development of ceramic art in the United States. The property is also eligible under Criterion B because TB-9 is associated with Robert Arneson, a nationally and internationally known ceramic sculptor who began the sculptural ceramics program at UC Davis and is recognized as the founder of Funk figurative ceramic art. TB-9 served as his studio as well as his teaching venue during the period of significance pertaining to this nomination. Although TB-9’s significant period began over fifty years ago, Criteria Consideration G applies because the building’s period of significance did not end until 1976. Extensive research demonstrates that TB-9 has exceptional importance. This establishes its eligibility for the National Register as a property that has achieved significance within the past fifty years. In addition to its historical significance under Criteria A and B, and Criteria Consideration G, TB-9 is eligible for the Register because it has retained its integrity with respect to location, physical appearance and association.
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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Temporary building #9, officially referred to as TB-9, was erected on the UC Davis campus in 1947 from World War II surplus purchased by the University. The facility has had a variety of uses, but is most important because it became the center for the new sculptural ceramics program established by Robert Arneson in 1962. Arneson began making nonfunctional figurative ceramic artwork that was humorous, irreverent and frequently offensive. His style was controversial among traditional ceramic artists, but his students were influenced by his attitude that ceramics was a fine art, and not exclusively the domain of conventional potters. These outrageous ceramic artworks became associated with UC Davis and specifically TB-9. Peter Selz, an art critic and director of the UC Berkeley’s University Art Museum, began referring to this new style as Funk ceramics, a moniker that became synonymous with TB-9 and figurative ceramic art.¹ Both this unique art movement and Robert Arneson garnered national and international recognition.

Because of TB-9’s association with the founding of an influential art movement and a famous ceramic artist, this project seeks to establish the eligibility of TB-9 for the National Register of Historic Places. Upon completion, the National Register nomination forms will be submitted to California’s State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) for certification that determines whether or not TB-9 meets the National Register

criteria. The SHPO recommends whether the property is significant at the national, statewide, or local level.

The first section of the second chapter reviews publications about historic preservation, including seminal textbooks, books about preservation theory and cultural resource management laws. This chapter discusses the reasons historic preservation is important, and what professional preservationists consider to be the best practices utilized in the field today. Also, the discussion includes anti-preservationist thought and alternatives to preservation. The remaining four sections of the chapter explain the process of establishing eligibility of a historic property. Guidelines for how to research a historic property include a list of questions that need addressing before a National Register nomination form can be completed. Understanding historic context and how to evaluate a property within its historic context is the first step of the process to determine eligibility of a property. The next section explains how to establish a property’s significance based on the four National Register criteria. The last section discusses how eligibility also depends on the property’s integrity, which is evaluated according to the Register’s seven aspects of integrity.

Chapter three establishes the historic context for TB-9. It discusses the history of TB-9, including the construction, multiple uses, and the conversion of the building into the UC Davis art department’s ceramic studios and teaching facility. Architectural drawings and photographs of the building’s interior floor plan during the period of significance, as well as the ceramic program’s current use of space, accompany this section of the chapter. The next section discusses the history of the UC Davis art
department, and outlines the evolution of the ceramic sculpture program. Richard Nelson, the chairman of the art department, and his role in the acquisition of a dynamic faculty is discussed along with reasons why UC Davis was a fertile ground for experimentation and creativity that led to the founding of a unique and influential figurative ceramic arts movement. The final section defines and differentiates between two California art movements that historically shared the moniker “Funk” art. Initially, the nonconformist art of the 1950s Beat generation was primarily assemblage (three-dimensional collage) art, and was labeled “funky” art. The “funk” art that is the subject of this project originated at UC Davis in the studios of TB-9 during the early 1960s, and this nontraditional work was figurative sculptural ceramic art.

The fourth chapter establishes the significance of TB-9 under two criteria and one criteria consideration defined by the National Register Criteria. The first section discusses TB-9’s qualification for the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion A because it is the site where the Funk Figurative Ceramics Art Movement began. This movement influenced and continues to influence the development of American ceramic sculpture. The second section discusses how TB-9 is significant under Criterion B because of its association with Robert Arneson. TB-9 served as Arneson’s studio and teaching venue during his tenure as the chair of the sculptural ceramics program at UC Davis. Arneson is nationally recognized as the founder of Funk Figurative ceramics. His work has been displayed in national and international exhibitions, and has been acquired by many public and private collectors. In addition to establishing TB-9’s significance under criteria A and B, TB-9 must also must demonstrate exceptional importance to be
considered eligible for the National Register because its period of significance does not end within the past fifty years. So under Criteria Consideration G, TB-9 can be found eligible for the Register through extensive research that confirms the impact of Funk Figurative Ceramics on the development of American ceramics, and Robert Arneson’s influence on the work of subsequent generations of ceramic artists. Also, chapter four discusses the evaluation of TB-9’s integrity. The building has retained its historic integrity with respect to location, design, setting, materials, feeling and association - all aspects that convey TB-9’s significance. The building’s exterior is recognizable by anyone who has been associated with TB-9 throughout its history.

The final chapter explains why TB-9 is important to preserve and summarizes the parameters that qualify it for the National Register of Historic Places. The completed National Register nomination form is included in this thesis as an appendix.
Chapter 2

HISTORIC PRESERVATION AND THE NATIONAL REGISTER

Theory and Practices of Historic Preservation

Historic preservation can be a controversial practice. A survey of literature written by professional historians and preservationists reveals that there are no definitive answers to questions such as, why is preservation important and what should be preserved? And who should interpret the past and whose stories should be told? Current practices and recent trends in the field reflect how preservationists struggle to find common ground with developers, investors and local planning commissions. The literature addresses conflicting perspectives between professional and amateur preservationists, but also discusses the philosophical changes that have led to productive partnerships and collaborative efforts to preserve the legacy of our nation.

Before undertaking a preservation project, it is important to understand the theory behind the historical preservation movement and establish why preservation is a desirable alternative to demolition. It is imperative that public historians are aware of the current best practices in the field of historic preservation, and they understand preservation law before nominating a property for a historic register at the local, state or national level. As preservation efforts expanded in scope after World War II, historians and preservationists saw a need for comprehensive academic training in historic preservation. During the early 1960s, James Marston Fitch began a certificate program in historic preservation at Columbia University. He published *Historic Preservation: Curatorial Management of the*
Built World to serve as an introductory textbook for his students. In his seminal work, Fitch states that a training program should prepare historic preservation specialists to collaborate with the numerous amateur preservationists, and prepare them to deal with the scope and complexity of the projects these non-professionals propose.\(^2\) He recognized that the preservation movement needed to change their exclusive practices. Historically, white, upper-class society was in charge of American preservation programs, so there was a bias towards preserving monuments, palaces, cathedrals and other structures that reflected the history of powerful and famous Americans of European descent. Consequently, the built environment of illiterate segments of society (slaves, white tenant farmers, the people of Appalachia), vernacular architecture and extant or prehistoric settlements were of little historic interest. Initially these properties were excluded from the National Register of Historic Places due to a lack of records and documentation of their existence, therefore eliminating any possibility of preserving them. Fitch wanted to see this attitude change to one of inclusiveness.\(^3\)

Fitch also recognized that the American philosophy of throw away the old and replace it with something new was a destructive practice. Post-World War II, instead of obsolescence meaning the result of physical deterioration over time, it now meant technological deterioration, where old tools, factories, buildings and other infrastructure were obsolete and obstructed progress. He argued against the notion that buildings have a


\(^3\) Ibid., 23-24.
finite lifetime, lose their usefulness, and should be replaced with new construction.\(^4\) Reusing buildings was a common practice through the end of World War II. Post-war consumerism and materialism created a disposable society where people believed that it was cheaper to demolish the old and replace it with something new. Reuse of buildings was viewed as an expensive practice because renovation was labor intensive, and labor in the United States was costly. Modernism also contributed to the belief that old buildings were old-fashioned and should be removed to make space for modern structures. If existing structures remained, most were modernized to appear new, a practice that destroyed their historic integrity. All significant features that dated buildings were either removed or concealed by plaster or paint. During the 1950s and 1960s, the government supported urban renewal by offering federal tax incentives for new construction, but they did not apply to preservation projects.\(^5\)

By the 1970s, Fitch relates that the public realized they were sacrificing their historic neighborhoods for skyscrapers and freeways. Americans began to embrace the philosophy that all old buildings have historical, economic and/or sentimental value, so preservation became a viable option for urban planners. He believes that historic preservation is both economically and culturally beneficial to communities. Restored and rehabilitated old buildings are no longer a liability but a source of tax revenue due to an increase in businesses and residents moving into revitalized urban cores. Fitch states that recycling of existing structures preserves energy, because old infrastructure contains residual energy that is wasted when they are demolished. A structure’s energy includes

\(^5\) Ibid., 165
the time it took to build it, its period of use, the fabrication of and investment in materials, the construction and craftsmanship, and the fuel that was consumed. Fitch also disputed the claim that labor-intensive preservation projects were more expensive than building new structures. By the mid-1970s, fuel and material costs escalated, so materials-intensive construction became cost prohibitive for many cities. During the 1980s, many community development programs took advantage of existing infrastructure, and began to preserve, restore and rehabilitate old buildings. This trend benefited the residents of old urban neighborhoods by preserving their history and saving their cities money by conserving capital, energy and materials. The labor-intensive nature of preservation projects also benefited communities by creating jobs. Extending the usefulness of older buildings proved to be more energy efficient than constructing new buildings because they were usually constructed with higher quality materials and were designed to take advantage of natural light and ventilation.

In addition to stressing the advantages of historic preservation, Fitch acknowledges that preservationists need to address the social and cultural problems that can result from the rehabilitation of inner city neighborhoods, such as gentrification. Historic preservation of old homes and buildings preserves the historic “fabric” of a community but it can result in residents losing their homes and businesses because they can no longer afford the cost of living in a revitalized urban core.

---

7 Ibid., 179.
8 Ibid., 40.
William J. Murtagh, a former director of the National Trust for Historic Preservation and the first keeper of the National Register of Historic Places, agreed with James Fitch that there should be academic training programs in historic preservation. He began to teach historic preservation classes in 1988, and saw a need for an introductory textbook on historic preservation. His book, *Keeping Time: The History and Theory of Preservation in America* (first published in 1988), is a text that defines the language of historic preservation, presents the history of the preservation movement, and explains federal preservation policies and laws. He covers the processes and methods that were established by the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966. Murtagh’s discussion of this landmark legislation emphasizes its impact on preserving both the built and natural environment. He views the NHPA as a reaction to the post-war federal programs that disrupted urban and rural communities, specifically the Department of Transportation’s interstate road program and the Department of Housing and Urban Development’s urban renewal programs.9

In his comprehensive coverage of Titles I and II of the NHPA, Murtagh emphasizes the act’s role in fulfilling the need for unifying the efforts of national, private and public preservation organizations by encouraging partnerships between them.10 He discusses the National Trust for Historic Preservation, established by Congress in 1949. As the largest, privately run national preservation organization, the National Trust represents the private citizen and their preservation issues. Murtagh recognizes the Trust

10 Ibid., 31.
for its contribution to the growth of local and statewide private preservation organizations
and its collaboration with public and national groups.\textsuperscript{11}

Title I of the NHPA established the National Register of Historic Places. The Register expanded the definition of historic preservation beyond a national level of significance to include significance at the state and local level. A goal of the Register is to identify historic resources worthy of preserving. This task is a collaborative effort that usually begins at a local or grass roots level. Title I provides the guidelines and procedures for identifying eligible properties and historic districts worthy of inclusion on the National Register. Title II established the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation; a group of professionals who apply Section 106 of the NHPA to evaluate the effects of federally funded or licensed programs on properties that are historically significant or eligible for the Register. This section restricts how the federal government can alter historic properties, but it does not prevent private citizens from modifying their property using personal funds.\textsuperscript{12}

Soon after the NHPA passed, the Secretary of the Interior, Stewart L. Udall recognized the value of decentralizing his new preservation responsibilities by delegating decisions to the states that concern identification of historic properties and impacts of federally funded projects on these properties. Udall requested that each state appoint a State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) to review nomination applications before they are submitted to the Keeper of the Register. Each state office hires professional historians, architects, architectural historians and archeologists to review the

\textsuperscript{11} Murtagh, \textit{Keeping Time}, 26, 157.

\textsuperscript{12} Ibid., 51-53.
applications. This policy is wise because it prevents potential conflicts over differences of opinion. The question of who decides what property has historic significance can be a contentious one. Udall believed that the states are more knowledgeable about local and regional histories, and therefore are better qualified to evaluate Register nominations. The initiation of the Section 106 process also begins at the state level with the SHPO. After the determination that the project is a federal undertaking, the state follows the procedures to carry out the Section 106 process. The state determines whether the undertaking affects any property on the Register or one eligible for the Register. The National Advisory Council reviews the state’s conclusions and has the final word on whether an undertaking has an adverse effect on historically significant structures.14

Murtagh’s book discusses specific types of preservation projects such as historic rooms and house museums, outdoor museums and historic districts. House museums, such as Mount Vernon, are a traditional way of preserving historic buildings. Frequently they are homes of historical figures, while other house museums and rooms are preserved because they are examples of significant architectural styles. Many of these museums are owned and operated by the National Trust.15 Outdoor museums, such as Colonial Williamsburg, are restorations, recreations or replicas of historic villages or towns. Their purpose is usually educational, and they interpret historical or cultural settings, eras or activities. The buildings function as venues for displaying historically significant artifacts, and in some cases, the structures are historically significant because they retain

13 Murtagh, _Keeping Time_, 56-57.
14 Ibid., 52-53.
15 Ibid., 63, 73.
their integrity and location.\textsuperscript{16} Some historians classify these museums as heritage tourism, especially if economic gain overshadows the preservation of artifacts and objects. Historic districts differ from outdoor museums because they consist of buildings, structures, objects or sites that are linked by past events and can be defined by a geographic area. Most of these districts are neighborhoods that have a distinct history, plan or building style. Local zoning laws and placement on the National Register contribute to the preservation of historic neighborhoods.\textsuperscript{17}

Murtagh devotes a chapter to rehabilitation, a trend that began during the mid-1970s due to federal tax reform. Rehabilitation is a type of preservation that converts a building to a use different from the use it was designed for, such as converting old warehouse buildings into artist lofts and entertainment venues. Rehabilitation or adaptive use is not as desirable as restoration, which returns a property to its original appearance at a particular time period. Adaptive use can threaten a building’s integrity if the alterations compromise features and elements that define its historical significance. Adaptations necessary to make the conversion economically viable have to be balanced with preserving the building’s character-defining features.\textsuperscript{18}

Recycling or adaptive use of old buildings became economically feasible when Congress initiated the use of tax incentives to preserve certified (certified historic by the Secretary of the Interior) income-producing properties. After passage of the Tax Reform Act of 1976, developers began investing in old buildings to adapt for new purposes. The

\textsuperscript{16} Murtagh, \textit{Keeping Time}, 75-76.
\textsuperscript{17} Ibid., 87.
\textsuperscript{18} Ibid., 99, 103.
Economic Recovery Act of 1981 improved and expanded tax credits for income-producing property. Certified historic property received 25% credit, while buildings at least forty years old received 20% and buildings thirty years or older received 15%. Wealthy investors abused this law so Congress passed a more restrictive Tax Reform Act (1986) that placed limits on credit amounts, and imposed strict eligibility requirements for receiving tax credits.\textsuperscript{19}

Historic preservation practice continues to evolve, and Murtagh discusses how the field has changed course over the past couple of decades. American society has become less Euro-centric and more culturally diverse, and preservationists are becoming more inclusive. They now recognize the historical significance of properties associated with American indigenous people, Latinos, Asians and African-Americans. Murtagh has observed a change in our attitude towards the preservation of landscapes. White European Americans are beginning to understand and respect the traditions of certain ethnic groups whose cultural identity is an integral part of the landscape. Native Americans view the land as sacred and believe its natural resources must be conserved for future generations. From a Euro-centric perspective, land is a commodity to be owned and developed.

People now see the destructive effects of sprawl on the environment and are interested in the preservation, restoration and rehabilitation of old buildings and neighborhoods to revitalize our cities. Murtagh sees an increase in large-scale preservation projects such as the development of National Heritage Areas. These areas

\textsuperscript{19} Murtagh, \textit{Keeping Time}, 58-59.
include multiple cities and towns or consist of large landscapes. The development of heritage areas begins at the grass roots. Historic preservation began with local activists who were concerned with preserving our national heritage, and Murtagh believes historic preservation will continue to depend on local activism.20

Like Fitch and Murtagh, Norman Tyler, an urban planner and professor at Eastern Michigan University, published a textbook on historic preservation. He originally wrote *Historic Preservation: An Introduction to Its History, Principles and Practice* for his students enrolled in his historic preservation course. Written in layperson’s language, Tyler views his book as a good resource for anyone interested in historic preservation. In addition to background information about the preservation movement, he uses examples of court cases concerning the preservation of urban historic buildings and districts to demonstrate how land use law was the basis for establishing a legal framework for historic preservation. Tyler’s book is also a good introduction to the methods and practice of historic preservation. One chapter discusses the important ideas and concepts that define the work of architectural historians, historic preservationists and architects involved with historic preservation projects. Tyler provides a survey of architectural styles that define American architecture, and he emphasizes the importance of placing buildings into a context of time and place to assure that preservation treatments of existing buildings and infill construction are compatible with the surrounding built environment. He also stresses the importance of design review. Developers and city planners determine whether to preserve buildings, demolish them or resort to façadism,

where new buildings are constructed behind the preserved exterior walls of historic structures.\textsuperscript{21}

In Tyler’s coverage of the United State’s preservation movement, he discusses the provisions of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, and outlines the process of Section 106 review.\textsuperscript{22} He describes how to nominate properties to the National Register of Historic Places. Tyler explains how to evaluate a property’s historic significance, and its retention of integrity throughout its period of significance.\textsuperscript{23}

Tyler also covers preservation technology. He explains the methods and materials preservationists use to protect and conserve historic buildings, sites and artifacts. The chapter defines and discusses the types of intervention strategies used when it is not possible to preserve structures without significant alteration. Tyler states that restoration is the best intervention because it is the least likely to destroy the integrity of a building. Other options are reconstruction of buildings or rehabilitation of structures to use for a new purpose (adaptive use).\textsuperscript{24} Tyler introduces research methods used in historic preservation to document the history of old buildings and districts. Extensive research is necessary for restoration work, and for qualifying a property for the National Register. He discusses how to conduct a resource search: reviewing the literature, using historic maps such as Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps, collecting oral histories, describing buildings based on visual observations, referring to blueprints, using photography to document

\textsuperscript{22} Ibid., 46-53.
\textsuperscript{23} Ibid., 135-154.
\textsuperscript{24} Ibid., 189-198.
existing conditions, and in certain cases, the examination and evaluation of archeological artifacts.\textsuperscript{25} Tyler also introduces the technology involved in the construction of buildings. This information is critical for preservation intervention such as restoration, reconstruction and rehabilitation.

Tyler’s discussion about the practice of historic preservation in the United States offers valuable insight into our attitudes concerning conservation and preservation of the American legacy. According to the National Trust for Historic Preservation, we must preserve because, we as a nation, have the responsibility to preserve our heritage and protect what is irreplaceable.\textsuperscript{26} This philosophy conflicts with the American ideal of seeking new ideas and opportunities, a way of thinking that informs our practice of disposing of the old and replacing it with something new. These attitudes have been imbedded in our psyche throughout our short history. Our belief in Manifest Destiny encouraged us to deplete and dispose of natural resources during our westward conquest of North America. The attitude that the environment was a consumable item began to change after World War II. After the razing of “blighted” urban cores to make way for urban renewal projects and freeways during the 1950s and early 1960s, many people observed that our irreplaceable historic properties were disappearing, and began to advocate for the preservation of property within their communities. Historic preservation has traditionally been a grassroots movement and local activism remains the impetus for saving old structures, objects and sites.

\textsuperscript{25} Tyler, \textit{Historic Preservation}, 202-220.  
\textsuperscript{26} Ibid., 297-298.
The preservation movement’s desire to preserve the existing built environment has its detractors. The movement has been accused of promoting anti-growth sentiment and hindering progress. Tyler disputes this claim and states that preservationists view the present as a product of the past, and the present has an impact on the future, so we will regret the indiscriminate demolition of historically significant properties that cannot be replaced.\(^{27}\) He also relates that preservationists do not oppose development but they do oppose “bad” development they define as construction that is insensitive to the existing environment. They view historic preservation as a tool for community and land use planning and believe that communities should integrate preservation plans into their comprehensive development plans.\(^{28}\)

Tyler promotes the idea that preservation can be profitable. Old buildings do not require building new infrastructure because they occupy sites where it already exists. He believes that the most efficient buildings are those that are already built because they can be adapted for new uses. Rehabilitation conserves energy because new construction requires massive energy to produce the building materials, and demolition of the old building requires energy and results in waste that is buried in landfills. This perspective has led to less animosity between developers and preservationists. Investors have discovered the economic advantages of preserving existing structures, especially since the introduction of tax incentives to preserve certified historic buildings. After the
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buildings are rehabilitated and used for businesses or residences, they generate taxes that contribute to the economic viability of a community.29

Tyler writes about the trend of partnerships between preservation organizations, private enterprise and local, state and federal agencies to promote both the preservation of our history and the economic development of our cities. An example of these collaborative efforts is the Mainstreet Program established by the National Trust in 1980. The Trust provides support for the revitalization of blighted urban cores by saving and adapting the old buildings for new uses. This program exemplifies how partnerships between developers and preservationists can combat the practice of demolition as a solution for urban decay.30 Near the beginning of his book, Tyler poses the question, “What role does historic preservation play in American society?” and he answers that it remains debatable because of the continuous shifting attitude about the value of preserving historically significant structures.31 The argument continues over who decides what is significant to preserve. But partnerships, such as the Mainstreet Program, are indications that the preservation movement in our country will continue to assure that we preserve our heritage.

Virginia O. Benson and Richard Klein wrote *Historic Preservation for Professionals*. Similar to Murtagh’s *Keeping Time* and Tyler’s guidebook, *Historic Preservation*, their book is a comprehensive coverage of historic preservation, but their book is written for a professional audience rather than students and amateur public

30 Ibid., 54, 60.
31 Ibid., 12.
historians. Benson and Klein’s book offers an in-depth discussion about how partnerships have been extremely effective in preserving historically significant property. Cooperation between preservation groups and organizations that represent both the public and private sectors demonstrate how preservation projects can stimulate economic development and play a role in urban planning. They claim that the sustainability of the preservation movement depends on these partnerships. Preservationists collaborate with environmental groups to advocate for new policies that will expand on and support existing laws that protect the environment.\textsuperscript{32}

Opportunities for collaboration with conservation groups are increasing due to the loss of integrity to the settings of historic property. Technology is responsible for many changes to our environment such as our reliance on cell phones that depend on communication towers that are unsightly additions to the landscape. Windmill farms produce inexpensive electric power, but their presence changes the ambiance of a setting. Preservationists can use existing preservation laws to combat inappropriate placement of infrastructure. Preservationists can also inform conservation groups about ways to prevent big box stores from wasting peripheral land and threatening the existing retail businesses in their community. Tax incentives are an effective means of encouraging developers to utilize rehabilitated buildings downtown instead of building new retail centers outside of the urban core. Adaptive use is a strategic way to maintain the

\textsuperscript{32} Virginia O. Benson and Richard Klein, \textit{Historic Preservation of Professionals}, (Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 2008), 169.
economic viability of communities because it also serves as a means to preserve their history.\textsuperscript{33}

Preservation organizations also form partnerships with developers to establish plans for appropriate new development in communities and historic districts. Historic preservation plays a role in selecting designs that will complement the existing built environment as well as in the restoration and rehabilitation of historic buildings.\textsuperscript{34} In addition to collaboration with developers, preservation groups partner with city planners to blend new construction with the existing buildings within historic districts. This trend is a part of the New Urbanism, a reaction to urban sprawl. Cities are employing mixed-use zoning that blends residences with businesses and are promoting the use of in-fill to reduce the reliance on cars. If people live where they work, there will not be a need for new roads.\textsuperscript{35}

Benson and Klein discuss issues that affect the practice of historic preservation. The Americans With Disabilities Act can have adverse effects on preservation projects because frequently the law requires modifications to historic property that destroy its integrity, such as ramps and elevators. Also laws that regulate public safety, such as the removal of asbestos, dangerous fire escapes, slippery floors, and unfenced balconies can discourage preservation of old buildings. Required modifications and removal of

\textsuperscript{33} Benson and Klein, \textit{Historic Preservation for Professionals}, 194.
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character-defining features damage the property’s integrity and eliminate the possibility it can be certified as historically significant.\(^{36}\)

The changing demographics of American society also can affect the practice of historic preservation. Our aging population is downsizing and relocating to warmer climates. Many retirees are attracted to urban areas where they can find small houses or apartments in close proximity to amenities. Historic preservationists have taken advantage of this need for more urban housing by partnering with developers to rehabilitate old historical buildings into loft housing and condominiums.\(^{37}\) This trend of retired affluent people repopulating older neighborhoods can displace long time residents who cannot afford the increasing taxes and rents. Although restored and rehabilitated old buildings transform former blighted areas into desirable places to live and contribute to the preservation of our past, gentrification is an exclusive practice. To combat gentrification, the Department of Housing and Urban Development offered financial assistance to residents of decayed inner city neighborhoods so that they could restore their old homes and turn their communities into historic districts recognized by the National Register. In some areas the effort to prevent gentrification failed because city officials repossessed decaying property by eminent domain to clear the site for new development.\(^{38}\)

Changing demographics has also resulted in the preservation movement’s reevaluation of whose history they are preserving. A variety of ethnic and racial groups
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live in the inner city, and preservation of particular historic buildings may be offensive to the existing population because they reflect white European culture. They want their history preserved as well, so the preservation movement is attempting to become more inclusive. In recent years, there has been an increase in the preservation of historic sites and structures that reflect the history of our country’s non-dominant cultures.\textsuperscript{39}

Benson and Klein discuss a recent trend in preservation partnerships, the rise in popularity of heritage tourism. The National Heritage Partnership Act of 2006, administered by the National Park Service, promotes the preservation of cultural integrity by establishing districts “where natural, cultural, historic, and recreational resources combine to form a cohesive, nationally distinctive landscape arising from patterns of human activity shaped by geography.”\textsuperscript{40} Partnerships consist of a variety of private and public organizations representing preservationists, environmentalists, conservationists, historians, and developers. There is no guarantee that these National Heritage partnerships will choose to represent the diverse histories of our nation.

In 1987, Robert E. Stipe and Antoinette Lee published \textit{The American Mosaic: Preserving a Nation’s Heritage}, a collection of articles written by prominent historians and preservationists. The book’s purpose was to introduce the public to the practice of historic preservation. In 2003, Stipe republished some of the original articles from this collection along with new articles in a book entitled \textit{A Richer Heritage: Historic Preservation in the Twenty-First Century}. Stipe’s prologue, “Why Preserve?” discusses seven reasons why historic preservation is important. He states that historic resources are
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our only physical link to the past, and these resources provide us with a way to recognize who we are, how we became who we are and how we are different from people in other countries. His second reason is that our physical past is a part of our environment and we attach meaning to these physical objects. His third point is that we save our physical heritage because it reflects our individuality and identity. Maintaining our identity as a nation is important in an era of globalization. Another reason we should preserve is because historic sites and structures are related to past events, eras and movements that are important to understand and respect. The history associated with preserved structures helps us appreciate the past beyond nostalgia and patriotism. Stipe’s fifth reason states that old structures have an intrinsic value as art, so their preservation saves our artistic heritage. His sixth point is that older structures are unique and exceptional and if destroyed, they cannot be replaced with a new structure. His last reason for preserving our past is that preservation can enhance the quality of our lives by improving deteriorating urban environments, and by alleviating social problems. Preservation can provide housing, schools, employment and encourage the integration of ethnic groups.41

Stipe’s seven reasons explicitly address the question, why is historic preservation important, a question that is still asked today. He suggests that many Americans do not value historic preservation so they will not be receptive to any reasons for preserving the past.42
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A Richer Heritage includes Stipe’s article, “Where Do We Go From Here?” He discusses the preservation movement’s significant change in emphasis over the past twenty years. There is a shift in focus from history, buildings, structures and artifacts to a focus on both physical and social community building. Socially, historic preservation has become more inclusive and diverse. Stipe believes these changes are due to a response to environmentalism, changing demographics, energy shortages and the impact of technology.43

Stipe believes a reality facing historic preservation is that it will always be dependent on some public support, although the majority of funding will come from the private sector and non-profits. He thinks historic preservation is not and probably never will be a valued public priority but if preservationists form partnerships with the environmental movement, preservation may become a higher priority.44 Another reality is that State Historic Preservation Officers (SHPOs) have to meet the demands of their governor and the demands of federal regulators. State governments focus on growth, economic development and progress, and do not always view historic preservation as a means to accomplish their goals.

In addition to resistance to historic preservation at the state level, Stipe identifies problems within the preservation movement that contribute to ineffective management of projects. One problem is the movement’s unwillingness to change their method of doing things, even if there are more efficient ways to reach a goal. Another problem is tension that builds within partnerships over unequal decision-making, and a third problem is the

43 Stipe, A Richer Heritage, 452.
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inability to see the long-term view.\textsuperscript{45} Stipe believes that preservation is best accomplished at the local level where residents are invested in projects that reflect their history and cultural identity. Local preservation organizations and community volunteers are the heart of the preservation movement.\textsuperscript{46}

Stipe observes that many communities now incorporate historic preservation into their city development plans, but he feels that local planning commissions need to become pro-active. Planners should be doing more than reacting to individual preservation proposals. Instead, they should be involved in planning large preservation projects that benefit their community.\textsuperscript{47} If everyone understood the benefits of historic preservation, there would be more money available for projects and increased government support. Stipe believes that the motivation to preserve must be ingrained in all of us. Preservation must become our way of thinking. Everyone has a stake in historic preservation because it (ideally) tells everyone’s story and it benefits our society.\textsuperscript{48}

In 2014, Michael A. Tomlan published a new textbook, \textit{Historic Preservation: Caring for Our Expanding Legacy}. He thought there should be a better book about historic preservation for students and practitioners. His book can be used as an introductory textbook, a reference book and a source for discussion and critical thought. Tomlan concentrates on the past fifty years of historic preservation with a focus on the last several decades. Many of the topics he discusses are covered in other preservation textbooks, so his book does not contribute a lot of new information about the practice of
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historic preservation. He begins with a history of historic preservation in the United States, introduces types of preservation interventions, discusses the economics of preservation, covers preservation law and chronicles the movement’s change of direction after the passage of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. Tomlan makes a point to say that his book does not focus on traditional artifact-centric historic preservation. Other historians and preservationists have documented that the preservation movement moved away from object-based preservation by the mid-twentieth century, so Tomlan’s idea to concentrate on post-war preservation practices is not a revolutionary approach.

However Tomlan’s book does contribute to the discussion about how historic preservation has become an inclusive practice where a variety of diverse organizations form partnerships to preserve the history of all our citizens. His emphasis on the preservation movement’s incorporation of socially progressive goals, and his discussion of the role faith-based groups play in historic preservation distinguishes his book from other preservation texts. These topics have not been traditionally included in introductory textbooks about historic preservation.

Tomlan views historic preservation as a social campaign composed of people who are interested in expanding the legacy and usefulness of existing buildings, structures and sights. Because preservation is a social activity, what is deemed significant depends on who was involved and why anyone should care. He defines historic preservation as the saving and caring for our cultural heritage. According to Tomlan, heritage is a combination of history and tradition, and culture consists of ways of thinking, feeling,
reacting and acquiring associations, beliefs, attitudes and values. Culture is the common understanding shared among a group of people.\textsuperscript{49} He agrees with other preservationists that the heritage of all sub-cultures must be incorporated into the over-arching American narrative. We are not exclusively preserving the heritage of the white European.\textsuperscript{50}

Tomlan observes that suburban developments are excluded from the realm of urban preservation organizations. Because many people believe that suburbia is devoid of cultural resources, old suburban buildings are in danger of being razed. Many of the older suburbs are well over fifty years old and these neighborhoods include numerous historically significant buildings worthy of preservation. Tomlan labels these older suburban communities “ethnoburbs” because immigrants now reside in most of the houses and own the majority of the businesses. The original white population has migrated outward to exclusive neighborhoods of “McMansions.”\textsuperscript{51}

When two culturally significant properties of different eras are located on the same land, preservationists have to decide whose history to preserve. Should the older historically significant property prevail? To illustrate this social dilemma, Tomlan uses the National Park Service’s decision to demolish Richard Neutra’s Cyclorama, a unique modernist building designed by an internationally famous architect, as an example. Neutra was commissioned to design a museum for the Gettysburg battlefield, and he designed it to house Philippoteaux’s famous 1883 mural, \textit{The Battle of Gettysburg}. The presence of the Cyclorama interfered with a restoration project that would return that
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portion of the battlefield to its original state. Although the Park Service acknowledged the historical significance of Neutra’s museum and admitted it was worthy of preserving, they continued with their battlefield restoration plan and razed the Cyclorama. The question of who gets to decide what history is the most important to preserve continues to be a contentious issue among preservationists.

Tomlan views faith-based community development as a socially progressive practice. Many religious groups have a history of assisting people in their community, regardless of faith. The involvement of faith-based groups in local historic preservation efforts is an extension of their sponsorship of hospitals, schools, retirement homes and other institutions that benefit everyone in the community. Tomlan mentions examples of churches converting their former religious space into day care centers, housing and health care clinics after experiencing declining membership. This is a good example of adaptive use of older buildings. Also, churches allow community groups to use their space for activities and meetings. Many religious groups also form partnerships with non-profit charities to deliver social services. Together they rehabilitate under-used sections of their church for use by social service providers. In some cases churches adapt part of their space to share with another religious faith.

Many non-profit, non-sectarian preservation groups value old religious properties. They apply for government grants to fund the restoration and repair of historic churches and other religious structures. The National Trust for Historic Preservation, a private
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organization, also awards grants and loans to fund both the restoration of religious property and the rehabilitation of religious buildings for reuse. These preservation projects concerning religious property avoid the conflict between church and state because the funding is either from a private source, or the government funds are awarded to secular preservation organizations. These examples of faith-based preservation efforts support Tomlan’s assertion that the practice of historic preservation has evolved into a social campaign.

Thomas F. King wrote *Cultural Resource Laws and Practice: An Introductory Guide* for use as a supplement to textbooks about historic preservation by Murtagh, Fitch and Stipe. His book is intended for college, university and continuing education classes in historic preservation, environmental studies, cultural resource management and social impact assessment. The focus of King’s book is the federal preservation system and how it affects compliance with federal cultural resource law. King begins with a short history of cultural resource management, but most of his book deals with federal laws that control the impact of government actions on the environment, including the cultural environment. His comprehensive discussion of the impacts of federal projects on historic properties and the process of review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) is the most applicable to the practice of historic preservation. Section 106 has been effective in preventing destruction of historical sites and properties by federal projects. King believes that cultural resources should be integrated into project planning. According to the NHPA, a cultural resource is a synonym for “historic
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"property" which refers to a known historic property or one that may be historic. Historic preservation deals with laws pertaining to historic properties, especially Section 106. Compliance with Section 106 means following the process outlined by NHPA that dictates what an agency must do to manage its impact on cultural resources. King discusses each step of the process that determines whether a federal undertaking will adversely affect historic properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places or are eligible for the Register. An undertaking is any project, activity or program funded or partially funded by a federal agency. If it is determined that there will be an adverse effect on a property, then a resolution is found through required consultation. The adverse effect must be avoided, minimized or mitigated. If no agreement is reached, then the undertaking is terminated or abandoned.

King states that there are problems with laws. Usually they have been written without a comprehensive vision. Sometimes laws contradict one another, and some laws have a broad range of interpretations. King’s book is a valuable resource because he is well versed in preservation law and he discusses the myths and misconceptions about compliance with each law. For example, many people believe that Section 106 requires a complete identification of all historic properties within the area of potential effects (APE) but the law does not state this requirement. Section 106 does say that a reasonable and
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good faith effort must be made to identify eligible historic properties within the APE.  

King’s guidebook is an asset for people working in the field of cultural resource management or historic preservation who need to interpret environmental law.

Diane Barthel’s monograph, *Historic Preservation: Collective Memory and Historical Identity*, is about the authenticity of historic interpretation and how it is influenced by collective memory and personal agenda. She defines historic preservation as the revaluing and representation of the past through saving, maintaining or reconstructing historic structures based on their local, regional or national significance. Barthel classifies historic structures as the tangible evidence of the past.

Historically the American preservation movement consisted of primarily white Anglo-Saxon Protestants from the upper middle and upper classes. Barthel claims that in addition to preserving their history, they viewed historic preservation as a vehicle to assimilate the influx of immigrants into American culture. They believed exposure to preserved homes of local heroes, revolutionary figures and presidents would teach civil obedience and help immigrants identify themselves as Americans. Consequently, early preservationists were accused of social elitism.

As American demographics changed, many urban areas became the home of numerous ethnic groups and cultures. Barthel observed that the preservation movement responded to these changes by striving for cultural pluralism regarding the interpretation of historically significant properties. Along with inclusiveness, she states that it is
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imperative that preservationists present authentic interpretations of historic structures and sites. Interpretation should never be self-serving of biased.\(^{64}\) Authenticity is a lofty goal due to the fact that history is a social construction, influenced by the viewpoint of the interpreter. Everyone has cultural capital. Barthel defines this as one’s class and family background that inform their tastes, attitudes, viewpoints and habits.\(^{65}\)

When people invest their cultural capital in historic preservation projects, sometimes their motivation is to increase their social status and/or their financial gain. With the rise in popularity of heritage tourism, Barthel is concerned that the preservationists involved with these projects replace the authentic interpretation of the past with their personal version of American history. She views John D. Rockefeller’s Colonial Williamsburg and Henry Ford’s Greenfield Village as mythological interpretations of the past. Both projects are infiltrated with the cultural capital of wealthy entrepreneurs. Local projects also can be guilty of romanticizing the past. Regional historic parks with themes such as the “wild west” or the “old south” tend to glorify and manipulate history when interpreting historic buildings and artifacts.\(^{66}\)

Ideally preservation groups should have diverse membership and be open to local ideas. Barthel feels they should encourage participation by amateur historians, especially if the historical narrative reflects their cultural background. Cultural groups should define their own values and have a voice in how they are interpreted. Many times, collaboration between the local community and professional preservationists leads to conflict. The
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professionals have knowledge about preservation practice and want to maintain control of a project so they can maintain authenticity. Frequently they believe the layperson would rather emphasize reconstruction of buildings and the recreational opportunities a project can offer, so they reject the ideas of local planners and residents. These conflicts are centered on the controversial question, who should decide what is preserved and how it is presented? Many preservationists believe these decisions should be professionally managed.\textsuperscript{67}

Barthel’s book presents historic preservation in terms of authentic interpretation. She warns of the inclination of preservationists to focus on their own cultural capital, and rely on collective memories that can result in a mythological interpretation of the past. Her monograph suggests that inclusion of the diverse cultural narratives that comprise American society, and collaboration between academic preservationists and local preservation groups can alleviate revisionist historical accounts.

Andrew Hurley’s monograph, \textit{Beyond Preservation: Using Public History to Revitalize Inner Cities}, promotes forming partnerships between historic preservationists and public historians as a way to create stable and collaborative communities.\textsuperscript{68} The premise for Hurley’s book is that history needs to be told from the bottom up. Hurley believes that when historical narratives are generated at the grassroots level, history becomes meaningful and empowers residents to participate in urban planning and invest
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in historic preservation.\textsuperscript{69} Shared authority creates useful public history. The vernacular and mainstream knowledge generated from personal and cultural experiences is equal in value to the scholarly background of professionals. Oral histories play a vital role in developing the historical narrative of a community because they reveal the perspectives of the people who live there.\textsuperscript{70}

Hurley writes about experimental partnerships between scholars and residents of urban neighborhoods. Through collaboration, they discover ways to utilize the built environment to tell the complex story of how a neighborhood evolved over time. A community’s story can involve numerous cultural narratives, each relating the story of a specific period of time when a particular ethnic group resided there.\textsuperscript{71} The interpretation of a place must also include its physical environment. Preserving the historic buildings, structures and significant sites present in urban neighborhoods preserves the distinct and rich history associated with it.\textsuperscript{72} In addition to preserving history, a community benefits from the preservation, restoration and rehabilitation of old historic buildings because preservation projects can stimulate the economic development of the inner city.

Hurley admits that professional-amateur partnerships can be challenging. The group will only be successful in fulfilling its goals if its members enter into the partnership with a collaborative attitude and the willingness to negotiate in good faith. There has to be mutual respect and genuine interest in each other’s ideas, otherwise
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reaching a consensus will be impossible. Both the historical narratives and the historic infrastructure associated with them should reflect everyone’s cultural identity.\textsuperscript{73}

The nine textbooks and monographs included in this literature review offer a variety of perspectives on the practice of historic preservation in the United States, and discuss reasons why preservation is important to our society. Norman Tyler and William Murtagh’s textbooks provide a good introduction to historic preservation. Several of the monographs in this survey, such as Hurley and Barthel, cover topics and issues in greater depth than the textbooks, so their books can serve as supplemental reading for preservation courses. King’s book is specifically about environmental law and is a valuable resource for students who are interested in either historic preservation or cultural resource management. All of these books contribute to the discussion about how partnerships and local activism play key roles in the success of the preservation movement. These authors also add insight into the controversies that arise from historic preservation efforts by presenting the issues from multiple viewpoints.

\textbf{Researching a Historic Property}

Before conducting research on a property, the historian should contact the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) at the Office of Historic Preservation (OHP), who can provide a copy of the state’s inventory documentation to find out if the property has been surveyed, and if it is listed on the State or National Register. The OHP also has information about National Register forms, guidelines and procedures concerning a

\textsuperscript{73} Hurley, \textit{Beyond Preservation}, 147.
National Register of Historic Places nomination. The National Park Service’s National Register Bulletin #39, “Researching a Historic Property,” lists questions that need answering before a National Register nomination form can be completed:

- What was the property’s name during the time it was associated with the events, persons or physical character that define its significance (the period of significance)?
- How many buildings, structures, and other resources make up the property?
- When was the property constructed and when did it attain its current appearance?
- What are the property’s historic characteristics?
- What changes were made over time and when did they occur? How have they affected its historic integrity?
- What is the property’s current condition, including the exterior, interior, setting and grounds?
- How was the property used during its period of significance and how is it used today?
- Historically, who occupied or used the property? Individually, did they make any important contributions to history? Who is the current owner?
- Was it associated with important events, activities or persons?
- Which National Register criteria apply to the property? In what areas of history does the property have significance?
- How does the property relate to the history of the community where it is located?
• How does the property illustrate any themes or trends important to the history of its community, State or nation?
• How large is the property, where is it located and what are its boundaries?
• Is this property part of a historic district?74

These questions provide a framework and a checklist for conducting research. When completed, they provide the critical information needed to nominate a property for the National Register of Historic Places.

**Evaluating Historic Context**

A property must be evaluated within its historic context in order to support its historic significance. The historic context includes information about the period, place, and the events that created or influenced the background that contributed to the historic property’s significance. The historic context should address the aspects of the history of the community that pertain to the history of the property. Historic contexts can be based on a theme that is significant in the history of a local area, the state or the nation. A theme is considered significant when scholarly research can establish its importance in American history. Property types can also serve as a basis for historical context. The context can include a variety of property types or a single type of property. Another basis for historical context are historic associations with specific events, individuals, or
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architectural features that reflect their function. Also, historical context can be based on a property’s physical features that reflect its significance.\(^75\)

**Evaluating Significance**

Establishing the significance of a property depends on its period of significance and its association with one or more of the National Register Criteria that define significance. The period of significance is the time period in which the property was associated with important events, people or physical characteristics. There are four National Register Criteria for the evaluation of significance:

- **Criterion A** recognizes properties that are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history. The property may be associated with a specific event and/or it may be associated with a pattern of events. The event or patterns must be important within the historical context of the property.

- **Criterion B** recognizes properties that are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past. The person associated with the property must be significant within a historic context, and must be an important individual within his or her profession or group. In addition to documenting the significance of the individual, it is necessary to document the person’s association with the property during the time he or she achieved significance (period of significance). When compared with other properties the individual was associated with during his or
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her lifetime, this property must best represent the person’s contributions to history.

- Criterion C recognizes properties for their distinctive characteristics of a type, period or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable district whose components may lack individual distinction. A property must possess enough physical features and traits that define a specific type, period or type of construction. These characteristics include form, proportion, structure, plan, style or materials. A property that is nominated as the work of a master must be an example of a specific time period or phase of the master’s career, a category of his or her work, or a particular theme or idea expressed in his or her work. Because a property is designed by a famous architect does not necessarily determine its significance. Masters are recognized for their talent and high level of skill, but an anonymous craftsman may also qualify as a master if his or her work has a style or quality that is distinguishable from the work of others. A property’s expression of high artistic values, a design concept or an aesthetic ideal must exceed that of other properties of their type.

- Criterion D recognizes properties that have yielded, or may be likely to yield information that is important in prehistory or history. Many properties that qualify for the National Register under this Criterion are archeological sites. These properties contain or may possess artifacts, structural remains, and natural or cultural features that make it possible to hypothesize about events, groups and
processes, or supplement and validate existing information, or can identify and explain discontinuities in the archaeological record for an area. In addition to archeological sites, buildings, structures and objects that are the principal source of important information can become eligible for the Register under Criterion D. All properties that qualify under this Criterion must be associated with human activity, and all information that these properties yield must be evaluated within their historical context.

Religious properties, moved properties, birthplaces and graves, cemeteries, reconstructed properties, commemorative properties, and properties achieving significance within the past fifty years are usually not eligible for the National Register. These properties can gain eligibility if they can meet the special requirements designated by the Criteria Consideration specific to their particular category.76

**Evaluating Integrity**

A property’s integrity is established by evaluating its ability to convey significance based on the seven aspects of integrity: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association. The location of a property is where it was constructed or where a historic event occurred. A property’s design refers to its form, plan, space, structure and style. The setting is a property’s physical environment, which includes both natural and man-made features. Materials are the physical elements that

were combined or deposited to create the property, and the property’s exterior must retain
the materials that date from its period of historic significance. Workmanship refers to the
craft of a particular culture during a specific period of history or prehistory. Feeling is a
subjective evaluation of integrity and it is a property’s ability to convey an aesthetic or
the historic character of a defined period of time. Association is an evaluation of a
property’s link to an important historic event or person and how it conveys that
relationship.

Retention of integrity under design, materials and workmanship are not as critical
for demonstrating significance for properties that are significant under Criteria A and B,
but ideally, these properties should retain some features of each aspect of integrity. The
most important means of determining the integrity of a property found significant under
Criteria A and B is evaluating whether the condition of the property today would be
recognizable by people who were contemporary to the property’s period of significance.
Properties significant under Criterion C must retain the physical attributes that define
their type, period or method of construction, therefore, their ability to convey significance
depend more on the aspects of design, materials and workmanship to demonstrate
integrity. The aspects of integrity that are the most applicable to establishing the integrity
of properties under Criterion D are location, design, materials and, in some cases,
workmanship. The aspects of setting and feeling may not be an accurate assessment of a
property’s integrity with regard to its ability to yield important information.77

77 US Department of the Interior, National Park Service, How to Apply the National Register Criteria for
Evaluation, National Register Bulletin 15 (Washington, DC, 1997), 44-49. Source of all information in the
section, “Evaluating Integrity.”
Before the National Register Criteria can be applied to a property, its historic context must be established through research and documentation. A property’s significance and integrity is only reliable when the property is evaluated within its historic context. After a property is determined to be eligible for the National Register based on its significance and integrity within its historic context, it can be nominated for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places by submitting a National Register Registration Form.
Chapter 3
HISTORIC CONTEXT

History of TB-9

TB-9 was constructed from surplus war housing sections that the University acquired through the temporary Federal Works Administration Program.\textsuperscript{78} Enrollment increased by 50\% at UC Davis during the 1946/1947 academic year, which resulted in a severe shortage of classroom and residential space. Purchasing military surplus buildings allowed the University to erect economical housing, classrooms and offices in a short period of time to accommodate the rapid expansion of the Davis campus. These temporary buildings were converted Quonset huts, recreational halls, barracks and cafeterias that were shipped to the campus from a military storage facility in Benicia.\textsuperscript{79} Seven permanent buildings were scheduled for completion by 1949, including Haring Hall, the new veterinary school, other academic buildings and dormitories.\textsuperscript{80} Many of the temporary buildings were razed after the new facilities were completed.

Originally TB-9 was designed by the UC Davis Office of Architects and Engineers to serve as overflow student housing and was named the Warehouse Dormitory. It served in this capacity until 1951 when Beckett and Hughes Halls, the first

permanent dormitories, were built.\textsuperscript{81} Between 1951 and spring of 1962, when Robert Arnesson arrived on campus, TB-9 housed the campus police department, the mail department, a Food Science library, a storage area for ice cream cartons used by Dairy Sciences (they made ice cream in the Dairy Industry building located across Hutchinson Drive from TB-9), and a lab storage area for Food Sciences experimental canned goods. Initially, about one fifth of the space was dedicated for use by the art department. In late 1962, Tio Giambruni began constructing a foundry in TB-9 that consisted of a burn-out kiln and casting area for metalworking. He was hired a year before Arnesson and was responsible for starting the metal casting program at Davis (fig. 1). The foundry shared space with the ceramic art kilns.\textsuperscript{82} By the early 1970s, the other occupants had moved out of TB-9, and the building became the sole domain of the ceramic arts program. Giambruni died in 1971, and the foundry was removed and replaced with additional kilns for firing ceramic ware.\textsuperscript{83}

During the mid-1960s, the art department planned to incorporate the ceramics facility into the new art building that was completed in 1966. The proposed space for the ceramics program was the area that became the art gallery storage room. Arnesson recognized that the proposed space was too small, and the blow-off from the foundry and the excessive dust created by the clay mixer would have to be vented through the roof of


a three-story building, which would be very expensive. So Arneson contacted one of the university’s engineers and invited him to observe the ceramic program and document what special accommodations were required for both their needs and safety. After evaluating the feasibility of relocating the ceramics lab to the new building, the art department decided to keep the program in TB-9 and upgrade that facility with improved ventilation and heating, a decision that saved considerable expense. Because of Arneson’s foresight, TB-9 was removed from the list of buildings scheduled to be demolished.\textsuperscript{84} In a November 4, 2014, interview, Annabeth Rosen, the current chairperson of ceramic sculpture, verified that TB-9 is considered the permanent facility for the ceramics art program. Under the tutelage of Dr. Rosen, new generations of artists study and create innovative figurative ceramic artwork within the walls of this iconic building (fig. 2).

In 1947, TB-9 was built at its present location on the southwest corner of Old Davis Road (A Street in 1947) and Hutchinson Drive. Several books and articles about TB-9 and Robert Arneson suggest a different construction date and report that the building was erected by the Butler Manufacturing Company in the late 1920s. This idea originated from the fact that the campus did acquire corrugated metal grain bins built by Butler, a company that contracted with the U.S. government to supply 14,500 metal grain storage bins for Midwestern farmers during the bumper harvest of 1938-39.\textsuperscript{85} Even


Arneson believed that TB-9 was a 1920s vintage Butler building. But UC Davis building records and plans as well as aerial photographs taken of the campus in 1941 and 1952 verify the construction date for TB-9 as 1947 (figs. 3-5).

The property is bounded by Putah Creek on the south, Cushing Way on the west, Hutchinson Drive on the north and Old Davis Road on the east. The site is approximately 0.62 acre, and is heavily forested along the creek. TB-9 is a single-story, 8,000 square-foot rectangular building with an east/west dimension of 160 feet, and a north/south dimension of 50 feet (fig. 6). The building is constructed on a cement slab foundation. Its exterior walls and low pitch front gabled roof are made of 18 gauge corrugated aluminum sheeting. The building does not have eaves, although the roof’s metal sheeting does overhang both the north and south walls by a few inches.

The main entrance to TB-9 is centrally located on the west wall of the building. It is a metal double door, each with a single square window in the upper half. Directly above the doorframe is a large rectangular six-paned window that extends beyond the width of the doorway. On both sides of the doorframe are wide, sliding metal panels that extend from the ground to top of the large rectangular window. The upper edges of the panels are attached to a track so that they can slide over the entryway (fig. 7). There is a metal strip that extends the length of the window and panels. Above the metal strip is a large rectangular louvered vent that is centered directly below the gable. There is a wall-mounted sconce (curved neck) light installed between the gable’s apex and the vent. To the left of the main entrance is a single non-glazed metal door whose access is blocked by
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a metal railing. A rectangular, corrugated aluminum storage shed extends westward from the wall and attaches to the building between the south side of the main doorway and the southern edge of the wall. The shed’s non-glazed (no windows) metal double door is located on its north wall with the northern edge of the foundation flush with the level of a concrete porch. The shed’s remaining foundation is raised on wood stilts (piers) that are mounted on cement footings imbedded in the asphalt pavement of the driveway. The low sloping gabled corrugated aluminum roof overhangs the shed on the north and south sides, forming deep eaves (fig. 8). A gradual sloping cement walkway parallels the wall, with a single step leading up to the cement porch in front of the entryway. An approximately three-foot high concrete block wall defines the path’s outer edge, and a metal railing extends the length of the block wall. Another railing extends along the inner edge of the walkway and ends at the start of the porch (fig. 9).

The southern elevation runs parallel to Putah Creek. There is a wide cement patio of varying width along the length of this side of TB-9. Large ceramic artworks sit on raised beds of wood ships or on wooden pallets either next to the building or along the fence separating TB-9’s yard from the Creek. The south side of the shed projects from the western edge of the building. The shed’s south wall consists of a metal door on the left side, and corrugated aluminum covers the right side (fig. 10). The south wall has a series of parallel pipes, mounted between the roofline and the top edge of the windows, that run eastward and end at a roll-up steel door. There are six triple sets of combination style windows separated by sheets of corrugated aluminum. The first three sets of windows on the western end contain swamp coolers mounted by two brackets to the aluminum siding
below. Each triple set is composed of two outer windows, each with six panes and a middle window with twelve panes. The top and bottom rows of each window are fixed while the middle section can open outward like an awning window (fig. 11). All windows extend from the roofline down to the midline of each wall. The lower pane of the left window of the fifth triple set from the western end was removed to accommodate a steel door. Mounted on the roof, above the eastern most set of windows, are eight conical cap chimneys of various heights that cover the flues from the kiln room below (fig. 12). There is a metal roll-up door surrounded by corrugated aluminum siding east of the last triple set of windows. East of this door is a large double metal paneled door that extends the height of the building. There are two curved aluminum vents on the roof over the paneled door to disperse clay dust from the mixing room, and east of the vents is a conical chimney cap covering a flue over the clay mixers (fig. 13). Aluminum siding fills the area between the eastern edge of the paneled door and the southeast corner of the building (fig. 14).

The eastern elevation faces Old Davis Road and is enclosed by a new decorative fence (built in 2013). There is a wide cement sidewalk along the length of the eastern wall, and between the walkway and fence are piles of bricks and ceramic ware. At the northern end of the sidewalk near the northeast corner of TB-9 is a large air conditioning unit. The center of the façade has a large double metal paneled door attached to a track mounted on the lower edge of the gable. This door is identical to the entryway panels on the western wall, except that these panels are moved together and locked in place. The panels do not cover a doorway, so when they slide apart, they create an opening in the
eastern wall. Directly above the slider, there is a large louvered vent that matches the vent on the western elevation. A wall-mounted sconce light is installed over the vent, just below the apex of the gable. To the left of the door and placed just below the lower edge of the gable, is a smaller louvered vent for the fan inside the clay mixing room located on the other side of the wall (fig. 15).

The northern elevation is parallel to Hutchinson Drive, and the façade is obscured by dense shrubbery (fig. 16). The northern wall has six sets of windows that are the same style as those installed on the southern wall. There is a metal strip that runs the length of the northern wall just below the roofline. The upper edge of each window frame is flush with the bottom edge of the strip, and the windows extend halfway down the side of the building. Corrugated aluminum sheeting fill the spaces below and between the windows. Beginning at the eastern end of the wall, there are two sets of triple windows, and a double metal door to the west of these windows. The top half of each door has a rectangular window, and the height of the doors extends about one foot above the windowsill on the left. Encased electrical wiring frames the door. A sconce light is mounted above the door. A cement slab extends from the foundation to the right of the door. There is a metal trap door on top of the slab with some narrow rectangular holes punched through its surface. It has a metal handle used for opening it. According to Annabeth Rosen, the ceramic department chair, underneath this door are the controls to turn on and shut down the building’s piped steam heating system (fig. 17). On the west side of the door is a triple window, and on the roof above this window is a tall conical cap chimney that covers the flue venting the hooded spray booth inside of the glaze room.
West of the conical cap chimney is a Swiss cap covering a vent for the bathroom fan (fig. 18). A swamp cooler extends from the aluminum siding between this triple window and a double window (instead of a triple window) to the west. The double window has one six-pane window and one twelve-pane window and it is the third set of windows from the west end of the wall. There are two triple windows further west along the wall, and each have a swamp cooler mounted in their frames.

Entering TB-9 from the west, the doors open into a narrow corridor with cement floors (throughout the building, there is no flooring installed over the cement slab foundation). Florescent lighting illuminates the hallway, as well as all of the other rooms in TB-9. The double doors on the north side open into Dr. Rosen’s studio (previously Robert Arneson’s studio), and the door to the east of her studio opens into the technician’s office (fig. 19). Doors on the south side open into graduate student studios. The hallway, its adjacent rooms, the bathrooms, the glaze room and the library have ceilings and gypsum walls (fig. 20). The corridor opens into the advanced student studio-classroom on the south, and the bathrooms, glaze room and library are located to the north of the studio (figs. 21-22). The advanced studio’s east wall, composed of concrete block and corrugated aluminum, divides this workspace from the kiln room (fig. 23). The northeast corner of TB-9 is a large open space that houses the undergraduate studio. A concrete block and corrugated aluminum wall on the south side of this studio separates it from the kiln room (east of the advanced studio) and clay mixing room located in the southeast corner of the building (fig. 24). Steel girders and supports for the roof are visible inside of both studios. All of the plumbing and plastic roof insulation is exposed
along with the ventilation ducts. Inside of both studios, gypsum board lines the spaces between the windows and the floor and sprayed insulation is visible in the spaces between window units. When TB-9 was constructed, the insulation was sprayed onto the inside of the corrugated aluminum sheeting (fig. 25). Inside the kiln room, the west end and former foundry, houses three large gas-fueled kilns (fig. 26). The east end has seven electric kilns (fig. 27). The clay mixing room contains two large clay mixers, a red metal casting slip blunger. Casting slip is liquid clay that is poured into plaster molds to make pottery and sculptures. The blunger continuously mixes the slip so that it will not settle. Most slip is white low-fire earthenware, but it can be made from other types of clay. The west end of the clay room is a storage area for bags of powdered clay (fig. 28-29).

The exterior of TB-9 has not changed significantly since it was constructed. There were some exterior changes when the building was converted from a dormitory to a mailroom, police station and storage area in 1951. When TB-9 was a dormitory, the sliding dock doors that were in place on the east and west elevations when the building units were acquired from the government were closed and locked. The entrance to the building was on the northern elevation through two doors on either side of the bathroom complex. On the west elevation, a doorway was added to the space behind the double metal sliding panels on the west wall and this was now the main entrance to TB-9. Also, a covered mail dock was added to the southern end of the west wall (where the storage shed is today). During the 1951 conversion, the eight sets of windows along both the north and south elevations remained in place, including the swamp coolers. Additional
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87 I learned about slip casting by observing students slip cast during a visit to TB-9 on February, 23, 2015.
changes were made to the exterior after the art department moved into the southeast section of the TB-9 in 1961. On the southern elevation a ten by ten foot roll-up door was initially installed in place of the third window unit down from the west end. In 1975, the roll-up door was de-installed and swapped positions with one of the kiln room window units. A large ceiling-to-floor metal paneled double door replaced the window unit at the east end of the southern elevation. Both the roll-up door and the metal paneled double doors are still in these locations on the south wall. In 1967, a double door was installed in place of the existing single door entry. On the left of the new entry a single door was installed as part of the mailroom remodel. Mail slots were cut into the wall between the double and single doors (fig. 30).

Since 1951, most of the alterations to TB-9 have been to the interior due to the building’s variety of functions since its inception. When the building was the Warehouse Dormitory, a central corridor divided the space into north and south sides. The western and eastern thirds of the building were each divided into six rooms, three on the north side and three on the south side of the hallway. Each room housed twelve students in six double beds. The middle third of the building contained a large bathroom facility with multiple sinks, toilets and showers on the east side, and a study hall on the west side (fig. 31). By 1961, the campus police station occupied the east side of the western third of the old dormitory. Across the hallway, the mailroom was in the southwest corner of TB-9 and occupied the equivalent of two dorm rooms (fig. 32). When Robert Arneson arrived in 1962, the art department’s space consisted of the old dorm room east of the mailroom, the old study hall space and the dorm room east of the study hall. The majority of the
space in the east end of TB-9 was storage space for Food Science and Dairy Science along with a room for the Food Sciences library. The bathroom had been reduced in size. The rooms housing the sinks, showers and drying rooms were removed. By 1967, the police station had moved out, and the mailroom expanded into the station’s space (fig. 33).

By the end of the 1960s, the ceramics program occupied all of the space in TB-9. There have not been major changes to the floor plan and use of space since alterations were made to the interior in 1975. One of the significant changes was the removal of the foundry. It was located in a room west of the original kiln room. After Tio Giambruni’s death in 1971, the metalworking program was discontinued so there was no longer a need for the foundry. The kiln room was on the east side of the foundry. By removing the wood stud and gypsum wallboard partition between it and the old foundry, the kiln room doubled its area (figs. 34). Because the ceramics program had expanded, they needed additional kilns to fire a greater volume of artwork. The walls surrounding the clay mixing and storage room and the kiln room were rebuilt. An eight-foot high concrete block wall was built on a reinforced foundation. Corrugated aluminum was installed on top of the blocks extending to the roof. Eight-foot hollow metal doors were installed in the entryways of both of these rooms, closing them off from newly expanded student studio workroom. Removing wallboard partitions between both classroom-studios and the old central corridor increased student workspace. Also in 1975, on the north wall, the old entry door to the west of the bathroom was removed. On the south wall, a door was installed in the smaller student studio that opened out onto the south patio. Today, the
interior layout of TB-9 is very similar to the floor plan created by the 1975 alterations. The most recent change was the removal of the wall between the faculty studio and the old office located in the northwest corner of the building (fig. 35).

TB-9 is surrounded by fencing except for the northern boundary where the building is adjacent to the sidewalk along Hutchinson Drive (fig. 36). The chain link fence that surrounds the south patio was installed in August of 1967. It begins ten feet east of the southwest corner of the building and extends fifty-three feet south from the wall of TB-9. The south fence line travels along a northeast/southwest diagonal, and connects to a new decorative metal fence that replaced the 1964 wood screen fence between TB-9 and Old Davis Road (A Street) on the east side (figs. 37-38). The fence is composed of corrugated aluminum sheets attached to metal posts. A wavy line, cut into the aluminum sheeting, adorns the northeast corner. Christina DeMartini Reyes of the UC Davis Campus Planning and Landscape Architecture department and Annabeth Rosen, the Robert Arneson Endowed Chair of the ceramics program, designed the fence, and it was installed in May of 2013 (fig. 39). According to Reyes,

Given the creative work taking place at this location every day, not mention historically, I knew we needed to create something out-of-the ordinary while staying within budget. Sure it’s just a fence, but a fence worthy of the program behind it, and one that actually gives passersby a glimpse into a UC Davis academic program they may not have know about before.\(^88\)

History of the UC Davis Art Department

In 1909, the Davis campus opened as the University Farm School for the University of California, which at the time consisted of a single campus in Berkeley. The Farm School evolved into the College of Agriculture, and offered a four-year degree through UC Berkeley. In 1952, the College of Agriculture separated from Berkeley and became an independent campus of the University.89

The College of Letters and Science at UC Davis began in the fall of 1952, and the section of Philosophy and Fine Arts offered the first art classes in drawing and art appreciation. Richard L. Nelson was the first professor to teach these classes, and in 1953, Joseph A. Baird, an art historian, was hired to teach Baroque art and art of the Americas. Roland Peterson joined the art faculty in 1956 to teach Art Practice. In 1957, the section created an art major, and in July of the following year, Provost Stanley Freeborn established the first art department. Initially, classes were held in various locations on campus, and the department office was in the Home Economics building. Later the department’s offices and studios were relocated to East Hall, and additional workspace was available in TB-10, a brown shingle building north of the Home Economics building. Richard Nelson became the first chair of the art department in 1958, and he organized the department by discipline: art history, art practice and art theory.

After UC Davis became a general campus in 1959, Nelson expanded the art department. Richard Cramer, an architect, Daniel Shapiro, a painter and print maker, and Ruth Horsting, a sculptor, transferred from the design department to the art department, and
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Nelson began recruiting new faculty. His first recruit was Wayne Thiebaud in 1960, the same year that enrollment in the College of Letters and Science matched that of the College of Agriculture. In 1961, Nelson began a Master of Arts program in Art Practice, and he hired Tio Giambruni, a metal caster, to establish a metal sculpture program and supervise the building of a foundry in TB-9. Nelson also expanded the art history section with the hiring of Daniel Crowley.⁹⁰

Seymour Howard, an art historian of classical art, and Richard Nelson planned to start a ceramics class and establish a studio in TB-9 in 1960. In the spring of 1961, Howard taught a ceramics class to six students in the large center space in TB-9. The space had partitioned areas for lab tables and wheels. He taught traditional Ch’an-Zen and Greek ceramics, along with some abstract expressionist ceramics similar to the style of Peter Voulkos (founder of Abstract Expressionist ceramic sculpture). Howard went on a European sabbatical during the fall of 1961, and in the spring of 1962, Richard Nelson hired Robert Arneson to set up a ceramic sculpture program in TB-9. When Arneson was recruited, he had a dual appointment. Three quarters of his commitment was in the design department, which was then a part of Home Economics, and the remaining third was in the art department. This arrangement was due to the art department’s small size and lack of funding.⁹¹

---

⁹⁰ Nancy Sue Chambers, “The Department of Art at the University of California at Davis: Its History and Reputation, Art and Artists, with Emphasis on the Art Practice Division.” (masters thesis, University of California, Davis, 1975), 1-4.

In addition to Arneson, Nelson hired William T. Wiley, a painter and assemblage (three-dimensional collage) artist. By 1965, Roy De Forest, a painter, and Manuel Neri, a sculptor, had joined the art department faculty. From 1960 through 1965, Nelson assembled an art department of faculty committed to innovation and experimentation. Thiebaud, Arneson, Wiley, Neri and De Forest were all products of Northern California art programs yet each had different artistic styles and personalities. But, they were young and shared a nontraditional attitude about creating art. They were not dogmatic and facilitated creativity by allowing their students to discover their own style. Nelson’s vision was to establish a dynamic art department, and he took advantage of the lack of tradition and precedence to allow his faculty to experiment and make things up rather than dictating how things should be done. The reputation of the UC Davis art department as a bastion of innovation and experimentation was due to Nelson’s ability to recognize creative potential in a new generation of San Francisco Bay area artists who could contribute unique ideas to a new art department.  

Richard Cramer became department chair after Richard Nelson retired from the position in 1966, although Nelson continued to teach through 1970. The art department moved into their new building in 1967; however the ceramics division remained in TB-9. The department continued to expand, and established a Masters of Arts program in art history in 1969, and a Master of Fine Arts degree in studio art in 1970.  

---

92 Chambers, *The Department of Art at the University of California, Davis*, 15-17, 51.  
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History of Funk Art

Peter Selz, an art curator and critic, is credited with coining the term “Funk” art to describe irreverent, sensuous, sometimes ugly, and usually three-dimensional art. Selz also used the adjectives “idiosyncratic,” “amoral,” “irrational,” “visceral” and “organic” to describe Funk.\(^94\) Several hundred years ago, “funk” meant stinky, and during the Jazz Age of the early twentieth century, “funk” meant a type of Blues music.\(^95\) In 1967, Selz staged an exhibition, “Funk” at the UC Berkeley Art Museum and he showcased funk art from the 1950s and 1960s. Unfortunately, the term “funk” has been used to describe two distinct art “movements,” both originating in Northern California. The original group from the Beat Era protested that the work of Wally Hedrick, a significant Funk assemblage artist of the 1950s was excluded from the show while the upstart TB-9 Funk artists Robert Arneson and his graduate student David Gilhooly had their work displayed. Critics claimed that the Davis group did not understand what “Funky” art was. After the controversy, the art community needed to distinguish between the two. Perhaps Jess Collins, an artist loosely associated with the Beat funk group, said it best. In order to distinguish between the two periods of Funk art, the 1950s group should be referred to as “funky,” and the movement of the 1960s should be labeled “Funk.”\(^96\)

The “funky” art that began in the mid-1950s during the Beat Era was more of an attitude than a movement. Wally Hedrick is considered to be the “Funk Daddy” of the Beat Generation funky artists, but he and his friends, all students at the California School

\(^{95}\) Diana Daniels, “Funk Art,” lecture at the Crocker Art Museum, October 11, 2011.
of Fine Arts, did not consider themselves to be a part of a group defined by a specific style. Instead, they shared an anti-intellectual and anti-materialistic attitude. In the 1950s, funk art was defined by a “dumb” attitude that evolved from their distaste for formal art school curriculum, and their dislike of material things, a reaction to post-war consumerism and affluence. Along with Hedrick, Manuel Neri, Joan Brown and Bruce Conner formed the core of the group. These artists were interested in ideas and not the actual production of artwork. Their art was a form of self-expression made to please themselves and their friends, and was never intended to be on display in a museum. They made “things,” rather than art, out of cheap and crude materials that they combined in a spontaneous manner. Hedrick made junk sculptures that were classified as funky assemblage. He combined found objects such as beer cans, television cabinets, radio parts, painted images and drawings.\footnote{Phyllis A. Clemmer, “What is/was Funk Art?” (masters thesis, Arizona State University, June 1971), 36, 48-58, 103.} Hedrick’s 1955 \textit{Christmas Tree} is a funky assemblage of old fans and car speakers (fig. 40).

The Beat funk art scene’s epicenter was upper Grant Avenue in North Beach, San Francisco. The artists met in coffee houses and bars to share ideas and plan informal art shows at North Beach cooperative galleries. By the end of the 1950s, the funk crowd left North Beach because gentrification and tourism had inflated prices, and the area became unaffordable for artists to live and work. The funk artists of the Beat Era existed for a brief period of time, and although their art was unique, they never developed into a significant avant-garde movement.
Unlike the urban 1950s “funk,” the Funk Art Movement of the 1960s was suburban and academic. Instead of assemblage and painting, the medium was clay. The ceramic funk art movement began in TB-9 at UC Davis when Robert Arneson was hired to teach sculptural ceramics. Arneson’s “funk” was a rebellion against the traditional exclusion of ceramics from classification as fine art. Funk ceramics is figurative, non-functional ceramic art. Arneson was interested in new ideas about how to work with clay, and mastery of the traditional craftsmanship associated with pottery was not important. He was incensed that ceramic artists were viewed as craftsmen rather than artists. Funk in the 1960s was influenced by Dada and Surrealism, but unlike Dada, it did not expose moral hypocrisy, and it was not based on the unconscious like Surrealism. Davis funk ceramics was absurd, irreverent, witty, humorous, sensuous, ribald, symbolic and sometimes offensive or ugly. During the early 1970s, Roy De Forest, one of Arneson’s colleagues in the art department, and other artists from UC Davis art scene exhibited their work as “Nut art,” a term De Forest adopted in place of “funk” to describe their humorous, “bucking the mainstream” art. This moniker did not stick and “funk” became the official label for this new movement out of TB-9.

Before they joined the UC Davis art department in the early 1960s, both Wiley and Manuel Neri were a part of the 1950s funky group. Their styles were similar to beat
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100 Susan Landauer, “Having Your Cake and Painting it Too,” in *Lighter Side of Bay Area Figuration* (Kansas City, MO: Kemper Museum of Contemporary Art, 2000), 6.
assemblage, but their work had a more finished appearance. By 1961, Neri was reworking many of his spontaneous life-size plaster sculptures of the human form by using live models to achieve more dynamic postures. He replaced his silver and garish color with plain white paint with touches of very bright or pastel colors. At TB-9, Neri taught sculpture, and he began making small bronze sculpture and casting life size bronze sculptures from his plaster figures. Like his plaster pieces, his bronze sculptures had ambiguous gender, and some lacked a head or a limb. He applied a similar color palette to his bronze artworks.¹⁰¹ His art was innovative and shared some Funk attributes.

Wiley easily transitioned into the 1960s Funk attitude that art could be anything, and new ideas were more important than tradition. Wiley’s funk assemblages and paintings from his TB-9 days were narrative or autobiographical.¹⁰² His work featured playful and humorous puns, riddles and double-entendres.¹⁰³ Although the UC Davis Funk Movement was primarily ceramic art, Arneson’s funk ceramics shared traits with the funk painters and sculptural artists on the faculty, especially word play and autobiographical material.

Wiley was responsible for the UC Davis art department’s association with the “Slant Step,” a funky wood object with a vertical back and a riser attached to the middle of the back that slanted downward at a forty-five degree angle (fig. 41). Wiley and a TB-9 graduate student, Bruce Nauman, bought it for fifty cents at a Marin County salvage shop, and Nauman kept it in his office to use for both inspiration and a foot rest. Wiley

¹⁰¹ Albright, *Art in the San Francisco Bay Area*, 73, 75.
¹⁰³ Landauer, “Having Your Cake and Painting it Too,” 8.
organized the “Slant Step Show” at the Berkeley Gallery in San Francisco, a true funk show that earned Wiley the distinction of being a neo-Dada funk artist. Other Bay Area artists created their own versions of the “Slant Step.” The original Slant Step was on display among slant steps made of bread, colored plastic with lights inside, hair, metal or silk. The Davis Slant Step disappeared for many years. Two TB-9 alumni had transported it to New York City, and in 2012, it resurfaced in Davis in the form of a donation to the Nelson Gallery, the campus art gallery. Former graduate students Frank Owen and Art Schade thought this funk icon belonged in the University’s permanent art collection. The Nelson Gallery was excited about the gift and organized a show, “Flatlanders on the Slant” to celebrate its return.  

In 2014, the art department selected an image of the Slant Step for its new department sign, a fine tribute to TB-9 and the funk art movement (fig. 42).

---

Chapter 4

EVALUATION OF TB-9 FOR THE NATIONAL REGISTER

TB-9 is eligible for the National Register of Historic Places because the building has retained the integrity that conveys its significance throughout its period of significance, 1962 through 1976. Even though Robert Arneson retained his affiliation with TB-9 through his retirement in 1991, by 1976 he had moved to Benicia and created the majority of his later work at his studio there. Also, by the mid-1970s, Funk Figurative Ceramics was a well-established and recognized art movement. Because of Arneson’s fame and reputation as an innovative teacher, the ceramics program at Davis became impacted. Admission to the program became highly selective due to excessive applications. Arneson no longer had control of recruiting or selecting students, leading to a more institutional, rigorous and formal atmosphere. Innovation and creativity yielded to a self-conscious and conforming attitude, especially after Arneson stopped working exclusively in his TB-9 studio.105

TB-9’s areas of significance are art and education, and its historical context includes its association with the development of the sculptural ceramics program at the University of California Davis, its association with the history of ceramic art in both California and the United States, and its association with a nationally recognized ceramic artist. In addition to retaining its integrity, TB-9 is eligible for the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion A because it is the site where the Funk Figurative Ceramics Movement began, a movement that was influential in altering the history of

American ceramics. TB-9 is also eligible for the National Register under Criterion B because Robert Arneson, a nationally acclaimed ceramic artist who started the Funk Figurative Ceramics Movement, produced his most significant and influential work in his studio at TB-9. Because TB-9's period of significance does not end within the past fifty years, the building is not eligible for the National Register without establishing its exceptional importance under Criteria Consideration G. An in-depth scholarly evaluation of TB-9 demonstrates how the development of the Funk Figurative Ceramics Movement at this site and its affiliation with Robert Arneson, the nationally and internationally recognized founder of this movement contributed to the history of American ceramics.

**Significance of TB-9**

TB-9 is significant under Criterion A because it is the site where the Funk Figurative Ceramics movement began. This movement made an important contribution to the history of ceramic art in the United States. Although it seems unlikely that a revolutionary new ceramics movement began at Davis, a suburban UC campus, there are several reasons this occurred there during the early 1960s. It was geographically isolated from urban areas where traditional ideas prevailed, so the young art department had the luxury of creating their own rules and philosophy. Also, the 1960s was a time of cultural and political upheaval, and this climate influenced artists to reject conventional practices.

---

and experiment and create new art forms. But Richard Nelson, the chair of the new UC Davis art department, was the primary reason the ceramics department spawned a nationally recognized art movement. He wanted to create a dynamic art program at Davis, and he had the foresight to hire a young faculty of artists who were graduates of Northern California art schools, diverse in their artistic interests but open to new ideas. Nelson was looking for creative and innovative artists who were interested in teaching, collaborating and pursuing their art. When he hired Robert Arneson in 1962, he instructed Arneson to begin a ceramic sculpture program in TB-9, but Nelson did not dictate how things should be done. Like Arneson, he viewed ceramics as a fine art discipline rather than a craft so Arneson’s new program began as a division of the art department. This distinction encouraged collaboration and discouraged departmental hierarchy among the faculty, factors that contributed to the success of the TB-9 artists. Because the Davis Art Department did not have an established curriculum for ceramic art, Arneson was free to create a ceramics program with a focus on innovation and experimentation rather than traditional pottery.\(^\text{107}\) Also, with no established protocols, Arneson was free to run his classes as a European atelier, where he shared studio space with his students and worked alongside of them. Instead of a didactic instructor, he was a facilitator, encouraging students to think of new ideas and experiment with clay.\(^\text{108}\) This set the stage for TB-9’s transformation into a center for Funk ceramics where Arneson and his students created new ways to work with clay, glazes and firing techniques.


Arneson had a special camaraderie with his students that encouraged an open exchange of ideas. During a 2014 panel discussion at Sacramento State University, Peter VandenBerge reminisced that there was constant interaction between everyone at TB-9. He remembered that they inspired one other and stole each other’s ideas. There was an atmosphere of mutual respect, and Arneson made it a habit of exhibiting his work along with that of his students at regional ceramic shows and galleries. This practice exposed their work to the art community, and the public soon realized that this TB-9 ceramic group at UC Davis was creating a new funky style of ceramic sculpture. Art critic E.M. Polley reviewed the 1966 exhibition, “Ceramics from Davis,” at Museum West at 900 N. Point Street in San Francisco, in the November 6, 1966 edition of the Vallejo Times Herald. She suggested that a new “school” of art was developing in the Davis Art Department, and that there was a “funkiness” about the art created by the instructor and his students.

As Arneson’s Funk ceramics gained exposure through local and regional exhibitions, his program attracted the attention of many artists who wanted to come to Davis to study and work at TB-9. His collaboration with his colleague Roy De Forest brought further recognition to the Funk ceramic program at TB-9. Together, they made thirty-five small humorous pots and had a 1969 show of “Bob and Roy Ware” at the Esther Robles Gallery in Los Angeles, and another show in 1970 at the Candy Store Gallery in Folsom. A few of the Bob and Roy Ware pots are in the collection of the Crocker Art Museum. When the work of the TB-9 artists began to influence the direction

of California ceramics, and eventually affect the evolution of ceramic sculpture at the national level, TB-9 became synonymous with Funk Ceramics.

TB-9 also qualifies for the National Register under Criterion B because Robert Arneson, the acknowledged founder of Funk Figurative Ceramics, created his original and most famous funk ceramic art in his studio at TB-9. According to Arneson, TB-9 was his only studio for fifteen years and TB-9 was where he created his iconic funk works, “Funk John,” a ceramic toilet, and his “Typewriter” (figs. 43-44).\textsuperscript{110} Although he moved to Benicia in 1975 with Shannonhouse, he continued working and teaching part time in TB-9 through 1991, the year he retired from UC Davis due to failing health. He died in 1992 at the age of 62.

During the late 1950s, Arneson was influenced by the abstract ceramic sculpture of Peter Voulkos. At the Otis Art Institute in Los Angeles, Voulkos pioneered the idea of using clay to create nonfunctional forms as a means of self-expression. The inspiration for Voulkos’ work was the Abstract Expressionist Movement. Arneson gave Voulkos credit for revolutionizing ceramic sculpture by creating a central column from which slabs of clay could be attached to make very large ceramic forms.\textsuperscript{111} He experimented with abstract clay sculpture before he developed his Funk Ceramics style while he taught and worked at TB-9. His inspiration for pursuing this unique style of representational (not abstract) clay sculpture began at the 1961 California State Fair. Arneson was demonstrating pottery techniques for Antonio Prieto, his mentor at Mills College, and he began playing with the clay. He threw a quart-size, thick-walled bottle and sealed it with

\textsuperscript{110} John Natsoulas, 30 Years of TB-9, 26.
\textsuperscript{111} Robert Arneson, Oral history interview with Mady Jones.
a clay bottle cap and stamped “NO DEPOSIT, NO RETURN” on it. This act was the beginning of Arneson’s “no return” to traditional ceramics. Many art historians consider this bottle to be the original figurative funk ceramic artwork (fig. 45).\textsuperscript{112}

Arneson believed that ideas were more important than mastery of a technique or craftsmanship. He encouraged his students to experiment with types of clay, paints and glazes to create original sculpture. The Funk ceramics that Arneson and his students created were humorous, witty, inane, irreverent, vulgar, and offensive. Many of Arneson’s pieces had a serious layer beneath a comical façade. His self-portrait busts mocked his shortcomings, and a lot of his more mature work was satirical or political. His caricatures were humorous commentaries on the human condition, and he used humor to expose the flaws and foibles of society. Arneson was continually fighting the perception that clay was only suitable for making functional pottery. He resented the belief that clay was not a legitimate medium for creating fine art. Through his work, he wanted to demonstrate that humor and fine art are not exclusive of each other. Arneson remarked, “The things I’m really interested in as an artist are the things you can’t do—that’s to mix humor and fine art. I’m not being silly about it. I’m serious about the combination. Humor is generally considered low art but I think humor is very serious—it points out the fallacies in our existence.”\textsuperscript{113}

In 1981, he became infamous for his caricature of George Moscone. The San Francisco Art Commission selected Arneson to make a memorial sculpture of their late mayor, George Moscone, to be placed in the new George Moscone Convention Center.

\textsuperscript{112} Neal Benezra, \textit{Robert Arneson: A Retrospective}, (Des Moines, IA: Des Moines Art Center, 1985), 18.
\textsuperscript{113} Hilarie Faberman et al., \textit{Fired at Davis}, 34.
The piece was controversial because of the references to events of Moscone’s murder that Arneson inscribed on the bust’s pedestal (fig. 46). Dianne Feinstein, the city’s mayor, asked Arneson to replace the work with a new piece, but he refused. He withdrew his sculpture and returned the commission money. This incident was front-page news and proved to be pivotal in accelerating his career. Arneson and his Funk ceramics now had national exposure beyond the world of ceramic art.114

By the late 1960s, Arneson’s work was included in major exhibitions at large urban museums. Throughout his career, his artwork was exhibited at the Smithsonian Institution, the Whitney Museum of American Art in New York City, and the M.H. De Young Memorial Museum in San Francisco. His first museum retrospective, “Robert Arneson,” was held at the Museum of Contemporary Art in Chicago in 1974, and the show later traveled to the San Francisco Museum of Art. Arneson sold his work through Allan Stone and Allan Frumkin, two major New York galleries. Many public and private museums and galleries purchased his artwork for their collections. During his lifetime, Robert Arneson was and continues to be recognized as a significant contributor to the history of American ceramics. Art historians, and individuals who are well versed in ceramic arts, agree that Robert Arneson is the pioneer of the Funk Figurative Ceramics Art Movement. In his essay, “Funk,” published in *Humor, Irony and Wit: Ceramic Funk From the Sixties and Beyond*, John Natsoulas writes that Robert Arneson was the

---


There are two additional buildings associated with Robert Arneson during TB-9’s period of significance. However, they do not possess the same level of historic significance as TB-9 within the established historic context for this nomination. One building is his house at 1303 Alice Street, where Arneson lived from 1962 through 1976. Although the house served as an inspiration for one of his ceramic projects, the “Alice Street series,” and the kitchen floor consists of original ceramic tiles made by Arneson, it is not the site where his artistic achievement transpired. After he married Sandra Shannonhouse, his second wife, they moved to Benicia, and built a studio at 430 First Street.\footnote{Fineberg, *A Troublesome Subject*, 249.} But this studio is not where he created his significant work.

Although TB-9’s period of significance ended less than fifty years ago, it retains its eligibility for the National Register under Criteria Consideration G because of its exceptional importance. Extensive evaluation of primary and secondary sources confirm the national and international recognition of the Funk Figurative Ceramics Movement as a distinct and original ceramic art movement that began in TB-9 on the UC Davis campus.
during the early 1960s. The literature validates the movement’s influence on the
development of American ceramics. In addition to primary source documentation of the
influence this movement had on American ceramic art, Arneson and the Funk Figurative
Ceramics of TB-9 continue to be recognized for their significant contribution to
American art history by museums, galleries and private collectors.

There are many publications about art history and ceramic art that explicitly
equate TB-9 with the Funk Figurative Ceramic Art movement. Art historians agree that
the movement began at UC Davis in the 1960s and they recognize Robert Arneson as the
founder of this original form of ceramic art. During Robert Arneson’s lifetime, Thomas
Albright included a discussion of the Funk Figurative Ceramics Movement in his history
of San Francisco Bay Area art from 1945 through 1980. A chapter entitled “The
Watershed: Funk, Pop and Formalism discusses the influential artists at UC Davis during
the 1960s and 1970s who created new directions for American art, specifically Arneson
and William T. Wiley. Albright writes that Robert Arneson’s new ceramic program was
located in TB-9. He attributes the combination of Arneson’s eccentric personality and the
appeal of his “adolescent iconoclastic artworks” as the reasons the “UC Davis look”
became an established regional style that gained national recognition.\footnote{117}

In her 1998 book, \textit{California Art: 450 Years of Paintings and other Media}, Nancy
Dustin Wall Moure acknowledges Robert Arneson as the leader of Funk Figurative
Ceramics. She writes that his Funk sculpture was made at TB-9 at UC Davis during the
1960s and she differentiates Arneson’s figurative ceramic sculpture from that of Peter

\footnote{117 Albright, \textit{Art in the San Francisco Bay Area}, 249-251.}
Voulkos. She credits Voulkos as the founder abstract expressionist ceramic sculpture, a nonrepresentational style of artwork.\textsuperscript{118}

Nicholas Rourkes’ book, \textit{artful jesters: INNOVATORS OF VISUAL WIT AND HUMOR}, states that Robert Arneson’s “provocative iconclasm” is the inspiration for “artful jesters” today who carry on his legacy. Rourke defines an artful jester as an innovative artist who sees and interprets the world through an ironic, witty, provocative and sometimes contentious lens. In other words he is describing the 1960s’ Funk ceramic artists of TB-9. His book features the work of David Gilhooly, one of Arneson’s first graduate students who adopted the Funk style for his mature work. The ceramic art of Allan Rosenbaum, a professor of art at Virginia Commonwealth University, also reflects Arneson’s legacy. His Funk figurative work resembles many artworks that were created by TB-9 artists. Rosenbaum’s “Toaster,” 2000, is a direct reference to Arneson’s “Toaster” of 1965, and his “Wheelbarrow,” 1997, has anthropomorphic features similar to Peter VandenBerge’s Funk vegetables from his early TB-9 days.\textsuperscript{119}

In his article, “California Funk,” Scott A. Shields, a curator at the Crocker Art Museum in Sacramento, writes, … Funk is most often equated with Arneson and the school of ceramics that developed at UC Davis, which in turn attracted other artists and ceramists to Northern California.” Shields identifies TB-9 as the center for Funk Ceramics and credits Arneson with encouraging his students to reject traditional ways to work with clay. He modeled experimentation that led to the creation of a new type of

\textsuperscript{118} Moure, \textit{California Art}, 356.
\textsuperscript{119} Nicholas Rourke, \textit{artful jesters: INNOVATORS OF VISUAL WIT AND HUMOR}, (Berkeley: Ten Speed Press, 2003), xiii, 1, 74, 116-117.
ceramic sculpture, the figurative Funk style. Shields states that influence of TB-9’s Funk ceramics spread beyond Northern California and achieved international fame.\(^{120}\)

Jonathan Fineberg wrote a monograph about Robert Arneson entitled *A Troublesome Subject: The Art of Robert Arneson*. This 2013 publication includes a comprehensive review of Robert Arneson’s career at UC Davis. There are many color photographs of Arneson’s iconic Funk ceramic art that he made in his studio at TB-9. Fineberg’s book contains numerous references to Arneson’s association with TB-9 and discusses the evolution of Funk Figurative Ceramics within the walls of this iconic building.

The exceptional importance of TB-9 can also be confirmed by the many museum exhibitions dedicated to UC Davis figurative Funk ceramics. In 1989, California State University Fullerton staged an exhibition, *Contemporary Ceramics: The Artists of TB-9*. This show highlighted the work of Arneson, Peter VandenBerge, Richard Notkin, Robert Brady, Arthur Gonzalez, Lisa Reinertson and Tony Natsoulas. These TB-9 ceramists continue to work as ceramic artists, although many have developed their own personal style. Along with Arneson’s artwork, their art is included in many large museum collections. Natsoulas and Reinertson have created many ceramic works of public art on display in the Sacramento region.

Currently, the legacy of TB-9 is on display at the Oakland Museum of California through April 12, 2015. A quarter of the exhibition, *Fertile Ground: Art and Community*

\(^{120}\) Shields, “California Funk,” 39-40.
in California, is dedicated to UC Davis Funk ceramics. This exhibit is entitled “TB-9: A Mentor Shapes a Community. A plaque next to a photograph of Robert Arneson states,

The ceramics program at UC Davis is centered in an old ‘temporary’ building known as TB-9. For almost thirty years, sculptor Robert Arneson mentored students in the nurturing confines of TB-9. The building was active 24 hours a day, with students and instructors interacting as peers in a highly collaborative atmosphere. The work that emerged from TB-9 had a national impact, transforming the image of ceramics from that of a utilitarian craft to a serious—often tongue-in-cheek—art form.\(^{121}\)

In the near future, the legacy of TB-9 and Robert Arneson will be a prominent feature at the new Shrem Museum of Art that is scheduled to open on the UC Davis campus in 2016. Rachel Teagle, the founding director of the Shrem wants to tell the story of the “golden era” of art at UC Davis between 1960 and 1980, a time when many of the artworks in the university’s collection were created in TB-9. She feels that UC Davis needs to advertise its rich legacy of innovation and creativity in order to encourage notable artists to come to the campus as residents and visiting lecturers.\(^{122}\)

The City of Davis also celebrates the legacy of Robert Arneson and the Funk ceramics of TB-9. Over twenty-seven years ago, John Natsoulas, an art gallery owner in downtown Davis, and Robert Arneson wanted to promote ceramic art by bringing together artists so that they could learn from each other. Their idea became the California Conference for the Advancement of Ceramic Art (CCACA), an annual event that takes place in Davis each April. John Natsoulas Gallery will host the 27th edition of this

\(^{121}\) I attended Fertile Ground: Art and Community in California in October 2014. This information is from my notes on the show.

conference in 2015. In multiple venues around Davis, professional and student ceramic artists display their artwork.\textsuperscript{123} The influence of the Figurative Funk Ceramic Movement that began in TB-9 is evident in many of these contemporary artists’ works.

In March 2014, Elaine O’Brien, an art professor at Sacramento State University, moderated a panel discussion, “Remembering TB-9.” She invited Stephen Kaltenbach, Gerald Walburg and Peter VandenBerge, all former graduate students of Robert Arneson, to speak about their days working with Arneson in TB-9 during the early 1960s. Their stories reveal the dynamics that set the stage for the revolution in ceramics they experienced in this iconic building. They all agreed that “Arneson was TB-9.” They also concurred that their personal drive and dedication developed in an atmosphere of mutual respect and collaboration that Arneson fostered inside of those corrugated metal walls.\textsuperscript{124}

It is a well-established fact that TB-9 is where Robert Arneson founded the Funk Figurative Ceramic Movement, and the legacy of TB-9 continues to inspire and influence new generations of ceramic artists. The examples presented in this section illustrate the exceptional importance of TB-9 and support the eligibility of this building for the National Register of Historic Places under Criteria Consideration G.

\textbf{Integrity of TB-9}

TB-9 has retained its ability to convey its significance. According to section VIII, “How to Evaluate the Integrity of a Property,” of the National Register Bulletin 15, \textit{How


\textsuperscript{124} Campling, “Talking TB-9,” video of lecture, March 6, 2014 at Sacramento State University.
to Apply the National Register Criteria, the basic test of evaluating the integrity of a property associated with an important event or person is if the property as it exists today would be recognizable to a historical contemporary. The exterior of TB-9 has not changed significantly since its period of significance, 1962-1976 (fig. 47). The interior of TB-9 did change significantly between 1962 and 1975 because the art department did not occupy the entire building until approximately 1970. TB-9 was renovated in 1975 to accommodate the needs of the expanding ceramics program. However, since this renovation, the interior has not been significantly altered (figs. 48-50; compare with figs. 20, 22-23).

TB-9 retains its location, design, setting, materials, feeling and association. These are the aspects of integrity that are significant to its nomination for the National Register. The location of the building has not changed since its period of significance. Also, the exterior design of the building matches the design of the building during its significant period. The setting has changed with regard to buildings on the west side of Cushing Drive. The fire station and the music building that replaced the station during TB-9’s period of significance have been torn down. However, these buildings were on property adjacent to TB-9 that is not a part of the site that is being evaluated for this nomination. TB-9 has retained its spatial relationship with the surrounding roads and Putah Creek. Its exterior retains a high percentage of the original construction materials. In some areas, aluminum siding was replaced due to wear, but the replacement siding is identical to the original corrugated aluminum. Campus architects and engineers designed TB-9 and constructed it with modified government surplus materials. Because the building is being
evaluated under Criteria A and B, the craftsmanship is not critical to determining the building’s eligibility. TB-9 continues to evoke the feeling of an informal, dusty “tin barn” that served as the ceramics workshop during its period of significance. Today, TB-9 still functions as the lab, classroom and studio space for the sculptural ceramics program at UC Davis, so it has retained its association with ceramics and the art department.
Chapter 5

CONCLUSION

According to Susan Landauer, “Certainly the most influential artist to come out of Davis in the 1960s was Robert Arneson, …under Arneson’s guidance, the corrugated metal building known as ‘TB-9’ had become the headquarters for the ceramic sculpture movement in Northern California.”\(^{125}\) Landauer’s statement summarizes why TB-9 is significant under Criteria A and B of the National Register of Historic Places. Her comment also verifies TB-9’s exceptional importance under Criteria Consideration G. The building’s association with Arneson and Funk Figurative Ceramics are the reasons TB-9 is worthy of preserving as a historic building. TB-9 is an icon. It is impossible to separate the building from the pervasive influence of Arneson and his students on the history of American ceramic art, and the work of other ceramic artists.

Their legacy is memorialized on the UC Davis campus as well as in the City of Davis. The “Egghead Series,” a collection of large bronze eggheads, created by Arneson during the last few years of his life, are prominent installations in front of the Celeste Turner Wright Hall (art building), Shields library, Mrak Hall and King Hall (fig. 50). Shields Library owns and displays Funk pieces by two of Arneson’s graduate students, David Gilhooly and Tony Natsoulas. These pieces were made in TB-9 and reflect the TB-9 Funk aesthetic. Gilhooly’s *Credit Card Whirlpool* functions as a centerpiece for student seating, and Natsoulas’ *Shoe Salesman* occupies an alcove by the central courtyard (figs.

\(^{125}\) Landauer, “Having Your Cake and Painting it Too,” 17.
51-52). The children’s room inside the Davis branch of the Yolo County library is home to Roy De Forest’s *Dog Table* (fig. 53).

Not all of Arneson’s students adopted his style. He encouraged his students to experiment and develop a personal style. The majority of his students did, and have become influential ceramic artists in their own right: Donna Billick, Arthur Gonzalez, Robert Brady, Richard Notkin, Lisa Reinertson, Richard Shaw and Peter VandenBerge. All of these artists have artwork in the Crocker Art Museum collection, and many have received public art commissions.

Arneson’s numerous commissions beyond the border of California are a testament to his national reputation. His last commission was for the University of Iowa. The artwork, *Gateway to Self-Realization*, 1992, was installed in the west courtyard of the University’s Eckstein Medical Research Building (fig. 54). And his legacy extends beyond national borders. One of his graduate students, Margaret Dodd, returned to her home in Australia after completing her MFA, and she began an Australian version of TB-9 Funk ceramics. She called named her movement “Skangarooian Funk.”

Arneson continues to influence many twenty-first-century ceramic artists. TB-9’s legacy is evident in the ceramic sculpture by Sacramento regional artists René Martucci, Joe Mariscal, Jeffrey Downing, Paul DiPasqua and Jeff Nebeker (figs. 55-56). Although the Figurative Funk Ceramic Movement lives on through the work of a new generation of ceramic artists, the placement of TB-9 on the National Register of Historic Places will be the ultimate tribute to the legacy of Robert Arneson and his students.

---

126 Peter Held et al., *Humor, Irony and Wit*, 10.
Appendix A: Figures

Fig. 1. Tio Giambruni in TB-9’s foundry, May 1966.

Fig. 2. Students working in advanced studio, February 2015.
Fig. 3. Aerial view of UC Davis campus, c. 1941, arrow shows empty site where TB-9 is today.

Fig. 4. Aerial view of UC Davis campus, 1952, arrow shows location of TB-9.
Fig. 5. TB-9 building plan, November 13, 1946.

Fig. 6. Aerial view of TB-9 site, 2015.
Fig. 7. Robert Arneson outside TB-9’s entrance.

Fig. 8. TB-9, western elevation, facing southeast.
Fig. 9. TB-9 building plan, porch and railing, October 1975.

Fig. 10. TB-9, southwest corner, facing northeast.
Fig. 11. TB-9, southern elevation, facing northeast.

Fig. 12. TB-9, southern elevation chimneys, facing northeast.
Fig. 13. TB-9, southeast corner, facing northwest.

Fig. 14. TB-9, east end of south wall, facing west.
Fig. 15. TB-9, eastern elevation, facing north.

Fig. 16. TB-9, northern elevation, facing south.
Fig. 17. TB-9, north wall, double door and metal trap door, facing south.

Fig. 18 TB-9, northern elevation chimneys, facing south.
Fig. 19. Robert Arneson in his TB-9 studio. Photo by Kurt Fishback, 1985.

Fig. 20. Central hallway, facing east.
Fig. 21. Library, facing north.

Fig. 22. Glaze room and spray booth, facing northwest.
Fig. 23. Advanced student studio and classroom, facing southeast.

Fig. 24. Undergraduate studio, facing east.
Fig. 25. Diagram of original sprayed insulation.

Fig. 26. Kiln room (west end), three gas-fueled kilns, facing southwest.
Fig. 27. Kiln room (east end), five electric kilns, facing east.

Fig. 28. Clay mixing room, two mixers and blunger, facing southeast.
Fig. 29. Clay storage area, facing southwest.
Fig. 30. Building plan for entryway remodel, May 1967.

Fig. 31. Warehouse Dormitory floor plan, February 1947.
Fig. 32. Floor plan of police station (right) and mailroom (left), May 1967.

Fig. 33. Expansion of mailroom into former police station space, May 1967.
Fig. 34. TB-9 floor plan, October 1975.

Fig. 35. TB-9 floor plan, 2015.
Fig. 36. TB-9, northern elevation and fence, facing southeast.
Fig. 37. Plot plan of new south fence, 1967.

Fig. 38. Plot plan of wood screen east fence, 1964.
Fig. 39. Comparison of old and new east fence, May 2013.

Fig. 40. Wally Hedrick, *Christmas Tree*, 1955.
Fig. 41. “Slant Step,” no date.

Fig. 42. UC Davis Art Building sign, 2014.
Fig. 43. Robert Arneson, *Funk John*, 1963.

Fig. 44. Robert Arneson, *Typewriter*, 1965.
Fig. 45 (left). Robert Arneson, *NO DEPOSIT, NO RETURN*, 1961.

Fig. 46 (right). Robert Arneson, *Portrait of George*, 1981.
Fig. 47. TB-9, western elevation, facing southeast, circa 1967.

Fig. 48. Central hallway, facing east, 1981.
Fig. 49. Advanced studio and classroom, facing southeast, 1983.

Fig. 50. Glaze room, circa 1980s.

Fig. 52. David Gilhooly, *Credit Card Whirlpool*, 1978.
Fig. 53. Tony Natsoulas, *Shoe Salesman*, 1994.

Fig. 54. Roy De Forest, *Dog Table*, 1994.
Fig. 55. Robert Arneson, *Gateway to Self-Realization*, 1992, University of Iowa.
Fig. 56. Joe Mariscal, *Sleeping Shriner (Howard)*, 1984.

Fig. 57. Jeff Nebeker, *Imagination Rules*, 2014.
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Building(s) ☒
District ☐
Site ☐
Structure ☐
Object ☐

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contributing</th>
<th>Noncontributing</th>
<th>buildings</th>
<th>sites</th>
<th>structures</th>
<th>objects</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TB-9, University of California Davis

Name of Property: ____________________
County and State: Yolo ____________________

Number of contributing resources previously listed in the National Register
N/A

6. Function or Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historic Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Enter categories from instructions.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government/correctional facility = campus police station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government/post office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/college = ceramics department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/education-related = college dormitory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Enter categories from instructions.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/college = ceramics department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Description

Architectural Classification
(Enter categories from instructions.)
Other: WW II surplus housing modules

Materials: (enter categories from instructions.)
Principal exterior materials of the property: 
Foundation: concrete slab
Walls: 18 gauge corrugated aluminum sheeting
Roof: 18 gauge corrugated aluminum sheeting
Other:
   Porch: concrete block, steel handrails
   Storage shed: wood piers
   Doors: steel
   Chimneys and vents: metal

Narrative Description
(Describe the historic and current physical appearance and condition of the property. Describe contributing and noncontributing resources if applicable. Begin with a summary paragraph that briefly describes the general characteristics of the property, such as its location, type, style, method of construction, setting, size, and significant features. Indicate whether the property has historic integrity.)

Summary Paragraph

TB-9 is located on the eastern border of the UC Davis campus. The property is bounded by Putah Creek on the south, Cushing Way on the west, Hutchinson Drive on the north and Old Davis Road on the east. The site is approximately 0.62 acre, and is heavily forested along the Creek. TB-9 is a single story, 8000 square foot rectangular building with an east/west dimension of 160 feet, and a north/south dimension of 50 feet. It was built in 1947 from World War II surplus housing sections obtained through the temporary
Federal Works Administration Program (Figs. 1-2). The building is constructed on a cement slab foundation. Its exterior walls and low pitch front gabled roof are made of 18 gauge corrugated aluminum sheeting (fig. 3). The building does not have eaves, although the roof’s metal sheeting does overhang both the north and south walls by a few inches. TB-9 has retained its integrity. It is well maintained, and has not changed in appearance since its period of significance.

Narrative Description

Exterior

Western Elevation

The main entrance to TB-9 is centrally located on the west wall of the building. It is a metal double door, each with a single square window in the upper half. Directly above the doorframe is a large rectangular six-paned window that extends beyond the width of the doorway. On both sides of the doorframe are wide, sliding metal panels that extend from the ground to top of the large rectangular window. The upper edges of the panels are attached to a track so that they can slide over the entryway. There is a metal strip that extends the length of the window and panels. Above the metal strip is a large rectangular louvered vent that is centered directly below the gable. There is a wall mounted sconce (curved neck) light installed between the gable’s apex and the vent. To the left of the main entrance is a single non-glazed metal door whose access is blocked by a metal railing. A rectangular, corrugated aluminum storage shed extends westward from the wall and attaches to the building between the south side of the main doorway and the southern edge of the wall. The shed’s non-glazed (no windows) metal double door is located on its north wall with the northern edge of the foundation flush with the level of a concrete porch. The shed’s remaining foundation is raised on wood stilts (piers) that are mounted on cement footings imbedded in the asphalt pavement of the driveway. The low sloping gabled corrugated aluminum roof overhangs the shed on the north and south sides, forming deep eaves. A gradual sloping cement walkway parallels the wall, with a single step leading up to the cement porch in front of the entryway. An approximately three-foot high concrete block wall defines the path’s outer edge, and a metal railing extends the length of the block wall. Another railing extends along the inner edge of the walkway and ends at the start of the porch.
The southern elevation runs parallel to Putah Creek. There is a wide cement patio of varying width along the length of this side of TB-9. Large ceramic artworks sit on raised beds of wood ships or on wooden pallets either next to the building or along the fence separating TB-9’s yard from the Creek. The south side of the shed projects from the western edge of the building. The shed’s south wall consists of a metal door on the left side, and corrugated aluminum covers the right side. The south wall has a series of parallel pipes, mounted between the roofline and the top edge of the windows, that run eastward and end at a roll-up steel door. There are six triple sets of combination style windows separated by sheets of corrugated aluminum. The first three sets of windows on the western end contain swamp coolers mounted by two brackets to the aluminum siding below. Each triple set is composed of two outer windows, each with six panes and a middle window with twelve panes. The top and bottom rows of each window are fixed while the middle section can open outward like an awning window. All windows extend from the roofline down to the midline of each wall. The lower pane of the left window of the fifth triple set from the western end was removed to accommodate a steel door. Mounted on the roof, above the eastern most set of windows, are eight conical cap chimneys of various heights that cover the flues from the kiln room below. There is a metal roll-up door surrounded by corrugated aluminum siding east of the last triple set of windows. East of this door is a large double metal paneled door that extends the height of the building. There are two curved aluminum vents on the roof over the paneled door to disperse clay dust from the mixing room, and east of the vents is a conical chimney cap covering a flue over the clay mixers. Aluminum siding fills the area between the eastern edge of the paneled door and the southeast corner of the building.

The eastern elevation faces Old Davis Road and is enclosed by a new decorative fence (built in 2013). There is a wide cement sidewalk along the length of the eastern wall, and between the walkway and fence are piles of bricks and ceramic ware. At the northern end of the sidewalk near the northeast corner of TB-9 is a large air conditioning unit. The center of the façade has a large double metal paneled door attached to a track mounted on the lower edge of the gable. This door is identical to the entryway panels on the western wall, except that these panels are moved together and locked in place. The panels do not cover a doorway, so when they are slide apart, they create an opening in the eastern wall. Directly above the slider, there is a large louvered vent that matches the vent on the western elevation. A wall-mounted sconce light is installed over the vent, just below the apex of the gable. To the left of the door and placed just below the lower edge of the gable, is a smaller louvered vent for the fan inside the clay mixing room located on the other side of the wall.
Northern Elevation

The northern elevation is parallel to Hutchinson Drive, and the façade is obscured by dense shrubbery. The northern wall has six sets of windows that are the same style as those installed on the southern wall. There is a metal strip that runs the length of the northern wall just below the roofline. The upper edge of each window frame is flush with the bottom edge of the strip, and the windows extend halfway down the side of the building. Corrugated aluminum sheeting fill the spaces below and between the windows. Beginning at the eastern end of the wall, there are two sets of triple windows, and a double metal door to the west of these windows. The top half of each door has a rectangular window, and the height of the doors extends about one foot above the windowsill on the left. Encased electrical wiring frames the door. A sconce light is mounted above the door. A cement slab extends from the foundation to the right of the door. There is a metal trap door on top of the slab with some narrow rectangular holes punched through its surface. It has a metal handle used for opening it. According to Annabeth Rosen, the ceramic department chair, underneath this door are the controls to turn on and shut down the building’s piped steam heating system. On the west side of the door is a triple window, and on the roof above this window is a tall conical cap chimney that covers the flue venting the hooded spray booth inside of the glaze room. West of the conical cap chimney is a Swiss cap covering a vent for the bathroom fan. A swamp cooler extends from the aluminum siding between this triple window and a double window (instead of a triple window) to the west. The double window has one six-pane window and one twelve-pane window and it is the third set of windows from the west end of the wall. There are two triple windows further west along the wall, and each have a swamp cooler mounted in their frames.

Fence

TB-9 is surrounded by fencing except for the northern boundary where the building is adjacent to the sidewalk along Hutchinson Drive. The chain link fence that surrounds the south patio was installed in August of 1967. It begins ten feet east of the southwest corner of the building and extends 53 feet south from the wall of TB-9. The south fence line travels along a northeast/southwest diagonal, and connects to a new decorative metal fence that replaced the 1964 wood screen fence between TB-9 and Old Davis Road (A Street) on the east side. The fence is composed of corrugated aluminum sheets attached to metal posts. A wavy line, cut into the aluminum sheeting, adorns the northeast corner. Christina DeMartini Reyes of the UC Davis Campus Planning and Landscape Architecture and Annabeth Rosen, the Robert Arneson Endowed Chair, designed the fence, and it was installed in May of 2013.
Interior

Entering TB-9 from the west, the doors open into a narrow corridor with cement floors (throughout the building, there is no flooring installed over the cement slab foundation). Florescent lighting illuminates the hallway, as well as all of the other rooms in TB-9. The double doors on the north side open into Dr. Rosen’s studio (previously Robert Arneson’s studio), and the door to the east of her studio opens into the technician’s office. Doors on the south side open into graduate student studios. The hallway, its adjacent rooms, the bathrooms, the glaze room and the library have ceilings and gypsum walls. The corridor opens into the advanced student studio-classroom on the south, and the bathrooms, glaze room and library are located to the north of the studio. The advanced studio’s east wall, composed of concrete block and corrugated aluminum, divides this workspace from the kiln room. The northeast corner of TB-9 is a large open space that houses the undergraduate studio. A concrete block and corrugated aluminum wall on the south side of this studio separates it from the kiln room (east of the advanced studio) and clay mixing room located in the southeast corner of the building. Steel girders and supports for the roof are visible inside of both studios. All of the plumbing and plastic roof insulation are exposed along with the ventilation ducts. Inside of both studios, gypsum board lines the spaces between the windows and the floor and sprayed insulation is visible in the spaces between window units. When TB-9 was constructed, the insulation was sprayed onto the inside of the corrugated aluminum sheeting. Inside the kiln room, the west end and former foundry, houses three large gas-fueled kilns. The east end has seven electric kilns. The clay mixing room contains two large clay mixers, a red metal casting slip blunger. Casting slip is liquid clay that is poured into plaster molds to make pottery and sculptures. The blunger continuously mixes the slip so that it will not settle. Most slip is white low-fire earthenware, but it can be made from other types of clay.127 The west end of the clay room is a storage area for bags of powdered clay.

Additions and Alterations

The exterior of TB-9 has not changed significantly since it was constructed. There were some exterior changes when the building was converted from a dormitory to a mailroom, police station and storage area in 1951. When TB-9 was a dormitory, the sliding dock doors that were in place on the east and west elevations when the building units were acquired from the government were closed and locked. The entrance to the building was on the northern elevation through two doors on either side of the bathroom complex. On the west elevation, a doorway was added to the space behind the double metal sliding

127 I learned about slip casting by observing students slip cast during a visit to TB-9 on February, 23, 2015.
panels on the west wall and this was now the main entrance to TB-9. Also, a covered mail dock was added to the southern end of the west wall (where the storage shed is today). During the 1951 conversion, the eight sets of windows along both the north and south elevations remained in place, including the swamp coolers. Additional changes were made to the exterior after the art department moved into the southeast section of the TB-9 in 1961. On the southern elevation a ten by ten foot roll-up door was initially installed in place of the third window unit down from the west end. In 1975, the roll-up door was de-installed and swapped positions with one of the kiln room window units. A large ceiling-to-floor metal paneled double door replaced the window unit at the east end of the southern elevation. Both the roll-up door and the metal paneled double doors are still in these locations on the south wall. In 1967, a double door was installed in place of the existing single door entry. On the left of the new entry a single door was installed as part of the mailroom remodel. Mail slots were cut into the wall between the double and single doors.

Since 1951, most of the alterations to TB-9 have been to the interior due to the building’s variety of functions since its inception. When the building was the Warehouse Dormitory, a central corridor divided the space into north and south sides. The western and eastern thirds of the building were each divided into six rooms, three on the north side and three on the south side of the hallway. Each room housed twelve students in six double beds. The middle third of the building contained a large bathroom facility with multiple sinks, toilets and showers on the east side, and a study hall on the west side (Fig. 4). By 1961, the campus police station occupied the east side of the western third of the old dormitory. Across the hallway, the mailroom was in the southwest corner of TB-9 and occupied the equivalent of two dorm rooms. When Robert Arneson arrived in 1962, the art department’s space consisted of the old dorm room east of the mailroom, the old study hall space and the dorm room east of the study hall. The majority of the space in the east end of TB-9 was storage space for Food Science and Dairy Science along with a room for the Food Sciences library. The bathroom had been reduced in size. The rooms housing the sinks, showers and drying rooms were removed. By 1967, the police station had moved out, and the mailroom expanded into the station’s space (figs. 5-6).

By the end of the 1960s, the ceramics program occupied all of the space in TB-9. There have not been major changes to the floor plan and use of space since alterations were made to the interior in 1975 (fig. 7). One of the significant changes was the removal of the foundry. It was located in a room west of the original kiln room. After Tio Giambruni’s death in 1971, the metalworking program was discontinued so there was no longer a need for the foundry. The kiln room was on the east side of the foundry. By removing the wood stud and gypsum wallboard partition between it and the old foundry, the kiln room doubled its area. Because the ceramics program had expanded, they needed additional kilns to fire a greater volume of artwork. The walls surrounding the clay
TB-9 retains its location, design, setting, materials, feeling and association. These are the aspects of integrity that are significant to its nomination for the National Register. The location of the building has not changed since its period of significance. Also, the exterior design of the building matches the design of the building during its significant period (fig. 12). The setting has changed with regard to buildings on the west side of Cushing Drive. The fire station and the music building that replaced the station during TB-9’s period of significance have been torn down. However, these buildings were on property adjacent to TB-9 that is not a part of the site that is being evaluated for this nomination. TB-9 has retained its spatial relationship with the surrounding roads and Putah Creek. Its exterior retains a high percentage of the original construction materials. In some areas, aluminum siding was replaced due to wear, but the replacement siding is identical to the original corrugated aluminum. Campus architects and engineers designed TB-9 and constructed it with modified government surplus materials. Because the building is being evaluated under Criteria A and B, the craftsmanship is not critical to determining the building’s eligibility. TB-9 continues to evoke the feeling of an informal, dusty “tin barn” that served as the ceramics workshop during its period of significance. Today, TB-9 still functions as the ceramics labs and studios for the sculptural ceramics program at UC Davis, so it has retained its association with ceramics and the art department.
8. Statement of Significance

Applicable National Register Criteria
(Mark "x" in one or more boxes for the criteria qualifying the property for National Register listing.)

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

Criteria Considerations
(Mark “x” in all the boxes that apply.)

- [ ] A. Owned by a religious institution or used for religious purposes
- [ ] B. Removed from its original location
- [ ] C. A birthplace or grave
- [ ] D. A cemetery
- [ ] E. A reconstructed building, object, or structure
- [ ] F. A commemorative property
- [X] G. Less than 50 years old or achieving significance within the past 50 years
TB-9, University of California Davis
Name of Property
State

Yolo
County and

Areas of Significance
(Enter categories from instructions.)

Art

Education


Period of Significance
For A and B: 1962-1976


Significant Dates
1962 Arneson hired at UC Davis
1976 Arneson moved to Benicia, CA
1991 Arneson retired

Significant Person
(Complete only if Criterion B is marked above.)

Robert Carsten Arneson


Cultural Affiliation
N/A


Architect/Builder
University Office of Architects and Engineers
TB-9’s areas of significance are art and education, and its historical context includes its association with the development of the sculptural ceramics program at the University of California Davis, its association with the history of ceramic art in both California and the United States, and its association with a nationally recognized ceramic artist. In addition to retaining its integrity, TB-9 is eligible for the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion A because it is the site where the Funk Figurative Ceramics Movement began, a movement that was influential in altering the history of American ceramics. TB-9 is also eligible for the National Register under Criterion B because Robert Arneson, a nationally acclaimed ceramic artist who started the Funk Figurative Ceramics Movement, produced his most significant and influential work in his studio at TB-9. Even though Robert Arneson retained his affiliation with TB-9 through his retirement in 1991, by 1976 he had moved to Benicia and created the majority of his later work at his studio there. Also, by the mid-1970s, Funk Figurative Ceramics was a well-established and recognized art movement. Because of Arneson’s fame and reputation as an innovative teacher, the ceramics program at Davis became impacted. Admission to the program became highly selective due to excessive applications. Arneson no longer had control of recruiting or selecting students, leading to a more institutional, rigorous and formal atmosphere. Innovation and creativity yielded to a self-conscious and conforming attitude, especially after Arneson stopped working exclusively in his TB-9 studio. Because TB-9’s period of significance does not end within the past fifty years, the building is not eligible for the National Register without establishing its exceptional importance under Criteria Consideration G. An in-depth scholarly evaluation of TB-9 demonstrates how the development of the Funk Figurative Ceramics Movement at this site and its affiliation with Robert Arneson, the nationally and internationally recognized founder of this movement contributed to the history of American ceramics.

---

128 Natsoulas, Thirty Years of TB-9, 19.
TB-9, University of California Davis

Narrative Statement of Significance (Provide at least one paragraph for each area of significance.)

History of TB-9

Originally TB-9 was designed by the UC Davis Office of Architects and Engineers to serve as overflow student housing and was named the Warehouse Dormitory. It served in this capacity until 1951 when Beckett and Hughes Halls, the first permanent dormitories, were built.130 Between 1951 and spring of 1962, when Robert Arneson arrived on campus, TB-9 housed the campus police department, the mail department, a Food Science library, a storage area for ice cream cartons used by Dairy Sciences (they made ice cream in the Dairy Industry building located across Hutchinson Drive from TB-9), and a lab storage area for Food Sciences experimental canned goods. Initially, about one fifth of the space was dedicated for use by the art department. Seymour Howard, an art historian of classical art, and Richard Nelson planned to start a ceramics class and establish a studio in TB-9 in 1960. In the spring of 1961, Howard taught a ceramics class to six students in the large center space in TB-9. The space had partitioned areas for lab tables and wheels. He taught traditional Ch’an-Zen and Greek ceramics, along with some abstract expressionist ceramics similar to the style of Peter Voulkos (founder of Abstract Expressionist ceramic sculpture). Howard went on a European sabbatical during the fall of 1961, and in the spring of 1962, Richard Nelson hired Robert Arneson to set up a ceramic sculpture program in TB-9. In late 1962, Tio Giambruni began constructing a foundry in TB-9 that consisted of a burn-out kiln and casting area for metalworking (fig. 13). He was hired a year before Arneson and started the metal casting program at Davis. The foundry shared space with the ceramic art kilns.131 By the early 1970s, the other occupants had moved out of TB-9, and the building became the sole domain of the ceramic arts program. Giambruni died in 1971, and the foundry was removed and replaced with additional kilns for firing ceramic ware.132

Criterion A: Funk Figurative Ceramics Movement

TB-9 is significant under Criterion A because it is the site where the Funk Figurative Ceramics movement began. This movement made an important contribution to the

history of ceramic art in the United States. Although it seems unlikely that a revolutionary new ceramics movement began at Davis, a suburban UC campus, there are several reasons this occurred there during the early 1960s. It was geographically isolated from urban areas where traditional ideas prevailed, so the young art department had the luxury of creating their own rules and philosophy. Also, the 1960s was a time cultural and political upheaval, and this climate influenced artists to reject conventional practices and experiment and create new art forms. But Richard Nelson, the chair of the new UC Davis art department, was the primary reason the ceramics department spawned a nationally recognized art movement. He wanted to create a dynamic art program at Davis, and he had the foresight to hire a young faculty of artists who were graduates of Northern California art schools, diverse in their artistic interests but open to new ideas. Nelson was looking for creative and innovative artists who were interested in teaching, collaborating and pursuing their art. When he hired Robert Arneson in 1962, he instructed him to begin a ceramic sculpture program in TB-9, but Nelson did not dictate how things should be done. Because the Davis Art Department did not have an established curriculum for ceramic art, Arneson was free to create a ceramics program with a focus on innovation and experimentation rather than traditional pottery. Also, with no established protocols, Arneson was free to run his classes as a European atelier, where he shared studio space with his students and worked alongside of them. Instead of a didactic instructor, he was a facilitator, encouraging students to think of new ideas and experimenting with clay. This set the stage for TB-9’s transformation into a center for Funk ceramics where Arneson and his students created new ways to work with clay, glazes and firing techniques.

There was an atmosphere of mutual respect, and Arneson made it a habit of exhibiting his work along with that of his students at regional ceramic shows and galleries. This practice exposed their work to the art community, and the public soon realized that this TB-9 ceramic group at UC Davis was creating a new funky style of ceramic sculpture. Art critic E.M. Polley reviewed the 1966 exhibition, “Ceramics from Davis,” at Museum West at 900 N. Point Street in San Francisco, in the November 6, 1966 edition of the Vallejo Times Herald. She suggested that a new “school” of art was developing in the Davis Art Department, and that there was a “funkiness” about the art created by the instructor and his students. The building’s association with Funk Figurative Ceramics is one reason why TB-9 is worthy of preserving as a historic building. TB-9 is an icon. It is impossible to separate the building from the pervasive influence of Arneson and his students on the history of American ceramic art, and the work of other ceramic artists.

Criterion B

TB-9 also qualifies for the National Register under Criterion B because Robert Arneson, the acknowledged founder of Funk Figurative Ceramics, created his original and most famous funk ceramic art in his studio at TB-9. According to Arneson, TB-9 was his only studio for fifteen years and TB-9 was where he created his iconic funk works, “Funk John,” a ceramic toilet and his “Typewriter” (figs.14-15).135

During the late 1950s, Arneson was influenced by the abstract ceramic sculpture Peter Voulkos. At the Otis Art Institute in Los Angeles, Voulkos pioneered the idea of using clay to create nonfunctional forms as a means of self-expression. The inspiration for Voulkos’ work was the Abstract Expressionist Movement. Arneson experimented with abstract clay sculpture before he developed his Funk Ceramics style while he taught and worked at TB-9. His inspiration for pursuing this unique style of representational (not abstract) clay sculpture began at the 1961 California State Fair. Arneson was demonstrating pottery techniques for Antonio Prieto, his mentor at Mills College, and he began playing with the clay. He threw a quart size, thick-walled bottle and sealed it with a clay bottle cap and stamped “NO DEPOSIT, NO RETURN” on it (fig.16). This act was the beginning of Arneson’s “no return” to traditional ceramics. Many art historians consider this bottle to be the original figurative funk ceramic artwork.136 Arneson believed that ideas were more important than mastery of a technique or craftsmanship. He encouraged his students to experiment with types of clay, paints and glazes to create original sculpture. The Funk ceramics that Arneson and his students created were humorous, witty, inane, irreverent, vulgar, and offensive.

In 1981, he became infamous for his caricature of George Moscone (fig.17). The San Francisco Art Commission selected Arneson to make a memorial sculpture of their late mayor, George Moscone, to be placed in the new George Moscone Convention Center. The piece was controversial because of the references to events of Moscone’s murder that Arneson inscribed on the bust’s pedestal. Dianne Feinstein, the city’s mayor, asked Arneson to replace the work with a new piece, but he refused. He withdrew his work and returned the commission money. This incident was front-page news and proved to be pivotal in accelerating his career. Arneson and his Funk ceramics now had national exposure beyond the world of ceramic art.137

135 John Natsoulas, 30 Years of TB-9, 26.
136 Neal Benezra, Robert Arneson: A Retrospective, (Des Moines, IA: Des Moines Art Center, 1985), 18.
During his lifetime, Robert Arneson was and continues to be recognized as a significant contributor to the history of American ceramics. Art historians, and individuals who are well versed in ceramic arts, agree that Robert Arneson is the pioneer of the Funk Figurative Ceramics Art Movement. In his essay, “Funk,” published in Humor, Irony and Wit: Ceramic Funk From the Sixties and Beyond, John Natsoulas writes that Robert Arneson was the indisputable leader of the Funk Ceramics Movement that began in TB-9 on the UC Davis campus.¹³⁸

There are two additional buildings associated with Robert Arneson during TB-9’s period of significance. However, they do not possess the same level of historic significance as TB-9 within the established historic context for this nomination. One building is his house at 1303 Alice Street, where Arneson lived from 1962 through 1976. Although the house served as an inspiration for one of his ceramic projects, the “Alice Street series,” and the kitchen floor consists of original ceramic tiles made by Arneson, it is not the site where his artistic achievement transpired. After he married Sandra Shannonhouse, his second wife, they moved to Benicia, and built a studio at 430 First Street.¹³⁹ But this studio is not where he created his significant work.

Criteria Consideration G

Although TB-9’s period of significance ended less than fifty years ago, it retains its eligibility for the National Register under Criteria Consideration G because of its exceptional importance. Extensive evaluation of primary and secondary sources confirm the national and international recognition of the Funk Figurative Ceramics Movement as a distinct and original ceramic art movement that began in TB-9 on the UC Davis campus during the early 1960s. The literature validates the movement’s influence on the development of American ceramics. In addition to primary source documentation of the influence this movement had on American ceramic art, Arneson and the Funk Figurative Ceramics of TB-9 continue to be recognized for their significant contribution to American art history by museums, galleries and private collectors.


¹³⁹ Fineberg, A Troublesome Subject, 249.
There are many publications about art history and ceramic art that explicitly equate TB-9 with the Funk Figurative Ceramic Art movement. Art historians agree that the movement began at UC Davis in the 1960s and they recognize Robert Arneson as the founder of this original form of ceramic art. During Robert Arneson’s lifetime, Thomas Albright included a discussion of the Funk Figurative Ceramics Movement in his history of San Francisco Bay Area art from 1945 through 1980. A chapter entitled “The Watershed: Funk, Pop and Formalism discusses the influential artists at UC Davis during the 1960s and 1970s who created new directions for American art, specifically Arneson and William T. Wiley. Albright writes that Robert Arneson’s new ceramic program was located in TB-9. He attributes the combination of Arneson’s eccentric personality and the appeal of his “adolescent iconoclastic artworks” as the reasons the “UC Davis look” became an established regional style that gained national recognition.\(^\text{140}\)

In her 1998 book, *California Art: 450 Years of Paintings and other Media*, Nancy Dustin Wall Moure acknowledges Robert Arneson as the leader of Funk Figurative Ceramics. She writes that his Funk sculpture was made at TB-9 at UC Davis during the 1960s and she differentiates Arneson’s figurative ceramic sculpture from that of Peter Voulkos. She credits Voulkos as the founder abstract expressionist ceramic sculpture, a nonrepresentational style of artwork.\(^\text{141}\)

Nicholas Rourkes’ book, *artful jesters: INNOVATORS OF VISUAL WIT AND HUMOR*, states that Robert Arneson’s “provocative iconclasm” is the inspiration for “artful jesters” today who carry on his legacy. Rourkes defines an artful jester as an innovative artist who sees and interprets the world through an ironic, witty, provocative and sometimes contentious lens. In other words he is describing the 1960s’ Funk ceramic artists of TB-9. His book features the work of David Gilhooly, one of Arneson’s first graduate students who adopted the Funk style for his mature work. The ceramic art of Allan Rosenbaum, a professor of art at Virginia Commonwealth University, also reflects Arneson’s legacy. His Funk figurative work resembles many artworks that were created by TB-9 artists. Rosenbaum’s “Toaster,” 2000, is a direct reference to Arneson’s “Toaster” of 1965, and his “Wheelbarrow,” 1997, has anthropomorphic features similar to Peter VandenBerge’s Funk vegetables from his early TB-9 days.\(^\text{142}\)

In his article, “California Funk,” Scott A. Shields, a curator at the Crocker Art Museum in Sacramento, writes, … Funk is most often equated with Arneson and the school of

\(^\text{140}\) Albright, *Art in the San Francisco Bay Area*, 249-251.

\(^\text{141}\) Moure, *California Art*, 356.

\(^\text{142}\) Nicholas Rourkes, *artful jesters: INNOVATORS OF VISUAL WIT AND HUMOR*, (Berkeley: Ten Speed Press, 2003), xiii, 1, 74, 116-117.
cereals that developed at UC Davis, which in turn attracted other artists and ceramists to Northern California.” Shields identifies TB-9 as the center for Funk Ceramics and credits Arneson with encouraging his students to reject traditional ways to work with clay. He modeled experimentation that led to the creation of a new type of ceramic sculpture, the figurative Funk style. Shields states that influence of TB-9’s Funk ceramics spread beyond Northern California and achieved international fame.143

Jonathan Fineberg wrote a monograph about Robert Arneson entitled *A Troublesome Subject: The Art of Robert Arneson*. This 2013 publication includes a comprehensive review of Robert Arneson’s career at UC Davis. There are many color photographs of Arneson’s iconic Funk ceramic art that he made in his studio at TB-9. Fineberg’s book contains numerous references to Arneson’s association with TB-9 and discusses the evolution of Funk Figurative Ceramics within the walls of this iconic building.

The exceptional importance of TB-9 can also be confirmed by the many museum exhibitions dedicated to UC Davis figurative Funk ceramics. In 1989, California State University Fullerton staged an exhibition, *Contemporary Ceramics: The Artists of TB-9*. This show highlighted the work of Arneson, Peter VandenBerge, Richard Notkin, Robert Brady, Arthur Gonzalez, Lisa Reinertson and Tony Natsoulas. These TB-9 ceramists continue to work as ceramic artists, although many have developed their own personal style. Along with Arneson’s artwork, their art is included in many large museum collections. Natsoulas and Reinertson have created many ceramic works of public art on display in the Sacramento region.

Currently, the legacy of TB-9 is on display at the Oakland Museum of California through April 12, 2015. A quarter of the exhibition, *Fertile Ground: Art and Community in California*, is dedicated to UC Davis Funk ceramics. This exhibit is entitled “TB-9: A Mentor Shapes a Community. A plaque next to a photograph of Robert Arneson states, The ceramics program at UC Davis is centered in an old ‘temporary’ building known as TB-9. For almost thirty years, sculptor Robert Arneson mentored students in the nurturing confines of TB-9. The building was active 24 hours a day, with students and instructors interacting as peers in a highly collaborative atmosphere. The work that emerged from TB-9 had a national impact, transforming the image of ceramics from that of a utilitarian craft to a serious—often tongue-in-cheek-art form.144

144 I attended *Fertile Ground: Art and Community in California* in October 2014. This information is from my notes on the show.
In the near future, the legacy of TB-9 and Robert Arneson will be a prominent feature at the new Shrem Museum of Art that is scheduled to open on the UC Davis campus in 2016. Rachel Teagle, the founding director of the Shrem wants to tell the story of the “golden era” of art at UC Davis between 1960 and 1980, a time when many of the artworks in the university’s collection were created in TB-9. She feels that UC Davis needs to advertise its rich legacy of innovation and creativity in order to encourage notable artists to come to the campus as residents and visiting lecturers.¹⁴⁵

The City of Davis also celebrates the legacy of Robert Arneson and the Funk ceramics of TB-9. Over twenty-seven years ago, John Natsoulas, an art gallery owner in downtown Davis, and Robert Arneson wanted to promote ceramic art by bringing together artists so that they could learn from each other. Their idea became the California Conference for the Advancement of Ceramic Art (CCACA), an annual event that takes place in Davis each April. John Natsoulas Gallery will host the 27th edition of this conference in 2015. In multiple venues around Davis, professional and student ceramic artists display their artwork.¹⁴⁶ The influence of the Figurative Funk Ceramic Movement that began in TB-9 is evident in many of these contemporary artists’ works.

In March 2014, Elaine O’Brien, an art professor at Sacramento State University, moderated a panel discussion, “Remembering TB-9.” She invited Stephen Kaltenbach, Gerald Walburg and Peter VandenBerge, all former graduate students of Robert Arneson, to speak about their days working with Arneson in TB-9 during the early 1960s. Their stories reveal the dynamics that set the stage for the revolution in ceramics they experienced in this iconic building. They all agreed that “Arneson was TB-9.” They also concurred that their personal drive and dedication developed in an atmosphere of mutual respect and collaboration that Arneson fostered inside of those corrugated metal walls.¹⁴⁷

It is a well-established fact that TB-9 is where Robert Arneson founded the Funk Figurative Ceramic Movement, and the legacy of TB-9 continues to inspire and influence new generations of ceramic artists. The examples presented in this section illustrate the exceptional importance of TB-9 and support the eligibility of this building for the National Register of Historic Places under Criteria Consideration G.

9. Major Bibliographical References

Bibliography (Cite the books, articles, and other sources used in preparing this form.)


Previous documentation on file (NPS):

- preliminary determination of individual listing (36 CFR 67) has been requested
- previously listed in the National Register
- previously determined eligible by the National Register
- designated a National Historic Landmark
- recorded by Historic American Buildings Survey #
- recorded by Historic American Engineering Record #
- recorded by Historic American Landscape Survey #

Primary location of additional data:

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

Name of repository: _____________________________________________

Historic Resources Survey Number (if assigned): _____________

10. Geographical Data

Acreage of Property __0.62____________

Use either the UTM system or latitude/longitude coordinates

Latitude/Longitude Coordinates

Datum if other than WGS84: __________
(enter coordinates to 6 decimal places)

1. Latitude: 38.539583°  Longitude: -121.746137°

2. Latitude:  __________________  Longitude:  ______________
TB-9, University of California Davis

Name of Property

3. Latitude: Longitude:

4. Latitude: Longitude:

Or

UTM References
Datum (indicated on USGS map):

☐ NAD 1927 or ☐ NAD 1983

1. Zone: Easting: Northing:
2. Zone: Easting: Northing:
3. Zone: Easting: Northing:
4. Zone: Easting: Northing:

Verbal Boundary Description (Describe the boundaries of the property.)

The property is bounded by Old Davis Road to the east, Hutchinson Road to the north, Cushing Way to the west, and Putah Creek to the south.

Boundary Justification (Explain why the boundaries were selected.)

The footprint of the building occupies the majority of the area within the described boundaries. The roads are established campus thoroughfares, and Putah Creek is a natural feature of the landscape.
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name/title: Jane Higgins, Public History graduate student
organization: California State University, Sacramento
street & number: 2724 Brentwood Place
city or town: Davis state: CA
zip code: 95618
e-mail: aqmajane@gmail.com
telephone: 530-400-5078
date: March 9, 2015
Additional Documentation

Submit the following items with the completed form:

- **Maps**: A USGS map or equivalent (7.5 or 15 minute series) indicating the property's location.
- **Sketch map** for historic districts and properties having large acreage or numerous resources. Key all photographs to this map.
- **Additional items**: (Check with the SHPO, TPO, or FPO for any additional items.)
TB-9, University of California Davis

Google Earth Aerial Map (substituted for USGS map)

Sketch Map
Additional Items
Photographs
Submit clear and descriptive photographs. The size of each image must be 1600x1200 pixels (minimum), 3000x2000 preferred, at 300 ppi (pixels per inch) or larger. Key all photographs to the sketch map. Each photograph must be numbered and that number must correspond to the photograph number on the photo log. For simplicity, the name of the photographer, photo date, etc. may be listed once on the photograph log and doesn’t need to be labeled on every photograph.

Photo Log
Name of Property: TB-9
City or Vicinity: University of California Davis
County: Yolo
State: California
Photographer: Jane Higgins
Date Photographed: February 22, 2015 (exterior); February 23, 2015 (interior)
Number of Photographs: 20
Description of Photograph(s) and number, include description of view indicating direction of camera:

1 of 20   TB-9, western elevation, facing southeast.
2 of 20   TB-9, southwest corner, facing northeast.
3 of 20   TB-9, southern elevation, facing northeast.
4 of 20   TB-9, southern elevation chimneys, facing northeast
5 of 20   TB-9, southeast corner, facing northwest
6 of 20   TB-9, east end of south wall, facing west
7 of 20   TB-9, eastern elevation, facing north
8 of 20   TB-9, northern elevation, facing south
9 of 20   TB-9, north wall, double door and metal trap door, facing south
10 of 20  TB-9, northern elevation chimneys, facing south
11 of 20  TB-9, northern elevation and fence, facing southeast
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 of 20</td>
<td>Central hallway, facing east</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 of 20</td>
<td>Library, facing north</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 of 20</td>
<td>Glaze room and spray booth, facing northwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 of 20</td>
<td>Advanced student studio and classroom, facing southeast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 of 20</td>
<td>Undergraduate studio, facing east</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 of 20</td>
<td>Kiln room (west end), three gas-fueled kilns, facing southwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 of 20</td>
<td>Kiln room (east end), five electric kilns, facing east</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 of 20</td>
<td>Clay mixing room, two mixers and blunger, facing southeast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 of 20</td>
<td>Clay storage area, facing southwest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional Documentation: Historic Photographs, Building Plans, Artwork

Fig. 1. Aerial view of UC Davis Campus, circa 1941. Arrow indicates empty site where TB-9 is today. Courtesy of UC Davis Special Collections.
Fig. 2. Aerial View of UC Davis campus, 1952. Arrow shows location of TB-9. Courtesy of UC Davis Special Collections.
Fig. 3. TB-9 building plan, November 13, 1946. Courtesy of Campus Planning, Facilities and Safety, UC Davis.
Fig. 4. Warehouse Dormitory floor plan, February 1947. Courtesy of Campus Planning, Facilities and Safety, UC Davis.
Fig. 5. Floor plan of police station (right) and mailroom (left), May 1967. Courtesy of Planning, Facilities and Safety, UC Davis.
Fig. 6. Expansion of mailroom into former police station space, May 1967. Courtesy of Planning, Facilities and Safety, UC Davis.
Fig. 7. TB-9 floor plan, October 1975. Courtesy of Planning, Facilities and Safety, UC Davis.
Fig. 8. Central hallway, facing east, 1981. Courtesy of Tony Novelozo and Pam Thompson.
Fig. 9. Advanced studio and classroom, facing southwest, 1983. Courtesy of Tony Novelozo and Pam Thompson.
Fig. 10. Glaze room, circa 1980s. Courtesy of Tony Novelozo and Pam Thompson.
Fig. 11. TB-9 floor plan, 2015. Courtesy of Planning, Facilities and Safety, UC Davis.
TB-9, University of California Davis

Yolo

Fig. 12. TB-9, western elevation, facing southeast. Courtesy of Tony Novelozo and Pam Thompson.
Fig. 13. Tio Giambruni in TB-9’s foundry, May 1966. Photo by Ansel Adams. Courtesy of Sweeny/Rubin/Ansel Adams Fiat Lux Collection, UC Riverside.
Fig. 15. Robert Arneson, *Typewriter*, 1965.
Fig. 16. Robert Arneson, *NO DEPOSIT, NO RETURN*, 1961
Fig. 17. Robert Arneson, *Portrait of George*, 1981.
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