1.4. Front elevation. Claim Bungalow (47315), date unknown.
1.5. Front elevation. Prototype School (47012), 1916.
II.1. Front elevation. (46746), before 1917.
II.3. Front elevation. Store and Apartment Building for the Mandan Transfer Company in Mandan (46725), 1928.
II.4. Front elevation. Commercial Building for Carl Miller in Napoleon (46743), 1926.
II.5. Front elevation. Brick Store and Apartment for Mr. L. Lenhard, et al. in Dickinson (46617), 1930.
II.6. Front elevation. Commercial Building for E.H. Mattingly in Flasher (46820), before 1917?
II.11. Front and right elevations. Rural School Building for the Telfer School District No. 46 Burleigh County (47125), 1924.
II.15. Front elevation. Grade and High School Building (Plan No. 304) in Washburn (47034), 1913.
II.17. Front elevation. J.H. Newton House in Mandan (47321), before 1917?
II.18. Front elevation. Dr. E.P. Quain Residence in Bismarck (47332), before 1917.
II.23. Front elevation. Apartment Building for E.A. Hughes to be erected at Mandan (47312), 1926.
II.26. Front elevation. Highway Shop and Storage Building for the Department of State Highways in Bismarck? (46840), 1930s.
II.27. Front elevation. Braddock Fire Hall in Braddock (46944), 1919.
II.28. Front elevation. Logan County Court Chambers in Napoleon (46942), 1921.
II.29. Front elevation. Logan County Courthouse in Napoleon (46945), 1924.
II.30. Front elevation. Hettinger County Courthouse in Mott (46735), 1933.
II.33. Front elevation. Municipal Auditorium for Valley City (46862), 1937.
II.34. Elevation. Tourist Court for Moomaw and Knapp in Dickinson (46719), 1939.
II.35. Front elevation. Church at Hebron (46609), date unknown.
II.36. Front elevation. Church for the German Evangelical Association in Bismarck (46937), before 1917.
II.38. Front elevation. German Lutheran Church in Ashley (46910), 1921.
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Archives No.*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Function*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Client*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Location*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Date*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Stylistic Influence*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Special Features#</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Primary Materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Secondary Materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Dimensions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Shape</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Structural System</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Stories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Roofline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Windows</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Interior: a. [ ] Yes [ ] No Hierarchy of Spaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Principal Space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Designer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Record Type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] a. Complete set</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] b. Elevation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] c. Floorplan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] d. Section</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] e. Structural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] f. Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] g. Remodeling commission#</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] h. Other#</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Setting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] a. Related commission nearby#</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] b. Distinctive setting#</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Alterations#</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. [ ] Yes [ ] No Exterior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. [ ] Yes [ ] No Interior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Disposition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] a. Extant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] b. Razed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] c. Never built</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] d. Not built as drawn#</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] e. Unable to determine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] f. Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Significance of the Design within the Context of the Architectural Firm#</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] a. Unusual functional type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] b. Unusual style</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] c. Common property type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] d. Early design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] e. Late design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] f. Pivotal in design evolution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] g. Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

Van Horn & Ritterbush, et al.
Complete Commission Units
By Date¹ and by Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C.1899-1916</th>
<th>1917-29</th>
<th>1930-39</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houses</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple unit</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State agencies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local govs.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; recren.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Dates and places were not known for all complete commission units.
APPENDIX C

Scopes of Work

Scopes of work for later intensive level surveys of buildings designed by the architectural firm are part of the project. Since the consultant has detailed knowledge of the work of the firm, the practice of recommending possible future courses of study is a sound one.

Intensive Level Survey

An intensive level survey could be organized under a number of categories:

--by place
--by building types that dominate the practice
--by technology and materials
--by time period
--combination of the above

The last named approach, a combination of factors, seems appropriate. The approach allows one to arrive at the buildings that best characterize the contribution of the particular architectural firm.

In the case of Van Horn & Ritterbush, et al., the following building types could lend themselves to intensive level survey, in order of priority. Priority is based on the relative importance of the category within the body of the firm's work and the ease and cost effectiveness of the respective surveys.

It is difficult to assess the relative degree to which these categories may be in jeopardy of alteration or removal. Commercial buildings are often prey to modernization programs. State-owned institutional buildings may be changed to follow federal mandates for safety or accessibility, and older buildings may be razed in the interests of "progress." The circumstances surrounding a collection of representative works is individual for each building.

---Representative commercial buildings

Commercial designs were the dominant building type represented in the firm's body of work. As such, they merit recognition. Their appearance illustrates features and practices the firm used which clients found desirable and attractive. Their large representation in Bismarck offers the chance to survey a large number with relative ease.
A sampling of Bismarck commercial buildings (including apartment houses) as well as selected potentially significant examples outside the capital city would illustrate an important aspect of the firm's work. Non-Bismarck examples worthy of consideration include three small banks Van Horn designed (in Braddock, Strasburg and Wilton) and The Willows in Linton. The relationship between the firm and the construction activities of Edmond A. Hughes should be studied in detail.

A complicating factor is the high degree of alteration to many Bismarck commercial buildings. These many changes cloud the prospects for finding a number of suitable candidates for the National Register in downtown Bismarck.

---Properties at the State Penitentiary

Arthur Van Horn received an important boost to his career from the buildings he designed at the State Penitentiary at Bismarck. Their appearance offers insights into his approach to the practice of architecture. Relatively few early noncommercial examples of his work are known, and the State Penitentiary offers the possibility of a small concentration of work by him or the firm.

There has been interest in surveying and studying the historical significance of state institutions. Such a survey could be combined with a look at the work of Van Horn & Ritterbush, et al., at the State Penitentiary.

---Representative Works by Van Horn & Ritterbush, et al.

Using the data from this study, good representative works could be selected and surveyed intensively. Some of the best examples of the firm's work are already listed on the National Register, such as the Bismarck Municipal Auditorium and the Van Horn Hotel. Possible candidates are listed below.

46609 Church, Hebron
46612 Commercial Building for E.A. Hughes, Bismarck
46702 Bank, Wilton
46706 Farmers' State Bank, Braddock
The desire to survey and nominate properties to the National Register points out a difficulty inherent in a project of this type. The plans have been studied in great detail. But the buildings, their current degree of integrity—even whether they were ever in fact built—cannot be determined from the plans. Subsequent survey work should bear this in mind. At the time of survey, one may find that the potentially important examples are too altered or have been razed or of lesser quality than plans suggested.

The suggested areas for intensive level survey could be combined or executed separately. Given the several unknowns, a conservative approach—beginning with just one of the three areas—seems a good course to follow.

**Related Recommendation**

In the course of the study of the two architectural firms, it became apparent that a number of communities sought the services of an architectural firm for some sort of community hall. These halls included community buildings that also housed fire fighting equipment and rudimentary jails. There were also community-sponsored halls for showing moving pictures and other entertainments. In addition, local governments and school districts built gymnasiums and auditoriums, especially during the Depression years as public works projects. It appears that a community hall is an important property type in North Dakota communities, one that bears further study.
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END NOTES

1. The year of the change has also appeared as 1933 and 1934. Van Horn died in 1931, and it is possible that the formal change in name did not occur for several years.


3. "E.A. Hughes dies; pioneer in utilities," Bismarck Tribune, October 9, 1970. At the turn of the century, the firm enjoyed the patronage of several Bismarck business leaders, including attorney John F. Philbrick and H.W. Richolt. References to the "good old boy" network that apparently functioned in Bismarck are ephemeral and difficult to document. However, several informants commented on the strong ties among Van Horn, Hughes, and Philbrick.


6. Herbert S. Schell, History of South Dakota (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1961), pp. 158-74, 208-11. It is interesting to note that Alexander Hughes, then of Elk Point, Dakota Territory, cast the deciding vote that made Bismarck the new Territorial Capital in a highly contentious, politicized atmosphere. His son, Edmond, was largely responsible for the development of downtown Bismarck. One wonders what inducements (Bismarck property) the elder Hughes may have had access to.


9. Crawford, pp. 385-7. The time in the east part of the state would have at least provided the opportunity for him to meet W.J. Edwards and members of the Ritterbush family. The former was a Grand Forks architect who died in the early 1920s and Van Horn's firm finished up some of his projects.


12. Ibid.


14. Van Horn & Ritterbush collection, State Archives.


18. For a discussion of Loven's reported perfidy, see "In the Architect's Eye. 100 Years of North Dakota Building," 1989, p. 22. Loven was not listed in the Bismarck City Directory, 1924-25.

A "Carl Lovin" was among the pallbearers at Mrs. Van Horn's funeral in 1949, but this was probably the Bismarck contractor of that name and not Karl A. Loven. See "Mrs. Van Horn dies at her home here," Bismarck Tribune, October 13, 1949.


22. Robert H. Ritterbush noted that reading blueprints was something he simply grew up with and when he went to college was surprised at all the fuss about "learning" how to read them. It was simply second nature to him.

23. Interview with Stan Sharkey, Ritterbush employee since 1954, October 10, 1990. The brother's pre-1920 time with Van Horn has not been substantiated. The brothers' names did not appear on the firm's plans from the period before World War I--a not unexpected absence for apprentices--and they were not listed in Bismarck city directories.
24. Sharkey interview; Ritterbush interview. Sharkey stated the brothers received their Naval training at the Dunwoody Trade School (location unknown). Following this training, the two were sent East headed for Europe. But before they could ship out together, Robert contracted spinal meningitis and Clarence went alone. Before leaving, however, Clarence used his persuasive charm to convince the head nurse to let him see his dying (and highly contagious) brother. Robert, of course, recovered and followed Clarence overseas, much to his brother's delight and surprise.

25. Certificates to practice architecture, Robert A. and Clarence W. Ritterbush, July 2, 1919, Series 448, SHSND Archives; Ritterbush interview; "A. Van Horn will have new firm on January 1, 1920," Bismarck Tribune, December 31, 1919. The extent of the brothers' work in Minot has not been learned.

26. "A. Van Horn will have new firm...," Tribune, December 31, 1919, quoting; letterhead in possession of Ritterbush Associates stating "Van Horn & Ritterbush, architects, successors to W.J. Edwards." Nellie R. Edwards, presumably W.J. Edwards' widow, was listed as secretary, and the letterhead also noted the firm was a member of the Architects' Small House Service Bureau. Plans in the Van Horn & Ritterbush collection at the State Archives show Bismarck and Grand Forks offices for the firm.

27. No additional information on the coal company has come to light beyond its identification in the Van Horn and Ritterbush collection of drawings.

28. Ritterbush Brothers to Capitol Commissioners, July 3, 1931, Series 278, SHSND Archives.

29. Ritterbush interview. Ritterbush recalled that his father and Clarence recounted this story.

30. Sharkey interview.

31. Ritterbush interview.

32. Ibid.

33. AIA form No. H503, Robert A. Ritterbush application to be named a Fellow in the American Institute of Architects.

34. Ritterbush and Sharkey interviews.

35. Sharkey interview.

36. Ibid.

38. For more information on the Transitional Brick Commercial style, see the SHSND Site Form Training Manual. The style has yet to be researched in detail. It is often referred to simply as Transitional Brick.

39. Commercial complete commission units were in Anamoose, Braddock, Dickinson, Flasher, Glen Ullin, Linton, Mandan, Napoleon, New Salem, Oakes, Regent, Strasburg, Wilton.

40. Van Horn was not a highly skilled draftsman. In many cases it appears that details that stand out rather sharply on his elevations would in fact not have appeared as prominent on the buildings. Many times the trim was brick that did not contrast sharply with the face brick. It appears that many Van Horn elevations provide an inaccurate picture of the appearance of the building.

41. All examples of brick schools had flat roofs with the exception of two prototypes from 1914 (47027) and 1915 (47023) which had truncated hipped roofs similar to the firm's wood frame schools.

42. The names of the firm as they appear on the plans are difficult to read.

43. There are two versions, 47321 and 47320. The latter is even more simplified than the former.


45. Crawford, pp. 386-87.

46. The power plant and warehouse additions and water tank were not counted as complete commission units in this report.

47. See survey of Selected State Properties, The Evolution of North Dakota State Reform School, 1890-1940 and related survey forms.


49. The present Burleigh County Courthouse in Bismarck is not represented in the State Archives but may have been designed by Ritterbush Brothers.

50. The Municipal Auditorium was not initially available for study at the State Archives because the present architectural firm has the plans and a five-number archives number was therefore not assigned to it.
51. See Survey of Selected State Institutions, The Evolution of North Dakota State Reform School, pp. 43-44.

52. The firm also designed a bath house for the coal company (46723) and other buildings.

53. The reports for the two architectural firms are contained in separate volumes.