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Until the early twentieth century, Park Row was synonymous with New York newspapers. Of the newspapers that left Park Row, the New York Times was notable for having established a geographic landmark that was identified with the newspaper. In fact, by 1906, Times Square had replaced Park Row as a place for New Yorkers to get election night news or to celebrate New Year’s Eve. Nevertheless, Times Square did not remain associated with its newspaper namesake, and today a successor to the “zipper” is the last physical reminder of the paper’s presence in this area of New York City. Drawing on the Archives of the New York Times Company, this article traces the history of Times Square from the construction of Times Tower through the twentieth century as the Times lost its identity as the neighborhood’s namesake.

New Yorkers had never seen anything like it. On December 10, 1890, thousands were reported to have gathered for the opening of the city’s tallest building, which was not just any building but “The Greatest Newspaper Building in the World,” according to a front-page headline in the next day’s edition of the New York World. Designed by architect George P. Post, the Pulitzer Building was, in fact, a grand monument to the importance of the newspaper and its publisher, Joseph Pulitzer. Built on the site of the former French’s Hotel, where Pulitzer was said to have been evicted as a younger man, the new building’s opening was celebrated with a lavish fireworks display and commemorated with an extensive and self-congratulatory “souvenir supplement” in the following day’s edition of the World. So high was the new building—309 feet from the street to the top of the building’s lantern—that upon reaching Pulitzer’s office in the building’s dome, one opening-day visitor famously inquired, “Is God in?” The Pulitzer Building, the first secular building in New York to surpass the height of the city’s tallest church steeple, was at that moment the crown jewel of Park Row, the New York City street that was synonymous with journalism in the nineteenth century. However, the exalted and historic status of “Newspaper Row” was not to last: within a few years, newspapers would begin leaving the neighborhood for disparate parts of Manhattan.

The Herald left Park Row on August 20, 1893, for a lavish building designed by Stanford White and inspired by Italy’s Palazzo del Consiglio. Passersby in what became known as “Herald Square” would have taken notice of the building, if not the twenty-six large bronze owls (with lighted eyes) that Herald publisher James Gordon Bennett, Jr. had ordered erected on the top of the building. The New York Times followed suit, erecting a 380-foot tower a few blocks further uptown at Broadway and 42nd Street. By 1954, all of New York’s newspapers would leave Newspaper Row and many of their buildings also would disappear, leaving only memories of what writer Pete Hamill in 2004 called “the vanished majesties of Park Row.” The Pulitzer Building fell to the wrecker’s ball in 1956 and the neighboring Tribune Building—once hailed as the “world’s first cathedral of commerce”—was demolished a decade later. The only remnants of the press’ association with Park Row are statues of Benjamin Franklin and Tribune editor Horace Greeley.

Herald Square and Times Square briefly replaced Park Row as
The press, Benedict Anderson wrote in 2003, provided Americans with a picture of the country as a cohesive nation. Perhaps nowhere was the press more important than in New York, a city widely acknowledged by the end of the nineteenth century as the mecca of American journalism. Similar to most large cities, New York's industries—whether garment manufacturing or finance—clustered together in neighborhoods, and newspapers were no exception. London's Fleet Street had been synonymous with journalism for 500 years. In New York, nineteenth-century newspapers congregated near City Hall on Park Row. The street, Hartley Davis wrote in Munsey's Magazine in 1900, "is to the newspaper world what Wall Street is to finance." Such a designation was more than a physical identification of a cluster of buildings: Park Row also evoked the collective identity of the New York press.

Cultural geographers, sociologists, and urban planning scholars say such identities result from the social production of space, which recognizes the physical or geographic presence of spaces as well as their social meanings. Alan Trachtenberg's 1965 study of the Brooklyn Bridge, for example, acknowledged the duality of architecture: its existence as both a physical fact and as a symbol. As facts, buildings occupy a physical, geographic, and temporal location; simultaneously, they exist as symbols in the popular imagination. Such distinctions help explain why the "pragmatic" issues related to the reasons for constructing a building as well as the "mythic" aspects that construct buildings and produce social space are both germane to historical research. The resulting "spatial grammar" helps us read social spaces as texts, revealing a rich cultural history of those who occupied the spaces.

Space to which meaning has been ascribed—what cultural studies calls "place"—acts as "a container of experiences," Edward Casey noted in 1986. In his 2006 study of Fenway Park as a symbol, Michael Ian Borer, delineated between the "use value" of a building and its "symbolic worth." The use value considers such things as the functions of a building—in this case, its ability to produce and distribute newspapers—while the symbolic value is related to "constructing and reconstructing collective memories." Historic sites, such as Newspaper Row, "help citizens define their public pasts," architectural historian Dolores Hayden wrote in 1995. Such places "trigger memories for insiders, who have shared a common past," and "represent shared pasts to outsiders." Similarly, Borer suggested that places are "pedagogical tools" that help transmit "cultural knowledge from one generation to the next."

Thus, the disappearance of Newspaper Row and the subsequent disassociation of Herald Square and Times Square from newspapers is a loss to the collective memory of American journalism. This disassociation of the squares from their namesake newspapers leads one to question whether the traditions of journalism can be effectively remembered by new generations.

Despite leaving Park Row, newspapers continued the practice of erecting buildings that "gave citizens a recognizable and unam-

major landmarks associated with newspapers. The Herald Building, born in 1921 of its owls, clocks, and bronze bell-ringers and then demolished, is now better known for neighboring Macy's department store. Similarly, Times Tower quickly proved inadequate as a newspaper plant, and the Times built a new plant on West 43rd Street in 1913. If the twentieth century was, as Aurora Wallace wrote in 2005, a time of "decline and, as a result, one of diminishing influence" for newspapers, that decline is now reflected in Times Square, where television and advertising—not newspapers—are preeminent. Where the New York Times once displayed news headlines on a ticker, enormous video screens now dominate the streetscape. Rather than being known for a newspaper, Times Square is perhaps best known as "the world's preeminent good-time place," thanks in part to the New Year's celebrations instituted by the Times in 1904. If architecture, as Hugh Ferriss wrote in 1929, "invariably expresses its age correctly," newspaper buildings reflect the prominence once held by newspapers. Buildings—specifically those of a monumental scale—were intended as expressions of power. Furthermore, the exteriors of newspaper buildings served as "exemplars of architectural taste," according to Lee E. Gray in 2005. Evidence of the importance that newspaper publishers of the time placed in the structures. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, newspaper buildings were sufficiently prominent to warrant the attention of architecture critics, such as the influential writer Montgomery Schuyler. More recently, scholars have studied the contributions of newspaper buildings. For example, Gray described how New York newspapers invented a new type of building: the hybrid newspaper-office building. Newspaper buildings also have been addressed in prominent contemporary studies of New York architecture, and other contributions to the literature have focused on the Chicago Tribune Tower and the architectural competition that led to its construction in 1925. However, such studies are largely confined to the literature of architectural history; with the exception of Wallace's study of the Tribune's Manhattan Examination of the Tribune, Times, and World buildings and Hy B. Turner's 1999 book on newspaper publishing on Park Row, little attention had been paid to newspaper buildings in journalism history literature. This article proposes to extend journalism history literature with an examination of the New York Times' departure from Park Row, its establishment of Times Square, and the paper's subsequent loss of identity with the site. Drawing on the Archives of the New York Times Company, it will document the building of Times Tower and the Times Annex at 229 West 43rd Street, which was the newspaper's headquarters for most of the twentieth century, as well as its decision to ultimately abandon Times Tower. Additionally, drawing on the perspective of cultural geographers, this study will consider Times Square's supplanting of Park Row as a place for newspapering and the landmark's subsequent contested identity.
biguous sign that commercial media were thriving in America,” said Wallace. In 1890, the Sun commissioned Bruce Price, who designed a thirty-four-story, pyramid-roofed tower inspired by the campanile of San Marco in Venice. However, ground was never broken because the site proved unsuitable for the building.

In July 1903, it was reported that William Randolph Hearst planned to build a thirty-story tower for the New York American and Journal near Columbus Circle. Just as Bennett of the Tribune and Adolph Ochs of the Times before him, he could see the business center of New York was moving further uptown. However, Hearst, who involved himself in building plans, believed the best area was even further uptown, near Central Park. In fact, he planned on building a series of skyscrapers at Columbus Circle, which he envisioned being named Hearst Plaza. One skyscraper design, by architects J. Stewart Barney and Henry Otis Chapman, called for a 550-foot, forty-story building on a Columbus Circle lot at Broadway and 58th Street that architectural critic Montgomery Schuyler wrote “demanded unusually clever handling.” In order to utilize all available space and without calling attention to the lot’s unusual shape, the architects proposed a building with each of its four fronts being a different height, a design that Schuyler thought “succeeded with conspicuous success.”

It also was considered a “wildly extravagant design,” including the use of giant caryatids (sculpted human figures that act as supporting columns), circular floors, and a 555-foot-high clock tower. Hearst’s plans were for Hearst Plaza to supplant Herald Square and Times Square as the city’s publishing center. However, the publisher eventually abandoned such ambitions, building a newspaper plant in lower Manhattan instead, leaving only a monument to the battleship Maine on Columbus Circle and the International Magazine Building nearby on Eighth Avenue.

As Hearst considered moving his newspapers uptown, Ochs’ plans were already underway. Although the Times occupied an admired building with a reputation of being an architectural marvel, the newspaper had outgrown it and its lease was soon to expire. He first considered constructing a new building near Park Row on the site that would eventually be occupied by the Woolworth Building. However, he abandoned the plan because he felt the land was too expensive. Ultimately, Ochs came to believe that “Park Row was dying, just as old persons must die.”

It was not the first time that Ochs had constructed a new newspaper building. As a struggling publisher, he had sought to reassure investors and readers of the Chattanooga Times that his business was prospering by erecting an attractive and imposing building. Opened in 1892, the six-story building was the city’s tallest at the time. Never mind that he was deeply in debt; his building, which was constructed of granite, topped by a gold dome, and cost $177,542 to build, was, Ochs told potential investors, “the handsomest structure in this section of the country.” Located in a prominent location—at the intersection of five streets—the building’s opening ceremonies drew 10,000 people. Not only was it meant to house his newspaper and printing operations, including the newest typesetting and printing equipment, but three floors were set aside to rent to tenants.

Constructing a new building for the New York Times proved to be more difficult. The financial and legal arrangements were complex, the building site was small and oddly shaped, and the building was proposed with the city’s new subway running through its basement. Just as he had in Chattanooga, Ochs chose a prominent site: a trapezoidal lot at Longacre Square, a neighborhood more populated by horse stables and brothels than by reputable businesses. Bounded by Broadway, Seventh Avenue, and Forty-First and Forty-Second streets, the lot was occupied by the Pabst Hotel. It was, according to one newspaper account, “not much bigger than would avail a group of school children for a fairly active game of hopscotch.”

But despite its odd shape and small size, Ochs could see huge potential in the lot, partly because of the construction of the Interborough Rapid Transit Subway (IRT), which planned to build a station where Ochs was going to put his newspaper. He could see the publicity benefits of having a building that “probably a hundred thousand people” would pass through each day. Although still deeply in debt from his purchase of the Times, he nevertheless arranged financing to purchase land from the Subway Realty Corporation, the company that August Belmont set up to build the IRT. The purchase was announced on August 4, 1902.

Ochs hired Cyrus L.W. Eidlitz to design his new building and the George Fuller Company, which had built the Flatiron Building, to construct it. The architect faced a challenge: to utilize all available space on the small and irregularly shaped lot while keeping the building looking symmetrical. In keeping with Ochs’ desire to build a monumental tower, Eidlitz originally sought to cap the building with either a cupola or pitched roof. However, a symmetrical cap on the building required a similarly symmetrical base, which would result in losing square footage, a prospect that did not sit well with one of Ochs’ financial backers, Spencer Trask. After viewing preliminary drawings, Trask wrote to Ochs that he did “not care for any of them” because they had not “made, by any means, the best utilization of space.” The unique site “calls for something that is original in design, and monumental in character,” he added. “An opportunity is here given for something that would be noticeable in the architectural line, and I do not think that Mr. Eidlitz has grasped the wonderful opportunity that is presented.” But a decision on the design could not wait because the foundation for the building had to be constructed simultaneously with the construction of the subway. Even before Trask complained about the architect’s preliminary drawings, Ochs’ builder was under pressure to order necessary steel. “The work on the Rapid Transit Subway is being pushed and after they once get it installed we will have a pretty hard time erecting the building in accordance with Mr. Ochs’ desires,” the Fuller Company wrote to Eidlitz in an effort to obtain the architects plans. “In fact, it will be impossible.”
Ultimately, Eidlitz abandoned a classical approach because of the impossibility of “fitting a symmetrical top to an unsymmetrical substructure,” instead settling on a Gothic design that would take advantage of the maximum amount of square footage. Inspired by Giotto’s campanile (bell tower) in Florence, the Times Tower was to be 58 feet long at the base of its south end and 20 feet long at the base of its north end while the longest sides of the building were to measure 143 feet and 138 feet at the base. It was to be twenty-five stories at its highest point, making it the second-highest building in New York City and visible from twelve miles in every direction, and constructed with more steel than any other building at the time. Originally to be covered in Indiana limestone, it was to consist of two sections: a nineteen-story building to be leased topped by a six-story tower at the broader end of the building to be occupied by the newspaper. The presses were to be installed in a subbasement fifty-five feet below street level. Construction of the basement would necessitate the digging of the deepest hole in Manhattan. Above the presses, tenants would share the first subbasement with the subway station.

Even after settling on a design for the tower, the architect had difficulty getting plans completed fast enough to satisfy the builders. “We do not want our Company to get into any kind of controversy with your architects,” the president of the Fuller Construction Company wrote to Ochs. “And yet at the same time I feel very well convinced that they are not affording us as rapidly as they ought, the information which it is necessary for us to have in order to promptly and expeditiously proceed with your building.” Meanwhile, the project was running significantly over budget. In 1902, the Equitable Life Assurance Company approved a mortgage for nearly $1.1 million and extracted an agreement for Equitable to be the only insurance company to lease space in the tower. However, during the course of construction, the projected cost of the building increased to $1.3 million, prompting considerations in May 1903 of scaling back on the height of the tower by omitting the top six floors. However, Eidlitz recommended to Ochs that the same amount of structural steel should be installed in the lower nineteen stories so that the top six floors could be added later. Omitting the steel for the top six floors, Eidlitz discovered, would only realize a small savings and possibly cause considerable delay in the project’s completion.

As Ochs struggled to lower the building’s construction costs to near the original estimate, he decided to substitute terra cotta for stonework to accompany the Indiana limestone, saving $100,000. Even so, his accountants could “not see how we can get down to our original figure of $1,100,000 without radically changing the structure of the building.” The radical change that his lenders wanted was the omission of the tower’s top six stories—including the observatory, lantern, and flagpole—which, by some estimates, would save nearly $170,000. However, he refused to admit defeat by giving up what he saw as the building’s crowning piece. Omitting the top floors, the publisher told his lenders, would be an architectural and a business mistake. “The tower makes the building monumental and attractive and differentiates it form the usual sky-scraper type and avoids it being called ‘the little Flatiron,’” he wrote, referring to the Flatiron Building at Madison Square. Such a designation, he believed, “would be harmful.” Nevertheless, Equitable turned him down. “I am sorry to disappoint you,” its president wrote after the company’s executive committee declined Ochs’ request for an additional loan to build the top six floors. Undaunted, he went ahead with the tower anyway. “I am satisfied that I can now build the tower at very much less cost now than

The New York Times moved into its Times Tower in January 1905. The newspaper editorialized that it “cherishes the modest belief that its building is an architectural adornment of New York City” and “the placing of the Times Building in this Square has caused a previously neglected part of the city to be born again.” (Courtesy of the New York Times Company records, Manuscripts and Archives Division, New York Public Library)
to do it later and the space it will make available for renting I am confident will more than justify the investment.”

Ochs not only was counting on leasing a good portion of Times Tower, he expected to charge premium rates. The building's small footprint—an entire floor was only 4,000 square feet—led him to believe that some tenants would lease an entire floor, allowing him to charge “more than the prevailing rate for floor space because of the extraordinary location, and light and air, to say nothing of the advertising value.”

More than two years before the building was scheduled to be completed, he was confident that the day it opened “there would not be a foot of vacant rentable space in it.”

Nevertheless, construction was complicated by labor troubles. The Times later estimated labor strikes delayed the completion by eight months. In late 1903, Ochs still clung to hope that the building could be opened in the spring. However, its completion was running so far behind that his real estate broker was worried about losing prospective tenants, reporting that he had clients “anxious to talk business, but whom we are holding off, not knowing where we stand in the matter.” The delay, he said, meant that “not only is the reputation of the building at stake, for if it is not rented by May 1, it will stand idle for a year and will receive a black eye in the eyes of the public, but the financial loss will be great.”

On January 18, 1904, Ochs' eleven year-old daughter laid the cornerstone for Times Tower. In a speech that she claimed she could still recite from memory in her old age, Iphigene Ochs dedicated the new building “for the welfare of mankind, the best interests of the United States and its people, and for decent and dignified journalism.” After tapping the cornerstone with a silver trowel, the young girl pronounced it “plump [sic], level and square.” There was, she later wrote, “a great deal of mirth around me” as a result of mispronouncing the word “plumb.” Only three months after the cornerstone ceremony, Ochs received a piece of welcome news: Longacre Square was to be renamed Times Square. Although he claimed the city had made its decision without the Times requesting that the name be changed, the new name had come about because of one of his powerful supporters. Writing on behalf of the IRT, August Belmont requested that the city consider the name change because the current designation of Longacre Square “means nothing and is not generally known throughout the city.” Furthermore, he wrote, the IRT desired subway stations have distinguished names, and “No station on our route is liable to be more active and important than that at Broadway and Forty-second Street. Owing to the conspicuous position which The Times holds, it being one of the leading New York journals, it would seem fitting that the square on which the building stands should be known as ‘Times Square.’”

The New York City Board of Aldermen voted for the name change, and Mayor George B. McClellan signed it into law, later sending the pen to Ochs. He replied in April 1904:

“I thank you for the presentation of the pen with which you gave me the legal existence to Times Square. Please accept the assurances of my appreciation of the great honor confirmed on the New York Times in giving its name to one of the most important centers in this great city. As time rolls on I am confident that the New York Times, in its devotion to the best intents of the City of New York, will justify this recognition of its work and usefulness.”

The Times' reporting was less genial, suggesting “very likely the name would have been conferred by the speech of the people without official action.”

By November 1904—two and-a-half years after Ochs acquired the property—tenants began moving into Times Tower. However, the newspaper operations would not move in until the first of the new year and the building would not be deemed “sufficiently advanced toward actual completion to be ready for inspection by visitors” until February 1, 1905. The Times move coincided with the New Year, and not one to miss a promotional opportunity, Ochs planned a New Year's Eve street party with a huge fireworks display. At midnight, flares were sent up from the top four corners of Times Tower, culminating with fireworks that spelled out “1905,” which was accompanied by “an ear-splitting blast . . . from the horns of the myriad of merrymakers on the streets below,” according to the Times.

The last edition of the New York Times to be printed on Park Row rolled off the presses on Sunday, January 1, 1905, with what it boasted was “one of the most notable newspaper editions on record.” The paper included a forty-eight-page magazine supplement devoted entirely to the new building. In it, the Times promised readers that they would find stories of the construction to be “as fascinating as fiction” with “no detail that does not carry with it interest and wonderment.” Printed on thick paper with lavish illustrations and a color cover, the newspaper regarded it as “a triumph of the printer's art” and suggested it would be “A Souvenir Well Worth Preserving.”

As the souvenir Sunday paper “melted away from the news stands all over the city at a faster rate than sun ever melted snow,” according to the Times, workers quickly moved the Times operations from Park Row into Times Tower. Of greatest concern was the dismantling of twenty-seven large linotype machines to be moved uptown and then hoisted up to the sixteenth floor of Times Tower, where they were reassembled alongside eleven new linotypes that had already been set up. The entire move had been completed in a day, which was “two hours less time than even the most optimistic among those concerned had hoped,” the Times claimed, and in time for the next day’s paper to roll off new presses in the basement of Times Tower, where it was delivered to news dealers by the subway.

The newspaper occupied the basements, as well as the thirteenth through the twenty-second floors, which was 21,097 square feet of the building. Ochs felt certain that the building contained all of the
space that the paper would need. After one year in the building, he was sure that he had made the right decision, as evidenced by an editorial that stated the newspaper “cherishes the modest belief that its building is an architectural adornment of New York City” and “the placing of the Times Building in this Square has caused a previously neglected part of the city to be born again.” However, the Times’ satisfaction with its new building was not to last.

Even as the Times’ circulation continued to rise, the newspaper was unable to expand because the pressroom was hemmed in by the neighboring subway and accessible by a single freight elevator. Within seven years, plans were underway to move the paper again, which was all but an admission that Ochs’ Tower was too small and impractical as a newspaper plant. While the Times intended to maintain an office at Times Tower, the editing and printing of the newspaper was transferred on February 3, 1913, to a new, nearby building at 229 West 43rd Street. It initially was referred to as the Annex, and it was to be “the last word in newspaper production.” All eleven floors, which totaled 144,000 square feet, were built specifically for the paper’s operations, which was “far in excess of the area provided for any other daily newspaper in the United States,” the Times reported. Furthermore, the building’s “architects, builders, equippers, and owners know of no other newspaper plant in the world which will compare in capacity, efficiency and modernity.” The facilities—the Times referred to it as a “Scientific Newspaper Plant” in its first edition printed from the Annex—significantly increased printing capacity, providing the Times with a “theoretical printing capacity” of 480,000 copies of sixteen-page newspapers per hour, seven times as many as could be produced when the paper moved into Times Tower eight years earlier.

Inspired by France’s castle of Chambord, the Times Annex was built in four phases. The second phase in 1923 more than doubled its original size and was, in essence, two buildings fused together. The project cost nearly $2.5 million, which was significantly more than the Times’ original estimate of $1.6 million. Ochs believed the increased cost was due to extravagance on the part of the architects, and he was having second thoughts about trying to “weld” a new building onto the original. His son-in-law, Arthur Hayes Sulzberger, attempted to absorb some of the responsibility for the building’s expense by explaining that the higher costs were due to changes in the building plans. He also reminded Ochs that while the addition was originally conceived of as a separate building, “to the best of my recollection we all fell in with the idea of making a monumental structure of the building.” Ochs, according to Sulzberger, was responsible for some of the changes. “Please do not think that I do not appreciate that the building has been extremely expensive,” Sulzberger wrote in an attempt to assuage the publisher. “I do submit, however, that a great part of it lay in the general labor conditions which could not have been avoided and that the balance was in the cost of making the home of The Times a monument to good journalism and to ADOLPH S. OCHS.”

As expensive as the 1923 expansion was, it paled in comparison to the eleven-story addition built between 1946 and 1948, which cost $10.1 million. The construction gave the newsroom a much-needed expansion and added another fifteen new presses. The ambitious project also brought with it a name change. Recognizing that the newspaper had occupied its West 43rd Street location since 1913, the paper dropped the “Annex” name and instead renamed it “The New York Times Building.”

Only the newspaper’s classified advertising office had remained at Times Tower when it removed its operations to the Annex. Nevertheless, the Times retained ownership of Ochs’ Tower, continuing with the Times Square New Year celebrations inaugurated on January 1, 1905. In 1907, new safety regulations prevented Ochs from continuing with a fireworks display on New Year’s Eve. So, he added an illuminated ball to the celebration, which dropped from the top of the tower’s flagpole as celebrants counted down the seconds until midnight. By 1906, the crowds that gathered at Times Square to watch the Great Ball were larger than those at City Hall Park, next to Park Row. Times Square was now considered the place to ring in the New Year.

Similarly, Times Square became a gathering place for the latest news on election nights. Previously, New Yorkers had gathered along Park Row, where newspapers first posted and then used large drum lights to project news headlines and election results onto their buildings’ walls. When Ochs took over the Times in 1896, the newspaper projected election results on the side of its building at 41 Park Row, but he conceded that Pulitzer’s World had a more impressive display for the estimated 50,000 people who gathered in the area. Not allowing himself to be outdone on election coverage in his new building, he had the results of the 1904 election projected on the sides of Times Tower, just as on Park Row, even before moving into it. However, the new building afforded a new device for the Times to signal results: a searchlight on the Tower’s roof was used to send results that could be seen from thirty miles away. If a steady beam of white light was seen pointed to the west, readers were told, Theodore Roosevelt had been elected president. Steady lights beamed in other directions indicated victories for one of Roosevelt’s opponents. Lights that tilted up and down to the west indicated a Republican Congress had been elected while the same signal to the east reported a Democratic congressional victory.

The building was used not only to report election results but sporting events with posters drawing tens of thousands into Times Square. For a 1910 boxing match between Jack Johnson and Jim Jeffries, the Times set up an electric bulletin pressboard. The newspaper gave a blow-by-blow account of the “Battle of the Century” on this device, which produced small letters on rolls of paper. By 1926, a New York Company named Motogram approached the Times with a proposal that an “electric moving letter sign” be installed around Times Tower. “There is no location in all the world like The Times Building,” Frank C. Reilly, a Motogram representative, wrote to Arthur Hayes Sulzberger. “The idea of displaying your messages and bulletins on all four sides would prove a master
stroke of publicity and public service . . . in reality giving to ‘Times Square’ even greater meaning than before.” The device Reilly proposed consisted of a light bulb-studded copper panel, 380 feet long and five feet high, mounted on the four sides of the Tower, and the 14,000 light bulbs on the sign spelled out news stories sent to it from a control room on the fourth floor. In the control room, a conveyer propelled metal characters over a series of brushes that established and broke electrical current to turn lights on and off. Words, twelve electric lights high, first appeared at the northwest corner of Times Tower and moved northward, eastward, and then westward until new words appeared. The device was constructed in time for the 1928 presidential election, making its first appearance on November 6.

The sign, which the Times never named anything more distinctive than “our electric bulletin sign,” eventually became known as the “zipper.” It was enormously successful and, although blacked out during portions of World War II, became even more famous for its role in announcing the war’s end. The zipper also continued to draw crowds for election coverage. For the 1952 presidential election, the Times added search light signals and an eighty-five-foot-high lighted display that looked like a thermometer to accompany the zipper. However, it became clear that the tradition of gathering in Times Square to watch election night results was greatly diminished by television. “Times Square last night had the smallest Election Night turnout in its long existence,” wrote Times reporter Meyer Berger. “It was the least demonstrative crowd, too—without voice, without the traditional horns and bells, and utterly without enthusiasm.”

Times Tower also had seen better days. It was succumbing to age and the elements, and its exterior was beginning to deteriorate. In May 1937, a piece of terra cotta fell from the building, prompting nearly $33,000 in repairs in the following year. In addition, tenants in the Tower wanted air conditioning, potentially adding additional expense. Despite the mounting expense of maintaining the Tower, Sulzberger believed it remained linked to the newspaper in the public mind. “Write me down as a sentimental fool,” Sulzberger wrote in 1959 in reference to his attachment to Times Tower. By 1956, the Times began to consider the possibility that it would leave the Times Square neighborhood when it began to receive word that the Hearst Corporation was interested in buying the New York Times Building on West 43rd Street. Sulzberger was ready to entertain an offer but only if he could get $25 million for it. Meanwhile, the Times had purchased property on West End Avenue, near the new Lincoln Center development, and Arthur Hayes Sulzberger’s son, Arthur Ochs Sulzberger, was put in charge of planning the construction of an auxiliary printing plant on the site. The property was advantageously located near rail lines and had considerable room for expansion. By the time that the plant opened in July 1959, the Sulzbergers were considering adding a twenty-story building to the printing plant and moving the entire Times operation from West 43rd Street: “We have just completed the first stage of our future home,” Arthur Ochs Sulzberger wrote to space management consultants.
in the spring of 1960. And just one month later, there was evidence that the newspaper badly needed a bigger building when he complained to his father about the increasingly cramped quarters at West 43rd Street: “We are splitting at the seams!”

As the Times considered moving all of its operations to the West Side plant, Arthur Ochs Sulzberger proposed it was time to sell the Tower because there was evidence that water was leaking through the terra cotta and corroding the steel columns. In time, the building could suffer significant structural damage, and more repair work was necessary after additional cracks and protruding pieces of façade were discovered in 1957. “As landlords for Times Tower, we are rapidly being forced to make a decision,” the younger Sulzberger wrote in 1959. While acknowledging that the sale of the Tower had not been contemplated in the past “on the theory that the monumental aspects of the building are too important to the Times,” he suggested “the state of the property is not good” and the company would have to spend a considerable amount of money to upgrade that building, or “sell it as quickly as possible.” However, the elder Sulzberger was reluctant to let go of it. “I will have to do a lot of thinking about it before I do say yes to that,” he wrote to his son-in-law, Orvil Dryfoos in 1959. “I can’t see the Times Tower turned into a big ad sign for Coca Cola on one side and Kotex on the other. And no one in his right mind would buy the building unless he planned to make a display of it.” It was, he added, “a unique bold thing to do when ASO (Adolph S. Ochs) built the Tower and I owe him too much to permit the building to be misused.” His preference was to keep the tower, at least “until we move out of the neighborhood.”

But keeping the Tower meant spending $150,000 to upgrade the building’s electrical system and install air conditioning, an amount that Arthur Ochs Sulzberger did not think was justified if the paper planned to dispose of the building anyway. The Times knew that not upgrading the building would result in the loss of two valuable tenants: Editor and Publisher, which occupied the space that was once the Times’ newsroom, and the Newspaper Publishers Association. Nevertheless, Sulzberger told his father that he was confident that others would rent the space and any minor renovations needed to satisfy new renters would be “peanuts” compared to the amount of money contemplated to keep the current tenants happy.

Despite the argument over costs, the elder Sulzberger held to his view in the spring of 1960 as discussions continued. In a letter dictated from his vacation home in Tucson, Arizona, the elder Sulzberger told his son that he would not consider selling the Times Tower while we were still at West 43rd Street unless under exceptional or extraordinary circumstances. We cannot permit Times Tower to deteriorate while we are still in the area. I don’t know how to say this any more strongly than I have and yet despite the fact that I have said it as strongly as I know how, nothing seems to have been done. I repeat that I wish the Times Tower kept up-to-date. We owe that to Mr. Ochs.

By the autumn of 1960, however, it was clear that something had to be done about the Tower. Among the options was the possibility of abandoning it above the seventeenth floor and reconstructing “completely the mechanical and decorative features of the building, leaving the basic interior and exterior structure as it is,” noted a Times executive. It was estimated such a proposal would cost slightly more than $2 million, but the company feared it would never recoup such an investment because it would lose rentable space by abandoning a portion of the building while the remaining renters would continue to lack air conditioning. Another option was the partial demolition of the Tower and the reconstruction of a six-floor building on the remaining, existing steel structure. This plan also proposed a large “spectacular” advertising sign on the north side of the tower. Again, executives struggled to justify the cost of the proposal; demolition and reconstruction would cost approximately $1.8 million while yearly operating costs were estimated at $270,000. Even charging advertisers $100,000 per year for the sign and tenants $6 per square foot, the company probably would lose money.

Finally, the Times considered demolishing the Tower and leaving a small park, which was an unattractive option because the company would take a total loss on the building and would have little to gain from a small tax deduction if it donated the park to the city. “Times Tower never has been, to my knowledge, a profitable real estate investment and it is doubtful if it ever can be,” a Times executive wrote Arthur Hayes Sulzberger. On the other hand, a sale would provide the company with cash that it could invest in the planned building at the West Side Avenue property. Thus, it was becoming more likely that the Tower would be sold.

Finally, Arthur Ochs Sulzberger convinced his father that the Times Tower was, in effect, an expensive family heirloom; there was no other reason to retain it. The elder Sulzberger anguished over the decision to sell and particularly regretted losing the zipper, but the newspaper’s executives were less sentimental. As one put it, “The sign is antiquated and can be relinquished without tears.” On March 16, 1961, the Times announced it was selling the Tower to developer Douglas Leigh. “We have retained the Times Tower building until now,” the Times quoted Arthur Hayes Sulzberger, “because of sentiment and tradition. However, we have committed our future to the Lincoln Center area where we have completed the first unit of a new plant.”

The Times did not move its operations to the West Side plant because the facility was considered a failure—poorly designed and badly equipped—and it was closed in 1976. Times Tower changed hands again when Leigh sold it to Allied Chemical in 1963. Shortly afterward, the Tower was stripped of its hand-carved stone and terra cotta façade and refinished with marble and glass. After it was remodeled, Life magazine operated a new zip store until 1970, when the Times was asked if it wanted to operate it once again. By then, the Times believed the newspaper’s identity with
the old Times Tower was forgotten. “If we want to polish up our identity with Times Square, we ought to find another way to do it,” one Times executive wrote. However, the building continued. In 2007, the New York Times left the West 43rd Street building for a new Times Tower on Eighth Avenue. After 102 years, the New York Times had finally left Times Square.

Ochs set out to build a monument to his newspaper. Originally, it was making Times Tower the second tallest building in town and the centerpiece of New York’s new center. As such, it was a reflection of the importance of newspapers in general and the Times in particular to the culture of the time, but like Newspaper Row, Times Tower’s monumental status was fleeting. A victim of its own success, the Times needed to expand, and the Tower left no room for expansion. Thus, the newspaper moved to West 43rd Street in 1913 and abandoned it altogether in 1963 because, despite Arthur Hayes Sulzberger’s fervent desire to retain it, the building could not financially sustain itself. Economic models, as Borer pointed out, “cannot access” cultural sites.

As it was being built, Ochs worried that Times Tower would be compared to the Flatiron Building at Madison Square. In fact, the Flatiron remains as one of New York City’s architectural treasures while Times Tower, now known as One Times Square, is regarded as unremarkable and is used as little more than a structure to hold advertising billboards and giant video screens. A successor to the zipper, although not associated with the New York Times since 1963, is the last physical reminder of the newspaper’s presence in Times Square. Even by the close of the 1950s, it was clear to Times executives that neither the tower nor the zipper was associated in the public mind with the New York Times. New Yorkers stopped showing up to see election results displayed on the building because they could see them on their televisions, and in time, television screens themselves would begin to dominate the signage in Times Square. Just as television eclipsed newspapers as the medium to which most Americans turned for their news, Times Tower was sold. Although its origin is not generally known, Ochs’s last remaining legacy is the New Year’s celebration and the dropping of the Great Ball, which the publisher instituted in 1906.

Places become “sites of contestation over which memories evoke,” noted Tim Cresswell in 2004. At times it may be done with purpose, as it seemingly was when Pulitzer built on the site of the former French’s Hotel, effectively replacing memories of an establishment that humiliated him as a young man. In other instances, it may simply be the result of economics and changing values. The dispersal of Park Row was the result of the consolidation of media ownerships and a general migration to midtown Manhattan. Times Square’s identity changed from being associated with the New York Times to a site that reflects the cultural values of the late twentieth century, namely entertainment and commercial advertising.

If architecture is a perfect reflection of its time, it also serves as a repository of memory; philosopher John Ruskin identified “the lamp of memory” as one of The Seven Lamps of Architecture. Meanwhile, places serve as “reminders of a community’s identity, past and present,” said Borer. Thus, if the formation of journalism as an interpretive community is reliant on collective memory, the contested identity of Times Square has implications for journalism’s historical memory and cultural identity. “Remembering the past is crucial for our sense of identity,” according to David Lowenthal. “To know what we were confirms that we are.”
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