INDEPENDENCE:

The Creation of a National Park

Constance M. Greiff
Heritage Studies, Inc.
1985

Preparation of this report was funded by

Eastern National Parks and Monuments Association

and

Independence National Historical Park.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments i

Chapter I - Welcome to Independence 1

Chapter II - A Park With a Past 35

Chapter III - Dreams for a Park 57

Chapter IV - The Beginnings of the Park 111

Chapter V - The First Wars of Independence 135
Master Planning, 1952-1956 141
Planning for Mission 66, 1955-1956 172
Master Planning and Decision Making, 1957-1960 187

Chapter VI - Restoring the Buildings 219
The Bishop White House 220
Independence Hall 251

Chapter VII - Telling the Park's Story: The First Twenty Years 313

Chapter VIII - The Second Wars of Independence
The Visitor Center 399
The Design for Franklin Court 419
Moving the Liberty Bell 433

Chapter IX - Celebrating the Bicentennial 441

Epilogue 487

Note on Sources 503

Notes
Chapter II 509
Chapter III 513
Chapter IV 522
Chapter V 525
Chapter VI 533
Chapter VII 545
Chapter VIII 553
Chapter IX 560

Index 565

ILLUSTRATIONS

Map of Independence National Historic Park.

1. Independence Square from the northwest. 1

2. The park in spring. 3

3. The Visitor Center, as seen from Dock Street. 7

4. The restored west facade of Independence Hall, seen from a window in Congress Hall. 11

5. The Liberty Bell Pavilion opposite Independence Hall. 15

6. Visitors inside the frame of the "ghost house" at Franklin Court. 19

7. Eighteenth- and early-ninteenth-century buildings on Walnut Street, restored and reconstructed. 21

8. Independence Hall as it looked to the delegates to the Continental Congress in 1776. 41

9. Judge Edwin O. Lewis. 53

10. "Plan for Redevelopment of Historic Area," drawn by Roy F. Larson in 1937. 67

11. One of the plans by Grant M. Simon that accompanied the Philadelphia National Shrines Commission's report to the Congress in 1948. 107

12. Former director of the National Park Service, Horace M. Albright, and others visit the fledgling park project. 123

13. Drawing, of late 1951, by Charles E. Peterson for National Park Service Director Arthur E. Demaray. 143

14. Preliminary drawing for the master plan of 1954. 157

15. Modified version of the master plan of 1954. 169

16. Preliminary drawing for the master plan of 1957-58. 189

17. The plan as accepted by Director Conrad Wirth on November 24, 1957. 189

18. Area A of the park from the northeast in 1950. 191

19. Area A in 1957. 191

20. Members of the permanent and summer architectural staffs of the park and the Eastern Office of Design and Construction. 227

21. Drawing of part of the west wall of the Bishop White House. 235

22. Unfinished copperplate engraving of Pine-Savage painting, "Congress Voting Independence." 259

23. The east wall of the Assembly Room in Independence Hall before restoration. 283

24. The east wall of the Assembly Room stripped for investigation. 283

25. The east wall of the Assembly Room restored. 283

26. The west wall of the Assembly Room stripped for investigation. 285

27. Visitors view the Assembly Room as workmen position samples of the west wall plaster paneling. 287

28. The west wall of the Assembly Room with restoration almost complete. 287

29. The Long Room on the second floor of Independence Hall. 307

30. Historian Martin I. Yoelson. 317

31. Three of the first "young ladies" hired as interpreters at Independence in 1961. 351

32. President John F. Kennedy visiting the Liberty Bell. 359

33. Arthur C. Kaufmann. 365

34. Superintendent Chester L. Brooks. 373

35. Proposal for the development of Franklin Court, as drawn by Penelope Hartshorne Batcheler in 1970. 393

36. Superintendent Hobart G. Cawood. 405

37. Market Street houses in the 1950s. 427

38. Market Street houses after restoration. 427

39. Visitors at the museum in Franklin Court, including Princess Grace of Monaco. 429

40. Don Murray, a member of the park staff, assists a young visitor. 455

41. "Miss Archer's chair," a Philadelphia armchair dating to between 1735 and 1750, now displayed in Independence Hall. 461

42. Portrait of James Madison by James Sharples, Jr. 467

43. Queen Elizabeth and Prince Philip visiting the Assembly Room on July 6, 1976. 481

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The history of recent events is a salutary reminder of how much of the past is lost when only a written record remains. Documents may establish what happened, but are less reliable for explaining why and how it happened. This is especially the case since the use of long-distance telephoning has become convenient and relatively inexpensive. At Independence, it is almost startling to note how the flow of correspondence and memoranda lessened after installation of the Federal Telephone System in the early 1960s.

It is therefore fortunate that it was possible to write this report soon after the fact, and not just on the basis of the written word, but with access to the thoughts and memories of many of the participants. Some of these were recorded during oral history projects in 1969-1970 and 1976-1977. Others were shared with me during a series of interviews conducted as part of the research for this book. I am grateful to all those who consented to be interviewed.

Of these, several people with long associations with Independence National Historical Park and retentive memories must be singled out. George A. Palmer, who retired as Deputy Regional Director of the Mid-Atlantic Region in 1973, has retained a lively interest in the National Park Service, the region, and Independence. He conceived the idea of this report, carried out the post-Bicentennial oral history project, and has been an unfailing and accurate source of information about park service policies and personalities. Charles E. Peterson, who was assigned to Philadelphia to assist in preparation of the report that convinced Congress to establish the park, became its first resident architect, and directed many of its restorations. He shared not only his reminscences, but also correspondence and memoranda from his personal files.

Martin I. Yoelson, who served at Independence from 1951 until his retirement as Chief of the Office of History in 1982, shared his encyclopedic knowledge of materials relating not only to the creation and development of the park, but also to its eighteenth-century history. Penelope Hartshorne Batcheler, who, as an historical architect, has dealt with the park's buildings since 1955, answered with patience frequent questions about planning decisions, particularly concerning Franklin Court, and about restoration procedures. All four read the manuscript and made valuable contributions and necessary corrections.

The current staff of the park provided full cooperation at all times. Superintendent Hobart G. Cawood and Assistant Superintendent Bernard Goodman not only were wholly supportive, but also provided insights into the park's operating procedures. David Dutcher, who succeeded Yoelson as Chief of the Office of History, served, after the latter's departure, as administrator of the project, and as my primary liaison with the park. I am also grateful to Librarian Shirley Mays, who assisted me in finding various materials, and to Thomas Davies, who took several modern photographs of the park specifically for this publication.

This project would not have been possible without the help of my research assistant Robert W. Craig, who located, copied, and organized the voluminous park service files on which it is based. A succession of administrative assistants, Cheryl Grek, Susan Borosko, and Sophia Coscia, transcribed interviews, and made seemingly endless revisions and corrections to the manuscript.

I - WELCOME TO INDEPENDENCE

A few ideas so capture the imagination of mankind that they imbue physical objects with universal meaning. For Americans, indeed for all people, there are no more potent symbols of individual freedom than Independence Hall and the Liberty Bell. Since 1951 this building and this long-silent tocsin have been maintained by the American people as part of Independence National Historical Park. The park includes three square blocks in the City of Philadelphia where the dream of a free country of independent citizens became fact. Here were written the two documents, the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, on which the foundations of our country rest. Here, from 1790 to 1800, when Philadelphia was the nation's capital, the principle of governance based on the rights of individual citizens was first tested. Through a series of events, which in retrospect seem almost miraculous, many of the buildings in which these events took place were preserved. With years of devotion and effort on the part of the City of Philadelphia, the National Park Service, and countless private citizens, these places have been restored for the enjoyment and enlightenment of the millions who come to Independence.

Independence National Historical Park is many things to many people. It is, of course, as it was intended to be, a national shrine. The events that took place here two centuries ago, and the buildings and objects associated with them, are what attract visitors from every state in the Union and almost every country around the globe. This place where our nation began arouses deep feelings. The attentive silence of the crowds in the Assembly Room is a testament to this emotion. So is the awe on the faces of children as they touch

the Liberty Bell. But Independence is more than an object of reverence. It is also a place to be reminded of the ideals that formed the basis for the founding of the United States, and on which its continued survival depends. And as they tour the park, visitors are made aware that the formation of this nation was the work of men, imperfect like themselves, who transcended their faults and foibles to create an enduring democracy, the oldest in the world and a model for free men everywhere.

The purpose of Independence is serious, but the mood in the park is not necessarily solemn. Independence can be the setting for ceremonial, or for protest, or for celebration. It is a site that often appears on the itineraries of visiting heads of state or other dignitaries. With luck, the day of such a visit will be fine and the flags on Independence Mall will be snapping in the breeze. The motorcade will come down Chestnut Street with more flags flying, flanked by motorcycle- mounted Philadelphia police. On the front steps of Independence Hall the superintendent, assistant superintendent, and other members of the park staff will be waiting in uniform to receive the distinguished guests. They will conduct them on a tour of the Assembly Room and to the Liberty Bell, and around more of the park if requested. How much these visits are enjoyed by the dignitaries is sometimes difficult to judge, but they are certainly enjoyed by the spectators. Like parades they offer a good measure of spectacle, enlivened by the excitement of press and television coverage, and spiced with a bit of pageantry and ritual.

Other events are less sedate. Philadelphians and tourists tend to congregate at Independence on many occasions. Some are scheduled, such as the annual Fourth of July celebration, culminating in a massive fireworks display. Others are unplanned. The biggest crowd ever gathered at the park came together

spontaneously when the Philadelphia Flyers won the Stanley Cup. That was a joyful, if somewhat raucous gathering; at other times the mood of the crowd has been less pleasant. Independence was the site of frequent protests and demonstrations, on both sides of the issue, during the Viet Nam War. It is a source of pride to the staff that all incidents were handled in a manner that kept them from becoming ugly.

Independence is also an urban park, a green oasis in the midst of a busy city. In pleasant weather mothers wheel baby carriages and strollers through the park, and toddlers roll on the lawns. In the gardens people read in the shade of the trees, feed the birds, or sit talking with friends. Office workers buy lunch from sidewalk vendors on the streets around the park, and eat in Independence Square. When the days become warm, sunbathers stretch out on the mall or other grassy areas. At all times of year people move through the park as they go from home to office, from office to shop. For Independence is not an isolated shrine, but, as it has always been, part of a living city.

The park, of course, changes with the seasons, but you can always feel the city around you. There are tall buildings on two sides, more obvious in winter when the trees are bare. Except on summer weekends, you can hear the pulse of traffic. The river at the park's back is also a constant presence. The light is aqueous; there is always a hint of moisture in the air, and sometimes a tang of salt, for the Delaware River is tidal at Philadelphia. Independence has other characteristic scents as well: in winter, roasting chestnuts and hot pretzels sold by the sidewalk vendors, and in warm weather the mingled perfume of flowers and, equally characteristic of an eigh- teenth-century atmosphere, the faintly sweet odor of horse dung, caught in the interstices of the brick sidewalks. On a weekend, when there is little automobile traffic, the clop of

the horses' hooves can be heard distinctly, as they draw tourist-laden carriages along the streets around the park. In spring, the high-pitched babble of young voices fills the air, as school buses disgorge the hundreds of thousands of children who visit the park for class trips. In summer there are other sights and sounds, exotic tongues of many foreign visitors, or the voices of actors, performing in a playlet or puppet show illuminating some aspect of the park's past.

If you come to Independence -- as most visitors do -- by car or bus, you will probably arrive from the east, just as travelers did in the eighteenth century. Now the park is easily accessible by interstate highway. Then the journey was often long and sometimes arduous, made by ships, which tied up at the wharves that lined the Delaware River and Dock Creek, or by horse or on foot by roads so rough that even a long voyage was the preferred mode of travel.

The weary traveller found rest and sustenance in the taverns near Philadelphia's waterfront, of which the most elegant was the City Tavern, on Second Street near Walnut. When John Adams arrived from Boston to attend the first Continental Congress, he noted that "dirty, dusty and fatigued as we were, we could not resist the importunity to go to the tavern, the most genteel one in America." At the tavern John Adams and his fellow delegates, other distinguished visitors, and Philadelphia's men of affairs could find refreshment for all occasions and all seasons.

Today, as you enter the park the reconstructed City Tavern welcomes visitors as it did 200 years ago. If you go inside you will see the kind of setting in which many of the country's founders met one another for the first time in 1774, and began to debate the course of action they would follow when they sat as the first Continental Congress. You can also dine on dishes that

would have been familiar to them, and try the drinks with which they slaked their thirst. In the days when no central heating warded off winter's damp chill and no air conditioning alleviated Philadelphia's summer heat, hot toddies and cooling punches offered the best relief from the weather's vagaries.

Across from the City Tavern, on the east side of Second Street, is Welcome Park. Honoring William Penn, the park was developed on the site of the Slate Roof House, which the Proprietor rented during his seccond residence in Philadelphia from 1699 to 1701. Pause to look at the paving, which lays out at your feet the original plan of the city as drawn by Penn's surveyor, Thomas Holme. In the center of the park a small replica of the statue of William Penn that tops City Hall overlooks this version of the Philadelphia Penn knew. Graphics mounted on a wall bordering the park illuminate Penn's career as statesman, soldier, and religious leader.

An alley on the north side of the City Tavern leads further into the park. As you follow it up to the curve of Dock Street the Merchants' Exchange is on your left. Designed by William Strickland, Philadelphia's most noted nineteenth century architect, it was built between 1832 and 1834. Here Philadelphia's merchants and traders awaited the return of ships from Europe, the West Indies, and China. Here they traded shares in their ventures, and purchased insurance for their ships and cargoes. From the magnificent curved portico, jutting towards the river, Philadelphia's businessmen could see the masts of the vessels tied up in the river. In turn the sailor, anxious for port, could glimpse the sun striking the gilded weathervane topping the elegant Grecian cupola. Today, restored on the exterior, and rehabilitated on the interior for modern office use, the Merchants' Exchange serves as headquarters for the Mid-Atlantic Regional Office of the National Park Service.

On your right is the Visitor's Center, a contemporary brick and glass building. In its tall tower hangs the Bicentennial Bell, a gift from the British people, formed in the same foundry that cast the Liberty Bell. Inside the Visitor's Center you will find information on all aspects of the park, as well as on other historical and nonhistorical places in Philadelphia. This is the place to examine the schedule of special events and to make arrangements for guided tours. Here, too, you will find a well-stocked book shop. The Visitor's Center also houses a theater in which the film "Independence" is shown at frequent intervals. Filmed under the guidance of director John Huston, the movie recreates, in the words of the participants, the stirring events that took place here. You can see the startled expression on Ben Franklin's face as John Adams tells him, at the gates of Carpenters' Court, that the colonies will eventually sever themselves from the mother country. You watch the delegates to the Second Continental Congress pound the green-baize covered tables in the Assembly Room of Independence Hall in response to Richard Henry Lee's rousing call for independence. And finally in 1787, you hear the relief in Franklin's voice as, referring to the chair in which George Washington presided over the Constitutional Convention, he expresses the belief that the emblem carried on its crest represents a rising, not a setting sun. The movie was filmed at Independence, at the sites, on the grounds and in the buildings, where the events took place 200 years ago.

If you have only a limited amount of time to spend at Independence the most direct approach to the main section of the park is to cross Third Street in mid-block. There, directly across from the Visitor Center is the First Bank of the United States with its graceful portico. Chartered by Congress in 1791 to serve as a national bank, the First Bank was the precursor of the Federal

Reserve system. The bank occupied rented quarters in Carpenters' Hall before completing this marble-fronted brick edifice in 1797. Shortly after the Federal Government failed to renew the bank's charter in 1811, Stephen Girard bought the property. Except for a brief hiatus, the building remained a component of the Girard Bank until 1929. Restored to its eighteenth-century appearance on the exterior, the building retains the magnificent interior rotunda installed by the Girard Bank in 1901-1902. The first floor is now used for special exhibits and other events; the second for park offices; the third houses the park's library.

To the left of the First Bank are gently contoured tree-shaded lawns. The deep swale, crossed by a little bridge, and often filled with water after a heavy rain, is a reminder that once Dock Creek flowed into the Delaware River from this area. Dock Creek was a prominent feature of the early Philadelphia townscape, serving first, as its name implies, as an anchorage, and later as a communal sewer until it was filled in by 1784. Much of the park, like this area, is in lawn, some twelve acres of it. Shade and ornament are provided by almost 2000 trees and a wide variety of shrubs, most of them varieties known in Philadelphia in the eighteenth century. Among the more unusual trees are Stewartia, Franklinia (discovered by Philadelphia's noted colonial botanist and horticulturalist John Bartram and named in honor of his friend, Benjamin Franklin), and the William Penn maple, with its upright rather than spreading branches. Rising above the lawns in many parts of this area of the park, especially along the city streets that form its boundaries, are low brick walls surrounding beds of ivy. These mark, like gravesites, the locations of some of the more important lost buildings of the colonial and Federal eras. If you stretch your imagination you can see the area as it was then, a tightly built urban landscape. The streets were lined with houses, inns, shops and other

businesses, and peopled with shopkeepers, sailors, housewives, merchants, and citizens on public business.

The pathways you follow through the park are the same ones they walked, for they follow the old patterns. By the middle of the eighteenth century Philadelphia's squares, the blocks of land bounded by the major thoroughfares, had been divided and interlaced with minor streets, alleys and walkways. At Independence, the old routes for vehicular traffic are paved, as they were originally, with cobblestones and flagstone gutters, although no vehicles now travel them.

As you walk west, the backs of the buildings along Walnut Street form a wall, sheltering this part of the park from the city's busy traffic. Ahead is Carpenters' Hall, a Georgian building of jewel-like precision and synmmetry. Despite its small size, it has a commanding presence that proclaims its function as an institutional building. Carpenters' Hall was erected on a piece of ground now known as Carpenters' Court between 1770 and 1774 by the Carpenters' Company of the City and County of Philadelphia. The Carpenters' Company, founded in 1724 by the master builders of Philadelphia, is the oldest surviving trade association in the United States. The organization still owns and maintains the building, opening the first floor to the public daily. In 1774 the Carpenters' Company offered use of this space in their new meeting hall to the delegates to the First Continental Congress. When you enter through the fanlit doorway, you will thus see the space where Congress sat during the first debates on the course to be followed by the newly-united colonies. The Minton floor tiles were added during the nineteenth century and some of the interior woodwork has been changed, but the general arrangement remains as it was then. The first floor of Carpenters' Hall now houses displays related to Carpenters' Court's history as

the offices of the Revolutionary Quartermaster and later of the United States' first war department, as well as of old carpenters' tools. There is also a remarkably detailed scale model of the building's construction.

Carpenters' Hall, with its cruciform plan and its perfectly proportioned facades on all four sides, seems to have been designed to be seen as it is now, out in the open. In fact, the Carpenters' Company placed it on an interior lot, hemmed in by other buildings, reserving the valuable street frontage for sale or lease. In 1775 the Carpenters' Company sold its Chestnut Street frontage on the east side of the alley leading to Carpenters' Hall. The purchaser, Joseph Pemberton, a Quaker merchant, built one of Philadelphia's most elegant houses on the site. In 1791 the Carpenters' Company leased Carpenters' Hall to the First Bank, and erected a building known as New Hall on the west side of their alley. The Pemberton House and New Hall have been reconstructed, the former as an Army-Navy Museum, the latter as a Marine Corps Museum. Together they recreate the enclosed character of the Chestnut Street approach to Carpenters' Court.

To the west of Carpenters' Hall stands the imposing bulk of the Second Bank of the United States. The classical grandeur of its design, executed in pale gray marble, forms a striking contrast to the smaller, more delicate Carpenters' Hall. The Second Bank was chartered in 1816. Although the Federal government had rejected the concept of a national banking system in failing to renew the charter of the First Bank in 1811, the financial dislocations attendant on the War of 1812 and its aftermath rekindled enthusiasm for such a system. Like its predecessor, the bank first leased Carpenters' Hall. In 1818 the Second Bank announced an architectural competition for its new building. The winner was William Strickland, a young Philadelphia architect, who would later design the Merchants' Exchange. His massive and impressive design, based on the Parthenon,

is one of the earliest and most magnificent buildings in the Greek Revival style in the United States. Nicholas Biddle, a director of the bank and later its president, is thought to have influenced the choice of style. Biddle, who had traveled in Greece as a young man, became an enthusiastic admirer and promoter of classical architecture. The Second Bank, completed in 1824, set a precedent for classically-styled banks that would be followed well into the twentieth century.

By the late 1820's and early 1830's, however, political sentiment had once more turned against the concept of a national bank. In 1832 President Andrew Jackson vetoed the bill re-chartering the Second Bank, and withdrew the Federal government's deposits. It was reorganized as a state bank, but by 1839, in the midst of one of the country's worst recessions, the bank, and Biddle, were bankrupt. Reorganized again, it continued to operate until 1845, when the Federal government acquired the property for use as the Philadelphia Custom House. The building was transferred to the National Park Service in 1939, making it the "oldest" component of the park. The interior is now a gallery of portraits of the Signers of the Declaration of Independence, the officers of the Revolution, and other notable figures of the Revolutionary and Federal periods.

Behind the Second Bank the cobblestones of Library Street lead past the rear extension of the American Philosophical Society's library. Like many of Philadelphia's enduring institutions, the Philosophical Society traces its founding to Benjamin Franklin. Organized in 1743, as a forum for the pursuit of scientific and technological knowledge, it counts the pioneering astronomer David Rittenhouse and Thomas Jefferson among its early presidents. The front of the Philosophical Society's building, facing Fifth Street, is a replica of Library Hall, originally built by the Library Company of Philadelphia. Like the

American Philosophical Society, the Library Company originated in the fertile mind of Franklin. He organized it in 1731, making it the oldest subscription library in North America. For many years after its founding, the Library Company rented space in buildings in the area, among them Carpenters' Hall and Independence Hall. In 1789 a young physician and amateur architect, William Thornton, won the architectural competition for the design of Library Hall. Four years later he would also win the competition for designing the United States Capitol in Washington. Library Hall was completed in 1790 and occupied by the Library Company until 1880, when the Library sold it and moved to larger quarters. The old building was demolished in 1884. Although the replica, reconstructed in 1959, stands on Federally-owned park land, the building was erected and is maintained by the American Philosophical Society, a private institution. The library is open to the society's members and visiting scholars.

Crossing Fifth Street, you enter Independence Square. The square and the buildings on it are the heart of the park, the ultimate reason for its being. The centerpiece, Independence Hall, is probably the most revered building in the United States and a universally recognized symbol of political liberty. Its soaring tower dominates the square, but its sense of power does not derive primarily from its architectural presence, but rather from its hold on the imagination of free people everywhere. Within its walls a remarkable group of citizens of diverse background and calling came together to debate and then create a new force in the civilized world, a government, just in purpose, deriving its powers from the consent of the governed. The ideas set forth in the two documents adopted in this building, the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, survive, after 200 years, with a power

undiminished by time.

The builders of Independence Hall could certainly not have foreseen the events it would witness. The building was erected between 1732 and 1736 as the State House of the Province of Pennsylvania. On the first floor was a broad hallway, flanked by the meeting room of the Pennsylvania Assembly and the Supreme Court Chamber. On the second floor the Long Gallery occupied the entire north front. Behind it were a Committee Room for the Assembly and a room for the Governor and his provincial Council. In 1751 a tower containing a majestic staircase was added to the south side. Almost from the day it was built Independence Hall began to undergo alterations and additions to accommodate changing functions. In 1972 the National Park Service completed restoration of the building's interior and such exterior features as the colossal all-case clock. Years of research to identify eighteenth-century features and to recreate those that had been destroyed preceded the restoration. If you take the tour of Independence Hall, which starts in the East Wing, you will once again see the interior as the delegates to the Continental Congresses and the Constitutional Convention saw it. When you enter the broad hallway through the Chestnut Street door, open archways give access to the Supreme Court Chamber. Here are bench and bar -- the dais where the judges sat in their scarlet robes and the railing that separated spectators from participants in the trial -- as they were in the eighteenth century.

Across from the hall, and separated from it by a wall rather than an open arcade, is the Assembly Room. Facing the door and raised on a platform is the chair from which George Washington presided over the Constitutional Convention. On the table in front of the presiding officer's chair sits the silver inkwell believed to have been used by the delegates when they signed the Declaration and

the Constitution. Ranged across the room from north to south are baize-covered tables like those at which the delegates sat in geographical order. The chairs are not original, but in collecting chairs like those used at the time, the park has assembled the finest known collection of signed Philadelphia Windsors. Especially on a drowsy summer day, with the sun slanting through the windows, it is easy to people this room with ghosts in perukes and knee breeches, to hear the rustle of papers, and the voices raised in impassioned debate.

Upstairs in Independence Hall the mood is less serious. A table in the Long Gallery is set as it might have been for a dinner or other entertainment. The room is cleared for dancing and a harpsichord stands ready to provide the music. In the southwest corner, the governor's Council Chamber, fitted with fine Philadelphia and English furnishings, stands ready to receive visitors, as it did in the days when Governor Thomas Penn welcomed delegations of Indians and other Pennsylvania citizens.

When the Federal government chose Philadelphia as its temporary seat, from 1790-1800, while the new capital city at Washington, D.C. was under construction, the government of Pennsylvania retained possession of Independence Hall and its wings. The nation's business was conducted in two new buildings at either end of Independence Hall. The Philadelphia County Courthouse, better known as Congress Hall, was built in 1787-89 at the corner of Chestnut and Sixth Streets. The building was hastily enlarged in 1793 to accommodate an expanded House of Representatives. Its near twin, Old City Hall at the corner of Fifth Street, was completed in 1791. During the last decade of the eighteenth century, the United States Supreme Court sat in the large courtroom on the building's first floor. It has been the only time in our nation's history that all levels of government -- federal, state, county and municipal -- were housed

in the same building complex.

You enter Congress Hall as members of the House of Representatives did, from the east side. In this chamber the Congressmen forged laws for the new republic, while spectators watched from behind the bar or from the gallery along the north side of the room. The discussions were often impassioned, occasionally breaking into physical violence. A political cartoon depicting one such occasion was an important document for the restoration of Congress Hall's interior. The Senators entered through the Chestnut Street door, proceeding up the graceful staircase to their second floor meeting hall, where, in succession, Vice-Presidents John Adams and Thomas Jefferson presided over a somewhat more dignified assembly. Facing the Vice-President were the Senators, comfortably disposed in the armchairs made for their use by cabinet-maker Thomas Affleck. Many of these, erroneously known as the Signers' Chairs, were collected over the years and were displayed in Independence Hall when the National Park Service took over its management; others were acquired by the Park Service.

Balancing Congress Hall on the east side of the Square is Old City Hall. In the courtroom at the rear you may watch a brief program explaining the founding of the nation's judicial system. It was in Philadelphia that the Supreme Court established its role as interpreter of the Constitution. Behind Old City Hall along Fifth Street, is the headquarters of the American Philosophical Society. It stands on land purchased by the society in 1785, and was completed in 1790. Restored by the society in 1953, it is an important element of Independence Square.

Across Chestnut Street, north of Independence Square, lie the three blocks of Independence Mall. The mall was created by the State of Pennsylvania, but is now part of the Federal park. It is plentifully supplied with such amenities as

trees, plazas, and fountains. But, most importantly, its first block is the site of what is, to most visitors, the most highly valued object in the park, the Liberty Bell. Housed in a glass pavilion, in full view of Independence Hall, the bell can be viewed from all sides and you are encouraged to touch it.

The bell is undoubtedly our nation's greatest talisman, instantly recognized throughout the world as a symbol of America's freedom. Despite the bell's present fame, its beginnings were not auspicious. Cast at London's Whitechapel Bell Foundry in 1752, it cracked on its first testing in Philadelphia. After two re-castings it was finally hung in the State House tower, but its sound was so unsatisfactory that a second bell was ordered, which tolled the hours. The old bell, however, still rang to summon members to meetings of the Pennsylvania Assembly and to mark important occasions. Thus, along with the city's other bells, it pealed to announce the public proclamation of the Declaration of Independence on July 8, 1776. The bell is believed to have cracked again in 1835, tolling for the death of Chief Justice John Marshall. Although repairs were attempted, they were not successful, and it was silenced forever after ringing on Washington's Birthday in 1846.

By that time, however, the bell had acquired a new life, almost a new identity, as the Liberty Bell. In 1839 a Boston abolitionist group gave the bell its name, inspired not only by its role in hailing the Declaration, but also by its prophetic Biblical inscription, "Proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof." In the next decade other Abolitionists and popular historians retold, and sometimes embroidered, the Liberty Bell's story. In 1852, the hundredth anniversary of the bell, it was taken down from the tower. For the next 124 years it was exhibited in various locations on the first floor of Independence Hall, where visitors could see and touch it. With

the approach of the Bicentennial, however, park management realized that the millions of visitors who want to get close to the bell could not be accommodated in the Hall. With appropriate ceremony it was moved to its present location at the stroke of midnight 1975/76.

The Liberty Bell has survived several potential disasters. In 1753 it was almost returned to England for credit toward the purchase of the second bell. In 1777 the bell was spirited away from Philadelphia and hidden in Allentown, to prevent its capture by the British Army. In 1828 it was given as scrap to the contractor who was casting a new bell. When he found that the cost of removing it exceeded its scrap value, he returned it as a gift to the City of Philadelphia. In 1846 a proposal to recast it came to naught.

Now the Liberty Bell is the most venerated object in the park, a national icon. It is not as beautiful as some other things that were in Independence Hall in those momentous days 200 years ago, and it is irrevocably damaged. Perhaps that is part of its almost mystical appeal. Like our democracy it is fragile and imperfect, but it has weathered threats, and it has endured.

The remaining major area of the park is slightly separated from the rest by the streets of Philadelphia. This is Franklin Court, which runs between Chestnut and Market Streets, mid-way between Third and Fourth Streets. Benjamin Franklin was Philadelphia's presiding genius in the eighteenth century, the founder of its major civic and intellectual institutions. He was also a scientific innovator of world renown, a profound political thinker and writer of persuasive eloquence, and an active participant in this country's founding. Yet, until the development of the park, he was the only major figure of the period with no tangible memorial. Washington's Mount Vernon, Jefferson's Monticello, the Adams Homestead had all been preserved, so that future

generations could understand their owners as living men, appreciate their interests, and experience their tastes. Establishing a similar site for Franklin became a major purpose of the park. Now, at Franklin Court, you can begin to comprehend this perhaps most complicated of the founding fathers in his own milieu.

The best approach to Franklin Court is from Market Street. Like the Carpenters' Company with their hall, Franklin chose to build for himself on an interior lot, reserving the more valuable street frontage for rental properties. In the last years of his life, from 1786-1787, he devoted much of his attention to erecting three new brick buildings on Market Street. One of them replaced the house where he boarded with his future wife's family, the Reads, when he first came to Philadelphia. The exteriors of these three, along with two other buildings in the row, have been restored or reconstructed to their eighteenth-century appearance. The building on the site of the Read House, at 316 Market, houses the B. Free Franklin post office, in recognition of Franklin's role, as colonial Postmaster General, in organizing a reliable postal service that helped to unite the thirteen colonies. You can buy commemorative issues here and mail home postcards and letters. Another of the buildings, 318 Market, commemorates Franklin the builder. The interior is devoted to a fascinating display of the types of evidence, archeological and architectural, that formed the basis for the park's restorations, and, in particular of Franklin Court. The third of Franklin's buildings is the "Aurora" print shop. Franklin, of course, had made his mark as a printer and publisher, and in the last years of his life, his development of Franklin Court included construction of a print shop, for his grandson and namesake, Benjamin Franklin Bache.

An arched opening in the center of the Market Street row provided a

carriageway giving access to the interior of Franklin Court. In this sheltered spot Franklin built his house. It was erected between 1763 and 1765. When it was completed, Franklin's wife and daughter moved into it, but Franklin himself was in London. On his final return to Philadelphia and retirement, Franklin added to the house in 1785-1786, improved the garden with walks, flowering shrubs and trees, and erected the Bache print shop within the court. He lived in the house until his death in 1790, but his family occupied it only rarely after that, and it was demolished in 1812. Franklin's papers yielded an astonishing amount of information about the house, including floor plans, uses of the rooms and even many of the interior color schemes. However, surprisingly, no pictorial representation could be found. Lacking an accurate view of the exterior, the Park Service reluctantly decided not to reconstruct the house. In an imaginative design for the court, colored paving outlines the floor plan of house and shop, and steel frames delineate their bulk. Paths and plantings suggest the secluded garden Franklin so enjoyed, and a mulberry tree, like the one under which he enjoyed sitting and receiving visitors, once more spreads its shade.

What you see on the surface is only about half of what there is to see at Franklin Court, for much of it remains, or has been newly constructed, underground. At 318 Market Street old underground storage vaults and pits are revealed in the building's cellar. Within the space frame marking the site of

Franklin's house, you can peer through viewing tubes at what the archeologists found of surviving foundations and other features. At the west side of the court an entrance gives access to the long ramp down to an underground museum. A corridor, lined with objects that actually belonged to Franklin or are like those used by him, leads to a large installation

interpreting the many facets of this man of many accomplishments. You may use a bank of telephones to "call up" a host of famous figures past and present to hear what they have to say about Franklin. You may also elicit Franklin's own opinions on a variety of topics ranging from politics to sex and marriage, summoned up at your touch for display on a video screen. Stand at the railed-in enclosure in the center of the room and watch "Franklin on the World Stage", in which mechanical figures perform a series of playlets illuminating his role as this country's first diplomat. Displays around the room portray Franklin as founder of institutions, printer-publisher, and inventor. The museum also includes a small theater. Since this is the site of Franklin's home, the brief film shown here concentrates on his domestic life. Nevertheless, the scope of the movie is not narrow. Franklin participated in epic events, and their effect on his family make the issues of the era more meaningful to us. Nowhere at the park is it clearer that the Revolution was in fact a civil war than in the poignant portrayal of the deterioration of the relationship between Franklin and his illegitimate, but acknowledged, son William, the Loyalist Governor of New Jersey.

It is possible to see these major elements of Independence in a day or even less. Those with more time to explore may wish to recapture the flavor of the eighteenth-century Philadelphia that the nation's founders knew. Once again the best place to start is the Visitor's Center. You may wish to check there to see the schedule for tours of buildings in the southern part of the park, and to inquire about other sites in adjacent Society Hill.

From the Visitor's Center stroll toward Walnut Street, passing the Merchants' Exchange again and then turn west. Here on the north side of Walnut an eighteenth-century streetscape of Philadelphia rowhouses has been recreated

from what was, 30 years ago, a motley collection of old and new houses.

Two of the buildings are meticulous restorations. The Bishop White House, at the east end of the row, was built by William White in 1786-1787. Bishop White was Rector of Christ Church and St. Peter's Church, first Protestant Episcopal Bishop of Pennsylvania, Chaplain of the Continental Congress, and a strong supporter of liberty and religious freedom. He lived in this house until his death in 1836. At the west end of the row, with its entrance on Fourth Street, is the Todd House. Built in 1775, it was purchased in 1791 by an up-and-coming young Philadelphia lawyer, John Todd,Jr., and his vivacious wife, Dolley Payne. Two years later John Todd was dead, a victim of the yellow fever epidemics that swept Philadelphia in the late eighteenth century. His 23-year-old widow stayed on in the house with her young son. Here Senator Aaron Burr brought his friend Congressman James Madison to meet the widow Todd. Madison was twenty years older than Dolley, but his wooing was swift, and within six months after John Todd's death, his widow became Dolley Madison. Both houses, furnished as they were at the time of their famous occupants' residence, are open for guided tours. Schedules and free tickets for the tours are available at the Visitor's Center.

Other buildings in the row include the Kidd, Fling, and McIlvaine Houses. These late eighteenth and early nineteenth century buildings, reclaimed from alterations that included modern storefronts on the first floor, have been restored on the exterior. The interiors were rehabilitated for adaptive use to new functions. The Kidd and Fling Houses are occupied by an institution with long associations in the area, the Pennsylvania Horticultural Society, founded in 1824. The Horticultural Society welcomes visitors to its exhibit room and interested readers to its specialized library. The McIlvaine House has become

part of park headquarters and also houses the offices of the Friends of Independence National Historical Park, a volunteer support group.

The remaining buildings in the row are reconstructions, erected to fill in the street scene and to provide structural stability for the Bishop White and Todd Houses. Those adjacent to the Todd House are used as offices by the Eastern National Park and Monument Association and the Carl Schurz Foundation. 313 Walnut, next to the Bishop White House, is park head- quarters. The block also includes two formal gardens, one at the Third Street corner maintained by the park, the other in mid-block maintained by the Horticultural Society.

Penn's plans envisaged Philadelphia as a "Greene Countrie Towne," with free-standing houses set in ample grounds. From the beginning, however, Philadelphia acquired a very different configuration. The Delaware River was so vital to the area's trade and commerce that the inhabitants clustered close to its banks. They followed the custom in cities and towns in the countries from which they had come, erecting buildings that were close together or in rows. By the late eighteenth century Philadelphia had grown so populous, and land values near the river had risen so high, that the rowhouse had become the prevailing form, with the land at the back of the houses occupied by stables, necessaries and other buildings. However, a few of the wealthier merchants dwelt in substanial mansions, and maintained formal gardens. The Horticultural Society's garden reflects the type of planting that might have ornamented the home of a prosperous Philadelphian of the period. Geometrically distributed paths focus on a gazebo. Shrubs border the paths, defining flower beds that change with the seasons. The garden also includes a small orchard, whose trees, like the other plants in the garden, are species grown in Philadelphia in the eighteenth century. You can observe another aspect of period gardening behind the Todd

House, where a kitchen garden of the era has been recreated. The vegetables are those Dolley Todd would have harvested, to serve immediately or preserve for winter use. Interspersed among them are plants that served as natural pesticides in the days before chemical sprays were known -- onion, garlic, and marigolds.

In the next block of Walnut Street a finger of the park reaches southward, forming a green walkway inviting you to Society Hill, the restored neighborhood that stretches from Walnut to South Street. In mid-block the greenway widens to form the Rose Garden. This is a quiet oasis at all times of the year, but is at its most beautiful in May and June. Then dozens of roses are in bloom filling the air with their fragrance. There are 56 varieties of roses, one for each Signer of the Declaration of Independence, given by the Daughters of the American Revolution. All are species known in the eighteenth century. In season the display of the roses is augmented by the brilliance of Spring bulbs and perennials. From the Rose Garden a walk bordered by the tall, upright forms of Columnar English Oaks leads to Locust Street, where the Park Service has rehabilitated a group of late-eighteenth century houses as residences for park personnel. Along the south side of the street the Magnolia Garden offers another serene retreat from the surrounding city.

If you have the time, you will want to explore Society Hill further. Society Hill derives its name not from the position or influence of its inhabitants, but from the Free Society of Traders, a joint stock company which purchased land from William Penn in 1632. Their strip of land ran between Spruce and Pine Streets from the Delaware to the Schuylkill. The company dissolved in 1723, but the name has been rediscovered and is now applied to an area bounded by Walnut, Front, South, and Sixth Streets. Society Hill was

indeed a fashionable part of Philadelphia from the early eighteenth century to the middle of the nineteenth century. It then entered a period of decline as the commercial activity along the waterfront spread, and as new residential areas were opened to the west. Revitalized, beginning in the late 1950's, it is once again one of Philadelphia's most desirable neighborhoods.

Society Hill's peaceful tree shaded streets are lined with brick rowhouses, punctuated with free-standing structures -- churches, schools, a market. Many of the buildings are architecturally and historically distinguished. About 800 of them date from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Blended with the old structures are contemporary buildings to serve the new residential and commercial needs of the community. You may wish to stroll through Society Hill on your own, savoring the pleasures of discovering a handsome fanlight, a skillfully wrought iron railing, or a glimpse of a hidden garden.

In addition to the areas close to Independence Square, Independence National Historical Park encompasses some relatively far-flung sites. The Deshler-Morris House is in Germantown. In the eighteenth century Germantown, now a part of Philadelphia, was a country village eight miles outside the city. The Deshler-Morris House, like many other in its vicinity, was built as a summer residence. Constructed by David Deshler in 1772-73, it belonged to Col. Isaac Franks in the years when Philadelphia was the nation's capital. Washington rented the house during the fall of 1793 to escape the yellow fever epidemic then ravishing Philadelphia. He liked it so well that he returned the following year. Although owned by the National Park Service, the house is shown to the public by the Germantown Historical Society. The reconstructed Graff House, at the corner of Market and Seventh Streets, is also part of the park. It was in Jacob Graff, Jr.'s new house, built the year before, that Thomas Jefferson

rented two rooms, a parlor and a bedroom, in the Spring of 1776. To these rooms Jefferson retreated to pen the draft of the Declaration of Independence. Two hundred years later the Park Service undertook the reconstruction of the house, with funds provided by the Independence Hall Association, a private support group.

Financial and other forms of cooperation with private and public institutions played a key role in the development of Independence and continues to be an important factor in the park's operation. Thus, four sites in the park's neighborhood, which are still privately owned and administered, are considered part of the park because their owners and the National Park Service have signed formal agreements to assure their continued preservation. All four are religious sites, illuminating the diversity that flourished in Pennsylvania under the guarantees of religious liberty conferred by William Penn. Christ Church, on Second Street just north of Market, is the oldest Anglican Church in Philadelphia. Its congregation formed in 1695 and erected the present building between 1727 and 1754. It is a notable example of Georgian architecture, with a superbly proportioned Palladian window dominating the east end. Washington and Adams worshipped here during their sojourns in Philadelphia. Two Signers of the Declaration of Independence are buried in its churchyard and five more, including Benjamin Franklin, in Christ Church Cemetery at the corner of Fifth and Arch Streets. The second church with a special relationship to the park is St. Joseph's Catholic Church, near Fourth Street on Willing's Alley, which lies between Locust and Walnut Streets. St. Joseph's is the oldest Catholic parish in Philadelphia, and, indeed, in the United States outside of Maryland, which was founded as a Catholic colony. Its parishioners have included Commodore John Barry, the Irish-American father of the United States Navy, whose statue stands

in the middle of Independence Square, and Joseph Bonaparte, the brother of Napoleon. The present building was erected in 1839 on the site of St. Joseph's two earlier churches. The third of the churches is St. George's Methodist Church on Fourth Street between Vine and Race Street, which traces its founding to 1769. The National Park Service has purchased and cleared land adjacent to all three buildings to enhance their settings and buffer them from fires. The fourth religious site is Mikveh Israel Cemetery on Spruce Street between Eighth and Ninth Street. Set aside as a burial ground for Jews in 1738, the cemetery later became the property of Congregation Kaal Kadosh Mikveh Israel, the oldest synagogue in Philadelphia. Haym Salomon, who helped finance the Revolution, is buried here.

Without its tissue of cooperative agreements Independence National Historical Park could not exist. Independence Hall and the Liberty Bell, for example, are part of the park because of such an agreement with their owner, the City of Philadelphia. Cooperative agreement is a term applied by the National Park Service to legal instruments pertaining to a wide variety of circumstamces. Some, such as those that apply to the churches, simply formalize the intent of the park service and another institution or individual to work together toward a common purpose, in this case the preservation of these historic places. Other cooperative agreements are more closely akin to contracts or leases. They govern the park service's use of property that does not belong to the federal government, or conversely, the use of federally-owned property that is occupied by a private institution.

The key agreement with the City of Philadelphia provides that the city retains ownership of Independence Square, the buildings on it, the Liberty Bell, and various paintings and furnishings. The National Park Service is responsible

for restoring and maintaining the city's property, and for exhibiting it to the public. The agreement, which became effective in 1951, runs for 99 years. It excepts from the Square the headquarters of the American Philosophical Society and the land on which it stands, which the society purchased from the State of Pennsylvania in 1785. However, the society is interwoven with the park under an agreement whereby it committed itself to restore its headquarters building to its eighteenth-century appearance and was permitted to erect its library, replicating the exterior of the original building of the Library Company, on Federally-owned land. Another essential privately-owned component of the park, Carpenters' Hall, is also covered by an agreement, akin to those pertaining to the churches. Although Carpenters' Hall is within the heart of the park, the building and the land it stands on remain the property of the Carpenters' Company. This private group continues to maintain and operate its building, as it has for over 200 years, but has entered into a formal agreement with the park service to cooperate in its preservation. The buildings flanking Carpenters' Hall, New Hall and Pemberton House, were developed and are operated respectively, under cooperative agreements with the United States Marine Corps and the Association of the United States Army and Navy League. Under another operating agreement the Germantown Historical Society shows the Deshler-Morris House to the public. Still other cooperative agreements cover tenancies of park-owned buildings or lands, sometimes with the provision that the tenants maintain the interior or other aspects of the property. Such agreements allow the use of the Kidd and Fling Houses and adjoining garden on Walnut Street by the Pennsylvania Horti- cultural Society and of the Free Quaker Meeting House at Fifth and Arch Streets by the Junior League of Philadelphia. Because of the cooperative agreements, the development and operation of Independence have

required a continuous interaction between the park service and dozens of public and private groups.

The intricacy of the cooperative agreements that make Independence possible is only a reflection of the complexity of managing a large national park in the middle of the fourth largest city in the United States. Independence consists of 42 acres of land, buildings, including 18 acres of plantings, most of it prime inner-city real estate. It must be maintained to the high standards the American people expect at a national shrine and it must be open to the public 365 days a year. Large parts of the park that contribute to its smooth operation are never seen by the visitor. Indeed, many of the park's support mechanisms are literally underground. Protection of the buildings and their contents from theft, fire, and atmospheric conditions in a modern city, and the comfort of visitors require sophisticated heating, cooling, air cleaning, and warning systems. To accommodate them, a continuous cellar under the buildings on Independence Square is a maze of pipes, machinery and controls. Under the sidewalk in front of Independence Hall is a vault dug to hold the condenser for the air conditioning system for the adjacent buildings. Across Chestnut Street, under the first block of the mall, is a 10,000-gallon reservoir, a precaution against failure of the city's water supply in case of fire. There are also large underground chambers under the other two blocks of the mall, containing the machinery and controls for the fountains, plus an underground garage, although that is operated by the city.

Many of the people who keep the park running also work beyond the visitor's eye. It takes over 200 park service personnel to run the park year round. That number is supplemented by 75 to 100 temporary employees or, in park service parlance, "seasonals" during the peak summer season. In 1976, the Bicentennial

year, the staff swelled to approximately 400. Even so, visitors would not receive as much attention as they do if it were not for the VIP's -- Volunteers in the Park -- some 150 to 250 of them, who put in regularly scheduled tours of duty. The volunteers are among the park's people that most visitors see. Wearing bright vests with the National Park Service emblem they help man the information desk at the Visitor's Center, give guided tours, and assist in interpretation. Other parks also have volunteers, but no other unit in the National Park System can boast so large and so dedicated a corps.

Primary responsibility for the visitor's experiences of the park rests with the rangers and park technicians of the Division of Interpretation and Visitors Services. The ranger is the basic building block of the National Park Service, dressed in the instantly recognizable green uniform and the "Smokey Bear" hat. Most supervisors in the National Park Service have come up through the ranger ranks. In the process of doing so, the supervisor has probably done all the jobs, dirty and routine, as well as interesting or glamorous, that it takes to run a park. He knows his business. The pronoun "he" could have been used entirely accurately 20 years ago, when the ranger corps was a white male preserve. Today the ranks include women, and people of varied racial and ethnic backgrounds. Rangers are college-trained, often with graduate degrees in the natural sciences, archaeology, or history. At Independence the latter is the preferred discipline. Rangers are responsible for the education of visitors, and for their safety and that of the park's resources, or, to use park service vocabulary, interpretation and protection. At Independence carrying out these two functions accounts for about half the park's staff. Park technicians, as part of the uniformed force, supplement the rangers as guides and guards. Technically, this entry-level position does not require a degree, although most

technicians are college-educated. Their objective, usually achieved, is to become rangers.

The other half of the staff at Independence is less visible to the average visitor. They work behind the scenes or are out of uniform during their daily rounds, but are no less vital to the park's operation. Overseeing the entire operation is the superintendent's office. The superintendent of a national park is like the captain of a ship. Everything that happens at the park, from planning for its future down to snow removal, is his responsibility. At large parks, the superintendent is backed up by an assistant superintendent, who, if the superintendent is analogous to a ship's captain, can be described as the chief mate or executive officer. At Independence, the superintendent and assistant superintendent may put in a normal working day, but one or the other, or both, is on call 24 hours a day, 365 days a year.

The superintendent and his assistant are also responsible for fiscal management, personnel, contract administration, the conduct of operations in accordance with National Park Service regulations and directives, and reporting to and maintaining liaison with the regional office, Washington headquarters, and other units of the National Park Service. It requires a staff of about a dozen people to carry out these functions for Independence and its satellites. At Independence the load is heavier than it might otherwise be because the superintendent is responsible for administering three other National Park Service properties in Philadelphia. The first of these is Gloria Dei Church, about nine blocks south of park headquarters at Christian Street and Delaware Avenue. Gloria Dei, which is a National Historic Site, was erected as a Swedish Church in 1700 and is sometimes called Old Swedes' Church, although it has been Protestant Episcopal since the mid-nineteenth century. Although its location is

now somewhat isolated, it is still an active church. The congregation maintains the building, but the Park Service is responsible for the grounds. Closer to Independence geographically and chronologically is the Thaddeus Kosciuszko National Memorial at Pine and Third Streets. In this restored brick townhouse, originally built in 1775, Kosciuszko rented rooms from November 1797 until May 1798. Kosciuszko, trained as an army officer in his native Poland, had served as a volunteer with the Continental Army. The third property administered through Independence is the Edgar Allen Poe National Historic Site at Seventh and Spring Garden Streets. Poe lived in Philadelphia from 1838 to 1844. These were the years during which, while employed as an editor, he began to compose mysteries, publishing such enduring tales as The Gold Bug, The Fall of the House of Usher and The Murders in the Rue Morgue. Of the several houses he rented during this period, this is the only one that survives.

Because of its size and the complexity and importance of its resources, Independence has a sizeable group of professional specialists on its roster. The specialists are clustered in two groups, the Office of History and Historic Architecture and the Division of Museum Operations. Although most of the basic research tasks at the park have been accomplished, historical study continues. Questions from visitors and staff must be answered, and new scholarly findings must be integrated into the park's interpretive program. The Office of History also maintains a specialized research library for use by park staff and scholars. The library contains 7,000 volumes, mostly dealing with the history of the Revolutionary and Federal periods and of Philadelphia, 12,000 photographs and 5,000 slides documenting the history of the park, and most important, 150,000 cards, indexed by subject, the fruit of approximately 200 man-years of historical research. The staff also includes historical architects. Although

the major restoration projects at Independence have been completed, the preservation of its historical fabric requires continuing skilled oversight. Additionally the architects are responsible for the architectural study collection. These building fragments and materials, mostly dating to the eighteenth century, were assembled in the course of background research for the park's restorations. They are an invaluable, indeed unique, source for information on early building techniques and technology.

Other collections within the park are the responsibility of the Museum Division. As a result of more than twenty years of collecting, the park is a notable museum of eighteenth-century furnishings, largely Philadelphia-made, period decorative arts, and paintings. Few of these objects were acquired with federal funds. In addition to the core turned over to the park for safekeeping by the City of Philadelphia, they were privately donated or purchased with donated funds. The acquisition phase is largely over, but the curatorial staff continues to refine the collections, both in quality and in appropriateness for interpretive purposes. Conservation also is an ongoing necessity. Paintings, fine woods, fragile fabrics and paper all require skilled care if they are to be preserved for future generations. This is an undertaking of some magnitude since the park's holdings include 18,000 objects and 250,000 items in the archaeological study collection.

In addition to the care of museum-quality objects, one of the park's major activities is maintenance of the grounds, and the buildings and their contents. Indeed, well over half the budget of Independence is devoted to this purpose. More than 3 million people visit the park every year; over 4 million came during the Bicentennial. Most treat the park with great respect. Nevertheless, the sheer task of housekeeping, plus repair of the wear and tear of such heavy

use, requires intense and unremitting effort. The task is especially difficult because of the park's schedule. Unlike most museums and historic sites, Independence never closes totally, and Independence Hall and the Liberty Bell Pavilion are open daily. Cleaning and routine maintenance must be carried out during the hours when the historic buildings are closed. Major repairs and maintenance often go on before an audience of visitors. During the interior restoration of Independence Hall, parts of the building remained open at all times, and visitors observed the architects and skilled craftsmen at work.

Many skills must be represented on the Independence maintenance staff. If the plumbing or air conditioning or other systems break down, it is not possible to await the pleasure of a service company; repairs must be made immediately. So the roster includes air conditioning specialists, an electrician, and pipefitters. The care of historic buildings requires constant attention to maintenance and repair, and particular skills. Not every workman can patch eighteenth-century wood or plaster moldings, or set a replacement brick with a proper joint. The painters, carpenters, and mason, who carry out both major and minor work, are backed by years of on-the-job training. Often it is these craftsmen, who live with the buildings on an intimate day-to-day basis, who call the attention of park management to the need for repairs. It was for example, a master carpenter, who had worked at the park for over twenty years, who noted in 1979 that the tower of Independence Hall required major maintenance, a project that was executed in the spring of 1982.

Maintaining the grounds is also an unceasing task. The park horticulturist supervises a staff of gardeners and laborers, who care for planted areas and walkways. Independence uses 600 pounds of grass seed, a ton of fertilizer, and several hundred tons of mulch every year. During periods of intense use, such

as occurred during the Bicentennial, this level of care may prove insufficient, and areas of the lawns will require resodding. Air pollution in the inner city is hard on trees and shrubs, which require more attention than in a more rural atmosphere. Although the growing season is obviously the busiest, and the regular staff must be supplemented with seasonals and volunteers, winter has its own demands. The park horticulturist and the grounds crew are always on call twenty-four hours a day, but it is usually in winter that the alarm is given. When there are storms, walks must be cleared, not only for park visitors, but also for local residents and workers in the near-by office buildings. If a winter storm starts during the night, snow removal begins at four or five o'clock in the morning, so that the walks can be cleared and salted or sanded by the time people go to work. Salt is efficient, but it must be used sparingly because of potential damage to plantings and historic buildings. The test of the park's smooth administration is that the visitor is scarcely aware of the extraordinary effort it takes to keep this mini-city open and in top condition every day of the year.

Independence today looks serene and beautiful. Rosy-red brick buildings sit amid green lawns, criss-crossed by neat brick and cobbled paths. Trees shade well-tended gardens. The setting looks immutable and inevitable, as if this is the way it has always been and was meant to be. Yet the appearance is deceiving. Independence National Historical Park is, in fact, the product of 300 years of change and over 40 years of unremitting effort and debate, some of it far from peaceful.

II - A PARK WITH A PAST

In the fall of 1682 William Penn first saw the site selected as the capital city of his New World province. The land which is now Independence National Historical Park was then but one step removed from wilderness. Its woods held a scattering of settlers, but their numbers were small. Indeed the commissioners Penn had sent ahead before his departure from England had chosen this location because of its sparse population. Upland (now Chester), which had been preferred at first, was rejected because it was already too far developed, and obtaining clear land titles would have been difficult.[1] Although previous settlement appeared to pose no impediment at Philadelphia, at least one family is said to have been established for several years in what is now the vicinity of the park before Penn's arrival, that of Edward Drinker in a dwelling near the southwest corner of Walnut and Second Street.[2] A small amount of building activity that been generated by Penn's purchase was concentrated in the area known as the Dock, along the Delaware River at the foot of what is now Spruce Street. Here in a low-lying whortleberry swamp, Dock Creek flowed into the Delaware River forming a small tidal basin that provided a natural landing area. By the time Penn reached Philadelphia, Budd's Long Row was nearing completion at the Dock. This consisted of ten, attached, half-timbered buildings, the last of which, closest to the river, was the Blue Anchor Tavern.[3]

Penn's ship, the "Welcome" anchored at Upland on October 27, 1682, and he came ashore on October 28. Exactly how and when he arrived at Philadelphia is a matter of debate. Tradition holds that the "Welcome" put in at the Dock. However, since no wharf facilities had been built, it is more likely that Penn came by small boat or by land.[4] However he traveled, he was pleased by what

he saw, writing that "of all the many Places I have seen in the World, I remember not one better; so it seems to me to have been appointed for a Town..."[5]

From the tidal flats of the Delaware River a steep bank rose to a wooded plain stretching two miles to the Schuylkill River. The gentle contours of the plain were broken by low hills. One notable hill, with its summit on Pine Street, was on the strip of land Penn had deeded to the Free Society of Traders; another was on Walnut Street.[6] Society Hill survived in name long after both the society and the hill were gone. Within less than a century the topography would be regularized -- the trees cut, the hills leveled, the declivities filled.[7]

Construction had begun on more than Budd's Long Row. Penn's surveyor, Thomas Holme, had preceded the Proprietor by several months, laid out the city, and begun to sell lots, on which "many pretty Houses are run up of late upon the River and backwards."[8] Holme's plan, the regularity of which was much admired in the eighteenth century, was a rectangular grid. It ran for one mile from north to south and a little over two miles from east to west. There were four major streets, one along each of the river fronts, a High Street (now Market Street) connecting the rivers, and Broad Street, running through the center of the city from north to south. An open square of ten acres was set aside in the center of the city, with squares of eight acres in each of its quarters. There were twenty additional north-south streets, numbered, and eight east-west streets, named for indigenous flora. These streets, which still are the spines of modern Philadelphia, divided the land into squares, or, more accurately, rectangles. So persistent was their image that for generations Philadelphians, in contrast to most Americans, referred to the divisions of their city as squares rather than blocks. Holme, with his patron, shared a

vision of Philadelphia as a town of ample open space, in which each "hath room enough for House, Garden and small Orchard."[9] Reality was far different. It was Budd's Long Row, with its attached buildings, that would prove to be prophetic, rather than Penn's dream of a "greene Country Towne."

Penn's venture in Pennsylvania was a curious blend of religious utopianism and real estate speculation. He hoped to provide a haven for fellow dissenters and at the same time enlarge his family's fortune. When Penn received the grant of Pennsylvania from Charles II in 1681, he was already familiar with the resources and needs of the New World, through his participation in the proprietorships of East and West New Jersey. Through personal tours and publications he moved quickly to promote Pennsylvania to prospective immigrants, offering the twin enticements of personal liberty and economic opportunity. Although couched in the more decorous language of the seventeenth century, Penn's promotional pamphlets differ little in tone from twentieth-century advertisements for Florida condominiums or New Mexico ranchettes.

This campaign achieved its goal of attracting settlers, although Penn's hopes for financial aggrandizement proved vain. In 1692 alone, twenty-three ships brought immigrants to Pennsylvania, many of whom remained in Philadelphia.[10] By the time Penn returned to England in 1694 there were "Three hundred and fifty-seven Houses; divers of them large, well built, with good Cellars, three stories, and some with Balconies."[11] There were also seven ordinaries or taverns, and Samuel Carpenter had built a 300-foot wharf that would be a landmark of the Philadelphia waterfront for decades. Operation of brickyards had begun, and, although most of the early buildings were probably, like Budd's Long Row, timber-framed, Penn was pleased that several were of brick. A start had already been made at ship-building, a harbinger of Philadelphia's role as a major port. Within a year the town had almost doubled

in size, and two Quaker Meeting Houses were under construction.[12]

By the beginning of the new century Philadelphia was established as a thriving town. Estimates that the number of houses had risen to 1400 by 1690 and more than 2,000 by 1698 were probably exaggerated; nevertheless Philadelphia's population had outstripped that of every city in the colonies but Boston.[13] The Quakers' Meeting Houses had been joined by several other churches: the Swede's Church south of the town and, within its bounds, buildings for Anglican, Presbyterian and Baptist congregations.[14] There was also a public grammar school, established by the Friends, as well as elementary schools.[15] Other wharves had joined Samuel Carpenter's along the Delaware, and industry had been added to commerce with the building of grist mills and a paper mill.[16]

The Proprietor's idealistic vision for the city, with ample grounds surrounding free-standing buildings, had not been realized. Penn had expected development to begin along the fronts and move inland toward the center square, where the major public buildings would be located. Instead the early buildings were tightly packed along the Delaware from Spruce to Vine Streets. Warehouses, stores and residences elbowed one another along Bank and Front Streets. "The Bank and River Street is so filled with Houses." Richard Morris reported to the absent Proprietor, "that it makes an inclosed street with the Front in many places, which before lay open to the River Delaware."[17] Thomas Holme's neat checkerboard was already punctured by narrow streets and inner courts. "There are very many lanes and alleys ... [which] extend from Front Street to the Second Street."[18] The focus of civic life was far to the east of the central square, at the intersection of High and Second Streets. On the southwest corner stood the Great Meeting House, completed in 1695. The town bell stood on a wooden platform in the center of the intersection. The public

wharf was at the foot of High Street a block to the east. West of the intersection was a brick prison house, replacing, in 1695, the "cage" that had been installed next to the bell in 1692.[19] Within a few years after the turn of the century, this town center was reinforced by the erection of a Town House, completed in 1709. It stood in the middle of the High Street, west of the intersection. Like similar buildings in English provincial towns, its arcaded ground floor afforded space for a market. The courtroom above was approached by a double staircase on the east end, terminating in a balcony from which addresses could be made or proclamations read. The steep gable roof was crowned by a cupola in which the town bell was hung; surrounded by two and three-story buildings, unadorned by towers or steeples, this must have been a notable landmark.

If the crowded town along the waterfront was contrary to Penn's hopes, his vision was more nearly realized on the outskirts. Here a number of wealthy merchants had built commodious houses on generous lots. The earliest of these, and the only one to survive into the age of photography, was the Slate Roof House built for Samuel Carpenter on Second Street at the southeast corner of Norris' Alley. It may have been standing as early as 1687, and was certainly completed by 1699.[20] The Slate Roof House had a large garden, extending half-way to Front Street on the east and nearly to Walnut Street on the south.[21] Carpenter himself probably continued to live in a house he had built a few years earlier on Front Street near his wharf, renting out the Slate Roof House to a series of tenants, the most distinguished of whom was William Penn, who lived there in 1699-1701.[22] A little further to the west was Clark Hall at the southwest corner of Chestnut and Third Street, which James Logan rented in 1704. Its gardens ran down in a series of terraces to Dock Creek, which in that period was still busy with shipping, and "were laid out in

the old style of uniformity with walks and alleys nodding to their brothers -- decorated with a number of evergreens, carefully clipped into pyramidal and conical forms."[23] Still further west, on Chestnut Street between Sixth and Seventh was the house of Samuel Carpenter's brother Joshua, with ample grounds, landscaped with gardens, an orchard, and a shrubbery.[24] South of Spruce Street the property surrounding Edward Shippen's house stretched from Second Street to the river. This then was the Philadelphia that Benjamin Franklin saw when he disembarked at the public dock at the foot of High Street in 1723. It was a long narrow town, strung out along the river, its streets and alleys closely hemmed with buildings. The skyline was low, unpunctuated by towers or spires. Although the streets near the river were crowded with buildings, a few of the town's wealthy merchants lived in what can only be described as suburban splendor on its outskirts.

Fifty years later, the delegates to the First and Second Continental Congresses arrived in a Philadelphia that could no longer be called a town, but had become a city. "Philadelphia," an English visitor wrote as early as 1755, "is London in miniature."[25] Those delegates arriving by ship must have seen Philadelphia much as it appears in Scull and Heap's great "East Prospect" of 1754.[26] For a mile and a half the river front was lined with wharves, along which warehouses had been built. Many of these were placed with their gable ends to the water, so that goods could be raised by booms in the gable's apex. Behind the warehouses were solid ranks of buildings, not identical in design, but often sharing party walls. Because Market Street was so broad, the cupola of the Town House was still prominent, but it was overshadowed by the soaring towers of newer buildings. The highest and handsomest was the 200-foot steeple of Christ Church, just finished in 1754. Only a year previously a tall steeple had also been placed atop the brick tower of the State House. Another spire

soared above the Second Presbyterian Church at Third and Arch Streets, and towers of the German Reformed and Wesleyan Churches added to the variety of the skyline.

By 1774 Philadelphia, with a population approaching 25,000, had surpassed Boston as the western hemisphere's largest port, and was, indeed, the second largest city in the English-speaking world.[27] It was, wrote a French observer "the entrepot of the general market of the English colonies ... one of the most beautiful cities in the world ... she must become the capital of the country which they have, for several years, named the American empire."[28] To its advantages of size and wealth were added those of location, mid-way between the northern and southern colonies, and political moderation. It was the obvious place for the representatives of the colonies to assemble to discuss common concerns and debate a course of action. With the agricultural wealth of Pennsylvania and southern New Jersey passing through their storehouses, Philadelphia's merchants enjoyed a profitable trade with the other colonies, the West Indies and Europe. Like their predecessors, most of the city's merchants continued to live on Front Street, close to or above their businesses. The city had, however, spread westward. The Clarkson-Biddle map of 1762 shows Market Street lined solidly with buildings from the Delaware River to Fifth Street, with scattered development as far west as Eighth Street. On Chestnut Street the continuous rows of buildings reached almost as far as the State House, a site that had been in the remote outskirts when construction began in 1732. Second and Third Streets were also closely built between Sassasfras (Vine Street) and Dock Creek. Here too, as had been the case between Front and Second Streets a generation before, Holme's squares were broken by alleys and courts, which also were lined with buildings.[29]

The delegates arriving in Philadelphia in 1774 and 1776 saw a city

predominantly of brick dwelling houses, which a French visitor admired because they "display a regular and noble appearance superior to that of our French houses."[30] The finest houses were on Front and Second Streets, although no street was entirely residential. On Front Street the merchants maintained their wholesale operations, and Second Street was the fashionable shopping area, which "at midday with its crowds of pedestrians and its variety of elegant shops presents a sight that one wishes might be seen on the Rue Saint Honoré."[31] Market Street, already popularly called by that name still housed the market, which by 1774 stretched to Third Street. Here were also located many of the most elegant of Philadelphia's hundred or so inns and taverns, prominent among them the Indian Queen and the London Coffee House. The latter, housed in a building erected in 1702 at the southwest corner of Front and Market, had been established as a central exchange in 1754 on a subscription basis by some of the city's most prominent merchants.[32] In 1774 it was yielding in fashion, however, to the newer and more commodious City Tavern. Although there was some functional and social differentiation, almost every street contained an admixture of uses and a variety of people. The gentleman and the laborer were often neighbors. Few of the buildings were simply single-family dwellings. Ground floors were given over to the storekeeper's shop, the artisan's workroom, the lawyer's or doctor's office. The family, usually rather small, occupied the upper floors, sharing them and any back buildings with apprentices and servants. Many households also included boarders or roomers.[33]

The city boasted a number of amenities. Many of the streets were paved with cobbles taken from the river at Trenton, rounded by the action of the water, and were supplied with flagstone cartways and gutters. There were brick sidewalks, some streetlights, a night watch, and several fire companies. Although the open squares provided in Holme's plan had not yet been landscaped,

large private gardens provided the welcome relief of greenery. As the delegates walked up Chestnut Street in 1776 to attend their meetings at the State House they would pass the still-handsome, if somewhat old-fashioned gardens of Clark Hall, then owned by the Pemberton family. In the middle of the block between Fourth and Fifth Streets, on the present site of the Second Bank, stood the stately mansion of the Norris family, the gardens of which stretched to Fifth Street on the west and Library Street (then Norris' Alley) on the south.

Delegates such as John Adams also visited, and were impressed by, the city's public buildings. Of course Carpenters' Hall, at the end of its alley off Chestnut Street between Third and Fourth, was well known to those delegates who had met there in 1774. The State House, site of the momentous deliberations of 1776, dominated the block of Chestnut between Fifth and Sixth Streets. It was undoubtedly the most impressive public building in the colonies with the mass of its main building topped by a lofty bell tower, and joined to the lower flanking office buildings by arcades containing handsome staircases. Bulking almost as large was the new jail, which filled almost the entire south side of Walnut Street between Fifth and Sixth, with wings, housing debtors, stretching back towards Locust Street. Also on Walnut Street, between Third and Fourth was the old Quaker Almshouse. To the west, beyond the built-up limits of the city were the Pennsylvania Hospital at Eighth and Pine Streets and the City Almshouse in the block between Pine and Spruce and Tenth and Eleventh Street.

There was much to be admired, and Adams found that the "Regularity and Elegance of this City are very striking."[34] Nevertheless, the atmosphere of the city was not entirely pleasant. In the 1770's Dock Creek was still an open sewer west of Third Street and there were several tanneries along its banks, one behind Carpenters' Hall. When the delegates sat in the State House in the summer of 1776 they could hardly have been unaware of the slaughterhouse across

Fifth Street between the back of the Norris garden and Walnut Street. Throughout the developed area of the city congestion made for poor sanitary conditions, and the mingled odors of garbage, manure, and human waste must have assaulted the noses of all but those who could escape to their country houses.[35] Still, conditions in Philadelphia were probably no worse than those in other cities of the period.

Those members of the Continental Congress who returned to serve in various capacities during the decade from 1790-1800, when Philadelphia was the seat of the Federal government, must have found much in the city that was unfamiliar. For, with the burst of post-Revolutionary prosperity, Philadelphia had expanded rapidly. Writing in 1793, Matthew Carey noted that "The manufacture, trade, and commerce of Philadelphia had, for a considerable time, been improving and extending with great rapidity. From the period of the adoption of the federal government at which time America was at the lowest ebb of distress, her situation [was] universally restored ... In this prosperity ... Philadelphia participated in an eminent degree. Numbers of new houses, in almost every street, built in a very neat, elegant stile, adorned, at the same time that they greatly enlarged the city."[36] Maps made in the 1790's, of which that drawn by the British engineer, John Hills, published in 1797, is the most detailed, show the north side of Market Street developed as far as Tenth Street and the south side at least as far as Eighth. Chestnut was also heavily built up to Sixth Street, and Walnut, which had been sparsely settled before the Revolution, had also become heavily developed; as had been the case in the older parts of the city, numerous alleys and courts broke up the squares of the original plan.

Fashion had followed the expansion of the city westward. Second Street as the location for the premier shops had largely given way to Chestnut and Market

Streets between Second and Fourth. Many of the city's most elegant dwellings were also on Market and Chestnut further to the west. George Washington occupied one of these, then owned by Robert Morris. The house had been built by Mrs. Masters in the early 1760's, and was occupied by her daughter and son-in-law, Richard Penn, in 1772-1775. During the British occupation of Philadelphia it had housed General Sir William Howe.[37] Aaron Burr and the ministers from France, Spain and the Netherlands all rented rooms on Market between Eighth and Ninth Streets. In 1794, on Chestnut between Seventh and Eighth, Robert Morris began to build a never-completed mansarded mansion designed by Pierre L'Enfant.

Some old landmarks had disappeared in the neighborhood of the State House; others had been altered; new ones made their appearance during the decade. Dock Creek had been filled to Third Street and was lined with new buildings. The Carpenters' Company had erected a new building, known simply as "New Hall" on the west side of their court in 1790.[38] The State House had undergone major changes. Its steeple had been removed in 1781 and the stair tower was now capped by a low hipped roof. More importantly, two handsome edifices flanked the wing buildings, one to the east to serve as City Hall, one to the west for the county offices, better known because of its function during the decade as Congress Hall. Behind City Hall was the new brick building of the American Philosophical Society. The State House Yard had been landscaped in the new romantic taste, with artificial mounds and declivities, serpentine paths, informally disposed clumps of elms and willows, and benches for the enjoyment of the public. Across Fifth Street from the State House Yard the slaughterhouse was gone. The graceful new building of the Library Company occupied part of what had been the Norris garden. Nearer to Walnut Street was the Philadelphia Dispensary and Surgeon's Hall, the remainder of the block being occupied by

somewhat ramshackle wooden buildings.

The yellow fever epidemic of 1793 slowed, but did not halt, the growth of the city. As William Bradford observed, "nothwithstanding the grate numbers that died with the late distressing sickness, the city is now crowded with inhabitants--and not a house to be lett--and Trade and Biseness flurrishing to an amasing Degree--."[39] As the seat of the Federal government, Philadelphia consolidated its position as the financial, as well as the political, capital of the United States. Toward the end of the decade new landmarks proclaimed the city's role as a banking center. The largest was the First Bank of the United States, with its colossal marble portico, on Third Street south of Chestnut, behind Clarke Hall on the site of what had been its terraced garden. Smaller, but perhaps even more imposing, was the Bank of Pennsylvania, erected on Second Street just north of the City Tavern in 1799. Designed by Benjamin Henry Latrobe, it was a classical building of great elegance. Twin porticos, each with six Ionic columns, fronted it on the east and west, and its domed banking room was expressed on the exterior, crowned by a glazed lantern.

The atmosphere of Philadelphia on the eve of a new century is lovingly captured in the series of watercolors and prints executed by William and Thomas Birch between 1798 and 1800. The renderings are somewhat idealized; nevertheless the streetscapes are reasonably accurate. The straight streets are lined with decorous brick buildings, picked out with restrained light-colored trim of wood or stone. At intervals a more imposing building breaks the rows: the First Bank of the United States and the Bank of Pennsylvania; the new theater at the northwest corner of Chestnut and Sixth Streets; and, on Market Street, the colonnaded portico of the new Presbyterian Church and Cooke's Building at the corner of Third Street, with its fanlit shop windows and plethora of Palladian openings on the upper floors. Despite its elegance,

Cooke's overlooks the more earthy scene of the Market Shambles, where freshly butchered meat hangs on hooks in open stalls and Philadelphia's housewives shop for produce brought from the country. The streets pulse with life. Farmers' wagons in from the country, gentlemen's carriages, and troops of cavalry clop along the cobbled way. There are barrowmen and vendors; shoppers and entertainers. Ladies and gentlemen promenade, and groups of Indians see the sights. Dogs and children frolic, while their elders go about their work. It is a cosmopolitan scene, and one in which activity of every sort is packed within a narrow compass.

In 1850 a pair of pioneering photographers, William and Frederick Langenheim, hauled their daguerreotype camera to the top of the tower of Independence Hall and made panoramic views of the surrounding area.[40] Their photographs show a city that had greatly expanded geographically since the decade when it served as the nation's capital. Independence Hall was no longer at its western edge. Now the rows of buildings stretched westward toward the Schuylkill and far to the south. Yet the scale of the city was still much the same. Philadelphia remained a city of relatively low buildings, where the spires of the churches were the chief punctuations on the skyline. What the panorama, with its view of rooftops, failed to show was how much the function of the area around the old State House had changed, and how these changes in use had altered the appearance of the neighborhood at street level. Residences, shops, countinghouses and taverns no longer intermingled in buildings that differed little in appearance from one another. The residential character of the blocks around Independence Square was almost gone, and the elegant retail shops had also followed the flight of fashion westward.

The early merchants had been content to live, in effect, "over the store." By the nineteenth century, improved transportation and changing social attitudes

began to separate the home from the place of business. Developers provided for, or even anticipated, the trend. "The first row of houses on a uniform plan was erected by or for Mr. Sansom, and were on Walnut Street, north side between Seventh and Eighth, and in the street between Walnut and Chestnut, from Seventh to Eighth, afterwards called Sansom Street. Some of them rented at only two hundred dollars per year. A few years later it was announced that the rent would be raised, because from being remote and lonely the houses had become eligible residences. Business men in 1800 said they were 'too far from their business.'"[41]

As the residents left the eastern part of town, the surviving dwellings on Chestnut and Walnut Streets were altered to house shops and businesses. For example, the McIlvaine House on Walnut Street, which had been built as an elegant town house in the 1790's, was occupied by William B. Fling, a cabinetmaker, after 1826. Fling also owned the adjacent building, which had been erected as a one-and-a-half story office, but was raised to three-and-a-half stories by 1840. By that time Fling had gone into the real estate business and had moved to Broad Street. For the next twenty years the buildings were leased to brokers, insurance agents and railroad companies. Fling moved his own business back to Walnut Street in 1860, where it remained until his death in 1873, after which his heirs sold the buildings to a broker. After 1857 the Bishop White House also was converted to brokers' offices. On Chestnut Street the adaptation of residential properties to commercial uses began even earlier. Edward Tilghman sold the Joseph Pemberton House, adjacent to Carpenters' Court, to a gilder in 1811. It continued in various business uses, eventually serving as a hotel and then the post office, before being demolished in 1846.[42]

Although no longer fashionable residentially, the area bounded by Walnut, Market, Second and Sixth Streets continued to be the civic and commercial heart of an expanding city. It became the center for banking and brokerage, for insurance and publishing. As these businesses grew and prospered, old monuments were altered or eradicated; new and bigger buildings took their place. In a section devoted to "Relics of the Past," a mid-nineteenth century guidebook noted, "Few of these remain in Philadelphia; they are being swept away by the onward tide of modern improvement."[43] Indeed, the sweeping had begun in the late eighteenth century when the First Bank succeeded the gardens of Clarke Hall. It continued during the first half of the nineteenth century with completion of the Second Bank of the United States in 1824, where the Norris Mansion had stood, while the garden, already partially occupied by the Library Company, had become the site of a commercial block called Norris's Row. In 1834 the Merchants' Exchange was erected on the triangle of land formed by Walnut Street and the curve of Dock Street. It was the third phase of development on the filled land adjacent to Dock Street. The excavation for its foundations revealed not only the cellars of the brick houses that were taken down to clear the site, but also the remains of tanyards several feet below.[44] The old Town House, which had survived as a market house after Old City Hall was built, was superseded as the head house by the semi-circular Jersey Market built in 1822, designed by William Strickland, and itself demolished in 1837.[45] The commercial areas least affected by change were those left furthest behind by the westward expansion, which suffered more from decay than from demolition. Front, Water and lower Dock Streets had become a locus of warehouses, flophouses and sailors' dives. It was hard to imagine that Philadelphia's early merchant princes had once lived in a neighborhood that by the 1850's was "deemed so unfit a place!"[46]

Chestnut Street, in contrast, was flourishing. From Second to Third Street many older buildings remained, although most had received new storefronts. Looming over them was the Jayne Building, designed by William Johnston, and completed in 1850, after his death, by Thomas U. Walter. Seven full stories, plus tower, this forerunner of the modern skyscraper, and headquarters of a patent medicine empire, dominated the south side of Chestnut Street. At the southeast corner of Third Street was the new five-story Van Dyke Building, which housed an insurance company.[47] Around the corner, on Third and Dock Streets, was another novel structure, the Penn Mutual Life Insurance Company, the first building in Philadelphia with a front made entirely of cast iron.[48] On the north side of Chestnut, across from the Jayne Building, was Congress Hall, "an extensive hotel, having accommodations for over two hundred and fifty inmates," masked by a deceptively modest front composed of two old buildings.[49]

The blocks from Third to Fifth Streets were developing rapidly as "Bank Row". The Bank of North America, the oldest bank in the city, first chartered at the instigation of Robert Morris in 1781, was ensconced on the north side between Third and Fourth. Its new building, completed in 1848, was a dignified Italianate palazzo, executed in brownstone. On the same side was another of lower Chestnut Street's hotels, the Franklin House. On the southwest corner of Third Street, was a plain five-story building housing the Philadelphia Public Ledger. Another of the early banks occupied the southwest corner of Fourth. This was the Philadelphia Bank, founded early in the nineteenth century. Its first building designed, like the Bank of Pennsylvania, by Latrobe, was an early essay in the Gothic style.[50] It stood on the site of an eighteenth-century tavern known variously as the Cross Keys and Anvil, Moon and Seven Stars and Sign of the Confederation. In its turn, the Latrobe building was demolished in

1836, its place taken by a Greek Revival structure, like its neighbor to the west, the Second Bank of the United States, designed by William Strickland.[51] In 1851 it also housed the Western Bank and the Girard Life Insurance Company. Next to it the former Second Bank of the United States then served as the United States Custom House. Across the street the United States Hotel was formed around the core of two Georgian houses built by John Rhea in the eighteenth century.[52] Long one of the city's most outstanding hostrelries, it was beginning to lose the carriage trade to newer establishments, such as the Girard House, further to the west. Also on the north side were the Farmers and Mechanics Bank and the Franklin Fire Insurance Company. The block from Fifth to Sixth Street, opposite Independence Hall, still remained a fashionable shopping area. George J. Henkels, the finest of Philadelphia's mid-nineteenth century cabinetmakers, had his showroom there. There were also a daguerreotypist, confectionery, purveyor of pianos, and a book store, as well as the American Hotel. In the block above Sixth on the north side the former site of Joshua Carpenter's estate was occupied by the Arcade of 1826, designed by John Haviland, and the Chestnut Street Theater of 1822, designed by William Strickland. The latter replaced the first Chestnut Street Theater, built in 1794 and remodeled by Benjamin Henry Latrobe in 1801.[53] More entertainment was available on the south side of the street, where Swaim's Building housed Barnum's Museum.[54]

North of Chestnut Street change in the mid-nineteenth century was fueled by a series of major fires. The biggest, in 1850, destroyed 367 buildings between Vine and Callowhill Streets, from Delaware to Second Street. In 1856 over forty buildings burned in the block bounded by Market and Arch, and Fifth and Sixth Streets. Fire also struck dangerously close to the historic buildings on Independence Square. On the day after Christmas in 1851 a fire at the corner of

Chestnut and Sixth Streets spread to Congress Hall, as charred timbers in the roof structure still attest.[55] Fortunately the fire did not spread to the floors below. Where it escaped burning, lower Market Street changed less radically in appearance than Chestnut, although it declined in elegance. Perhaps the continued presence of the open market sheds contributed to its fall from grace in an era less tolerant of unpleasant sights and odors than the eighteenth century had been. All vestiges of its reign as the city's most desirable residential area had vanished. Franklin's house had long since been demolished, in 1812, and the court in which it had stood was lined with tenements.[56] Still, many of the old buildings remained, housing a variety of stores, among which clothing stores predominated. Some of them, such as the rental properties Franklin had built, were totally unrecognizable behind new, five-story fronts. Interspersed among the old buildings were newer ones, immediately distinguishable by the more elaborate treatment of windows and cornices. The new buildings at most exceeded the old ones by only one or two stories, but because their floor to ceiling heights were greater, they were considerably taller. Here, as in other commercial areas, metal or fabric canopies were hung over the sidewalks.[57]

South of Walnut Street, the predominantly residential Society Hill changed too in the second half of the nineteenth century. The alteration was not so much one of use, but of the social and economic character of the neighborhood. As the streetcars and railroads drew its former residents to Rittenhouse Square and the suburbs, newer occupants, often recent immigrants, took their place.

> The great houses of the founding fathers (and the Tory patricians) turned into tenements and grocery stores.
>
> The shift was remarkably sudden .... Its very abruptness averted the piecemeal destruction of the eighteenth-century town to a remarkable extent; land values fell so rapidly that the old buildings by and large survived, decrepit but miraculously conserved. 58

Much of eighteenth-century Society Hill was thus saved for the future because it had become unfashionable.

In the fifty years following the departure of the Federal government for Washington, the face of old Philadelphia had been transformed. Some sections had become backwaters; the financial district had evolved from decorous rows of brick to a close-packed area of marble, brownstone and granite. In the next fifty years these trends continued, producing the very different city that greeted a young Virginian named Edwin O. Lewis, who arrived in Philadelphia by steamboat in 1896. Like an earlier transplant, Benjamin Franklin, Lewis started life as a printer. It was Lewis who would eventually spark the movement to create a great park centered on Independence Hall. In his early years in Philadelphia, most of his waking hours were spent in the neighborhood of Independence Hall. His first job was with the Philadelphia Press , a block from Independence Square; his second at the Public Ledger on the southwest corner of Chestnut and Sixth Streets. While operating a typesetting machine at night, he attended law school during the day in a building behind Congress Hall. He was not impressed by his surroundings, finding the neighborhood "pretty sorry".

> Directly opposite Independence Hall was the chain restaurant I remember very well because I used to eat my dinners, you'd call them, but really for me it was breakfast because I was starting work on the newspaper at six o'clock .... That was right opposite and was a rather attractive building, well lighted, and the others were banks, and they kept up the buildings pretty well.
>
> The decline was in back of the facade ... in the block from Market Street to Arch, north, that declined very rapidly. That was terribly hazardous. I used to go into the little alleys and the shops there, fires burning, machine shops and everything in there that never should have been there ....
>
> The architecture on Chestnut Street on the north side was a conglomerate,

> mostly banks, which the architects of that period designed to be built of huge-- mostly granite, some marble blocks and thick walls, no period design about them, just awful. 59

What Lewis looked at with disapproval was the accretion of 200 years of development. By the turn of the century, many sites in the neighborhood had held four or five buildings in succession. More of the landmarks of the Proprietor's City and the Founding Fathers' City had vanished, some after spiraling downward into decay. The Slate Roof House, which at mid-century wore "a sadly-neglected appearance, -- the front rooms of the lower story being occupied as a huckster's shop, and those in the rear as a saw manufactory, while the upper stories are used by a cabinet-maker as a varnish-room," was demolished in 1867, to provide room for a building for the Chamber of Commerce.[60] Across Second Street, the Bank of Pennsylvania came down at the same time, while the City Tavern had been removed two decades earlier.[61] The London Coffee House, at Front and Market Streets, was also gone, razed in 1883.[62] The most prominent of Market Street landmarks, the markets themselves, which eventually stretched to Eleventh Street, had been demolished in 1859. In their place ran the tracks of streetcars and overhead, in the late nineteenth century, on both Market and Chestnut Streets was a tangle of wires for trolleys, telephones and electric lights.

More recent buildings had also fallen to redevelopment as the banking, insurance and publishing industries expanded. Old institutions, such as the Library Company and the Mercantile Library had left the neighborhood, although others, such as the Philosophical Society, remained. Where the Library Company and Norris' Row had stood was the cubic bulk of the 11-story Drexel Building, erected in 1885.[63] Another tall blocky structure, the R.D. Wood Building, was at the southwest corner of Chestnut and Fourth Streets, where the Philadelphia Bank had stood, while the Girard Estate Building would soon occupy

the old site of Clarke Hall at Third Street.[64] West of it Frank Furness' masterly polychrome Guarantee Safe Deposit and Trust Co. had been erected in 1875 along the east side of Carpenters' Court on the site of Joseph Pemberton's eighteenth-century house. Across Chestnut Street, "Bank Row" had become a solid line of buildings erected durng the second half of the nineteenth century, obliterating the once-prominent hotels and shops. At the southwest corner of Chestnut and Sixth, the mansarded bulk of the Public Ledger Building was the centerpiece of the publishing district, which stretched south toward Washington Square.

Walnut Street had become, as it would remain, the heart of the insurance district, lined on both sides from Second to Sixth Street with insurance companies and agencies. Most were housed in nineteenth century buildings, but here and there, "a company or an agency has taken over some very old house and converted it into offices, so that a visitor entering a perhaps dingy building is surprised to come upon a beautiful staircase, or a graceful fanlight, or a room wherein doors, fireplace and windows are connected by white wooden panelling into the definite architectural scheme of an early Colonial house, or where there is the massive walnut woodwork of a later period."[65]

When young Lewis first saw the Independence neighborhood in 1896, it was an area already far past its peak. The center of residential and retail activity had long since moved to the west. With the completion of the new City Hall at Center Square, more than a quarter of a century after construction began, the financial community would follow. Although some of the courts were still located in the building on Independence Square, they too would soon be relocated in the new civic complex. After more than 160 years the block on Chestnut would cease to be the seat of an active government. In the surrounding neighborhood, the pace of change would slow, although it would not cease. The old Merchants'

Exchange, despite an atttempt to revivify it as the location of the Philadelphia Stock Exchange, had become the Produce Exchange by 1922. The monumental steps leading to the curved east colonnade were removed, along with their guardian lions. Market sheds took their place. Only around Independence Square the publishing and insurance industries, still securely anchored in the area, continued to build. By the Sesquicentennial of the Declaration of Independence, the square was surrounded on three sides by tall office buildings.

Through all the decades of change, numerous buildings survived that had witnessed the genesis of the nation and the early days of the Republic. Some lasted because of the sentiment or conservatism of their owners; others because there was no demand for the land on which they stood. The Independence Hall group, Carpenters' Hall, the First and Second Banks of the United States, Christ Church and other colonial churches were engulfed by the later city, while to the south, hundreds of half-forgotten early buildings in Society Hill succumbed slowly to decay. Except for Independence Square and Washington Square to its southwest, the only open space was parking lots.[66] As the government of the City of Philadelphia finally left Independence Square, groups of Philadelphians from all walks of life began to concern themselves with the future of the historic buildings and their surroundings.

III - DREAMS FOR A PARK

Through all the years of change, two buildings increasingly were viewed as shrines -- Independence Hall and Carpenters' Hall. Other historic buildings in the area survived through chance or because they continued to serve a purpose akin to that for which they were designed; in contrast Independence Hall and Carpenters' Hall were the objects of pioneering historic preservation efforts. Carpenters' Hall, removed from commercial use and opened to the public in 1857, was refurbished on several occasions in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries; Independence Hall underwent a long series of alterations and restorations in its gradual transformation from Pennsylvania State House to national shrine.

In 1799 the government of Pennsylvania followed the movement of the state's population westward to Lancaster. A year later the federal government left Philadelphia for Washington. After over a half a century the complex on Independence Square was no longer the hub of political life for state or nation. Although state and city courts continued to sit in the Supreme Court Chamber, the Assembly Room and second floor of Independence Hall stood empty and unused.[1] In an early example of what is now called adaptive use, the Pennsylvania Legislature in 1802, granted the painter Charles Willson Peale permission to occupy these spaces as a museum. One of his painter sons, Rembrandt Peale, set up his studio in the Assembly Room. The elder Peale fitted up the second floor to display his portraits of prominent national figures and his natural history collection. This included such awe-inspiring specimens as a stuffed grizzly bear and an "Ourang Outang," and the skeleton of a mammoth, as well as 760 varieties of birds and 4,000 insects. To house them Peale carried

out one of the first "restorations" of the building, returning the Long Gallery and the southern rooms to their original arrangement.[2]

Peale was a sympathetic tenant for the building, but he also supported the first, and most destructive, of the major nineteenth-century alterations. In 1812 the Pennsylvania Legislature authorized the Philadelphia County Commissioners to demolish the wing buildings and their connecting piazzas, or arcades, in order to erect fireproof buildings for the storage of records. Because the fireproof buildings were considerably larger than the old wings, their construction necessitated razing the library and committee rooms and the colossal clock case on the west wall of the old State House.[3] Meanwhile, the state government, having once again moved west, this time to Harrisburg, and needing to fund construction of a new capitol, determined to sell the State House Square and the buildings on it. A proposal to subdivide the land into building lots met with howls from the citizens of Philadelphia. The bill that finally cleared the legislature in 1816 offered an alternative. The City of Philadelphia could purchase the property for $70,000. On June 29, 1818, the city took possession of its new property.[4]

While the legal proceedings for the transfer were in process, the legislature vested control of the building in the Philadelphia County Commissioners, who in 1816 embarked on an elaborate program of alterations to Independence Hall. Decorative plasterwork was added to the interior; on the exterior the original simple front doorway was replaced by one with a more elaborate Corinthian surround and the marble trim was painted. What aroused public sentiment, however, was a wanton act of destruction, the motives for which have never been ascertained. The paneling and other architectural woodwork of the Assembly Room were stripped from the walls, dismantled and sold.[5] The outrage expressed at this act reveals the aura of veneration

that already clung to that space, if not to the entire building, and the desire to preserve the room's appearance for future generations. According to John Read, Jr., a member of Select Council:

> We in common with our fellow citizens felt the highest respect for the antient [sic] Capitol of the State;... it would have particularly gratified us, to have perceived entire, every ornament and decoration, which had been placed in the building, by a correct architectural taste, particularly in that department of it, in which the declaration of independence, and the federal Constitution, were devised and completed. 6

The indignation and sense of desecration felt by Read and others was not quelled by time. Almost forty years later John Binns described the commissioners' action as a "sacreligious outrage."[7]

In the next decade two events caused the city to attempt to rectify the commissioners' mistake: the visit of the Marquis de Lafayette in 1824 and the fiftieth anniversary of the signing of the Declaration in 1826. Having redecorated the Assembly Room, by then referred to as the Hall of Independence, for Lafayette's use as a levee room, the city decided to restore it to its original appearance. Another part of the building, however, claimed attention first. This was the tower, the wooden steeple of which had been removed in 1781. In 1828 the City Councils commissioned William Strickland to design a replacement. Although the new steeple was of the same size and general form as the old original, it differed considerably in detail. It was designed to accommodate a four-faced clock and was adorned with a free interpretation of classical ornament in the early nineteenth-century taste. Nevertheless, the councilmen clearly viewed the steeple as a restoration.[8]

Three years later, in 1831, the English-born architect John Haviland was commissioned to study the Assembly Room. His report of March 29, 1831 made it clear that restoration was the aim, stating, "In compliance with your request, I have examined 'the Hall of the Declaration of Independence,' with a view of

reinstating it with its original architectural embellishments."[9] Surprisingly enough, although only fifteen years had elapsed since the destruction of its original finishes, the fact that Haviland's work was inaccurate in many particulars elicited no known comment from the many Philadelphians who must have been familiar with the room before it was denuded.

As Philadelphia grew, its government required expanded offices. The need for additional space became especially urgent with the approaching consolidation of outlying districts to form the greatly enlarged modern city of Philadelphia. These pressures might have resulted in the destruction or total alteration of the buildings on Independence Square. In 1848 Thomas U. Walter proposed a plan to replace Congress Hall and Old City Hall with Renaissance palazzi in the style of the new Athenaeum of Philadelphia: Independence Hall was to be covered with brown stucco to match. This scheme may be represented in a mid-nineteenth century wood engraving, which shows the flanking buildings replaced by larger structures.[10] Fortunately, less radical measures were taken, and the existing buildings were made to serve. In 1854, the Common Council and Select Council of the expanded city moved into the second floor of Independence Hall. By this time the Assembly Room had clearly become a shrine. The Liberty Bell, removed from the tower in 1852, stood there, surmounted by the stuffed bald eagle from Peale's Museum. A life-size statue of Washington by William Rush presided over the scene, while the walls were lined with portraits of distinguished figures of the Revolutionary and Federal eras, purchased from Peale's estate.

Despite this growth of reverence, the Independence Square group had another narrow escape at the end of the next decade. In 1868 the City Councils voted to erect new municipal buildings on Independence Square.[11] John McArthur, Jr., who would later become architect of the City Hall on Center Square, produced

designs much in the style of that structure. Bold and flamboyant Second Empire pavilions, scaled to the boulevards of Paris, entirely surrounded the square on three sides. Independence Hall remained, forlorn and dwarfed, between the two terminal buildings on Chestnut Street.[12] Within a few years, the councils rethought the matter and decided to build on Center Square. The approaching Centennial of the Declaration may have influenced this reversal. Soon after ground was broken for the new City Hall, the City Councils confirmed the sacred status of the Assembly Room by setting it aside forever as a shrine in 1872. A committee, chaired by Colonel Frank M. Etting, commenced work on refurnishing and restoration, erroneously including the installation of four columns in the Assembly Room. The project expanded to include removal of the paint that had been applied to the exterior marble trim and repair of woodwork in the hallway and stair tower. Etting's committee also dealt with the Supreme Court Chamber. Covering over the bench and other trappings of the judiciary, they fitted it out as a "National Museum", displaying furnishings, relics, and portraits related to the early history of Pennsylvania and the nation.[13] For the first time the entire first floor of Independence Hall was opened for the enjoyment and education of the public.

In 1895, as the city government prepared to complete its move to the new City Hall, attention turned again to the fate of Independence Hall. In 1896 the Daughters of the American Revolution received authorization from the city to restore, at their own expense, the building's second floor. This was the start of a restoration program that eventually extended to the entire building. The DAR retained T. Mellon Rogers as architect, and Rogers continued in this capacity for the city's restoration of the remainder of the building. The work extended from the interior to the exterior and also involved substantial structural reinforcement. Most dramatically, the fireproof buildings

constructed in 1812 were razed, and wings and arcades resembling the originals were constructed in their place. Unfortunately, although old views were consulted, Rogers seems to have made no attempt to seek out historical documentation or architectural evidence for his work, but to have based it on a personal vision of eighteenth-century taste. As a result, much of the "restoration" was far from accurate. The wing buildings, for example, differed in dimension and detail from the originals. An even more damaging result of this approach was the destruction of original features, such as the cornice of the Supreme Court Room.[14] These unfortunate consequences had one happy result. Rogers' restoration precipitated so much criticism, especially from the Philadelphia Chapter of the American Institute of Architects that the city asked the organization to appoint a subcommittee to advise on Independence Square. Over the next quarter of a century the committee, under the chairmanship of Horace Wells Sellers, superintended restoration work on all the buildings in the row. In 1912-1913 the committee made studies and prepared plans for the restoration of Congress Hall; in 1917 they carried out similar tasks for Old City Hall, although the work on the building was not completed until 1922; from 1921 to 1923 their work on the second floor of Independence Hall eradicated most of T. Mellon Rogers' "ice-cream saloon" colonial.[15] The AIA restorations were landmarks in the field; the architects made careful measurements and subjected the buildings to rigorous architectural anaylsis. Much of their work at Congress Hall and Old City Hall was of such a high degree of accuracy that the National Park Service left it undisturbed in their subsequent restoration of the buildings.

Thus in the century that followed Lafayette's visit in 1824 reverence spread from the Assembly Room to all of Independence Hall and then to its flanking buildings. There was a concomitant growing interest in the grounds in

which the buildings stood. As a public park, Independence Square was subject to continuing rearrangement and maintenance of the landscaping. A major effort during the Etting restoration of 1875-76 lowered the walls that had surrounded the square, and provided flights of steps leading to its broad flagstoned paths from the surrounding streets. In 1915-16 the mid-nineteenth century courthouse that had been erected behind Congress Hall was removed and the city undertook extensive relandscaping, producing the design of the square that remains today.[16] Like the city's restoration of Independence Hall, the plan for the square depended on contemporary perceptions of eighteenth-century landscape design rather than on historical documentation. Nevertheless, the idea that the buildings on Independence Square deserved an appropriate setting was a powerful one that would recur in different forms and under different auspices for the next fifty years.

With such a setting provided at the rear of the buildings to the south, attention focused on the northern approach. As the AIA completed their restoration of Congress Hall and prepared to make plans for restoring Old City Hall, two Philadelphia architects, Albert Kelsey and D. Knickerbacker Boyd presented a preliminary study for a "new setting" for Independence Hall. For many years the broad sidewalk on Chestnut Street across the front of Independence Hall had been the focus of Philadelphia's celebrations, the terminus of its parades, and the site of political rallies. On these occasions temporary bleachers and platforms were set up along the front of Independence Hall, posing the danger of fire, and traffic on Chestnut Street came to a standstill. Kelsey and Boyd proposed to alleviate the situation by creating a "reviewing square" on the north side of Chestnut Street. This provided a relatively modest public open space, running half way to Market Street. At the north end it terminated in a Colonnade of the Signers. A Palladian five-part

plan, with curved passages linking a central block to small pavilions, the structure was intended to serve the dual purpose of permanent reviewing stand and perch from which visitors could contemplate the historic buildings. The plaza in front of it was flanked by formal gardens and fountains, and the whole was sheltered from the surrounding streets by rows of trees.[17]

In the 1920's additional impetus to plans for the setting of Independence Square came from three coincidental events of 1926, the Sesquicentennial of the Declaration of Independence, the opening of the Benjamin Franklin Bridge, linking Philadelphia with New Jersey, and publication of the first regional plan for the Philadelphia area. In anticipation, a patriotic society asked the noted architect Paul Philippe Cret to make a study for a plaza facing Independence Hall.[18] Cret sketched at least two schemes. Both covered the same area as the Boyd and Kelsey study. The more elaborate Scheme A proposed a raised semi-circular plaza, embraced within an arcade terminated by square pavilions. Terraced steps flanked by statues led to the plaza from Chestnut Street. On the other three sides tree plantings shielded the plaza from the surrounding streets. Scheme B was more modest. The plaza was smaller, closer to street level, and rectangular, with a simple arcade along the north side. Trees played a more prominent role and there were connecting walks to Fifth and Sixth Streets.[19]

Meanwhile, Cret's sometime collaborator the French architect Jacques Gréber, approached the problem at the request of the city in 1924. He envisaged a monumental rectangular mall, running from Walnut to Market Streets between Fifth and Sixth Streets. The rectangle was divided into two squares. On the south, Independence Square was organized on a cross-axial plan. Colonnades punctuated by pavilions ran from the rear of Congress Hall and Old City Hall to Walnut Street. Between Chestnut and Market was a "Great Marble Court" with the

"Liberty Bell Altar" at its center. The court was surrounded by buildings on three sides, and entered through an archway on Market Street. Gréber's grandiose Beaux Arts scheme had the effect of reducing Independence Hall to a sculptural centerpiece.[20] Six years later, Gréber produced a more modest plan for the city. It left Independence Square untouched, but retained the great court across Chestnut Street. Since the court was still to be surrounded by Neo-Palladian buildings, Independence Hall would not be visible from the surrounding streets except though the ceremonial archway from Market Street. The Liberty Bell was again presented as an icon on an altar at the center of the court.[21]

At least one idea presented during the period was both more ambitious and less credible. At the time of the Sesquicentennial, Dr. Seneca Egbert, Professor of Hygiene at the Medical School of the University of Pennsylvania, proposed clearance of the three blocks from Chestnut to Race Street between Fifth and Sixth Streets. Half of the first block would be developed by the City of Philadelphia and the United States government. The space at the north end, at the Benjamin Franklin Bridge entrance would be allocated to the State of Pennsylvania. In between, a concourse to be developed by the city would be flanked by plots allocated to each of the other twelve original states. Egbert hoped that each state would erect a replica of one of its historic buildings of the colonial era to serve as a museum and archives of its role in the founding of the nation.[22] Egbert was a physician, not an architect or planner; had his vision been realized, the result could have been ludicrous in design and scale. Although he continued to advocate what he called "America's Forum", for the next decade, the details of his program were never taken seriously. One aspect of his concept, however, did command attention -- the creation of a three-block mall north of Chestnut Street. In a prophetic interview in 1935,

George E. Nitzche, recorder at the University of Pennsylvania suggested that the three blocks to the north be transformed into a national park, so that Independence Hall could have "a setting worthy of its pre-eminence."[23]

At about the same time a prominent Philadelphia architect, Roy F. Larson, began, in his words, to "play with" a setting not only to the north of Independence Hall, but also for a "thrust" to the east of Independence Square. Larson, who had joined Cret as a partner in 1926, became, in the late 1930's, chairman of the Municipal Improvements Committee of the Philadelphia Chapter of the AIA.[24] One of his plans for the historic area, presented to that group in 1937, shows a broad mall reaching to Race Street, where a semi-circle serves both as terminus and transition to plazas forming an approach to the Benjamin Franklin Bridge. The extension to the east is more intimate, with narrow walks leading past the rear of the Second Bank of the United States to Carpenters' Hall and from Carpenters' Hall to the Merchants Exchange.[25]

Larson was not the first to consider an enhanced setting for the historic buildings east of Independence Square. In the 1930's interest in the area was undoubtedly sparked by the building of the new Federal Custom House at the southwest corner of Chestnut and Second Streets. This largest of Philadelphia's Depression-era construction projects loomed above the small-scale buildings, historic and non-historic, near the Delaware River front. In 1933 A. Raymond Raff, in his dual capacity as Collector of the Port and President of the Carpenters' Company, proposed a series of improvements for the neighborhood around the Custom House, among which was a "Congress Plaza". This plan called for a formal landscaped park along Third Street west of the Customs House. West of Third Street three buildings -- the First Bank of the United States, Carpenters' Hall, and the Second Bank of the United States -- would

be preserved. The buildings between them and along Chestnut Street would be removed and replaced by plantings.[26]

Emerson C. Custis suggested a project more attuned to commercial development. Custis, whose real estate office was in the Merchants Exchange, and who managed the building for its owners, had participated in lobbying the Custom House through Congress.[27] In 1933 he was among an ad hoc committee of prominent Philadelphians who met with Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Ferry K. Heath to discuss the possibilities of clearing the site at the southeast corner of Chestnut and Third Streets in order to erect modern office buildings, to be used by Custom House brokers, and other private businesses dealing with the customs, as well as by the United States Treasury. Within a few months, tentative plans for the buildings had been drawn up by the firm of Thalheimer and Weitz.[28] The plan called for three low, but massive, office buildings grouped in an irregular U-shape around a small plaza between the new complex and the Custom House. Despite their bulk, the buildings were tricked out in red brick with colonnaded and pedimented porticos, presumably in compliment to the "colonial character of the area's historic buildings."[29] Even before Thalheimer and Weitz's scheme was off the drawing board, Custis expanded his vision. He proposed a mall to run from the new development adjacent to the Custom House to Independence Hall. Sansom Street, parallel to Chestnut, was to become a private, landscaped street. Although the First and Second Banks and Carpenters' Hall would remain, banks, insurance companies and other businesses were expected to construct new buildings running back from Chestnut and Walnut Streets to the mall.[30] Custis managed to obtain both moral support and a pledge of $250,000 from Cyrus H.K. Curtis whose Curtis Publishing Company owned the Saturday Evening Post, Ladies Home Journal, Public Ledger, and the buildings along the west side of Sixth Street between

Walnut and Chestnut. Although Curtis died before his pledge could be called, the project was known as the Curtis Mall in his honor.[30]

Few of these early schemes to preserve Philadelphia's historic buildings in an appropriate setting dealt with the issue of implementation. Those that did assumed that the projects would be privately funded or would be carried out through the initiative of the City of Philadelphia. When the Depression of the 1930's appeared to preclude financial support from either private philanthropy or the municipality, proponents of enhancement of the historic scene turned to a new potential source of assistance, the Federal government.

A series of events in the early 1930's had put the National Park Service squarely in the historic preservation business. Although components of the system had included what were classified as historic areas, most of these earlier acquisitions were Indian ruins in the southwest. In 1930, however, two historic areas in Virginia were added to the system, Colonial National Monument at Yorktown and the George Washington Birthplace at Wakefield. In 1933, the country's first National Historical Park was created at Morristown, New Jersey. A reorganization in 1933 dramatically increased the National Park Service's supervision of federally-owned historic properties. It incorporated into the National Park System the National Capital Parks, which included such buildings as Ford's Theater and the Custis-Lee Mansion; the National Memorials, giving the park service custody of such monuments as the Statue of Liberty and the Lincoln Memorial; and the National Military Parks, including the leading Revolutionary and Civil War battlefields; as well as National Military Cemeteries and National Monuments. The reorganization almost quadrupled the number of historic areas administered by the National Park Service.[32] The role of the National Park Service as the agency charged with the federal government's historic preservation responsibilities, and the acquisition and

management of historic properties, was recognized and expanded by passage of the Historic Sites Act of 1935.[33] The act placed the National Park Service in the forefront of preservation activity by authorizing it to engage in research and educational and service programs.[34] Most importantly for the future of Independence, the act provided that the Secretary of the Interior, through the National Park Service, could "contract and make cooperative agreements with States, municipal subdivisions, associations, or individuals ... to protect, preserve, maintain, or operate any historic building, site, object, or property used in connection therewith for public use, regardless as to whether the title thereto is in the United States."[35] This was a broad mandate, allowing the park service to engage in a wide range of preservation activities in cooperation with other public and private agencies. There was, however, one overriding limitation; the park service could not commit general revenues without a Congressional appropriation.

Philadelphians were quick to recognize the opportunities afforded by the 1935 Act. Even before the act was passed, Sen. Joseph E. Guffey drafted a bill calling for the creation of a National Monument at Carpenters' Hall. George Nitzche recommended that Guffey's bill be amended to provide for the inclusion of Independence Hall and other adjacent historic structures.[36] Proposals for a larger park continued to be discussed. In 1939 Struthers Burt contacted the National Park Service about a project aimed at razing non-historic structures in a radius of three or more city blocks in the vicinity of Independence Hall.[37] Burt had returned to Philadelphia after living for many years in Wyoming. He was well known to the National Park Service for his role in interesting the Rockefellers in purchasing land at Jackson Hole, Wyoming to add to Grand Teton National Park. [38] His suggestion produced a flurry of activity, but Burt became discouraged because he believed Philadelphians would

never provide sufficient support.[39] Fiske Kimball, the respected director of the Philadelphia Art Museum and an influential member of the National Park Service Advisory Board, doubted that the necessary components of a park could be assembled. He thought it unlikely that the city or the Carpenters' Company would yield control of their buildings, and viewed the mall scheme as liable to abuse by real estate speculators.[40]

Nevertheless, by the late 1930's the National Park Service had established a foothold in Philadelphia through ownership of the Second Bank of the United States. For ninety years after 1845 the building had served as the United States Custom House for Philadelphia. With completion of the new Custom House, the building had become redundant, and in early 1938 the Treasury Department put it up for sale.[41] This was a crisis in which Kimball could take a positive stance. He fired off telegrams to National Park Service Director Arno B. Cammerer and Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes. Characterizing the building as "the masterpiece of the Greek Revival in America" and its possible loss as an "artistic calamity", he urged acquisition by the National Park Service if no other public or quasi-public use could be found.[42] Local patriotic and historic groups supported the building's preservation. So did the National Park Service historian, Alvin P. Stauffer, who was sent to Philadelphia to evaluate the Second Bank. He pointed out that in addition to its architectural distinction, the bank was a reminder of the landmark struggle between Andrew Jackson and Nicholas Biddle over the federal government's financial policies. Considering the unusual architectural and historical significance of the building, Stauffer's superior, Ronald F. Lee, chief historian of the National Park Service, recommended to Cammerer its transfer from the Treasury Department and drafted a letter for Ickes' signature, requesting delay of its disposition. Cammerer agreed with Lee's

appraisal, on condition that maintenance of the building could be assured.

Within a few weeks the major components of a feasible plan began to emerge. Fiske Kimball had found that the Carl Schurz Memorial Foundation, a non-profit group dedicated to preservation of the cultural heritage of German-Americans, would maintain the building, to house their offices and library. The Works Progress Administration would fund its restoration and renovation. On the strength of these proposals the Department of the Interior applied for transfer of the property from the Treasury Department in January 1939, a transfer duly made in April of the same year. Up to this time the disposition of the Second Bank had been a matter of internal arrangements between two departments of the United States government, governed largely by questions of financial feasibility. However, the worsening international situation began to produce questions about the park service's negotiations with the Carl Schurz Foundation. By early 1939 Germany was widely viewed as the aggressor in a potential European war. Doubts were raised about the suitability of an organization devoted to German culture as the occupants of a national shrine. Another contender for the building came forward. Temple University wished to lease it for use as a law school. Kimball, Lee, and the Park Service's architects opposed the scheme. They believed that adaptation of the building for such use would require too much structural change. Furthermore, the university was unable to meet the terms proposed by the Department of the Interior for a financial contribution to restoration and annual maintenance. After abortive negotiations with the American Red Cross, and assurances from the Carl Schurz Foundation that they were not Nazi sympathizers, the Department of the Interior entered into a cooperative agreement with the foundation on December 18, 1939. The building would be restored, under the direction of National Park Service architects, by the WPA, using $100,000 in Federal funds and $15,000 contributed by the Carl

Schurz Foundation. The foundation would maintain it and allow reasonable public access. By the fall of 1940, the work had been accomplished and the foundation had moved in.[43] The Historic Sites Act of 1935, by providing for cooperative agreements, allowed the park service to participate in the preservation of important properties that were not in federal ownership. With protection of the Second Bank assured, the Park Service set its sights on the Independence Hall group. In April 1941 Director Newton Drury, former Director Cammerer, and Chief Historian Lee met with Philadelphia's Mayor Lamberton to discuss a cooperative agreement for the city-owned buildings. Although the park service drafted such an agreement, the city did not sign it.[44] The idea, initiated by the National Park Service, and unsupported by any strong constituency of Philadelphians, had been presented without sufficient preparation.

The approach of war, however, fueled renewed local interest in protecting Independence Hall and the adjacent historic buildings. Fear of possible damage from fire-bombing, coupled with an upsurge of patriotism, inspired an outburst of activity in late 1941 and 1942. Despite Struthers Burt's misgivings, Philadelphians from several walks of life began to garner support for a National Park. One of these early activists was Isidor Ostroff, who represented the Fifth Ward, which included Independence Square and Society Hill, in the Pennsylvania legislature. Ostroff, a Democrat in a city long dominated by a Republican machine, had been elected on President Roosevelt's coattails in the landslide of 1936.[45] Born in Camden, New Jersey, Ostroff, who practiced law in Philadelphia, was frankly emotional in his patriotism. "It was to me quite an honor that the son of an immigrant in this great country could be elected to represent what was to me the holiest district in all the United States. There stands Independence Hall, a symbol of everything that's decent in humanity and

in civic life."[46] Ostroff was dismayed by conditions in the Fifth Ward, a "stumblebum area, where people lay around in a drunken stupor," especially with the dilapidation of the housing stock, much of which lacked adequate plumbing.[47] In 1938 he tried to interest realtor Alfred M. Greenfield in rehabilitating the area by constructing moderate income apartments in the area, but Greenfield and other realtors dismissed the idea as visionary.[48] Ostroff persisted. As he read the various proposals for a park around Independence Hall, he began to view a federal takeover as the key to revitalization of the neighborhood. In the fall of 1941 he persuaded the Democratic committeemen in the Fifth Ward to circulate a petition to Congress.[49] The petition, addressed to Congressman Leon Sacks, asked that Congress pass appropriate legislation to create a National Historical Park in an area bounded by Second, Sixth, Sansom and Chestnut Streets.[50] Ostroff and his committee were afraid to include Dock or Walnut Streets or the land opposite Independence Hall because of the cost of land acquisition.[51] The Fifth Ward was then sparsely populated; Ostroff had won the 1936 election with something in the neighborhood of 2500 votes. Still, in a year in which there was no major election, he managed to garner about 1200 signatures on the petition.[52] Sacks duly introduced a bill, H.R. 6925, on January 21, 1942, asking Congress to create a commission to study such a park. In a country reeling from the shock of Pearl Harbor, the bill went nowhere.[53]

The onset of the war appeared to put a stop to the National Park Service's attempts to expand its toehold in Philadelphia. On March 28, 1942, President Roosevelt signed a letter designating Gloria Dei (Old Swedes' Church) as a National Historic Site. At the same time he placed a virtual stop on the designation process for the duration of the war.[54] Nevertheless, the secretary entered into a cooperative agreement with the Corporation of Gloria

Dei Church on May 1, 1942. Under its terms, the church agreed to preserve the church and other buildings, and the burying ground, to seek Park Service approval before making repairs or alterations to the buildings, to "advise with" the Park Service about decorations and furnishings and to allow public access.[55]

Meanwhile, the idea of a National Park at Independence had attracted a champion far more influential than Ostroff, Judge Edwin O. Lewis. A courtly Virginian, Lewis was an imposing presence, articulate, persuasive, and personable. Even those who disagreed with him usually found him likeable. Charles E. Peterson, the park service's leading expert on historic buildings, would often be at loggerheads with Lewis in the 1950's about the fate of nineteenth-century architecture within the park's boundaries. On a personal level, however, their relationship was cordial.[56] Lewis maintained contact with a broad spectrum of people in the arts, business, and politics. He was, himself, a consummate politician. As Ostroff remembered:

> In my association with Judge Lewis, whom I learned to love as a second father, I had to admire the way he played off Republicans against Democrats and Democrats against Republicans, making the other fellow feel that he'd better do something about it before the other party got credit for doing the thing, and he did it skillfully. He handled the political situation in this entire project like a master of a great orchestra. He played the right instruments and brought out the right reactions and brought out the right results.[57]

Lewis was also persistent and determined that any project for which he was responsible would be a success.[58] There were those who sensed a certain ruthlessness behind the charming manner. Roy Larson, who worked closely with Lewis on early plans for the park, thought he was not "a very generous person to the many people who had something to do with this."[59] Edmund Bacon, the director of the Philadelphia City Planning Commission, thought Lewis was a "real

honest to God giant" and "quite a selfless man," but that he could be "stubborn" and "opinionated."[60]

Like an early Philadelphia benefactor, Benjamin Franklin, Lewis was not a native of the city. Like Franklin, he came to Philadelphia as a young man to work as a printer. Like Franklin, he became active and accepted in social and political circles, and was a tireless worker for the civic good of his adopted city. Edwin O. Lewis was born in Richmond, Virginia, where, at the age of fifteen, he learned to operate a linotype machine. In 1896, when he was sixteen years old, he came, by steamboat, to Philadelphia. He worked nights as a linotype operator, first at the Philadelphia Press and then at the Public Ledger in the Independence Hall neighborhood, and later at The North American at Broad and Sansom Streets. The newspapers were his liberal education.

> There's nothing that teaches you as much as working on a newspaper, a young man. You learn everything. Of course you learn the mechanics of it.. You learn spelling. You learn geography. You learn punctuation, which I've never forgotten since. You're taught punctuation just automatically, and for anybody who's going to be a lawyer this is fine training. Then you learn so much of what's going on in the world. You sit there studying a cablegram from London, one from Paris, one from Buenos Aires--everything comes over your desk...I met all the famous writers of the day...And a young man, not only making the contacts but learning the mechanics of literary construction--they were very good writers, and you learned geography, you learned world history, you learned everything. 61

However, the newspaper did not provide Lewis with enough formal education for law school. So for a year he attended a tutoring school, which met in the old courthouse behind Congress Hall. He worked at night, and went to classes during the day.[62] He went through the University of Pennsylvania Law School in the same manner. It was a grueling schedule, but Lewis seemed to thrive on it.[63] Obtaining his degree in 1902, Lewis began to practise law, and quickly became involved in local politics, first as a Democrat, then as secretary of an

independent party, the City Party, and eventually as a Republican. In 1907 he was elected to the City Council, serving two years, and from 1912 to 1916 was first assistant city solicitor. Briefly out of politics thereafter, he returned to office as a judge in 1923, and by the late 1930's was President Judge, Common Pleas Court #2, Philadelphia County.[64] When the Japanese bombed Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, Lewis was president of the Pennsylvania Chapter of the Sons of the American Revolution. Concerned with dangers to Independence Hall, possibly from enemy bombing and almost certainly from deterioration, he appointed a committee of architects to consider the problem. He named D. Knickerbacker Boyd as chairman of the committee.[65]

David Knickerbacker Boyd, FAIA, was an architect perhaps as well known for his services to the profession as for the buildings he designed. Credited with being one of the first to devise the set-back principle for the design of tall buildings, he had served as consultant to various federal departments and state and municipal governments, as well as to the Russell Sage Foundation. A former president of the Philadelphia Chapter and Pennsylvania Association of the AIA, he had also been secretary and vice-president of the national body.[66] In addition to his architectural activities, as a professional and as a volunteer, he was genuinely interested in patriotic and historical affairs, and was a long-time member of the Society of the Cincinnati and the Sons of the American Revolution.[67] His involvement with Independence Hall went back to 1915, when he had collaborated on a design for a park fronting the building across Chestnut Street. Boyd had other qualities that would be useful in his new assignment. According to his daughter he had "great tact -- he was very tactful -- and if any sign of envy would arise, any temper or anything, as people do, he was witty and with a genial good humor...and he had an intensity and personal

drive."[68] Boyd also had the time to devote to the project, since his architectural practice had suffered during the Depression.[69]

The Sons of the American Revolution Committee on the Protection of Historic Buildings held its first meeting on December 22, 1941.[70] Boyd moved quickly to solicit support from various historical and civic groups and several sub-committees were established.[71] In the early months of the committee's existence he also persuaded the Insurance Company of North America to underwrite a protective mechanism costing $15,000 for the Liberty Bell. The scheme called for mounting the bell on an elevator, which, in the event of an air raid, would lower the bell into a steel and concrete underground vault.[72] In the course of the committee's various meetings and discussions, it began to become clear that the group's interest in Independence Hall and the buildings around it probably outstripped that of the Sons of the American Revolution. The primary issue that disturbed the parent organization appears to have been lobbying. The committee had discussed creating sentiment for a National Park connected with the Independence Hall group. Congressman Leon Sacks, who had introduced a bill appropriating funds for a commission to define the boundaries of a park in January, had asked for support. The response of the Board of Managers of the Sons was to disassociate itself from the committee's work with a vote of thanks to all concerned.[73]

Boyd and Lewis were not willing to let the matter drop. Acting in a personal capacity, rather than as chairman of the committee, Boyd issued invitations to a meeting to be held at the library of the Philadelphia Chapter, AIA, in the Architects Building on May 21, 1942.[74] The list of the fifty-one persons invited was carefully drawn. It included politicians, architects, representatives of city government, business groups, and historical

and cultural institutions.[75] The call for the meeting states:

> You are invited to attend an informal meeting at which will be discussed various possibilities for further protecting the Historic Buildings of Philadelphia and for planning in advance for developing open areas in the vicinity of Independence Hall, Carpenters' Hall, the Old Custom House and adjacent Shrines of National Importance.
> A small preliminary exhibit will be shown of drawings and illustrations pertinent to the subject, and of surveys already made. 76

Eighteen people attended the meeting. In addition to Boyd and Lewis they included: Congressman (later Senator) Hugh D. Scott, Jr., Lewis's nephew; Dr. William E. Lingelbach, a distinguished historian and as Librarian of the American Philosophical Society interested in restoration of the area in which his institution's headquarters was located; H.W. Wills, Secretary of the Board of Trade; Horace D. Carpenter, Curator of Independence Hall; John P. Hallahan, President of the Carpenters' Company; Frances Wister, President of the Society for the Preservation of Landmarks, and a leading pioneer in Philadelphia preservation efforts; Col. S. Price Wetherill; Joseph Jackson, antiquarian and author; Rev. Croswell McBee of Old St. David's Church; Sydney E. Martin, President of the Philadelphia Chapter, AIA and Roy F. Larson, Chairman of the organization's Committee on Municipal Improvements; George A. Landell, Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States; William H. Gravelle, Consulting Engineer; Edwin H. Silverman, President of the Pennsylvania Association of Architects; Charles Abell Murphy, an early proponent of a park north of Independence Hall; and C.C. Zantzinger, President of the City Parks Association.[77]

It was a small group, but one whose members had, for the most part, already given the protection and enhancement of Philadelphia's historic buildings considerable thought. Although the meeting was brief, taking less than an hour, a great deal was accomplished. There was some discussion of the designation of

Old Swede's Church as a "national shrine," and the desirability of obtaining similar recognition for the Independence Hall group. Evidently the gathering was unaware of President Roosevelt's proscription of the designation of further National Historic Sites. Congressman Scott advised the group that it was unlikely the Sacks bill would be reported out of committee unless some organization developed and submitted plans, backed by competent data. Various prospective projects to be undertaken by a newly-formed organization were discussed, including an educational exhibit. At the conclusion of the meeting the group appointed an Organization Committee, chaired by Roy Larson, and including Lingelbach and Boyd. The three were charged with preparing a prospectus and other information, to be sent to patriotic, historical, professional and technical organizations. Each group would be invited to appoint a representative to attend a subsequent organizational meeting.[78]

On June 30, 1942, fifty-seven persons assembled at the Hall of the American Philosophical Society. The major business of the meeting, the formation of an organization, was accomplished quickly. Debate over a name took longer. The tentative choice was "An Organization for the Conservation of Historic Sites in Old Philadelphia", but the group left the opportunity for future name changes open. They also chose a slate of officers and an executive committee: Lewis as President, Larson and Miss Wister as vice-presidents, Joseph F. Stockwell as treasurer, and Boyd as executive secretary.[79]

The Executive Committee finally settled on a name on August 11, selecting the catchy and comprehensible "Independence Hall Assocation", even if it did not fully express their aims.[80] Meanwhile the organization was busy on many fronts. Larson chaired a Committee on Research and Planning, which at its first meeting began to define alternatives and techniques for various areas to be included in a park.[81] Among its members was Nitzche, who assumed the task

of assembling and analyzing data on the properties in the three city blocks north of Independence Hall. By January 1943 Nitzche was able to report on the approximately 200 properties, valued at about $5 million, "which would have to be acquired by the Federal Government to provide a suitable aproach to Independence Hall."[82] M. Joseph McCosker, curator of the Atwater Kent Museum, heading up the Committee on Public Relations and Exhibitions, began to plan the Independence Hall Association's first public event, an exhibit dealing with the history of the Independence Hall group and proposals for its future.[83]

From the beginning it was obvious that the founders of the Independence Hall Association had bigger ideas than simply protecting Independence Hall from enemy bombing. Clearly they wanted a national park in Philadelphia. In early August Larson and a new recruit to the board of directors, Sylvester K. Stevens, Pennsylvania state historian, met with the park service's director, Newton Drury, in Washington. Drury and Herbert E. Kahler, acting chief historian, gave them a copy of the abortive 1941 cooperative agreement.[84] Undoubtedly Drury informed them that a cooperative agreement and designation of the Independence Hall group as a National Historic Site were prerequisites to any National Park Service involvement in the project. Lewis moved quickly. Within a week after the Washington meeting, he had arranged to see Mayor Bernard Samuel to reopen the question of a cooperative agreement.[85] Negotiations with the city government were not easy, but Lewis was persuasive. On December 21, 1942, City Council passed an ordinance "Authorizing the execution and delivery of an agreement between the City of Philadelphia and the United States of America, designating the Independence Hall group of structures as a National Historic Site and providing for its preservation and improvement," and repeating the language of the 1941 draft agreement.[86] On the federal level the way had

already been cleared earlier in the month, when President Roosevelt acceded to Secretary Ickes' request to exempt Independence Hall from the wartime ban on designating National Historic Sites.[87] On January 11, 1943, the Mayor delivered the agreement, executed by the city, to Lewis.[88] The next day the Philadelphia press reported that Independence Hall was now an "official U.S. site."[89] This was premature, since there was still disagreement about the precise nature of the agreement. The city had executed a version of the 1941 agreement from which language had been stricken requiring the city to "secure the approval" of the director of the National Park Service before making changes to the buildings, rather than merely to "consult" with him. Drury advised Lewis that the stricken language was incorporated in the agreement as approved by Roosevelt and suggested impartial arbitration as an alternative.[90] Both Lewis and Stevens wrote to Drury to confirm that the provision for approval had been deleted from the copy of the agreement transmitted to the city. Stevens pointed out that it had been difficult enough to obtain the city's consent even in the milder form.[91] The park service gave in. With the offending language removed and continuing city control assured, Ickes announced consummation of the agreement on March 30. Official designation as a National Historic Site was deferred until May 14.[92]

This was perfect timing. On April 22, 1943, the Independence Hall Association opened an exhibition in Congress Hall. Arranged by McCosker's committee, it brought together rich material on the history of the buildings on Independence Square. The items on display, some of which had never been exhibited previously, came from both public and private collections. The concluding section of the exhibition introduced the association's basic aim.

A NEW IDEA FOR AN OLD SHRINE

Independence Hall no longer needs to be saved. An informed public will not

> permit destruction, nor even slight change without the most exhaustive study and research. But Independence Hall needs care in a larger sense. The Association wants to put it into a proper setting, by removing unsightly buildings that were long out-moded and have ceased to be useful. These plans are here first submitted for the consideration of the public.93

So successful was the exhibition that the association extended it for a month beyond the original July 11 closing date.[94]

Other projects went less smoothly. Boyd continued to pursue one legacy of the Sons of the American Revolution committee, the scheme for lowering the Liberty Bell into a bomb-proof vault. Drawings were prepared by George Wharton Pepper, in cooperation with Thomas Pym Cope, under the aegis of the Philadelphia Chapter, AIA.[95] In keeping with the association's views on thorough research, Boyd sought the services of an archaeologist to monitor the excavation.[96] Markley Stevenson, a landscape architect and engineer, who, according to Boyd, had been in charge of examining the excavations made during the restoration of Williamsburg, agreed to take on the task.[97] One hurdle seemed to have been removed in the fall of 1942 when Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau told Lewis that he thought steel could be made available.[98] By August 1943, however, there was still no steel.[99] Meanwhile there was growing protest about disturbing the Liberty Bell.[100] Eventually the city vetoed the project on the grounds that the excavation might imperil the foundations of Independence Hall.[101]

Progress was also discouragingly slow on the legislative front, although, under the tutelage of Isidor Ostroff, the organization began to launch an aggressive lobbying campaign. Ostroff, the Democratic district leader who had persuaded Sacks to introduce his bill, wrote to Lewis a few days after reading about the formation of the Independence Hall Association.[102] Lewis replied, suggesting a meeting.[103] He quickly persuaded Ostroff to join the

organization in promoting their common cause, naming him liaison to Congress. Obviously Ostroff could be useful. The Judge was a Republican; the Congress and administration were Democrats. "If we were to get federal money, we would have to be able to appeal to the Democratic organizations and the Democratic bureaucrats to help us."[104] As an accepted form of patronage, municipal judges like Lewis could assign lawyers masterships carrying fees in the neighborhood of $100. According to Ostroff, Lewis assigned him forty-three masterships in one year, on condition that he would contribute a major portion of the fees to the Independence Hall Association.[105] Lewis later denied or forgot using his patronage in this manner.[106] On at least one occasion, however, Boyd reported to Lewis that Ostroff had turned over, in advance, half the fee for two mastership assignments.[107] They were welcome, since money was always a problem. The association needed funds to operate the office, for travel and entertaining, and for promotional materials. There were no major gifts in the early years.[108] Attempts to secure financial assistance from the city were unavailing.

The association first approached City Council's finance committee in July 1942, seeking funds to make studies and architectural plans for a park.[109] Finally Mayor Samuel informed Boyd that he was rejecting a request for an appropriation of $25,000 for the association, because the city solicitor had advised him that such grants had been held to be illegal in the state of Pennsylvania.[110]

Despite its lack of funding, the Independence Hall Association began to push hard for legislation. In the November 1942 elections James Gallagher won the seat in Congress that had been held by Sacks. Boyd consulted with Ostroff on the Sacks bill before contacting Gallagher about sponsoring the legislation in the new Congress. The two also suggested that Lewis arrange a meeting with

Gallagher and other local congressmen and politicians to garner support.[111] Gallagher duly introduced his bill, H.R. 2550, on April 21, 1943. Like the Sacks bill it called for a commission to investigate establishing a national park in Philadelphia. However, the administration, although willing to make an exception and designate Independence Hall as a National Historic Site in wartime, would not go further. Ickes, commenting on the bill to J. Hardin Peterson, chairman of the House Committee on Public Lands, suggested some minor amendments, and wrote that he thought such a study "desireable." Nevertheless, the Bureau of the Budget had advised him that the bill "should not be considered in accord with the program of the President."[112] Boyd believed that this objection would not apply if there were no appropriation, and Ostroff assembled a list of people to whom Lewis should write to urge passage of the bill.[113] Gallagher was also optimistic, informing Boyd that, despite the adverse report, Peterson's committee had agreed to hold hearings.[114] These hopes were soon dashed. At the end of the year, A.E. Demaray, associate director of the National Park Service, advised Boyd that the Bureau of the Budget opposed the bill in any form.[115]

Undaunted, Ostroff and Lewis turned to the most highly placed Philadelphian in the administration, Attorney General Francis Biddle. In January 1944 Ostroff wrote to one of Biddle's assistants, James P. McGranery, telling him that the appropriation of $15,000 had been dropped, and inquiring about progress.[116] Through the spring, Ostroff and Lewis attempted to persuade Biddle to intercede with the Bureau of the Budget.[117] Lewis also went to Washington to meet with Peterson.[118] These efforts bore some fruit. In May Gallagher reported to Lewis that, "in view of the increased interest shown in connection with this proposal not only by civic minded individuals and societies of Philadelphia, but from all parts of the country as well," Peterson was referring H.R. 2550 back to

the Bureau of the Budget.[119] The park service was also resubmitting the bill.[120] In August Ickes told Peterson that since the Bureau of the Budget no longer had objections, he recommended enactment of the bill.[121]

Despite this favorable news, progress was discouragingly slow. Gallagher, the bill's sponsor, was slated to lose his seat in Congress because of redistricting. Even before the election of 1944, Ostroff was in touch with Gallagher's probable successor, Michael J. Bradley, filling him in on the background of the bill.[122] Bradley later recalled that "Mr. Ostroff was the first to see me at my office in Washington to solicit my interest and to ask me to sponsor the legislation which had been introduced in other sessions of Congress by the members who represented the area at that time."[123] Ostroff still hoped that the bill would pass during the lame duck session of 1944. He fired off letters to Pennsylvania's senators, Joseph Guffey and Francis J. Myers, and continued to importune Biddle, urging speedy action.[124] Toward the end of the year he went to Washington and called on Bradley, Guffey and Myers. Once again the news was discouraging. There was no chance of getting the Gallagher bill through before the end of the year. Bradley would have to reintroduce it in the next session.[125]

Regardless of the immediate prospects for federal participation, the Independence Hall Association moved forward with plans for the project. As early as October 30, 1942, Larson, Lewis, and Boyd collaborated on a newspaper release describing three alternative plans, all harking back to earlier schemes. The first extended half a block north of Independence Hall, the second to Market Street, and the third the three full blocks to the Benjamin Franklin Bridge Plaza. It was the latter that was illustrated, much as Roy Larson had worked it out in 1937. Although the article noted that there "probably isn't any federal money to be had during the present emergency," it expressed the association's

view that there was "no reason why plans should not be developed so that work may proceed promptly when termination of the war releases the necessary energies."[126] By the end of the year, Larson's committee had reviewed four plans. The more extensive schemes contemplated redevelopment of the area east of Fifth Street toward Christ Church. More important was the concept of a modest mall east of Independence Square, "exposing and glorifying" the Second Bank, Carpenters' Hall and the First Bank. Larson's committee, spurred on by one of its members, Fiske Kimball, voted to support the most ambitious alternative. The executive committee concurred, with Lewis noting that he thought Congress would give its approval to a big plan as readily as a small one.[127]

Over the next year Larson proceeded to refine the chosen scheme. On January 25, 1944, he and Lewis addressed a luncheon meeting of the Fairmount Art Association. Larson exhibited a plan and rendering. Opposite Independence Hall the plan reverted to Cret's scheme for a semi-circular reviewing plaza set off by a colonnade. A broad grassy mall stretched to Race Street, flanked by tree-shaded walks and gardens, interrupted by the major east-west streets. Buildings occupied the four corners of the block between Market and Arch Street, one being the Free Quaker Meeting House, the others intended to be new or moved "colonial" structures of similar scale. The mall terminated at Race Street in a semi-circular plaza centered on a monument. To the east a modest tree-lined mall led from the center of Independence Square past the rear of the Second Bank to a landscaped square around Carpenters' Hall. A cross-axis opened a vista of the Second Bank from Walnut Street. Buildings, some existing, some new, remained along Walnut and Chestnut Street. None of those on Chestnut rose higher than the roof ridge of the Second Bank. The blocks east of the north mall appeared as new development of similar height, although somewhat larger scale.[128] The two associations collaborated in publishing a handsome

Lewis was determined that there would be a national park in the three full blocks from Fifth to Second Streets between Walnut and Chestnut.[132] In so doing, he firmly rejected Larson's concept of retaining and reinforcing the urban fabric around the area's historic buildings. Of course, neither the idea of the north mall, nor the park to the east was new. What Lewis did was to combine the biggest dreams of the 1920's and 1930's, and persevere until he turned them into reality.

One step in that direction was to turn from total dependency on the federal government. Lewis's mounting impatience and frustration with the lack of Congressional action were reinforced by the comments of an old friend and fellow member of the Sons of the American Revolution, Lambert Cadwalader, who was also a member of the Pennsylvania Legislature. "Why in the hell do you go to the federal government?" Cadwalader asked Lewis one night. "Everybody's always running to Washington to get anything. Why don't you come to the legislature in Harrisburg?"[133] Lewis proceeded to approach Governor Edward Martin, requesting a meeting on January 19, 1945.[134] He presented the case for the North Mall and was delighted to find Martin receptive.[135] By October the Pennsylvania legislature had voted to undertake development of the North Mall, and had authorized $4 million for the purpose.[136]

Meanwhile, real progress had been made toward creation of a national park. With the surrender of Germany and ultimate victory in sight, Congress was beginning to view possible peacetime projects. In April, after months of hesitation, members of the House Committee on Public Lands finally visited Philadelphia. In June Bradley triumphantly telegraphed Lewis that H.R. 2551 had been reported out of committee.[137] By this time the bill had the support not only of the committee, but also of the House leadership, with both Speaker Sam Rayburn and Majority Leader John McCormack favoring its passage.[138] The

house passed the bill unanimously in September; the Senate followed suit in November.[139]

The Judge's dual goal seemed within his grasp, with the state prepared to fund the North Mall and the federal government taking the first steps toward a national park to the east. Once again, however, there were delays. News reports of the state's proposed participation reached Washington and caused confusion about the nature of the federal role. Mayor Samuel stepped in as mediator, clarifying that the state's interest was confined to the area north of Independence Hall.[140] Finally, after almost four years of effort, Public Law 711 was enacted on August 9, 1946.[141] It called for creating a seven-member commission, known as the Philadelphia National Shrines Park Commission, to investigate the establishment of a national park "to encompass within its area the buildings of historical significance in the old part of the city of Philadelphia."

Almost as a matter of course, Judge Lewis became the Shrines Commission's chairman. The other members were Albert M. Greenfield, serving as vice-chairman; George McAneny, a prominent New York preservationist, president of the American Scenic and Historic Preservation Society, and also of the Carl Schurz Memorial Foundation, which still occupied the Second Bank; two members of the Pennsylvania Congressional delegation, Representative Robert N. McGarvey and Senator Francis J. Myers; Judge Hugh Martin Morris; and the author and biographer of Franklin, Carl Van Doren.[142] The group held its first meeting in Philadelphia on November 15. One of their earliest decisions was to retain an architect to draw plans for the park. Although Larson had served the Independence Hall Association in this capacity from its formation, Lewis wanted an architect more in sympathy with his concept of an expansive thrust to the east. He first approached Joseph Patterson Sims, Jr., an architect who was both

well-connected socially, and a fine delineator. Sims declined, but recommended Grant M. Simon. Simon was also a talented delineator. He could produce water color renderings that would translate Lewis's ideas into attractive visual representations. [143]

Informed of this decision, Newton Drury demurred. He explained to Lewis that although Congress had authorized $15,000 for the work of the commission, it had not actually appropriated the money. Until the funds were appropriated, the park service could not pay salaries or expenses for the project. Furthermore, the law specified that project personnel must have Civil Service status. Drury suggested that park service architect Charles E. Peterson assume the task of advising the commission. Such an arrangement would fulfill the Civil Service requirements and also conserve funds. Drury went on to detail Peterson's qualifications. After joining the Park Service in 1929, Peterson had quickly become the organization's leading expert on historical architecture. He had played a key role in the development of the major historical areas in which the park service had been involved up to that time: among them Colonial National Historical Park in Jamestown and Yorktown, Virginia, Morristown National Historical Park in New Jersey, and the historical areas inherited from the War Department. In 1946, after four years in the Navy, he had returned to work on the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial project in St. Louis, Missouri. Peterson's accomplishments and expertise were widely recognized outside of the Park Service. In 1933 he had originated the Historic American Buildings Survey. A cooperative project of the National Park Service, the American Institute of Architects and the Library of Congress, H.A.B.S. had offered work to hundreds of architects during the Depression, and recorded over 6,000 structures. Currently he was serving as vice-chairman of the AIA's Committee on Historic Buildings.[144]

These were impressive credentials, but Lewis was adamant. Drury finally acquiesced and agreed to support Lewis's choice of Simon as the Shrines Commission's architect. Nevertheless, he made it clear that the park service intended to have a voice in the commission's recommendations to Congress. In a letter informing Lewis that Simon could be employed as a consultant without Civil Service status, he concluded:

> The National Park Service desires to work closely with the Commission, and particularly so in all technical and planning matters. Later on it will be very desirable, as the National Park Service becomes more closely identified with the program, for Mr. Charles Peterson's exceptional talents in these matters to be utilized in the evolution of plans for the project.[145]

Having won his point, and with Simon's preliminary plans committed to paper, Lewis acceded graciously. "We believe we now need the services of Mr. Peterson." Lewis responded to Drury at the end of February 1947, "and if you can have Mr. Peterson assigned to work with the Commission in Philadelphia to go over suggestions before we become too deeply committed to them, I will be glad."[146]

Perhaps Lewis had been convinced of the wisdom of this course by the chief historian of the National Park Service, Ronald Lee. Lee was one of a group of young historians who had joined the National Park Service, fresh from the University of Minnesota, in 1933. He rose rapidly within the ranks, becoming Chief of the Branch of Historic Sites and Buildings in 1938.[147] His rather cherubic face tended to mask a keen intellect. He was that rare combination, a first-rate conceptual thinker and a good administrator. At the same time he was a skilled negotiator and a man of considerable charm, adept at dealing not only with people within the National Park Service, but also with outsiders who shared his abiding interest in history and the preservation of historic sites. For over thirty years a succession of directors of the National Park Service relied

on his opinions. Lee had been on leave from the park service from 1942 to 1946, serving in the Air Corps, and thus had not participated in the negotiations that led to the passage of Public Law 711. With his return and the establishment of the Shrines Commission, Lee became a more active presence in the Philadelphia project. On February 22 he represented the park service at a meeting in the office of Pennsylvania's new Governor, James Duff. Representatives of the city, including Mayor Samuel, of the Independence Hall Association, and of the Fairmount Park Art Association were also present. Simon exhibited plans for the North Mall, the federal park, and other historic structures. The Governor assured the group that the $4 million already appropriated was committed to the mall, but pointed out that $4 million more would be needed. The state Department of Highways, which would be responsible for the development of Fifth and Sixth Streets, was working on an agreement with the city to define their respective roles. Lee confined himself to expressing the park service's interest in the "Shrines Park" and its willingness to aid in expediting the project.[148] Immediately after this meeting Lewis requested that Peterson be sent to Philadelphia.

Peterson was in Philadelphia to attend the next meeting of the Shrines Commission on March 11. Lee came up from Washington, accompanied by Dick Sutton, chief architect of the National Park Service. Once again representatives of various interested groups were present: the City Planning Commission; the Fairmount Park Art Association, including its president, the architect Sydney E. Martin; and the Independence Hall Association, including Roy Larson. A major purpose of the meeting was to hear the views of the Market Street Businessmen's Association, who opposed the scope of the north mall. They had retained an architect, Louis Magaziner, who expressed the opinion that the scale was too large and would reduce Independence to insignificance.[149]

Peterson later recalled that Magaziner said they were making the frame too big for the picture.[150] Morris Passon, spokesman for the businessmen told the group that he was aware of the probable futility of his mission, but expressed hope that some consideration would be given to the problems of relocation. Lewis suggested that demolition might proceed in stages in order to avoid undue disturbance of the business community. On this conciliatory note, the meeting with the merchants' representatives ended. The commission then proceeded to examine once again plans by Simon and the City Planning Commission. Judge Hugh M. Morris proposed that the commission adopt the Simon plan insofar as the inclusion of existing buildings was concerned. Lewis concurred.[151] Although no vote was taken, Peterson thought the point so important that he requested a copy of an excerpt from the minutes.[152] The issue of which existing buildings would remain and which would be demolished would continue to be the subject of sometimes heated debate for twenty-five years.

In April Arthur E. Demaray informed Lewis that arrangements had been made for Peterson and another seasoned park service professional, Roy Appleman, to assist the commission.[153] Appleman was one of the trained historians hired by Ronald Lee in 1935, as part of the Civilian Conservation Corps program for work in national and state parks.[154] In 1947 he was regional historian in the old Region I office in Richmond, Virginia. Both Peterson and Appleman were present at a meeting in Philadelphia on April 18. Although this was described in the minutes as a meeting of the Philadelphia National Shrines Park Commission, the only member of that body present was Judge Lewis. As usual Sydney Martin represented the Fairmount Park Art Association, Dr. William E. Lingelbach the Independence Hall Association, and Robert E. Mitchell and Edmund Bacon, the City Planning Commission. Simon was also present. Once more the discussion focused on park boundaries. There was general agreement that the

national park should extend east to Second Street. Edmund Bacon, on behalf of the City Planning Commission, displayed maps showing not only what was described as the "usual area" for consideration, but also the area south of Walnut Street to Lombard Street. Bacon believed that the latter area, with its concentration of eighteenth and early nineteenth-century rowhouses, should be developed with "greenways", small parks and landscaped walks. Both the park service men felt that the southern section, Washington Square East as it was shown on the city's plans, was not suitable for inclusion in the Federal project. The areas shown were too narrow and long and were not interconnected. In the proposed national park, Bacon expressed concern for the appearance of the historic buildings as seen from the side. There was agreement, for example, that Strickland had designed the sides of the Second Bank knowing that they would be hidden from view by flanking buildings. Simon's plan recognized this by providing new, low buildings along Chestnut Street on sites where non-historic buildings would be demolished. Such buildings, he suggested, might be fitted up as inns and restaurants to serve visitors to the park. There was thus general agreement on the boundaries, combined with a variety of opinions on the treatment of specific sites and on possible additional acquisitions. Peterson called attention to the special interest and restoration potential of the Todd and Bishop White Houses on Walnut Street, and the mid-nineteenth century Jayne Building on Chestnut Street. The group also discussed the desirability of acquiring the sites of the Franklin House, the Robert Morris House on Market Street where both Washington and Adams had lived as President, and the Graff House where Jefferson drafted the Declaration of Independence.[155]

Both park service men spent time in Philadelphia over the next several months. In addition to his visit in April, Appleman was in Philadelphia for the last week of June and the first three weeks in July.[156] Peterson spent

about a month there in the spring and another two-and-a-half months during the summer.[157] Although both had been detailed to Philadelphia by the National Park Service, they worked independently, rather than as a team. They conferred on architectural questions, but otherwise saw very little of one another, and neither saw a copy of the other's report.[158] Indeed, each seems to have approached the assignment to Philadelphia in a very different manner. When they arrived, Judge Lewis offered to arrange for both men to stay at the Union League Club. Appleman felt that he could not afford to. The National Park Service per diem of the 1940's was pegged to the small towns near which most parks were located, and provided six or seven dollars a day. Appleman found that staying at the cheapest respectable hotel he could find took all but a dollar of that. Despite eating most of his meals at Horn and Hardart's, he was out-of-pocket about $90 at the end of his Philadelphia assignment.[159] His meetings with Philadelphians were directly related to his assigned tasks. he conferred often with Judge Lewis, with Joseph McCosker, who had been retained to write the historical background of the Shrines Commission's report to Congress, and with Dr. Lingelbach, and encountered other Philadelphians during attendance at various meetings.[160]

Peterson entered more freely into the life of the city, in which he immediately felt very much at home.[161] He accepted Lewis's invitation to stay at the Union League Club and was delighted that Lewis "invited me to everything that was going on and introduced me to everybody."[162] Philadelphia was quick to seek him out as a public speaker. Early in his visit, he was invited to address a meeting of the Landmarks Society. He found himself facing an audience including members of distinguished old Philadelphia families such as Miss Sophie Cadwalader and Miss Frances Wister, as well as others long active in the preservation of the city's historic sites. Aware, from his

observation of the Williamsburg restoration, of the pitfalls in store for an outsider lecturing to native antiquarians and preservationists on their home ground, he began by saying, "Well, it's an honor to speak before this group. I don't know very much about Philadelphia, being only newly arrived, but I'd be glad to tell you my impressions and things I've learned that have interested me. But I want to remind you that the first white man's ship that ever sailed into Delaware Bay was captained by a Captain Peterson. So -- and the Swedes were here, you know, before the English -- so I don't feel entirely a newcomer. Maybe I'd better welcome you all as newcomers."[163]

Philadelphians responded well to Peterson's forthright manner, which probably helped allay fears of the consequences of a federal takeover at Independence. His most important public statement, more serious in tone, was delivered at the annual dinner of the American Philosophical Society on April 25, 1947, and incorporated in his report to the director of the National Park Service. Asked to comment on Simon's sketches of the Shrine's Commission's plans, he expressed some personal opinions. Although he did not directly attack the Commission's scheme, his viewpoint was clearly in opposition to its grandiose malls. He urged retention of the city's historic street patterns and the sense of enclosure provided by groupings of buildings. "Connecting the little old buildings of the district with formal and symmetrical axes a la Burnham to develop new 'lines of sight' would create relationships which have never existed before and which offer, in the writer's opinion, no important advantages." To bolster his argument, he quoted letters from distinguished colleagues in architecture and architectural history. Dr. Hans Huth of the Art Institute of Chicago had written, "I hope they won't pull down too much in Philadelphia. I [would] hate to see In. H. in splendid isolation like a restroom." Dr. Turpin C. Bannister, Dean of the School of Architecture and the

Fine Arts at Alabama Polytechnic Institute, and Chairman of the AIA's Committee for the Preservation of Historic Monuments, agreed.

> The proposed creation of a grand mall on the axis of Independence Hall in Philadelphia threatens to disrupt the eighteenth century character of this unique building. This is not to say that the present adjoining buildings from a suitable setting for the cradle of the republic, but it would be equally inept to impose a grandiose neoclassical or Grand Prix parti on it. 164

Peterson's written report went much further. He began with a brief review of the project's history, and then touched on some practical considerations that had not been dealt with previously. He outlined the need for parking space, comfort stations, places to eat and stay overnight, a staging area for guided tours and a store for sale of publications and souvenirs. He suggested that these functions might be accommodated in buildings which would help to recreate the historic scene and reinforce the urban character of the neighborhood. Although generally opposed to reconstructions, he reported favorably on a proposal to rebuild the row of three-and-a-half story houses (Norris's Row) that once fronted Chestnut Street between the Second Bank and Independence Square. The row could be authentic on the outside and modern on the interior to serve as an inn of eighteenth-century flavor akin to those at Williamsburg. Peterson forecast that a million visitors a year might visit Independence, requiring a visitors' reception center on a scale previously unknown in the National Park Service. His preferred location was on the north side of Chestnut Street opposite Independence Hall. This would serve two purposes. It would place the major interpretive center close to the park's main attraction. If low in height it would allow a good vista of the tower, and also provide what he considered a necessary frame, a "north wall for the Square." He thought screened surface parking for 500 cars could be provided on the state's land to the north, and that eventually one or more multi-storied garages would also be required.

Peterson's report also cautioned against overzealous demolition around the historic buildings. "If the pulling down is kept up long enough it will leave the historic buildings standing in large open spaces like country churches, a condition which their designers did not plan for." He pointed out that both the Larson plan of 1944 and the City Planning Commission's scheme called for including compatible new construction in the historic area. "What is needed," he wrote, "is not so much open and vacant space as an architectural setting of a sympathetic character." He believed it would be desirable for the legislation establishing the park to allow the National Park Service to lease land to private developers, who would erect compatible infill buildings.[165]

Peterson also drew attention to the City Planning Commission's proposals for rehabilitating the residential area south of Walnut Street. In what may have been the first modern use of the neighorhood's eighteenth-century name, he referred to it as Society Hill. He recommended that the National Park Service give the City Planning Commission as much professional and other assistance as possible. Preservation and restoration in each area would support and enhance efforts in the other.[166]

Without attacking or directly criticizing the Shrines Commission's plan, Peterson was clearly expressing doubts about some of its underlying assumptions. His concept of how the park should be treated was less anti-urban and aesthetically more respectful of the historic buildings. The Philadelphia City Planning Commission shared his concern. In July Simon wrote to the vacationing Judge Lewis that Martin and Larson had told him that while they supported the eastern extension in general, they were not prepared to approve the Shrines Commission's design. Furthermore, Robert E. Mitchell, executive secretary of the City Planning Commission, had indicated that the commission would also withhold approval.[167] These differences were largely overcome at a meeting

in the City Planning Commission's offices on July 11. Appleman described the planners' attitude at the start of the meeting as "mistrustful". He and Peterson attended the meeting along with Mitchell; Edmund Bacon, the planning commission's senior planner; and the three architects who had long been interested in the project, Simon, Larson, and Martin. The planning commission expressed strong opinions on two issues: the retention of street patterns and of existing businesses along Walnut and Chestnut Streets. Martin and Larson shared the commission's views that the park should include business buildings along street frontages. Larson particularly emphasized the importance of buildings on either side of the Second Bank, which had been designed to be sandwiched between flanking buildings. Martin took a less absolute position. While favoring a screen of buildings along the principal streets, he agreed with Judge Lewis that the area should have a park-like character, with extensive expanses of lawn and trees.

Asked by Mitchell to comment on the National Park Service's policy on these questions, Appleman responded that he could not speak for the service. It was his opinion, however, that no fixed policy had been formulated. The Philadelphia project posed new and complex issues. The National Park Service would give these issues considerable thought and study, and consult with all interested parties. He was sure that the park service would approach planning for the park with "great elasticity of mind in considering and formulating a policy of development on this subject." His comments appeared to reassure Mitchell. It was Martin, in Appleman's opinion, who played the role of conciliator, and who was instrumental in assuring that the Philadelphia Planning Commission would not oppose, even if they did not fully support, the Shrines Commission's proposals. He cautioned, however, that other influential

Philadelphians might not agree with the views of Judge Lewis and the Shrines Commission, or, for that matter, with whatever development the National Park Service might plan.[168] Lewis did not need reminders from Simon or Appleman to be aware of the need for wide-spread public support. Action to whet Philadelphia's appetite for the proposed park had already been taken. In the spring of 1947 the Independence Hall Association had placed a model illustrating their ideas for development on exhibit in Congress Hall.[169] In September the City Planning Commission opened the "Better Philadelphia Exhibition" on the fifth floor of Gimbel's department store. Through a scale model occupying over an acre of floor space, the exhibit showed a five-year plan for civic improvement calculated to cost over $300 million.[170] Over three-quarters of a million people filed past the model, which showed the proposed redevelopment around Independence Square as an integral part of plans for the revitalization of Philadelphia.[171]

In addition to raising planning questions, Peterson's report dealt briefly with the areas and buildings he thought should be included in the Federal park. They were the Walnut to Chestnut, Fifth to Second Street area, the general acceptance of which had been established; Franklin Court, and the Jefferson (Graff) House. Peterson also recommended that Christ Church be given National Historic Site status as "a detached area of Federal reservation,": and that the National Park Service should secure land across from Independence Square, after it had been acquired by the state, as a site for a visitors' reception center.[172] Appleman's thoughts on federal acquisition were similar. He agreed with Peterson that the park service should control the block north of Independence Square. Although he was not sure that the specific location for a reception center recommended by Peterson was the best solution, he too believed that such a facility should be somewhere on that block. Furthermore, he thought

it important that the National Park Service control the immediate approach to Independence Hall. In addition, one of the key historic sites was within the block. This was a lot on the north side of Market Street, where the Robert Morris House had stood. As the residence of Presidents Washington and Adams it deserved recognition.[173]

In addition to recommending areas and boundaries for federal acquisition, Appleman devoted considerable attention to the treatment of particular buildings, and to how these and other issues should be handled in the Shrines Commission's report and the bill authorizing the park. He suggested that the insurance companies should be permitted to retain their buildings on the north side of Walnut Street for a decade or two, to avoid disruption of their businesses. Provisions of the legislation should cover two of the area's historic private institutions. The Carpenters' Company should be allowed to "tenant" their building, as long as it remained active. Evidently, he was not entirely familiar with the nature of the organization's membership or function, since he thought that, "with slow but gradual disappearing of the carpenter apprenticeship of which members are composed, it is likely that the old company or guild, will become obsolete at some date in the future." In fact, the Carpenters' Company is composed of principals in Philadelphia's leading architectual and contracting firms.

The American Philosophical Society should be given the option of constructing a replica of the old Library building on Fifth Street.[174] During his visits to Philadelphia, Appleman had met several times with Dr. William E. Lingelbach, librarian of the Philosophical Society. Appleman found Lingelbach one of the soundest and most helpful sources of information on the project area's history. He was also influential, because Lewis respected and relied on his judgment.[175] Lingelbach had been one of the strongest

adherents of the idea of a Federal park. He was motivated, like many of its proponents, by patriotism and a genuine interest in the past. In addition, he was concerned for the future of his institution. The Philosophical Society had long since outgrown its ancient headquarters, on Fifth Street behind Old City Hall. It was currently housing many of its books in rented space in the Drexel Building at the corner of Fifth and Chestnut Streets, but there had been discussions of moving to larger quarters elsewhere in the city. Lingelbach preferred to remain close to Independence Square. Early in his acquaintance with Appleman he had broached the feasibility of reconstructing the Library Company's building to serve the Society's need. Appleman believed there was sufficient evidence on which a good reconstruction could be based.[176]

Appleman recommended that these matters should be covered in the bill. The legislation should also include provisions to preserve all existing structures erected prior to 1800, and pinpoint those after that date that were also to be preserved, such as the Second Bank of the United States and the Merchants Exchange. Despite the desirability of specificity on these points, Appleman believed that the bill should not go into detail on development plans. The development issues were complicated, and required considerable additional research and study. The legislation should assure that the National park Service had broad powers in planning development and an interpretive program.[177]

Appleman shared the fruits of his researches into Philadelphia's documentary and pictorial resources with Judge Lewis and M. Joseph McCosker, who had been commissioned to write the historical background of the Shrines Commission report. Although Appleman to a large extent helped to determine content and, indeed, provided a detailed outline, Lewis felt that the final product should be prepared by the commission, not by an employee of the National

Park Service. He wanted the work done by someone retained by the commission, under his supervision and guidance. "The final body of the report, [the] ideas expressed, however," Appleman remembered, "of course had to be Judge Lewis's and the commission's, but from my early work with Judge Lewis, it would appear to me that his views were accepted by the rest of the commission with very little objection, if any at all, and that he in effect was the commission, and it was his drive and his energy and his leadership at that time that saw the thing through to a successful conclusion."[178]

McCosker appeared to be well qualified for the task of preparing the historical section of the report. As director of the Atwater Kent Museum he had a broad familiarity with Philadelphia history, and he had been chairman of the committee that put together the Independence Hall Association's 1943 exhibit on the Hall and its neighbors. Over the summer, despite bouts of illness, he proceeded to collect historical data and illustrative material for what he referred to as "the book."[179] True to his conviction that the report should be a Shrines Commission project, Lewis had raised $4,000 from the Insurance Company of North America to pay for McCosker's services.[180] There was also a staff of three: a research assistant, a secretary-typist, and a photographer. McCosker appeared to resent the involvement of the park service specialists. He was particularly at odds with Peterson, who, he believed, was attempting to make him alter the findings to emphasize Christ Church at the expense of the Shrines Commission's plan for a narrow extension of the park south of Walnut Street. He found Appleman helpful, but became annoyed when he had not received the latter's research notes by the end of the first week of August. "I fear," he wrote to Lewis, who was vacationing in Maine, "that the combined 'help' of the two Federal men has not meant much in concrete aid to the work at hand."[181] A week later, however, he reported to Lewis that Peterson had returned to

Philadelphia and had "become cooperative". Perhaps McCosker sensed that the two were not entirely impressed with the quality of his work. Appleman subsequently recommended that the Shrines Commission's report not be published unless it was carefully edited, because it contained so many mistakes. Peterson thought that although McCosker did "a good job of that kind, it was all more or less window dressing," simply a promotional brochure.[182]

While McCosker worked on the historical background, Lewis was composing the section of the report detailing the Shrines Commission's recommendations for the scope of the park. In reminiscing about the report in later years, he took credit for its authorship, referring to McCosker's work as the "historical supplement" or "historic appendage".[183] On October 6, 1947, the Shrines Commission, which had not met for six months, gathered to consider a draft of the report. The members present, in addition to Lewis, were McAneny, Morris, Van Doren and McGarvey. Guests included Edward Hopkinson, Jr., representing the City Planning Commission; E. Norris Williams, 2nd, Historical Society of Pensylvania; Edward M. Biddle, Treasurer of the Independence Hall Association; and Sydney Martin. What might be termed the Shrines Commision's staff was also present: Simon, McCosker, and Lewis's assistant, Dwight Lowell. The commission quickly proceeded to recommend four areas for acquisition by the federal government: the three blocks east of Independence Square, a lateral extension south to Pine Street, Franklin Court, and the site of the Graff House. The idea of extending the federal park to the vicinity of Christ Church won support from McAneny. The other members of the commission, however, decided that Christ Church should be a separate area, with sufficient land cleared around it to constitute a firebreak.

Two other recommendations made by Appleman and Peterson fared badly. The first was a proposed extension to the east side of Second Street, which the

commission vetoed because the then current city plan called for widening the street as a major artery. In a more important vote, the commission rejected the suggestion that the federal government acquire the block north of Independence Hall. Lewis was afraid that such a move might jeopardize the state's project for the mall.[184] As usual, the commission followed the Judge's lead. As Appleman had said, Judge Lewis was the commission. At various times he had been the only member of the commission present at its meetings. It was Lewis who had conferred continuously with Simon, McCosker, Appleman, and Peterson on the content of the report. He was slated to prepare the text of the most important section, the recommendations.[185]

The commission duly submitted its report to Congress on December 29, 1948. Copiously illustrated, it filled seven fat volumes. Most of the bulk consisted of McCosker's "historic appendage". This provided descriptions of buildings and sites within the proposed park and its vicinity, and of events associated with them. Modern photographs and historical views accompanied each description. Carl Van Doren provided a graceful preface. The meat of the report, however, was the commission's recommendations for property acquisition with estimates of cost, the expressions of support from the City of Philadelphia, and the draft of a proposed bill establishing the park.

The report called for a park consisting of five areas, each designated by a letter of the alphabet. Although the letters are now virtually forgotten, they were used for handy reference to the park's various sectors for almost two decades. Project A was, of course, foremost. This was the core area east of Independence Square, with an estimated acquisition cost of $3,560,000. Language undoubtedly calculated to conciliate the City Planning Commission of Philadelphia proposed postponing the removal of existing business structures on the north side of Walnut Street until, in the judgment of the Secretary of the

Interior, they should "become reasonably obsolete." Project B, with an estimated cost of $300,000, was described as a "small mall" from Walnut to Pine in the middle of the block between Fourth and Fifth Streets. It linked St. Joseph's and St. Mary's Roman Catholic Churches with the Pine Street Presbyterian Church, along with such other sites as the Contributionship Garden behind the offices of one of the oldest of the city's venerable fire insurance companies, and the Cadwalader and Shippen-Wistar Houses.

The three remaining acquisitions were more modest in scope. Project C, with a price tag of $175,000, was Franklin Court, a narrow lot with frontage on Market Street, and an extension on Orianna Street, connecting it to Chestnut Street in the vicinity of Carpenters' Hall. More remote from the core area was Project D, the site of the house where Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence at the corner of Seventh and Market Streets. It was also more expensive. Acquisition was estimated to require the expenditure of $250,000. Finally, Project E, lands and buildings to provide a firebreak around Christ Church would cost $110,000. The total required came to $4,485,000. The Commission recommended an appropriation of $5 to $5.5 million. The larger sum would allow the National Park Service to construct a building housing offices, an auditorium, and restrooms. Although Independence Hall was the first building discussed and illustrated in the historical section, followed by the other buildings on the square, there was no mention of its future ownership or management in the recommendations.

Philadelphia's Mayor Bernard Samuel and Chairman of the Planning Commission Edward Hopkinson, Jr. submitted statements of support. Samuel was brief, but pledged full cooperation from the city. Hopkinson not only indicated that the commission's recommendations were in accord with the city's plans, but detailed how the proposed park and Philadelphia's schemes for rehabilitation of areas to

the south and east would reinforce one another. He painted a glowing verbal picture. Walkways through the "Old City Redevelopment Area" would link its historic sites, and help in its re-establishment as a residential area. Although the term "Old City" later meant the area north of Chestnut Street, Hopkinson was then using it to refer to what became known as Society Hill. The City Planning Commission envisioned the removal of the wholesale markets along Dock Street. This would be accompanied by enhancement of the riverfront with gardens, walks, and a plaza at near the site where Penn was thought to have landed. The federal park would thus be the linchpin in the rehabilitation of a large area of Philadelphia.[186]

Large-scale illustrations prepared by Grant Simon supplemented the written report. Several of these were primarily pretty pictures, watercolor renderings of how some of the historic buildings would look after restoration. Others fleshed out the Shrines Commission's thinking on the eventual appearance of the park. There were, however, some discrepancies among the drawings. One, an aerial photograph of Philadelphia, with the park areas skillfully airbrushed in, showed Area A bisected by a broad grass mall. All of the buildings on Walnut and Chestnut Streets were gone, with the exception of the main historic monuments and a few unidentifiable eighteenth-century houses on Walnut Street. Double rows of trees took the place of the buildings. A site plan drawing was more specific. The buildings to remain on Walnut Street were identified as the Moylan (Todd) and Bishop White Houses, plus the buildings at 339, 341, and 315-321. However, a perspective watercolor rendering, dated 1947, of the same area, showed Walnut and Chestnut Streets lined with new construction, low in height and in the "colonial style". The 200 by 850 foot grass plot remained consistent. It was, indeed, integral to Simon's ideas for the east mall. He had developed all his plans on the assumption that to

> accomplish this I suggest the creation of a "commons", bordered by these historic buildings; a great lawn with double rows of trees on four sides, with open vistas to the buildings themselves ...
> The Commons would be bordered on the South by business buildings extending about 100 feet to Walnut Street. While I am not convinced that this is absolutely essential to the business development of the neighborhood, it does have the definite advantage of providing a southern wall to the commons, in an architecture sympathetic to the historic shrines. ...
> The northern boundary of the commons is formed by park areas. 187

The plan of the proposed park also showed development for Franklin Court. It encompassed four buildings on Market Street, the passageway between them, and a reconstruction of Franklin's house. Project B, the southerly extension, was also treated as a relatively broad mall, although a discontinuous one. It stopped on the north side of the graveyard of St. Mary's Church, and began again to its south.[188] Despite the inconsistency of the drawings, the members of the Shrines Commission evidently believed that they had not only prepared a report demonstrating the desirability of a national park in Philadelphia, but also had worked out the best scheme for its development. Section 3 of the proposed legislation incorporated in the report read, "The park shall be developed in accordance with the report of the Philadelphia National Shrines Park Commission to the Congress of the United States, dated December 29, 1947."[189]

Over a decade had elapsed since George Nitzche first broached the idea of a national park in Philadelphia. Since the seminal meeting in the Architects' Building, Judge Lewis, using first the vehicle of the Independence Hall Association, and then of the Shrines Commission, had conducted a masterly public relations campaign, skillfully coordinated a successful lobbying effort, and supervised research and planning. He had garnered support from Federal, state, and local government, from the Philadelphia newspapers, and from a host of civic and patriotic organizations. He had overseen production of a document

impressive for both its bulk and its rhetoric. Now, after all the years of effort, the questions of whether there would be a national park in Philadelphia rested with the federal government.

IV - THE BEGINNINGS OF THE PARK

Once the Shrines Commission's report had been delivered, Congressional action was swift. Representative Hardie Scott introduced H.R. 5053, authorizing creation of a national park in Philadelphia, on January 20, 1948. Scott was then the Congressman for the district in which Independence Hall is located. Despite the resemblance in name, Hardie Scott, a Democrat, was no relation to Judge Lewis's nephew, Hugh Scott, who was a Republican. Hardie Scott's version of the bill was copied verbatim from the proposed legislation in the report. It authorized the Secretary of the Interior to accept by donation, or acquire by purchase or condemnation, certain areas to become "Philadelphia National Historical Park." The bill then proceeded to describe the areas. It further authorized the Secretary of the Interior to construct offices and administration buildings, and an auditorium, and authorized an appropriation of $5,500,000. It also called for development of the park in accordance with the plans of the Shrines Commission.

Although the National Park Service heartily endorsed the creation of the park, the legislation proposed by the Shrines Commission was unsatisfactory in many respects. The park service prepared to submit its own bill in the guise of amendments to the Scott bill. In February Oscar L. Chapman, Acting Secretary of the Interior, commented on the bill to Richard J. Welch, chairman of the House Committee on Public Lands, in a letter drafted by Ronald Lee.[1] The letter strongly recommended passage of the bill as amended, and enclosed the amendments. So extensive were the amendments that only the first two lines of the original bill remained intact. Even the name was new. In place of the pedestrian Philadelphia National Historical Park, it had become Independence

National Historical Park. This would be more expressive of the project's national rather than local significance.

Perhaps the most important aspect of the amendments was a deletion. The park service's draft did not mention developing the proposed park according to the Shrines Commission's plan, or indeed to any preconceived plan. On the other hand, the amendments added some requirements. Full establishment of the park would depend on execution of agreements with the City of Philadelphia and the Carpenters' Company for the preservation and interpretation of their buildings. The agreements must assure that the park service would have access, at all reasonable times, to all public portions of the properties in order to conduct visitors through them. The park service would also have control over interpreting them to the public. The agreements would also provide that no major alterations could be made without mutual consent. Obviously, if such key buildings as Independence Hall and Carpenters' Hall could not be included, there would be little point in establishing a park. The bill did not require that all the land in the recommended areas must be acquired before establishment; two-thirds would be adequate. However, this partial acquisition would have to include certain designated buildings: the First Bank of the United States, the Merchants' Exchange, the Bishop White House, the Todd House, and the site of Benjamin Franklin's House. At the same time that it clearly specified those buildings essential to the park service's concept of the park, the amended bill omitted two areas recommended by the Shrines Commission. These were Project B, the southern extension between Walnut and Pine Streets, and Project E, the lands around Christ Church. Undoubtedly this decision reflected, in part, the park service's long-established reluctance to acquire properties associated with religious buildings, although precedent for a lesser form of involvement with sectarian structures existed in cooperative agreements with Gloria Dei Church in

Philadelphia and Touro Synagogue in Newport, Rhode Island. The reason cited for the omission was that the areas were "not sufficiently related to the essential national historical properties desired for the park to justify their inclusion in the area. It is believed that these two projects could more appropriately be developed by the city of Philadelphia."[2]

Whether or not he was responsible for their precise language, Ronald Lee had undoubtedly shaped these amendments. Following his return from military service in 1946, Lee had assumed responsibility for the negotiations for Independence, without much communication with his colleagues in the Branch of History.[3] Although there are thus no memoranda or other documents that record his thinking, Lee's decisions were probably influenced by experiences with other historic areas. In at least three of those developed before Independence the park service's historians and other professionals had lacked sufficient control. Disagreements, sometimes acrimonious, had arisen with local supporters of the projects, and history had too often been on the losing side. The actions taken to propitiate the local groups had damaged the integrity of the sites, and made it difficult, if not impossible, to interpret them in a historically accurate manner.

At Colonial National Historical Park the Lightfoot Stable was reconstructed fifty feet from its original site because the rector and parishioners of neighboring Christ Episcopal Church objected to the proper location.[4] At the George Washington Birthplace National Monument at Wakefield, Virginia, inadequate research and planning, combined with pressure to complete a commemorative building in time for the 1932 bicentennial of Washington's birth, had resulted in construction of the house on the wrong site.[5] Freshest in Lee's mind must have been the major disagreements in philosophy between the National Park Service and Luther Ely Smith, the chief local proponent of

Jefferson National Expansion Memorial in St. Louis. Smith wanted a "City Beautiful" open park along the Mississippi River, with a major monument on the lines of the Washington Monument or Lincoln Memorial in Washington, D.C. The park service professionals would have preferred to retain the historic commercial buildings along the riverfront, from which the country's westward expansion had been supplied. Herbert E. Kahler, Lee's chief assistant, thought that the demolition carried out in 1939-1940 had destroyed the historic interest of the area. At the same time that the Independence legislation was being discussed, Smith was promoting an international architectural competition for a memorial on the St. Louis site. This grandiose concept was opposed by the park service professionals, who wished to see the site interpreted through a relatively modest museum in one of the few surviving historic buildings, the Courthouse. They also hoped to preserve the Manuel Lisa Warehouse, an early stone building that had been restored under Charles Peterson's direction in the late 1930's. This rare survivor might be destroyed (as it was) if Smith's scheme came to fruition. Once again it was a losing position. Director Drury supported Smith's proposal.[6]

Lee and his associates were certainly competent enough historians to learn from their own past. The errors that had been committed at other sites must not recur in Philadelphia. Independence was not merely the most important historic site the park service had dealt with, but the premier historic site in the nation. The attention of the country would be focused on its treatment; whatever was done must meet the highest standards. From the time the Shrines Commission had begun its deliberations, the park service had made it clear that this time it intended to maintain control over the development. As Drury had informed Lewis, when recommending that Peterson come to Philadelphia to assist the commission, the park service ultimately would be responsible for the

planning. Roy Appleman had indicated at the decisive meeting in the City Planning Commission's office, in July 1947, that the park service would want to devote considerable time to research and study before drawing up a development plan. His final report on the situation in Philadelphia had recommended that the legislation for the proposed park should list specifically those buildings that were to be preserved, but should not be specific about the plan for development, reserving broad decision-making powers for the park service. These recommendations undoubtedly had a strong influence on the amendments to the bill.

Although the park service was firm about retaining control, it approached Independence with considerable caution. This was an enormous undertaking on many levels, not least of them financial. Most previous parks had been established on land already belonging to the Federal government or acquired through donation. For the first time the National Park Service was asking Congress to authorize millions of dollars to purchase property. The provisions in the Department of the Interior's version of the bill establishing priorities for cooperative agreements and certain acquisitions recognized that there would be no point in making these expenditures if key sites could not be included within the park. The proposed omission of Projects B and E probably reflected concerns about costs, not only of acquisition, but of maintenance of discontinuous parcels of property, as well as consideration of the separation of church and state.

The final amendment, the change of name, was the product of a long-standing concern. As early as December 1945, when the bill creating the Shrines Commission had passed the House and Senate, Kahler had noted that the "name for the proposed area needs careful consideration."[7] Changing the name could thus scarcely be considered an impulse, but it was certainly an inspiration.

The Subcommittee on Public Lands held hearings on the bill as amended by Interior on March 1, 1948. A large contingent from Philadelphia traveled to Washington to testify or to lend support by their presence. Lewis, of course, led the delegation, accompanied by two fellow members of the Shrines Commission, McAneny and Greenfield, and by McCosker. Hopkinson and Mitchell were there for the City Planning Commisssion. There were also representatives of several institutions: Thomas Gates, President of the American Philosophical Society; Clement Conolo from the Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce; Dr. Charles F. Jenkins, President of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania; Mrs. Henry P. Borie, Secretary of the Independence Hall Association; and E. Hubert Ulrich of the Curtis Publishing Company. Director Newton Drury of the National Park Service was also there to testify, accompanied by Assistant Director Hillory Tolson, Lee, Peterson, and Chief Counsel Jackson Price.

Representative Hardie Scott opened the proceedings by introducing the visitors. He was followed by Representative Francis E. Walter, who had sponsored a bill identical to Scott's, docketed as H.R. 5054. Walter stated that, as far as he knew, there was no opposition to the bill. Lewis took the floor next. His testimony was eloquent and well calculated to appeal to the intense patriotism of the post-war period, as well as to the uncertainties of the burgeoning Cold War. He linked Independence to the greatest treasures of the American people.

> You gentlemen are all familiar with American history and you know when you stand on the bridge of Grand Canyon, for instance, all the mystery and all the grandeur of the creation of the universe is impressed upon you and your mind registers a great many impressions. Likewise, when one stands at Mount Vernon, all of the elements comprising the character and life of George Washington come into our minds in about three or four minutes. It is like the turning of a dial on the radio when reception is good or when you stand on a mountain peak on an October night and look up at a cloud in the sky. You cannot avoid being affected by this feeling of the immensity and mystery of The Creation.

> When you come to Philadelphia; when any person from California, Nevada, Texas or anywhere comes to Philadelphia and enters Independence Hall and entering it is immediately met with the full view of the Liberty Bell, crack and all, there registers every sentiment of patriotism that runs through the mind--everything taught in the schools to that person as a child relating to American history--is so strong that goose pimples come out upon the body of anyone who is really an American and many who are not Americans. Everybody knows.
>
> We see it in our people continuously. When foreigners come to American and visit Philadelphia, they enter Independence Hall and see the Liberty Bell, they all become conscious of this ideology that America represents and in the preservation of which you gentlemen and I are so much interested today.

With this as preface, Lewis went on to describe each of the buildings and sites in the areas recommended in the Shrines Commission's report. He stressed their associations with the founding fathers. Here Washington, Adams, Jefferson, Franklin, and their fellows had lived, worked, worshipped, and participated in the city's social and intellectual life. He included the two projects eliminated by the National Park Service, Project B, the south mall, and Project E, land aroud Christ Church. At this juncture the committee interrupted Lewis to ask why the Shrines Commission had recommended the two areas. Representative Barrett pointed out that National Park Service disapproval was not conclusive for members of Congress. Lewis responded that it was his understanding that the park service opposed the two areas because they involved Christ Church, St. Mary's, and other churches, although they did not actually take land belonging to religious institutions. Furthermore, the Park Service believed these projects should be undertaken by the city. Encouraged by the subcommittee's attitude, he launched a spirited defense of the Shrines Commission's decisions, especially in regard to Project B. He concluded by reminding the Congressmen of the importance of protecting these national shrines from fire. Only weeks earlier there had been a fire in a building on the north side of Chestnut Street, directly across from Independence Hall. Every piece of fire apparatus in the city had been called out, and it had been necessary to

turn on the sprinkler system that protected the Hall. The safety of the historic sites demanded the removal of what Lewis viewed as the deteriorating structures around them.

The subcommittee accepted Lewis's testimony with enthusiasm. The members had nothing but praise for the inspirational force of the report and its subject. Several thought it should be printed and distributed to every school in the country. After this reception, the remainder of the testimony could only be anti-climactic. Drury reviewed the park service's proposed amendments, stressing those that were non-controversial, such as the change of name to Independence and the provisions for cooperative agreements. The subcommittee's only question concerned operating costs, about which Drury could not be specific. Hopkinson, Gates, and Jenkins all spoke briefly in favor of the bill. Even Emerson Custis, the proponent of the Curtis Mall, who was also present, raised no objections. Custis had written to the committee, stating his belief that the bill was unnecessary, that his scheme could be carried out with private funds. Called to express his views at the end of the hearing, he said that he now favored passage of the legislation.[8]

A few days after the hearing Hardie Scott wrote to Lewis, telling him that there was a good chance the subcommittee would include all five areas in the bill. However, its members would like to hold an additional hearing in Philadelphia. Scott suggested that the Philadelphians entertain them at lunch.[9] Lewis adopted the idea with enthusiasm, and orchestrated, as he had in the past, and would in the future, a Congressional trip to Philadelphia. On a fine spring morning, members of the subcommittee and their wives, along with several park service representatives, were met at 30th Street Station by a welcoming committee of prominent Philadelphians. After checking in at the Bellevue-Stratford, the party moved to the Union League Club for a luncheon with

the Colonial Society of Philadelphia. (The wives lunched below stairs in the women's dining room.) A tour followed lunch. Each of the Congressmen must have had a personal guide, for the group was joined by McAneny, Greenfield, Hopkinson, Martin, Larson, Simon, McCosker, Ostroff, and others. The visitors saw the areas and buildings encompassed in the proposed park, had their pictures taken at the Liberty Bell, and visited Society Hill for a reception at a private house on South Fourth Street. The day ended with a dinner at the Barclay Hotel, where Mayor Samuel and Hopkinson, among others, made brief addresses. Several of the Congressmen had never been to Philadelphia before, and appeared to be impressed by the importance of what they were seeing.[10] Chairman Richard J. Welch of the full House Committee was unable to make the trip. Three weeks later, on April 10, Welch and his wife came to Philadelphia at Judge Lewis's invitation. In the course of his visit he told the press that the subcommittee had recommended approval of all the proposed areas with the exception of Project B, the section south of Walnut Street. After his tour, he thought "it would be a shame if this historic area is not included in the project."[11]

On April 21 the full House Committee on Public Lands met to consider the subcommittee's recommendation to approve H.R. 5053, as amended, with elimination of Project B. Chairman Welch immediately reiterated his belief that the area should be included. Although it was true that Projects B and E bordered several churches, no federal funds would be spent to acquire property belonging to a sectarian organization. A question was raised on Franklin Court, since it was not certain that anything remained of Franklin's house or print shop. However, the committee agreed that because of the importance of the site to Philadelphians it should be included. Congressman LeCompte then brought up Project D, the site of the Graff House, where Jefferson had composed the

Declaration of Independence. Despite its illustrious associations, the site was now "nothing but a cheap modern hamburger stand," and there had been no indication of plans to develop it.[12] The committee appeared to be in sympathy with this view. At this juncture Lewis recalled turning to solicit Hopkinson's opinion. In a whispered exchange, the two agreed that it would be wise to settle for 80 per cent of what they wanted.[13] In terms of land area they were, in fact, getting more than 90 per cent of what they had proposed. Without further debate, the committee proceeded to a unanimous vote recommending passage of the Park Service's version of the bill, but restoring Projects B and E, and dropping Project D, with an authorization of $4,435,000.[14]

Before the bill went to the full House of Representatives, the National Park Service managed to effect two changes. Project B, south of Walnut Street, was reduced in size so that it ended on Manning Street north of St. Mary's Cemetery, and eliminated the discontinuous section running south to Pine Street. The Jayne Building, probably at Charles Peterson's behest, was added to the specified list of buildings. Although there was every indication that the bill would pass easily, Lewis continued to lobby. He began to woo the legislators on their own ground.

> We went to Washington. We used to give dinners at the Congressional Hotel for the Congressmen, give it at 12:30 and we'd ask all of them and you'd get about 50, then we got 100, and we got up to about 125 would come over to luncheon. We got the chairmen, the important ones, and we had no trouble getting the bill passed. [15]

The House passed the bill on June 14, 1948, and the Senate approved a companion bill, S. 2080, on June 18, 1948.[16] President Truman signed it as Public Law 795 on June 28, 1948.[17]

The park project now existed on paper, but without funding. The law demanded the acquisition of considerable property before the project could become a park. Any activity toward that end, however, would depend on

appropriations made by the next Congress. While the federal government's timetable thus remained uncertain, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania moved ahead on its Independence Mall north of Independence Hall. Early in 1949, the Public Works Committee of the Philadelphia City Council held hearings on an agreement between the city and the state to establish the mall. The move was opposed once again by Morris Passon, who had previously represented local businessmen before the Shrines Commission. Passon characterized the plans as "grandiose", and warned that appropriations by the state were uncertain. Another local businessman, Louis Herbach, suggested that the money might better be spent on cleaning up the city's rivers and slums. He objected on aesthetic grounds as well. In his opinion, "Independence Hall would look like a peanut in a two-block vista." The weight of opinion was against the businessmen. Lewis pointed out that every state legislator favored the project, and that Rear Admiral Milo F. Draemel, Pennsylvania Secretary of Forests and Waters, who had been given responsibility for its execution, had assured him that funds were already available. Albert Greenfield assured the committee that the mall would boost the city's tax revenues. Representative Hardie Scott expressed fears that failure to act would appear in Washington as bad faith on the part of the city.[18]

Although it was not stated at the hearing, the most persuasive argument for the development was its potential for encouraging large businesses to remain in the city. Three major companies, employing 15,000 people, were contemplating moves to the suburbs because of the continuing deterioration of the area. If the city would commit itself to civic improvement, as represented by the mall, these businesses might be persuaded to participate in redeveloping the neighborhood. Two of them, Rohm and Haas and General Accident,

in fact, remained.[19] The committee recommended execution of the pact.[20] City Council passed an ordinance to that effect on January 18, 1949. While the state and city were working out the details of their agreement, Congress was wrestling with an appropriation to initiate the federal project. A suggestion for an appropriation of $3,000,000 was quickly whittled down to $500,000. The most eloquent opponent was Representative Foster Furcolo of Massachusetts. Furcolo attacked spending any funds for the project, saying,

> There are more important things for this Congress to consider, and I cannot sit idly by and see $3,000,000 or $300 or 300 cents being appropriated for a project such as this, regardless of tradition.
>
> What we have to do right now is provide money for housing those who do not have homes in America. 21

The Department of the Interior was satisfied with the $500,000 that was finally appropriated. It was all that they expected to be able to use in the next fiscal year.[22] Furthermore, the House and Senate conference committee had worked out a compromise. Although the park service would receive only $500,000 for the fiscal year 1950, the conference recommended that they be authorized to contract to the extent of almost $4 million.[23]

The bill authorizing the park called for an advisory commission, representing the city, the state, the federal government, and important private organizations interested in the project. The park service, which had worked successfully with such commissions in the past, believed that such a body would "integrate and give effectiveness to the best thought of the city, State and Federal Government in carrying into execution a program."[24] With funding secured, the Secretary of the Interior moved in June to make appointments to the commission. He chose, as the bill required, eleven members, three selected by himself, three recommended by the Governor of Pennsylvania, three by the Mayor of Philadelphia, and one each by the Carpenters' Company of Philadelphia and the

Independence Hall Association. Among the Governor's recommendations were Judge Lewis, the banker A.G.B. Steele, and Arthur C. Kaufmann, executive director of Gimbel Brothers department store. The mayoral appointees were Thomas Buckley, Edward Hopkinson Jr., and Albert M. Greenfield. John P. Hallahan represented the Carpenters' Company, and Sydney E. Martin the Independence Hall Association. The Secretary's own appointments were Senator Francis J. Myers, Joseph Sill Clark Jr., then director of the Citizens' Council on City Planning and later reform Mayor of Philadelphia and United States Senator, and Michael J. Bradley, Collector of Customs, who, as a former Representative, had introduced one of the bills to study the park.[25]

Meanwhile the state mall moved ahead steadily. In May 1949 Governor Duff and Mayor Samuel signed an agreement laying out the respective roles of city and state. The city would widen Fifth and Sixth Streets; the state would develop the land between them.[26] By November Admiral Draemel, Pennsylvania's Secretary of Forests and Waters, announced that negotiations would begin for thirty-seven properties in the block opposite Independence Hall from Chestnut to Market at an estimated cost of a little under $3 million.[27]

The National Park Service was also preparing to get its land acquisition under way. The project's office opened in Philadelphia on October 1, 1949, with a small staff to handle property transactions, plus two seasoned Park Service professionals, Charles E. Peterson and Dr. Edward M. Riley. The group occupied a couple of rooms in the rear of the Second Bank. The budget was lean and postwar shortages still prevailed. They obtained desks and chairs from the Office of Real Property, War Assets Administration, which the project manager, Joseph M. O'Brien, had managed previously.[29] As was customary, the men in charge of property acquisition were not long-term park service employees. No matter how good the intentions, land acquisition always was (and is) a

potentially controversial practice. Appraisals would be questioned; some owners would be unwilling to sell and condemnation would be necessary. Park service custom generally followed the premise that the eventual managers of a new park would be more effective if they were free of the taint of involvement in real estate negotiations that were sure to produce some lingering ill-will.

O'Brien, the project manager, had obvious qualifications for the post. He had spent over a quarter of a century in real estate in Philadelphia, specializing in appraisals, management, and sales. He was also well connected politically. A Democrat, he had served for eleven years in the state legislature.[30] The assistant project manager, Melford O. Anderson, had spent fifteen years in land management for the Federal government. In the 1930's he had worked for several of the new "alphabet" agencies that had been established to respond to the human distress generated by the Depression. During World War II he served with the War Relocation Authority, dealing with housing, employment, and other problems of Americans of Japanese descent who had been involuntarily evacuated to the Rocky Mountains. After the war he transferred to the Public Housing Adminstration in Chicago, handling the disposal of surplus wartime housing.[31] He had long been a close friend of Undersecretary of the Interior Oscar L. Chapman, who recommended him for the Philadelphia post.[32]

The park service assigned two of its top professionals to Independence. Both had worked at Colonial National Historical Park in Yorktown, Virginia. It was there, in the early 1930's, that Peterson had initiated a methodology for analyzing the fabric of historic buildings and reporting the findings in the form of a Historic Structures Report. Subsequently he had supervised most of the park service's restoration work. He was already quite familiar with Philadelphia and Independence, because of his several visits in 1947. Riley, a native of Mississippi, brought up in Virginia, had been historian at Colonial

both before and after World War II. There he had followed in the footsteps of historians who had been instrumental in formulating park service procedures for research and the interpretation of historic sites, Elbert Cox and B. Floyd Flickinger.[33] During the war he had served in the United States Navy and the War Assets Administration.[34] Accustomed to digging hard for historical evidence in Virginia, he was both awed and delighted by the wealth of documentation available in Philadelphia. "I felt something like a mouse in a cheese factory," he recalled. "I didn't know where to start nibbling."[35]

The new staff, with the exception of Peterson, attended the first meeting of the Independence National Historical Park Advisory Commission on November 29, 1949. In many ways it resembled the meetings of the Shrines Commission. Judge Lewis presided as chairman, and a number of the members were carryovers. Several of the guests had met frequently with the Shrines Commission: architects Roy Larson and Grant Simon, planner Edmund Bacon, and Dr. William Lingelbach. The group gathered not at the project offices, but at the Rittenhouse Club, Judge Lewis's turf. It was a sizeable gathering of over forty people. Nine members of the commission attended.[36] Undersecretary of the Interior Oscar Chapman headed a delegation from Washington that included park service Director Drury, Conrad Wirth, then assistant director, Thomas Vint, chief of planning, Ronald Lee, the chief historian, and Herbert Kahler, assistant chief historian. Thomas J. Allen, the park service's regional director, was also present, as was Francis J. Ronalds, who, as superintendent of Morristown National Historical Park in New Jersey, had been assigned oversight responsibilities for the new project. There was also a group from the city, led by city solicitor Frank F. Truscott. Despite the presence of so much high-powered talent, most of the meeting was taken up with a review of the arrangements necessary before the park could be established.

It was only as the meeting drew to a close that a new and important subject was broached. Roy Larson, speaking as the chairman of the city's Art Jury, proposed that the City Planning Commission undertake a study of the areas surrounding the park. He wished to see these "fringes" rezoned to assure that they would be architecturally compatible with the park's development. It was an idea that immediately appealed to Lee, who not only was one of the strongest proponents of the National Park Service's historic preservation activities, but also had recently played a key role in the foundation of a new organization, the National Trust for Historic Preservation. Lee was in close communication with preservation groups around the country. He recommended that Philadelphia study the pioneering preservation ordinances of Charleston, South Carolina, and New Orleans.[37] It would, however, be a number of years before the city took action to control the preservation of areas adjacent to the park.

The meetings of the Advisory Commission were set at six-month intervals. In theory it seemed unlikely that a group that met so infrequently would exercise much power over decision-making at Independence. In practice, Judge Lewis utilized his position as chairman to wield tremendous influence over the park's development. From the beginning the project staff conferred with Lewis about all significant planning activities on a regular and frequent basis.[38]

The project's top priority for its first year was to begin fulfilling the legislative mandate for land acquisition and consummation of cooperative agreements. The agreement with the Carpenters' Company, signed May 19, 1950, provides that the company would continue to own, maintain, and operate and exhibit its building. The National Park Service obtained the right to exhibit the exterior and interpret the building as part of the park. The agreement calls for mutual agreement on restoration projects. On July 14, 1950, the City of Philadelphia and the National Park Service executed the agreement covering

Independence Hall, Old City Hall, Congress Hall, and Independence Square. Under its terms the property and buildings remain in city ownership, with the park service assuming full custody, and responsibility for administration, maintenance, and interpretation. Major alteration or restoration would require the consent of both parties. The third agreement, with the Vestry of Christ Church, took effect at the end of the year. As at Carpenters' Hall, the vestry would not only continue to own, but would maintain and operate the property. The park service would include the church and its cemetery in its interpretive program, and would cooperate in their preservation and restoration.[39]

Early in 1950 the park project contracted with the Land Title Bank and Trust Company and the Commonwealth Title Company of Philadelphia for title searches on 123 separate properties. In the spring three independent appraisers began evaluating the properties in Projects A, the blocks bounded by Chestnut, Walnut, Second and Fifth Streets, and C, Franklin Court.[40] At the April meeting of the Advisory Commission O'Brien told the members that his first priority was to complete acquisition of the buildings named in Public Law 795 as soon as possible. Despite rumors to the contrary, Admiral Draemel had assured him that the state's acquisition program was progressing smoothly. Demolition negotiations were already underway on two properties in the path of the state mall.[41] By the end of the year appraisals had been completed for about 90 per cent of the properties in Projects A and C, and work had begun in B, the extension south of Walnut Street and E, the land around Christ Church. Options had been taken on fifteen properties. Two properties, one part of the street leading into Franklin Court from Chestnut Street, the other near Carpenters' Hall, had been offered for donation. The former was being given by the city, the latter by the Fairmount Park Art Association.[42]

While O'Brien and Anderson dealt with property negotiations, Riley and

Peterson were laying the groundwork for the necessary research in their respective fields. Since they shared an office, it was easy for them to exchange findings as they began to scrape at the surface of the vast holdings related to the history of the area and its buildings.[43] Riley's first task was to become familiar with the many public and private repositories where documents might be found: the city and state archives, institutions such as the American Philosophical Society, the city's long-established fire insurance companies, and the title insurance companies.[44] He found helpful guides among the park's early supporters. Judge Lewis knew where many of the relevant public records were, and used his influence to make them readily accessible.[45] The state historian, S.K. Stevens, with his thorough knowledge of the state's holdings, suggested numerous shortcuts through the maze of the Pennsylvania archives.[46] Riley's chief mentor, however, was Dr. William Lingelbach of the American Philosophical Society. Lingelbach was, in many ways, the eminence grise of the early research program at Independence. He was one of the handful of people to whom Judge Lewis assigned a share of credit for the creation of the park.[47] Roy Appleman had depended heavily on his guidance during his 1947 sojourn in Philadelphia. Lingelbach knew the holdings not only of his own institution, but also those of the city's other repositories. For Riley, "he became something of my father confessor. I'd run into a problem, I'd go over and talk it over with Dr. Lingelbach. He was most helpful all the way through."[48]

One of the first objects of research at Independence was to establish historic ownership patterns. During his first year in Philadelphia, Riley prepared preliminary chains-of-title for all properties in Project B and determined the boundaries of property owned by Benjamin Franklin in Project C.[49] However, the demands of research for a historical area as large and

complex as Independence would obviously go far beyond the background of properties and buildings. It might well be beyond the resources of the park service to carry out the multi-faceted research that should be done. Riley saw one possible solution in encouraging graduate students to work on subjects relevant to Independence. His idea appealed to Dr. Roy Nichols, an early member of the Independence Hall Association, who was also Professor of History and Dean at the University of Pennsylvania. They set up a cooperative program to accomplish the purpose.[50] Although the idea was a sound one, it probably required more attention than either Independence or the university could give it. The program languished, and produced little concrete result.

While Riley was familiarizing himself with Philadelphia's libraries and record centers, and tracing chains-of-title, Charles Peterson was also engaged in research. Since he believed that the understanding of an educated public was essential if important buildings were to be preserved and restored, he hastened to get the preliminary results of his work into print. Peterson seems to have set his own priorities. He first turned his attention to two mid- nineteenth century buildings that had attracted him during his 1947 visits to Philadelphia. His brief article on the Jayne Building appeared in the October 1950 issue of the Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians; an article on the cast-iron Penn Mutual Life Insurance Building was in the December 1950 issue of the same publication. Peterson next dealt with the other buildings enumerated in Public Law 795, publishing an essay identifying them, and describing some of the planning problems in creating the park in the July 1950 issue of the American-German Review. During the year he explored Philadelphia's pictorial resources, and collected reproductions of views, photographs, and measured drawings of historic buildings in the projected areas, especially those on Independence Square. By year's end he had also

completed research on Library Hall, which the American Philosophical Society remained interested in reconstructing.[51]

Peterson's responsibilities, however, went far beyond research, to include physical planning and architectural design. He made studies of the Second Bank of the United States (Old Custom House), to which the American Philosophical Society had proposed moving its library. Adaptation of the building to this use was impractical, he found; the library simply could not be fitted in.[52] As the time when the park service would assume administrative and interpretive control of Independence Square grew closer, Peterson worked on preliminary plans for adapting the first floor of the United States Fidelity and Guaranty Company's building on Fifth Street as a temporary auditorium and offices, and on designing restrooms for the basement of the west wing of Independence Hall. He also conferred with representatives of the Garden Clubs of America, who had assembled a collection of magnolia trees, one from each of the 48 states, for possible donation to the park.[53] This would be the first major gift to Independence from an outside group. But it was at Project B, between Walnut and Manning Streets, that Peterson's ideas of what the park should be were most clearly revealed. He drew up a preliminary site plan showing eleven houses to be rehabilitated for use as staff quarters. An existing garage was to be adapted for storage, workshop, and service area.[54] Clearly Peterson viewed Independence as incorporating preservation on a scale far greater than specified in the authorizing legislation. His view went beyond the restoration of a handful of historic buildings to preservation of the historic ambience of the entire area, and the integration of the park service's project with the existing neighborhood.

At the end of the first full year of operation, major changes in the management of Independence became essential. The land acquisition program was

well underway; research had begun. On January 1, 1951, the project staff would assume responsibility for several historic properties: the city's buildings on Independence Square, the Second Bank, and the Deshler-Morris House in Germantown. In 1948 the park service learned that this last property was being offered as a donation to the federal government by its last private owners, the heirs of Marriott C. Morris. It was a gift the park service, severely pressed for funds, was reluctant to accept. George Washington had rented the house as a summer residence twice during the 1790's. Fiske Kimball considered it a fine example of a Germantown roadside house. Nevertheless, as Roy Appleman suggested, there was already a superabundance of memorials to Washington. Francis Ronalds, the superintendent of Morristown, who then had administrative responsibility for the park service's holdings in Philadelphia, recommended that it become a part of Independence, provided that a cooperative agreement could be negotiated under which the Germantown Historical Society would maintain and operate the house. When Congress amended the 1949 Interior appropriations bill to include a sum for maintenance of the property, the National Park Service had no choice. It accepted the property and negotiated an agreement along the lines laid out by Ronalds. This enabled the park service to use the appropriated money for needed repairs to the property, which the society would then maintain and operate.[55]

Caring for these properties and interpreting them to the public would require a considerably larger operation in Philadelphia. Once the park service assumed custody of Independence Square, it would also, as part of its agreement with the city, transfer to the park service's payroll the city employees who had been maintaining and providing security for the property. In January, Representative Hardie Scott had requested that a larger appropriation be available for Independence, including authorization to contract for $3.9 million

in acquisitions.[56] The Senate finally approved $150,000, earmarked for management and protection for Independence Square and its buildings, but authorized $1 million less in acquisitions.[57]

The added responsibility would also necessitate augmentation of the slender professional staff, and reorganization of the project office. It was not practical for the project manager, who had been selected for his skill in real estate negotiation, to supervise the necessary professional and administrative personnel. Independence had reached the stage at which an acting superintendent should be designated. Assistant Project Manager Melford O. Anderson was named to the post on November 15, 1950.[58] It was a surprising appointment. Just as it was customary that personnel carrying out land acquisition were not park service career people, it was usual, by this period, for superintendents to come up through the ranks. Several candidates had been considered, among them Edward A. Hummel, the superintendent at Colonial National Historical Park in Yorktown, Virginia.[59] According to Charles E. Peterson, Associate Director Arthur E. Demaray had told Peterson he was slated for the job when he assigned him to Independence. Peterson expressed some reluctance. He told Demaray, "Look, I don't want to take care of the flags and put out the seats for celebrations, and mow the grass, and all that." To which Demaray replied, "Well, you can get an organization together to do that."[60]

Demaray, while later discussing a number of appointments and promotions with George A. Palmer, then superintendent at Hyde Park, said that he had appointed Anderson at the request of Secretary of the Interior Oscar L. Chapman. Chapman had called Demaray and reminded him that in all his years as undersecretary and then secretary, he had never attempted to influence personnel decisions. Now he had this one request. Demaray had no choice but to accede.[61] It was generally assumed within the park service that there was a familial relationship

between Anderson and Chapman, although no one was sure of its precise nature.[62] Although he was not a park service career man and was not always entirely familiar with policies and procedures, Anderson had certain qualifications for the job. With a square-jawed ruddy face under a shock of prematurely white hair, carrying himself with the trim, erect bearing of a former athlete, he looked like a leader. Despite an innate reserve, he had a pleasantly appealing voice and low-keyed manner. He was reasonable and willing to listen, but could be firm in upholding decisions. Most importantly, he got along well with Judge Lewis.

Anderson's appointment coincided with a reorganization of the Independence office to enable it to cope with its new duties. Land acquisition, of course, continued as the major activity, but the office would now have an administrative section as well. The latter was divided into four divisions: administration, maintenance and protection, history, and development and planning. To man the first division, a fiscal officer and fiscal accountant were transferred in from other parks. The functions of the second division would continue to be carried out by city employees, who would be transferred to the federal payroll. The professional staff would also be augmented, and began to recruit an architect and two historians, who would commence work after the first of the year.[63]

On New Year's Eve, at the stroke of midnight, a group of men, having climbed the tower of Independence Hall, rang the tower bell, to welcome the start of 1951 and the 175th year of the Declaration of Independence. The group called themselves the Independence Hall Bell Ringers Association. Among their number were Anderson, Riley, and Warren McCullough, formerly the city's curator of Independence Hall, and now, as a park service employee, in charge of maintenance and protection.[64] The Centennial bell pealing over Independence

Square was the first official event under the management of the National Park Service.

On Tuesday, January 2, 1951, at eleven o'clock in the morning, a simple ceremony marked the transfer of custody of Independence Hall from the City of Philadelphia to the National Park Service. About 150 guests, including representatives of local patriotic and civic organizations and the National Park Service, gathered in Congress Hall. With Judge Lewis as master of ceremonies, Mayor Samuel made a presentation speech, which was accepted by Secretary of the Interior Chapman. Morris Duane, a prominent Philadelphia attorney, made an address on behalf of the citizens of the city. The group then adjourned to Independence Hall, where, in front of the Liberty Bell, Samuel turned over a key to the building to Chapman.[65] After a century and a quarter of stewardship, Philadelphia was relinquishing custody of Independence Square and its buildings. Subject to the terms of the cooperative agreement the National Park Service was now in control.

V - THE FIRST WARS OF INDEPENDENCE

Although after January 1951 the National Park Service was in charge on Independence Square, not much difference was perceptible. The same former city employees, familiar figures now transferred to the park service staff, opened Independence Hall to visitors. There was little change in the buildings or their grounds, or in the surrounding neighborhood. In the early years at Independence the major activities remained invisible to the public. Land acquisition continued to be the chief priority of the top administrators, O'Brien and Anderson; the augmented professional staff concentrated on the necessary background for development -- research and planning.

In January two new historians, Martin I. Yoelson and Harry Lehman, squeezed into the cramped offices in the rear of the Second Bank. Lehman would be at Independence for only a few years, but Yoelson would remain until his retirement over thirty years later, to become the historical conscience of the park, its quality control.[1] For Yoelson, universally known as Marty, a job as research historian at Independence was a plum beyond imagining. A native of New York City, Yoelson had received a bachelor's degree in social science from the City College of New York during World War II. Inducted into the Army, he was sent briefly to Philadelphia in 1943, where he met the young woman who would become his wife. He returned to Philadelphia in 1947, married, and completed a master's degree at Temple University. His ambition was to be a high school history teacher. Teaching jobs were scarce however, and Yoelson found work as a timekeeper and bookkeeper. In the meantime he took a Civil Service examination, hopeful of obtaining a job that would make use of his educational background. Despite his lack of experience in historical research and writing, he was selected from the Civil Service list for appointment at Independence.[2]

Yoelson's first assignment was to research chains-of-title. Riley, the park's chief historian, gave him brief instructions on how to do title research and sent him up to City Hall. From there on it was a process of learning by doing. His chief help came from Hannah Benner Roach. Mrs. Roach was a highly skilled historian and genealogist. Her architect husband, F. Spencer Roach, was a partner in the firm of Harbeson, Hough, Livingston and Larson, which had entered into a contract with the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to design the mall north of Independence Hall. As part of the project, Mrs. Roach was preparing a historical base map of the area.[3]

A month after Yoelson's arrival two more professionals joined Riley's staff. Both were experienced park service employees, Dennis Kurjack, historian, from Hopewell Village National Historical Site, and James Mulcahy, museum specialist, from the Washington office.[4] This augmentation of his staff enabled Riley to set up an organized research program. Kurjack and Mulcahy would develop plans for exhibits to be displayed in the temporary information center planned for the west wing of Independence Hall. Yoelson and Lehman would continue to concentrate on chains-of-title. Another young historian, who joined the staff soon afterwards, R.W. Shoemaker, would edit and microfilm the insurance records of the Philadelphia Contributionship for the Insuring of Houses from Loss by Fire.[5] By the end of the year, however, basic research had slowed in relation to more pressing demands. Work on chain-of title went on, because it was useful to the real estate acquisition program. The main energy of the historians, however, was diverted to the immediate need for preparation of a historic handbook and the interpretive section of a master plan.[6]

The concept of the master plan was one of which the National Park Service was justifiably proud. Long before cities and towns in the United States were engaged in comprehensive land use planning, the National Park Service had begun

looking at each of its entities in this light. Within the park service, the master plan appears to have been the invention of Thomas C. Vint. In the late 1920s Vint was head of the Office of Design and Construction in San Francisco. When he presented what he called the "Master Plan for Mount Rainier" to Horace M. Albright, then director of the National Park Service, Albright was so impressed with the concept that he asked Vint to prepare master plans for each of the system's units. Vint delegated the task of preparing individual plans to resident landscape architects, who were assigned to a major park or to groups of parks as funds became available. The practice continued after the Office of Design and Construction moved to Washington in the 1930s. Although the plans were subject to review by the park superintendent and staff, Vint's design office, the Washington directorate, and, after their establishment, the regional offices, the master plan was the responsibility of the resident landscape architect.[7]

At Independence, therefore, Charles Peterson, as resident architect, was in charge of the process. Peterson, however, was reluctant to commit his ideas on the master plan to paper. Aware that he and Judge Lewis disagreed fundamentally on what the park should be, he was afraid to give Lewis a target to shoot at. Peterson, Lewis's junior by some thirty years, thought that if he could delay long enough the attitudes toward the park expressed in the Shrines Commission's report might change.[8] Although there were actually two plans presented with the report, which differed in detail, they shared certain basic design principles to which Peterson was opposed. Most prominent of these was the axial arrangement, with a broad swath of lawn running from Independence Square to Third Street, and a second minor cross axis from Walnut to Chestnut Street. Except for the major monuments, few, if any, old buildings remained, although at least one of Grant Simon's drawings showed new, presumably compatible, buildings along Chestnut and Walnut Streets. Peterson felt that the Shrines Commission

"never thought in terms of street architecture at all." He recalled that Vint compared the Shrines Commission's treatment of the buildings to jewels sitting in a jewelry store on a piece of green velvet. In Peterson's view the buildings would become "just lumps. They weren't part of an urban landscape at all. They [the Shrines Commision] were just grubbing out the vitals of a great city and putting a New England village green in."[9]

Although he had yet to take steps toward creating an official master plan document, Peterson articulated his differing design philosophy at the annual meeting of the Fairmount Park Art Association on January 23, 1952. Rather than the stiff axes of the Shrines Commission's plans, Peterson advocated an informal layout, "balanced, but not symmetrical." He hoped to retain the old streets, lanes and courts, using them to route pedestrian and vehicular traffic through the park. Although the land within the area had long since been leveled, and earlier plans had conceived of the park as flat, Peterson wished to restore at least a suggestion of the historic contours, especially in the area of Dock Creek. Reminding his audience that the landscape was urban, not rural, he urged retention of at least fifteen houses a century or more old. In design terms these would reinforce the urban character of the area, while at the same time setting off the more monumental structures. Functionally they could serve as quarters for park personnel, helping to maintain the vitality of the neighborhood, especially at night. Pointing out that it would be extremely destructive to "freeze" the historic area as of any one period, he urged the preservation of important buildings constructed as late as 1850. Lest there be any question about which buildings he meant, he included an engraving of the Jayne Building among the illustrations.[10]

Shortly before making his address, at the continued urging of Arthur E. Demaray, Peterson prepared a sketch plan of Area A, the main section of the park.[11] Demaray, long the associate director of the National Park Service

and a friend and supporter of Peterson, had announced his intention of retiring in 1950. At the behest of Secretary of the Interior Oscar L. Chapman, he deferred his retirement for a brief period, so that he might have the honor of serving and retiring as director of the National Park Service. He held the post from March 31 to December 10, 1951.[12]

The plan Peterson prepared for Demaray is organized on the principle of maintaining the system of city blocks rather than creating a new mall. Thus old buildings were to be retained, or new ones constructed, to mark the corners where major streets intersected, and to define street lines. The pattern of old streets, lanes and courts would remain or be restored. Several old buildings not specifically identified in the legislation would be preserved: John's Tailor Shop and the Carter Houses on Library Street, an unidentified house on Fourth Street, the Kidd and McIlvaine Houses on Walnut Street, the Front Store and New Hall on Carpenters' Court, the Jayne Building on Chestnut Street and the Penn Mutual Building at the corner of Third and Dock Streets. Between the two latter buildings, a parking garage would be erected, fronted by new office buildings along Third Street. A smaller garage would be constructed between Second and Third Streets, adjacent to the new Custom House. Although the plan thus proposed adding a considerable amount of new construction as an adjunct to the retained buildings, there would still be ample greenery. All the streets would be planted with trees, as would small courtyards and gardens between and behind many of the buildings. A modest mall on axis would lead north from Walnut Street to the rear of the Second Bank. In the next block a vista would open to the east of Fourth Street revealing a broad lawn, through which the course of Dock Creek would be modeled in the surface of the earth.[13]

As the acquisition and planning programs proceeded, the park service became aware that the legislation authorizing the Independence project provided neither sufficient authority nor sufficient funds to accomplish the task. Two bills

passed in 1951 and 1952 provided partial remedies. The first permitted the staff to operate and manage acquired properties, depositing moneys derived from rentals in a special account. These funds could then be used for operating the properties, or for the demolition or removal of buildings.[14] The premise was logical, and demanded no expenditure of government funds, so the measure passed easily. The second bill was more complex and more controversial. As originally introduced it had three major provisions. First, it allowed the American Philosophical Society to construct a building to house its library, at its own expense, on park land on the site of Library Hall. The design of the facility would require approval by the Secretary of the Interior. Second, the bill called for acquisition of additional properties: 269-275 South Fifth Street, in Area B, which would round out a site that had been selected as a future utility area; the Irwin Building, a large office building at the corner of Walnut and Fourth Streets; and the site of the Graff House at Market and Seventh Streets. Finally, the bill almost doubled the previously authorized appropriation to $9,857,000.[15]

The first of these proposals met with no opposition. If the Philosophical Society were to construct, as it proposed, a replica of Library Hall, it would be a great asset to the park at no cost to the government. The proposed acquisitions were another matter. Congress had refused to authorize acquisition of the Irwin Building and the Graff House site once before. This time the Bureau of the Budget had strong objections.[16] Eventually a compromise was reached. Congress passed the bill, raising the authorization to $7,700,000, and including acquisition of the Fifth Street properties, but omitting the Irwin Building and the Graff House site.[17]

During the legislative maneuvering Judge Lewis once again assumed his role as chief lobbyist. He kept up a routine of written communication and visits to the Pennsylvania delegation, to Secretary of the Interior Oscar Chapman, and to

National Park Service Director Conrad Wirth and his immediate subordinates.[18] Wirth, who prided himself on his own skills in dealing with Congress, was quick to recognize another master of the art. According to Wirth the two soon achieved "an unwritten arrangement -- he'd keep me informed of who he was talking to and I'd keep him informed of what was coming in to me, and when we had to come up [to the Hill] on anything important, he'd come down and come in, because he had the stature they liked."[19] Thus Lewis's standing with the Congress translated rapidly into considerable influence with the park service.

Master Planning, 1952-1954

By 1952 the lack of concrete proposals for a master plan was becoming disturbing. On July 31 Anderson, accompanied by Historian Riley, traveled to Richmond for a preliminary discussion of the master planning process with regional officials. Acting Regional Director E.M. Lisle summarized the meeting by stressing the importance of formulating a development outline, a statement of the policies on which the master plan would be based. Such an outline consisted of four sections: an introduction, incorporating a statement of significance and the general theme of development; general information; an operational prospectus; and an interpretation section. The latter had already been prepared. Those present then discussed ideas for the theme of development suggested by the staff at Independence. The group agreed that the development had four main objectives:

> a) to restore or develop and preserve specific historical structures and sites designated by the Congress in P.L. 795, or other Acts of Congress establishing national historic sites, b) to reconstruct selected structures [e.g. Library Hall or City Tavern] historically significant in the focal period for interpretation, 1774-1800; c) retain, rehabilitate and preserve other surviving structures of the period to the middle of the nineteenth

century; d) retain and rehabilitate, or construct, additional structures and landscaping features which will contribute to portraying the early urban atmosphere of the area. With the possible exception of the structures under point a) all buildings, except those used by the interpretive program, shall be put to a good functional use and, if possible, self-sustaining economically. It is not feasible to maintain a large number of historic house museums. 20

Obviously, at this juncture in the master planning process, Peterson's viewpoint had prevailed, even though he had yet to spell out its ramifications in the form of drawings. The development objectives not only called for preserving buildings erected between 1800 and 1850, but also for reinforcing the urban fabric with new construction. Furthermore, although assistance had been requested from the regional office, responsibility for drafting the master plan remained with Peterson as resident architect at Independence.

Preparing the master plan was more than a paper exercise. What was decided in the process would determine whether numerous individual structures within the park's boundaries would stand or be demolished. More surviving early buildings were being discovered as the historical and architectural research progressed. Some were readily recognizable presences in the urban landscape; others were hidden behind the accretion of later alterations. Each became the subject of intense, sometimes acrimonious debate. By the time a major master plan conference was scheduled in February 1953, much of the discussion centered on the fate of particular buildings.

The largest and most conspicuous of these were two mid-nineteenth century structures, the Jayne and Penn Mutual Buildings, located in the block bounded by Chestnut, Third, Second and Dock Streets. The first of these had caught the attention of Charles Peterson as early as his initial visit to Philadelphia in 1947. He had lobbied successfully in the Washington office to have it incorporated in the list of buildings to be preserved in the legislation

authorizing the Independence project. In 1950 and 1951 he had published two short articles in the Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians, giving a brief history of the building and indicating its significance as a prototype of the American skyscraper and possible inspiration to the young Louis Sullivan. In 1950 he also contributed a brief piece on the Penn Mutual Building to the same publication. He had addressed the issue of preserving important buildings of all periods in his January 1952 speech at the annual meeting of the Fairmount Park Art Assocation. At every opportunity he escorted visiting architects and architectural historians to see the two buildings. Peterson had also made his views known within the National Park Service. The buildings were shown as preserved on the sketch plan drawn at Demaray's request. In a report, which may have been prepared to accompany the sketch, he suggested potential architectural treatments and uses for the buildings. The street facades of both were to be restored. The land between would be filled in with new construction, which would "complete the architectural lines of the street," and provide needed parking. The design of the new buildings should be "quiet and business-like. The criterion [should be] harmony with the mid-nineteenth century structures without imitation of them." The park service would retain control over the design; the work would be paid for, and the buildings in front of the garage operated, by the Public Buildings Service [predecessor of the General Services Administration] as offices ancillary to those in the neighboring Custom House.[21]

Smaller eighteenth and early nineteenth-century buildings had been identified, most through visual observation and title research; others had been brought to the attention of the staff at Independence by Philadelphia antiquarians and the buildings' owners. In late 1951, for example, Reverend Allen Evans, rector of St. Peter's Church and president of the Independence Hall Neighborhood Association, wrote to M.O Anderson, requesting a meeting to discuss

the possibility of the National Park Service assuming responsibility for the Head House of the New Market at the corner of Second and Pine Streets. [22] Anderson consulted Conrad Wirth, who had just succeeded Demaray as director of the park service. Wirth suggested that Anderson encourage preservation of the Head House, but cautioned that the park service could not get involved. [23] At about the same time J. Somers Smith, Jr., assistant treasurer of the venerable Philadelphia Contributionship, wrote to Judge Lewis. He asked that Project B, the small mall running south from Walnut Street, be omitted from the park, or that its boundaries be altered, so that the company could retain ownership of and preserve an outbuilding, which later research proved to have been an early stable, on the rear of its lot.[24] Lewis turned the inquiry over to O'Brien, who informed Smith that his request was impossible, because the area was specified for acquisition in the legislation.[25] O'Brien's answer was technically correct, but did not address the question of the fate of the early building in park service stewardship.

In the case of another building closer to the Independence boundaries, the response was more positive. In August 1952, shortly after the meeting to discuss the master plan in Richmond, Morris W. Kolander, a lawyer for Bookbinder's Restaurant, wrote to Frances Wister, asking the help of the Philadelphia Society for the Preservation of Landmarks in determining the feasibility of preserving the Krider Gun Shop. The building, which belonged to his clients, had been condemned by the city.[26] Although the city's order for the building's demolition was purportedly based on its poor condition, other factors were influential. At the time, the city's plan for improving traffic circulation called for widening Second Street. The Krider Gun Shop stood at the corner of Second and Walnut Streets, close to the sites of the Slate Roof House and the City Tavern. Although the park as then proposed did not extend east of Second Street, this was well within Independence's sphere of influence.

Furthermore, Krider had been an important nineteenth-century Philadelphia gunsmith; the building that had housed his shop had been constructed in the mid-eighteenth century.

Thus, when Miss Wister turned to Independence for help, the park was quick to respond. Anderson wrote to Wirth, requesting that Harold L. Peterson be sent to Philadelphia to examine the structure.[27] Harold L. Peterson, unrelated to Charles E. Peterson, was the park service's specialist in early American weaponry, whose scholarship and expertise were recognized nationally. Harold Peterson was aware of Krider's importance, although he lacked details on the gunsmith's career. He immediately wrote to Samuel E. Smith, a Philadelphia collector, and other experts around the country, asking for information on Krider, and urging them to communicate with Bookbinder's about the importance of the site.[28] This was a property the park service was interested in acquiring, if the owners could be persuaded to donate it.

Other early buildings were identified by the Independence staff among the motley collection of structures along the north side of Walnut Street between Third and Fourth Streets, their lines partly masked by nineteenth-century storefronts and window alterations. A similar situation existed on Chestnut Street, where Charles Peterson suspected that New Hall and the Front Store, buildings constructed by the Carpenters' Company in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, had been incorporated in a commercial building on the west side of Carpenters' Court. At least a dozen eighteenth and early nineteenth century houses had been identified on land already acquired or proposed for acquisition in Area B.

The fate of most of these buildings was on the table at a major master plan conference held at Independence on February 5 and 6, 1953. Such full-dress debates were a vital component of the master plan process. Every step in the procedure was intended to permit the airing of opposing views and resolution of

conflicts. Thomas C. Vint, chief of Design and Construction, who had introduced and developed the master plan concept, was convinced that discussion and review at all levels were essential. "One complaint was that you have so many arguments about it; but that's the key to its success; you have all your arguments and clear them up; it isn't done piece by piece, but as a whole....It may be a little complex, but just as soon as you start to cut it down, you wind up with one more thing to do....There's such a feeling in the [park] service that everyone should be represented. You can't deny it on a master plan, because it affects them all."[29] The process was highly democratic, up to a point; once a consensus was reached, the dissenters were expected to maintain silence.

Edward Riley prepared for the February master plan conference by summarizing his thoughts in a long, confidential letter to Herbert Kahler, assistant chief historian. He welcomed the forthcoming conference because it seemed to him that "the planning is being done by individuals working alone, each in his own sphere, without much interchange of ideas....So far there has been no thorough airing of views and I can give you only a very incomplete picture since I have been unable to determine [Charles] Peterson's ideas on the subject."[30]

Riley listed four major viewpoints on development of the park, with the comment that Peterson's unknown ideas might constitute a fifth scheme. The four of which he was aware he categorized as "Raze and Reforest," "Dream of the Shrine Commission," "Living Museum of Philadelphia Architecture," and "Tool for Interpretation." The first two were closely akin, calling for extensive demolition and an open landscaped park. The difference was that the Grant Simon plan, which to Riley represented the second view, retained the street lines along Walnut and Chestnut Street by rebuilding or reconstructing "suitable houses." The third alternative seems to have been an exaggeration of Peterson's

position. Riley believed that it was favored by the City of Philadelphia as a model of how attractive a rejuvenated neighborhood could be, and that it would not constitute a national historical park, but rather a city improvement plan.

It was the fourth alternative that Riley favored. He visualized restoration of the historic buildings that were significant in the period from 1774 to 1800. To these would be added selected reconstructed period buildings to provide a "stage setting" as a proper ambience for the historic buildings. These would largely be along street lines with the interior of the blocks left open. The atmosphere would further be enhanced by landscaping, brick sidewalks, and period street lights, pumps, watch boxes, and other items of street furniture. Provisions for visitors would include a reception and interpretive center, perhaps in a reconstructed Norris's Row, "trailside exhibits" and rest stops, and one or more reconstructed taverns. Above all, he wished to communicate the ideas behind the park, rather than displaying its buildings as architectural specimens. "Finally," he wrote, "it is a historical park---its rich architectural features are a prime asset but only if they can be made subordinate to the main purpose of the Park, viz, bringing the American people in contact with tangible remains of the days when their country came into being and began to grow and necessary corollary, the interpretation of the great ideas which made this nation grow."[31]

The participants in the February planning conference were a who's who of the park service in 1953. A large contingent arrived from Washington, headed by Director Conrad L. Wirth. Wirth, son of a nationally known park planner and administrator, had trained as a landscape architect and practiced his profession in San Francisco and New Orleans before accepting employment with the federal government in 1928. He first worked as a landscape architect for the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, transferring to the National Park Service as assistant director in charge of the Branch of Land Planning in 1931. During

the 1930s he had supervised Civilian Conservation Corps work in the national and state parks. Although he had made his mark because of his administrative talents and his skill in dealing with Congress, he retained an abiding interest in park planning. Wirth was accompanied by two men on whose advice he relied in their respective fields, history and architecture, Ronald F. Lee, then holding the title of chief of Interpretation, and Thomas C. Vint, chief of Design and Construction. The Washington party was rounded out by Herbert Kahler, who had succeeded Lee as chief historian and Dick Sutton, who, as chief architect, was Vint's lieutenant. From Richmond came Elbert Cox, who had replaced Lisle as regional director, Edward S. Zimmer, trained as a landscape architect and then assistant regional director, and two other staff members, an architect and landscape architect. Several members of the Independence staff were also present, as were three outside architects, including Grant Simon.

The issues were not fully resolved. The group reached a consensus that the general theme of development for Independence would be the conditions that existed and the events that occurred in the period from 1774 to 1800. The statement was so broad, however, that continuing debate on how this was to be achieved was inevitable. Attention then turned to those individual buildings that had come to the fore during the previous year. The Kidd and McIlvaine Houses were elevated to protected status, although the architectural treatment of Walnut Street was reserved for further study. The desirability of including Krider's Gun Shop in the park had been generally accepted, and Wirth asked Anderson to pursue discussions with the owners about donating the property to the park service. The more thorny question of the Jayne and Penn Mutual Buildings defied a swift resolution. To maintain harmony, Wirth temporized by employing a device that had stood the park service in good stead in the past, the appointment of a temporary advisory committee. This special committee would study the signficance of the two buildings. He named Dr. Turpin C. Bannister,

dean of the School of Architecture at Alabama Polytechnic Institute, as chairman. Bannister, a distinguished and respected architect and architectural historian, had worked with the park service before on preservation issues both in his capacity as chairman of the American Institute of Architects Committee on Preservation of Historic Buildings and as first president of the Society of Architectural Historians. The committee of three would also include Grant Simon, representing the Independence advisory commission, and an architect to be named by the American Institute of Architects.

Further study by the park service staff would be devoted not only to the Walnut Street buildings, but also to the buildings west of Carpenter's Hall, and to the houses adjacent to the Irwin Insurance Building at 134 and 136-8 South Fourth Street. The staff would also study the reconstruction of Norris's Row, at the corner of Chestnut and Fifth Street in the light of two proposed uses: as an addition to Library Hall, to be reconstructed to house the library of the American Philosophical Society, or as an interpretive center. Any decision on Norris's Row, along with other more basic decisions on the master plan, would be held in abeyance pending completion of the historical staff's study of the feasibility of beginning the interpretive tour at a reconstructed City Tavern. Wirth gave the historians a March 1 deadline for completion of their report.

Most of the situations too complicated for resolution concerned Area A, the "main park." Other areas were more easily disposed of. The plan for Area E, the lands around Christ Church was approved, although it would later be reopened and the question of how much land should be acquired would remain unresolved for many years. So was the plan for Area C, Franklin Court, a simple, rather formal, landscape treatment, with the reservation that if archaeological investigation revealed the foundations of Franklin's house, these would be marked appropriately. The plan for Area B, the southern extension of the park,

was approved in principle, although the specifics were still to be determined.[32]

There was a flurry of activity in the aftermath of the master plan conference of February 5 and 6. Vint sent Peterson a tactful, but firm, suggestion that it was time to start preparing master plan drawings. He suggested that Peterson send the young architect he had hired as an assistant, Don Benson, to Washington for a brief indoctrination course in the preparation of master plans.[33] Anderson touched base with officials outside the park service, whose decisions would affect the appearance of the neighborhoods bordering Independence. He contacted representatives of both city and federal governments, urging the former to act on plans to impose zoning restrictions on the streetfront opposite Independence Mall and Area A of Independence National Historical Park, and the latter to encourage progress on the rehabilitation of buildings adjacent to Area B.[34] Meanwhile, Wirth, having consulted the American Institute of Architects, asked Milton Grigg, a distinguished restoration architect from Charlottesville, Virginia, to serve as the third man on the committee to study the Jayne and Penn Mutual Buildings.[35]

The committee of three duly met in Philadelphia on April 19, 1953. A month later Turpin Bannister, as chairman, submitted his report to Wirth. The committee had agreed unanimously, according to Bannister,

> that the day when interest in American culture stopped short in the middle of the nineteenth century and when recognition of architectural merit was accorded only through the Greek Revival period is now happily past. Our civilization has developed without interruption and the critical monuments which symbolize this continuity and evolution deserve sympathetic attention along with their more accepted predecessors. [36]

Following this premise the committee had also agreed that both the Penn Mutual and the Jayne Building represented "very significant" stages in the development of American architecture. Bannister continued his report with a

short, scholarly disquisition on the reasons for that significance. Finally, he dealt with something the committee actually had not been asked to consider, the question of whether the buildings should be preserved. He pointed out that earlier commercial buildings, the First and Second Banks and the Merchants Excahnge, were already slated for preservation, so that there would be no inconsistency in saving the later structures. Furthermore, aesthetically the buildings would serve as a buffer, an excellent transition between the enormous bulk of the modern Custom House and the smaller historical buildings in the park. On May 29 Wirth responded to Bannister, acknowledging the "excellent report." He went on to say that the "recommendation of the Committee to preserve the two buildings as exhibits in the historical park has my approval, and the development plans for the area will be prepared accordingly."[37]

It seemed that the device of appointing an outside committee to defuse controversy over the two buildings had succeeded, but it soon became apparent that this was not the case. Far from settling the question, the Bannister report proved to be only the opening salvo in a battle over the buildings that would continue for three years. The first retort came from a member of the ad hoc committee, Grant Simon. Speaking not only for himself, but probably also for Judge Lewis, Simon submitted a minority report, differing in almost every respect from the views expressed by Bannister. While acknowledging that preservation of the buildings should be given "some consideration," this goal should "not in any way interfere with the objectives of the development of the National Park." It was clear that to Simon the preservation question had been given some consideration and found wanting. He held that the buildings were of interest only to "students of architecture and building techniques," and that the information that could be derived from them could be readily recorded in the form of measured drawings, models and perhaps some salvaged building fragments. Simon not only denigrated the importance of the buildings; he also held that if

allowed to remain they "could appear incongrous and confusing to those millions of people who will be pilgrims to what they hold to be hallowed ground." In addition he claimed that their preservation would be costly.[38]

Simon also wrote to Bannister, alleging that the committee had not gone so far as to recommend preservation of the building. He reminded Bannister that the committee had noted a number of other structures that were of interest to scholars. In somewhat sarcastic, but succinct, terms, he went on to set forth the basic view of those opposed to any but the most outstanding monuments associated with the historic events that had taken place at Independence.

> In fact, there is hardly a building in this neighborhood that lacks either an historical, architectural or whimsical aspect of some interest. The preservation of these buildings would logically result in the maintenance by the Federal Government of a museum of architectural and literary curiosities.
>
> In the latter part of the 18th century, the principal part of the city covered about one half square mile. This was the scene of events of cataclysmic importance to the whole world, as well as to our country. So, the characteristics of the architecture are, by comparison, of minor importance. This is not a program to preserve Georgian or any other particular kind of architecture, or building techniques, but an attempt to present to the public evidences of the events that led to the founding of the nation.
>
> It is not an easy task. We already, have the problem of rationalizing the preservation, within the area of both the Second Bank and the Merchant's Exchange. It seems that much more important not to further confound the issue with an architectural program of period preservation. 39

Although the last official word from the park service was still Wirth's response to Bannister that the preserved buildings would be incorporated in the master plan, Wirth let it be known internally after receipt of Simon's letter that his final determination in the matter would be contingent on still further study. Furthermore, the opponents of preservation had won a strong supporter, Superintendent M.O. Anderson. In January 1954 the Society of Architectural Historians would hold their annual national meeting in Philadelphia. One of the events was a walking tour of the park area, for which Charles Peterson, a recent

past president of the organization, would act as guide. On January 12 Anderson summarized his attitudes in a memorandum to Peterson, after a series of discussions between the two men. In fairly stiff language he told Peterson that "it is considered imperative that every precaution be taken to avoid arousing or influencing interest or action among individuals or groups outside the Service" on either side of the issue, which might "embarrass" the director or the park service. When Wirth had made his decision it would be "his sole prerogative to solicit such outside support for his position as he may deem advisable."[40] In the light of subsequent events, it seems unlikely that Anderson's gag order had much effect. In any case, most of the members of the society were well aware of Peterson's views on the two buildings. He had already given verbal and written testimony of his belief in their importance, including articles in the Society's Journal.

Meanwhile, Peterson was preparing to defend two older buildings within Area A, New Hall and the Front Store, along the west side of Carpenters' Court. Peterson had dealt briefly with these ancillary buildings in an article published in 1953 in a special issue of the Transactions of the American Philosophical Society devoted to Philadelphia's historic architecture.[41] Since both had been altered, it would require more intensive documentary research and examination of the physical fabric of the buildings to determine how much original work had survived. Peterson assigned the study to a young architectural student from the University of Pennsylvania, James C. Massey.

Massey had been hired at Independence for the summer of 1953 to work as a member of a Historic American Buildings Survey team. The Historic American Buildings Survey, generally known simply as HABS, was a program designed by Peterson and first put into effect in 1933. Intended to provide a permanent archive of historic American architecture through documentation and recording, it also served the purpose, during the Depression years, of providing emergency

relief work for architects and draftsmen. HABS became a permanent program of the National Park Service under authority of the Historic Sites Act of 1935, and continued to flourish through the 1930s. With the coming of World War II HABS, like so many park service activities, virtually lapsed. Peterson, however, remained convinced of its enormous value. Studying a building in sufficient detail to make accurate measured drawings was, in his view, the best method of understanding how it had been designed and constructed and what changes had been made to its fabric. In addition, the process of studying and recording a building was superb training for young architects. At Independence Peterson saw an opportunity for revivifying HABS. Measured drawings would certainly be required for buildings that were to be restored, because they would form the basis for construction documents. Student teams, working under the direction of a team leader who combined architectural experience with historical knowledge, could make the drawings with relative speed and at low cost.

The first HABS team worked at Independence in the summer of 1951 under the direction of William M. Campbell. A senior member of the architectural faculty at the University of Pennsylvania, Campbell was also an antiquarian by avocation. He was a first-class draftsman, and especially skilled at rendering. Campbell could produce beautiful pencil or watercolor perspectives that could provide a graphic illustration to the layman of what a building would look like after restoration. After retiring from the University of Pennsylvania he became a permanent member of the staff at Independence, first on the architectural and later on the historical staff. The 1952 HABS team was headed by Ernest Allen Connally, who held an undergraduate degree in architecture from the University of Texas and a doctorate in architectural history from Harvard University. Connally would later become an associate director of the National Park Service, with reponsibility for all activities in the fields of preservation, historic

architecture, history and archeology. Many of the students who participated in the HABS program at Independence also became leaders in the preservation field, especially in the heady decade that followed passage of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. James C. Massey eventually became chief of HABS, after it was once again funded as a regular program of the park service in 1957, and subsequently a vice-president of the National Trust for Historic Preservation. William J. Murtagh, who served on HABS teams in 1952 and 1954, became the first Keeper of the National Register of Historic Places and also, subsequently, a vice-president of the National Trust. Several well-known restoration architects first dealt with historic buildings while working for HABS at Independence, among them John Milner, Nathaniel Neblett, Robert Raley and John Waite.

The work of the students hired through HABS often went well beyond the preparation of measured drawings. Thus when Massey was assigned the study of Carpenters' Court, he was directed to prepare a full history of the court and its buildings, based on documentary research, much of it already assembled by the historians, and on thorough investigation of the physical evidence. His report would include not only measured drawings of the buildings as they then stood, but also reconstruction drawings of their appearance in the historic period.

The Carpenters' Court study was not yet complete when the first draft of the master plan began to take final form in early 1954. The drawings for the plan were prepared not by Peterson's office, but by a team from Region I in Richmond. By this time Peterson's reluctance to produce drawings had become apparent. To break the logjam, Vint ordered the assistant regional director, Edward Zimmer, to prepare the plans. From this time forward Zimmer would be in charge of master planning for Independence. Zimmer came up to Philadelphia in 1953 accompanied by Hodge Hanson, a senior landscape architect in the Richmond

office. The two reviewed the work that had been done, obtained whatever drawings were available, and returned to Richmond. There Hanson, assisted by Edward Peetz, Robert Steenhagen, and Edward Clancy, produced the first set of official master plan drawings.[42]

Preliminary drawings were reviewed at conferences at Independence on February 23-25 and March 15-16 and submitted as recommended by the superintendent on March 25, 1954. The most detailed drawing in the set dealt with how the park should be developed for interpretive purposes.[43] Since the main focus of interest, Independence Hall, was located at the western end of the park the master plan called for a reception center at the east. This would encourage visitors to see other buildings in the park first, "reserving Independence Hall as the climax."[44] The drawing thus shows the reception center at a reconstructed City Tavern, where visitors would be provided with background information on Independence, and a museum in the Merchants' Exchange, where an orientation program would be available. From there visitors would follow the basic tour to Carpenters' Hall, the Independence Square group, and the First and Second Banks. A more extended tour would lead visitors to the Free Quaker Meeting House, Christ Church Burying Ground, the Arch Street Meeting, Franklin Court, the Bishop White, McIlvaine and Todd Houses, and St. Mary's Church. Fifteen interpretive stations were planned, although it was not clear whether all were to be manned. Two of these, City Tavern and the Merchants' Exchange, would dispense general information; the others would develop specific aspects of the park's story. Carpenter's Hall would be devoted to the First Continental Congress. At the Independence Hall group visitors were expected to proceed through all the buildings, from east to west. In Old City Hall (then referred to as the Supreme Court, because of its function during the Federal period) they would receive information and orientation about the whole Independence Hall group. There would be more detail on the history of

Independence Hall in its east wing and then visitors would move on to the Hall itself. The west wing would serve as the information center for Congress Hall and the Federal period. The Second Bank would be devoted to interpretation of the Bank War of 1837, and the First Bank to the beginnings of national banking. In addition to these major themes, the sites on the extended tour would explore such topics as the history of the Quakers, in general terms and in the context of Philadelphia, the relationship of Christ Church to the struggle for independence, and Benjamin Franklin's contributions to that struggle. It was an ambitious, if not particularly imaginative, scheme. It was also, for the times, somewhat unrealistic. Operating funds for the entire park service for fiscal year 1955 were under $20 million. It was highly unlikely that in the foreseeable future Independence could employ enough ranger-historians to mount and operate so grandiose a program.

In contrast, the plans for physical development were relatively modest. Carpenters' Hall stood in lonely splendor, with no buildings flanking its court. On Walnut Street between Third and Fourth Streets, there were only four houses, with gardens between them. There was ample greenery around the City Tavern, and a parking lot on the oddly-shaped site where the Jayne Building and Penn Mutual stood. The chief landscape feature was trees in thick profusion. There were stands of trees around all the buildings and a grove in the middle of Dock Street. A great rectangle of lawn was placed at the rear of the Second Bank. Independence Square was shown as restored, with the serpentine walks of the 1785 plan.[45]

The February and March conferences were by no means the last opportunity for comment on the proposed master plan. Through the spring of 1954, as the drawings circulated through the various park service offices, numerous opinions were aired. Peterson led off on March 23. Some of his comments were technical, concerning, for example, the omission of the New Jersey Turnpike from the index

sheet. At least one was substantive, his objection to the tree plantings in Dock Street.[46] He followed up on April 15 with another memorandum to M.O. Anderson on the buildings he had been defending since the inception of the project, reiterating his opinion and that of Turpin Bannister that the Jayne and Penn Mutual Buildings, as well as New Hall and the Front Store should be preserved.[47] Anderson transmitted this memo to the regional director on the following day, making his contrary opinion clear. Referring to himself in the third person, he wrote:

> While recognizing the relative architectural interest and significance of the Jayne and Penn Mutual buildings, and without consideration of the cost factor involved in the rehabilitation and permanent future operation and maintenance of them if retained, it remains the opinion of the Superintendent that their preservation is inconsistent with the basic Theme of Development recommended March 25, and not required or desirable in relation to the proposed future interpretation program and administration of the Park. 48

Anderson's views evidently found a sympathetic ear in the regional office. Historian J. W. Holland tersely summed up the prevailing attitude. "It should be decided (or maybe has been) whether Independence NHPP should commemorate the Declaration of Independence and the early Federal Period or the development of architecture. Once the policy has been set (if it hasn't already) the answer to this is rather obvious."[49] In making this comment, Holland was voicing what had been the prevailing park service attitude toward historic sites since the 1930s. Such sites primarily were worth preserving not because of any aesthetic merit, but because of their commemorative and didactic value. The chief purpose in displaying them to the public was to interpret, or teach, a lesson about the events that had taken place at the site, or the broad themes in American history they exemplified. To do this they should be accurately restored. If they were aesthetically pleasing, so much the better, but this was only the icing on the cake of historical significance.

While the internal debates about the master plan went forward, external pressures began to be felt at Independence. As demolition proceeded in the block between Third and Fourth Streets and restoration plans for the surviving buildings matured, a number of proposals for new uses within the park surfaced. It might be said that outside forces would influence the development of Independence more directly in the next few years than would the yet to be completed master plan. One of the first to approach the park with a proposal for new construction was Isidor Ostroff, who had been one of the early advocates of creating the park. Pointing out that Catholic and Protestant interests were represented at Independence through the cooperative agreements with Christ Church and St. Mary's, Ostroff suggested the reconstruction of Mikveh Israel Synagogue within the park boundaries to interpret the contribution of the Jewish religion and the Jewish people to the founding of the country. It was a thorny question. The park service had already encouraged a private institution, the American Philosophical Society, to reconstruct Library Hall on federal land. What other groups might also be allowed to occupy federal property? Wirth dealt with the issue at a meeting of Independence's advisory commission in May 1954. He pointed out several differences between Mikveh Israel and the other instances cited by Ostroff. The churches were existing buildings and neither was actually within the park boundary. The American Philosophical Society as an institution had an extremely close relationship with the events related to the park's story. Its intent was to rebuild a building that had historically stood on the Fifth Street site; in contrast, the eighteenth-century synagogue had been located well north of Independence. While it was clear that Wirth did not think Ostroff's idea should be encouraged, he did point out that it brought up a basic and important policy question about the use of land or buildings within the proposed park by non-governmental agencies.[50]

At about the same time that Ostroff was making his controversial proposal

another organization approached the park service with a suggestion that was more favorably received. The Company of Military Historians contacted Charles Peterson, expressing interest in establishing a military museum at Independence.[51] Anderson forwarded the information to Wirth, suggesting that such a project might be accommodated in the buildings on Walnut Street, or, even more appropriately, in the buildings on Carpenters' Court, which had been the first home of the War Department during the Federal period.[52] A few months later a third organization, the Pennsylvania Horticultural Society, also requested space in the park. Clearly a policy on tenancy would be required.[53]

Developments within the National Park Service would also have an impact on the planning for Independence. By 1954 Conrad Wirth had been director of the park service for two years, and was beginning to formulate plans to poise the agency for a dramatic reversal of the lingering post-war austerity under which it had been operating. One step he took was a reorganization creating additional regional offices. Effective January 1, 1955, the responsibilities hitherto carried by Region I in Richmond, Virginia, would be divided between regions in Atlanta, Georgia, and Philadelphia. The region housed in Philadelphia would be Region V and woud cover the northeast. The design and construction activities of the park service, then centralized in Washington, would be split between two offices, one in the west and one in the east. The latter, the Eastern Office of Design and Construction (EODC), would be accommodated, along with the new Region V's offices, somewhere within the park. EODC was established in Philadelphia by July 1954 and assumed primary responsibility for coordinating the master planning function. Peterson was reassigned from his position as resident architect at Independence to the new office. He would hold the title of supervising architect, historic structures, with oversight of all park service restoration projects in the east, but would

have no responsibility for master plans, including that for Independence.

In the meantime, although the question of use or participation in construction by outsiders had not been resolved, discussion of the master plan went forward. By mid-May of 1954 the drawings and narrative had been fleshed out with preliminary Project Construction Proposals (PCPs). The architectural data had been prepared under the direction of Peterson in his last months on the Independence staff; estimates for the landscaping came from the regional office. The grand total for landscape features and buildings shown on the master plan drawings came to approximately $6.7 million, a sum whose modesty can only be judged in light of the fact that rehabilitation of buildings was estimated at $.80 per square foot and full scale restoration at $2.00 per square foot, with a 20% contingency. In addition, there was a shopping list of items still subject to discussion, most of which were recommended by Peterson. These included reconstruction of the kitchen wing of the Bishop White House; rehabilitation of buildings on Walnut Street; reconstruction of New Hall and the Front Store; retention of the Jayne and Penn Mutual Buildings; restoration of Krider's Gun Shop; removal of John's Tailor Shop to Locust Street and rehabilitation as small employee quarters (estimated to cost under $10,000); and construction, of a garage and storage building in Marshall's Court, and a general purpose auditorium at the corner of Chestnut and Fifth Streets. The bill for these "extras" was estimated at $3 million.[54]

With submission of the preliminary PCPs, the master planning process of 1954 was ready for final review. Wirth approved most of the drawings on May 21. The sole exception was the area around Christ Church, where questions about just how much land the park service should acquire remained. He did not, however, approve the introduction because it appeared "to leave the door too wide open for reconstruction, rehabilitation, and construction of any features considered to be in harmony with the historic period."[55] Obviously Wirth was leaning

more toward the Shrines Commission concept of a cleared area with a few historic buildings remaining than to the retention of an urban fabric advocated by Peterson. Nevertheless, even in approving most aspects of the plan, he made it clear that numerous questions remained. Stressing that the plans were still general in nature, he deferred any decision on the Jayne and Penn Mutual Buildings, and on Carpenters' Court. The determination of appropriate usage was still troublesome. Noting that space must be found for a headquarters for the park, as well as for the regional office and for the Eastern Office of Design and Construction, he recommended further study of whether a visitor center should be located in a new parking structure or in the Merchants' Exchange. The incidence of requests from organizations for space at Independence was, in fact, the primary reason he gave for disapproval of the introduction. The policy to which he objected might make it impossible to refuse applications from organizations that applied to reconstruct buildings of the appropriate period, resulting in additions that might compromise the significance of the area. A tenancy policy was needed that would restrict organizations to occupancy of buildings that were being preserved for the proper interpretation of the park.[56]

Independence responded quickly to the points raised by Wirth. A revision was proposed for the general theme of development, the section of the introduction to which Wirth had objected. It set forth a development philosophy considerably more restrictive temporally and interpretively than the original draft.

> The general theme of development is to interpret the story of independence and the establishment and early development of the United States in the period from 1774 to 1800, and to restore, reconstruct, construct, and preserve structures and landscape features necessary and appropriate for this interpretation. Any other factors shall be incidental to and should not conflict with or intrude upon this basic theme.
>
> Any structure or landscape features provided within the area shall be either of historical importance which must or should be retained or which

> are provided as necessary, desirable, or permissible in the design and public use or the area, or which are required or desirable for Park interpretive and administrative purposes. 57

Any rationale for preserving such buildings as the Jayne and Penn Mutual had been eliminated from the statement of purpose. Nor was there any mention of the preservation of old structures or construction of new ones that would identify Independence as a park in the midst of a city. The course of the park as one which would commemorate events had been set, although the last controversy over the issue had not yet been heard.

Park staff also made an attempt to define the conditions under which outside organizations might occupy park facilities. Anderson submitted a memorandum in July, which started with a list of twenty-two organizations that had already demonstrated interest or might be expected to have some interest in locations within the park. The Carl Schurz Memorial Foundation, still occupying part of the Second Bank, and the American Philosophical Society, were already on the ground. In addition to Mikveh Israel, the Company of Military Historians and the Horticultural Society of Pennsylvania, five other groups had made approaches of varying degrees of formality to the park service: the Garden Clubs of America, the Daughters of the American Revolution, the Lincoln Civil War Society of Philadelphia, the Protestant Episcopal Church Historical Society, and the Philadelphia City Archives. Of these, only the last had the unqualified support of the park staff. The city's Department of Records, established under a new city charter, had embarked on a long-term program of classifying, cataloguing, and arranging for proper storage of the city's rich archival material. To the park historians, who had struggled for four years to untangle the Independence story from a mass of unsorted material, this must have been a most welcome boon. A location for the early records close to Independence would be both appropriate and convenient.

The next question was where the City Archives or any other organization

might be housed. Old City Hall, of course, embodied the most direct historical connection for the archives. However, it was not considered adaptable for the use, because it was not fireproof, and in any case was thought to be too valuable to the interpretive program to be dispensed with. The recommended site for the archives was the Second Bank, although no real thought had been devoted to its architectural suitability for the use. This would mean dispossessing the Carl Schurz Foundation, but under the recommended policy of allowing occupancy only to those institutions whose history and purposes related directly to the period 1774-1800, it would not qualify anyway. Nor, under a strict interpretation of the policy would the other organizations that had expressed interest. Furthermore, the only other buildings that the park staff believed could be available for such purposes were the Kidd and McIlvaine Houses, and those they thought were more desirable as quarters for senior personnel.[58]

The revised draft of the general theme of development and the recommended policy on occupancy by outside groups represented a hardening of attitude toward buildings that were not within the strict time frame chosen for interpretation or that had only a peripheral relationship to the events that had taken place in the Revolutionary or Federal periods. Had the Kidd and McIlvaine Houses not already been approved for preservation, it is uncertain that they would have passed muster if measured against so strict a standard. If the policy were to be adopted, any rationale for preserving the Jayne and Penn Mutual Buildings, or even the earlier Front Store would certainly be discredited. Other buildings beginning to attract the attention of architects and architectural historians would receive even shorter shrift. This was certainly the case with Frank Furness's Guarantee Trust (Tradesmen's Bank), on Chestnut Street along the east side of Carpenters' Court. Agnes Gilchrist, an architectural historian and authority on William Strickland, who had been retained to work on a history of the Merchants' Exchange, called the building to Riley's attention in the spring

of 1954, citing it as a masterpiece of nineteeth-century American architecture, and noting that buildings such as the Second Bank and the Merchants' Exchange had been erected after 1800.[59] Saving the building was supported by some of the younger members of the staff, but their opinions were not solicited and would not have been heeded.[60] Anderson, indeed, dismissed the suggestion out of hand, citing the 1800 cut-off date. The Merchants' Exchange and the Second Bank, he noted, were being preserved because they were specifically named in the legislation authorizing the park, leaving the inference that even they might not have survived under the current policy.[61] Two smaller buildings, identified through research carried out by William J. Murtagh under Peterson's direction, also failed to arouse interest. These were early nineteenth-century houses at 269 and 271 South Fifth Street, one, with an oval stairway of considerable beauty, built for Thomas McKean, Jr. c. 1816, the other built for Dr. William Currie c. 1811.[62]

Through the fall of 1954 the park service continued to wrestle with the problem of utilization of the buildings at Independence. Assistant Director Thomas Allen wanted to know just what the plans were for the fourteen buildings, three in Area A and eleven in Area B, designated as staff quarters.[63] Wirth finally responded to Anderson's July memorandum in October. He too raised the question of the use of historic buildings, especially in Area A, as employees' quarters. Most of his comments, however, were directed to the use of park properties by outside organizations. The Washington office was far more sympathetic to the concept of such use than the park staff. "While the selection of suitable organizations may be a difficult one, we believe it worth while to get appropriate organizations to take over the rehabilitation, maintenance and use of certain structures." Appropriate organizations would be those established by 1800, or those whose historical interests meshed with the period represented by Independence, such as the Daughters of the American

Revolution. Wirth was also loath to disturb existing relationships. He pointed out that the park service had an obligation to the Carl Schurz Foundation, which had helped to restore the Second Bank and had maintained it for a number of years. He also hoped to encourage the tenant of the First Bank, the City Trust, to remain, so that the building would simply be continued in its historic use. If that proved futile, the First Bank might be a suitable location for the Philadelphia City Archives. Finally, extreme caution would be necessary in negotiations with organizations that might wish to restore existing buildings or construct new ones. In addition to the Company of Military Historians' interest in New Hall, the Assistant Secretary of the Navy had recently submitted plans to reconstruct it as a memorial to the United States Marine Corps, a project for which the Bok Foundation had already donated $70,000. It was too early to deal with such proposals because planning for the park had not been completed; the planning function for the park and for individual projects must remain under park service control and could not be "farmed out" to organizations.[64]

These ideas were incorporated in the tenancy policy that was finally approved early in 1955. Organizations occupying buildings within the park would be those specified by law, such as the Carpenters' Company, or those founded before 1800, or whose primary purpose was to commemorate the events of 1774-1800. No organization could construct a historical or memorial building of its own design; its assistance (presumably financial) in reconstruction could be considered, but only for buildings called for by the master plan and designed by the National Park Service. Further, organizations would have to demonstrate financial stability and competence to exhibit their buildings to the public in a manner to be determined by the park service.[65] Over the years the policy on park service control over planning and design would be maintained; the policy on what organizations might occupy the builings would be applied more flexibly, as it suited the park's needs and wishes.

With the new year the cast of players at Independence was augmented by the arrival of the personnel of the new Region V, the Mid-Atlantic office of the National Park Service. Daniel Tobin, a former assistant regional director in Richmond came up to Philadelphia as director. Tobin had worked his way up through the National Park Service ranks, starting as a clerk in the west. There were few functions in park management that Tobin had not handled, and few incidents unfamiliar to his experience. His quiet manner must have been a calming influence in the sometimes volatile atmosphere of Independence.[66] His assistant was George A. Palmer. Palmer, along with Ronald Lee and Herbert Kahler, was one of the group of young University of Minnesota historians who had joined the National Park Service in the 1930s. He had served as superintendent at the Statue of Liberty and as the first superintendent of Hyde Park, Franklin Roosevelt's home, before assuming his post in Philadelphia.[66] He would remain as the assistant regional director for almost two decades, a participant in and keen observer of planning and development at Independence. Also moved to Philadelphia from Richmond, and transferred from the regional staff to the Eastern Office of Design and Construction, was Hodge Hanson, the landscape architect who had supervised preparation of the 1954 master plan drawings. Others on the staff of regional landscape architects were Harvey Cornell and Eugene DeSilets, who would play key roles in the development of subsequent versions of the master plan for Independence.

The Eastern Office of Design and Construction, with considerable input from the regional and park staff, would carry the burden of producing the master plan from this point forward. The head of the office was Edward Zimmer, known to his colleagues as "The Baron." Zimmer, a landscape architect, had entered the park service at Yorktown, Virginia, in 1931, hired by Charles Peterson, whose boss he had now become. Although he usually remained somewhat aloof from the details of producing drawings, he retained a lively interest in design details. There was

always a roll of yellow tracing paper handy in his desk drawer. This would be pulled out whenever Zimmer disagreed with some aspect of a drawing, so that he could communicate his own ideas in the form of rapid sketches, traced over the offending original.[68]

Technically, according to the table of organization, Peterson, as supervising architect, historic structures, was supposed to report to John "Bill" Cabot, chief architect in the Eastern Office of Design and Construction. It was an arrangement Peterson never fully accepted.[69] In practice Peterson could always go directly to Zimmer or to Thomas Vint, chief of the Division of Design and Construction in the Washington office, or even to Director Conrad Wirth. The relationships among the "old boys", who had been in the park service since the 1920s and 1930s were close. These men shared a knowledge of one another's strengths and weaknesses, and a memory of the days when, as the National Park Service expanded rapidly, they, as very young men, assumed enormous responsibilities. Zimmer never forgot that it was Peterson who had hired him. Vint, who had given Peterson his first park service job, continued to regard him as a protegé.[70] Wirth had also known Peterson since the '30s and respected his opinions, even when he disagreed with them. In any event, Wirth, although he still considered himself a landscape architect, and played an active role in master plan review, depended heavily on Vint's advice and rarely tried to second guess him. Indeed, there were cases in which Wirth would request that a plan be changed, see the alterations made on paper, and then on a field visit realize that Vint had had the project executed in the way he wanted it in the first place.[71] Thus, although the reorganization technically reduced Peterson's role in the master planning process, his opinions would still be heard. His continued advocacy of saving more buildings than were slated for preservation would receive consideration at the highest level, although there was certainly no guarantee that his views would prevail.

Through much of 1955, planning activity centered on revision of proposals for Area A, the "east mall" encompassing the blocks between Chestnut and Walnut and Second and Fifth Streets. The revised master plan, issued in draft form in July, showed office facilities at the Second Bank, with proposed offices for the park, region and EODC at the Merchants' Exchange, where they would share space with a visitors' center. Interpretation was viewed as a particularly difficult problem. As had been noted from the first, visitors tended to come straight to Independence Hall and the Liberty Bell, and exhibited little interest in seeing the rest of the park. Thus a visitors' center at the eastern end was of the utmost importance, as a means of attracting visitors through the entire area. Pedestrian circulation was cited as another problem, impeded as it was by the heavy traffic on the north-south streets. The suggestion was to depress Third, Fourth and Fifth Streets, a solution that never received serious consideration, probably because of cost. The Walnut Street houses were identified as "excellent landscape elements," harmonizing well with the historic buildings.[72] The revised drawing for Area A reflected the uses described in the narrative, and showed a parking garage on the site occupied by the Jayne and Penn Mutual Buildings. There were fewer trees around the buildings and the grove in Dock Street had disappeared.[73]

Up to this point master planning had been a paper exercise. There was not even enough money to accomplish the portion of the program for demolition that had been universally agreed to. Most of the available funds came from the "Use and Special Receipt Account." This account, set up by a special act of Congress in 1951, permitted Independence to use rents from buildings already acquired by the park service, but still occupied by tenants, for maintaining and operating the buildings, and demolishing them as the leases expired.[74] Otherwise, although Congress had appropriated money for acquisition and small amounts for operations, it had provided no funds for development. This sorry financial

situation was not unique to Independence. The National Park Service as a whole was not receiving enough funding to maintain the park system, much less develop new areas. At the end of the Depression, in 1940, the National Park Service had available annually, including Civilian Conservation Corps funds, $33,577,000. With wartime cutbacks these funds were drastically reduced, sinking to a low of $4,740,000 in 1945. Gradually funds were restored, but by 1955, with twenty more areas to administer and trebled visitation, the total annual appropriation for the park service was only $32,525,000. True this was only $1 million less than in 1940, but considering wartime and postwar inflation, it was actually a substantial reduction in funds. Furthermore in 1940, after eight years of intensive activity, largely paid for by Depression-era work relief programs, the parks had been in excellent condition. By 1955, after fifteen years of neglect, they were in a shabby, perhaps even dangerous, state. Conditions were so bad that conservation writer Bernard DeVoto suggested that half the parks should be closed, with the available funds allocated to those that would remain open. An article Harper's Magazine, reprinted in the widely-read Reader's Digest, which included quotes from Wirth, proclaimed the parks to be a health hazard, because sanitary conditions could not be maintained.[75]

Wirth, a planner and a builder, found the situation frustrating. He remembered the accomplishments of the 1930s, when he was in charge of dispensing the emergency relief funds that had fueled the development of the national parks, and many state parks as well, into a first-rate system. In those days it had seemed as if he had a bottomless bucket of money next to his desk, into which he could dip to pay for worthwhile projects. Now much of the work had been undone by time and neglect. Early in 1955 Wirth conceived an ambitious remedy. Small increases in appropriations, wrung from a reluctant Congress year by year, would never enable the park service to catch up, much less to grow. The answer might be a bold long-term program to bring the entire park system up

to a standard of excellence. In early February Wirth presented his idea to his branch chiefs, who received it with enthusiasm. Special committees were established quickly to plan the program. One of their earliest decisions was selection of a title for the effort, a title that would both rivet the attention and summarize the purpose. The choice was Mission 66. It referred to the park service's sense of mission about the program and, with the effort slated to begin in 1956, defined the ten-year span needed to complete it. The National Park Service would also celebrate its golden anniversary in 1966, a suitable occasion to mark with completion of a revivified park system. As Wirth had hoped, Mission 66 captured the imagination and support of both the Eisenhower administration and Congress. Over the ten-year period park service operating funds increased 200 per cent, while capital improvement funds increased 136 per cent.[76]

Of course, continuing support for the increased appropriations would be necessary. One of the key figures in assuring that support was Representative Mike Kirwan, chairman of the House Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations and second-ranking member of the full Committee on Appropriations. Wirth succeeded in convincing Kirwan, who came from Ohio, and whose speech carried the lilt of his Irish ancestry, of the importance of the ongoing program. Independence provided at least one opportunity for cementing Kirwan's allegiance to the park service. Early in Wirth's directorship, Kirwan called him to ask a favor. Kirwan had an old friend, a man with whom, as a boy, he had walked the railroad tracks, scavenging the lumps of coal that fell from the trains. Kirwan had risen through politics; his friend was a laborer. Now he lived in Philadelphia and needed a job. Wirth called Anderson, who had no berth on the park staff to offer. He did succeed, however, in writing a contract with Kirwan's friend to provide janitorial services for one of the not-yet-demolished office buildings the park owned and was leasing to tenants. The man proved to be an

extraordinarily efficient worker, and the arrangement was entirely satisfactory to all concerned. Wirth took the opportunity to ask Kirwan to join some of the Washington staff on an inspection trip to Philadelphia. The Congressman could see for himself what was going on in the most historical of the nation's parks, and at the same time visit with his old friend. The Washington party took a suite at the old Benjamin Franklin Hotel, a few blocks from Independence Hall, and invited Kirwan's friend to join them for dinner. The occasion was a great success. As the evening progressed, and the drinks flowed, Kirwan and his friend entertained the party with Irish songs. Finally, around midnight, some of the park service men carefully placed Kirwan's friend on a streetcar that would pass his house, giving the conductor instructions to be sure that he got off at the right stop.[77] The incident was undoubtedly helpful in establishing the warm rapport between Wirth and Kirwan that would last for almost a decade.

Planning for Mission 66, 1955-1956

In November 1955 Regional Director Daniel J. Tobin explained the effect of the Mission 66 program to the park's advisory commission. Judge Lewis was indignant. Philadelphians, he protested, had no intention of waiting ten years for the completion of the Independence project. He also complained about the slow pace of demolition. Anderson patiently explained that demolition could not proceed until leases expired and that in any event, there were no funds available except from rentals. Lewis suggested, and the commission agreed, that the commissioners should go directly to Congress for special funding outside of the normal budgeting process. Lewis and some other members of the commission were also highly critical of proposals to save or reconstruct buildings that were being made in the course of the master planning process.

John P. Hallahan, the Carpenters' Company representative, opposed the idea, which had surfaced, of rebuilding the Pemberton and Fawcitt Houses on either side of the Chestnut Street entrance to Carpenters' Court. He cited the old fear of potential fire hazards as a reason for total clearance around Carpenters' Hall. Dennis Kurjack supported Hallahan's point of view, saying that the houses had no historical significance. So did commission member Albert M. Greenfield, the realtor, who commented that the Court would be better off without them. Lewis did not participate in the discussion of Carpenters' Court, but saved his fire for the end of the meeting. He then made a statement expressing his concern about the basic concepts for developing the park. It had come to his attention that a certain group of architects and "architectural interests" were recommending retention of the Jayne and Penn Mutual Buildings, the Tradesmen's Bank, and other structures not related to the historical focal period of the park, and, in effect, were encouraging the creation of an architectural museum within the park. (It could hardly have escaped his attention, since the issue had been on the table since the preparation of the Shrines Commission's report in 1947.) Lewis maintained that preservation of these buildings would be directly contrary to the purposes expressed in the Shrines Commission's report and to the Act of Congress authorizing development of the park. Most of his colleagues agreed. Hallahan commented that what was wanted was a park, not a curiosity shop. The buildings had only one defender, the architect Sydney Martin. The meeting concluded with Lewis requesting Grant Simon, who was acting as an unpaid architectural consultant to the commission, to prepare a report and draft a resolution. The resolution put the commission on record as holding that the park area should include only such existing or reconstructed structures as were in existence before 1800, and which possessed "adequate" historical or political significance connected with the colonial or Federal period. All others would be demolished. Sydney Martin finally

consented reluctantly, providing that the Jayne and Penn Mutual Buildings were thoroughly recorded before demolition.[78]

Although the fate of several of the buildings at Independence had been debated for almost eight years, it had been simple to defer decisions, as long as there were no funds available. Independence would receive only a small share of the moneys appropriated for Mission 66 in the program's first few years because repair of some of the older parks had a higher priority. Nevertheless the certainty that funds would begin to flow to Independence within a relatively short time meant that the issues would have to be resolved. Accordingly, early in 1956 Anderson suggested some solutions. He based his ideas on the adopted policy on tenancy and on the advisory commission's resolution. Unhesitatingly he first tackled the largest issue, the question of the Penn Mutual and the Jayne Buildings. For the former he recommended demolition, after recording and salvage, to make way for a parking area or garage. The adjoining buildings were slated for demolition in June, and it would be more economical to clear the entire group at once. On the Jayne Building Anderson's opinion was less definite. Its Chestnut Street location would, he believed, be a good one for offices for the region and EODC. This could be done either by retaining the building's facade, with sufficient depth to provide the office space, and somehow incorporating this section into a parking garage, or by constructing a new building usable for both purposes. Anderson expressed a preference for the latter course. A new building, he explained, could be designed to "harmonize more readily with the predominating architecture of the Park;" in his eyes the Jayne Building would always constitute an intrusion.

Anderson was particularly anxious to commit the regional offices and EODC to the Jayne Building site because he hoped the Merchants' Exchange would be devoted entirely to use by the park, with a visitor center, museum and auditorium on the first floor, and offices on the second and part of the third

floor. He persisted in the view that the First Bank of the United States should become part of the public interpretive program, and not serve as offices, and that the best use of the Second Bank would be to house the Philadelphia city archives. While avoiding the issue of Carpenters' Court, he dealt with potential tenants for the buildings on Walnut Street. For the McIlvaine and Kidd Houses he recommended three potential tenants, the idea that they might be used as staff quarters evidently having been abandoned. Reluctantly he included the Carl Schurz Foundation, although he still maintained that its "tenuous association" with the basic park story raised doubts as to whether it should be housed permanently within the park. If it were to remain, he thought it should be moved to a less conspicuous location on Walnut Street, rather than being permitted to occupy even a portion of so important a monument as the Second Bank. He also now approved of the Pennsylvania Horticultural Society. This organization had joined forces with the Pennsylvania Society for the Promotion of Agriculture in applying for space within the park. Because the latter group could date its founding to before the magic date of 1800, it passed muster under the tenancy policy, and could carry the younger organization on the basis of its impeccable antiquity. The third organization, the Distinguished Daughters of Pennsylvania, a group of about seventy women, made no claims as to age. They were, however, offering to act as hostesses and to provide entertainment for distinguished visitors. There was some hope that Christ Church or the Protestant Episcopal Church Historical Society would assume at least partial responsibility for the Bishop White House, and that some other group, perhaps the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, would become involved with the Todd House.[79] It also seemed highly likely that, although the Company of Military Historians was no longer exploring an involvement in New Hall, the building would be reconstructed as a memorial to the United States Marine Corps.

In June 1956 Regional Director Tobin recommended demolition of the Penn

Mutual Building to Wirth. He thought the building "not of sufficient architectural merit that it should be retained as part of the overall architectural scheme."[80] After considering the request for almost two months, Wirth approved of the demolition, with the proviso that the building be recorded with measured drawings and photographs before it was destroyed.[81] As it became evident that not only the Penn Mutual Building, but also the other significant nineteenth-century buildings in the park would be slated for demolition, well-known architects and architectural historians around the country rallied to their defense with a campaign of letters addressed to Judge Lewis. A letter from Professor Carroll Meeks of Yale University was typical, calling for preservation of the Guarantee Trust, and the Jayne and Penn Mutual Buildings.

> The Independence Hall project is one of the outstanding examples of the national interest in the preservation of our architectural heritage, but it differs from the Williamsburg and Old Deerfield projects in that it is located in a city which has grown continuously hence it is hightly [sic] artificial to restore the area back to a given date as though there had been no subsequent development. From the long range point of view, the preservation of our architectural heritage is not limited to specific periods but should be a record of continuing development.
>
> The three buildings now threatened have extraordinary interest and value, as representing the vigor and creative originality of the America of the 19th century. I hope that this broader point of view may come to prevail among preservationists everywhere. [82]

The architect Philip Johnson described the effort, especially to save the Furness bank, as "a most important battle."[83] Lewis answered all the letters punctiliously, but without yielding an inch. His response to Johnson was characteristic.

> I acknowledge with appreciation your courteous letter of September 19th manifesting your interest in the preservation of the Furness Bank Building located in front of Carpenter's [sic] Hall, and of other old buildings scheduled for demolition. These buildings are out of character with the older buildings to be preserved in Independence National Historical Park and also do not belong to the Colonial or Federal period of Philadelphia's history. These buildings are interesting only to architects and it seems

> to us that photographs will suffice to preserve their appearance and dimensions. There would be a heavy restoration and maintenance cost and no possible use for occupancy that we can see now. Finally, to allow the buildings to remain would interfere with the development of the Park - in fact, they would destroy the very appearance of the Park to a considerable extent.
>
> Under the circumstances, I cannot bring myself to make any change in our attitude that the buildings should be demolished as soon as possible, in order that there may be realized the object which Congress had in view in providing for the creation of the Park. However, we do have many massive old bank buildings on the north side of Chestnut Street and they will not be destroyed in connection with the National Park, so the architectural interest can be centered upon them without material loss.
>
> Please do not think we have not fully considered the matter and appreciate your interest. 84

Lewis's letters were couched in the courteous language of a southern gentleman, but privately he fumed. He permitted his anger to show in a letter he sent Anderson accompanying copies of his correspondence. Intemperately he described some of the country's most noted architects and scholars as "uninformed." The letter also revealed to what extent his opposition to preservation of the buildings was caused not by his feelings about their historicity, but by his personal architectural taste and antipathy to Victorian design.

> Somebody is stirring up letters from uninformed people. It is amazing how easy it is to get people to write letters advocating something, the eventual consequences of which they do not comprehend. If the idea of these art teachers had prevailed many years ago, the City of New York would still be a glorified small town, and even the Frank Furness buildings would never have been constructed in Philadelphia, the latter of which would have been a great piece of good luck for the City. 85

Anderson, who had been quick to chide Peterson for expressing opinions to those outside the park service before the director's decision on the issue was final, found no fault with the judge's actions. He liked and respected Lewis, and probably also somewhat feared him, because of his influence with Congress and the park service directorate in Washington. Besides Anderson agreed with

the judge, both about the disposition of the buildings and in believing that the campaign to save them was being orchestrated. "The similarity in arguments and justifications in the various letters," he replied, "would tend to indicate that in most cases the writers are using material which appears to have been provided from a central source, almost in the form of a form letter."[86] Although the "central source" was not named, there is little doubt that Anderson and Lewis held Peterson responsible. At the same time Anderson forwarded to Lewis estimates of the costs for various treatments of the Jayne and Penn Mutual Buildings provided by Charles Grossman, who had succeeded Peterson as resident architect at Independence. Demolition would cost $132,600; fireproof reconstruction would require $3,543,800, almost half the sum that had been authorized for the entire acquisition and development program at Independence; annual maintenance would be $290,250.

With these figures in hand, Anderson wrote to the regional director in late November 1956, requesting a decision on the Jayne Building. The Penn Mutual Building was already down. Indeed, its demolition had finally been accomplished with such haste that although some measured drawings and photographs had been made, there had not been sufficient time to make full-scale detail drawings.[87] By January 1, 1957, the remaining leases on spaces in the Jayne Building and the buildings adjacent to it would expire and the premises would be vacated. Anderson wanted to proceed with the demolition program for the block; once again he justified his request for a swift decision by arguing that it would be more economical to include demolition of the Jayne Building with the others in a single contract. He reiterated his opinion that the site was the most suitable location for offices for the region and EODC and that these could best be accommodated in new construction combining offices with a garage for visitors arriving by car or bus.[88] Nevertheless the decision on the Jayne Building was not made in haste. In February Wirth, responding to a letter from

Edmund R. Purves, executive director of the American Institute of Architects, discussed the rationale for destruction of two out of the three major Victoran buildings, and implied that the decision on the Jayne Building, while not definite, was not apt to be favorable. After assuring Purves of the park service's appreciation of the AIA's cooperation in the preservation and restoration of historic buildings, Wirth discussed the Philadelphia situation.

> In the case of these buildings referred to which seem to be the subject of the controversy concerning their demolition, extensive historical and planning research has been made over the past ten years without coming up with anything concerning them of sufficient importance to justify their retention in an area of buildings of outstanding architectural and historical significance. The opinions of architects relative to the merits of the buildings have been sought and they are anything but unanimous in advocating their preservation.
>
> The Furness Building, on the east side of Carpenters Court leading from Chestnut Street competes with Carpenters Hall, one of the most important structures in the Park associated with the founding of this Nation. It was designed for use as a bank and could not be converted readily to ther uses. It is not generally considered one of Furness' better designs. It is proposed to reconstruct the Pemberton House on this site as a more appropriate structure to recapture the Independence theme. On the west side of the court New Hall is being restored as a museum and a memorial to the Marine Corps through funds donated by the Mary Louise Curtis Bok Foundation. The buildings on both sides of the street should be architecturally harmonious.
>
> The Penn Mutual Building has been razed and the Jayne Building could not be used without complete reconstruction of its interior. Originally built for office and commercial purposes it successively passed to lower occupancies and is now empty. Removing the buildings adjacent to it would leave the ugly sides exposed. The street facade is the only remaining interest, and that is of doubtful value.
>
> The decision to remove the buildings was not arrived at primarily because they were constructed subsequent to the 1776-1800 period of the Park. As you have observed, other buildings of a later period are being retained and reconstructed buildings have been authorized.
>
> In order to obtain appropriations for preserving and restoring any building under its administrative jurisdiction, the Service is faced with the same problem that would confront individuals in that an appropriate use must be provided which will justify the cost and subsequent operating expenses. Insofar as possible, the use should reflect the occupancy for which the buildings were originally constructed. These buildings are scarcely suitable for museum purposes and are not needed for Park operation. The

> Government cannot rent to private individuals or firms for office purposes without receiving criticism of unfair competition from firms who may have comparable space available. 89

Wirth's letter to Purves illuminates several facets of his attitude toward maintenance of the nineteenth-century buildings as part of the park. Certainly he was not as rigid as Judge Lewis or Anderson in adherence to an arbitrary cut-off date of 1800. He was willing to consider the importance and quality of later buildings, and was not deaf to their advocates within the park service, primarily Charles Peterson, or to the opinions of respected architects and historians outside the service. Nevertheless, he probably shared the view of the majority of park service professionals, backed by the popular opinion of the era, that the buildings were neither historically significant nor aesthetically appealing. For Wirth another factor, perhaps the most telling, was economic. The park service had never before faced preserving so many structures that would not serve as historic musuems. Wirth's comments on the tenancy policy at Independence had demonstrated his relatively flexible view of adaptive use and occupancy of park buildings by outside non-profit institutions. He was prepared to stretch the instrument of the cooperative agreement to the fullest extent in the interest of obtaining financial assistance for maintenance, and even for restoration or reconstruction. There was no mechanism, however, for selling or leasing buildings such as the Jayne complex to private entrepreneurs in order to insure their preservation. Even had such an option existed, it is unlikely that Wirth would have exercised it, because the pressure to demolish was so strong.

Certainly Judge Lewis refused to tolerate further delay. In early March 1957 he wrote to Anderson, congratulating him on the progress of demolition, while at the same time urging speed in completing the program. His conclusion made clear his impatience to see the Jayne Building down, and a none too closely veiled threat that he would take action on the matter himself.

> I hesitate to again mention the Jayne Building and its two wings; however, I observed that they all seem to be without occupants of any kind and therefore are candidates for early demolition. I hope you will give them a substantial shove soon; somebody can undoubtedly use the building material, particularly the facing on Chestnut Street.
>
> Tomorrow I will call Congressman Byrne and perhaps other Congressmen, having already written direct to Mr. Wi[r]th today seeking an appointment next week. 90

Within two weeks, Anderson requested a final determination on the Jayne Building, reiterating his previous arguments, and indicating that lack of a decision was delaying demolition of the adjoining buildings.[91] Wirth finally approved the demolition in early April.[92]

If these major monuments were doomed, it was even less likely that smaller structures would survive. Some, brought to management's attention at various times, were never seriously considered. These included the building known as John's Tailor Shop, and the Carter, Currie and McKean Houses. One that management would have liked to see preserved, Krider's Gun Shop, was torn down by its private owner. Others, specifically a group of houses on Marshall's Court, were found to be expendable. These had been intended for use as staff quarters. Indeed two had already been rehabilitated for this purpose, and in 1956 funds for work on three more were initially included in proposed expenditures for Fiscal Year 1958, which would start on July 1, 1957.[93] However, Regional Director Tobin suggested that expenditure of the funds be deferred because the disposition of the buildings had not been definitely determined.[94] By April 1957, when the Mission 66 prospectus for Independence was approved, the document contained a recommendation that the Marshall's Court houses be demolished. The reasons given were various. Further research had revealed that the series of simple brick rowhouses had been

erected after 1800; a report on the buildings held that they had no connection with what had been deemed historically significant events or personalities, although they had been built for Charles Marshall, whose diary is an important source of information on late eighteenth-century Philadelphia. Structural evaluation had determined that the cost of rehabilitation might be "prohibitive." The location, on a narrow alley, surrounded by other dilapidated buildings was thought unattractive. Finally, and perhaps most tellingly, the site had been selected as particularly suitable for a needed maintenance facility.[95] Ironically, twenty years later, in part thanks to development spurred by the presence of the park, similar residences on neighboring streets in Society Hill would be considered highly desireable and valuable properties.

Work on preparing a formal master plan had virtually ceased during 1955 and 1956, while the energies of the park and the regional office were devoted to producing the Mission 66 prospectus. This document was, in a sense, an interim substitute for a master plan, containing most of the same elements, but without accompanying drawings. It would serve to guide development until a full-scale master plan could be produced. The introduction noted that the essential purpose of Independence was commemorative, celebrating the events that had occurred between 1774 and 1800, as well as the "early growth of the economic, political and cultural growth of the new nation." The management and development statement reiterated in slightly different language the substance of the same section of the revised master plan of the early 1950s, clearly indicating how attitudes toward the design of the park and the retention of buildings had hardened.

> The general theme of development is the restoration, reconstruction, construction, and preservation of those structures and landscape features necessary and appropriate for the interpretation of the story of independence and the establishment and early development of the United States under the Constitution in the period from 1774 to 1800.

> Except in cases of specific designation by the Congress, a structure or site will be provided or retained in the Park only if it is of sufficient historical importance in keeping with the above stated theme of development, if it is necessary or desirable in the harmonious design and public use of the area, or if it is essential for the interpretive and administrative purposes of this Park.

Reconstruction of buildings or landscape features was confined to those originally occupying sites within the park boundaries during the chosen historical period considered "essential to the design, public use, interpretation and administration of the Park." New construction would be undertaken only to "facilitate the administrative and interpretive plans approved for the Park."

This was not, however, an inconsiderable part of the park's development. Although overnight accommodations and meals for visitors were expected to be provided by private enterprise in the surrounding city, numerous facilities would be available for their reception within the park. There were to be a garage, new offices for EODC and Region V, and a visitors' reception area at the Jayne-Penn Mutual site, closely related to the main visitors' center in the Merchants' Exchange. That building would house an auditorium, library, portrait gallery and museum, as well as the park offices. Below the Merchants' Exchange, on Second Street, there would be a special childrens' reception center and museum in the reconstructed City Tavern. There would also be a subsidiary reception center on Independence Square, as well as auxiliary park offices in the wing buildings of Independence Hall. The first priority for development was continued demolition and landscaping, along with some restoration and construction work. This included restoration and/or rehabilitation of the Merchants' Exchange, the Bishop White, Todd and McIlvaine, and Kidd Houses on Walnut Street, and reconstruction of New Hall on Carpenters' Court.[96]

Since its initial authorization Independence had received little attention

from the national press. By 1956, however, demolition and planning had proceeded far enough so that the ultimate shape of the development was beginning to be visible. Between November 1956 and April 1957 a series of articles by the well-known architectural critic Lewis Mumford appeared in the New Yorker. Mumford, who was Visiting Professor at the University of Pennsylvania's School of Fine Arts from 1951 to 1956, was a regular contributor to the magazine, producing a column titled "The Sky Line." The four articles, sub-titled "Historic Philadelphia," covered several aspects of the city's redevelopment, but concentrated on the area around Independence Square.[97] Mumford found much to criticize and some things to praise. Like Riley four years earlier, he subdivided attitudes toward the development into four categories. However, Mumford was concerned almost entirely with design issues. He scarcely dealt with the interpretive questions that loomed so large for the park service. Thus his categories were very different from Riley's.

> Those concerned with this matter divide into several groups. There are the people who are interested in creating a handsome frame for the old picture, and the people who would like to create a greatly enlarged picture, filled with pseudo-Colonial reproductions that would "blend" with the originals. There are those whose bump of historic respect disappears between 1800 and 1840, and those who believe that characteristic mementos of each generation should be cherished until they become a positive nuisance or, though perhaps intact, an obstacle to a fresher act of creation. Then there are the "total preservationists," who would permanently maintain these significant examples even if they impede a sound new development. 98

Obviously Mumford did not find himself in entire sympathy with any of the four. Certainly he was not a "total preservationist." Basically he was a modernist. Although his 1931 collection of essays The Brown Decades had helped to restore post-Civil War American art and architecture to critical respectability, Mumford's own "bump of historic respect" disappeared for the 1840s and '50s. Thus he supported the demolition of the Jayne and Penn Mutual buildings and even of Furness's Guarantee Bank, which he admired somewhat more. His chief concerns, however, were with the settings for the buildings, and with

issues of restoration, reconstruction and new design. The state's project for the north mall struck Mumford as overbearing. What he admired in Georgian architecture was its air of domesticity and intimacy, with which the mall, with its grand Baroque axial scheme, was at war. The mall had progressed so far, however, that basic changes were not possible. Mumford could only hope that the National Park Service's part of the project, east of Independence Square, would be carried out with greater sensitivity. He suggested that Carpenters' Hall, for which he had no great aesthetic regard, characterizing it as "gawky," would look even more awkward at the terminus of another great axis running east from the square. It should be approached through cordons of trees and a series of small, intimate, partially walled gardens.

Mumford also attacked the park service's fundamental planning philosophy, which had been designed to attract visitors to the eastern end of the federal area. "Thus the whole center of gravity may be shifted away from Independence Hall to the subordinate buildings, and the dutiful sightseer may finally reach that original symbol of our freedom only after he has lost the last vestiges of his own, which he will have exchanged for a headache and tired feet."[99] He thought the information center should be located, as Peterson had recommended in 1947, on the north mall. Conversion of the Merchants' Exchange to this purpose would be a falsification of history; it had been designed as a commercial or office building and should remain one. He also held that reconstruction of the City Tavern would produce a counterfeit. If it had to be rebuilt, he suggested that it be a restaurant, not an empty relic. Indeed, Mumford was opposed to reconstruction on principle, believing that the erection of reproductions would debase the genuine surviving buildings. He also opposed rebuilding New Hall. Although he agreed that the secluded setting of Carpenters' Hall should somehow be restored, he thought this should be accomplished in a modern idiom, with an arcade or simply with screening walls. In similar strain he derided the

reconstruction of Library Hall. Although he welcomed the prospect of the expansion of the American Philosophical Society's library, he held that it should be housed in a structure of contemporary design.

Mumford's articles caused considerable consternation in Philadelphia. Judge Lewis made them the first item on the agenda at a meeting of the park's advisory commission on April 30, 1957. Lewis had already discussed with Conrad Wirth a proposal put forth by what he described as "certain influential citizens of Philadelphia" to raise funds to employ architects to provide a suggested landscape design for the park. Lewis was motivated less by any reaction to Mumford's criticism, than by a desire to get the planning over with and construction under way. Wirth, whose pride must have been considerably piqued by the suggestion, had assured Lewis that the park service staff was entirely capable of producing the park's design. He expected to have more detailed master plan designs available in the fall. Lewis also reported that the city intended to construct a parking garage underneath Independence Mall. He wanted to know whether this decision had affected the park service's plans for a garage and visitor orientation center at the east end of its holdings. Wirth assured him that this was not the case. Although detailed drawings had not yet been completed, the basic concept of the master plan remained unchanged. Wirth was scheduled to elucidate the park service's point of view at a meeting of the Poor Richard Club that evening. The commission hoped to submit pertinent sections of his speech to the New Yorker as a rebuttal to Mumford.[100] If the submission was made, it was never published.

The advisory commission's impatience placed considerable pressure on the park service staff to come up with a master plan, pressure of which the staff was well aware. In response to a memorandum from Anderson suggesting that the park plan might require modification in view of some of the city's proposed

undertakings, such as the redevelopment plans for center city and Society Hill, Zimmer wrote:

> My urgent concern is to quickly resolve any basic planning problems in order to crystallize a final Master Plan upon which to base construction development. In this connection I am afraid we cannot wait one and a half years for certain center city studies to be completed. Judge Lewis et al will certainly be in our hair long before then. 101

Master Planning and Decision-Making, 1957-1960

By 1957 new master plan drawings were being circulated internally. The key drawing, numbered 3018 and covering areas A, the three blocks east of Independence Hall, and B, the thrust to the south from Walnut Street, had been approved by Zimmer on May 31.[102] It was probably just as well that Lewis Mumford had not seen this drawing, the design of which was almost as formal and axial as the state's Independence Mall. The most prominent feature was a broad promenade running through the entire area from west to east, terminating in the curve of Dock Street. Other landscape features tended to be rectilinear as well, including gardens along Walnut and Chestnut Streets. West of Third Street was a T-shaped water feature, in the approximate historical location of Dock Creek. Some relief from the prevailing angularity was provided by the proposed restoration of an informal treatment, including serpentine walks, in Independence Square, based on reconstruction of its 1787 landscape.

The plan, produced by the landscape architects in EODC, elicited strong objections from the park staff. Dennis Kurjack, the park's chief historian, who also served as acting superintendent in Anderson's absence, protested to Tobin that the plan violated historical values. Its underlying philosophy, he believed, was that of landscape design rather than historic preservation. The park staff proposed an alternate, which eliminated the central walkway and what was described as the "lagoon."[103] Opposition to a revised version of the

plan was aired more fully during a Park Development Conference at Jackson Lake Lodge in mid-September.[104] Although the participants were in Wyoming for a discussion of development of all the parks under the Mission 66 program, the occasion was an opportunity for Tobin and Palmer from Region V, and Anderson and Supervising Historian Murray Nelligan from the park, to present their views to the top supervisors from Washington: Wirth, Associate Director Eivind T. Scoyen, Assistant Director Hillory Tolson, Kahler, Lee and Vint. Consensus was reached on a number of points. The central walkway would not be constructed, unless it proved to be needed for pedestrian circulation at some future time. In its stead the historic streets in Area A would be preserved and developed "for the time being." There would be no lagoon; instead the branches of Dock Street would be suggested by contouring. Landscape treatment around individual buildings would relate to their historic appearance.[105]

Despite the agreement that had seemingly been forged in September, the revised drawing submitted for review by EODC in mid-October still contained many of the offending features, plus some new ones.[106] In a blistering memorandum to Wirth, Anderson outlined the plan's sins of commission and omission. In the first place, although the lagoon was gone and the rectilinear garden at the corner of Chestnut and Fifth Streets had been replaced by a less formal one reminiscent of the eighteenth-century treatment of Independence Square, the central walkway remained, along with an entrance structure at its east end, and perpendicular walks leading to the rear of Carpenters' Hall. If the walkway were not to be constructed unless need could be demonstrated in the future, as had been previously decided, then the plan should show some new means of access to Carpenters' Hall from the interior of the park. A corollary to the decision not to create the walkway had been the restoration of the historic street system as the basic pedestrian circulation system. The streets as shown on the plan were, however, considerably narrower than they had been in the

historic period. Furthermore a new feature on the plan was a serpentine wall behind the houses on Walnut Street. Not only did this Jeffersonian conceit encroach on the historic right-of-way of Harmony Street, but also such walls had not existed in the park area in the eighteenth century. The memorandum also raised questions about specific details of the design of other walls and plantings, especially those adjacent to the historic buildings.[107]

By the time the advisory commission met on November 8, 1957, a new plan had been prepared encompassing most of the changes requested by the park. The center walkway had gone, with Harmony Street at its full width as the main internal pedestrian link between Third and Fourth Streets. The offending serpentine wall had also been removed.[108] Although many details of the landscaping still remained vague, Wirth was able to exhibit the major drawing at the commission's meeting. Since he had not yet officially approved the changes, Wirth passed over the park's master plan rather quickly. Most of the meeting was devoted to Anderson's exposition of the city's announcement of plans for revitalizing the area south of the park. The city was referring to it as the Washington Square East Development Project, although the area was already more commonly known by the eighteenth-century name revived by Peterson, Society Hill. For the first time, as part of the proposed redevelopment, it was suggested that the park service consider expanding its holdings by acquiring land east of Second Street for visitor parking.[109]

Although Wirth did approve the drawings in late November, they were quickly subject to modification. At a master plan conference in mid-April 1958 Wirth accepted Anderson's recommendation that the Merchants' Exchange, instead of being adapted as a visitors' center, be rehabilitated as offices for the region and the Eastern Office of Design and Construction. The visitors' center would be housed in new construction at the eastern end of the park. A revised plan for Walnut Street was also discussed. Architects' reports on the Todd and

Bishop White Houses had predicted potential structural problems if the houses were restored in isolation. Both had been built as row houses with party walls that, according to the reports, might be difficult to stabilize when the adjacent buildings were demolished. The proposal was to reconstruct one or two houses that had formerly stood to the east of the Todd House, and to remove the top two stories of the five-story Yoh Building between the Bishop White and McIlvaine Houses; its facade would then be rebuilt on the pattern of the early nineteenth-century buildings that had occupied its site. Finally, a new use for the Second Bank was agreed to. Negotiations with the city archives having lapsed, a proposal from the Library Company had been agreed to. With some space allotted to exhibits and public visitation, the building would be used to house the library's collections.[110] Certainly the Library Company fulfilled all the requirements of the tenancy policy. Not only had it been founded well before the Revolutionary War; it had also erected and occupied, in the last decade of the eighteenth century, Library Hall on Fifth Street within the park boundaries -- the building that, ironically, the American Philosophical Society was now in the process of reconstructing.

While the internal debate on the master plan continued, growing dissatisfaction with the pace of progress at Independence was becoming evident. It was now a decade since Congress had authorized creation of the park, and there seemed little to show for it. Although many buildings had been removed, some still stood, with parking lots and patches of new grass between them. The advisory commission's restlessness had already been evident in their reluctance to see Independence included as part of the Mission 66 program. In their opinion another decade was too long to wait, and they had little liking for a program in which other parks had a higher priority than Independence. They had long since favored support of a bill that would authorize an additional $7,250,000 appropriation reserved for Independence.[111] Furthermore, the

commission and Mayor Richardson Dilworth were disturbed by indications that the park service had not requested more than $500,000 for development work at Independence in the 1958 fiscal year.[112] As the fiscal year drew to a close in June 1957 the mayor began to exert increasing pressure. He had already wrung a commitment for $1,500,000 for the following fiscal year from the Congress. Before leaving for a vacation, he took Anderson to task for not having expended the $500,000 already available. Anderson hastened to assure him that much of the money had been held in reserve for the first major landscaping project, and that a contract in the sum of $270,000 had just been let.[113]

At the same time, Lewis was adding his importunities to those of the mayor, and in somewhat less diplomatic language. His complaints covered not only the slow pace of the work, but other issues as well.

> The Mayor wants me to be vigilant to hasten the remaining demolition, the landscaping and the renovation of the two bank buildings, the Merchants' Exchange and the other structures. He also favors the flood lighting proposal [for Independence Hall], as do I, and the letting of contracts by the Park Service for work that you cannot perform with your small staff.
>
> I believe that we should complain to Washington of the years of delay in preparing the Master Plan that has been talked of and promised to us, but has not been received.
>
> Complaints come to me of the terrible appearance of the Park area; of the fact that Carpenters' Hall is surrounded by parked cars and looks much worse than it did before the National Park work was begun--the environment looks worse, that is, to natives and to tourists. There are cars parked on the sidewalks adjacent to the First Bank and it, too, is almost in a sea of parked automobiles.
>
> I believe the United States Government should get out of the business of operating car-parking lots on such costly land, fronting on main highways of the City, and that the Park Service should make no more leases to tenants of buildings or lots, including the building occupied by that tailor of whose actions I complained to you.
>
> The Advisory Commission has been considerably ignored and its expressed wishes ignored for the last three years, and we are getting ready to show resentment, so what do you suggest by way of getting better cooperation? There has been no serious delay in getting along with the "New Hall," which shows what can be done where there is a will. Cannot we accomplish the flood lighting of the Independence Hall group, even if we have to wait for

the broadcasting of the history and for band concerts in the Summer evenings.

Please give these things your best thought before we have more complaints. 114

Lewis now had more time than ever before to devote to oversight of the park's progress, and a more intimate knowledge of day-to-day occurrences, including the behavior of the proprietor of John's Tailor Shop. On his retirement from the bench late in 1957, he had requested and been allocated space within the park. The judge was now ensconced in a pleasant office at the rear of a not-yet-demolished building at 135 South Fifth Street.[115] Here he joined the park's historians, who had been shifted from the overcrowded Second Bank.

Complaints from the mayor and the judge coincided with another major master planning conference at the park from June 4 through 6, 1958. Several issues recently decided by Director Wirth, who was not present, plus newly-introduced legislation, required reconsideration of the master plan and proposed course of development. Wirth had now determined that the Merchants' Exchange would be devoted to office use in its entirety, that the Second Bank should be occupied by the Library Company, and that the Carl Schurz Foundation would be offered office space in one of the Walnut Street Houses. Furthermore, Senator Joseph Clark had introduced legislation that would add land east of Second Street to the park. As a consequence of Wirth's decision on the Merchants Exchange a new location would have to be found for a visitors' center, and he was urging that this determination be made immediately. There was a lengthy discussion of the potential choices. Surprisingly, since from the beginning the interpretive program had focused on a visitors' center at the eastern end of the park, there was considerable sentiment that selection of a location was premature. Too much in Philadelphia was in a state of flux. Both development within the park and that proposed for the surrounding area by other agencies could so change

automobile traffic and visitor access patterns that any chosen site might prove inappropriate or alien to normal traffic flow within a few years. Certainly if Clark's bill passed, the situation at the eastern end of the park would be altered, and a site east of Second Street would be available as a location for the visitors' center. The parking lot of the Custom House was also considered. George Palmer proposed that the visitors' center be located south of the Second Bank.[116] The latter site would have the advantage of a full view of both Independence Hall and Carpenters' Hall, and would also be visible and accessible to visitors entering the park at Independence Hall or at any other point. Although reluctant to make a commitment to any location, the group was also mindful of Wirth's request for action. Eventually they settled on a recommendation of the block bounded by Dock, American, Third and Chestnut Streets, the former site of the Jayne and Penn Mutual Buildings.

This conformed to previous master planning decisions more closely than the other alternatives. The site had long been proposed for new construction for offices for Region V and EODC and a garage, when the plan called for rehabilitation of the Merchants' Exchange as the visitors' center. In effect, the functions were simply switched. There were, however, several major changes in the concept of what the visitors' center should be. Among these were a decision that it should not be designed in relationship to a parking garage provided by the federal government. Rather parking for automobiles should be the responsibility of the city, as it was at such National Park areas as Federal Hall in New York City. It was hoped that the city might make special arrangements for buses, as Washington did; if not limited space for bus parking might be provided by the park. The visitors' center itself should be devoted to an orientation area and audio-visual presentation rather than being conceived as an exhibit area. This recommendation was predicated on the assumption that the Peale Collection of portraits of important figures of the revolutionary and

federal eras would be shown elsewhere, although no suitable location had been determined. The recommendation to house the portraits elsewhere was based on two factors. It was assumed that visitors arriving at the park would be impatient to see the major sights. Probably they would not pause long enough to view the portraits after sitting through an orientation program. In addition museum support facilities would require an inordinate amount of space.

At the close of the meeting, obviously in reponse to attacks on the park's progress, the conferees recommended a crash program for research. The program would be directed at assembling data necessary for the restoration of the historic buildings within the park, with priority assigned to Independence Hall. It would be financed, in a somewhat unconventional manner, from construction funds.[117] Lest this become too much of a blank check the regional office soon suggested that the research program be confined, for the time being, to projects expected to be under construction in the next four years.[118] This was a limitation with which the Washington office agreed, noting that research for rehabilitation and landscaping projects would take precedence over restoration and reconstruction, with the exception of the reconstruction of City Tavern, which had a high priority.[119]

The master plan drawings that evolved in 1957 and 1958 would shape the development of Areas A and B through the years of most intensive construction. A basic design philosophy was finally in place. It was a compromise solution, which undoubtedly failed to satisfy anyone completely, but aroused little opposition on major principles. The opponents of a grand axial scheme had won. The park was organized on a series of broken axes, with open spaces of varying scale setting off the individual monuments. Numerous references to eighteenth-century Philadelphia had been maintained or restored, including the street pattern and a hint of the topography of Dock Creek. Charles Peterson's concept of maintaining or recreating an urban fabric had never received serious

consideration from park service management. Yet the historic buildings were not as isolated as they would have been had the advisory commission's wishes been followed. The proposed reconstruction of buildings on either side of Carpenters' Court would recreate a suggestion of the sequestered situation of Carpenters' Hall, and the retention or reconstruction, for whatever reason, of the row houses on Walnut Street would preserve an urban streetscape on the block between Third and Fourth Streets. Low walls and plantings of ivy would mark the sites of vanished buildings of the historic period. Higher walls and fencing would define the street lines in other areas.

With the basic premises established, master planning attention focused on the details of implementation and use. The availability of construction funds enabled research and the preparation of Historic Structures Reports on proposed construction projects to proceed at a more rapid pace. At the same time, the research raised fresh questions about particular sites and buildings; and the intentions of outside institutions, such as the Library Company, that could have an impact on the park's development remained uncertain.

One of the situations that demanded resolution early in 1959 was the fate of a building in Area B, a stable that had belonged to the Philadelphia Contributionship. This was on land that the insurance company had tried to have excluded from the park in 1952, but that Anderson had told them was essential to park development. Historical research had established that the stable, with its cobbled forecourt, was an eighteenth-century structure.[120] Chief of EODC Zimmer, in language reminiscent of Peterson's and perhaps composed by him, suggested to Tobin that the stable be retained both because of its historical significance and its potential use for storage. "Also we believe that its elimination would destroy the present natural relationship between this old building and its just as old surroundings, including the courtyard and the masonry walls on adjoining property."[121] The answer came back in a few

days, not from the regional office, but from Washington. Wirth was not in favor of retaining the stable, which he thought would spoil the vista down Area B's mini-mall.[122] Eventually there was a sop to the historians and preservationists. The cobblestone paving and some truncated walls remained, integrated into the landscape plan, but incomprehensible in their isolation.

Undoubtedly Wirth's quick decision on the Contributionship Stable was influenced by the renewed bombardment of criticism about the lack of progress at Independence. Lack of funds to accomplish the development program was no longer an acceptable excuse. With the help of intensive lobbying by the mayor and Lewis, the bill authorizing the expenditure of up to $7,250,000 for development at Independence had been passed in August; the bill also raised the ceiling on acquisition to $7,950,000.[123] The cost of Independence had thus more than trebled since its original authorization. By the fall of 1958 Lewis was once again complaining to Wirth about the absence of an approved master plan and the "leisurely" pace of development.[124] Wirth responded to Lewis in a letter composed by Lee, reminding him that master planning was well advanced, and that the advisory commission had seen the interpretive program and a general plan for development; it was only details that remained to be worked out. Funding, however remained a problem.[125] Wirth was correct. Drawings had been exhibited to the advisory commission in November 1957, probably including a perspective rendering of the park as seen from Dock Street, drawn by Penelope Hartshorne. The drawing enabled a layman to understand how the park would look when completed. It emphasized the mall-like and ceremonial character of Area A, which should have pleased the judge.[126] Nevertheless, Lewis replied that the advisory commission had only seen a "tentative plan...an architect's study, not final or definite" several years before. He concluded by once more invoking the mayor, who, he was sure, would like to see a definite plan.[127] Wirth

arranged to have an up-to-date set of drawings sent to Lewis and the mayor.[128]

At the end of 1958 and the beginning of 1959, adverse reaction to park planning also began to be heard from several quarters in city government. Surprisingly, since most of the demands that had been heard previously had been for increased speed in the removal of existing buildings, one complaint was about the Marshall's Court houses. Although their demolition in order to provide a site for a maintenance building had been recommended two years earlier, the buildings were still standing. Early in 1959, Edmund Bacon wrote to Anderson on behalf of the City Planning Commission. He asked that the park service reconsider its decision, which had been made before the city had formulated its plans for the redevelopment of Society Hill. The situation had changed dramatically now that the city had targeted the immediate area for revitalized housing. Bacon urged relocation of the proposed maintenance facility and retention of the houses, which had been certified by the city's newly-formed Historical Commission.[129] Anderson, however, refused to budge. He reiterated the reasons given previously for the decision to demolish: the buildings had no known significant historical associations or architectural interest; they were believed to be structurally unsound; they were not in a suitable location for staff housing; the site was needed for the maintenance facility. Besides the city's plan showed garages serving housing on Spruce Street located on Marshall's Court The maintenance facility therefore would not be incompatible with the city's plan, and care would be taken to see that its design was harmonious with the surrounding neighborhood.[130] A carbon of Anderson's reply went to Lewis. Although Anderson always held that he maintained close contact with the city administration through the advisory commission, and particularly through the judge, it was obviously usually Lewis's opinion that prevailed. The episode left the impression that to Anderson

liaison meant soliciting Lewis's opinion. Officials of the planning commission would be listened to when their views coincided with those of the judge, and could be ignored when they did not.

Lewis did agree with a protest by the City of Philadelpha Art Commission in late October of 1958 about the reconstruction of buildings around Carpenters' Court, particularly about New Hall, which was then under construction. The commission, chaired by Roy Larson, objected to the building on several levels. In the first place, they felt it obstructed the view of Carpenters' Hall. They believed a low wall or some other means of marking the site would have been more appropriate. Secondly, the commission deplored the quality of what was being done, which "can hardly be an exact replica, particularly since modern methods of construction are being employed which are quite obvious to anyone familiar with architecture at the time the original was built." Harking back to Lewis Mumford, and indeed to the park service's long-standing policy on the follies of reconstruction, the commission pointed out that "history is [not] best served by the re-creation of buidings no longer existing which have doubtful material upon which to base their reconstruction." Citing the Philadelphia ordinance by which Independence Square had been turned over to park service custody, on condition that both parties "pledge themselves to consult on all matters of importance to the program," the commission requested the opportunity to view plans as they were developed.[131]

Lewis also disliked New Hall, although for somewhat different reasons. Reconstruction of buildings interfered with his vision of an open park just as much as retention of existing structures. "We do not want any more buildings such as New Hall placed in the Park;" he wrote to Wirth in November, "rumors are rife that either your office or the local office or the Regional Office is planning erection of buildings on Chestnut Street at Fifth and adjacent to Carpenters' Hall. We will oppose any such move decidedly and hope the rumors

are not true." He reminded Wirth of his interpretation "of what Congress had in mind -- a Park area enclosing the main historical buildings now existing."[132] Wirth hastened to assure Lewis that there were no plans for construction at the corner of Chestnut and Fifth Streets. Although Wirth had advocated the reconstruction of Norris's Row if the Philosophical Society needed additional stack space for its books, he had no strong feelings about the idea. As for New Hall, he professed himself astounded at Lewis's views, since the latter had been fully advised of the plans for Carpenters' Court since their inception.[133]

While Wirth was attempting to placate Lewis, Anderson was arranging a conciliatory meeting with the city's arts commission. The group gathered at the Second Bank on December 29, 1958, where they were joined by representatives of the city solicitor's office, the planning commission, and City Architect George I. Lovatt, Jr. Anderson reviewed the history of the Independence project, and pointed out that the park service's decisions were not only the result of extensive internal review, but also were undertaken after consultation with the official advisory commission for Independence. He also expressed the opinion that the requirement for mutual approval of plans applied only to Independence Square and its city-owned buildings. On the surface, at least, the meeting was cordial, concluding with an agreement to seek avenues for liaison between the park and the arts commission.[134] The commission, however, still sought defintion of its legal responsibilities, as representatives of the city, for review of plans for the park. In rereading the cooperative agreement between the city and the park service for the management of Independence Square and the buildings on it, Anderson found that Article III called for the two "to develop a unified long range program of preservation, development, protection, and interpretation for the whole Independence National Historical Park."

This clause could form the basis for participation by the arts commission. He asked the regional office for legal advice and policy guidance.[135]

Tobin believed that legal advice was unnecessary and would merely give the matter an importance it did not deserve. Nevertheless, he forwarded Anderson's request for assistance to Wirth, suggesting that the director's experience in working with city officials and others interested in planning in Washington might be helpful.[136] Wirth was furious. Anderson he believed, had "apparently invited the cooperation of the Art Commission in the development of Independence National Historical Park." This was one of two or three incidents in which Wirth believed Anderson to have acted before proper consultation with the regional office or with Washington. Such activity embarrassed the park service, which then was perceived as not presenting a united front. Furthermore, Anderson should remember that the advisory commission was the official consultative body, and their opinion should be solicited about dealings with the art commission. Wirth asked Tobin to meet with Anderson and take steps to assure that policy matters went through the chain-of-command in the approved way. In the meantime, considering what had already occurred, there seemed to be no alternative but to confer with the art commission.[137]

Wirth's anger at the situation with the art commission may have been exacerbated by frustration at the continuing criticism being directed at him and at the park service as a whole. He had already had to fend off suggestions from Judge Lewis that the advisory commission assume responsibility for planning the park, in addition to unjustified complaints about lack of consultation on such matters as the reconstruction of New Hall. When he responded to Tobin's inquiry about the art commission, he was probably already aware that Judge Lewis and Mayor Dilworth had arranged to come to Washington for a meeting with Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton. Dilworth had already won agreement for an increase in the 1959 appropriation for Independence, from $632,100 to

$1,500,000. In preparation for the meeting, the park staff, regional office, and EODC undertook a reappraisal of the budget for the next few years, attempting to speed up projects.[138]

The Philadelphians met with Seaton and Wirth on April 8, 1959. Dilworth took the occasion to loose a blast in the press, claiming that, after seven years of restoration work by the National Park Service, Independence looked like a blitzed area. He complained that Philadelphia was losing the benefits of tourism because of the condition of the park. Seaton assured him that steps would be taken to centralize authority in order to expedite the project.[139]

One of the first steps was a meeting later in the month, attended not only by Wirth, but also by Assistant Secretary of the Interior Roger Ernst and Senator Hugh Scott's secretary. The meeting brought together park service personnel, the members of the advisory commission, and representatives of the city government. Essentially it served merely as a forum in which progress could be reported and the controversies of the past several months could be rehashed. Wirth stressed that there were two basic reasons for the slow pace of development, lack of funds and the necessity for tremendous amounts of research because of the overwhelming importance of the sites. Ernst made a number of concessions, promising to give serious consideration to relocating the maintenance facilty from Marshall's Court and to establishing a mechanism through which the advisory commission and the city could comment on the design and treatment of buildings within the park. The chief accomplishment of the meeting was an opportunity to clear the air. Substantive resolution of the issues would await a second meeting scheduled for the following month.[140]

The advisory commission convened again on May 25, 1959. Wirth came up from Washington accompanied by Chief Historian Herbert Kahler. Also present were Tobin from the regional office, Zimmer and Cabot from EODC, Anderson, architect Charles Grossman and historian John Platt from the park, and Grant Simon. The

latter had by this time been named chairman of the Philadelphia Historical Commission. In addition, after having served as a voluntary architectural consultant to the advisory commission for several years, he was now being paid a retainer by the park service to act in that capacity.

Wirth opened the meeting by recommending more frequent meetings for the advisory commission. These should not depend on his presence, since planning had now advanced to the stage where he believed most issues could be resolved among the commission, the regional director and the park superintendent. The park service had adopted procedures to keep commission members better informed. As a symbol of the new procedures, he presented each member with a copy of the recently-completed Part I Historic Structures Report for Independence Hall. Much of the meeting was devoted to informing the commission about the progress of such items as the continuing and almost completed demolition program, landscaping, and the rehabilitation of the Merchants' Exchange. A proposed reconstruction of the Pemberton House on the east side of Carpenters' Court was also explained. Wirth told the commission that the park service had fully documented the existence of the house, as well as its character and basic dimensions. Its reconstruction would complete restoration of the historic appearance of Carpenters' Court. Besides, based on previous approval of the concept by the commission, Wirth had conferred with high officials of the United States Navy, including Secretary Thomas S. Gates, Jr., and efforts had already begun to raise funds to reconstruct the house as a Navy museum. The objections that had already been raised in the case of New Hall were raised again: the building would obscure a proper view of Carpenters' Hall; only buildings of outstanding historical significance should be reconstructed. Since the commission had, in fact, approved the concept once, it would be somewhat embarrassing to reject it summarily now. On the other hand, the analogy to New Hall, to which members of the commission, especially Judge Lewis, had objected

so vociferously, made it difficult for the commission to agree to the project immediately. The suggestion of one of the members, Arthur Kaufmann, that a special committee study the issue and report back to the commission at its next meeting in September, was therefore accepted with alacrity as a way out of the dilemma.[141] The committee duly reported favorably, recommending reconstruction not only of the Pemberton House, but of the neighboring Fawcitt House as well.[142] Although the issues of the Pemberton House were identical to those raised by New Hall, the report of its own committee was accepted by the advisory commission without demurral. Indeed, the fight over New Hall had probably been not so much about design issues or reconstruction philosophy as about the power to make decisions. In agreeing to study of the question by the committee, the park service had soothed the advisory commission, at least for the time being.

Wirth announced another step at the May meeting of the advisory commission that would help to stem controversy over the power of the art commission or other city agencies to review design. This was the appointment of a special seven-man architectural review committee, composed of six architects with experience in historic preservation and one historian. The members, chosen after consultation with the advisory commission, were historian Roy Nichols of the University of Pennsylvania, John Harbeson, Sydney E. Martin, Grant M. Simon, George I. Lovatt, Jr., representing the City of Philadelphia, and Joseph T. Fraser, Jr., representing the Philadelphia Chapter of the American Institute of Architects. The committee originally was conceived of as providing advice and consultation only on the buildings on Independence Square.[143] Its title, however, chosen by Wirth, suggested that its responsibilities would be somewhat broader. It was called the Historical Architectural Committee for Independence National Historical Park.[144]

This decision proved to be a wise one. The art commission continued to

press a claim for review powers. Not receiving any satisfaction from Anderson, a member of the commission, Philip Price, senior partner in the large law firm of Barnes, Dechert, Price, Myers & Rhoads, wrote to Senators Joseph Clark and Hugh Scott. Price pointed out that the commission was "devoted to the improvement of the quality of public buildings in the City and its judgment should not lightly be disregarded." Anderson, however, had "taken the position that he can do what he pleases and ignore the objections or recommendations made by the Art Commission." Price went on to recite the commission's objections to New Hall, and to the "indiscriminate erection" of brick walls, including the low ones marking the sites of eighteenth-century buildings. He asked Clark to talk to Wirth about the participation of the art commission in reviewing plans and proposed construction. There was obviously considerable bad feeling. Calling Anderson's decisions "arbitrary," Price concluded:

> I can understand Mr. Anderson's reluctance to take advice from any one, particularly from a group which he considers to be so far beneath him in political importance. However the welfare of the community is not enhanced by that attitude. 145

Clark and Scott both passed Price's letter along to Wirth, who was able to inform the Senators that, in addition to continuing liaison with the advisory commission, the park service was now consulting with a distinguished architectural committee on "Independence Hall and other restorations and new buildings." He also assured them that Anderson would keep in touch with the art commission on "matters of joint interest," an ironic comment in view of his adverse reaction to Anderson's dealings with the art commission.[146] Although much of Price's attack on Anderson was unjustified, relationships with groups in Philadelphia probably had suffered because of Anderson's personality

and view of his role as superintendent of Independence. Anderson was soft-spoken and pleasant, but he tended to "play pretty close to his chest."[147] He joined no groups and indulged in minimal consultation with the city, feeling that the advisory commission served as the park's bridge to the city and that constant communication with them was sufficient.[148] Had he remained in unofficial contact with other groups, explaining and soliciting their support for decisions on park planning, much of the controversy might have been defused before it flared up.

The establishment of the architectural committee appeared to satisfy the demands of the art commission for some form of outside professional review. In forming the committee, however, the park service was responding less to complaints about its design decisions than to protest about proposed methods of handling the restoration of the buildings on Independence Square. The battles of the mid-1950s had been about whether buildings would remain standing. Those of the end of the decade centered on basic questions about restoration and reconstruction. Park service policy since the 1930s had held that it was better to preserve than restore, and better to restore than to reconstruct. But there was no firm policy on exactly how preservation, restoration, or reconstruction would be accomplished. The art commission's complaint about the quality of the reconstruction at New Hall had been a signal that the park service's handling of these issues could be questioned. A far more serious disagreement arose over the triumvirate of historic shrines on Independence Square: Independence Hall, Congress Hall, and Old City Hall.

As it could be foreseen that large amounts of money would begin to flow to Independence in 1959 and 1960, planning went forward for the long-sought restoration of the key buildings. Almost immediately it became apparent that the structural integrity of all three was doubtful. Conditions were particularly bad at Congress Hall, where, after a heavy snowfall, an outward

bulge in the east wall was clearly visible to the naked eye. Considerable reinforcement of the fabric of the buildings would undoubtedly be necessary, but the extent of what was required was unknown. Responsibility for determining the need fell to John Cabot, supervising architect in EODC. The choice reflected the continuing dichotomy in EODC about methods of dealing with historic buildings. On one level Thomas Wistar, Jr., who reported to Charles Peterson, was in charge of the restoration work at Congress Hall.[149] Restoration at this point, however, evidently was sometimes interpreted by management, although not by the restoration architects, as a matter of cosmetics. Peterson's crew could see to the replication of accurate detailing where an authentic restoration was called for, but might not even be consulted when, for example, houses on Locust Street were rehabilitated as staff quarters. This was a restoration philosophy that saw only the skin of the building as historic. The bones and muscles beneath were necessary to keep the building standing, but had no value in their own right.

Cabot certainly thought that he could deal with structural problems without directly involving Peterson's staff. He retained the George M. Ewing Company, a highly respected structural engineering firm, to study the buildings on Independence Square in the fall of 1958.[150] Their report was submitted in March 1959. Based on limited probing, they found, as expected, that the condition of all three buildings was poor, with Congress Hall in the worst state. Their recommended remedy was tantamount to total reconstruction. The buildings would be supported on new skeletons of steel and reinforced concrete. Steel uprights would run in channels through the old brickwork, which would be pressure grouted from the interior. The interiors would be gutted, and then rebuilt with floors of concrete and steel and plaster partitions on steel studs, over which the old ornament and trim would then be fitted. Finally, the

buildings would be crowned with tile cast to replicate wood shingles, laid on concrete roof plank supported by steel trusses.[151]

To many this appeared to be a reasonable solution. It was similar to the "restoration" of the White House that had been carried out in 1950-1951. There the building had been razed except for the exterior walls, and a new load-bearing steel frame erected within their perimeter, so that in effect the old stones became a curtain wall. The interior was entirely new.[152] There were others, however, inside and outside of the park service, who believed that this was not the way to treat the buildings on Independence Square. In their opinion the fabric of the buildings was itself of historical importance, reflecting the knowledge and attitudes of the eighteenth century. No structure erected on a steel frame would ever have the same appearance, the same patina of age. Besides, the long-range effect of running steel through channels in the old brick walls could itself be damaging. The steel would react to thermal change by expanding and contracting in a manner that was not compatible with the response of the brick, and could crack the walls.

Wistar was among those who disagreed with the Ewing Company's recommendations. Having been in private practice before joining the park service, he was a member of the Philadelphia Chapter of the American Institute of Architects, and well acquainted with prominent members of the Philadelphia architectural community. Quietly he let his doubts be known to some of the members of the chapter.[153] Peterson also believed a less drastic solution could be found, and at considerably less than the estimated $2 million cost. When Zimmer finally discussed the Ewing plan with him, as the scheme was laid out for estimating, he asked for an hour to go over and reexamine the building before commenting. "I came back," he remembered," and said, 'I just saved you half a million dollars, because the building doesn't need to be taken down.'"[154]

Nevertheless, EODC accepted the Ewing Company's basic recommendations, although disagreeing with some details.[155] They had, indeed, already issued bid invitations for emergency stabilization work at Congress Hall, based on the Ewing findings..[156] On April 3, 1959, Anderson, following the provisions of the cooperative agreement, of which the art commission had so recently increased his awareness, officially informed Mayor Dilworth of the Ewing Company's findings. He requested the city's approval for emergency work on Congress Hall, for which he enclosed the drawings and specifications that had gone out to prospective bidders, and promised to submit additional plans as the work program progressed.[157] When more than two weeks had passed with no official reply forthcoming from the mayor's office, Anderson wrote again. This time rather than offering to forward plans for review as they were developed, he requested blanket approval for the park service to determine the method and then to execute stabilization and structural work on the Independence Square buildings, based on the findings of the Ewing report.[158] It was perhaps not a wholly tactful request, considering that the Office of the City Development Coordinator had already asked to review Ewing's report. When Dilworth's reply to Anderson finally arrived, it was not favorable. Although Dilworth had given oral approval to Anderson's earlier request on emergency stabilization measures, he would not agree formally to the park service's recommendations. The proposals had been reviewed by the city architect, George I. Lovatt, Jr., and the chairman of the art commission, Roy Larson. Both reported serious doubts about the proposal.

> They do not believe that it is necessary to install steel columns, nor do they believe that grouting of the interior walls with gunite is advisable.

> The city architects and engineers believe that Congress Hall can be rehabilitated and made stable without changing the original construction and thus retain in its entirety the precious heritage represented by this building. 159

In seeking advice, the mayor had turned to two men who had already exhibited considerable sympathy for old buildings. In 1955 Lovatt, with advice from Roy Larson and the art commission, came up with a solution that preserved the great ceremonial Conversation Hall in Philadelphia's City Hall. Faced with the problem of providing offices in the high-ceilinged space, Lovatt designed an interior frame that left the original walls, ceilings, and elaborate architectural detailing intact.[160] Larson had demonstrated his continuing concern for such issues in his comments on the quality of reconstruction at New Hall. It was in the context of the criticisms of New Hall, the city's attitude on Congress Hall, and other ongoing controversies that Wirth appointed the special architectural committee to advise on the restoration work at Independence.

Wistar made his views known officially in a long memorandum directed to Zimmer through Peterson in early May. The Ewing Company had based its recommendations, in part, on enabling the second floor of Congress Hall to bear loads of 100 pounds per square foot, the code requirement for spaces intended for public assembly. Wistar proposed that one solution would be to control access to the second floor limiting the number of people it at any one time. With lighter loads, it would be posible to continue to utilize a wood-framed floor, rather than to insert steel and concrete. Wistar objected strenuously to the insertion of steel columns in the brick walls. He had observed no sign of failure in the bearing walls. If, however, the columns were inserted, parts of the walls might collapse in the process. Later cracks might develop in both exterior and interior walls because of settlement of the column footings.[161] Wistar also disagreed with the findings of the local AIA chapter's Committee on

the Preservation of Historic Monuments, which had supported the Ewing Company's findings. He told the chapter's representative, John Harbeson that in his view the primary object was "to preserve as much of the historic structure and fabric as is humanly possible."[162]

The Ewing Company's recommendations, with particular reference to Congress Hall, were the sole topic at the first meeting of the special architectural advisory commission in June. Cabot did not defend the report with great strength, although he did maintain that there was "some" complete structural failure at Congress Hall. Kurjack, probably sitting in for Anderson, reported that he had discussed the situation with Lovatt, who believed that, with less drastic measures, the second floor could be made adequate for loads of 60 pounds per square foot. Charles Grossman, the park's resident architect, and Grant Simon were the only ones present expressing strong support for the Ewing proposals. Simon believed that only total reconstruction would insure the building's eternal preservation, while making it available to all those who wished to see it. Harking back to the fears generated by World War II, he cited the potential of a steel-framed structure to withstand explosions.

The most eloquent spokesman for exploring other solutions was Edward Brumbaugh, Jr. Brumbaugh, of those present, probably had the most experience with restoration, the linchpin of his architectural practice. Congress Hall, he informed the group, was very different in structure and use from the White House. It could be preserved, he assured them, with less radical measures. The committee responded by recommending retention of a second structural engineer, to review conditions from the viewpoint of minimal interference with the existing fabric. Brumbaugh suggested that the assignment be offered to Sheldon A. Keast.[163]

Keast had been the City of Philadelphia's building inspector for many years. Through this work he had developed unsurpassed familiarity with the construction details of the city's older buildings, and considerable experience in evaluating their condition. On his retirement from that post he had joined a group of structural engineers, most of whom were considerably his junior, forming the firm of Keast & Hood in 1953. Keast was a "hands-on guy", a pragmatist rather than a theoretician. His approach would be to see what could be done to make the existing structures function, rather than applying mathematical formulae to arrive at some ideal.[164] Brumbaugh's recommendation was sound politically as well as technically. Not only did Keast have a generally respected reputation, but also he would carry considerable weight with city officials, with whom he had a long-standing professional and collegial relationship.

Keast's report was ready by the fall of 1959. Rather than accepting the concept of total replacement of the old structural framing, as the Ewing Company had, Keast followed a conservation approach. The purpose was to let the original structure function where it could, and supplement it, or as a last resort supplant it, where it could not. Even where the old structure was supplanted, it would usually remain as historical evidence, and new structural elements would be introduced carefully so that the original fabric would suffer the minimal amount of damage.[165] Keast's conclusions that this could be done at Congress Hall were accepted by both the National Park Service and the city.[166] From this time on Keast & Hood would consult on the structural aspects of work on the buildings on Independence Square.

Although the park service staff spent much of its time in 1959 embroiled in disputes about how the master plan for Area A would be implemented, work continued to go forward on refinement of the plan itself. The smallest details received attention. In October 1959 Dennis Kurjack, then holding the title of

chief of the Division of Interpretation at the park, reviewed the planting plan for the "Northwest Portion, West Section 'Area A'." This was probably the garden at the corner of Fifth and Chestnut Streets. Kurjack not only objected to the choice of two species, an Japanese Snow Azalea and European Linden, not known in eighteenth-century America, but also suggested appropriate substitutions, the Swamp Azalea and European Linden.[167] The historians had obviously done their botanical homework. Comments by John Platt, who had replaced Kurjack as supervising park historian when the latter became a division chief, expressed concern that areas delimiting the location of former buildings be accurate in dimension and complete. Platt also wanted the paving of Library Street, not layed until 1811, to differ in detail from those of other streets within the park which had been paved earlier. The design should follow specifications set forth in a 1791 ordinance.[168]

Several questions pertaining to the disposition and use of individual buildings were reaching final resolution. Anderson summed up decisions made in the past two years and the conclusions of the park staff on future development in a long memorandum on October 13. The ultimate function of the Second Bank was still uncertain. The Library Company, following the precedent of the city archives, was considering other alternatives. If they did not occupy the Second Bank, it would become the park's major museum, housing the portrait collection, archaeological collections, and attendant support facilities. Part of the building would also be used to interpret the history of the bank. The First Bank was proposed as a temporary visitors' center. Ultimately, however, it should be devoted to interpretation of banking and economic development in the Federal period. The upper stories could become park offices.

Several alternatives were suggested for the buildings on Walnut Street. The Bishop White House would become, as had always been intended, a house museum operated by park staff. Now it was proposed that the Todd House be elevated to

the same status. Reconstruction of the two houses east of the Todd House, at 341 Walnut Street, had been approved by Wirth during a visit to the park in September. These, according to the findings of the park staff, would be suitable quarters for the Pennsylvania Horticultural Society and the Philadelpha Society for Promoting Agriculture. Moving east on Walnut Street, the Kidd Houses, at 323-325, had been recommended for demolition in structures reports submitted in May 1958. However, the regional office had reminded Anderson that their retention had been provided for in the master plan and the office of the Secretary of the Interior had offered them to the Carl Schurz Foundation in March 1958. Demolition was still recommended for the building adjacent to the Kidd Houses at 319-321 Walnut Street, although this meant that some method would have to be found for stabilizing the party walls of the Kidd Houses and the McIlvaine House at 315-317 Walnut Street. The latter had been suggested as a location for a museum dealing with the architectural history of the park and housing the architectural study collection. This collection consisted of structural and decorative fragments assembled for their instructional value to the historical architects in the course of their research. Now the park staff was recommending that the McIlvaine House, together with the adjacent Yoh Building at 311-313 Walnut Street become the park offices. However, if the Second Bank was not available, the portrait gallery might be housed in these two buildings. [169]

In the main, the regional office agreed with these proposals. Tobin reminded Anderson, however, that final decisions would have to await the resolution of proposals for outside use of the two banks. Not only had the Library Company not yet responded to the park service's written commitment on occupancy of the Second Bank, but also it had never been determined whether the continuation of "live" banking at the First Bank, favored by both Mayor Dilworth and Director Wirth, was feasible. Furthermore, the question of demolishing the

Fling House at 319-321 Walnut Street would depend on the outcome of structural studies of the entire block then underway. [170]

Within a month Zimmer informed Anderson that EODC recommended retaining the Fling House, claiming that removing it would require extensive bracing of the party walls of the adjacent Kidd and McIlvaine Houses, as well as considerable alteration to the plan of the latter. Furthermore, the architects believed that there were historical and aesthetic reasons for the building's preservation. It had been erected in "the same architectural period" as the Kidd House, and any rationale for keeping that structure applied equally to the Fling House. Its removal would break the only relatively intact row of early buildings remaining in the park. The gap would be an unsightly one, and produce maintenance problems. It would require waterproofing the exposed party walls, and landscaping a dark narrow lot between high windowless walls would be difficult.[171]

One by one a series of decisions made in the course of master planning had entirely altered the design concept applied to Walnut Street. The original plan had envisioned a landscaped area, in which the restored Bishop White and Todd Houses stood in isolated splendor. Several factors had produced incremental change in the plan: the structural requirements of the buildings for which preservation had been mandated, discoveries about the historical qualities of some of the other Walnut Street buildings, and the necessity of providing office space for the park and for cooperating organizations. Perhaps the most important impetus for change had been growing acceptance within the park service of the concept of preserving a streetscape that would convey some sense of the appearance and feeling of the Philadelphia the founding fathers knew.

The decisions of a decade were summed up at a full-scale master plan conference in Philadelphia on March 9-10, 1960. Presiding was the new regional director, Ronald F. Lee, who had replaced Tobin in January. Lee, of course, was

familiar with decisions and events at Independence as a member of the Washington directorate since the park's inception. While the meeting served as a review of park planning, most of the discussion was devoted to implementation of earlier decisions. However, several of the remaining questions in Area A were also resolved. The Library Company having withdrawn its proposal, the Second Bank was now slated to house the portrait collection, as well as storage and offices for museum administration. The First Bank would become the interim visitors' center, to be converted to a banking museum when a permanent visitors' center was constructed. The park's recommendations for the Walnut Street houses were accepted, with the park offices to occupy the McIlvaine and Fling Houses and the Yoh Building. Planning for the park south of Chestnut Street and west of Second Street was thus virtually complete. But a new look at the master plan was called for. Several issues remained -- a location for the visitors' center, the possible acquisition of additional land east of Second Street and of the state-owned Independence Mall, and last, but certainly far from least, the treatment of Area C, Franklin Court.[172]

The master plan that emerged at Independence after almost a decade was a product of compromise. It was based on hours of discussion, which sometimes flared into acrimonious debate or pitched battles. The plan probably satisfied none of the participants totally, but was at least palatable to most. The main part of the park was neither the formal, barren ceremonial landscape visualized by the Shrines Commission, nor the architecturally-oriented program sketched by Charles Peterson. Neither the buildings defended by Peterson, nor the broad malls of the earliest schemes, punctuated by buildings in shrine-like isolation, survived. The strong axes were replaced by more intimate spaces, their shapes determined in part by the old Philadelphia city plan. If the park was far more open and green, more "park"-like than the colonial city had ever been, still there were, at every turn, suggestions of what the country's founders had seen:

the course of Dock Creek, the cobble-paved streets and alleys, the outlines of vanished buildings. As planning evolved, some elements of the eighteenth-century streetscape were targeted for retention or reconstruction at Carpenters' Court and along Walnut Street. The motivation was in part practical and usually cloaked in the language of pragmatism. The reasons given for decision cited such factors as providing space to house desireable cooperating organizations or assuring the structural stability of neighboring buildings for which preservation was mandated. Yet it was obvious that a sense of history also affected the decisions and was felt by all those who dealt with Independence, not only the historians, but architects, landscape architects, and administrators as well.

Indeed, if there were winners or losers in the debate over master planning, the historians may be have said to have won the war, if not all of the battles. The park came closer to the concepts described by Edward Riley in his 1953 letter to Herbert Kahler than to other visions of what it might have been. It became an area that commemorated the events of the period from 1774 to 1800 and also served as an interpretive tool through which the course of those events could be conveyed to the American people. Judge Lewis and his supporters were also satisfied. The plan accomplished the judge's primary purpose, the replacement of a run-down neighborhood with a park, and the preservation of the most famous historic buildings. The judge occasionally raised a protest about specific projects, such as reconstructing buildings at Carpenters' Court. On the whole, however, he showed little concern for the details of planning; his objective was to see the park completed as quickly as possible. It was Peterson, and his fellow advocates among the architects and architectural historians, who had lost the most. Most of the buildings for which they had fought had come down and could never be replaced. The bitterness engendered by those long drawn-out battles would never totally subside. In retrospect,

however, it was a cause that could only have failed at that time and in that place. Concepts such as adaptive use of historic buildings, or leasing of government-owned buildings to private enterprise in order to preserve them, were rarely considered or implemented, either within the park service or among the general public. In the early 1950s, when most of the cases were argued, park service funding was so low that it seemed a miracle that so ambitious a park could be created at all, much less one that incorporated such seeming "white elephants" as the Jayne and Penn Mutual Buildings.[173] The historical architects did, however, carry the day, with the assistance of the City of Philadelphia, on the question of how historic buildings should be treated. In finally rejecting recommendations that would have been tantamount to reconstructing rather than conserving the buildings on Independence Square, the park service made a decision that would eventually guide implementation of the policy that it was better to restore than to reconstruct. The historical architects had made their point about exercising control over all aspects of building restoration, although the design of such building components at mechanical systems would continue to be a problem.

The master plan of the late 1950s was never, in fact, a full or formal document, and was never issued as such. Rather it was a series of approved drawings, covering specific areas and omitting others, such as Franklin Court, and based on policies hammered out over the course of their preparation. What it did provide was a basis for implementation, and as funds from Mission 66 and special appropriations for Independence began to flow in the late 1950s and early 1960s, development proceeded quickly. It was a startling contrast to the early 1950s, when there was so little visible change. By the spring of 1960, three-quarters of the landscaping south of Chestnut Street and east of Fifth Street had been completed. Finally the stories in the Philadelphia newspapers were glowing reports rather than complaints about the lack of progress.

> To Independence Historic Park this year, summer will come with a delightful difference. Instead of creeping apologetically into a few cluttered back yards, it will sweep happily across wide lawns. Instead of greening clumps of weeds and scattered ailanthus trees, it will have scores of trees and shrubs to work out on, and a whole magnolia garden to frolic through.
>
> For the first time in some 150 years, this section of Philadelphia, which lies east of Independence Hall, is recapturing some if its original sweet simplicity: the returned honesty of neat brick walls and iron gates and plain narrow walks and small tranquil buildings. 174

The panegyric may have been premature. It would be several years before trees and shrubs would mature sufficiently for the full effect of the landscaping to be felt. Clearly, however, the development of the park was finally proceeding. During the next several years the major effort would be concentrated on carrying the construction program forward. The planning process would continue, but on a less intensive level; the attention of both the park and regional staffs would shift to just how the broad decisions already made would be implemented in brick and mortar. What the public could welcome next were not only grass and trees, but also restored and rehabilitated buildings.

VI - RESTORING THE BUILDINGS

From the time the park service began considering acquisition of what would become Independence National Historical Park, it was assumed that their stewardship would include restoration of the most important of the historic buildings. These buildings finally were detailed in the legislation authorizing establishment of the park. The list included not only the monumental structures like Independence Hall and the Second Bank of the United States, but at least two buildings of domestic scale, the Todd House, where Dolley Madison had lived with her first husband, and the Bishop White House.

The National Park Service had undertaken some important restoration projects before World War II, most notably at Morristown National Historical Park in New Jersey, and the progress of the restorations at Williamsburg was well publicized. On the basis of its own experience, and observation of the efforts of others, the park service had evolved a restoration philosophy. It called for conservation of what was original, removal of later accretions, and the accurate recreation of missing elements. How this was to be achieved had not been codified. The small staff at Independence had no recognized methodology to adhere to in investigating and restoring historic buildings. There was little literature on the subject, no written guidelines or manuals for them to follow. Knowledge of how old buildings had been constructed and of what physical evidence might provide clues to their original appearance was handed down from one practitioner to another, and some architects with experience in restoration were secretive about what they knew. So those responsible for restoration at Independence were forced to develop techniques, learning as they went along from one another, from the craftsmen on the park's staff, and from

the buildings. Many of these techniques were developed at the Bishop White House, the first of the restorations to be completed, and at the park's centerpiece, Independence Hall.

The Bishop White House

Charles Peterson had recognized the Bishop White House as an unusually fine example of a late eighteenth-century Philadelphia rowhouse during his first visits to the future park in 1947. Like other examples of the genre, the Bishop White House consisted of three major sections. The front building, the full width of the lot, was three stories high with a dormered attic. In plan it consisted of an entrance hall providing access to two rooms at one side. Behind the hall was a narrow "piazza" or stairhall, which joined the front building to the back building or service wing. This back building was wider than the piazza, but considerably narrower than the front building, thus leaving room for a yard at the side as well as the rear. The Bishop White House was an unusually commodious rowhouse, with a twenty-six foot frontage on Walnut Street, and fine detailing -- carved stone window lintels, brick stringcourses, and a modillion cornice -- still visible on the upper stories. It posed, in microcosm, the full range of conditions that might be encountered in a projected restoration project. Comparison with old views and photographs showed that the upper part of the facade was almost intact, except for the replacement of window sash on the second and third floors. The first floor, however, had been completely transformed, initially with a heavy Victorian treatment when the building passed from residential to commercial use in the third quarter of the nineteenth century.[1] Only a year before Peterson arrived in Philadelphia the Victorian construction had been removed and the facade "colonialized," complete with

small-paned picture window.[2] The situation in the interior of the front building was similar. The first floor had been gutted, even to removal of the rear exterior wall and the partition between the front and back rooms. On the second floor, trim in the front room had recently been stripped to allow for the installation of plywood sheathing. The rear room, however, was virtually undisturbed. The piazza had retained its original configuration, although the stair had been replaced, but the back building had been considerably enlarged and altered over the course of the nineteenth century. Thus the building would demand a full range of treatment. Some sections, such as the upper stories of the front wall, would require preservation rather than restoration. Other areas, such as the piazza, would call for the restoration of missing elements. In areas such as the back building or the gutted first floor, nearly total reconstruction might be called for.

Peterson knew that it was unlikely that he could argue for preservation of the building only on the basis of its architectural merit. Fortunately it also possessed strong associations with a leading figure in the nation's early political and religious life. Bishop William White, who had had the house built in the 1780s and lived in it with his family until his death in 1836, was rector of Christ Church and St. Peter's Church in Philadelphia. Unlike many American Episcopalians, whose ties to England and the mother church were strong, he was an ardent patriot. He served for many years as chaplain of the Continental Congress and later of the United States Senate, and after the Revolutionary War was instrumental in establishing the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States as an entity spiritually related to but distinct from the established Church of England. In an attempt to discover more about the bishop and his house, Peterson wrote to the editor of the Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church.[3] Valuable information was indeed forthcoming. The editor

provided the name of one of Bishop White's descendants, the Reverend Dr. James A. Montgomery.[4] Montgomery in turn knew of other descendants, as well as the whereabouts of original furnishings and decorative objects.[5] One of these heirlooms would provide evidence that would be invaluable for restoration of the building's interior. This was a painting by John Sartain, commissioned by the family shortly after the bishop's death. It depicted White's study, which occupied the rear chamber of the second floor of the front building, and a portion of the bedroom at the front of the house. So complete was the detail that it even included the stubs of the half-smoked cigars that the bishop was wont to leave smoldering on the chair rail behind his desk.

Armed with both documentary and architectural evidence, Peterson argued successfully for inclusion of the Bishop White House in the authorizing legislation. Once the National Park Service began operations at Independence, however, its slim budget precluded initiation of restoration work on the buildings, or even of the detailed investigation that would be required before restoration could be undertaken. Peterson did, however, make a preliminary examination of the Bishop White House, and in 1950 commissioned a series of photographs documenting existing conditions[6]. In the course of his explorations he discovered in the cellar some precious remnants of the original building fabric, a shutter and the front door. Their preservation was testimony not to appreciation of their aesthetic or historical value, but to their sturdiness; the door was approximately two-and-a-quarter inches thick. As stout pieces of lumber their continued utilty had been recognized, and they had been thrown down as walkways on the dirt floor of the cellar.[7]

Although he had acquired a certain familiarity with the house, Peterson was indignant when Superintendent M.O. Anderson asked him to prepare an estimate of the cost of restoration in April 1951. Pointing out that it was impossible to

provide accurate figures on three hours notice, Peterson nevertheless set down the sum of $65,496, plus twenty per cent for plans and supervision.[8] Like all the restoration estimates made at Independence in the early 1950s, this was far too low. Based on rates that had prevailed during the Depression years, it failed to take into account the extraordinary rise in construction costs that would characterize the next two decades. Nor could the estimate have been based on more than an approximation of the building's square footage. Measured drawings were not available until the following summer, when they were prepared by the first student measuring team, working under the direction of William M. Campbell.[9] Even these drawings left some questions unanswered, because it was not always possible to get above dropped ceilings or behind plywood paneling to determine original dimensions with precision. Nevertheless, they formed a useful base from which more accurate drawings could be made subsequently.

As time permitted, Peterson continued to search out Bishop White's descendants and others who might be interested in the house and its most famous resident. His purpose was threefold: to add to his store of information about the building and its original contents, to locate surviving furnishings, and to engender the interest of those who might assist the restoration through contributions of funds or objects. Accordingly, in 1952, he organized a tree-planting ceremony. Christ Church cooperated by exhibiting books from Bishop White's library. Bishop Hart planted a young sapling on Walnut Street in front of the Bishop White House. The tree died, but it had accomplished its purpose; members of the family and representatives of Christ Church attended the ceremony and appeared gratified at the attention the building was receiving.[10]

It soon became apparent that the house required more than public relations. Although construction funds continued to be severely limited, some emergency repair work was essential. Removal of the adjacent building had exposed the

east party wall, and revealed numerous holes where the wall had been cut to accommodate flues and pipe chases.[11] Woodwork in the upper stories, in particular the cornice and original frames and sash in the dormers, was also in poor condition and required immediate remedial measures. These became the responsibility of one of Peterson's young assistants, Donald Benson. Work on the east wall and dormers was carried out in 1953; the cornice was repaired in 1954, at which time the front wall was cleaned.[12] The work was accomplished in a conservative manner. Wherever possible original fabric was preserved and reinforced. Where wood had become too rotten or brick too soft to serve, replacement pieces were carefully fabricated to match the example of the original.

By late 1955, with programming for the Mission 66 program well under way and additional special appropriations for Independence contemplated, it looked as if the funding drought might finally end. Preparation of actual restoration plans for the buildings assumed greater priority, with the Bishop White House high on the list. The sum of $141,600 was proposed for inclusion in the National Park Service budget for fiscal year 1958.[13] A use for the building had not yet been determined, although Anderson hoped the Episcopal Church would either assume full responsibility for its maintenance or operate it in cooperation with the park for "some acceptable Museum activity."[14] When the budget for fiscal year 1958 was finally accepted, however, Independence received no construction money.[15] Nevertheless, the background research for the restoration projects begun in the fall of 1955 went forward.

The goal was to restore the buildings to their appearance at the time the historic events commemorated at the park had taken place. To accomplish this is would be necessary to determine what that appearance was. This task would require the combined efforts and skills of experts from several disciplines --

architects, historians, curators, and craftsmen. There was no particular hierarchy about which of these disciplines had the major voice in restoration decisions at Independence, although the investigative work in the buildings was generally carried out under the supervision of an architect. There was also a certain amount of confusion in the late 1950s about organizational responsibility for restoration. By 1954 Charles Peterson had transferred to the Eastern Office of Design and Construction as chief architect for historic structures, which technically gave him authority over all restoration projects in the eastern parks. At Independence, however, responsibility for research and, indeed, for preparation of restoration drawings for some of the buildings remained with the park's architectural staff, at least until 1959.

The investigative team at the Bishop White House worked under the direction of William Campbell. Campbell, who had previously supervised HABS student measuring teams during the summer, including the team that had measured the Bishop White House, had become a permanent member of the Independence staff after his retirement from a teaching post at the University of Pennsylvania.[16] In addition to his architectural skills, Campbell had other important qualifications for his assignment. By avocation he was an antiquarian, with a knowledge, gained through many years, of old Philadelphia families and old Philadelphia buildings. He understood archaic construction techniques and had a keen eye for detail. Courtly, gentle and patient, he was a superb teacher, well equipped to instruct his apprentices in observing evidence and drawing conclusions.[17] Campbell also could produce meticulous and beautiful pencil or watercolor drawings that would illustrate to management or the general public just how a building would look after it was restored.

Although several other junior architects also helped to investigate buildings, Campbell's chief and most consistent assistants were Frank Boeshore

and Penelope Hartshorne. Boeshore, like Campbell, had joined the park staff in retirement, in his case from a private architectural practice. Although the two men were similar in age, they were different in attitude and experience. Campbell, something of the aesthete-scholar, was a product of Beaux Arts training, in which knowledge of historical architecture, fine drawing, and attention to detail were essential components. Boeshore's strength was not theory, but practical knowledge of how to put a building together. The restoration architects would turn to him for assistance on structural questions and other "nuts and bolts" problems.[18] Hartshorne was of another generation with what seemed an unlikely background for a restoration architect. She had received her architectural degree from the Illinois Institute of Technology in 1953. The presiding genius of that institution was then Mies van der Rohe, a doyen of the International School, whose dictum "less is more" expressed a view that found much of the architecture of the past over-decorated and non-functional. Hartshorne, however, had been brought up in a family with strong historical interests, which she had come to share. For two years after graduation she lived in Sweden, working at the Zorn and Nordiska Museums, studying, in particular, log buildings. On her return to the United States she wished to continue to deal with historical architecture. Learning from a friend that Independence might be hiring architects, she approached Charles Peterson. Peterson suggested that she seek an interview with Charles S. Grossman, his successor as resident architect at Independence. Hartshorne arrived for her appointment carrying a large notebook crammed with drawings and photographs of Swedish log buildings.[19] She could not have struck a more sympathetic chord. Before transferring to Independence, Grossman had worked in rural Pennsylvania and at Great Smoky Mountains National Park. His expertise and passionate interest were in log buildings, and he responded appreciatively to

Hartshorne's work. Whatever his reasons for hiring Hartshorne, he had selected someone with a natural aptitude for the investigation of buildings. Of a generation brought up on the fictional adventures of Ellery Queen and Dick Tracy and the real-life exploits of the FBI, Hartshorne found that searching for clues and sifting evidence seemed a natural and enjoyable exercise.[20]

Hartshorne's first assignment was to take photographs in Independence Hall and to assist in the investigation of the Supreme Court Chamber.[21] It was her introduction to a building in the restoration of which she would be involved for twenty years. Within a few months, however, she was shifted to the Bishop White House, although she returned to Independence Hall at intervals to make and record observations, as work on repairing and repainting its woodwork went forward. Campbell already had begun his study of the building by reviewing the historical data that had been accumulated in the last five years. Yoelson had assembled a chain-of-title for the property, and the historians had also found insurance surveys made in 1787 (another survey dated 1795 would be found as the investigation proceeded), established which members of the bishop's family had shared the house with him at various times, located numerous furnishings and decorative objects, and put together an iconography or graphic record of the building, consisting of nineteenth-century watercolors by B.R. Evans and David J. Kennedy and old photographs. The historical research showed that the house had been completed for White in 1787 and, thanks to the insurance survey, provided some idea of its arrangement at that time. White occupied the house for almost half a century, dying there in 1836. Shortly thereafter Charles Chauncey bought the property, which remained in his family until 1870. For the first part of this period the building continued in residential use, but in 1857, as the neighborhood became increasingly commercial, it was rented to a brokerage firm.[22] Campbell also reviewed later photographs and building

permits. Numerous alterations had been made since 1910. The partitions on the first floor of the front building, he found, had been removed in 1916. The "colonial" front installed in 1946 was, he concluded, the result of a second or third remodeling.[23]

The documents provided a good deal of information, especially about the facade of the Bishop White House, but many questions remained to be answered. The precise appearance of the facade's first story, the configuration of the back buildings, and many of the interior details, except for those of the bishop's study, were still a mystery. To solve it would require coaxing the building itself to reveal its secrets. Campbell and his team began their investigations in late October 1955. They were well aware that it would be necessary to examine every part of the building in minute detail. Even small fragments could provide crucial information, as was the case at the Merchants' Exchange.

Research for the restoration of the latter building was being carried on simultaneously with the investigation of the Bishop White House. Although the ultimate function of the building had not yet been decided, it had always been assumed that the park service would undertake an exterior restoration. This would include reconstruction of the original cupola or lantern, which had been replaced in 1902. The architect of the Merchants' Exchange, William Strickland, had based his design for the lantern on the Choragic Monument of Lysicrates in Athens, a favorite source of inspiration in the Greek Revival period. It consisted of a base, a drum with attached columns, and a small dome. The general appearance of this feature and many of its details were well recorded in historic views and photographs, but these did not supply sufficient information for determining the precise measurements upon which construction drawings for the rebuilding could be based. Accordingly two summer employees, Samuel

Edgerton, Jr. and William J. Murtagh, were assigned to the roof to search for whatever dimensions relevant to the previous structure could be found. Over the portico they found a space where workmen had evidently stood while dismantling the original roof and cupola. It was full of debris, which required careful examination. It was a task made particularly unpleasant in the summer heat by the presence of a layer of pigeon droppings several inches thick. Nevertheless, their powers of observation remained keen, and were rewarded when they discovered small pieces of applied decoration from the original cupola wedged between two walls. The slight curvature of one fragment enabled the architects to project the circumference of the drum of the original cupola, which they laid out in chalk on the floor of the attic of the Second Bank.[24]

With the potential for such discoveries in mind, the investigators approached the Bishop White House like archaeologists searching for a buried civilization. Layer by layer they peeled back plaster, seeking the ghosts of vanished structural elements and decorative trim. Although they sometimes had assistance from the park's maintenance staff, much of this controlled demolition was accomplished by Campbell and Hartshorne. The evidence they were searching for was often so faint or so fragile that they were afraid it might be missed or destroyed if the work went too fast. That their efforts would be rewarded was predictable because of their knowledge of eighteenth-century construction techniques. Contrary to later practise, in which wooden trim was applied after a room was plastered, the eighteenth-century builder first put the trim -- door and window surrounds, baseboards, chair rails, cornices, mantels and the like -- in place and then plastered up to it. Therefore, even if the trim were removed subsequently, its dimensions and profiles would be preserved in the adjoining plaster. This would hold true, although the outlines might be somewhat obscured, if the gaps left by the trim were filled in with new plaster, for

faint differences in color would persist. By carefully chasing back the new plaster to recover the extent of the old plaster precisely, it was often possible to obtain remarkably sharp profiles of missing elements.

The architects began their search for evidence on the denuded first floor of the Bishop White House. Despite the radical alterations, they were able to determine the dimensions of the cornice and height of the chair rail in the two major rooms. Surprisingly, some original material remained in the rear room, "breast closets" with shelves on either side of the chimney. The west party wall was amazingly informative. It revealed the configuration of the original stair, its slope, the position of the landing, and the size and shape of the half-newel that had once been attached to the wall. Not only could the position of the rear wall of the eighteenth-century back building be found by the scars its removal had left on the west wall, but also so could the floor levels and the winding rear stair. The location and size of vanished fireplaces and their flues were discernible through the patterns of soot deposited on the bricks.[25]

Even more dramatic revelations accompanied the exploration of the cellar. The survival of chimney foundations and of the massive stone arches that supported the partitions of the front building's upper floors had, of course, long since been noted. Other elements evocative of life in the house had also remained intact through the centuries. One was the bishop's wine cellar under the front hall. Its massive batten door still hung on the old strap hinges and the iron-barred interior window that provided ventilation was also intact. Immured in the stone west wall were two wine bottles, placed there by eighteenth-century masons with a sense of posterity, and perhaps a sense of humor as well. Long after White's fine madeiras and clarets had been drunk or otherwise disposed of, the traces of the masons' more modest tipple would

remain, mute testimony of the past offered to the future, as well as a graphic indication of the room's original function. More evidence of the various mundane uses of the building's nether regions was found at the rear of the basement. In 1951 the student measuring team, digging test pits in this area, had pierced what appeared to be a section of brick vaulting. In November 1955 Campbell, working with a junior architect, David Connor, uncovered this vault, buried under the cement and earth floor of the back building's cellar. Believing that excavation of this feature would require special expertise, Campbell called on the park's archaeologist for assistance.

Paul J.F. Schumacher began excavating the subcellar in the second week of December 1955, assisted by two workmen from the park's maintenance staff. So confined was the space that the men had to remove dirt with a system of buckets and pulleys. The fill contained mostly early and mid-nineteenth century artifacts, suggesting that the subcellar had been in use throughout White's tenure. The vaulted room consisted of a space entirely surrounded by stone walls, with only a vent leading to the rear yard supplying light and air. There were no traces of stone steps, and Schumacher surmised that access had been through steep wooden stairs or a ladder placed in an alcove. By the next week Schumacher had four men working, two continuing in the subcellar. When they reached its floor, they uncovered a round pit, which Schumacher concluded had probably been used for storing butter and other perishables. The other two workmen began exploring foundations. They not only found the foundation walls for the original kitchen, but also one of the building's most remarkable features. From the area adjoining the kitchen at the rear a concave marble trough ran northward at a downward slope to a small vaulted brick tunnel, which continued across the rear yard. Schumacher associated this drain with what he assumed was a wash house located in the cellar. Subsequently, when a 1795

insurance survey was found, it revealed that the eighteenth-century necessary had been a two-story structure, located immediately behind the kitchen and thus over the marble trough. The architects therefore concluded that the drain had functioned as a sewer, carrying off waste from the necessary. Schumacher pursued the course of the sewer to the rear of the yard and found it crammed with sherds of ceramics and glassware of late eighteenth-century and early nineteenth-century date. The only access to the drain had been from within the Bishop White House; thus these artifacts must have been the remains of White family possessions.

The first excavation at the Bishop White House terminated at the end of December 1955. In August 1956 Schumacher resumed his explorations. With one workman he was able to trace the drain north, despite some breaks produced by utility lines, to the former course of Dock Creek. When Bishop White built his house, this stream had been recently channeled and covered over to serve as a municipal sewer, a function it still fulfilled in 1956. Throughout its length, White's private sewer line proved to be extraordinarily rich in household artifacts. During the August campaign Schumacher also excavated a pit in the rear yard, which he determined to be a water well.[26] Like most of the early archaeological work carried out at Independence, the program at the Bishop White House was not a systematic investigation of the full potential of the site to yield information about the past. It concentrated on individual features, which were explored in order to find information that would forward the restoration process. Nevertheless, the excavations of the mid-1950s at Independence were among the first in a major American city and thus among the pioneering efforts of urban archaeology.

While Schumacher dug in the Bishop White House subcellar, the architects continued their examination of the upper floors into the new year. Here more original fabric was intact. The woodwork of the rear room on the second floor, as comparison with the Sartain painting showed, had remained almost entirely undisturbed. The front room, unfortunately, had been stripped of its trim only a few years before the park service's acquisition. Nevertheless, here, as on the first floor, the outlines of window and door surrounds, chair rail and mantel remained in the plaster. Small human touches made the former occupants of the house seem very real to the investigators. In White's study, there were charred marks on the chair rail, just where the Sartain painting had shown that the bishop rested his partly-smoked cigars. On a closet shelf, carved in a childish hand, were the initials "T.W.," undoubtedly the work of the bishop's son, Thomas. The inscription "W.W. Bronson - 1834," carved by a grandson, was found on the southeast dormer trim on the third floor.[27]

The interior examination supplied the investigators with a great deal of information, but many details were still missing. For example, they knew the vertical dimension of the chair rails on the first floor, but not the details of how they were molded. How did they terminate when interrupted by a door frame or by windows? What happened at the fireplace? They had found an original stair tread in the attic, which had provided the width of the stair, the depth of the tread, and the position of the balusters, but still lacked information about the height of the risers, hand rail and treatment of the stair ends. Similar questions arose about a host of other features: the precise arrangement of the kitchen fireplace; the workings of the necessary; the possibility of applied decoration on mantels. There was also the more amorphous question of the feel of the various elements, what someone dealing with cloth would refer to as its hand. To assist in their understanding of what the components of the

Bishop White House would have looked like when assembled as a whole, Campbell and Hartshorne began to look at surviving contemporary rowhouses. Fortunately, Philadelphia provided a wonderful laboratory on their doorstep. Campbell obtained a list of buildings of similar date from the Philadelphia Historical Commission, which was then conducting a survey of Society Hill.[28] Within a few blocks of the Bishop White House were some thirty comparable row houses. During the early months of 1956, Campbell and Hartshorne, sometimes accompanied by Grossman, examined most of these, recording in sketches and photographs elements that would be useful in the Bishop White House restoration.[29]

Another source of data about eighteenth-century design and building practises was the park's architectural study collection.[30] This gathering of everything from windows to cornices to mantels, staircases, shutters, hardware, and nails, had been started by Peterson almost as soon as he arrived in Philadelphia. Some of the items came from eighteenth-century buildings that had been demolished when United States Steel's Fairless Works was constructed in Bucks County north of Pennsbury Manor. Most of the examples, however, came from Philadelphia. They had been collected by many hands from many sources. Although Society Hill would become one of the largest preservation projects in the country, involving the restoration or rehabilitation of hundreds of buildings, the program also called for the demolition of a large number of early buildings, as did the park's plan. Some buildings went when space was cleared for the erection of three modern apartment buildings, the Society Hill Towers, and for Penns Landing; others for the future construction of I-95; still others were demolished because their condition was thougt to be too poor to warrant restoration. Many of the park service people, especially the architects, became part-time scavengers. Frequently items were acquired with some formality. Knowing that a building was slated for demolition, park staff would request

permission to remove interesting material before the wreckers arrived. But some of the material was retrieved from the rubble on demolition sites, or from trash piles and garbage cans.[31] Not all the salvage ended up in the study collection. Glazed bricks from a stable on Orianna Street were used in the restoration of the Todd House, and marble steps from seven houses in the Poplar Street - East Redevelopment Area were recut for use at the Todd and Hibbard-Griffiths Houses.[32]

Through 1956 and 1957 Campbell and Hartshorne continued their investigations, checking what they found in other buildings against what was present in the Bishop White House. Meanwhile, new evidence was being found. In April 1957 additional archaeological excavation, under the direction of B. Bruce Powell, unearthed a cistern in the rear yard. In June a new photograph was discovered, the earliest taken of the house, made in 1859. At the same time Hartshorne was recording the evidence they had found by means of photography and drawing.[33] Campbell also began the working drawings for restoration, a task that engaged him, although with frequent interruptions, from August 1956 into 1958.[34]

The photographs and drawings would become part of an official document then known as an Historic Building Report. The first such report had been prepared by Charles Peterson for the Moore House in Yorktown, Virginia. Although written after the work on the building had been completed, it contained historical documentation and a report on the physical evidence that had provided justification for the decisions that had formed the basis for restoration. During the years before World War II, a number of such reports were completed for other National Park Service properties. It was not, however, until the restoration work at Independence got under way that such documents were required and their format institutionalized. In 1957 Conrad Wirth, director of the

National Park Service, issued a memorandum calling for the preparation of such reports and mandating that they contain administrative, historical and architectural data. A memorandum of 1958 from the associate director determined a new title, the Historic Structures Report.[35]

The Wirth memorandum stimulated activity aimed at completion of full reports for the buildings at Independence, including the Bishop White House. In July 1957 William Everhart, then supervisory historian at Independence, assigned a newly-arrived historian, David H.Wallace, the task of ascertaining the significance of Bishop White's role in the Independence story. At stake was the important question of how the house should be interpreted -- whether it should be a memorial to Bishop White or be put to some other use. As was usually the case with most research projects, Wallace was not able to devote uninterrupted time to the assignment. He was simultaneously overseeing an archaeological project connected with the placement of utilities in Independence Square and carrying out general research tasks. Nevertheless, he finished his assessment, with laudable speed, by the end of the month. Dennis Kurjack, chief of the Division of Intepretation, then asked him to expand his work into a historical report on the Bishop White House. Despite continued diversions to other assignments, such as research on a building at 422 Walnut Street, Wallace completed a draft by late August. For the next three months, always interspersed with other work, he made revisions, wrote picture captions, and added a chapter on the furnishings.[36]

Wallace's work formed the major part of what was issued as Part I of a "Historic Buildings Report" in April 1958. The report recommended that the bishop's study be restored, but that the first floor of the building be interpreted as a museum devoted to the idea of religious liberty. By March 1959, when Part II of the report was issued, much had changed. For one thing,

the name of the document was now "Historic Structures Report." For another, the estimated cost had almost quadrupled from approximately $141,000 to $494,000. In part this probably represented a more realistic appraisal of construction costs; in part it reflected a change in program. The recommendation now was not to use the first floor as a freely-designed museum, but to restore and refurnish the entire house, not only as a memorial to White, but also to illustrate the way of life of a prominent citizen of Federal Philadelphia. The report must have been persuasive. At the master plan conference held in March 1960, it was decided that the Bishop White House would be restored for exclusive use by the park as a furnished house museum.[37]

Obviously, higher standards of authenticity were being applied by the time the second report was written. Where the first report had suggested furnishing the house with whatever antiques could be obtained supplemented by reproductions, the second advocated the use of period pieces exclusively, with the exception of some reproduction seating in the hall for the convenience of visitors. The recommendation for reconstruction of the first floor also represented a change in attitude. The second report also contained a longer architectural section, written by Grossman, Campbell, Hartshorne, and Boeshore. It described their methodology for studying the building and provided a list of precedents on which missing details had been based.

The report on the Bishop White House was among the earliest prepared under the new system established by Wirth's directive. It shows some of the marks of a pioneering effort. The historical section is reasonably detailed, but lacks the extensive appendices reproducing key data that would characterize later examples of the genre. Even in the expanded version of the March 1959 report the architectural data section is notably brief, lacking much narrative explanation of how the house had developed, or discussion of the reasoning

> Only those who have taken the pains to study old construction in general. They must have the curiosity and persistence to get acquainted with a fabric, reconstruct on paper what were the original builder's intentions and train and police the mechanics who create with their hands the physical restoration. This type of drudgery does not require a professional degree but it does take something much less common. 41

The man on whom Peterson depended as his chief assistant and field lieutenant, Henry A. Judd, filled the description. Judd came from New England, where he had been a contractor. Although he held the title of architect in the National Park Service, he had no formal degree. He had learned the practical aspects of construction from his builder father. Before coming to Philadelphia he had worked for Peterson restoring Mount Locust in near Natchez. A craftsman, William A. Ernst, also came to Philadelphia from the General Schuyler House restoration in New York State to join what was informally known as the day labor force. This was something of a misnomer; the day labor force was composed not of common laborers, but of skilled carpenters and masons. These craftsmen were capable not only of carrying out repairs on old buildings, but also of carrying out full-scale restoration work, as they did at the Bishop White House.

Several architects and draftsmen also were hired. Hartshorne was transferred to the EODC roster. Despite her considerable knowledge of the Bishop White House, she was assigned to work on Congress Hall as an assistant to Thomas Wistar Jr., an experienced architect who joined the park service from private practise. Campbell, close to, if not beyond, the normal park service retirement age, was not asked to join the EODC staff. He remained at Independence, however, as part of the historians' office, and continued working on Historic Structures Reports under their aegis.[42]

In September 1960 two young EODC architects, Norman M. Souder and George L. Wrenn began work on the Bishop White House, under the supervision of Peterson and Judd. The former had been transferred from Hopewell Village; the latter was

a new recruit. One of the first results of their labors were new estimates, increasing the projected cost of restoration to $567,000.[43] The EODC team proceeded to carry out further investigations of the building with the assistance of the day labor force, including considerable controlled demolition. Their findings, presented at the end of the year in the form of revised working drawings, differed in several particulars from those of Campbell's team, and reflected reinterpretation of the evidence uncovered by Campbell, as well as a number of fresh discoveries. For one thing, Peterson disagreed with Campbell's design for the frontispiece, the chief adornment of the facade. Citing B.R. Evans's watercolor depicting the section of Walnut Street that included the house, and early photographs of the John Clement Stocker House, a similar building on South Front Street, Peterson held that the Bishop White House doorway had originally been flanked by engaged columns supporting a pediment. The team also demonstrated that originally there had been no vestibule in the hall, and that the windows had been made up of larger panes of glass than those shown in Campbell's drawings. Other changes in the recreation of missing features were more a question of taste or judgment than of demonstrable fact, and included designs for dormer consoles based on the Carpenters' Company price book issued in 1786, the omission of a corner cupboard in the piazza, and substitution of a single door for a double one between the two major rooms in the front building. The report also recommended different methods of reinforcing the building's structure and incorporating a modern heating system.[44]

The recommended changes were submitted in the form of new and revised drawings without written justification. They were not well received at Independence. George Wrenn reported hearing that the park would reject the

drawings because the conclusions expressed in them were not explained.[45] In January 1961, therefore, EODC submitted a supplement to the Historic Structures Report. It was couched in language that did little to soothe the ruffled feelings of the park staff. Commenting that the earlier reports had included "no written architectural justification for the conclusions shown in preliminary drawings," the report went on to justify the changes made by EODC. Some of these were based on new evidence; others, such as the decision to redesign the doorway were actually matters of taste. The more robust and more elaborate frontispiece proposed by EODC "would be more in harmony with the wide frontage (26') of the building."[46] Obviously the park staff did not enjoy having its conclusions called into question. They registered their initial reaction to the new report not directly to EODC, but to the regional office. Superintendent M.O. Anderson suggested to Regional Director Ronald F. Lee that in instances where questions still persisted, as for example the dormer consoles or the necessary, it would be helpful if EODC personnel consulted with members of the park staff who had worked on the earlier reports. The large collection of evidence photographs of the Bishop White House, as well as photographs of similar buildings studied by the park were available, if EODC chose to consult them.[47]

The photographs accompanying the January 1961 report were not ready until March, and the park historians, of whom Campbell was now one, waited until June before responding to the report with a blistering memorandum. The comment that the March 1959 report had not contained written justification for restoration conclusions seems to have been particularly galling. The memorandum pointed out that not only had ten sheets of evidence drawings formed part of the earlier report, but also that lists had been provided of the sources, either within the house or in similar buildings, for fifty-five missing details. EODC had

declared that no two-story necessaries dating to the eighteenth century had survived; the park cited two examples in the city that had been examined from the exterior in the course of their study. The memorandum also attacked several of EODC's conclusions. The latter's prototypes for the frontispiece were all later in date than the Bishop White House. The choice of stone facing for the basement was against the weight of precedent. The dormer consoles based on the Carpenters' Company price book did not resemble those shown (although not very clearly) in early photographs of the Bishop White House; appended was an exceptionally fine photograph of dormers on the building that had served as the first location of the United States Mint, which, indeed, appeared closer in design to those suggested by the photograph of the Bishop White House.[48]

The debate about the restoration of the Bishop White House seems to have engendered some bitterness between the historians on the park staff and the architects on EODC's staff, which would flare up repeatedly over the next decade. Restoration is rarely a scientific undertaking, based entirely on documentary or physical data. Experience, taste, and professional judgment must be applied where factual evidence is lacking. So room for disagreement remains. The Bishop White House was only one of several buildings about the details of which the two parties differed. At the Todd House, as at the Bishop White House, Peterson disagreed with a doorway design previously drawn by Campbell. He assigned George Wrenn to prepare new drawings. Wrenn began by looking at photographs and survey reports at the Philadelphia Historical Commission, as well as at surviving buildings suggested by the commission's assistant director, Beatrice Kirkbride, and Peterson. Henry Judd and James Massey also produced photographs of doorways in buildings similar to the Todd House, that is, corner houses with the main entrance on the side. The results were by no means definitive. Kirkbride thought the doorway should be square cut without a

pediment; Peterson thought it should have a pediment. There were precedents for both designs. Eventually Wrenn produced a pedimented design and submitted it to Peterson for approval. Peterson then decided that a transom should be added and suggested a prototype, but when he saw the revised drawing he found the transom not to be aesthetically pleasing and it was removed. Once again the park historians objected to the drawings and requested written justification.[49] In truth, however, the Todd House was a case where total justification could not be provided. The entire facade of the first floor on both Walnut and Fourth Streets had long since been destroyed and no photographs or drawings could be found that recorded the original appearance. The design could only be based on informed opinion, on which honorable experts could differ.

The disagreements between the historians and architects at Independence led to some unpleasant moments, but the tension also had positive results. It forced thorough exploration of all possible solutions to disputed issues, and all concerned probably produced better work because of it. At the Bishop White House the architects eventually used the photograph produced by the historians as the basis for the dormer consoles, and, having found a molded watertable brick on the site, faced the basement with brick rather than stone. The historians, on the other hand, agreed that the structural solutions proposed in the January 1961 report were preferable to those shown in the original drawings. Nor was the debate confined to those two parties. The architects often disagreed among themselves. Although Hartshorne was not assigned to the Bishop White House, she maintained a lively interest in its progress. Stopping by the site during construction in March 1962, she observed that the configuration of the staircase being installed by the day labor carpenters did not agree with the evidence of the west wall; she was able to convince Peterson and Judd to stop the work until the error could be corrected.[50] Wrenn also found himself

arguing with Judd about restoration philosophy. He felt that Judd was sometimes too quick to replace worn, but original, material for the sake of appearance, and too slow to order changes in approved drawings when new evidence turned up, especially if the changes might create future maintenance problems. "I disagree with this philosophy of restoration," he wrote in his journal. "I think that all original work should be preserved in place where it exists. In fact that is what is really interesting about the old bldg. Bishop White looked at <u>those</u> bricks not others (modern) built to same hgt. etc." He also disapproved of what he called "restoration geared to future maintenance rather than restoration to the evidence."[51]

Meanwhile another facet of restoring and interpreting the Bishop White House began to receive intense consideration, the question of how the completed restoration would be furnished. In June 1960 Charles G. Dorman joined the staff of Independence as a curator. His first assignment was to prepare a furnishings plan for the Bishop White House. Born in Wilmington, Dorman had attended the University of Delaware, where he continued to pursue a life-long interest in the furniture and decorative arts of the Delaware Valley. For five years afterwards he worked as the manager of an antiques shop in Wilmington. The life of an antiques dealer, he concluded, was not for him. "I couldn't buy things that I didn't like, and I couldn't bear to sell things that I loved, so that impasse could only be resolved by becoming a museum curator." He had been at the Smithsonian Museum before coming to Independence.

As Dorman worked on the furnishings plan, the program became further refined. The building would be furnished not merely with period antiques, but with pieces that had been owned or might have been owned by the bishop. Building on the tracing of inherited furnishings begun by Peterson and Campbell, Dorman became a "half-baked" genealogist. He found descendants of the bishop

spread from South Africa to Hawaii. He became so familiar with the White furnishings and who owned them that he could tell his startled hostess in western Massachusetts that the rest of her dining room chairs were in Baltimore, Maryland. Dorman knew that there would be little money available to purchase furniture. Congress appropriates funds to the National Park Service to purchase, restore, reconstruct and maintain historic properties, but not to furnish them. So Dorman found that he had "to develop a convincing sobbing voice and tear in the eye and hope that it works." Furnishing the Bishop White House and other buildings at Independence would depend on the generosity of White's descendants and other patriotic citizens, and Dorman took steps to engage their interest.[52]

> The first thing that I can recall, in an empty house I invited all the Philadelphia area descendants, and we had a meeting with tea in the bishop's parlor, and there were collapsible card-table steel-type chairs. Everything was by candlelight, but we didn't have one stick of antique furniture in the house at all. I sort of said, "Welcome to Bishop White House. I know you all so very well as, "Mrs. _____, she has three of the dining room chairs" or "Mr. _____, he knows where the tall-case clock in the hall is." And with that, two very elderly descendants in the front row, ladies, one of them turned to her cousin and said, "Do you think we will get out of here alive?" 53

Thanks to Dorman's persistence and personal charm, his techniques of cajolery and persuasion were highly effective. Despite the intrinsic and sentimental value of the furnishings, Bishop White's descendants proved to be remarkably generous. Because of their gifts, a large percentage of the furnishings in the Bishop White House are those that were there in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Only one major Bishop White item had to be purchased. This was a tall-case clock that had long ago been given to a Philadelphia charitable organization. The organization was in the midst of a scholarship campaign, and accepted a contribution to the scholarship fund in

exchange for the clock.[54]

There were not, however, enough of White's former possessions available to furnish the house fully. Over the course of the years many things, unfashionable, worn out, or damaged beyond repair, must have been discarded. Occasionally such items would resurface. During the period when he was immersed in the furnishings for the Bishop White House, Dorman gave frequent talks about his plans. On one occasion after such a talk, a woman came up to Dorman carrying a brown paper bag. In it were two early nineteenth-century five-light sconces, coal-black with tarnish. One of her ancestors, as a youth, had been among the crew commissioned to clean out the house prior to its sale after the bishop's death. He had found the sconces in a closet in the attic, and, when they went unclaimed, took them home. His family had never used them, but because of their association had kept them.[55] Now, after a century and a half, they would go back to the house where they belonged.

For knowledge of what the missing furnishings might have been, there were two major sources. One was the archaeological evidence derived from excavation of the bishop's sewer. The sherds of ceramics and glassware provided clues to the kinds and quantity of the wares used in the the Whites' dining room and kitchen. There were Chinese export porcelains in the Canton and Nanking patterns, as well as some of the more delicately-patterned teawares and serving pieces, English creamware and salt glaze, and Pennsylvania redware and slipware. The bishop and his guests drank wine from footed glasses and punch from engraved glass cups.[56] Further information came from contemporary household inventories. These were usually prepared after the death of the property owner and were often very detailed. Unfortunately, no inventory for Bishop White could be found. Dorman therefore carefully analyzed a group of twenty-two inventories of householders, whose wealth and social position were comparable to

the bishop's, and who lived in houses of similar design. There was considerable variety among the inventories; no two revealed identical patterns of room use nor identical collections of furnishings. However, some general patterns did emerge. For example, it had not been usual to reserve a room exclusively for dining in the early eighteenth century. It was possible to determine from the inventories, however, that by the time Bishop White built his new house after the Revolutionary War, the rear room on the first floor of a Philadelphia row house was customarily devoted to that purpose.

The report embodying the furnishing plan for the Bishop White House was issued in December 1961. It was extremely thorough, providing a furnishing guide that was complete to the smallest detail, and illustrated by plans and elevations showing the furnishings in place. These had been drawn, on her own time, by Hartshorne. Historian David A. Kimball had supplied the historical narrative. This supplemented David Wallace's historical background for the Historic Buildings Report, which had dealt with the bishop's religious and political life. Available information about White's private life was sparse, but from scattered sources Kimball pieced together a picture of the bishop's economic and social position, and of his family life. White had been comfortably supplied with worldly goods, if not rich. His social ranking was impeccable, not only through family and marriage, but also by virtue of his position as rector of Philadelphia's wealthiest parish and Bishop of Pennsylvania. He entertained, and was entertained by, Philadelphia's leading families and most of the city's distinguished visitors, including George Washington. Even when no guests were present, the household must have been lively, because it was always filled with young Whites. When Bishop White and his wife moved into the house in 1787, they were the parents of five children, ranging in age from two to thirteen. There were also three servants in

residence. Two of the children died young and Mrs. White died in 1797, but the remaining son and daughters lived with their father until they married. The bishop's son, Thomas, continued to reside with his father after his marriage; he and his wife gradually augmented the household with four offspring. Other grandchildren came to live with the bishop after a parent's death or widowhood; at one time there were eleven in residence. Even at the time of the bishop's death, at the age of eighty-eight, his son and seven grandchildren were still sharing the house with him. Despite the demands this large family must have made on his time, White managed to pursue a life of scholarship, producing four books, twenty-four published sermons, and a number of shorter works. He was also active in several charitable and intellectual organizations.[57]

Dorman hoped to furnish the Bishop White House in a manner that would portray the busy life of the bishop and his extended family. Accordingly he had provided a plan for every interior space in the house from cellar to attic. Not only the bishop's study and drawing room, but also the scullery and servants' rooms would be completely furnished and fitted out. There would be clothes in the closets, combs and brushes on dressing tables, household cleaning equipment in the kitchen, and demijohns in the wine cellar. Items already owned by the park or available for donation were listed, and costs were estimated for those that would be need to be purchased.[58] It was an ambitious scheme, and one that has never been executed fully. Only the first and second floors of the front building and the first floor of the back building, including the kitchen and necessary have been furnished and opened to public view.

While Dorman worked on assembling the furnishings, and after construction work had been completed, Penny Hartshorne returned to the Bishop White House to determine the original finishes on walls and woodwork. Her task began with an analysis of all painted surfaces. She used techniques that she had learned from

Anne F. Clapp, an art conservator who had joined the park staff. Clapp dealt mainly with the restoration of the collection of portraits of leading figures of the Revolutionary and Federal periods that had hung in Independence Hall when the park service had assumed custody. She had also been responsible for restoration of the painted eagle that decorated the cove cornice of the ceiling over the speaker's rostrum in Congress Hall. In addition to this involvement in what might be categorized as the park's fine arts, she had worked on determining the original paint colors at the Todd House, with Hartshorne as an apprentice. Paint analysis, as carried out at that time, consisted of two basic procedures, both requiring a sure eye and a steady hand. First, with a surgeon's scalpel, the analyst gradually scraped down a "bull-eye" from the top coat to bare wood, exposing seriated layers of paint. Next, an intact sample of all the layers was cut and observed in cross section under a microscope. Through careful study of the layers it was possible to determine what color had been applied first to the wood, and whether that color had simply been a primer or a finish coat. The primer would sink into the wood; the finish coat would retain a layer of dirt. Subsequent coats would also exhibit a dirt layer. Through establishing how many layers there were and how thick the dirt was, it was possible to form a relative idea of the frequency with which a surface had been painted and how long each color had been exposed to view.[59]

At the Bishop White House Hartshorne determined that the original trim colors had been predominantly buff or cream. The walls of the first floor and hallway, however, had been papered rather than painted.[60] Vestiges of paper remained, but were too small to determine anything but that the paper had been made of rag. Once again study of neighboring buildings was called for.[61] Fortunately, larger samples of wallpaper were turning up in houses undergoing restoration. The precedent for the living room paper was found, backed by a

1785 copy of the Pennsylvania Packet, on the third floor of a tavern, The Man Full of Trouble at 127 Spruce Street.[62] Other interior details also remained to be studied. In 1964, after considerable research, Hartshorne prepared a schedule for doors and hardware.[63] Once again, the materials in the architectural study collection provided invaluable background. Photographs or even other pieces of hardware in situ can convey the outward appearance of an object such as a hinge. But to make an accurate working reproduction it is necessary to know how an object is manufactured and how it should be installed, information that may well be invisible once the object is in place. Such knowledge can only be observed from the object itself.[64]

The Bishop White House was opened to the public in October 1967[65] . Over the previous seven years the exterior and interior had been restored and the back building reconstructed, largely by the day labor force, authentic or appropriate furnishings had been installed, and wallpaper of the period of the house had been copied and hung. The bishop's books were back in the bishop's bookcases in the bishop's study, thanks to the generosity of the Philadelphia Divinity School; much of the bishop's silver was in the dining room, thanks to the generosity of the bishop's descendants; and his brother-in-law's sofa adorned the parlor.

The process of restoring the Bishop White House had covered a span of almost fifteen years. In part this was due to lack of funding; in part to interruption of the work of the historians, archaeologists, architects, and craftsmen, who were spread thin. Hartshorne interspersed efforts at the Bishop White House with assignments to Congress Hall and Independence Hall. Souder and Wrenn shifted between it and the other houses on Walnut Street. The historians were interrupted frequently in their tasks of research and report-writing to lead groups around the park, to monitor archaeology, or to research other

topics. The transfer of responsibility for restoration of the Bishop White House from the park staff to EODC also occasioned some delay. Besides, there was almost no way that the National Park Service, with its system of levels of review and comment, could carry out a project with the speed that might be possible in the private sector. On the other hand, the thorough study of a building by several disciplines, and submission of the fruits of that study to review by peers and superiors, served as a system of checks and balances and formed the basis both for more authentic restoration and more accurate interpretation of the buildings to the public.

The Bishop White House provided a testing ground and laboratory for many of the restoration staff at Independence. It was the project on which they cut their teeth, learning and trying out methods of discovering and analyzing evidence. Because the knowledge they required could not be found in books or manuals, they had to acquire it through experience, from dealing with the buildings themselves. They would profit from that experience, and would continue to learn more, as they dealt with the park's centerpiece, Independence Hall.

Restoring Independence Hall

"I am filled with deep emotion," said Abraham Lincoln, speaking at Independence Hall on the way to his inaugural in 1861, "at finding myself standing in this place, where were collected together the wisdom, the patriotism, the devotion to principle, from which sprang the institutions under which we live."[66] These feelings might not be expressed so eloquently, but they were still shared by most Americans a century later. Preservation of this sacred icon was the ultimate purpose for which Independence National Historical

Park had been created. Its custody had been tranferred to the federal government, somewhat reluctantly, by the City of Philadelphia so that the National Park Service could lavish on it the attention that the city had not been able to afford. Just what that attention should be was not, however, a simple matter to determine. Independence Hall had stood for 200 years, but had been both altered and restored several times in the course of those two centuries. It had been depicted in virtually every medium and written about in hundreds, if not thousands, of publications. Yet it was obvious that the available information left many questions unanswered about the appearance of Independence Hall in 1776, and certainly provided no guidance about the methods to be employed in returning it to that appearance. Finding the answers, exploring the options, and carrying out the work would take almost a quarter of a century.

It was evident, however, as soon as the National Park Service took custody of Independence Hall on January 2, 1951, that some immediate steps were required. There were leaks in the roof; sections of the brick exterior walls needed repointing; and parts of the exterior wooden trim had rotted. Repairs were essential, lest these conditions lead to progressive damage to the building. In addition the staff of the new park project "was anxious to create an appearance of efficient housekeeping and of due concern for an important public trust." To demonstrate this in an immediately visible manner, the exterior and most of the interior of the building would be freshly painted. Beginning in March 1951 weekly staff meetings were held to plan and schedule the work. Those in attendance were Peterson, Edward M. Riley, Benjamin Franklin Gibson, the park project's first fiscal officer, and Warren A. McCullough, a long-time city employee at Independence Square, who had joined the park service staff with the title of curator. Also participating in the meetings was John B.

Lukens, a young architect on Peterson's staff. Lukens would prepare whatever drawings were required and write specifications, as well as supervise the roofing and pointing, which would be done by outside contractors; McCullough would supervise the rest of the work, which would be carried out by the project's maintenance staff. There was some urgency to the schedule; it was hoped that the entire program could be accomplished by the first week in July, which would inaugurate the celebration of the 175th anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration of Independence.

As would often prove to be the case with the buildings at Independence, contractors, workmen and suppliers were proud to be associated with the project, and were often helpful in suggesting methods of dealing with the historic fabric. The roofing contract was awarded to M.G. Kulzer & Sons, who had recently completed re-roofing Carpenters' Hall; the masonry contractor was Jules H. Rosenberg. It was Rosenberg who suggested that all the rainwater conductors be removed so that the brickwork behind them could be examined and repointed as needed. When no longleaf yellow pine of the proper dimensions for replacement of the stair treads could be found locally, a nation-wide appeal was broadcast. The lumber, which came from Florida, was donated by the Southern Pine Association. The same group arranged for a donation of eastern white pine to repair the bottom rail of the roof balustrade.[67]

The stair treads installed were the product of an ingenious design by Peterson. Although the existing treads were badly worn and thus presented a hazard to visitors, it was feared that their removal and replacement would require disassembling the staircase, which Peterson had determined was the original. Because the staircase was dovetailed and paint-bound, the potential for damage was high if this course was followed. Therefore rather than replacing the treads completely, Peterson devised a system of removing the main

walking surface, leaving the tread ends intact. New sections of board were then slipped into place and fastened down, and the entire tread stained, shellacked and varnished. The separate boards, he believed, could readily be replaced when the treads once again became worn.[68]

Even as the emergency remedial work went forward, Riley's staff was beginning to search for historical data on Independence Hall, its contents, and the events that had taken place within its walls and on its grounds. It was a formidable task. Over the next three years researchers from Independence would examine approximately 2 million manuscripts and published items, and could estimate that 10 million more required investigation.[69] In 1953, when they had assembled a selected bibliography, it contained some 8,000 titles.[70] The magnitude of the research effort can only be appreciated by remembering that it was accomplished before publication of the National Union Catalogue of Manuscript Collections and before the invention, or at least the common use, of copying machines. Each potential repository of manuscripts, rare published materials, and pictures had to be visited and systematically explored. Every relevant item had to be painstakingly copied by hand and then transcribed onto the five by eight research cards that were both record of and index to the findings. The staffing was rarely adequate for the task. During six weeks at the end of 1953, when the first written report on Independence Hall was due for completion, the historians logged 495 hours of uncompensated overtime. Most of this, 382 hours, was put in by Dennis Kurjack, who had been working fifteen hours a day, seven days a week.[71]

The first fruits of the research on Independence Hall and other buildings in or related to the park were published in 1953, as a volume in the Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, in a compendium entitled Historic Philadelphia. The opening article was on the Independence

Square group. Written by Dr. Edward M. Riley and based on the historians' research, it dealt with the acquisition, construction and alterations to the buildings and the State House Yard. Illustrated with early views gathered by the research staff in the previous two years, it depended heavily on published records of the Congress, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and the City of Philadelphia, as well as travelers' accounts and early guide books. One of the most valuable sources of information was the Horace Wells Sellers Collection at the Historical Society of Pennylvania. This represented the fruits of his research performed after the Philadelphia Chapter of the American Institute of Architects assumed responsibility for overseeing work on the buildings on the square in the early twentieth century. In addition, a few manuscript collections had been consulted, notably the Norris Papers at the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, John Trumbull's papers at the Library of Congress, and John Haviland's papers at the University of Pennsylvania. Although much information had clearly been assembled about the design and construction of Independence Hall and its subsequent alterations, it was obvious that much more research would be needed. Very little was known about the appearance of the interior of the building or its furnishings at the time that the Declaration of Independence was adopted.[72]

Even before Riley's article was published the park service had received fresh impetus to conduct more detailed research on the interior of Independence Hall in the form of a generous offer from the General Federation of Women's Clubs. In October 1952 representatives of the park project and the federation met informally in Philadelphia. The federation's president, Mrs. John L. Whitehurst, put forth a proposal for a nationwide campaign to raise funds for the restoration and refurnishing of Independence Hall. In February, even before details of the federation's plans were complete, the historical staff was

detached from other duties to concentrate on intensive research on Independence Hall.[73] On June 17, 1953, the then president of the federation, Mrs. Oscar A. Ahlgren, met with National Park Service Director Conrad L. Wirth in his Washington office. Mrs. Ahlgren was prepared to commit the group to raising sufficient funds to pay for the restoration and refurnishing of the first floor of Independence Hall. Within a year the campaign had been successful. On August 2, 1954 Mrs. Ahlgren sent Wirth a check for $209,541.82, with the stipulation that priority was to be given to refurnishing. It was the largest single amount that had ever been applied to Independence Hall from the time its construction had been proposed in 1729.[74]

National Park Service management was eager to see the project substantially completed by May 1955, when the General Federation of Women's Clubs was scheduled to hold its annual meeting in Philadelphia.[75] As was often the case at Independence, however, despite the high priority assigned to the project, the research program took longer than anticipated. Among the causes of delay were internal reorganization and changes in personnel.[76] In July 1954 Riley, who had organized and supervised the historical research, left the park service to accept a post at Colonial Williamsburg. His position as chief park historian was filled by Dr. Murray H. Nelligan, who had transferred to Independence from National Capital Parks in Washington. At the same time, Charles E. Peterson, under whose direction Robert G. Stewart had conducted research on various earlier restorations of the building, left Independence to take up his post at EODC. Responsibility for carrying forward the architectural aspects of the project devolved on his replacement as resident architect, Charles S. Grossman. Each of these men, as well as others assigned to the project, had to familiarize himself with the data that had already been assembled before the work could be carried forward. The research program was

also interrupted in the spring of 1954 while most of the historical staff worked on the master plan.[77] Furthermore the mass of potential documentation rendered the task formidable, especially since information about the furnishings could be found only by searching the records for minute detail.[78]

Having already been through the printed documents relating to Independence Hall, the historians now began to concentrate on manuscript sources, first in Philadelphia repositories and then further afield. In September 1954 Dennis Kurjack investigated papers at the William L. Clements Library at the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor, while Marty Yoelson perused the collections of the New-York Historical Society.[79] In the meantime, the Washington office of the National Park Service had decided that it should be possible to proceed with the acquisition of at least some of the furnishings concurrent with the research program. As was often the case in that period, the park service determined to turn to outside experts for advice and assistance. Anderson had proposed in June that a small committee of such experts be appointed, and in September Chief of Interpretation Ronald F. Lee made his recommendations. His list was a short one. It consisted of Charles Nagel, director of the Brooklyn Museum, Charles Montgomery of the Henry Francis duPont Winterthur Museum, and Dr. Hans Huth, associate curator of the Department of Paintings at the Art Institute of Chicago. In a postscript he suggested substituting Mrs. Francis B. Crowninshield, a well-known collector, for Dr. Huth. He believed it might well be suitable to have a woman on the committee, evidently in consideration of the funding source.[80] Regional Director Elbert Cox was pleased with the substitution. Mrs. Crowninshield, like Nagel and Montgomery, lived on the east coast in reasonable proximity to Philadelphia, which would ease the task of bringing the committee together.[81]

Lee's hope that the acquisition program could go forward before the research was complete was based on the amount of material that had already been found relevant to the appearance of the Assembly Room in the years between 1776 and 1787. Previous research had located a painting at the Historical Society of Pennsylvania that would prove to be a key document for both the architectural restoration and the refurnishing. This was a canvas entitled "Congress Voting Independence, July 4, 1776," thought to have been begun by Robert Edge Pine in 1784 and completed after his death by Edward Savage.[82] Cruder artistically than the far more famous "Declaration of Independence" by John Trumbull, it was, however, the Independence staff had concluded, on the basis of careful study of the painting and the objects shown in it by Museum Specialist James M. Mulcahy, much more accurate. The Pine-Savage painting shows the members of Congress in various poses, some seated at tables, others standing, still others occupying Windsor chairs. Partial confirmation for such seating had been found, a bill to the Pennsylvania Assembly from Philadelphia chairmaker Francis Trumble (or with the varied spelling common in the eighteenth century Trumbull), dated November 27,1778. The Assembly had purchased twenty Windsors, probably to replace furnishings destroyed or stolen by the British during the occupation of Philadelphia.[83] William McPherson Hornor, author of The Blue Book of Philadelphia Furniture, and his former wife also claimed to have knowledge of Trumble account books showing that four different types of Windsors had been sold to the Assembly in 1775. David Stockwell, an antiques dealer, was thought to have several chairs bearing Trumble's brand or signature. A search for additional chairs in museum collections could provide additional guidance to the forms of chairs that should be acquired.[84]

By the time the advisory committee on the furnishings held its first meeting, the park staff had determined that it would be possible to achieve a

partial architectural refurbishing and refurnishing by May 1955, but that research and procurement for a number of desired items would take longer. On the basis of the historians' and curators' recommendations, Superintendent Melford O. Anderson advised that the following could be in place by the target date: the secretary's and speaker's tables; the president's or "Rising Sun" chair; and the silver ink stand by Philip Syng, all of which had been displayed among the room's contents when the park service had acquired custody from the City of Philadelphia; thirteen delegations' tables (period or reproduction), with green baize cloth coverings; at least sample Windsor chairs from a group of forty to be acquired eventually; a Penn family coat of arms; Charles Willson Peale's portrait of George Washington, either the original owned by the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts or a copy; and miscellaneous minor furnishings such as writing paper and hickory firewood. Future acquisitions would include appropriate ink stands, captured British flags, engravings and maps, books and newspapers, stoves, candles and candlesticks and Venetian blinds.

Anderson also entered a plea for patience, asking the Washington office to intercede with the General Federation of Women's Clubs who were pressing for completion of the project and were exhibiting a "limited grasp...of the scope of the research problem involved and their reluctance to allow use of the funds for this abnormal and extensive basic requirement."[85] It was not the first time, nor would it by any means be the last, that Anderson would issue such a plea. Pressures to meet specific deadlines and to complete the entire project mounted frequently, coming from private organizations, the city, and the park's own advisory commission. Repeatedly Anderson defended his staff, reminding outsiders and park service management that they had embarked on a project of enormous scope, requiring an unprecedented commitment of time and manpower. Independence Hall had been restored several times before; this time the park was

determined that it would be done with the highest degree of accuracy possible.

Fortunately the advisory committee was fully supportive of the thesis that the furnishings program should be based on careful research and documentation. The committee met for what was essentially a briefing session in December 1954 and again in January 1955. In a lengthy and substantive discussion the committee agreed on several issues. They supported retention of the "Rising Sun" chair in the Assembly Room, based on evidence of its presence there during the Constitutional Convention. They also agreed that the speaker's table should remain, provided that expert examination validated its authenticity for the period. For the time being it would be sufficient to equip the room with only one or two antique delegates' tables; the others could be reproductions, since they would be hidden under their green baize covers. It was suggested that swatches of this material at Winterthur and Williamsburg be examined so that appropriate cloth could be reproduced. On the important issue of the Windsor chairs, Nagel and Montgomery believed that those shown in the Pine-Savage painting were a few years too late in period; they preferred a branded Trumble chair of which a photograph had been obtained. The group agreed to circulate photographs of the chair to dealers, and to inspect examples that were proffered for sale.[86]

By the end of the following month, this approach had proved successful. Two chairs had been offered for sale by the Ziegler family of Lititz, Pennsylvania. According to family tradition the chairs had been in their possession ever since Conrad Ziegler bought them at a sale of State House furnishings in 1800 and hauled them to Lititz on his farm wagon.[87] Mulcahy and Montgomery had been out to inspect them and had recommended their acquisition. Another major collection of signed Windsor chairs was in the possession of antiques dealer David Stockwell.[88] By late March Nelligan was

able to report to Anderson that the purchase of the Ziegler chairs had been accomplished, and that negotiations were almost complete for the Stockwell collection. In addition Stockwell had offered to donate two of the finest pieces, chairs signed by Francis Trumble. Stockwell would probably also be able to provide at least one and possibly two delegates' tables of suitable size and period.

Progress had also been made on a number of other items. Charles Montgomery had agreed to procure period writing paper; prototypes for inkstands had been found; and the National Park Museum Division had negotiated with the U.S. Army to obtain copies of the captured British flags at West Point. Although the curator of the museum at West Point had informally agreed to permit the copies to be made, he had also suggested that such a display might be damaging to British-American relations. He thought the State Department should be consulted before such a step was taken.[89] This diplomatic issue seems to have been taken seriously at Independence; the captured colors were never put on display in the Assembly Room.

Nelligan also reported that a manufacturer had been found to reproduce the green baize table coverings.[90] Although these were in place when the room was dedicated at the annual meeting of the General Federation of Women's Clubs in May 1955, they were replaced two years later with handwoven cloth made at the Penland School of Handicrafts in North Carolina. Wirth assured the General Federation of Women's Clubs that "the difference between the two is striking, that the Penland product has a rich hand-woven appearance which contributes much to the authenticity of this handsome room."[91]

Although the dedicatory ribbon cutting duly took place in May 1955, the refurnishing of the Assembly Room was by no means complete, and the architectural restoration had not even begun. So uncertain were the researchers

about what the appearance of the room had been in 1776, that a few months after the members of the General Federation of Women's Clubs left Philadelphia, the furnishings were removed to storage so that a thorough investigation of the room could be undertaken.[92] The Assembly Room had received little attention from the architects until the General Federation of Women's Clubs gift focused attention on its restoration. Other aspects of Independence Hall, such as the emergency restoration work carried out in 1951, as well as master planning for the park, had been higher priorities.

When he first began to investigate the architectural fabric of the Assembly Room, Resident Architect Charles Grossman appeared to accept Philadelphia architect John Haviland's work of 1831 as an authentic restoration. After all, Haviland had declared he was "reinstating it [the Assembly Room] with its original architectural embellishments" and that "the materials we have are in good taste ... and constitutes nearly the whole finish."[93] Although the historians were aware that the original paneling had been removed, they at first interpreted Haviland's statement to mean that it had been stored and reused.[94] Thus when Grossman was asked to design a reproduction for the bar or railing, which had once separated spectators from the assembled delegates, he looked for evidence of its former attachment on the pedestals of Haviland's pilasters along the north and south walls.[95] Grossman had begun his investigations of the first floor of Independence Hall in early November 1954, assisted by two student summer aides, Ralph Frost and Philip Atcheson.[96] They began with the frontispiece of the tower entrance. Their first procedure was to strip paint in order to distinguish old work from alterations.[97] Soon, however, they shifted to the Assembly Room, using the same technique of stripping paint on a section of paneling on the east wall. Almost immediately it became evident that the changes wrought by T. Mellon Rogers in 1897-1898 were

greater than had previously been assumed. Rogers had removed Haviland's carved wooden cornice and pilaster capitals and replaced them with elements made of compo, a form of plaster.[98]

By the time the advisory committee on furnishings met in mid-December, Grossman could only report that because of the several past "restorations," it would be exceedingly difficult to determine the original construction and finishes of the Assembly Room.[99] Furthermore, the more intense search for documentation sparked by the federation's gift had uncovered evidence indicating that the Haviland treatment was not an accurate reflection of the appearance of the room in the eighteenth century. James Mulcahy, after careful study of the Pine-Savage painting and the engraving of it by Edward Savage, was certain that this view, showing architectural finishes quite different from the Haviland paneling, was the most authentic representation of the room and its contents.[100] Early in February 1954, Marty Yoelson had found a document in the Pennsylvania Archives showing that the Pennsylvania Assembly had decided on January 25 1734/35 that the room should be finished with wainscot to a "convenient height" on three sides, with a full wainscot or paneling at the east end.[101] This document conincided with the treatment shown in the Pine-Savage painting. Although figures of the delegates obscured the wainscot of "convenient height" on the north side of the room, the plain plaster above, adorned only with wooden window trim and a cornice, agreed with the description, as did the fully paneled east end. The latter included pilasters of the Ionic order. The view also showed a pulvinated frieze and cove cornice, all in sharp contrast to the Doric pilasters and cornice present in the Assembly Room. With so many questions raised by the documentation and even the most minimal architectural investigation, the staff recommended treating the Assembly Room conservatively for the time being. Old paint would be stripped from the

woodwork and a fresh coat applied to the walls and the floor.[102] Otherwise the room would be left undisturbed until a more thorough investigation could be undertaken.

During the summer and fall of 1955, the height of the visitation season at Independence, the refurnished Assembly Room remained on display and the architectural investigation of Independence Hall remained in abeyance. By December, however, the park's painters and carpenters had returned to the work of removing paint on the first floor, repairing woodwork, and, at the same time, providing an opportunity for the architects to study the building. Penelope Hartshorne's first assignment was to assist in the examination of the Supreme Court Room. As part of the refurnishing funded by the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the judge's bench was to be restored. Hartshorne crawled under the existing, later bench to record joist pockets related to former levels of the bench, as well as of the steps leading up to it. Unfortunately, there were two sets of holes left by the joists in the masonry, and she could not determine their relative dates at that time. When paneling on the north and south walls was removed, she also found evidence of the position and stepped profile of the former grand jury boxes.[103] Hartshorne soon left Independence Hall to assist in investigation of the Bishop White House, where she worked through much of 1955 and 1956. At the same time, as work progressed in Independence Hall, she returned periodically to make observations and to record the architects' findings.

Grossman's approach to investigating Independence Hall, stripping paint, had several purposes. For one thing, the many paint layers -- in some case a build-up over 200 years -- obscured the details of the architectural trim, hiding the delicate beauty of finely-carved wood. For another the paint was masking areas in need of repair. Finally, Grossman believed that the bare wood

would reveal where alterations and repairs had been made in the past. On the other hand, the architects eventually learned that the layers of old paint could themselves provide important evidence, evidence that was irretrievably lost when the paint was removed without careful preliminary study. Paint stripping began with the east wall of the Assembly Room, proceeded to the Supreme Court Room and had reached the center hall by January 1956. As the work progressed carpenters removed loose pieces of trim so that they could be reattached more securely. Examining these closely, the architects found the penciled and inscribed initials of various workmen.[104] A boldly penciled "TN." on a hidden rail in the back of the entablature recorded the presence of Thomas Nevell, later a prominent carpenter-builder, who, as a young journeyman, had helped master carpenter Edmund Woolley install the paneling in the 1750s.[105] These were exciting findings, vivid links with the past. More significant for restoration technology, however, was a discovery Charles Grossman made in examining paneling over the door from the central hall to the Assembly Room. Here, beneath the present pediment, and outlined by the residue of the original red iron-oxide primer, was the shape of a triangular pediment used at an earlier period.[106]

Up to this point the architects had devoted attention to the woodwork itself, to the manner in which it was formed and attached, but not to the finishes applied after it had been installed. Grossman's discovery suggested that close study of paints might reveal information about the building's original detailing that could not be found by other means. The study of the center hall woodwork led Grossman to look again at the accounts of Samuel Harding, a woodcarver who had supplied architectural ornament for Independence Hall in the 1750s. In addition to woodwork for the center hall, Harding had provided Ionic capitals for what he described as the "green room." Could this, the architects speculated, be the Assembly Room? By this time, the architects

were accepting the Pine-Savage painting as a reliable document, although clearly the perspective was impossible and the architectural details crudely represented. It showed pilasters of the Ionic order, rather than those of the Doric order installed by Haviland. If the Pine-Savage view was accurate, Harding's account, with its reference to Ionic capitals, might provide a valuable clue to the original color treatment of the room.[107]

In order to determine whether traces of green paint could be found, even though the woodwork had already been stripped,the tabernacle frame at the east end of the Assembly Room, some parts of which were thought to be original, was examined. Although nothing was established at this time about paint colors, the examination did reveal the outline of Haviland's pilaster capitals, which had been removed by Rogers in the course of the 1890s restoration.[108] This was confirmation of what had already been observed in the center hall, that study of the presence or absence of paint layers could indicate the size and outline of missing archtectural trim. The architects were also beginning to consider other materials as possible clues to dating. Hartshorne asked a representative of the G. & W.H. Corson Company to take mortar samples from joist holes that were possibly associated with the original location of the judge's bench in the Supreme Court Room. They hoped that when these were compared wth dated samples from other parts of Independence Hall and Congress Hall they would reveal when the holes had been filled in.[109] Although the results of the particular tests were inconclusive, mortar sampling would become another standard element in the approach to dating building fabric.

At the same time the architects began to subject paints to more than examination by the naked eye. Experts from the Glidden Paint Company were called in to take samples for analysis from the Assembly and Supreme Court Rooms. Almost immediately this procedure called into question the technique of

total paint stripping and application of wood preservative. Paul Blachman of Glidden found that he could not perform tests on the pediment of the tabernacle frame in the Assembly Room because a coat of pentachlorophenol had been used as a preservative over the newly-stripped wood.[109]

From then on the process was modified. Although paint removal would continue in order to recapture the details of the woodwork, samples would be taken beforehand and sections would be left undisturbed to preserve evidence of original colors and subsequent coats. Thus, when in May, with the advent of good weather, attention shifted to the exterior of the building, chips of paint and two dentils were obtained and brought into the architects' office before paint removal began on the main cornice of the north elevation. The chips were sent to the National Lead Company's laboratory for analysis. Late in June National Lead reported the results of their study. The cornice, thought to be original, undoubtedly was. It bore approximately 150 to 160 coats of paint. The first fifty coats over the primer were of white lead tinted a "dirty yellow." The next twenty-five to thirty coats were white; the forty above them again yellowish, although lighter than the bottom coats. The top forty or fifty paint layers were once again white.[110] In its fashion this was a startling revelation. For as long as anyone could remember, the exterior trim on most colonial buildings, including Independence Hall, had been painted a dazzling white. The information sent Hartshorne on a search through the historic literature. Confirmation of the use of such a color rather than pure white came from the New England Farmer of 1827, which recommended the addition of yellow ocher to white paint to slow the decomposition of white lead.[111] Based on these findings, the architects chose a warm cream as the exterior trim color for Independence Hall. It was a decision that would revolutionize the appearance of eighteenth-century masonry buildings over the next decade or two.

A local paint company reproduced the color as "Independence Hall White" and private owners of buildings undergoing restoration in neighboring Society Hill followed the example of the park service buildings.[112] Visitors to Independence and restoration architects from other parts of the country also noted the color change and, with or without the benefit of paint sampling, began to use cream for exterior trim on colonial buildings. Gradually the cream of Independence Hall became as ubiquitous as bright white had once been.

While most of the workmen were occupied in repairs to the north exterior facade and the center hall, the architects had an opportunity to review their findings. They also spent part of the early summer mounting an exhibit for installation in the Supreme Court Chamber. Throughout the long investigation of Independence Hall, at least part of the building always remained accessible to the public. Park service management believed that those Americans who had come to see Independence Hall and the Liberty Bell (which still stood in the tower hall) should not miss the experience. Still what visitors saw in the summer of 1956 might be disappointing -- scaffolding up on the exterior and in the center hall, paneling removed, and sections of wall stripped and not yet repainted. The exhibit, which opened on August 1, helped the public understand the condition of the building by sharing the research problems facing the park staff and observing what progress was being made.[114]

By late October the repairs to the north facade of the building were completed, and attention turned back to the interior of the building. While repairs in the center hall proceeded, scaffolding went up in the tower stair hall, so that the woodwork there could be examined and repaired as well. The tower stair hall was added to the original building in the 1750s. Its interior is extraordinarily felicitous in design and detailing. A broad staircase rises against its walls, lit midway by a large Palladian window in the south wall.

The space is crowned by an elaborate cornice, with a dentil course and a frieze with acanthus leaf modillions interspersed with carved flowers on the soffit. When the flowers were removed so that the old paint could be stripped, it was immediately obvious that they were part of the original decoration. The wood surface beneath them was clean, and they had been attached with wrought nails.[115] To guide the workmen who had originally installed them, those in the corners had been marked on the back with the word "corner," while those along the sides were marked with the orientation of the wall to which they were to be affixed. Over the windows in the east and west walls the flowers were oval rather than round, in order to preserve the rhythm of the spacing of the modillions in relation to the windows. Here someone, perhaps the master carver Samuel Harding, had sketched the proper shape in chalk on the underside of the soffit.[116]

Mindful of the potential loss of evidence caused by wholesale paint removal in other parts of the building, Hartshorne scraped paint down in selected areas. It soon became apparent that there were more layers of paint on richly carved elements than on flat surfaces, and that the latter bore torch marks. This suggested that paint had been removed previously by burning. On a dentil removed from the north corner, paint had been stripped from the front face, but not from the sides, which would have been difficult to reach with a torch.[117] The National Lead Company, to whom this dentil was sent for analysis, found that the original color was blue. Their report sent Hartshorne back to a soffit panel, a horizontal member that also might have escaped the torch. Scraping down layer by layer revealed that here too the bottom layer was blue. With these tests made, paint removal on the cornice proceeded, with the exception of a section in the southeast corner, where the full layering was preserved as evidence for future study.[118]

As work proceeded in the tower stair hall further aspects of the building's original appearance came to light. Removal of a wainscot panel on the stair landing revealed the original brickwork of the main building, covered over only some fifteen years after its construction. The architects ordered a plaster cast made, so that the evidence could be used as a guide for future repointing of the exterior.[119] Other important clues were discovered by Carpenter Foreman Joseph Silberholz, who was not only a highly skilled artisan, but a keen observer. Capable of carving flowers to replace those missing from the cornice, he also, while repairing paneling in the wainscoted dado, noticed one panel that had been repaired previously. Under a thin wooden strip that had been attached to bridge a spot where the tongue of the panel had loosened because of shrinkage, the old paint layers had escaped the earlier stripping.[120] These established that the dado, like the cornice, had origially been blue. While working on the doorway leading from the landing to the second floor, Silberholz also found in the open pilasters the outline of the original carved floral decoration behind compo flowers that had been applied in the 1890s.[121]

Silberholz was also one of the first to indicate that there might be underlying structural problems at Independence Hall. In the summer of 1957, while repairing the wooden arch of the Palladian window, he discovered that the detachment of the wooden trim from the wall was caused by the fact that the arched brickwork behind it had cracked and fallen. Although he and the mason carried out temporary repairs, they told the architects that they believed the cause to be settling of the tower's southeast corner.[122] Grossman warned Anderson immediately about this condition. He added that similar signs of collapse, caused by deterioration of mortar, had been observed in the Supreme Court Building [Old City Hall] and in the interior walls of Independence Hall that divided the center hall from the Assembly Room and Supreme Court Room.

These findings suggested that similar conditions might prevail elsewhere in the building in areas that were still concealed. However, the only remedies he suggested were that the Liberty Bell Ringers avoid swinging the tower bell in order to lessen vibration and that a tie rod be installed connecting the east and west walls of the tower[123] Nor did he recommend a thorough study of the building's structure, although additional areas of weakness began to surface as repairs to the south side of the exterior were undertaken in the fall of 1957. The cornice of the tower was found to need considerable repair because the blocking and outlookers supporting it had rotted. By Christmas the roof was leaking badly. When the carpenters began to attempt to trace the source of the leaks, they reported that the roof trusses should be inspected. Some had shifted out of position as much as three and a half inches.[124]

While repair work was being carried out in the tower stair hall and on the exterior, the architects returned, in October 1957, to their investigation of the Assembly Room. Armed with the skills they had acquired in paint analysis in the center hall and tower stair hall, they began a closer examination of the room's fabric. One of their primary objectives was to establish the original color scheme. They began by having the carpenters remove paneling along the west wall, so that they could search for evidence of earlier paint and plaster. Unfortunately, all the old plaster, save for a few small scraps, had been removed before the 1831 paneling had been installed. Grossman began to despair of ever finding the original paint color. With the west wall barren, the architects turned to the east wall, which proved far more rewarding. This time, in looking more closely at the tabernacle frame, the pedimented feature that occupied the center of the wall, they realized that both cut and wrought nails had been used in its construction. The presence of wrought nails suggested the

possibility that some elements of the frame might, in fact, be part of the original decoration of the room.[125]

As the tabernacle frame was dismantled Hartshorne looked with special care at the cockleshell frieze. Such a feature was represented in the Pine-Savage painting, and the carving of the piece, with its deeply scalloped shell and richly entwined foliation, was reminiscent of the finest of Philadelphia eighteenth-century furniture. Hartshorne's careful study was amply rewarded. The cockleshell frieze had, indeed, been in the Assembly Room when the Declaration of Independence was adopted. John Haviland had evidently reused it, but in a frame of somewhat different configuration, exposing more of the center of the board, but covering sections at its ends. Despite the wholesale stripping of paint from the Haviland paneling, traces of the original red primer could be discerned in the wood pores, and on the ends, which had been protected by the Haviland frame, the original green color and all subsequent paint layers were intact.[126]

Repairs to the interior woodwork of the center hall and the center stair hall continued through 1958. In the meantime, however, the question of the basic condition of the buildings on Independence Square came to a head. Symptoms of structural defects had been observed in Independence Hall and Old City Hall in 1957 and early 1958; Grossman had informed Anderson about them, but had not expressed urgency about dealing with them. Meanwhile, similar repairs of woodwork underway at Congress Hall had revealed the failure of a major roof truss.[127] Here the problem was not hidden, but readily apparent; the failure had caused a highly visible bulge in the building's side walls. In view of the seemingly critical situation at Congress Hall, the park service decided in the fall of 1958 to suspend further work on the buildings until a structural survey was completed.[128]

At the same time, responsibility for architectural research on the buildings at Independence was shifted from the park to the Eastern Office of Design and Construction. Charles Peterson began to organize and augment his staff in preparation for assuming responsibility for research, reports, and architectural work on the Independence buildings. Well aware of the knowledge that Penelope Hartshorne had acquired during the investigations of the previous three years, he requested her transfer from the park staff to EODC.

> If my section is expected to prepare these extremely complicated and detailed reports some personnel will have to be added for that purpose. The type of person who can do it is about the scarcest in the architectural profession. The only person I can think of in the Service, with background for this sort of thing and that might be available, is Miss Hartshorne. I don't know whether or not she can write, but she can draw, has a deep and intelligent interest in such subjects and has spent more time in and around these buildings than anyone else. 129

EODC also prepared the contract and specifications for an outside engineering group to conduct the structural survey of the buildings on the Square. These documents were written, however, not by Peterson or Thomas Wistar, Jr., to whom Peterson had assigned responsibility for restoration of the buildings on Independence Square, but by the "modern" architectural group under the direction of John Cabot. The contract called for the park craftsmen to expose and rehabilitate those areas that would be opened up or otherwise disturbed in the course of the structural investigation. While it was desirable to have men who were familiar with the delicate fabric of the buildings carry out needed removals of the historic materials, their employment on this task effectively halted the program of ongoing physical research and repairs. The contract was awarded to the Ewing Company, who began the examination of the buildings in November. The company submitted its controversial report, with its radical proposal for reconstruction of the buildings, in March. The debate over

acceptance or rejection of their recommendations was not resolved until June 1959. By this time, it had been decided that restoration work on the Square would begin with Congress Hall.[130] Its structural system appeared to require rehabilitation more urgently than either Old City Hall or Independence Hall. It was also a far smaller building than Independence Hall, and more readily understood; its restoration could therefore be completed with more speed, thus satisfying the demands for progress that had been coming from Judge Lewis, the mayor, and the Philadelphia newspapers. It was to Congress Hall, therefore, that structural engineer Sheldon Keast was first asked to turn his attention in considering alternatives to the Ewing Company's recommendations.

Meanwhile, Independence Hall remained in a state of suspension, its first floor unpainted and its structural problems unattended. The first situation was partly remedied in the spring and summer of 1960, when the center hall and tower stair hall were painted.[131] The second was left in abeyance, pending further study by EODC. Even without work at Independence Hall, there was enough activity to occupy the architects assigned to Independence in EODC and the park's carpenters, mason and painters. In addition to the structural rehabilitation of Congress Hall, research activity and construction work were in progress in 1959 and 1960 on the exterior of the Merchants' Exchange, the Bishop White House and the other houses on Walnut and Locust Streets.[132] There was also time to consider what was and was not known about Independence Hall. Indeed, although the historic section of the Historic Structures Report on the building was completed in 1959, and Grossman and Hartshorne had been examining the first floor since 1956, a great deal of concrete information was still lacking. The center hall and tower stair hall had been established as largely original, along with major segments of the Supreme Court Room's paneling. But little was known about that room's arrangements, and still less about the actual

apearance of the Assembly Room in the historic period. Architectural investigation of the interior of the second floor had never been undertaken by the National Park Service, nor had the nature and condition of the building's structure been fully examined.

In June 1961 Regional Director Ronald F. Lee convened a conference on planning and programs for Independence, attended by representatives from region, the park, and EODC. Two alternative programs had already been discussed for Independence Hall. Lee preferred the program calling for a five-year moratorium on restoration.[133] This would allow for thorough research and investigation before any alterations were made to the building's fabric. Indeed a new phase of such research was about to get underway. When the Ewing Company's solution for structural reinforcement of the buildings was rejected, the park service had determined that it would perform further structural studies in-house. As a preliminary step, a summer measuring team, consisting of an architect and three students, was assigned to make measured drawings of the roof framing.[135] The team worked under the supervision of a young park service architect named Lee H. Nelson. For Nelson it was the beginning of an association with Independence Hall that would last for over a decade, until completion of the building's restoration in 1972.

Nelson was another of Peterson's recruits, noticed by the older man for his talent, and carefully nurtured through a succession of work and learning experiences. Nelson had been brought up in Oregon, and had already produced a book on covered bridges that had brought him to Peterson's attention. His first job with the park service was as supervisor of a HABS summer team at Fort McHenry in 1958, just after he finished graduate school in architecture. Peterson watched Nelson carefully, and at the end of the summer suggested that he stay on with a draftsman and make more drawings. Whenever Peterson passed

through Baltimore, he would have Nelson meet him at the train station, review his work, and suggest new leads for fresh avenues of research. "He was a very hard taskmaster and set a very high standard," Nelson recalled.[135] By the time funds for the recording project ran out, Nelson was in trouble at Fort McHenry. In his enthusiasm he had carried his architectural investigations into the realm of archaeology, excavating a cellar room. That earned him censure from the archaeologists and some official letters of reprimand, but was not enough to preclude further employment with the park service. Anxious to keep him, Peterson next sent Nelson to Yorktown to work on the Archer and Dudley Dix Houses. There he would have the opportunity of working with Gordon Whittington, who would himself come to Independence in the early 1970s, and for whom Peterson had the highest respect. Whittington was a craftsman, not an architect, but he could plan, draw, had an intuitive sense for physical investigation and research, and was inventive in using tools and techniques. He and Nelson devloped an excellent working relationship, which would continue when they both transferred to Independence.[136] Nelson came to Philadelphia, somewhat reluctantly, in the summer of 1960, to supervise a student measuring team at Old City Hall. He remained to work on the building's Historic Structures Report and to supervise rehabilitation of its cupola.

The work of Nelson's measuring team in the attic of Independence Hall in the summer of 1961 was arduous and uncomfortable. Their task was to record the trusses that support the building's roof and help to support the second floor ceiling as well. In order to examine and record the bottom chords of the trusses, Nelson had had the attic floorboards taken up, adding to the awkwardness of working in a cramped space. The attic was hot and dusty, and the task must have seemed somewhat dull, at least until July 13 at 11:45 a.m., when part of the second floor ceiling cracked.[137] Blaine Cliver, a student on

the measuring team, heard a sound that seemed familiar. Almost instantly he remembered the collapse of a ceiling in his fraternity house at Carnegie-Mellon Institute and called to his fellow draftsmen to vacate the building.[138]

As soon as they could find a telephone, Cliver called Nelson, who was lunching at his desk in the Merchants' Exchange. Nelson and others in the office immediately began a frantic telephone search for the carpenters, who were then headquartered on Market Street. He needed them fast with a load of shoring timbers. His great fear, like that of the students, was that the trusses, which were obviously overstressed, were now in structural failure that might lead to the collapse of the building.[139] Nelson, Judd, Hartshorne, Wistar, and a young architect named J. M. Everett then headed on the run for Independence Hall, where the plaster cracking was extending rapidly and parts of the ceiling were beginning to fall. Concerned for the safety of the public, they asked the guards to clear the first floor of visitors and to remove the most valuable furnishings, such as the Syng inkstand and the "Rising Sun" chair.

Happily, the incident was not as serious as it had first seemed. No major components of the building were in structural failure. Instead, the activity in the attic had loosened the inadequate nailing of furring and metal lath for the plaster ceiling installed in 1922. Over the next few weeks the ceiling, floor, and relatively modern woodwork on the second floor were removed to prevent further incidents and facilitate study of structural conditions. Observation of the Assembly Room ceiling showed that it too was in perilous condition. To prevent its collapse, temporary shoring was installed until the plaster could be taken down, and the furnishings were once again removed.[140]

The fall of the ceiling had both good and bad consequences. Among the latter were the attentions of the press, which tended to treat the situation in terms of "have you stopped beating your wife?" They wanted to know if the

architects had been aware that the ceiling might come down. If the answer was yes, the reporters wanted to know why nothing had been done about it. If the answer was no, they wanted to know why the architects hadn't realized there was a problem.[141] On the whole, however, the press was not hard on the park in the early '60s. In contrast to 1958, when the local newspapers were full of the mayor's complaints about the slow pace of progress at Independence, there were stories about the progress that was being made, with such headlines as "Old Graceful Phila. Emerges."[142]

One of the good consequences was the decision to hasten the structural investigation and to retain Keast & Hood as consulting engineers. Sheldon A. Keast had joined the firm of Keast & Hood as a principal in 1953 after many years as building inspector for the City of Philadelphia. His work for the city had engendered his respect for historic buildings and provided him with practical knowledge of their strengths and weaknesses. He was prepared to work with the buildings at Independence, not by the engineer's rule book, but with a bias toward retaining as much of the old structure as possible.[143] Nelson was named project supervisor, with Gary Dysert as his assistant, and Hartshorne was also assigned to work on the investigation. [144] Keast, along with his younger associate, Nicholas L. Gianopulos, would work closely with the park service architects over the next two years analyzing the nature of the structure of Independence Hall, pinpointing its problems, and devising solutions that would preserve as much of its historic fabric as possible.[145] In proceeding with this work, the park service recognized that the urgency of immediate remedial measures overrode the previous decision to delay disturbance of the fabric of Independence Hall for five years.[146]

By the end of the summer of 1961, the team of engineers and architects had acquired a good understanding of how the structural framing system in

Independence Hall functioned. One of the conclusions they came to was that the exterior masonry bearing walls and the foundations of the building were still sound and would need only minor underpinning. The attic trusses had been weakened, in part, by the mid-nineteenth century removal of trussed east-west partition walls on the second floor. These wall trusses had helped to support the first floor ceiling. Their replacements had been hung from the roof girders and had overstressed those members. Although new wall trusses were installed by T. Mellon Rogers in the 1890s, they had been poorly designed and had sagged. There was no point in trying to save them. Since the interior of the second floor would be entirely redone in the course of restoration, Nelson and Keast decided to replace the wall trusses with steel plate girders. In the attic, the old trusses would remain, but would be supplemented with new steel beams and girders. The attic floor would be supported by hanger rods from the new beams, and additional support for the roof, where needed, would be provided by adjustable steel pipe columns.

The contract for the steel work was let in June 1962. The successful bidder was the A. Raymond Raff Company. The contractor's project manager, Walter Riley, had taken on an unconventional job. In order to minimize cutting through parts of the building to install the steel, the design called for relatively small lengths, which required assembly in place. In the attic the steel would have to be threaded through a maze of wooden posts and iron straps that had been installed at various times in previous attempts to reinforce the roof structure. Small holes were cut in the roof to bring in the steel for the attic; the plate girders for the second floor were eased in through a window. In addition to working out technical solutions to these unconventional requirements, the contractor had to coordinate scheduling with the park service staff, who had determined that at least parts of the building would remain open

to the public during structural rehabilitation. While this first phase of the work was underway, Nelson and Keast's office designed systems to reinforce and stabilize the building's tower. By late in the summer of 1963 work in the tower had been completed.[147] Most of Independence Hall was now in good structural condition; the restoration of its eighteenth-century appearance still lay ahead.

It was a restoration that Charles Peterson would not supervise, for he left the park service in October 1962. Peterson had sent a long memorandum to Conrad Wirth the previous February, detailing his reasons for considering such a step after thirty-three years of service. Although he expressed a desire to carry on his work, he felt that this would be impossible unless the position of the historic architecture section improved. He complained that good people he had trained were transferred to what he referred to as the "modern department," that his historic structures section was routinely deprived of secretarial and drafting help, and that the "modern department," technically his superiors, had no understanding of the nature of his group's work. He hoped that historic structures could be given a position akin to that established for the museum function in the park service, closely associated with the history office, but not subordinate to it.[148] The memorandum was never answered. At an earlier time Wirth might have considered such a request seriously. By 1962, however, Peterson's major supporters in higher management, Tom Vint and Ed Zimmer, had themselves retired. Furthermore, Wirth was also considering retirement. Although the directorship of the National Park Service had traditionally been a non-political appointment and Wirth had been named director at the end of the Truman administration, most of his accomplishments were associated with the Eisenhower years. Soon after John F. Kennedy's inauguration, newly appointed officials raised fundamental questions about the philosophy of the National Park Service. What the park service had traditionally viewed as pride in the

institution and "family" closeness among personnel, was interpreted as elitism and exclusivity. Wirth had begun to think about retirement in the fall of 1961. By the summer of 1962 it was clear that his position would sooner or later become untenable.[149] Wirth did not step down as director until January 1964, but undoubtedly even in February 1962 he was concerned with issues that loomed far larger to him than Peterson's resignation or the position of the unit dealing with historic structures. When no reply was forthcoming from Washington, Peterson carried out his intention. He could leave knowing that at Independence, at least, the restoration program was in good hands. Wistar would also leave when Congress Hall was completed, but Nelson and Hartshorne would remain. They would continue to apply the principles to which Peterson had adhered. Restoration would be based on careful research and observation, attention to detail, and high standards for materials and workmanship.

Further investigation to uncover the original appearance of interior features at Independence Hall began even while the structural survey and rehabilitation were underway. Although the historical section of the Historic Structures Report on Independence Hall had been completed in 1959, by the summer of 1961 new records had been discovered in Harrisburg and in the Philadelphia archives.[150] Penny Hartshorne, Marty Yoelson, and two other historians, Miriam Q. Blimm and Paul Sifton crowded into Hartshorne's Volkswagen "bug" and drove out to make a concerted attack on the new Harrisburg materials.[151]

Between September and December carpenters Phil Lang and John Pecoraio carefully disassembled the Haviland paneling in the Assembly Room.[152] Architect Gary Dysert keyed each piece to the measured drawings, so that the paneling could be reerected. For the first time the entire interior of the 1730s walls was laid bare for examination. Even the most cursory observation of the walls imparted some basic information about the original location and shapes

of door and window openings, and of fireplaces. The ceiling structure, if not the plaster, was original; although much of the structure of the floor and the floor itself had been replaced, three original joists remained. Thus the level of the floor and the height of the room could be established. Nailing patterns in the surviving joists also revealed the width of the floor boards.

Some fragments of the original wooden trim remained in place. The architects determined that many features of the doorway between the Assembly Room and the center hall were undisturbed. These included the architrave, or molded surround on the hall side, and the paneled jambs and soffit, or inner frame of the doorway. Other pieces of the original woodwork, some fifteen of them, including the cockleshell frieze on the east wall had been reused in the Haviland restoration. One minute, but important fragment was found by the sharp eye of Gary Dysert, wedged between a joist and the brick wall. This was a dentil from the original cornice, evidently lodged there when the room was dismantled in 1816. Although it measured only two inches high by one and five-sixteenths inches wide and one and one-quarter inches deep, it provided the key dimensions from which the internal proportions of the cornice could be extrapolated.

Other aspects of the room could be determined by a careful reading of the walls. Unfortunately, most of the original plaster had been removed, so that the type of clue that had proved so important in the Bishop White House was of little use here. However, in the eighteenth century it had not only been customary to install woodwork before plastering, but to prime paint it as well. Because the painters knew that traces left on the masonry walls would be covered in plastering, they made no effort to maintain neat edges. Thus the position and outline of much of the woodwork -- window architraves, chair rails, the bottom of the cornice, the entablature and plane of the paneling on the east

wall, and the surround of the west door -- could be traced. The iron anchors with which the woodwork and marble fireplace surrounds had been affixed to the walls remained in place. From these the architects could determine the position and size of the fireplace openings and their surrounds.

Although the location of most elements and some profiles could be established through the evidence of the paint traces and the original paneling of the frame of the west doorway, many details were still missing. For these the architects turned to a variety of sources. Most important of these were the Pine-Savage painting and the Savage engraving, which showed the general arrangement of the east and north walls, and, by inference of the south wall as well. The painting was not, however, correct in an architectural sense. Therefore, the architects looked at eighteenth-century books for proportions and proper forms for such features as the cornice. They depended particularly on two books by the English architect James Gibbs, published in 1728 and 1732, and known to have been available in Philadelphia. Careful study of Gibbs's plates had already convinced both the historians and the architects that the general form of Independence Hall, as well as much of its decoration, was derived from Gibbs. The building itself provided other prototypes; the paneled window jambs were copied from originals in the Supreme Court Room, the baseboards and chair rails from the tower stair hall. There was one design, however, for which the architects had to look elsewhere. No eighteenth-century fireplace surrounds remained in Independence Hall; the written documentation described the fireplaces in the Assembly Room as embellished with keystones. For these, the architects based their designs on two houses of the same period in the Philadelphia area: Hope Lodge and Whitby Hall.[153]

By the fall of 1962 the architects had solved the riddle of the appearance of three walls of the Assembly Room; the west wall remained a mystery. True,

they knew the location of the central door and the appearance of its pedimented surround. Documents suggested that the west wall also had had a paneled dado. But the distribution of the panels and the treatment of the wall above them was unknown. A few days after Peterson retired from the park service, a friend showed him a sketch bearing on its back an inscription in John Trumbull's hand: "Jos. Sansom's Sketch of the Room in which Congress sat at the time of the Declaration of Independence." The owner's grandfather had purchased the sketch, drawn by an ancestor, at a sale of Trumbull's possessions in 1896.[154] The drawing showed what could only be the west wall, with a central pedimented door flanked by pilasters, a paneled dado, coved ceiling, and a wall above the dado laid out with ornamental plaster panels. On the face of the sketch, in a hand other than Trumbull's, was the inscription "40 ft. sqr. & 15 high to the cving, 4 or 5 more."

Although the owner had known of the sketch, he had been unaware of its potential importance for the restoration until he conducted some foreign visitors on a tour of Independence Hall. As was their custom, the architects had mounted a small exhibit to inform the public of the progress of the restoration. The exhibit included two alternative schemes for the west wall, with the frank admission that the architects did not have sufficient evidence to form a definitive conclusion about the original appearance of that part of the room. Having seen the architects' drawings and been made aware of what the evidence revealed about the general arrangement of the wall, the owner realized that he held what might prove to be a key document.[155] The architects were elated by the drawing. It was not to scale, but the dimensions noted on its face agreed with those of the room. Although sketchy, it revealed more architectural understanding than the Pine-Savage painting. Such a drawing might well have been made by someone like Sansom, who, according to information

produced by the historians, was a Philadelphia merchant, and also an author, antiquarian, and self-proclaimed "admirer of architecture."[156] Nevertheless, the park service subjected the drawing to the most rigorous tests. Wilman Spawn of the American Philosophical Society analyzed the paper on which it was drawn. He was able to confirm not only that the paper was genuine, but also that it could be dated within the five year span from 1809 to 1813.[157] A photocopy of the inscription on the front went to the FBI, along with three signed letters of Sansom's, for handwriting analysis. The FBI concluded that the inscription had indeed been written by Sansom.[158] Armed with these assurances, the architects proceeded to produce drawings for the west wall based on the Sansom sketch. The sketch also established the rhythm for the dado paneling of the north and south walls and confirmed that not just the west doorway frame, but also the double-leafed paneled door was authentic.

The research on the Assembly Room had been minute and highly productive. It had also been time consuming. The final report on the restoration was not submitted to the architectural advisory committee until July 1964. In the meantime the new city administration, along with Judge Lewis, showed renewed signs of impatience about the progress of the restoration. Mayor James H.J. Tate complained to Lewis about his embarrassment with the condition of Independence Hall when important visitors, such as Rose Kennedy, came to Philadelphia. Lewis immediately put pressure on Superintendent Anderson, although privately he told Anderson that he was not "mad" at anybody in Philadelphia, but wanted to make park service management aware of the need for haste.[159] In response to demands for an accelerated schedule, Robert E. Smith, chief architect for EODC, in February 1965 transferred responsibility for construction activities at the Independence Square group from Lee Nelson to Hugh Miller. Nelson retained control over the research and, by inference, the design

decisions based on that research.[160] The move appeared to be logical, but the divided authority would itself cause delays due to lack of coordination and therefore poor phasing of aspects of the construction.[161]

In January 1965, Murphy, Quigley & Co. was awarded a contract for restoration of the Assembly Room for the sum of $88,400.[162] By May the new paneling had been installed and the plasterers were working on the walls and ceiling. A few highly specialized tasks were not executed by the contractor. John Pecoraio of the day labor force carved replacements for missing or broken fragments of the cockle shell frieze; Albert Cooper, woodcarver, of Doylestown, Pennsylvania replicated the pilaster capitals and other ornamental carving of the east wall.[163] For all involved it was a particularly rewarding job. Willam J. O'Connell, president of Murphy, Quigley, spoke for his staff and the subcontractors:

> They look on this as the most important job in the United States. Every bit of their work has been checked minutely, and they're very proud of it. So is the man who furnished the millwork. Everything was done just as it was in the 18th century, even down to the red undercoat [of paint primer].[164]

Even a wildcat teamsters strike did not delay the completion of the room in time for a dedication ceremony at the end of June. The last pieces of the woodwork, the mahogany tabernacle frame and its pediment, were brought into the city at night from a Valley Forge farm in a convoy consisting of two station wagons.[165]

With construction complete in the Assembly Room, Nelson moved on to the tower and its steeple. He shared the work with Joseph Petrak, who was assuming Miller's former role in overseeing construction. They noted that the steeple had been reshingled in 1961, and the weathervane repaired and regilded, but that the lower roof deck was in poor condition and that the condition of the cornice

was questionable. They also recommended reinforcing the stair with steel, so that it could withstand the expected loads of millions of visitors. To strengthen the handrail, they advised replacing a few of the balusters with cast steel replicas.[166]

At the same time, Nelson was examining the paving in the central hall and tower stair hall and the front and rear entrances. This aspect of the investigation demanded both architectural and archeological skills. Because Independence no longer had an archeologist on its staff, Nelson requested and received cooperation from the Mid-Atlantic Region. Chief Regional Archeologist John L. Cotter and Archeologist B. Bruce Powell supervised excavations inside the building and around both sets of exterior steps. They found that the floor of the center hall had been paved with bricks when the building was first constructed in the 1730s. When the ornamental woodwork was installed in the 1750s, the paneling was erected over the paving. Subsequent repavings were laid up to the paneling, but not under it, so that the original bricks, and the herringbone pattern in which they were laid, survived around the periphery of the hall, establishing its design and its original level. In the tower stair hall the paneling and flooring had been installed at the same time, and none of the original paving survived, but the level of the floor could be determined by the depth of the baseboards and door frames, as well as by the height of the first step of the great staircase. Nelson's report, issued in February 1966, recommended restoration of the floor to its original level and appearance.[167]

Outside the archeologists excavated in an attempt to establish the original configuration of the steps, which had been changed at least once at the tower entrance and more often on the Chestnut Street front. Although both fronts had been shown in old views, and the rear steps had been described in some detail,

their dimensions were not known. Besides, the ground level had obviously changed in the course of 200 years, so that the number of steps would necessarily differ. The excavation uncovered the original foundations for both sets of steps, thus establishing their original extent. Because they were pyramidal, that is, with steps rising on the sides as well as at the front, the excavation also revealed their profiles preserved in the foundation walls of the building. Nelson also determined that, although the doorsills had been replaced even more frequently than the steps, fragments were preserved at both the Chestnut Street door and the tower entrance. The original sills had been integral with the construction, wider than the doorways and set into the brick walls on either side. The masons replacing them had cut out the section within the width of the doorways, leaving the ends that were embedded in the walls in place. From these Nelson could determine that the original steps had been made of soapstone, which had also been used for the building's stone trim of quoins and beltcourses. Unfortunately certain details about the steps, such as the shape of the nosings or curved edges, could not be established. In the restoration these would be based on the profiles of surviving steps at eighteenth-century houses in the Philadelphia area such as Stenton.

The paved area in front of Independence Hall on Chestnut Street was also excavated. Here the archaeologists confirmed that conditions in the third quarter of the eighteenth century had been accurately depicted in the Birch engraving of the area published in 1800. The main paving had been of small stones set in mortar, bounded and crossed by brick walkways. Sections of both the pebblestone and the brick walks remained below later resurfacings. The dimensions of the brickwork could be readily traced -- six feet along Chestnut Street, nine feet adjacent to the building, and a generous eighteen-foot path from Chestnut Street to the front entrance. Nelson recommended restoring the

front area to its appearance in the Birch print, complete with watchboxes and pumps, especially since the existence of the latter had been confirmed by the archaeologists' location of the wells that had supplied them.[168]

By the time the architects began their renewed examination of the remaining major space on the first floor, the Supreme Court Room, they had acquired considerable sophistication in applying a broad range of investigative techniques. Paint research remained one of the most significant tools, but it had developed considerably since the search for original colors had been initiated in the mid-1950s, although the question of what color should be restored remained important. To analyze paints, Hartshorne now used two separate methods, scraping down layer by layer in situ, and removal of samples for cross-sectioning and microscopic analysis. By this time Hartshorne had learned to perform such visual analyses herself, rather than sending the samples to commercial laboratories. She also ground up paint from some of the layers so that the color of the pigment could be observed more closely; some of these samples were sent to outside laboratories for analysis of the pigment's chemical content. Experience in comparing the scraped layers to freshly exposed paint in the cross-sections had made Hartshorne aware that the exposed paint surfaces had been dimmed through yellowing. The colors in the centers of the cross-sectioned layers, which had been protected from the atmosphere, were far brighter. There were several reasons for this, fading from exposure to light, the aging of the oil medium in which the pigments were suspended, and the effect of pollutants in the air.[169] Thus, in choosing an accurate color, the paint analyst would have to compensate for these changes. This was a step that had not been taken, for example, at Williamsburg in the 1920s and 1930s. The result had been a muted palette of "Williamsburg" colors that became enormously popular in interior decorating and gave the American public the false impression that

eighteenth-century taste had been subdued in matters of color. Although the colors at Independence Hall were, in fact, rather soft, they were somewhat stronger than those that had been used at Williamsburg. More importantly, the techniques developed at Independence, when applied to such eighteenth-century houses as the Paca House in Annapolis, Maryland, or Stenton on the outskirts of Philadelphia, have revealed the use of colors of a sometimes dazzling vividness. Indeed, at Williamsburg itself, refined research in the last two decades has resulted in a far brighter palette than was conceived of in the 1930s. Nevertheless, paint analysis remains an art rather than an exact science. It is still dependent on matching color by eye and in the judgment by the analyst of the effects of aging.

In 1960, when Hartshorne chose the colors for the center hall and tower stair hall at Independence, she had also selected a new system for designating them. In a preliminary report on the colors, she had attempted to use such descriptive phrases as "onion white," "warm cream," and "olive drab."[170] Obviously such designations could be open to misinterpretation, with one person's "onion white" being another's "pale cream." By the time she prepared her final report, she was using the Munsell Color Company's system of color notation.[171] This system describes color numerically, in a manner akin to that in which written notes equal the sounds of music. It is thus a permanent, objective means of recording the value, hue and tone components of a particular color.

Hartshorne had also made a careful study of the documentation on Independence Hall and concluded that eighteenth-century paints must have been longer lasting than their modern equivalents. Accounts for the building showed that a great deal of money had been spent on painting between 1754 and 1759, and then, except for some minor expenditures in 1779, not again until 1789. Thus,

she concluded, the first color over the primer had been visible on the walls in the key year of 1776. Accordingly, she recommended painting the woodwork in the tower stair hall blue and in the central hall a sandy biege.[172]

Hartshorne's research had led to something perhaps even more important than determining original paint colors. It had established paint as an important tool in dating pieces of woodwork. Already in the 1950s Grossman and Hartshorne had observed that the profiles of missing features could often be reconstructed from paint outlines. By 1960, however, the architects had realized that the paint layers on specific pieces of woodwork could be diagnostic. For example, the dentil found in the Assembly Room carried the same sequence of primer and first coats found on the cockleshell frieze, but none of the coats found above the primer on the Haviland paneling. Thus they could conclude that this small piece had formed part of the original decoration of the room, and had been removed before the Haviland paneling was installed. Examination of this type of evidence would prove particularly helpful in the Supreme Court Room, where fragments of the original cornice, which had been used as blocking and furring for the plaster ceiling installed in the 1890s, could be identified positively by the sequence of paint layers.[173]

In addition to increased sophistication in using and interpreting paint evidence, the architects had developed a considerable body of knowledge about the evolution of nail manufacturing technology in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. In the 1950s the architects had been able to distinguish between wrought nails, which they assumed to be of eighteenth century date, and nineteenth-century cut nails. Nelson refined this technique through making a detailed study of Philadelphia nail manufactories of the period and collecting as many examples as he could from dated buildings.[174] Change and improvement in manufacturing methods had been rapid in the period from about

1785 to 1830. Thus in the Supreme Court Room it was possible to distinguish between alterations made in 1815-1816 and those made later in the nineteenth century by careful study of the nails.[175] The architects even attempted to discover the character of nails that had been removed by making molds of the holes left by the nails. After blowing talcum powder into the holes, they inserted an unbent and barbed paper clip surrounded with latex. After the latex had set, it could be removed by pulling on the paper clip.[176]

Above all, the architects had learned the importance of careful investigation. Clues to the original design might be discovered in anything from the reduction in size of a structural member, to a change in coloration on a brick wall, to the shape of a nail hole or the presence of a metal anchor or strap. In 1965, when they began their investigation of the Supreme Court Room, much of the basic information about the space had already been established by Hartshorne's work of a decade earlier. By studying the existing paneling and old photographs Hartshorne had come to the conclusion that on all but the west wall the woodwork below the entablature and above the dado was original. The entablature and the capitals of pilasters had evidently been removed when the ceiling was lowered nine inches in the 1890s; their appearance could be readily determined, however, from photographs, paint "ghosts" and the survival of reused fragments. The paneled dado had been removed and replaced by plaster at an indeterminate time in the nineteeth century. The paneling of the west wall was entirely gone, except for pilasters at each end. The old photographs showed two more pilasters and a tabernacle frame with broken pediment, which Hartshorne believed to have been original. Most frustrating was the lack of clearcut information about two prominent features of the room known to have been present through written documentation: the judge's bench along the west wall, and galleries along the north and south walls. Hartshorne had found a number of

holes along the north and south walls under the center windows that evidently marked the location of the galleries, but offered no clues to their configuration. She had also located two sets of joist holes that related to the judge's bench, but they were at different levels and she could not establish which might have been in place in 1776.[177]

Finding further information would necessitate careful examination of every inch of the room's fabric. In order to do this, the paneling installed during the late nineteeth-century restoration was removed, so that the walls behind it could be studied. Assisting Nelson and Hartshorne were a group of younger architects, some working summers, some on temporary assignment during the year. All observations were recorded in photographs and in a set of fifty evidence drawings.[178] The contribution of one young draftsman, John Milner, stood out. Milner had been working his way through architectural school at the University of Pennsylvania in the early 1960s as a parking attendant at a restaurant. One evening he fell into conversation with a customer who was an architect, who told him that the park service hired architectural students for summer work, and suggested that he contact Peterson. Peterson in turn referred him to James C. Massey, then supervising the HABS program, who hired him for a summer measuring project. Although Milner's first assignment was to measure the Dock Street sewer, then exposed, his enthusiasm for historical architecture was not quenched. As had been the case with Nelson, Peterson and Massey continued to find a succession of summer and one-year temporary assignments for Milner.[179] Milner became the most consistent of the assistants at the Supreme Court Room, working year-round.

By the summer of 1966, the team had established the original configuration of the north, south, and east walls and recommended proceeding with the reinstallation and restoration of the paneling down to the level of the window

sills. However, there was still insufficient evidence for an authentic restoration of the west wall; more research would be needed.[180] This recommendation was accepted, although park service management was again expressing concern about the slow pace of restoration at Independence Hall. In January 1966, Lon Garrison, who had succeeded Ronald F. Lee as director of the Mid-Atlantic region, received a briefing on the development program at Independence. One of the points discussed was that the Supreme Court Room had not progressed as fast as anticipated, and that additional work would be necessary.[181] In the early spring Superintendent M.O. Anderson complained to Garrison about the disruptions to visitation caused by continued investigative and construction activity in the center hall and the tower. He wanted the architects and workmen out of those areas before the start of the summer visitation season.[182] From this time forward relations between the design office and the park appear to have become more formal, with frequent meetings and status reports. The added formality may also have been caused by a reorganization, which put an additional level of responsibility between the park and the architectural researchers. When Garrison received the first formal status report in May, it came from H. Reese Smith. Smith was now Chief of Design and Construction in a new entity that had been set up to replace the Eastern Office of Design and Construction, the Philadelphia Planning and Service Center. At the same time, a Washington Service Center had been established, which was responsible for all research. Officially Nelson and Hartshorne were now part of the latter organization, although they remained on assignment in Philadelphia. In practice research went on much as it had. Nevertheless, in seven years ultimate responsibility for architectural research had shifted from the park to EODC in Philadelphia, to the Washington Service Center, which made the reporting and review process more complicated and time-consuming.

Smith's status report reviewed the progress of restoration at Independence Hall, reminding Garrison that the Assembly Room had been completed and dedicated less than a year before, in June 1965. Many of the practical aspects of the building's rehabilitation were well advanced. Fire protective and security systems had been completed; ductwork for atmospheric controls had been installed; and plans and specifications for the electrical system were almost ready. Arrangements had been made so that the summer's visitors would not be too aware of construction activity. The day labor force, that is the staff carpenters and painters, expected to finish repair work on the exterior of the tower by June, and would work on rehabilitation of the interior stair at night. True the Supreme Court restoration had been delayed because of a lack of personnel and the inability of the historians, curators, and architects to locate a suitable eighteenth-century court room that might serve as a prototype. However, some of the replacement moldings had been designed, and the day labor force would install them as time permitted. Optimistically the memorandum predicted that restoration of the second floor of Independence Hall would commence in the late fall of 1966.[183]

By August there was some progress to report, but less than anticipated. The stairway was half completed, and it was expected that new brick for the hallways would be laid in the fall. The day labor force was making moldings for the cornice in the Supreme Court Room, but working drawings were still needed for the rest of the woodwork, and for the front and back entrances and steps.[184] Nelson had been unable to spend much time at the drafting board. During the summer he had been working on the section of the Historic Structures Report covering part of the Supreme Court Chamber, and, in collaboration with Hartshorne, on the architectural data section for a report on lighting in Independence Hall, for which Historian Miriam Q. Blimm had supplied the

historical data.[185] In late October Anderson requested a review of the situation at Independence Hall because he would be away on leave from mid-November to the end of the year. Progress in several areas had been delayed because it was dependent on historical and architectural research. Atmospheric control remained unfinished in the Supreme Court Room because the location of grilles could not be determined until the research was completed. The installation of the electrical system had also been postponed pending approval of the report on historic lighting. There had been no progress on the working drawings for the two main entrances because of other demands on Nelson's time and the lack of drafting assistance. Partial relief for this chronic problem was in sight however. Nelson reported that a contract would be let to an outside architectural firm for evidence drawings and additional research on the second floor.[186] The contract was awarded to Price & Dickey.[187] One of the firm's principals, John Dickey, had considerable experience in restoration work.

Although this helped, it provided no solution for other underlying problems. A few months later, in March 1967, Architects Nelson and Petrak, responding to a request from Anderson for an explanation of the slow progress at Independence Hall, cited three basic causes. The first was the complicated review procedure through which all reports passed. Although recognizing the necessity of reviews, they complained that the process had been unnecessarily slow. This was particularly frustrating when coupled with the desireability of scheduling construction for times of off-peak visitation. Any slippage could throw the construction off by months. The second was the chronic shortage of drafting help, which had grown worse after the reorganization that separated Nelson and Hartshorne from the Philadelphia design office. The lack of working drawings not only made it difficult to maintain a schedule for the construction

work, but also without the guidance of such drawings the quality of the restoration work could be threatened. They then pointed out that pushing some phases of the work, such as atmospheric control, ahead of the research created lost motion and inefficiency, as well as compromising the integrity of the restoration. Finally they reminded Anderson of the importance, magnitude, and unusual character of the task.

> Over the years it has been very difficult to accurately estimate completion dates for research and construction. The unprecedented scope of the work, coupled with the unknown conditions is of such magnitude as to frustrate even the best estimates. The recently uncovered dry rot in the hallway woodwork is a case in point. We simply cannot ignore these conditions to meet a previously established deadline. 188

That Nelson found the review process frustrating was not surprising. Not only did it take a long time, but also the comments were often contradictory. The review of Nelson's report on paving in the hallways of Independence Hall is typical in expressing opposing points of view. Frank Barnes, the regional historian, wrote:

> The usual excellent report, but I am appalled at the thought of still further structural upheaval. Is it so necessary to restore the original floor level? Can't we approximate the "look" of the original (historic period) outside steps, keeping present floor level. We're not restoring the wings:why then such detail. The scene is running away with the story. As a matter of fact, we're not "certain" re the look of the period hallway floor: the bricks found date to 1797. This report has no Admin. Data Section, either!

In fact, Barnes had evidently not read the report carefully. Although the bricks had been replaced in 1797, fragments of the paving had been found that predated installation of the paneling in the 1750s. Restoration of the original level was not a mere whim. It would be necessary if the hall were to conform to the restored level in the Assembly Room as well as the restoration of the front entrance. The comment of John Cotter, who had participated in the research on

the paving, was perhaps unusually effusive, but otherwise typical of those historians, architects, and archeologists, who, whatever their disagreements about specifics, were generally united in their desire for an accurate restoration.

> The best break Independence Hall and the NPS ever had was to benefit from the research and scholarship of its best historical, archeological and architectural investigators. Lee Nelson and Penny Hartshorne are tops in their field. There never was an adequate excuse for "the hell with accuracy -- who will ever know" school of economy. There isn't now. The "restoration" of Ind. Hall will go on bit by bit as long as it stands. Let's get on with it as recommended. 189

Such dichotomies required reconciliation by top management before a decision could be made. This meant considerable discussion, a time-consuming process, which, although it was meant to compose differences and end in consensus, nevertheless often left hard feelings in its wake.

Mild-mannered and soft-spoken, Nelson was also determined that Independence Hall would be restored with the highest degree of authenticity, no matter what the pressures to hasten completion. The almost desperate tone of the memorandum he and Petrak sent Anderson led the latter to appeal to Garrison for help for Nelson and Hartshorne.[190] No help was forthcoming, however, although the pressure continued to mount. Henry Judd, who, as chief historic architect in Washington, was technically Nelson's boss, told him that the push to complete the Independence Hall restoration rapidly was coming from the highest levels. The restoration should proceed, even if some of it had to be based on conjecture. Nelson reminded Judd that the Historic Structures Report on three sides of the Supreme Court Room had been presented for review in 1966. True, it had called for further research on the west wall, but this work had not been carried out because other requirements had assumed higher priority. Furthermore, the chronic shortage of personnel meant that the architects could

not produce drawings or provide proper supervision for the day labor force. The situation had worsened since Milner had left the park service to go to work for John Dickey. Thus, although the architects knew how three walls of the Supreme Court Room should be restored, they had been unable to proceed. Nelson pressed Judd to institute measures that would expedite the work. For one thing, although it had been known for many months that the arrangement of the Supreme Court Room had been considerably altered in 1778-79, Nelson had been unable to procure a decision as to what period it should be restored to, 1776 or post-1779. Again he pleaded for drafting help. He hoped to rehire Milner, who had the knowledge and experience to make an immediate contribution. If more drafting help was not available, Nelson suggested dismissing part of the day labor force. There was no use keeping them on the payroll when they could not work because they had no drawings to guide them.[191]

Nelson's previous protestations had brought little or no relief from the chronic shortage of architectural personnel. This time action was swift, consummated within a week at a meeting in Philadelphia. The decisions came directly from Ernest Allen Connally, chief of the Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation. This was a newly-established group, product of yet another reorganization, the second in approximately a year. The Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation [quickly reduced by the usual federal alphabetizing to OAHP] had been established to administer new programs, such as the National Register of Historic Places. It also embraced, however, some existing programs, such as the Historic American Buildings Survey, and responsibility for all historical, archaeological, and restoration work within the National Park System. Peterson's wish for a group of historical architects who were not subsidiary to the "moderns" had been realized some five years after he had left the park service. Judd reported to Connally and Connally reported

to the director of the National Park Service without intermediaries.

Judd accompanied Connally to Philadelphia on August 30 for a series of meetings with Nelson, Hartshorne, Petrak, Superintendent Anderson and representatives of the Mid-Atlantic Region, including Regional Director Lon Garrison, and Assistant Regional Director George A. Palmer. In the course of these meetings the group quickly resolved the issue of the period to which the Supreme Court Room would be restored, choosing 1776. They then settled on a completion date, the summer of 1968, and took a series of steps to alleviate Nelson's problems. First, they gave him immediate authority to hire Milner on contract to complete the drawings. Next, they affirmed Petrak's position as coordinator of the work. Finally, they agreed to circumvent the normal report procedure. Nelson and Hartshorne would no longer have to prepare and seek approval for Historic Structures Reports before construction could commence. Henceforth they would be answerable only to Judd.[192]

These decisions temporarily palliated the architects' situation. With the final choice that the room was to be restored to its 1776 appearance, and with Milner's services secured, they moved ahead with research and preparation of working drawings for the west wall. Even the pressure for completion could not diminish the joys of discovery as sometimes small fragments provided answers to questions that had puzzled them for a decade. Careful examination of the base of the pilaster in the northwest corner, exposed when the paneling was removed for study, for example, was particularly rewarding. The base, which was still covered in the 1950s and thus not visible during Hartshorne's previous study, had been altered to allow installation of the higher of the two levels of joists supporting the judges' bench. Thus it was the lower of the two sets of joist holes that related to the original bench, which had been in place from about 1740 to 1778-79.[193] A more serendipitous find was a board that had been

used as a scab to fur down the ceiling in the 1897 restoration. This board had the same paint layers as the lower layers of the original metopes in the entablature. In its center was a substantial, but broken wrought-iron hook. The hook had been mounted over the original finish paint layer. The architects' concluded that the board was the central strip of the glued-up panel in the tabernacle frame. The hook had undoubtedly held the King's Arms that documents showed had once hung in the frame; the hook perhaps had been broken when the sculpted arms were torn from the wall and burned on the evening of July 8, 1776.[194]

By May 1968 research on the Supreme Court Room was complete and working drawings had been begun. Production would slow shortly, however, because Milner had once again decided to leave the park service.[195] Furthermore, Nelson had a myriad of other details to attend to: supervision of continuing work in the halls and on the exterior; design of a control center in the closet under the stairway and for several exterior features; and summary reports on the work completed to date, with recommendations for maintenance.[196] Meanwhile there had been no real abatement in the pressure to finish not only the restoration of Independence Hall, but also the remainder of the park's development program. By this time 1976, the Bicentennial year, was less than eight years away. Much of the demand for more progress came from Arthur Kaufmann, who had succeeded Judge Lewis as chairman of the park's advisory commission.[197] Although Kaufmann's displeasure with the park's rate of development did not erupt in the press in the manner in which Lewis's and Mayor Dilworth's impatience had a decade earlier, he made his feelings known in Washington. Kaufmann blamed much of the delay on M.O. Anderson; the interaction between the two men was far different from the friendly and confidential relationship Anderson had long enjoyed with Lewis. Lewis, subdued by age, had turned over the reins to Kaufmann, his

hand-picked successor, and now relied on the younger man's judgment; he would no longer defend Anderson.[198] Without Lewis's support Anderson's position became increasingly difficult. He no longer could count on the backing from Washington, which he had enjoyed while Conrad Wirth, with whom he had shared a link to former Secretary of the Interior Oscar Chapman, was director of the National Park Service. By the end of the year Wirth's successor, George Hartzog, had reassigned Anderson to a desk job in Washington, and had named Chester L. Brooks as superintendent of Independence.

The late 1960s were thus a period of major organizational change, with the establishment of the Washington and Philadelphia Service Centers and of the Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation, as well as a new superintendent at the park. One change, however, was personal rather than institutional. In February 1968 Penelope Hartshorne married. Henceforth she would be known as Penny Batcheler. Wherever the table of organization placed them, Nelson and Batcheler continued their planned program of architecural investigation and research, moving, while construction work went forward in the Supreme Court Room, to the second floor of Independence Hall. Restoration of this area appeared to pose almost insurmountable problems. Like the Assembly Room it had been stripped of almost all of its original finishes, and here there would be no Pine-Savage painting, no Sansom sketch to guide the architects. Nevertheless, their accumulated knowledge about the building enabled them to interpret minute clues and form sound judgments about the eighteenth-century appearance of the four major spaces: the lobby, long room, Governor's council chamber, and committee room. At a relatively early date they informed Judd that the second floor would be less conjectural and more elegant than had previously been assumed. They could establish the size and some profiles for much of the woodwork, as well as the location and dimensions of such features as fireplaces

and closets.[199] Although the ban on formal Historic Structures Reports was still in effect, Nelson and Harsthorne kept a record of their rationale for their restoration of the second floor. They derived most of the detailing from other parts of the building, painstakingly scaling moldings to fit the known dimensions of the second floor woodwork. Where Independence Hall itself could not supply prototypes, they turned to other early eighteenth-century buildings in the Philadelphia area.[200]

Hartzog had sent Chester Brooks to Independence with the charge to "get things moving." When Brooks arrived in January 1969, he discovered that the construction budget had been overspent by $70,000. One of his first acts, therefore, was to give notice to the day labor force, who were paid out of construction funds. Recognizing, however, that skilled craftsmen were essential to the restoration, he quietly rehired a few of the best people for the park's maintenance staff. Several months later when Hartzog came to inspect progress at Independence, he observed these men installing woodwork on the second floor. He turned to Brooks and expostulated that Independence had no construction money that year. Brooks, in false innocence, replied that the men were doing maintenance work on the building, and that the administrative manual certainly permitted upkeep in any park. Hartzog protested that what was meant was the maintenance of trees, lawns and the like, to which Brooks simply answered, "The hell you say, George." Hartzog had given him a mandate, and he intended to carry it out, as long as technically he could remain within the rules[201]

Brooks also took immediate steps to involve everyone in setting schedules and deadlines, and to make sure that all understood where their activities fit into the process. Once the schedules were established, he expected them to be met. At one point, when progress on the second floor of Independence Hall was slow, he called Nelson and Batcheler in, and asked them to agree to a deadline

for producing drawings. They were to do nothing else, for Brooks or anyone else, in the meantime. A week before the deadline, Brooks visited their office on the second floor of the First Bank. Nelson, always thin, and now almost cadaverous, looked up from his drafting board and said, "Welcome to the factory." They made their deadline.

Brooks had great respect for Nelson's and Batcheler's professional capabilities and integrity, but sometimes became impatient with their perfectionism. He felt that they wanted to "love Independence Hall to death." When it came time to install the chair rail on the second floor, Brooks told them that he would instruct Petrak to make a model, and that they would have a fixed period in which they could review it and either approve it or make changes before the final installation. Once they had done that, however, they could not change their minds.[202] In at least one instance a disagreement between Brooks and Nelson over the treatment of the second floor required resolution at the highest levels. Nelson frequently had raised the issue of split responsibility for the restoration, under which others had authority for the design and installation of mechanical and other systems. Sometimes the presence of elements of these systems interfered with the accuracy of the restoration. This had been the case in the Supreme Court Room, where previously installed ductwork required some adjustment of the entablature along the north and south walls. An even more extreme situation involved the west end of the second floor. Here the presence of ductwork for the atmospheric control system would require that the paneling covering the entire wall would have to be placed a few inches forward of its original position. Nelson's recommended solution was removal of the ductwork and its replacement with a newly designed system that would permit installation of the paneling in its proper location. Brooks balked, and Nelson appealed to his superiors, Judd and Connally. Connally came

up from Washington and somewhat reluctantly supported Brooks. Although agreeing with Nelson that professional standards of accuracy demanded the change, he feared the delays and extra costs that would be incurred. Brooks suggested that inaccuracies in the restoration could be recorded in structures and completion reports.[203] Connally, however, had already suspended preparation of such reports in order to expedite the progress of construction at Independence. With Nelson's transfer to the Washington office after completion of the second floor, the reports remained unwritten.[204]

Although the last degree of perfectionism was not encouraged, extraordinary care and pride in the quality of design and workmanship was. Howard LaRue, the administrative officer at Independence, was impressed by the dedication and skill of the craftsmen, especially by Edmund Whitlock, who installed the chair rail in the long room, hand fitting it where necessary to compensate for the anomalies found in all old buildings.[205] Although most of the interior of the second floor had been stripped in the course of nineteenth-century alterations, the architects had determined that the window sills were original. These sills had once been integral with the chair rail; that is, the same molding profile had carried across the plaster walls between and under the windows. Nelson and Batcheler decided to leave the sills in place, protected from wear by a covering made of a modern laminated material. Similar protective coverings had been installed in other parts of the building to preserve original material. In the Supreme Court Room, for example, the architects had placed stainless steel plates over some of the metopes, on the backs of which were inscribed:

> These plates are installed to protect the accumulated paint layers dating between 1740's-1890's on the original metope areas. Between the 1890's-1960's no additional paint layers were added because the 1898 entablature covered these areas.

Do Not Damage this Evidence!
National Park Service Restoration of the Original Entablature, October 1966
Architects Lee H. Nelson and Penelope Hartshorne. 206

Mindful of problems their restoration had faced because of the lack of records and destruction of evidence by previous alterations, the architects were determined to leave adequate information for their successors.

Preserving the window sills and creating a smooth transition between the old wood, covered by laminate, and new millwork posed difficulties, for which Whitlock, by this time the foreman of the craft crew, found the solutions.[207] In their years of working together at Independence, the architects developed a strong sense of respect for the craftsmen's abilities to solve such problems. Nick Gianopulos, who, as Sheldon Keast's assistant and successor on the structural rehabilitation, also worked closely with the craft crew, compared Whitlock and his assistants to the master-builders of eighteenth-century Philadelphia. Without formal education, they had an ingrained perception, based on long experience, of how a building was put together.[208] These skills sometimes enabled them to devise the means to make the architects' and engineers' ideas work without elaborate written instructions or drawings. They were especially important on the second floor of Independence Hall, where haste to complete the work was keenly felt. Most of the millwork was fabricated in the park carpentry shop in Franklin Court, run by Gordie Whittington, and installed by the craft crew. This procedure reduced the necessity for detailed working drawings. Often the craftsmen could work on the basis of verbal instructions, looking for detailed guidance to examples in the park's architectural study collection. When the time came to raise the end-wall paneling, it was done as it had been in the eighteenth century by manpower, not machine. Fittingly, in light of the close working relationship, Nelson, the

designer, joined the craft crew in putting the paneling into place.[209]

In 1972, after two decades of effort, the fully-restored interior of Independence Hall was open to the public. The restoration of Independence Hall was in itself a tremendous accomplishment. In the process, however, something even more far-reaching had been achieved. The architects who worked on it had, sometimes through trial and error and learning from past mistakes, developed procedures and techniques that became standard for building restoration in the United States. That these did not become merely local or park service "arts and mysteries" was due largely to the fervor and persistence of Charles E. Peterson. A teacher by instinct, indeed a militant evangelist in the cause of old buildings, Peterson also had what Lee Nelson called a "strong sense of accountability." He wanted to let the public know how its money was being spent on historic architecture, and what knowledge was being acquired through that expenditure.[210]

From his earliest days in Philadelphia, Peterson made a point of becoming known among the local historical and architectural historical communities.[211] He was an early member of the Philadelphia Historical Commission. He also had a wide acquaintance among scholars and those engaged in preservation and restoration around the country.[212] He had long been a member of the American Institute of Architects' Committee on Historic Buildings and an early member and past president of what was then the American Society of Architectural Historians. These contacts would serve him well as he proceeded to construct a restoration "academy" in Philadelphia, a center in which architects, scholars from other disciplines, and craftsmen could come together to learn from one another. One of his earliest steps, in 1952, was to revive the Historic American Buildings Survey. Although he had never been appointed to its staff, HABS had been his creation in 1932, and he had always nurtured it.

During his tenure as resident architect at Jefferson National Expansion Memorial in St. Louis, Missouri, he had arranged for intensive HABS recording of buildings along the central section of the Mississippi River front.[213] HABS had virtually ceased to operate during World War II and had no budget account within the National Park Service when Peterson came to Philadelphia.

Peterson saw a fresh opportunity for the program at Independence, where measured drawings were needed as a basis for the restoration work, and recruited the first of a series of summer teams in 1952. These were paid from the park's budget. Although the students were expected to produce drawings that would be useful in the park's development program, Peterson also viewed HABS as having a strong didactic purpose. For one thing, he believed that measuring and drawing was one of the best methods of learning about old buildings. But the students were given far more than instruction in how to draw and the opprtunities to practise their skills. During the summers, Peterson arranged a weekly series of informal lunch-time talks. The speakers might be academics from the University of Pennsylvania or other Philadelphia institutions, local practitioners, or visiting scholars and experts. Peterson was also generous in inviting students or young professionals on the park's staff to join him and his fairly steady stream of distinguished visitors for lunch.[214] Among those on the early HABS teams were Dr. Ernest A. Connally and Dr. William J. Murtagh, who after passage of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, became respectively the first chief of the Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation and the first keeper of the National Register of Historic Places. In their hands these positions became bully pulpits from which to apply nation-wide principles learned in the Peterson preservation school.

When Peterson moved from the Independence staff to the Eastern Office of Design and Construction, he seized the opportunity to expand HABS recording at

other parks in the east.[215] A few years later, Thomas C. Vint, chief of Design and Construction for the National Park Service, persuaded Congress to include an appropriation for HABS in the Mission 66 program. An office to supervise HABS in the east was established within EODC in 1957.[216] James C. Massey became supervisory architect for the eastern operation. Massey had been a member of two early summer measuring teams at Independence, and then had worked briefly on the EODC staff before leaving for two years of army service.[217] He remained in Philadelphia until 1966, moving to Washington as chief of HABS, when the program was put on a national basis as part of the organization of the Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation. Under Massey and succeeding chiefs HABS continued the strong educational focus established by Peterson.

HABS was not the only vehicle through which Peterson sought to arouse interest in and expand knowledge of historic buildings. Always anxious to see the fruits of new research in print (he was for many years editor of "American Notes" in the Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians), he was one of the moving forces behind the 1953 publication of the special edition of the Transactions of the American Philosophical Society published as "Historic Philadelphia." The volume brought together the latest information on Philadelphia buildings in and outside of the park, in a series of essays written by park staff and scholars from other institutions. To foster the type of cooperation that made such a book possible, Peterson constantly encouraged members of his staff to attend meetings and to address such groups as the Society of Architectural Historians and the Historical Society of Pennsylvania.[218] In addition to fostering attendance at such formal occasions, Peterson in the mid-1950s organized a series of monthly Dutch luncheons at the Hotel Edison. At these architects from EODC and HABS, along

with the park historians, would meet with professional staff from Philadelphia's historical and cultural institutions. There would be opportunities for informal discussions over lunch, and then Peterson would make a very brief talk about recent discoveries at the park. Others were encouraged to follow with five minute presentations of their research, or descriptions of interesting materials in their holdings.[219] These meetings not only provided an important forum for the exchange of information, but also helped to create an atmosphere of cooperation between the park service and Philadelphia's venerable institutions, which in that era could still be cool to outside researchers.

A somewhat later phenomenon were the Carpenters' Carnivals, affairs more formally known as Historic Structures Training Conferences. Peterson organized the first of these just before he left the park service in 1962. These were more formal affairs than the Edison Hotel lunches, involving prepared speeches and demonstrations of building crafts. Those attending included not only National Park Service personnel from Independence and elsewhere, but also Peterson's outside constituencies, architects and architectural historians, historians, builders, and residents of neighboring Society Hill who were restoring their own houses. Members of his staff were assigned to contribute.[220] Penny Batcheler's pamphlet on paint analysis and Lee Nelson's on nail chronology, both subsequently published by the American Assocation for State and Local History, grew out of papers presented at a Carpenters' Carnival.

Peterson infused his staff with a sense of obligation for making their findings comprehensible to the public that outlasted his tenure in the park service. Throughout the long restoration process at Independence Hall, Nelson and Batcheler regularly mounted small exhibits explaining their activities and findings to the visiting public. In 1970 they organized a major exhibit in the

First Bank, entitled "See What They Sawed." The exhibit used items from the park's architectural study collection to explain early building practises.[221] It expanded on a show of the study collection that had been mounted in the McIlvaine House during the Society of Architectural Historians meeting in 1954. In recent years Batcheler has arranged a series of small exhibits in the basement of the First Bank, again using items from the collection to illuminate various aspects of building technology. These are open by invitation or to groups by appointment. Others who had worked for Peterson also continued his tradition of public participation. James Massey and John Poppeliers of HABS were instrumental in arranging a display of Philadelphia architectural drawings for the 1964 Society of Architectural Historians meeting, long before such drawings achieved the popularity they now enjoy. Peterson, who remained in Philadelphia working as a consultant after his retirement, helped to insure the continuation of such activities through a mixture of encouragement, cajolery and prodding. In 1974 he persuaded the Carpenters' Company, of which he had become historian, to sponsor a three-day conference entitled "Building Early America." Batcheler and Nelson were among the speakers. Their contributions, which appeared in the resultant volume of the same title, remain the best published accounts of the restoration of the structure and fabric of Independence Hall.

Independence in the 1950s and 1960s became a national center for restoration for a variety of reasons. The major attraction, of course, was the restoration of a score of buildings, among them the most historically important building in the United States. Because of the building's associations, its restoration attracted the attention of the popular press, enhancing public awareness of restoration processes and of what constituted authenticity. As the work on the buildings progressed the park became a laboratory, in which the most

advanced techniques for investigating and rehabilitating historic buildings were developed and tested. In the process, and through the host of allied activities for which Peterson was the catalyst, a cadre of professionals received their training and formed their attitudes. This included not only the architects working for the park service, but also architects in private practise, structural engineers, and contractors. As these people moved on from Independence, to other park service posts, to the burgeoning restoration scene in Society Hill, and to other areas in the country, they carried with them the principles they had absorbed: careful research, respect for the integrity of a building's historic fabric, and the necessity of leaving a record of what they had done for the future. Independence thus became the testing ground at which American restoration came of age.

VII - TELLING THE PARK'S STORY: THE FIRST TWENTY YEARS

Research and interpretation are the twin foundations of Independence National Historical Park. All activity -- research, restoration, planning, construction -- has ultimately rested on conveying to the public the events that occurred in Philadelphia in the years between 1774 and 1800. Thus when Frank Barnes, commenting on Lee Nelson's plans for the center hall of Independence Hall, complained that the "scene was running away with the story," he was voicing a sense of priorities shared by many in and out of the park service. Independence had been acquired and was being developed not in order to restore historic buildings, rehabilitate a neighborhood, or create an urban park, but to commemorate and interpret the events associated with the founding of the Republic. Thus decisions about how the park would be planned, whether buildings would stand or fall, and how and to what period those that did remain would be restored and furnished depended on perceptions of the manner in which these actions would help tell the "story." At the same time, Barnes's view that absolute accuracy was inconsequential was not held by most of his peers. The architects were determined to explore every avenue to assure the accuracy of the restorations; the historians, trained to devotion to uncovering historical truth, were equally committed to fidelity in recreating the past.

The major events that the park was intended to commemorate were, in a general way, familiar to all Americans. Every schoolchild knew that there were such documents as the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, and that these had been drafted and signed in Philadelphia. Everyone also knew that there was such a building as Independence Hall and such an object as a

Liberty Bell. Those whose education had progressed further were aware of the struggle to establish the new Republic on a sound basis, of the nature of early Congressional debates, of the establishment of procedures for the operation of the executive and judiciary branches under the new Constitution, and of the Hamiltonian faction's attempts to put the new nation on a strong financial footing through establishment of a national bank. Yet even the most thorough-going histories of the Revolutionary and Federal periods had not dealt with the myriad of questions that would be raised by the National Park Service in the course of attempting to convey the story of the years from 1774 to 1800 in a reasonably authentic setting. Where had the events transpired? What had the buildings in which they took place look like? How had they been furnished? Where and how had the delegates to the Continental Congresses and the Constitutional Convention and the members of the new government lived? Where and how had they spent their leisure time? Who was actually present at various events? What had they thought of one another and how had they interacted? It was a long list; finding the answers would require meticulous research of a nature wholly different from that with which conventional political history was approached.

When Dr. Edward M. Riley arrived from Yorktown in December 1949 he therefore was faced with the formidable task of organizing a wide-ranging and innovative research program. For the first year, however, Riley was the sole historian at Independence; much of the research effort would have to await augmentation of the historical staff. He spent 1950 familiarizing himself with the holdings of Philadelphia institutions, with one foray to Washington to obtain copies of twenty-four maps of Philadelphia dating between 1683 and 1850 from the collections of the Library of Congress. At the same time he

introduced himself to the historical community in Philadelphia and formed a particularly fruitful association with Dean Roy F. Nichols of the University of Pennsylvania's graduate school. With the counsel of Dr. Willam E. Lingelbach of the American Philosophical Society, Riley and Nichols set up a cooperative research program through which graduate students at the University of Pennsylvania and other Philadelphia-area schools would work, for credit, on projects related to the research program at Independence. By the summer of 1950 two doctoral candidates were participating in the program; by fall the number had reached thirteen. Most were working on an iconography, a pictorial record of early Philadelphia and its buildings.

Riley also began to assemble the basic materials the historical staff at Independence would consult. He purchased books to supplement the collection used by the city's curators, forming the foundation of the park's library. He surveyed the records of two eighteenth-century insurance companies, the maps and prints of the city and its buildings held by Philadelphia institutions, and compiled a bibliography of city directories and guides. With this groundwork accomplished, Riley turned his attention to the physical property at Independence. He inventoried the contents of Independence Hall, aided by a catalogue, which had been maintained by the city, and by the accumulated knowledge of Warren McCullough. McCullough, who, as a city employee had long served as curator of Independence Hall, had transferred to the park service staff.[1] Riley also began a title search for the park service's authorized real estate purchases, and, on the basis of these findings, prepared a report on Franklin Court.[2]

In early 1951 the historical staff at Independence quintupled, with the hiring of Martin I. Yoelson and Harry Lehman, and the transfer of Dennis

Kurjack from Hopewell Village and James Mulcahy, a museum specialist, from Washington.[3] Later in the year another historian, R.W. Shoemaker, joined the group. The historians now formed, as they would through the 1950s, the largest single component of the Independence staff. Riley could, to some extent, begin to put his plan for an organized research effort into effect. Research projects were ranked by priority and assigned to particular staff members, although the priority of the projects and the historical sophistication needed to carry them out did not necessarily coincide. Thus two of the least experienced historians, Yoelson and Shoemaker, were assigned to projects carrying the highest priority, establishing chains-of-title and perusal of the insurance company records. Riley, assisted by the entire staff, worked on the physical history of the Independence Square group, and also retained personal responsibility for Franklin Court and manuscript collections. Kurjack, the next most qualified and experienced historian, assumed the iconography project, and shared with Riley examination of diaries and journals. Altogether, seventeen research projects had been established by the end of the year.[4] Several of these projects, however, existed only on paper.

The scope and richness of the historic resources was both exciting and intimidating. Riley felt that he and his staff were like "mice in a cheese factory," somewhat overwhelmed by the riches around them, and able only to "bite off very minute portions of the program."[5] There was simply far too much material for even the augmented research staff to encompass, especially since aids to research were still primitive. Many of the needed records were uncatalogued, as indeed were the full holdings of some of the institutions in which they were located. Copying was difficult and expensive. The historians laboriously transcribed their notes, including verbatim copies of long

documents, by hand and entered them on five by eight inch index cards, which were organized into the "Historical Research Master File."[6] Riley did take advantage of whatever technology was available. He had acquired a second-hand microfilm camera, and during 1951 groups of important records were microfilmed, including the early insurance surveys, records from the Pennsylvania Archives, and the Federal Direct Tax of 1798 from the National Archives. The latter, found by Riley, was one of the most exciting discoveries of the early research program.[7] The Direct Tax was a national tax on real estate, imposed, because of its general unpopularity, for only two years. It contained brief descriptions of the property, including buildings, to which the tax was applied. Although not as detailed as the Philadelphia insurance companies' surveys, it was more comprehensive, including many buildings that had not been insured by the two companies whose records had been preserved. Information derived from the Direct Tax reinforced the iconography in identifying buildings that had stood within the park boundaries in the historic period, but were no longer extant.

Not only was the research task massive, but the historians also were hampered by other obstacles. Although the city had transferred custody of its buildings and their contents to the park service in January, it was not until July 1951 that, with the intercession of Judge Lewis, it permitted access to the City Archives.[8] Once the barrier was breached, however, relations became cordial. The city was quick to report the discovery of early records of the Bureau of City Property that shed considerable light on the details of the restoration of Independence Hall carried out between 1896 and 1898. After cleaning and packing these, the city transferred them to the Second Bank where they would be readily available to the park historians.[9] Indeed, through

most of the 1950s, the City Archives occupied the basement of the Second Bank, so that the records were conveniently available to the Independence historians.[10]

In addition to difficulties and delays in gaining access to some groups of records, the historians' research activities were continually subject to interruption for other assignments. Riley had sought publicity for the research activity at Independence. This helped to insure cooperation from outside groups that might contribute information and support for the research program. At the same time, it produced numerous requests for information. To maintain good public relations, the Independence staff would drop work on its own projects in order to carry out the research necessary to answer the queries. Furthermore, while ordinary visitors to Independence were ushered through the Independence Square buildings (all that could then be seen) by the former city guards, groups that had made appointments and visiting dignitaries were conducted around the park by one of the historians. On such occasions the historians, who usually worked in ordinary business suits, would don National Park Service uniforms and assume their other persona as rangers. There was no formal scheduling for such duty. Sometimes the historian conducting the tour was simply the one most readily available. At other times a particular historian would be selected for ethnic or religious reasons. Thus when David Ben-Gurion visited Independence in the spring of 1951 Marty Yoelson served as his guide.[11]

A more serious, even if necessary, brake on the research program, was the historians' preparation of various interpretive materials and their participation in master planning. During late 1951 and throughout 1952 Riley, Kurjack, Yoelson and Mulcahy spent major portions of their time producing

printed material, including the text for an historical handbook, small exhibits, and memoranda related to the master plan.[12] These needs created dramatic shifts in the priorities assigned to various aspects of the research program. By the summer of 1952 chains-of-title had dropped from first place to sixth and the physical history and interior furnishing of Independence Hall to tenth and eleventh out of a list of sixteen topics. At least one new subject had been added, City Tavern.[13] This addition probably reflected the historians' developing concept of the interpretive section of the master plan, in which they were recommending beginning tours of the park at its eastern end. The top three priorities for fiscal year 1953 were preparation of interpretive sections for the master plan outline, of the historical handbook, and of a guide manual.

Priorities for the research program could thus shift rapidly and dramatically, depending on management decisions and other events beyond the control of the historians. By mid-1953, with announcement of the proposed gift by the General Federation of Women's Clubs for restoring and refurnishing Independence Hall, the buildings on Independence Square and their furnishings were back to the top of the list, with Kurjack carrying much of the burden.[14] Indeed Kurjack was becoming the workhorse of the group, putting in hundreds of overtime hours.[15] While Riley, Kurjack and Mulcahy concentrated on the interpretive programs and aids that had acquired high priority, the basic research program went forward, but at a much slower pace than originally had been expected. Yoelson, Lehman and Shoemaker continued with the tasks of chains-of-title, insurance surveys, and public records, but only sporadically because of other demands on their time.[16] Riley's monthly reports regularly expressed frustration at the pace of the research

because of these interruptions. In his view the sole compensation for the lack of research by the Independence staff was the amount of material produced by the cooperative research program, which had been extended from the University of Pennsylvania to Bryn Mawr College. By early 1953 this had resulted in five seminar papers, two senior honors papers, two masters' theses and five dissertations on Philadelphia topics. Three seminar papers, four masters' theses and eighteen dissertations were in progress.[17] Further fruit of the cooperative program was the production, in 1954, of a filmstrip entitled "The Birth of Independence." The filmstrip, along with a tape recording and teachers' guide, was aimed at schoolchildren. It was prepared jointly by staff from Independence and the University of Pennsylvania.[18]

By early 1954 the historians had completed the report on Independence Hall that would be used as the basis for the refurnishing program spurred by the General Federation of Women's Club's gift. Almost immediately they turned their attention to completion of the interpretive section of the 1954 master plan.[19] Shortly after this had been accomplished, Riley left Independence to assume a post at Colonial Williamsburg. Riley's successor, with the title, Chief, History and Interpretation Branch was Dr. Murray Nelligan. There were other changes in personnel as well. A new historian, Thaddeus W. Tate joined the staff in June, but Lehman resigned in August, so that the total number of historians remained the same.[20]

By the time Riley departed, the historical program at Independence had undergone a fundamental change. The underlying purpose, providing the background for the restoration and interpretation of the park remained the same. Riley, however, had viewed this purpose in the broadest possible sense, envisioning a research program that would deal with eighteenth-century

Philadelphia in a wide-ranging manner, establishing the context for the physical development of Independence and for the events that had transpired there. Events, such as the General Federation of Women's Clubs gift and the necessity of drafting a master plan, had already skewed research from the general to the specific. This trend would continue. From 1954 onward the highest priority would be assigned to site specific research, aimed at providing information for whatever restoration was targeted to get underway next. One of the first victims of this change in emphasis was the cooperative research program. To some extent the program had lapsed even before Riley's departure, because the University of Pennsylvania's American Civilization curriculum had not been offered in the academic year that ran from September 1953 to June 1954, and because the new chairman of the university's history department did not share Roy Nichols's enthusiasm for the project.[21] It was the support of Riley and Nichols that had fueled the program. Dennis Kurjack, who was supervising historian under Riley and Nelligan was not convinced that the program had produced useful results.[22] Without the efforts of Riley and Nichols the Cooperative Research Program was not so much killed, as allowed to die a slow death.

The mid-1950s were peak years for the research program. In 1955 Nelligan transferred to the regional office, with Kurjack assuming the position of branch chief. William C. Everhart arrived to become supervising historian. Tate had left, but two new historians joined the staff in this period: Sydney Bradford and David A. Kimball. There was not only more staff, but also money for travel, first from the General Federation of Women's Club's gift and a donation from the Eastern National Parks and Monuments Association, and, after 1956, from Mission 66 funds.[23] Until 1955, most of the research had, of

necessity, been conducted in Philadelphia. Although new information would continue to be discovered in that city, the first phase of research there, as well as the exploration of printed source material was complete. The latter had resulted in a bibliography of 20,000 entries arranged by author and subject.[24] With the infusion of funds the researchers began to fan out to more distant repositories, Yoelson to the New-York Historical Society and New York Public Library in New York City and Princeton University in New Jersey, Everhart to the Huntingon Library in Pasadena, California, Kurjack to the Clements Library in Ann Arbor, Michigan.[25] Even foreign travel was included. Bradford went to England to examine manuscripts at the British Museum and the Public Records Office. He spent approximately five months abroad, with just over three months devoted to archival work. It was all the budget would allow, and he returned to report that it was insufficient. Considering the intricacy of the British archives and the amount of material relevant to Independence he thought that an additional year of research in England would be necessary.[26]

Through 1956 most of this research had been targeted toward accumulating information about the Supreme Court Room, which was the next space slated for restoration and refurnishing with the funds from the General Federation of Women's Clubs. Neither the documentary evidence collected earlier nor Penelope Hartshorne's architectural investigation had been able to resolve all the questions about its accouterments. Part of Bradford's purpose in going to England had been to look at British courtrooms of the the period. It soon became apparent, however, that it was not efficient to research a single topic in distant libraries. Although reports submitted by Independence continued to list priorities by topic, with the Supreme Court Chamber and the buildings on

the Square heading the list, in fact the research was being conducted on the basis of repositories.[27] By 1957 the park requested that the historians be permitted to plan priorities based on collections to be examined, rather than on the subject to be researched.

> It is certainly not feasible to go to a large manuscript repository, such as the Yale University Library, and look for material only on a single subject, such as the Supreme Court Chamber of Independence hall. Obviously it would be unrealistic not to record every scrap of information about all the park buildings (and all the research projects) when going through the library collections. For that reason we strongly recommend that consideration be given to the possibility in the future of listing the Independence research program by repositories, rather than by individual subjects. 28

In the meantime, despite the accelerated pace of the research, it was still subject to interruption while the historians conducted tours, answered queries, and provided research assistance to others. Kurjack provided a sample listing of such assistance during the years 1951-1958 to Acting Chief Herbert E. Kahler of the Division of Interpretation in Washington. During that time requests for research assistance had averaged about four a month. Undoubtedly the historians must have enjoyed responding to at least some of the inquiries; other requests may have appeared more frivolous, but were viewed as good public relations. Among the well-known scholars who had been aided were Douglas Southall Freeman, for his biography of George Washington, and Samuel Eliot Morison seeking information on a portrait of John Paul Jones, Whitfield Bell, associate editor of the Papers of Benjamin Franklin, and Jacob Cooke, assistant editor of the Alexander Hamilton Papers. Government offices seeking information had included the State Department, the Department of Defense, the United States Marine Corps, and the office of Governor G. Mennen Williams of Michigan, who had wanted to know about Signers of the Decaration of

Independence of Welsh descent. The staff had also been called upon by producers of television programs and movies. By far the most popular topic was the Assembly Room. Warner Brothers wished to replicate it as a set for the movie "John Paul Jones," and Walt Disney Productions intended to reproduce it at Disneyland.[29]

In January 1958 John D. R. Platt came to Independence from the Air Force Historical Program to assume Everhart's position as supervising park historian, following the latter's tranfer to San Francisco.[30] Kurjack now held the title of chief of the Division of Interpretation. Museum exhibits and curatorial functions, visitors' services, and archaeology were under his supervision, as well as the research program. He also served as de facto assistant superintendent, acting for Anderson in the latter's absence. He enjoyed Anderson's complete confidence and was free to hire personnel without seeking Anderson's concurrence in his choice. Platt, for example, was interviewed by Kurjack only, and never met Anderson until he arrived at Independence.

Platt found a pleasant informality and warmth among the park service staff that contrasted favorably with the Air Force's hierarchical attitudes. When he arrived at his new office he found the wall adorned with a crayon portrait by Joseph Sharples of Jeremiah Wadsworth, the subject of Platt's doctoral dissertation. It was one of the pictures from the Peale collection that had been removed from Independence Hall and were temporarily being stored in the building the historians then occupied at 135 South Fifth Street. Kimball, who knew that Wadsworth had been Platt's subject, had arranged for its "temporary storage" in his office. On a table beneath the portrait was a worn ranger's hat with a note under its brim. The note, from Everhart, advised Platt that

people would tell him about how Everhart did things while he was at Independence, and suggested that Platt tell them to go to hell.

Platt also found the park service's attitude towards professionals refreshing after his experiences with the military.

> I very quickly learned that the park service as then constituted was run by a body of professionals meshing gears, that you were among a group of fraternities of that sort, that the operational people weren't just administrators. You arrived at consensus by means of conferences, and that's how the decision-making process was conducted. It's nice to think that working for a federal agency, but not being an administrator per se, that you made decisions along with your fellow professionals -- an attractive aspect of working for the park service as against working for a typical line organization of the government. 31

That collegiality was an all-important factor in the research program at Independence. The nature of the research demanded minute and painstaking study of millions of documents in search of single nuggets of information. Although negative findings could also be viewed as significant, much of the work was boring and tedious. Still, it could be exhilarating when new evidence turned up. Riley recalled the research as resembling a jigsaw puzzle. Finding a missing piece that fit with the rest of the puzzle was an exciting experience.[32] With so many hands seeking evidence in so many sources and through diverse disciplines, the pieces might not have fit together, had it not been for the free exchange of information among the staff. Kimball recalled:

> a very highly developed, totally unstructured, informal communications system. Coffee breaks played, in my judgment, a pretty significant role in this. Archaeologists, historians, historical architects, and curators all attended, and the tendency was to talk shop. The interpretive staff, broadly defined -- again archaeologists, curators, historians, historical architects -- had periodic and fairly frequent social contacts in the form of parties and, again, even the presence of wives and husbands only slightly dampened the tendency to talk at the party about what you had been working on for the past couple of weeks. So, I cannot remember whether we had any kind of periodic staff meetings or not. I don't think

> we did, but on the other hand, I have a feeling that anyone who didn't know what their colleagues were doing at any given time almost had to work to avoid picking up the knowledge informally...in those days we liked each other as people; there was a fairly close personal relationship among most of the staff. 33

The knowledge acquired through these informal exchanges was vital to the restoration and refurnishing process, where small clues from varying sources could be highly significant. The original appearance of the Assembly Room, for example, was pieced together largely from Yoelson's discovery of the original order for its finishes, Mulcahy's analysis of the Pine-Savage painting, the serendipitous appearance of the Joseph Sansom sketch, taken in conjunction with the physical analysis of the surviving fabric. All of the pieces were required to complete the jigsaw puzzle.

With Platt's arrival the production of reports assumed new importance. By this time Historic Structures Reports (or Historic Building Survey Reports as they were first known) were being required before restoration or reconstruction could begin. A report on New Hall had been issued in 1956. By early 1958 David Kimball had completed a report on the Merchants' Exchange and several others were in progress. In preparation for the master plan, several Historic Grounds Reports were also undertaken, dealing with such issues as appropriate planting, paving, and fencing.[34] Platt insisted on high professional standards for the reports, with conclusions backed by solid research.[35] The reports were thus not only the fruits of the work already accomplished; their preparation also revealed how much remained to be done.

In the meantime, pressures for completion of the park began to mount. Judge Lewis, Mayor Tate, and others in Philadelphia were anxious to see concrete progress in the construction program. Lack of funding was no longer

an acceptable excuse. Some money would come to the park through Mission 66, and in August of 1958, Lewis succeeded in shepherding authorization for the expenditure of an additional $7 million through Congress. The pace of the research program could not be allowed to impede park development. In response to these pressures, National Park Service management took an extraordinary step at a master plan meeting in June 1958, agreeing to authorize the expenditure of construction funds for a two-year crash program of research, leaving the details of what was to be accomplished for later determination.[36] In response to this decision the historians at Independence assembled a proposal describing their appraisal of the scope of work and staff requirements. It called for seventeen professionals and four clerical workers. The professionals would be organized into four teams, each consisting of three historians. Each team would be responsible for particular subject areas -- two for the Independence Square group, and one each for other buildings, and for other sites and features in the parks -- and would also be assigned particular repositories or record groups. In addition there would be a supervising historian, two senior historians to evaluate the product and write the reports, a librarian for records management, and a historian to do the research for exhibits, signs, and other interpretive devices. The teams would examine over two million items, located in thirty-seven institutions scattered up and down the eastern seaboard, as well as in England and France. They would also peruse over two million pages of newsprint, including full runs of thirty-three early Philadelphia newspapers, seven additional Pennsylvania imprints, thirty-four from other states, and selected later papers. The price tag came to just under a quarter of a million dollars.[37] When the park added its estimates for architectural, museum and archaeological research, the sum grew to over a

million dollars.[38]

This was far higher than management in the regional and Washington offices had envisioned. Assistant Regional Director George A. Palmer recommended slashing the budget to $100,000, and, because the program was to be paid for with construction funds, that it deal only with items relevant to proposed construction, not with the general ideas and purposes of the park. Thus he called for confining the immediate research to the physical history of the Independence Square buildings and their contents.[39] Chief of Interpretation Murray Nelligan and Lawrence B. Coryell questioned the size of the architectural staff requested by Charles Grossman, and recommended transferring responsibility for architectural research to the Eastern Office of Design and Construction.[40] In late July Ronald F. Lee, recently returned from a trip, expressed considerable concern about the scope of the proposed project to Regional Director Daniel Tobin. Lee urged Tobin not to submit the highly critical memorandum the latter intended to prepare, but instead to express his opinions at a Washington meeting.[41] This meeting took place in the office of Thomas C. Vint on August 20. In attendance were Vint, Lee, Chief Architect Richard Sutton, and Chief Historian Herbert Kahler and others from the Washington office, Edward Zimmer from EODC, Tobin, and Anderson. The conclusions of the meeting were that any special research program would have to be financed from available funds, that the research be centered on the Independence Square group and should be aimed at rehabilitation and stabilization rather than restoration, and that historical reports on the buildings and their furnishings should be completed by mid-1959.[42]

The meeting had obviously been a call for restraint. It was therefore with considerable consternation that the regional office reviewed the park's

revised proposal, submitted in September, for its development program for the four-year period 1960-1963. Although the research program had been stretched out over four years rather than compressed into two, the proposal now called for an even higher expenditure, by some $100,000, than had been requested in July. Over half of the proposed funds were for architectural research. George A. Palmer, as acting regional director, proposed Draconian measures. He first recommended restricting the research to be paid for with construction funds to the $60,000 already authorized for the reports on the Independence Square buildings. Those were scheduled for completion by June 30, 1959. At that time the research program could be reassessed. The more radical recommendation, already suggested earlier, was transfer of the architecural research program from the park staff to the Eastern Office of Design and Construction. Citing the success of EODC in conducting both architectural research and the preparation of restoration plans at Harpers Ferry, Hopewell Village and Saratoga, Palmer recommended that the work at Independence be carried out in the same manner.[43]

Palmer's views prevailed, and by late October Anderson described how projects for the coming year would be rearranged to accommodate the reduced research program within the established funding limits. He proposed hiring two new historians and one new clerk-typist to assist with report preparation.[44] With the approved increases there were in 1959 nine historians at Independence. Two, Kurjack and Yoelson, had been at Independence almost since its inception; Kimball had been on board for several years, and Platt for at least a year. In addition, William Campbell, who had worked on the park's architectural staff for several years, had transferred to the historians' office when responsibility for architectural research was shifted

to EODC. In the preceding year not only had two new positions been created, but also there had once again been considerable turnover in the staff. There were thus several new faces among the historians, including Mary Anne Hagan, James Mullaly, James R. Sullivan, and Paul G. Sifton.[45]

Platt had had considerable experience with collaborative writing in the Air Force. Thus, when the reports were complex, as was certainly the case for Independence Hall and Congress Hall, they became a team effort. Bradford and Mullally, who had been on assignment at Fort McHenry in Baltimore Harbor, prepared the first draft of the Independence Hall Part I report. So that they could have the materials at hand, the research cards were microfilmed. The cards went to Baltimore, with the microfilm remaining in Philadelphia for use by the rest of the historians. The final version of the report was written in Philadelphia by Platt and Kimball. Platt made this assignment, as well as that of other topics, on the basis of his estimate of the interests, abilities and expertise of the historical staff. He was also insistent that the reports be concise and well-written.[46] It was in this period, spurred on by Platt's reviews and comments that the staff at Independence, Yoelson believed, "really became professional historians."[47]

Under this collaborative system, the 1959 fiscal year was an extremely fruitful one, at least in the production of reports. The basic research program Riley had formulated nine years before began to return its dividends. Most of the information needed for the reports was already available in the park's research files; where it was lacking potential sources had usually been identified, if not yet studied. The iconography especially was proving to be of great value, at least for evidence of the original appearance of the exterior of the buildings. The staff could also be more productive because the

use of construction funds for the reports on the Independence Square group freed other monies to fund additional aspects of the historical program. In addition to the four required reports on Independence Hall, Congress Hall, Old City Hall and the State House Yard (Independence Square), the staff had prepared preliminary or final reports on fourteen other topics. Three were partial furnishings plans for the buildings on the Square. One report, on horticulture, was intended to form the basis for the selection of trees, shrubs, vines, ground cover and flowers to be planted in thse sections of the park that were then being landscaped. This general guide to historically appropriate plant materials was supplemented by more specific reports on the historic appearance of the grounds around the Merchants' Exchange, Carpenters' Hall, and the Second Bank.

Six of the reports were prepared to form the basis of decisions about the use and/or retention of buildings and sites, including: conversion of the Second Bank for use by the Library Company; the reconstruction of the Joseph Pemberton House as a Navy Museum; 139 Walnut Street, as an alternative site for a Navy Museum; and determination of the fate of the Contributionship Stable, the Marshall's Court Houses, and the Market Street Houses. The remainder, providing the basis for restoration decisions, included the first report on the Bishop White House and reports on the exterior of four houses on Locust Street owned by the park service.[48] Of the reports intended to provide information for adminstrative decision making, only one had any real effect. The decisions to reconstruct the Pemberton House and demolish the Contributionship Stable and the Marshall's Court Houses were made for reasons related to political pressures, aesthetics, or convenience rather than on historical grounds. Only the historical associations of the Market Street

Houses, which had been built by Benjamin Franklin as income-producing properties, would ultimately have an effect on shaping the park.

For the time being, however, virtually all the efforts of the historians continued to be concentrated on the Independence Square group. First Part I Historic Structures Reports were prepared. These contained sufficient historical information to provide the basis for administrative decisions about how each building was to be treated. When the decision was made the staff would proceed to refine and expand their findings in order to produce the historical sections of the definitive Part II reports. These detailed the specific documentary evidence needed for restoration. While work on other buildings, especially Independence Hall continued, the priority was Congress Hall, which, because of the urgency for structural repair, was the first of the group slated for restoration. Not only was Congress Hall thought to be more in need of immediate attention than other components of the Independence Square group, but also it required relatively little intervention to bring it to a condition of historical accuracy. In contrast to Independence Hall, where much of the first floor had been subjected to T. Mellon Rogers's fanciful recreation of "colonial" features, Congress Hall had been carefully restored by the American Institute of Architects in 1912-1913. Its major architectural components were judged to be reasonably accurate historically. [49] Thus its restoration could be carried out with relative speed.

There were, however, details that would require further research. The architectural investigation had revealed that the AIA had made at least one mistake. They had removed the original marble mantels in the Senate Chamber and installed wooden mantels in their place.[50] Furthermore, beyond the major architectural elements, there was the question of the arrangement of the

first floor during the period when it served as the chamber of the United States House of Representatives. If the furnishings had left any physical evidence, it had long since been obliterated by alterations and restorations. When the first version of the Historic Structures Report was submitted in March 1959 this was one of the missing pieces of the jigsaw puzzle -- and an important one -- for which there was then no ready reference in the card file. Fortunately, however, the sharing of information in coffee breaks and other get-togethers led to finding a vital piece of evidence rather quickly. In November 1959 Fred Hanson joined the museum staff as a curator. One of his first assignments was to assemble materials for an exhibit on Congress Hall. The first resource, of course, was the park's iconographic file, which included not only views of early Philadelphia and its buildings, but also of events. Among the latter holdings were copies of early political cartoons, which, because of their vivid style and comedic overtones, made particularly good exhibit material. He selected one that showed a fight, with fists and canes as weapons, between Congressmen Matthew Lyon of Vermont and Roger Griswold of Connecticut, on the House floor.[52] As the potential exhibit began to circulate, the historians, looking at the cartoon with fresh eyes, could see that its background revealed a good deal of information about the arrangement of the room. Quickly, Hagan was put to checking newspapers of the appropriate date for information about the fight and was able to find some further description.[53] The cartoon showing the Lyon-Griswold fight was thus as key a document for the restoration of the interior of Congress Hall as the Pine-Savage painting would prove to be for the Assembly Room in Independence Hall.

The interiors of Congress Hall posed some interesting research problems, but there was never any doubt that the major spaces would be restored to their appearance in the last decade of the eighteenth century. Without any need for lengthy discussion or written directives, historians, architects, museum staff and management agreed on that goal. There was no such consensus, however, for other aspects of the restoration. In the course of preparing the first version of the Historic Structures Report, architectural investigations showed that the rostrum for the Speaker of the House had been located not, as might have been assumed, at the south end of the House chamber, but along its west wall. The members of the Congress had therefore usually entered the House from a door opposite the rostrum located approximately midway along the building's east facade, the side adjacent to Independence Hall, rather than from the front door on Chestnut Street. Late eighteenth-century views of the Independence complex showed an arched and balustraded portico in the approximate location of this doorway, although its precise relation to the west arcade and wing of Independence Hall was unclear. Subsequent changes to the wing buildings west of Independence Hall had obliterated any trace of the portico above ground. In 1959, therefore, the historians recommended archaeological investigation of its site.[54] This investigation was carried out by Jackson W. Moore in June 1959. He found portions of the portico's north and south foundation walls. The east wall had been destroyed during construction of Robert Mills' fireproof office wings for Independence Hall in 1811, and, indeed, a corner of the extant west wing reconstructed in 1896 had been built over the portico's site. Nevertheless, when read in conjunction with a recently-discovered 1783 ground plan of the complex, the remains below ground were sufficient to establish the dimensions of the portico.[55] The historians believed that the

archaeological and pictorial evidence combined were sufficent to form the basis for an accurate reconstruction.

The second version of the Historic Structures Report for Congress Hall was not completed until April 1960, when the architectural data section was added. By that time, however, the historical data had been available for over a month, and opposition to reconstruction of the portico, based on both philosophical and economic grounds, began to surface. Edward Zimmer, chief of EODC, summed up his opinion of the issue in a memorandum to the new regional director, Ronald F. Lee. Not only would reconstruction of the portico require extensive changes to the west wing and delay letting the contract for construction work on Congress Hall, but also, he believed, there was insufficient evidence for an accurate reconstruction.[56] Charles Peterson took a more extreme position, arguing that neither the portico nor the door under it should be reconstructed. The door was not original to the building, having existed only between 1794 and c.1812. Without the portico he believed that the door would be meaningless, and there was insufficient evidence of the details of the portico to justify its reconstruction.[57] There were intermediate points of view. Penelope Hartshorne thought that the portico and side entry were important aids to "recreating the aspect" of Congress Hall at the end of the eighteenth century. She suggested reconstructing the doorway, for which there was considerable evidence, and constructing a platform with partial walls to represent the portico.[58] The discussions over the doorway went on for over two years. Platt fought hard for full reconstruction. In the end, the decision hinged more on costs than on the philosophy of restoration, satisfying neither Platt nor Peterson. The doorway was reconstructed because of its interpretive value and relation to the building's restored interior; however, it was approached by

a simple flight of steps with no suggestion of the portico.

Platt, and some of the other historians, firmly believed that historical accuracy demanded that Independence Hall and its ancillary buildings should be totally rebuilt as they were in 1776-1800. This would include not only reconstruction of the arcades and wings on either side of Independence Hall, but also of the State House Yard, and of the committee room at the southeast corner of the Assembly Room, to which Congress had withdrawn for some of its most important sessions.[59] National Park Service management, however, took a more pragmatic view, which enabled them to approach the buildings and grounds at Independence with considerable flexibility, and with one eye on the budget. At the August 1958 meeting, at which the limited scope of the immediate research program had been determined, the directorate had also decided that the current approach to the buildings would be rehabilitation and stabilization. They did not, however, preclude eventual full restoration.[60] Thus the debate about the portico began in an environment in which no ultimate limits had been set. By March 1961, however, Director Conrad L. Wirth had ordered that full restoration of the buildings on Independence Square should not be contemplated. The question of historical accuracy did not arise; Wirth's concern was carrying out work needed to put the buildings in good shape and restoring them in a manner sufficient for interpretive purposes within the authorized budget.[61] Because Wirth did not, however, define what would constitute an acceptable partial restoration, there was still considerable room for determination of whether particular features would or would not be restored. In some cases, such as the issue of reconstruction of the doorway of Congress Hall and its portico, varying points of view were aired in formal discussions and memoranda. At other times, unspoken underlying assumptions

prevailed. The reconstruction of the portico could not have been undertaken unless the 1896 wings and arcades of Independence Hall were demolished and replaced with more accurate reconstructions, because the existing west wing impinged on the space the portico had occupied. Even before Wirth's directive had been issued, Zimmer had pointed out to Lee that the question of reconstruction of the portico would have to be deferred until reconstruction of the arcades and wings was undertaken.[62] Once Wirth's opinion had been heard, such a reconstruction never was discussed, much less programmed, nor was reconstruction of the committee room.[63] On the other hand, full and accurate restoration of the exterior envelope of Independence Hall and its interiors was pursued without question, with two exceptions. There was early, if unwritten, agreement that the Strickland steeple of 1828 would remain.[64] The other decision, not made until the 1970s, captured the spirit of Wirth's policy. Originally, there had been two tall-case or "grandfather's" clocks on the east and west walls of Independence Hall. That on the west wall was rebuilt because it provided a needed shaft for the mechanical system ductwork; its balancing companion, an important component of the building's symmetrical composition, was not.

Restoration of the State House Yard was a victim of both the decision to retain the 1896 wings and arcades and local political pressures. The plot of open ground behind Independence Hall appeared as reconstructed on master plan drawings through the early 1960s, with serpentine walks and informal plantings.[65] Its restoration was recommended in the Historic Grounds Report of June 1959. But, like reconstruction of the portico, an accurate restoration of the State House Yard would have depended on reconstruction of the wings and arcades. Although much was known about the original appearance

of these features, including their dimensions, there was considerable opinion that the information was insufficient to produce an accurate reconstruction[66] Furthermore, restoration of the State House Yard would have required a high wall around its perimeter and a massive gate on Walnut Street. The insurance companies on Walnut Street, whose employees were accustomed to cut through the yard on their way to and from work, objected to reconstruction of the enclosure. City officials supported the companies. Although the objections might have been overcome, uncertainty about the proper configuration of the buiding elements defining the north end of the yard and the high costs involved combined to preclude serious consideration of the area's restoration.[67]

In the years following 1959, the historians at Independence continued their research program and production of reports, although never at the frantic pace of that one remarkable twelve-month period. As time and the budget permitted, they visited the Massachusetts and Virginia Historical Societies, Yale and Princeton Universities, and other repositories on the east coast, as well as the Pennsylvania Archives at Harrisburg to look at newly-found material. In 1964 Sifton went to France to examine material at the Bibliotheque Nationale and in other archives. The historians pursued inquiries in the papers of members of Congress and in the correspondence and diairies of visitors to its sessions. They continued to search for additional material to supply answers to questions about the interior finishes and furnishings of the Independence Square group. Reports were prepared on buildings not yet covered, especially on City Tavern, Benjamin Franklin's house, and Franklin's tenant houses on Market Street. There were also reports on the Christian Street Houses near Gloria Dei Church, and on several early churches in the vicinity of

the park. Another group of reports supported completion of landscaping features in the area bounded by Walnut and Chestnut, Third and Sixth Streets. These covered individual gardens, for example, at the Todd House, street lighting, paving, watchboxes, and signs, especially those marking the sites of buildings no longer standing.[68]

As the expertise of the park staff became more widely known, its members were called on increasingly for research assistance by outside scholars, students, writers for serious and popular publications, and government officials. The inquiries ranged from those requiring considerable depth of knowledge to what can only be classified as trivia. The most frequent questions concerned the Liberty Bell. Other topics were rarely repetitious. They included biographical questions about such figures as Caleb Pusey, Andrew Hamilton, George Read, and Philadelphia cabinetmaker Benjamin Randolph, and inquiries about eighteenth-century paints and pigments, nineteenth-century street lighting, early taverns, and Philadelphia booksellers. One Congressman from Texas requested assistance in locating the portrait of Count Bernardo de Galvez, for whom Galveston had been named, that was presented to the Second Continental Congress on May 8, 1783.[69] Platt would read all the correspondence as it came in and parcel out the letters for response based on the interests and knowledge of members of the park. Because of Yoelson's long association with Independence and unusually retentive memory, he carried most of the burden of preparing replies.[70]

In late 1965 George Hartzog, who had replaced Conrad Wirth as Director of the National Park Service in 1964, announced one of several periodic reorganizations carried out during his tenure. This established a Washington Service Center, which would bring together in one place historians and

architectural historians to carry out major research programs for the entire park service. Only those historians whose functions were largely interpretive would remain at the parks "to perform such minor park investigations as the superintendent may direct and to pursue such studies as are necessary to familiarize them with the park story."[71] Under this directive the history staff at Independence gradually began to dissolve, with its members transferring to the interpretive staff, to regional offices or to Washington. Only Yoelson, Campbell and Miriam Quinn Blimm remained on the park staff to answer the myriad questions of those carrying out the park's restoration and development, its interpretive program, and the inquiries of outsiders. Yet Independence was too big a research project, and the materials too concentrated in Philadelphia, for such a system to work efficiently. Thus, the architects chiefly responsible for architectural research, Nelson and Hartshorne, while administratively part of the Washington staff, remained assigned to Philadelphia. So, too, after a brief transfer to Washington, Platt returned to Philadelphia to work on the research and reports needed for the development and restoration projects of the late 1960s and early 1970s.

The division between research and interpretation implicit in Hartzog's directive had not always been the case at Independence. Through the 1950s responsibility for interpreting Independence to the public rested with the same group that carried out research and prepared reports. Thus, those who were most familiar with the historic background also told the park's story. Because, however, the historical staff was so small, each of these activities -- research and interpretation -- could only be carried out as an interruption to the other. As a result both suffered. Interpretive planning in the early years was carried on only sporadically, and implementation in the form of

signs, exhibits or written materials was meager. In the last months of 1950, Riley put together a three-fold leaflet, so that when the park service assumed administration of Independence Hall in January there would be a piece of literature to replace the somewhat dubious information sheet the city had been using.[72] During the first year that the historians' office was in full operation, Kurjack worked briefly on a guide manual, and Mulcahy mounted a small exhibit for the first information center, which was in the west wing of Independence Hall.[73] The emphasis within the office, however, was almost entirely on research.

In the following year the situation was reversed, as the program of basic research was almost laid aside while the staff concentrated on two interpretive projects, preparation of an historical handbook and of the interpretive statement for the first master plan. Although visitors to Independence could then see the interior of only Independence Hall, the master plan envisioned the visitor's experience as it would be when the park was complete. In order to encourage visitors to view the entire park, not just Independence Hall and the Liberty Bell, the historians recommended a plan focused on entry to the park from the east. This would not only lead visitors through other sections of the park, with Independence Hall as the climax. It would also respect the historical chronology; many of the delegates to the first Continental Congress had initially met informally at the City Tavern before the sessions in Carpenters' Hall in 1774. So the progression from a reconstructed City Tavern to Carpenters' Hall and thence to Independence Hall would, in a sense, retrace their footsteps.

Certainly a large information center would be needed. The inadequacy of the west wing of Independence Hall became clearer as visitation increased. The

growing number of visitors also placed heavy demands on the staff's time to provide personal interpretive services as tour leaders for organized groups. The task of conducting visitors around the park was not a particularly congenial one for the historians, most of whom were more interested in research than in personal interpretation. Riley's frustration surfaced frequently in his monthly reports on the group's activities. He described preparation of the layout of the historical handbook as "tedious," and noted that in the spring, "the heavy increase in visitation, especially in the number of school groups, had an adverse effect on the historical research."[74] This situation was somewhat alleviated by hiring seasonal ranger-historians to provide tours not only for groups with advance appointments, but also for the general public during peak visitation periods. Six seasonals served in 1951; by the following year, the demand was so great that the number was increased to ten. By the mid-1950s two seasonals were also on duty during April and May, when visitation by school groups was at its height.[75] Gradually other devices were designed to ease the burden of conducting tours. In 1953 Yoelson prepared a self-guided tour leaflet, which was made available to groups that could not be accommodated with conducted tours, and the historical handbook went on sale in 1954.[76]

As the number of visitors increased, the west wing of Independence Hall was no longer adequate as an orientation center. Anderson suggested the possible use of the Supreme Court Building [Old City Hall] for that purpose, a proposal supported by Lee, then chief of interpretation in the Washington office.[77] Chief Park Historian Murray Nelligan disagreed. Staffing the Supreme Court Building as well as Independence Hall was beyond the capabilities

of the existing number of guards and rangers. Priority had been given to research for Independence Hall and its restoration; the emphasis, he believed, should remain. More tellingly he argued that the alterations would require too much change in what was, after all, one of the prime historic buildings. Converting it to an auditorium might require the installation of such features as acoustic tile, drapes, and floor coverings, and even more drastic alterations to make it conform to fire and safety codes. The result would be neither good preservation nor good interpretation. He advocated locating a temporary interpretive center in the wing buildings[78] Nelligan's view prevailed. In 1955 the orientation center was shifted to the east wing of Independence Hall, so that the west wing could be fitted up as an exhibit gallery. The first exhibit, installed early in 1956, was on Franklin. In addition, two small exhibits explained work that was being done at the park, one at the site of archaeological investigations in Independence Square, the other in the Supreme Court Room.[79] Similar exhibits were mounted regularly as restoration and development went forward, explaining not only the historic importance of the park, but also the ongoing work.

In the early 1950s only the most rudimentary printed interpretive aids were available to visitors. In the second half of the decade emphasis shifted to audiovisual aids. These were largely the province of William C. Everhart, who came to Independence in the fall of 1955. He filled the post of supervising park historian, left vacant when Dennis Kurjack succeeded Nelligan, who had moved to the regional office as chief of interpretation, as chief park historian. Everhart, who would subsequently become associate director of the National Park Service for interpretation, had considerable interest in the potential of sight and sound for interpretive purposes. He equipped Warren

MacCullough, the city's former curator of Independence Hall, with a camera and set him to photographing the process of demolition and development.[80] He also arranged for a professional film crew to make movies documenting the same activities.[81] By 1956, in cooperation with the Philadelphia CBS affiliate, WCAU-TV, he had arranged for production of a slide-tape program, narrated by John Facenda, which was shown to visitors in the refitted east wing.[82] Two years later, in 1958, an audio device was installed at the Liberty Bell and visitors could hear a three-minute recording of the story of the bell; in 1960 the tape became available in five foreign languages -- Spanish, French, German, Italian, and Russian.[83]

These devices were attempts to compensate the average visitor for the lack of any form of personal interpretation at Independence. Organized groups might be fairly well served through conducted tours, led by the park historians, or in spring and summer by seasonal ranger-historians. For some groups this must have been an experience of considerable quality, sparked by the enthusiasm many of the historians felt about what they were discovering about the park and its buildings. For visitors who came on their own, however, the experience could be far from satisfactory. Independence Hall was still manned on a daily basis by the guards who had staffed it during the city's tenure. They were indeed guards, not historians or trained interpreters, although some might attempt to engender a rough respect for the resources they guarded. Charles Dorman, who would later become a curator at the park, remembered being taken to Independence Hall as a boy, while it was still in the city's custody.

> I remember a wonderful person with a Slavic accent, who was in charge of standing by the bell and interpreting it, I suppose, and as a boy -- if you came into the bottom of the steps there, the bottom of the tower with

> the bell -- and you had your hat on, he would do everything but whip it off. He would say, "Take off your hat, youse is in a sacred place." And he was right. 84

Other visitors were less amused at the behavior of some of the guards than Dorman. One woman from Indiana reported, just before the park service assumed custody of Independence Hall:

> When closing hour arrived the guard told the people in a very insulting manner to move on out...The guard then told a boy waiting to take a picture of the Liberty Bell to break it up, to move on out. The boy explained to him that he had waited a long time to take his picture when no one was in the way and it would only require a second. The guard held his hand in front of the camera and refused his request. His manner was very rude. 85

The treatment the public was receiving at Independence Hall did not go unnoticed within the park service, although there seemed to be no great urgency felt about alleviating the situation. George Palmer had been shocked, while touring the park with his family a few years before coming to Philadelphia as assistant regional director in 1955, at the manner in which visitors were elbowed through the buildings. The situation had not improved by the time he took up his post in Philadelphia, and he discussed it with Murray Nelligan, then chief of interpretation in the regional office. Nelligan, however, was not particularly concerned. His view was that you first completed a park, then opened it, and then installed an interpretive program.[86] John Platt also, when he arrived at Independence in 1958, felt that the interpretive program was lagging, and urged Kurjack several times to authorize him to take some action to improve the state of affairs. Kurjack, however, was determined that nothing would interfere with the production of reports. "We have a mandate from the Director of the National Park Service, Conrad L. Wirth," he would tell Platt,

thumping his fist on the table, "to develop Independence National Historical Park."[87] That development in Kurjack's view meant completing the research, not improving the interpretation. Without Kurjack's approval, there was little Platt could do.

Independence did make some effort to educate the guards about history and manners.

> Attempts to improve the performance of the guards on public contact began almost immediately and the long painstaking process of educating them in courtesy and in giving accurate (if limited) information continues. As a result, complaints about the guards which had been frequent in the beginning have now almost disappeared. It should be pointed out here, however, that we have never conceived of employing guards for interpretive services, but simply tried and are trying to make the most of an existing situation. 88

George Palmer still had not forgotten his first experience at Independence, nor abandoned hope of seeing the situation improved. In the spring of 1959 a historian with considerable experience in interpretation, James R. Sullivan, was assigned to the Philadelphia regional office and was temporarily without an assignment. Sullivan had worked as a historian-interpreter at Colonial National Historical Park and at Chickamauga-Chattanooga, the Civil War battlefield in Tennessee. More recently, he had served on teams studying the recreational and interpretive potential of proposed park service acquisitions at Delaware Water Gap-Tocks Island, and the Great Lakes. Palmer urged Tobin to name Sullivan to a team to study Independence. To serve with Sullivan, Palmer selected Robert H. Rose, a naturalist and interpretive planner in the regional office, and Albert Manucy from St. Augustine, who had a service-wide reputation as an interpreter.[89] The study garnered support from the highest authority. Kurjack had been wrong,

or at least only partially correct in his interpretation of Wirth's "mandate" for Independence. Wirth may have wanted the park developed, but, always conscious of public opinion, he also wanted the visitor's experience improved, and would not brook delaying this goal because of construction. He commented to Tobin, perhaps somewhat unfairly:

> I understand that a belief exists on the part of the Independence National Historical Park staff that, during the development period, visitor services should largely be deferred so construction may proceed. While I do not wish to delay essential construction, I am of the firm opinion that the program of interpretation must be improved. 90

The study group presented its report in June 1959. It did not prove to be a panacea for interpretation at Independence. The most radical proposal, that the interpretive master plan be changed to reflect the approach of most visitors from the mall to the north, rather than from the east, was never implemented. Beyond that the report recommended several remedies: preparation of a new self-guided tour leaflet; a warm weather orientation station at the entrance to Independence Hall, preferably in the form of a reconstructed watch box, manned by uniformed personnel; exhibits in the Supreme Court Building; and use of a restored Congress Hall as an orientation auditorium. The report also suggested a somewhat different route for guided tours and means of controlling traffice flow through Independence Hall. Concluding that the building could only accommodate 200 people, the team suggested controlling traffic flow through appropriately placed velvet cords and allowing access only through the Chestnut Street doors, which could be closed when that capacity was reached. Finally, they advocated training and direction for the guards, whom they had found friendly and pleasant, but who could be taught about "the fine art of making the visitor feel welcome."[91]

Recommendations about routing through Independence Hall were put into effect immediately.[92] Another outcome of the report was the appointment of Sullivan to the Independence staff, at first as a historian. Within a few months, the interpretive function was removed from Platt's purview and assigned to Sullivan. This was accomplished through an administrative reorganization, establishing two branches within the Branch of History, one the Branch of Research and Planning, reporting to Platt, the second the Branch of Visitors Services reporting to Sullivan.[93] Platt was so angered by the change that he considered resigning. He felt that criticism of his handling of the interpretive function was unjustified, and that the reorganization created an unfortunate dichotomy between those who studied the materials of history and those who used those materials to educate the public.[94]

In fact, interpretive problems within the park service were not unique to Independence, although difficulties were more apparent there because of the high visibility and popularity of the park. The guards at Independence and many of the rangers at other parks were present primarily to protect the visitors and the resources rather than to dispense information. Interpretation had largely been the province of professional staff, historians at the historical parks, naturalists at the others. They had been hired for qualifications relating to their disciplines, not for their ability to deal with people. Sometimes, of course, the two skills coincided, but there were many instances in which they did not. In an attempt to determine how other areas with large numbers of visitors handled the situation, the division of interpretation in the Washington office established a study committee. In September 1960 one of the committee members, Roy E. Appleman, called on Maria Lombard, director of the guide service at Rockefeller Center.

Appleman was deeply impressed by his tour of Rockefeller Center, as well as by a visit to the United Nations, where Lombard had also established the guide service. He reported her criteria for selecting guides in great detail and with considerable approval. Lombard had at first hired young men as guides, but came to the conclusion that they were unsuited to the work. One of their number was Gregory Peck, whom she described as "irritable" and an unsatisfactory guide. Men, she believed, were difficult to control, "did not receive instructions gracefully," and acted in too independent a manner, departing from the approved interpretive program. The only ones who made good guides were, in Lombard's opinion, homosexual or had homosexual tendencies, which she found intolerable. Accordingly, Lombard had switched to hiring "young girls," and professed herself pleased with the results. Young women were fitted for the role of guide because they were "natural hostesses," liked being the "center of the show," and did not get bored by repetitive tasks. Besides, they were "more susceptible to instruction, more obedient, and they constitute less of a management problem than do men."

Lombard cautioned, however, that not just any young women would do. Those selected should be neat and attractive, but not too good-looking. Too pretty a girl would distract the visitors, who would pay attention to her rather than to the subject of the tour. A warm personality was also required. Age was another criterion. After twenty-five a "girl's" legs would "play out." The employment period was for two years, after which she believed that the guides' efficiency and enthusiasm declined markedly. Applicants should have at least two years of college, and a training program was essential. Lombard trained her recruits in poise, voice, and projection.

Appleman was receptive to Lombard's views. His own experience of tours at National Park Service facilities had convinced him that men were not effective as guides. "In uniform," he wrote, "they stand around looking like guards, and they act like guards." They lacked warmth, and did not initiate conversation with the visitors. Not only did Rockefeller Center and the United Nations employ women for the purpose; so did Colonial Williamsburg and many of the other historic sites he had visited. He forcefully recommended that the park service cease employing men to conduct tours, and substitute young women wherever conditions would permit.[95]

A quarter of a century later, Lombard's recommendations and Appleman's ready acceptance seem so blatantly sexist as to appear ludicrous. In the early 1960s, however, such views were almost universally accepted as unremarkable. Questions of equal opportunity had not really been addressed within the federal government, and, although the park service employed a few women in a professional capacity, its management and indeed its personnel, except for clerks and secretaries, were overwhelmingly male.

Nowhere was Appleman's proposal received with more enthusiasm than at Independence. By 1960 the ranger-historians at the park were conducting over 1,000 tours annually. Even though the regular staff was supplemented by seasonal employees during the summer, and in some years one or two in April as well, the demands on the historians conducting the research necessary for the restoration program were still immoderate. The guards, if improved, were still considered inadequate for most contact with the public. Accordingly Independence immediately began to formulate plans for hiring young women as "hostesses." Their criteria for selection were clearly based on Appleman's findings. Letters were sent to local colleges and universities, placement and

employment agencies, seeking young women "possessing a high degree of such personal attributes as a warm personality, cheerful disposition, bearing, poise and good grooming."[96]

By June 1961 five "personable, attractive, and intelligent young ladies" had joined the staff.[97] Because Sullivan was responsible for their training and supervision, the group quickly became known as "Sullivan's Harem." The group received six to eight weeks training, which consisted of lectures, reading, voice and speech instruction, and critiques of recordings of their talks. They also went out into the field, touring Philadelphia, and visiting the park service's chosen prototypes, Williamsburg, Rockefeller Center, and the United Nations.[98]

By the end of the summer, the new guides were in place on Independence Square, looking very much like airline hostesses in trim uniforms with perky caps. This was no accident. Discussions of appropriate dress for the women had been part of the planning almost from the first. One thought was that they might appear in clothing reminiscent of the eighteenth century, although not strictly in period costume. This was quickly abandoned, but the idea of a distinctive costume was not. Evidently the idea of putting the women in a version of the park service uniform was never considered. Some other prototype would have to be found, and Sullivan targeted the airlines as providing the best example. He wrote to and received advice on uniform designs and suppliers from American Airlines and TWA.[99] Park visitors in the early 1960s were thus greeted by smiling young women, who, in place of coffee or tea, dispensed snippets of historical information.

There is no doubt that the new form of personal interpretation provided at Independence was a huge success, although the initial premises were soon modified. Within a few years the two-year limitation on employment, impossible to maintain under Civil Service regulations, had disappeared, and the program had been opened to men.[100] Still, young women remained the backbone. So skilled did they become that other units of the park service sought their advice in emulating Independence's methods. In the summer of 1965, two of the Independence interpreters, Carole Scanlon and Laura Sells, were loaned to the National Capitol Region to establish interpretive services at the White House, and to assess the quality of visitors' services at the House Where Lincoln Died, the Old Stone House and the Custis-Lee Mansion.[101]

The female presence at Independence became more pronounced in 1963, with initiation of a program in which members of the Junior League became volunteer interpreters on Independence Square. The Junior League approached Anderson, suggesting that they would undertake this service during the spring. During the period from April to early June the park always experienced heavy visitation from school groups. Because the seasonals were not yet available, this influx strained the park's ability to provide tours. The assistance of the Junior League was therefore welcomed with enthusiasm. Sullivan, with the assistance of the historians, architects, and curators, offered an intensive training program similar to that provided for the staff interpreters. The women, many of whom had an academic background in history or political science, attended class once a week for a period of six weeks. They heard lectures, were provided with reading lists, and prepared sample talks, which were then critiqued by the park staff. Some twenty to twenty-five women participated. Each, after training, put in one or two sessions of three to four hours a week

for a period of eight weeks.[102] The program, which was enormouly successful, lasted for about a decade, laying the foundation for an expanded volunteer effort that would be instituted in the 1970s.

As personal interpretation became more organized in the early 1960s, other forms of telling the park's story also became more sophisticated. There were now two slide programs for visitors to the interpretive center in the east wing of Independence Hall. The explanatory tape at the Liberty Bell was available in five foreign languages -- Spanish, German, French, Italian, and Russian -- through cooperation with the State Department and the Voice of America.[103] Such devices became increasingly necessary, as visitation to the park rose to close to 2 million people in 1961, including visitors from over 40 foreign countries.[104] The most ambitious program for instructing and entertaining this increasing stream was installation of a sound and light program in Independence Square. The impetus for the program had come not from the park service, but from Mayor Richardson Dilworth. Impressed by such programs, then operating at a number of historic sites in Europe, he had appointed a committee to explore the feasibility of sound and light in Philadelphia, specifically at Independence.[105]

The prospect of such an evening activity was of great interest to the park service, because it corresponded with existing practice at other parks. Park service planners thought of visits to the national parks as total experiences. At many of the larger western parks, visitors stayed within the park, often for several days, at campgrounds or hotels run by concessioners. The day's program therefore generally extended into the evening, with campfires at which lectures or perhaps sing-alongs involved the visitor.[106] Because master planning decisions had precluded accommodation for overnight visitors within the

boundaries of Independence, it was unlikely that a relatively informal gathering analogous to a campfire would succeed, or be particularly relevant to the resource. Sound and light, however, could provide both a dramatic and appropriate evening program.

Indeed, although Mayor Dilworth had come forward with the concept for Independence, the park service had already been exploring the possibilities of sound and light at major historic sites. It had considered Fort McHenry in Baltimore, El Morro in San Juan, Puerto Rico, the Lincoln Memorial and other memorials in Washington, but had concluded that Independence would be the ideal location for a pilot project. Conrad Wirth therefore responded favorably to a proposal that the Old Philadelphia Redevelopment Corporation undertake to provide such a program, although with many conditions. The corporation could charge an admission fee, but would be entirely responsible for all the expenses of the production, including one season's operation and any liability claims. Any profit would go to a public purpose, such as the National Park Trust Fund. Nothing in the installation would violate the historic integrity of the buildings or Independence Square. In fact, the equipment would have to be so unobtrusive that daytime visitors would not be unduly aware of its presence. Finally, everything about the production, from its script, to the performance, to the installation, and even to the publicity would have to be "consistent in every respect with the dignity, character, beauty and national and international significance of Independence Hall," and would be subject to review and approval by the National Park Service.[107]

In June 1960 members of Mayor Dilworth's committee met with the park's advisory commission to discuss the proposal in more detail. The city's representatives were enthusiastic. Planner Edmund Bacon had seen sound and

light performances in Europe the previous summer and had been very much impressed. John P. Robin, executive vice-president of the Old Philadelphia Development Corporation had also seen such programs in France, and thought that potential traffic and policing problems could be handled by the city. Some of the members of the advisory commission agreed with the city representatives. Congressman Michael J. Bradley had also seen European performances and could foresee no insuperable difficulties in accommodating such a program at Independence. Others, including Harry A. Batten and Grant Simon thought that sound and light was inappropriate and would diminish the dignity of Independence. Regional Director Ronald F. Lee temporized. The park service, he pointed out, was impressed with the concept, but recognized that execution could pose problems in policing and crowd control. He acquiesced quickly to a suggestion from Judge Lewis that the park service should send someone abroad to study some of the European productions at first hand.[108]

M.O. Anderson and Donald Nutt, an architect in the Eastern Office of Design and Construction, went to Europe. They managed to visit fifteen sound and light presentations in Italy, France, Belgium, and England. Anderson came back convinced that such a program at Independence would be not only feasible but desirable.[109] Thanks to a donation from the Avalon Foundation, by late 1961 the Old Philadelphia Development Corporation had been able to raise most of the money needed for the sound and light presentation.[110] They retained a company called Lumadrama, Inc., of New York City, to produce the program. Lumadrama contracted with Archibald MacLeish, the Pulitzer Prize-winning poet and former Librarian of the Library of Congress, to prepare the script. The equipment would largely be portable, except for some concealed floodlights in specially designed benches on

Independence Square and on the roof of Independence Hall. Anderson estimated that between 700 and 1,000 visitors could be accommodated in the center of Independence Square for each performance. Keeping the crowds off the grass might prove to be a problem, but one that he was convinced could be solved by cooperation between the city police and park service personnel.[111]

The sound and light presentation was launched in the summer of 1962. Eventually it became a permanent part of the park's program, although never enjoying the success of its European prototypes. Its beginnings, however, were not propitious. Attendance was lower than expected, and the program, which was meant to be self-supporting, did not generate enough income to repay the investment. By the next summer the electrical conduits and floodlights on Independence Hall had to be removed so that structural work on the roof and tower could be carried out.[112] Thus, after only one season, the program effectively halted for a period of three years. The city fathers lost patience with what was, at least temporarily, a useless attraction, and agreed to purchase the equipment from Lumadrama and give it to the park service.[113] In 1965, with the structural rehabilitation complete, Lee requested fresh consideration of sound and light at Independence. Kurjack and Sullivan went to view the presentation at Boscobel along the Hudson River; they must have been sufficently impressed to report favorably, for in the summer of 1966 sound and light was revived at Independence.[114] Thereafter the presentation, entitled "The American Bell," was shown regularly in the summer months, despite frequent technical difficulties. Once the park service acquired the rights and the equipment no fee was charged; nevertheless attendance never lived up to the high expectations with which the program had been launched.[115]

Although increasingly the park service arranged events, such as the sound

and light presentation, celebrating and orchestrating the interpretation of Independence, outside groups also played a strong role in selecting the park as the site for a variety of observances and ceremonies. As publicity about development of the park became widespread beginning in the mid-1950s, a variety of organizations included Independence in the itinerary of national conventions headquartered in or near Philadelphia. One of the first, of course, was the General Federation of Womens' Clubs, whose generous gift provided funds for the restoration and refurnishing of the first floor of Independence Hall. Ceremonies marking the reopening -- albeit temporary -- of the Assembly Room coincided with their annual meeting in Philadelphia in May 1955. Other major groups incorporating in their national convention program tours of the park, or ceremonies in Independence Square or at the Liberty Bell included the Albanian - American National Organization in 1955, 1958, and 1962, the Army and Navy Legion of Valor in 1957, the Catholic War Veterans in 1962, and the American Bar Association in 1968. In 1964, following an Annual Jamboree at Valley Forge, the Boy Scouts, some 20,000 strong, descended on Independence.

Other events were more parochial. Philadelphians from all walks of life and all backgrounds had long considered Independence Hall a rallying point. The local chapters of the Daughters of the American Revolution and the Descendants of the Signers of the Declaration of Independence had been accustomed to hold their annual meetings in the historic buildings. After the park service determined that those buildings would be off limits for such meetings, the groups continued to gather at Independence, but in the east wing of Independence Hall. The historic buildings could still be used, however, for special events related to the significance of the park. In June 1957, for example, the American Students Constitution Convention, a program of the

Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission, met in Congress Hall; the same space, by then restored, was the site of the eastern division finals of the American Legion Oratorical Contest in 1969.

Independence Hall was also the traditional climax for Philadelphia parades. In September the parade of the Society of Commodore John Barry culminated with a wreath-laying ceremony at the foot of the commodore's statue in Independence Square. In October the Columbus Day parade terminated with ceremonies at Independence. By far the most important of these annual celebrations was, of course, the Fourth of July. The first of these in which the park service participated was in 1951. It was not only the first celebration after the park service took custody of Independence, but also the 175th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence. Ceremonies were planned on a nationwide scale and with worldwide publicity, with the main focus on Independence. The celebration there went on for four days, highlighted by two events. The more public was a pageant in Independence Square, performed by a group of 100 costumed actors from New York, to the accompaniment of music and narrations by John Carradine and Oliver Thorndike. Somewhat more sober was a re-enactment of the adoption of the Declaration, carried out in the Assembly Room by costumed members of the Philadelphia Bar Association. Although because of the size of the room few spectators could be accommodated, the program, narrated by John Daly, was televised.

Succeeding Fourth of July programs could only be somewhat anticlimactic, although Vice-President Richard M. Nixon delivered the annual address in 1953. By 1955, with some restoration accomplished on the first floor of Independence Hall, Superintendent Anderson began to feel that the Fourth of July celebration at Independence should be of national rather than local importance, with a

speaker of outstanding stature, preferably the President of the United States. The advisory commission warned him that such an event would require as much as two or three years advance planning. In fact, it would be seven years before a presidential speech would be delivered from the rostrum in front of Independence Hall. The speaker was President John F. Kennedy, who addressed a large crowd on July 4, 1962. Although the presidential visit was not repeated for subsequent Fourth of July celebrations, the speakers did tend to be prominent representatives of the national government: Vice-President Lyndon B. Johnson in 1963, Attorney General Nicholas de B. Katzenbach in 1965, Secretary of State Dean Rusk in 1966 and Vice-President Hubert Humphrey in 1968.

By the early 1960s, the City of Philadelphia had extended the Fourth of July to a seven-day celebration of Freedom Week. The activities included crowning a beauty queen dubbed "Miss Liberty Belle," along with musical performances and speakers in Independence Square. Other patriotic occasions were also regularly celebrated, including Flag Day, Memorial Day, Law Day, and Jefferson Day. An annual Franklin Day was instituted on the 250th anniversary of Benjamin Franklin's birth in 1956.

A patriotic occasion directly associated with the events that had taken place at Independence was the anniversary of the Constitution, whch was sporadically observed in the 1950s and 1960s. Like the Fourth of July celebration, this reached a peak, at least in terms of the importance of the speaker, in the early 1960s. In 1962, the 175th anniversary of the drafting of the Constitution, former President Harry S Truman delivered the major address; in 1963 Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy spoke. For Truman it was the third major event at Independence in which he had participated. In 1954 he had come to Philadelphia to present to the park service for display at Independence

Joseph S. Duplessis' portrait of Benjamin Franklin, which had been given to him by the French government. It was among the earliest, and also among the most important, of the additions to the park's portrait collection. In 1958 he had participated, along with Chief Justice Earl Warren and Ambassador Abba Eban at ceremonies marking the tenth anniversary of Israel's independence. The significance of the events that had transpired at Independence was not lost on those nations that had undergone their own struggles for freedom. Greek Independence Day was regularly celebrated at the park. For Israel the associations with the park created so soon after it had achieved nationhood appeared to be particularly strong. Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion had been one of the first foreign heads of state to visit the park, coming intially in the spring of 1951, and returning to give the annual Israel Day address in 1961.

Starting in the late 1950s and with increasing frequency in the turbulent 1960s, the symbolic meaning of Independence, as interpreted by groups of various persuasions, led to its choice as the setting for support or protest of current political movements. One of the earliest of such events was a ceremony held at the Liberty Bell by members of the 26th of July Movement, supporters of Fidel Castro, on Pan-American Day in April 1958. In the relatively calm temper of the times, it did not attract much attention. Nor did the Philadelpha Walk for Peace in May of the same year. By the mid-1960s, however, as the country began to respond to divisive issues, the nature of protests centered on Independence became more controversial. In March 1965 a group of students supporting the civil rights movement staged an overnight sit-in lasting three days at the Liberty Bell. Although public reaction to the event was adverse, the demonstration was peaceful. The park service was assured of full

cooperation from the Philadelphia police and the FBI, but no outside intervention was needed. From the point of view of the protestors, the action was successful; it brought them the attention they sought. Their example probably sparked demonstrations by others, such as the one in support of homosexual rights a few months later.[116]

Meanwhile, however, the possibility of violence became an ever-present threat. In February 1965 New York City police uncovered a plot to blow up the Statue of Liberty, the Washington Monument, and the Liberty Bell. Police apprehended a small group calling themselves the Black Liberation Front as they were transferring explosives from a Bronx parking lot to an automobile.[117] The episode prompted greater monitoring of future demonstrations. Thus, when about 100 students marched from City Hall to Independence Mall in April to protest the war in Viet Nam, about two dozen Philadelphia police accompanied them. Inside Independence Hall members of Young Americans for Freedom, a pro-war group, circled the Liberty Bell to "protect" it.[118] Minor demonstrations continued through the summer, but by fall, as the issue of the Viet Nam War impinged more deeply on the consciousness of the American people, the crowds became larger and the occasions more turbulent. In October 1965 3,000 people gathered in Independence Square in support of the war. Demonstrations continued on a smaller scale through the winter and spring, but on July 4, 1966, there was another rally protesting the war, in the course of which thirty-one people were arrested. Mass demonstrations and rallies continued through the late 1960s and early 1970s on the Mall, which was still state property, and in the Square. Most were relatively calm, and although they kept the park's protection forces on the alert, required little action. Occasionally, however, there were incidents that, if they did not escalate into

violence, could be said to disrupt the peace. There were demonstrators who chained themselves to the tower stair; others placed rice from Viet Nam around the Liberty Bell and spilled animal blood on the front steps of Independence Hall. These gestures were countered by students and disciples of the Reverend Carl McIntire, a right-wing fundmentalist preacher, who requested and received permission to carry out ritual cleansings.[119] Throughout these episodes the park service upheld the Constitutional right of free assembly with an attitude of steadfast calm, which appeared to engender respect from demonstrators of all persuasions. Although some of the situations were potentially explosive, and some resulted in arrests, Independence never suffered from the violence and charges of police brutality that characterized demonstrations in Washington or those in Chicago during the Democratic National Convention in 1968.

Dealing with visitors, whether heads of state, schoolchildren, or potentially unruly demonstrators, was a major responsibility for the historians and interpreters at Independence during the first two decades of the park's existence. It was not, however, the lasting accomplishment of the men and women who worked there. That lay rather in the successful completion of a massive research project and in the establishment of a system of personal interpretation through the use of well-trained specialists. Yet for all the success of the research program at Independence, it failed to achieve the outside recognition that was accorded the architectural restoration. In part this was due to the conditions set by the park service, in part to personalities, and in part to the attitudes of the academic historical community.

Park service management set two goals for the research program, supplying historical information for development of the park as a whole and, more particularly, for the restoration and refurnishing of the buildings and providing the background for an interpretive program. The former task, because it fulfilled an immediate need, always received priority. The latter was carried out insofar as it generated material for specific products, such as leaflets, tour guides, films, and the like. It never progressed beyond that to what John Platt hoped would be "studies of depth and profundity" on the events that took place at Independence. The pressure to produce materials for the restoration work, combined with the dissolution of the park historians' office when research was centralized in Washington in the mid-1960s, precluded such intensive and contemplative efforts. Platt did attempt to arrange the historians' schedules so that each had one day a week to pursue collateral studies of particular interest to the individual, but often emergency demands for answers to questions at particular development projects required abandonment of this "free" time.[120]

In addition to the information generated for the park's purposes, the historians' research resulted in the assembly of a body of material that could illuminate the urban and social history of eighteenth-century Philadelphia. It was a body of organized material that was far larger in scope than had been assembled for any other American city at that time. Yet neither park service management nor the academic historical community appeared to recognize what a treasure trove had been collected. The work at Independence was carried out just before such topics began to engage the interest of academic historians. Some attempts were made by members of the park staff to arouse such an interest. Riley's cooperative research program was an early effort to involve

young scholars in collateral projects based on the park's resources, which failed from lack of continued nurturing. Platt attempted to awaken his peers to the potential rewards of interpreting the resources at Independence in a speech delivered at the annual meeting of the American Historical Association in the fall of 1963. He pointed out that the surviving physical fabric of colonial Philadelphia, and the information collected about it, could illuminate such topics as the social organization of American cities in the Revolutionary era, the development of municipal services, as well as the ideals and necessities of the men who built the nation.[121]

The historians never, however, promoted and publicized their methods and findings in the same way that the architects, under Charles Peterson's impetus, brought their work to public notice. Peterson used the organizations to which he belonged, and their publications, to inform the professional community of architects and architectural historians about virtually every new discovery at Independence and in its environs. He prodded his staff to deliver papers, to publish, and to appear on panels. Although the historians also belonged to local and national organizations and attended their meetings, they were not encouraged to participate in the same way.[122] Thus, the work at Independence remained relatively unknown to the broader scholarly community, although individual historians did turn to the park's staff for the answers to specific questions. It remains, however, as a virtually untaped resource for future scholars of the development of urban America.

VIII - THE SECOND WARS OF INDEPENDENCE

In April 1968, Arthur Kaufmann, assuming the chairmanship of the park's advisory commission, expressed his sense of urgency about completing the grand scheme of Independence National Historical Park in time for the celebration of the Bicentennial. True a great deal already had been accomplished. Most of the buildings scheduled for demolition between Walnut and Chestnut from Fifth to Third Streets were down, their place taken by open vistas of greenery. Congress Hall and the first floor of Independence Hall had been restored, as had the Merchants' Exchange and the houses along Walnut Street. Yet if the park was to be ready for the Bicentennial, now less than eight years away, development would have to proceed at a greatly accelerated pace. To accomplish what rapidly became viewed as a crash program would take more money, greater effort, and, as events unfolded, a new management team.

The leadership at Independence had been remarkably stable. Judge Edwin O. Lewis had been promoting and guiding the development of the park for over twenty years, first as president of the Independence Hall Association, then as chairman of the Philadelphia National Shrines Commission, and finally as chairman of the park's advisory commission. Superintendent Melford O. Anderson had been at Independence since 1950; Assistant Superintendent Dennis Kurjack only a year less. Now, however, change in management would be marked and relatively swift. The first sign of this transition was Judge Lewis's announcement that he intended to step down as chairman of the advisory commission at the end of 1967. Although he would continue as a member of the commission, he could no longer devote the time and energy that its leadership required. He also appointed as vice-chairman his chosen successor for the top post, Arthur C. Kaufmann.[1]

Kaufmann was not only considerably younger than Lewis, but also a man of very different temperament. Lewis had been an effective, indeed forceful, leader, with a remarkable record of achieving his ends through southern courtliness and persuasion. Kaufmann was more direct, stating his views firmly and expecting quick implementation of the mandates of the commission.[2] Lewis was a lawyer, politician and judge, Kaufmann a business executive, accustomed to making decisions and having his subordinates carry them out.[3] His accession to chairmanship of the advisory commission was marked by renewed activism, an aggressive stance demanding completion of the park in time for the Bicentennial. Kaufmann presided for the first time in April 1968, and immediately expressed concern about whether the park would be ready for 1976. He set forth three objectives: swift completion of the park; provision of parking facilities to the extent possible within the limits of the existing park boundaries; and construction of a Visitor Center that would include a film similar to that shown at Williamsburg. To determine how these goals could best be implemented he recommended a "critical path study." In the meantime, he intended to seek a meeting with National Park Service Director George Hartzog to discuss the planning and development program at Independence. He also announced that the advisory commission would meet more often, suggesting a bi-monthly basis.[4]

It was not only changes in local leadership that affected decisions at Independence in the 1960s. George Hartzog's reorganization and centralization of such professional activites as research, planning and design would also influence the course of events. Planning, for example, would be carried out by special teams from the Washington Service Center, rather than by planners and landscape architects working from the park or the regional office. Design and

construction activities would be centralized at a new Denver Service Center. Hartzog also created a Division of Planning and Interpretive Services at Harper's Ferry, West Virginia, to plan programs for the parks and implement them through the design and production of exhibits, films and other audio-visual devices. Further organizational change followed passage of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, which gave the National Park Service responsibility for establishing, in cooperation with the states, a broad-based National Register to identify and give a measure of protection to sites and districts of national, state and local significance. This was a major expansion of the park service's role in preservation. To coordinate these new "external" affairs with activities within the National Park System, Hartzog established the Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation, generally referred to as OAHP. It would have full responsibility for all historical, archaeological and preservation efforts in the parks, as well as implementing the preservation role of the park service outside of the National Park System.

Many of those in leadership positions in these new entities were well acquainted with Independence. Dr. Ernest Allen Connally, initially appointed as Chief of the Office of Archeology and Historical Preservation and later Associate Director for Professional Services, had first worked for the park service as supervisor of a HABS team at Independence. Connally appointed as the first Keeper of the National Register Dr. William J. Murtagh, who, after experience on a HABS team, had worked on studies for the restoration of the Merchants' Exchange. These men, both trained as architects and as architectural historians, would be instrumental in shifting the emphasis of preservation policy within the National Park Service away from a concern with associative and commemorative values toward aesthetic and environmental considerations. Along

with Henry Judd, who was tranferred from Philadelphia to Washington as Chief, Division of Historic Architecture in OAHP they would support a high standard of authenticity for restoration. The new Division of Planning and Interpretive Services was also headed by an Independence alumnus, William C. Everhart, who had been John Platt's predecessor as supervising historian at the park.

Despite these management changes, a degree of continuity was maintained at Independence. John Platt, although briefly transferred to Washington and continued on the OAHP personnel roster, returned to Philadelphia on special assignment. Lee Nelson and Penelope Hartshorne Batcheler were placed on Judd's staff, but remained on assignment at Independence. Others who would have a voice in developments at Independence, such as Martin Yoelson and Charles Dorman, remained on the park's staff.

In 1968 as the advisory commission under Kaufmann's leadership was exhibiting intensified activity, a team from the park service's Washington Service Center was studying a revised master plan for Independence to guide the next phase of development. The team, captained by David Turello, also included David Wallace, who had worked previously at Independence. They examined and asked for comment on a number of unresolved questions, of which the most important concerned the treatment of Franklin Court and of the area east of Third Street, chosen as the general location for a Visitor Center, and the relocation of the Liberty Bell from the interior of Independence Hall to a separate structure. Other remaining issues included uses for the First Bank of the United States and a reconstructed City Tavern. There was also the question of what should be done about the Irwin Building, the one large commercial structure that remained standing within the park boundaries. Some new ideas were on the table, including construction of a major educational and research

center in a location north of the Merchants' Exchange, and of a branch office for the National Park Service's Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation.[5]

It was the location for the Visitor Center that appears to have most engaged Anderson's attention. There had long been broad consensus that it should be at the eastern end of the park, but never agreement on a precise site. Anderson turned for the answer to an outside consulting group, Quorum Five.[6] Their report was not yet ready when a major meeting to review the master plan took place in the office of Director George Hartzog on October 3, 1968. It was known, however, that the consultants would recommend locating the Visitor Center at the southwest corner of Chestnut and Second Streets, where the thirty-year-old Custom House stood. The Visitor Center might occupy the existing building or a new one erected on its site. Hartzog agreed to accept Quorum Five's recomendation if it was seconded by a park service review committee. There were many other aspects of the proposed plan, however, of which Hartzog disapproved. He did not wish to see Franklin's house reconstructed, nor did he wish a secondary interpretive center built at Franklin Court. He vetoed a separate building for an educational center, although he supported a good schools program. He also disapproved of demolishing the Irwin Building and of restoring Independence Square to its eighteenth-century appearance.[7]

There were several points on which Kaufmann and the advisory commission disagreed with Hartzog. They supported reconstruction of the Franklin House and Independence Square. They also thought that the Visitor Center should be built on the lot at the southeast corner of Chestnut and Third Streets.[8] Once the site of the Jayne and Penn Mutual Buildings, the lot was then being used for

parking. These were fundamental differences. Because conflicting opinions continued to be voiced, there would not be a final master plan for Independence for another three years, long after the debate over most of the questions had been resolved on an individual basis.

Kaufmann and the advisory commission were undoubtedly impatient with the master plan process, with its thorough airing of all points of view before consensus was reached. What they wanted was expeditious action. Kaufmann became increasingly displeased with the lack of progress as 1968 wore on. His dissatisfaction focused on the performance of M.O. Anderson, and he did not hesitate to make his feelings known in Washington.[9] It was certainly not the first time that pressure from Philadelphia had been exerted to speed development at Independence. Judge Lewis and Mayor Dilworth had protested the slow pace in the late 1950s. Anderson, however, had not been the special target of their wrath. Indeed, he seems to have enjoyed a warm and confidential relationship with Lewis. Ten years later the situation had changed. Lewis, having turned the reins over to Kaufmann, was accepting the younger man's judgment that Anderson could not supervise completion of the park in an expeditious manner.[10] Furthermore, Anderson had lost his primary protector in the park service's corridors of power, Conrad L. Wirth, who had resigned as director in 1964. Gradually George Hartzog was replacing with his own associates many of the men who had been appointed to top management posts by his predecessor. By the end of the year Anderson was gone, transferred to Washington, where he briefly held a desk job before retiring.

In his eighteen years at Independence, Anderson had presided over the transformation of a densely-built, deteriorating urban area into planted parkland dotted with restored buildings. The approach of wide-spread demolition

had evoked some criticism in the planning stage, and planners and preservationists would continue to raise questions about the validity of removal of so much of the fabric of an urban area. Nevertheless, the open mall-like character of the park, with the historic buildings set off as carefully landscaped relics was the conception set forth in the shrines commission's report, accepted by the park service, and reinforced in the early versions of the master plan. Anderson had supported the basic premises of these plans fully and carried them out to the best of his ability. Phlegmatic, patient, and persistent, he had hewn to the program through changing adminstrations in the city and the park service's regional office. Neither a historian nor a restorationist, he had overseen the creation of a competent staff, and fought for them to have the time to accomplish the research they believed to be vital to the success of the project. By 1968, however, although aware that the development was lagging, his chief supporters were gone and he appeared to have expended the energy that had enabled him to carry the program so far from its beginnings.[11]

His replacement, Chester Brooks, knew clearly what his role was to be. George Hartzog gave him only one mandate, to get the program at Independence moving.[12] On his arrival in January 1969 Brooks immediately began to carry out those directions in his own manner. There could hardly have been a greater contrast with his predecessor. Part of the difference was symbolic, a fresh expression of the park service's presence. Anderson, who had not worked for the park service before coming to Independence, rarely wore a uniform, appearing on most occasions in well-tailored business suits. Brooks, who had come up through the ranks, wore full uniform for many public appearances. Part was a matter of personality and style. Where Anderson was reserved, Brooks was outgoing.

Anderson spoke deliberately, in measured cadence. Brooks's speech tumbled out, hardly able to keep up with the pace of his thoughts.

Brooks believed that he could succeed only with the full support of his staff and the community. His way of achieving that was through communication, by informing everyone of what the total program was and reminding them of the importance of their individual contributions its success. He began to participate in the life of the community, attending various events, instituting what he jokingly referred to as "management by cocktail parties."[13] He also held regular staff meetings with his department heads, and urged them to discuss with their staffs what they had learned about plans and activities.[14]

So eager was Brooks to share his thinking with others that he often repeated instructions and information to his staff. James R. Sullivan, who was chief of a division called Interpretation and Resource Management when Brooks became superintendent, appreciated the contrast with Anderson's reticence.

> Chet went 180 degrees the other way, which was marvelous because he would tell you something on Monday, it may be repeated on Wednesday and you would hear it for the third time on Friday....When I became the assistant superintendent under Chet I had no qualms about anybody calling, including the director, because I knew exactly where we were at the time, what Chet wanted done, why he wanted it done, and how we were going to do it. 15

There were others, however, who found Brooks's management style difficult to accept. One complained to Sullivan about the constant repetition, to which Sullivan replied, "Would you rather be over-informed or under-informed?"[16] One key staff member who found it hard to adjust to the new regime was Dennis Kurjack. Anderson had expected Kurjack to wait for information and for specific assignments before acting; Brooks, on the other hand, expected his assistant superintendent to grasp the

iniative. Brooks also felt that Kurjack resisted his attempt to establish strict completion schedules at Independence. Within less than a year after Brooks's arrival, Kurjack had resigned. Brooks then named Sullivan to the post of assistant superintendent.[17]

Despite Brooks's attempt to keep everyone informed and moving together toward a common goal, it was often difficult to achieve consensus. Nowhere was this more evident than in the controversy over the treatment of the Franklin House site, a thorny issue that had remained unresolved since the early 1950s. Benjamin Franklin's house had stood on a lot of land that ran from Market Street back toward Chestnut Street between Third and Fourth Streets. Like the Carpenters' Company on their property south of Chestnut, Franklin, when he erected a building for his own occupancy in 1764-1765, built in an inner courtyard, reserving the more valuable Market Street frontage for rental properties. After his return from Europe in 1785 he built tenant houses on Market Street on either side of an arched passageway leading back to his house. Franklin's descendants demolished his house in 1812; the passageway from Market Street became the public Orianna Street, running through to Chestnut Street. By the time the park service acquired the property, there were buildings on all of the site but the street itself.

Edward M. Riley prepared the first report on Franklin Court early in 1950. He had found that a good deal of information was available in the public record and in Franklin's correspondence at the American Philosophical Society, but believed that there was insufficient evidence to justify reconstruction of the house. He did recommend, however, that archaeological investigation be undertaken to determine whether remains of

the foundations of the house could be discovered. If so, he recommended outlining them as one of the central features of a memorial park. For security, he thought Franklin Court should be surrounded by a wall at least ten feet high. Believing that the buildings on Market Street, which then had Victorian fronts, had replaced Franklin's tenant houses, he recommended their demolition and replacement with new structures. The passageway, although he believed it also to be of mid-nineteenth century date, he thought should remain. The entire project should memorialize the contributions of Franklin as statesman, diplomat, scientist, and sage.[18]

After this initial effort, interest in Franklin Court subsided for a time. It revived in 1953, under the dual impetus of the master planning process and the American Philosophical Society's intention to celebrate the 250th anniversary of Franklin's birth in 1956.[19] With the assistance of that institution the first excavations in Franklin Court were carried out from May to September 1953. The American Philosophical Society provided the funds for the labor, while the park service contributed the tools and a trained archaeologist to supervise.[20]

The archaeologist was Paul J.F. Schumacher, who had come to Philadelphia for a two to three week stay in February 1953 and remained for over three years to institute the archaeological program at Independence.[21] Schumacher had been assigned to the historians' office at Independence to monitor the excavation of the steam line trench between the Custom House on Second Street and Independence Hall. One of Charles Peterson's first priorities as resident architect was to remove the ancient coal-fired boilers from the cellars of Independence Hall and supply heat

from an outside source in order to minimize the danger of fire. This would require a trench running virtually the entire length of the park and would offer an opportunity to locate the foundations of eighteenth-century buildings. Schumacher did monitor the steam line trench in March 1953, but by May he had transferred his attention to Franklin Court.

The premises for the project at Franklin Court were very different from those that governed Schumacher's work on the steam line trench and much of the other archaeological work at Independence. In most cases the archaeologist's role was confined to monitoring and noting observations at excavations performed for development projects. Franklin Court on the other hand was excavated at this time solely for the purpose of confirming and expanding, through archaeology, information about the location and configuration of Franklin's house that had been established through documentary research. Because buildings still occupied much of Franklin Court, Schumacher could operate only in a very limited space, under Orianna Street and the sidewalks. Nevertheless, he did find fragments of the foundation walls, the basement floor, and a privy.[22] In 1955, after the acquisition and demolition of some of the buildings within the court, Schumacher was able to extend his excavations.[23]

Schumacher's work was valuable in proving that there were remains of Franklin's House underground. It was, however, carried out in less than ideal conditions. One wall fragment Schumacher excavated disintegrated because it was not sufficiently protected from heavy rains; he also failed to record the depth provenience of some of the artifacts he found.[24] Schumacher was then a young practitioner, with almost no experience in excavation, hampered by working on an urban American site for which there

was no recognized methodology. In fact, Schumacher's work was a pioneering effort in urban archaeology.[25] Furthermore, the intention in the 1950s was not to carry out a planned archaeological program at Franklin Court, but only to find the foundations of the Franklin House so that their outline could be a feature of the memorial garden.[26]

While Schumacher was undertaking his first excavation at Franklin Court, the site's eventual appearance was under discussion as part of the master planning process. At a meeting on February 5-6 1953, the participants had accepted Riley's recommendation that the court be developed as a memorial garden. A schematic drawing showing a simple, but formal scheme was approved in principle.[27] Shortly after the master plan meeting, M.O. Anderson retained Grant Simon, the architectural consultant to the Independence advisory commission, to prepare alternative designs for the proposed garden. Meanwhile, several questions of principle and policy arose about the design, interpretation and use of the site. These were on the table at a master plan conference on April 17. Some questions were readily disposed of. The participants, including representatives of the Washington and Philadelphia offices of the National Park Service, as well as members of the Independence staff and Simon, agreed that the court should include restrooms and a small museum facility to aid in interpretation. Design issues engendered considerable discussion. The final decisions called for the marking of the foundations of Franklin's house as the central feature, surrounded by plantings reflecting, as far as possible, the landscaping arrangement of the property in Franklin's day. The Market Street frontage, with its row of buildings, then thought to date to the mid-nineteenth century, would be demolished;

two three-and-a-half story buildings spanning an arched passageway would be rebuilt on the site of Franklin's tenant houses.[28]

Charles Peterson hoped for maintenance of the site's urban character. After reviewing Simon's next sketches for the project, he suggested that the entire frontage along Market Street be built up, as it had been for two centuries.[29] Although Peterson espoused this view at a master plan conference in June it did not prevail. Instead after Simon reported that the cost of reconstructing the Market Street buildings would exceed $400,000, they were eliminated entirely. Their place would be taken by a high wall with an arched gate.[30] The plan that Conrad Wirth finally approved in the spring of 1954 might well have been characterized as Fort Franklin. A ten-foot paneled brick wall girdled the property, with a sort of sally-port on Market Street. Within, low walls marked the assumed location of the foundations of the tenant houses and Franklin's House. A memorial tablet relieved the east wall. Along the west wall were small pavilions, to house an exhibit, a guard station and storage. A formal garden occupied the space within the house foundations, with large trees and less formal plantings in the remaining area.[31]

During the remainder of the 1950s, Franklin Court was largely ignored as the National Park Service concentrated its efforts on planning and development for the areas of the park south of Chestnut Street. Even the master planning effort of 1957-1959 dealt with Franklin Court only in a minimal way. It was not until the accelerated research program of 1959-1960 got underway that attention turned again to the approximately 4,000 square feet of property that had been the center of Franklin's world, starting with renewed interest in its archaeological potential.

Paul Schumacher left Philadelphia in October 1956; for over a year there was a hiatus in archaeological work at Independence. The arrival of B. Bruce Powell in January 1958 marked the beginning of a new campaign of exploration of the park's underground resources. Powell was joined in March 1959 by Jackson W. Moore, Jr.[32] Although these men were assigned to the regional office rather than to the park, the bulk of their work was at Independence, then the most important project in the region. Better trained and more experienced than Schumacher, the two worked under the close supervision of John L. Cotter, who had been named chief of the regional archaeological office in 1957. Cotter had twenty-five years of field experience when he came to Philadelphia. Trained as a prehistorian in the southwest, he had also worked at historic sites, notably on a major investigation of Jamestown, Virginia, just before coming to Philadelphia.[33] Cotter also had strong ties to the academic community, serving on the faculty of the University of Pennylvania as well as on the park service staff. With the advent of this team, archaeological work at Independence achieved higher standards. Planning improved; records were better kept; and the staff began experimenting with new, more sophisticated techniques, such as electrolytic and ultrasonic cleaning of artifacts.[34] Powell's first work at Independence was in Carpenters' Court in 1958. Moore excavated the Contributionship Stable and the Portico site at Congress Hall in 1959.[35] The archaeologists also monitored excavations for extensions of the steam line trench along Walnut and Fifth Streets.[36]

Indeed much of the archaeologists' work continued to take the form of ad hoc monitoring, often with little advance warning, of excavations

undertaken as part of the development program. Nevertheless, some investigations were the result of advance planning. Moore's search for the foundations of the portico, for example, was undertaken at the request of the historians on the basis of thorough research. It was at Franklin Court, however, that a major archaeological campaign would be carried out. The largest undertaken in any American city up to that time, it would proceed in spurts for over a decade. Powell began planning such a campaign late in 1959, first reviewing what had already been accomplished and then projecting the level of effort and funding requirements for completing the program over a period of four years.[37]

Powell carried out his first excavation at Franklin Court between July and September 1960. He again located the basement paving, privy pit, and most of the wall fragments found by Schumacher, plus additional lengths of the north foundation wall, and other walls and wall traces.[38] Park administration was so pleased with the results of the excavation, combined with additional research carried out by Marty Yoelson, that Anderson told the advisory commission that there was sufficient justification for reconstruction of Franklin's house.[39] Powell returned to the site the next season, assisted by Moore, this time keeping the excavation open from April to September, and extending the explorations to the cellars of the houses on Market Street.[40] By this time the excavation had produced results that were sufficiently comprehensible to the general public for visits to the site to be included in conducted tours.[41] By the time the second phase of Powell's campaign was completed he was able to conclude that the cellar of Franklin's house had had at least four, and probably five, rooms, and that one entry was from a brick-paved areaway along the

south side. There had also been a necessary with some form of a flushing arrangement, and an ice pit. Powell also reported finding numerous examples of building materials, including bricks, floor tiles, stone, marble, slate, mortar - some with pointing, plaster with paint, wood, Delft fireplace tiles, window glass, and nails. The campaign had also uncovered other features of the court. The archaeologists had found the foundations of walls that bounded the site along the property lines, as well as foundations they believed could relate to the print shop Franklin had erected in 1786-1787. So pleased was Powell with the findings that he believed that no further excavation would be necessary.[42]

In the meantime, as part of the expanded work on historic structures reports, Marty Yoelson headed a team that was reviewing the research that had already been accomplished on the Franklin site and searching for fresh documentation. In October 1961, while perusing materials in the Franklin papers at the American Philosophical Society, Yoelson came across a 1765 ground plan, drawn by Franklin's brother-in-law John Read, showing the north wall and gate.[43] Interestingly enough, a sketch plan had been found by Edward Riley a decade before on the back of a receipt dated May 17, 1764. Riley suggested that the sketch might be a contemporary plan for the house, but was unable to identify it with any degree of specificity.[44] If there were two sketches, might there be more? Quickly Yoelson recruited a larger team from the historians' office to look at the Franklin papers again. Paul Sifton, Miriam Quinn, Richard Tyler, and William Campbell began examining every page of the approximately 250 boxes of material. Their painstaking efforts were rewarded. Quinn found, on the back of a letter, a plan in Franklin's hand of the first floor,

revealing structural features, and the direction in which the house faced; Campbell found a possible framing plan.[45]

With these documents in hand, and with the knowledge garnered from the most recent excavations, Yoelson could now assess the importance of Riley's previous discovery, which was the plan for the second floor. Armed with this new evidence, the historians believed that they could establish the location of the front and rear doors of the house, as well as of windows and fireplaces. The voluminous correspondence between Franklin and his common-law wife Deborah had long been available, and provided information about room usage and furnishings. These accounts, fleshed out by insurance surveys, were almost sufficient to convince the historians that an authentic reconstruction of the house was possible.

One important piece of evidence remained elusive. In the course of their research the historians had become aware of a rumor that an exterior view of the house existed, a drawing signed with the initials "J.T.," probably for the engraver John Thackara. This, if it could be found, would be a key document. Although a great deal about the building could be extrapolated from the documentation and the archaeological evidence, many details of its exterior appearance would remain unknown without such a view. Accordingly the park began to query historical agencies and antiquarians about this key piece of visual documentation. Their inquiries bore fruit. In November 1961 Dennis Kurjack received a letter from Carl Williams, an antiquarian and dealer headquartered in New York City. Williams recounted the purchase, in 1949, of the bulk of Thackara watercolors and sketches from a descendant of the artist then living in Lancaster, Pennsylvania. Among the collection was an album containing

about seventy-five drawings, one of which was entitled "Franklin's house off High-Street." According to Williams, the view, taken from the southeast, showed the house in considerable detail. Williams had broken up the album, selling the individual drawings to various purchasers. The Franklin view had gone to a dealer in Philadelphia, who had since died. Williams thought he had retained a photograph of the original, but would not be able to retrieve it from among his papers in storage until he could pay the warehouse's bill. In the interim, he thought that his wife, who was an artist, could reproduce the drawing from a description he had prepared while the original was in his possession. "If circumstances were different with me," he wrote, "I would be glad to help gratis." Since they were not, he expected to be reimbursed if he could produce the photograph or some other reasonably accurate version of the drawing.[46]

The park service made no immediate response to Williams. By the time this letter was received, Wirth had stricken funding for the reconstruction of the Franklin House from the budget for the following fiscal year. Wirth was not yet persuaded that anything more than landscaping was an appropriate treatment for the Franklin site. Regional Director Ronald F. Lee reassured Anderson, however, that the matter would be reevaluated after further historical, architectural, and archaeological studies.[47] The studies had by this time been extended to cover not only the Franklin House and the ground immediately surrounding it, but also the properties on Market Street. By the early 1960s the researchers at Independence were convinced that significant portions of the Franklin tenant houses, and the buildings adjoining them to either side, survived. Contrary to what the staff had assumed in the 1950s, these buildings had not been demolished to

make way for new construction in the mid-nineteenth century. Rather they had been raised two stories and had suffered extensive alteration. Nevertheless, a considerable amount of original fabric survived.

The first to perceive that this might be the case was Charles Grossman, the resident architect at Independence in the late 1950s and early 1960s. Checking the buildings prior to issuance of a demolition contract in 1959, he was struck by the appearance of handsplit lath and hand-wrought nails in the plaster ceiling of the arched passageway leading to Franklin Court from Market Street. Examining them and the bricks and mortar behind them, he became convinced that the arch was of eighteenth-century construction. Spurred by this discovery, he and Penelope Hartshorne began to probe the buildings' walls. They found that the foundations and party walls were of eighteenth-century construction and that they bore clues to the original arrangement of the buildings.[48]

In March 1961, when the first Historic Structures Reports were completed on the Market Street houses, John Platt composed an eloquent rationale for preserving and restoring Franklin's buildings.

> The remains themselves are intimately related to Franklin and his times. The mode of construction still evident in the scarred walls bears his imprimatur. They stand in mute testimony to his ingenuity. They are tangible remains, conferring on him who knows of them a sense of Franklin's presence and a link with the scene which surrounded him. Through the arched passageway Washington and other members of the Constitutional Convention passed on their way to pay respects and confer with the venerable philosopher. 49

Platt's eloquence and the interest engendered by the results of the ongoing historical, architectural, and archaeological investigations of Franklin and his property, gradually produced a change in attitude on the

part of National Park Service management. Certainly acquisition of Franklin Court had been a component of the legislation establishing Independence, but its future development had always been a low priority, and the memorial garden approved in the 1954 master plan, and confirmed by Wirth in 1961, was a modest one. By early 1962, however, although no definitive plan had been accepted, a more ambitious scheme was under discussion. Regional Director Ronald F. Lee reassured Edmund Bacon, the executive director of the City Planning Commission, who favored retention of the Market Street buildings.

> We are still studying this area but at present it certainly appears that we, like you, would prefer not to have an open park space there. We definitely expect to retain the arch and the two immediately adjoining buildings and probably will retain the third and fourth as well, which heretofore we expected to demolish. Research and master plan studies on the whole Franklin Court unit are now in progress. 50

Lee's letter to Bacon proved somewhat sanguine. It was only after several years of further intensive study, and considerable controversy within the park service that final decisions were reached about the treatment of Franklin Court. After the flurry of investigation in the early 1960s, there was relatively little research at Franklin Court, although the historians, curators, and architects continued work, interspersed with their concentration on restoration of the buildings on Independence Square. Yoelson prepared a base map, showing the Franklin property from 1785 to 1800; Campbell made conjectural renderings of the exteriors of the Market Street buildings and the Franklin House, and of several of the interiors of the latter.[51]

It was not until the master planning process of the late 1960s that definite proposals for the treatment of Franklin Court were again put on the

table. The master planning team's draft report, issued in 1968, proposed a tri-theme concept for Independence.[52] The first two themes - "Independence and the New Nation" and "Historic Philadelphia, Capital City" - had always been central to the concept of the park. The third, however, "Franklin, Man of Ideas," represented a reassessment of values at Independence over a period of some twenty years. This was, in large part, due to the accumulation of knowledge through the park service's research. That research, however, coincided with a broader historical interest in Franklin and his affairs, engendered by the study and publication of Franklin's papers then being carried out at the American Philosophical Society and Yale University. Franklin had always remained a towering figure to Philadelphians, and certainly historians had recognized the importance of his contributions to the founding of the nation. Nevertheless the renewed attention of scholars in the 1950s and 1960s tended to enhance his significance and called for a reappraisal of the value of the property most closely associated with his life.

It was in that context that the master planning draft report not only elevated the Franklin story to a major theme at Independence, but also called for reconstruction of Franklin's House and rehabilitation of the Market Street buildings. This approach had been advocated by the historical sections of the various historic structures reports prepared by the park staff and supported by Superintendent Anderson.[53] It was not, however, a universally accepted view within the park service. Alan E. Kent, acting chief of the Division of Planning and Interpretive Services, located at Harper's Ferry, West Virginia supported an archaeological interpretation of Franklin Court, using a miniature sound and light presentation with the

excavated artifacts as props. "If we goof with this approach, we can always reconstruct," he noted. "If we reconstruct the opportunity to use the interpretive archeological approach is lost forever."[54]

Although this particular interpretive plan did not receive serious consideration, it was the anti-reconstruction forces that won out. At a plan review meeting in October 1968 Director George Hartzog refused to approve the plan to reconstruct the Franklin House and to build a new interpretive center at Franklin Court. Franklin, he believed, could be interpreted in the Market Street buildings, which were to be restored on the exterior only.[55] It was a decision that did not sit well with many of those who had dealt with the site. Shortly before Hartzog's decision was formalized, one of the advocates of reconstruction, Chief Regional Archeologist John Cotter, had taken what he later termed an "outrageous" step. He wrote a personal letter to Hartzog protesting the decision without going through official channels.[56] Although Hartzog had proclaimed that his "door is open," going to the director without consulting his supervisors in the Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation, the regional director, or the park superintendent was virtually unheard of. Cotter, however, had the advantage of a personal acquaintance with Hartzog dating back to the late 1940s, when both had worked at the Natchez Trace Parkway.[57] He was possessed of an impeccable professional reputation, both within and outside of the National Park Service.[58] Therefore he could afford to take such an action and could expect to have his comments treated with respect.

Cotter based his support for reconstruction on several points. The Franklin House, he believed, represented its builder and occupier in a way that was uniquely intimate to his personality and history. There were,

moreover, no other tangible memorials to Franklin in the entire country, except for statues. Cotter considered the evidence ample for a reconstruction and refurnishing of the house so authentic that Franklin "could walk in and feel at home," pointing out that many of its features and contents represented Franklin's inventive genius. He also expressed the opinion that it was quite possible that funding and maintenance responsibilities would be assumed by private interests.[59]

Cotter's letter must have reached Hartzog too late to influence the decision at the early October plan review meeting. It did, however, cause the director to reconsider the Franklin House question. At his request Ernest A. Connally, chief of the Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation, reviewed and evaluated the material in park service files and concluded that there was insufficient evidence to justify reconstruction. But Hartzog had also turned to Ronald F. Lee for an opinion. Lee had retired as regional director in 1965, but had remained, as what the park service called a "rehired annuitant," with the title of special assistant to the director, to advise Hartzog on just such thorny matters as Franklin Court represented. Thoroughly familiar with the situation in Philadelphia, he believed that evaluation of existing files was not sufficient. Every report and opinion proffered by those who had done the research had indicated that that it was not yet complete. He pointed out that the Administrative Policies for Historical Areas in the National Park System provided that "every reasonable research effort shall be made to exhaust the archeological, architectural and historical evidence" before decisions were made. This he felt had not yet been done for the Franklin House, which he thought to be of the first order of significance. Accordingly, Lee suggested

two actions: appointment of a special advisory committee, a device that had served the park service well in the past, and completion of the research.[60]

Hartzog accepted Lee's recommendation, appointing a committee chaired by Lee and consisting of Herbert A. Kahler and Joseph Brew. The committee met for the first time in Philadelphia on March 17, 1969. They were joined by Connally, Cotter, Henry Judd and Platt from OAHP, Murray Nelligan from the regional office, and Brooks, Kurjack, Sullivan and Yoelson from the park. After an orientation talk by Platt, the group visited Franklin Court. The afternoon was devoted to a discussion of park service policy on preservation, restoration and reconstruction. Adopting Connally's suggestion that Franklin Court be considered as a complex or small historic district, it was agreed that the Franklin House would complete the historical scene and that reconstruction on the original site was feasible. The question of whether there was sufficient evidence for reconstruction remained open to discussion. To investigate the matter, the committee recommended formation of a research team consisting of Cotter, Platt and Judd, or a member of his staff. This team would meet with Lee for a progress briefing every two weeks.[61]

Connally duly assigned the requested personnel with Penelope Hartshorne Batcheler as Judd's representative. This task force was joined on a fairly regular basis by Charles Dorman, museum curator, and Marty Yoelson. Their first task was to review all previously assembled materials. In addition Dorman began compilation of a list of known Franklin furnishings and objects.[62] Beyond the review of existing research notes, Platt's highest priority was a renewed attempt to find the lost Thackara drawing. With considerable difficulty Platt tracked down Carl Williams, through whose hands

the drawing had passed, in New York City. Remembering that Williams had thought he might be able to produce a photograph or that his wife might be able to reconstruct the drawing from memory, but was unwilling to part with information without remuneration, Platt had raised $1,000 in private funds. With this in hand, he made an appointment to meet Williams in New York. The two men talked and Platt believed that his mission would be successful. At the last minute, however, William's wife appeared and insisted that her husband had never seen nor had in his possession such a drawing.[63] Platt went back to Philadelphia still lacking the vital piece of evidence that might have convinced park service management that reconstruction was justified.

In July 1969 members of the research team presented their reports and views in writing. Platt and Cotter still supported reconstruction. Batcheler, who was opposed to reconstruction not only submitted a written report, but also a series of drawings, annotated to show what was not known as well as what was known about the house. In her opinion the evidence, although of a tantalizing quantity and fascinating in its revelations of Franklin's personality and tastes, was too limited to permit anything but a conjectural reconstruction. To illustrate the practical difficulty of cloaking the written evidence in tangible form, she described the multiple conjectural choices an architect would have to make in designing just one feature of the building's interior as described in an insurance survey.

> Let us consider "A Rich Chimney peice" in the "old Dining Room," even when it is in fact further modified by presumably being flanked by "fluted Collums & half pilasters with intabliture." When the architect has conjecturally decided how high the ceilings might have been, and fixed a possible dimension for the width of the room, he must then choose a size for the fireplace openings [sic], and then a possible

> width for the chimney masonry mass. Having done this, he would perhaps turn to architectural books which may have been owned by the 18th century architect Robert Smith, who may have dictated the design of such important elements in the house. And from these books he could choose a plate which shows possibly three chimney pieces. The question then to be asked would be -- which of the three might the 18th century Robert Smith have chosen for Benjamin Franklin's dining room? Having made his choice, he would then start sketching to see how this choice would fit with the chosen dimensions, and how it would compose with fluted engaged flat (or possibly round?) columns, with half pilasters flanking them, and all under a full entablature of an architectural order of his choice.
>
> And when he has made all these basic decisions, there are a myriad of other decisions of construction methods, moulding profiles and the carving which probably made the insurance surveyor add the adjective rich. 64

Cotter, while acknowledging that it was impossible to recreate the literal Franklin House, argued that such accuracy was beside the point. What the house was expected to provide was the most appropriate setting for displaying authentic Franklin possessions, his furniture, books, scientific apparatus and inventions.[65] To the reviewers at the Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation in Washington, however, Batcheler's arguments were more convincing. Robert M. Utley, then chief historian, believed that even with further investigation there was little likelihood that information sufficient to justify reconstruction could be found.[66] Although a meeting of the special committee chaired by Lee was scheduled for October 9 in Philadelphia, it was clear that Connally and his chief advisors had already pre-judged the issue. Connally reported to Lee that although the data permitted "a good literary vision of the house" it was "not enough to support architectural drawings and specifications." Connally went on to describe the practical difficulties that would face the architects, especially in view of the fact that the house was an atypical specimen of its

period, incorporating unique features of Franklin's invention.

> In summary the unknowns are so overwhelming that an attempted reconstruction would require conjecture, and even pure guesses, to such a degree that the architectural staff who will be responsible for the work are unable to give assurances that the Franklin House would in fact be reproduced. 67

These comments and the discussion that followed at the meeting on October 9, 1969, were set in the context of new administrative policies for historic areas that had been promulgated soon after Connally assumed responsibility for the National Park Service's preservation programs. The park service had viewed reconstruction as an activity to be approached with extreme caution since the 1930s. In so doing it was following a dictum that, if he did not originate it, was frequently cited by National Parks Advisory Board member Fiske Kimball: Better to preserve than restore, better to restore than to reconstruct. Old park service hands such as Ronald Lee could still remember the embarrassment attached to one of the park service's early forays into historical areas. Urged on by local interests, the park service had become involved in the erection of a house at Wakefield, the birthplace of George Washington, that proved to be on the wrong site and the design of which had no basis in documentary evidence.[68] The episode left the park service extremely chary of reconstructions. To avoid furture Wakefields, the park service, in 1937, adopted its first set of written policies for restoration and reconstruction. In the final analyis this policy left the decision to the tact and judgment of those making it.[69] The policy drawn some thirty years later was firmer, deeming reproduction valid only when three conditions were met: it was essential for public understanding of the site's significance; sufficient data existed for accuracy; and the

structure could be erected on its original site.[70]

The special committee to consider Franklin Court met in Philadelphia on October 9, 1969. The three members of the committee were in attendance, as were the researchers who had spent the past year reviewing the Franklin materials. Others around the table were Superintendent Brooks, Assistant Regional Director George A. Palmer and Regional Historian Frank Barnes, and Joseph Watterson representing OAHP. Platt, Cotter and Dorman reiterated their position that sufficient evidence existed to warrant reconstruction of the Franklin House. Dorman made the most persuasive argument. His investigations had convinced him that thirty per cent of the building's original furnishings survived, that another thirty per cent could be located by intensive search or supplied by period counterparts, and that the remainder of a valid furnishings plan could be implemented on the basis of educated conjecture. Lee thought that the amount of furnishings surviving might justify reconstructing the house as the most appropriate setting in which to display Franklin's belongings. Considerable doubt was expressed, however, that institutional and individual owners would part with their Franklin holdings.

Like Connally, the committee ultimately was swayed by Batcheler's arguments that the evidence was insufficient to allow an accurate reconstruction. Convinced of her point of view, Batcheler could be a persuasive advocate. To make her case, she supplemented her verbal and written presentation with drawings clearly illustrating the practical difficulties of actually building the Franklin House. In the afternoon she buttressed her arguments against reconstruction with a presentation of an alternative concept for interpretation of Franklin Court that captured the

imagination of the committee. Her scheme would use the Market Street houses as a museum and small theater showing a movie about Franklin's life. Entrance to the theater would be to the south, so that visitors would first pass through the archway into Franklin Court. The Market Street facades would be treated in a contemporary idiom, perhaps in glass, so that the old party walls would be visible. At the site of the Franklin House, she proposed outlining the plan of the house on the ground and covering it with a shelter of two tiers of concrete slabs held on slender steel columns. Underneath, shafts below the ground would allow a view of the archaeological remains. She also suggested planting the garden with plane trees, flowering shrubs, a mulberry, and other plants known to have been grown by Franklin. Lee in particular liked the distinction between the surviving orginal fragments and new construction. It was clear by the end of the meeting that the committee's report would recommend, as it eventually did, against reconstruction and in favor of further consideration of Batcheler's ideas.[71]

Over the next few months Batcheler, at Connally's request, further developed her thinking on Franklin Court. In late January 1970 she conferred with the Washington staff of OAHP, reaching consensus on a program for the property's development. Most of her original concept remained intact, with the exception of the contemporary design of the Market Street fronts. The final decision was set forth in a five-point memorandum, calling for:

1. Restoration of the street fronts and the backs of the five Market Street Houses.
2. Adaptive restoration of their interiors, preserving the orignal party walls and the arched passage.
3. Construction of new visitor facilities to the rear of the Market Street Houses, planned so as not to damage archaeological remains nor impinge upon Franklin's garden.
4. Construction of an interpretive pavilion above the remains of the Franklin House, leaving portions open to view.
5. Reconstruction of brick garden walls, with grass, trees, and flowering shrubs (including plane trees and a mulberry, as referred to in the Franklin correspondence), according to the historic spatial arrangement of the site. 72

It would, however, be a few years before any construction work could be undertaken at Franklin Court. Despite the considerable research already accomplished, more information would be needed before final plans could be drawn. If the Market Street houses were to be reconstructed, for example, the surviving party walls would have to be carefully studied to determine such features as the position of floor levels and the location and size of chimneys. Furthermore, although Powell had thought no further archaeological investigation would be necessary, this had not proved to be the case. Attempts to draw plans for possible reconstruction of the Franklin House had disclosed discrepancies between the written documentation and Powell's interpretation of the archaeological evidence. Powell had thought he had uncovered a fragment of the eastern wall of the addition to the house made by Franklin in 1786-1787. Instead, he had found the eastern wall of the 1765 construction. The later addition remained to be excavated. A fresh archaeological campaign might also add information that would assist in restoration or interpretation of the Market Street houses and other features of the site.

Between 1970 and 1973 Barbara Liggett, under contract to the National

Park Service through the University of Pennsylvania, conducted a systematic archaeological investigation of almost the whole of Franklin Court. The findings refined knowledge of the precise location and extent of the house, unearthed footings of the retaining wall of the garden, and located the print shop Franklin had erected for his grandson Benjamin Franklin Bache. Over 2,000 vessels and many more thousands of fragments were retrieved, largely from four privies, a well, and a storage pit that had been sealed at various times between 1765 and 1835. Of special interest were the ceramics and glassware from the period 1690 to 1740, which at the time represented the earliest documented assemblage of artifacts of that period.[73]

Because Powell and Liggett's investigations were visible to the public, they received considerable attention in the popular press. Heretofore archaeology had generally been viewed as something pertaining to aboriginal cultures or lost civilizations. It was an activity carried out in remote places such as Greece or Peru or undeveloped areas such as the American southwest. At Independence large groups of people could begin to see that the past might be uncovered under the streets they walked daily or the buildings they occupied. The work at Independence was meaningful to the professional archaeological community as well. It had been assumed that urban sites were too disturbed, too often built upon to produce verifiable results. Historical archaeology in the United State had therefore been confined to rural or abandoned sites, such as Jamestown and Williamsburg in Virginia or Plimoth Plantation in Massachusetts. Powell and Liggett proved that even a site that had been built and rebuilt several times could yield information about its several layers of occupancy. It could provide data about the daily life of the inhabitants, about civic infrastructure, about

patterns of trade and international commerce, about industry and building methods. The excavations at Independence, and particularly at Franklin Court, thus became a milestone in urban archaeology in the United States.

Funding

Even before he arrived at Independence, Chester Brooks was aware that neither of the major projects called for in the draft version of the master plan, the development of Franklin Court and creation of a Visitor Center, would come to fruition without additional funding. Appropriations for development at Independence had always lagged behind planning. In the decade beginning in 1956, Mission 66 moneys had alleviated the perpetual funding shortage to some extent, paying for the demolition program and work on the Independence Square group and the Walnut Street houses. By 1968, however, the demands of the Viet Nam War were adversely affecting the park service budget.[74] When Brooks took command, he learned that the year's construction budget at Independence had been overspent by $70,000. He solved the immediate problem by dismissing the day labor force, the craftsmen who had been working on the restoration of Independence Hall, although he immediately rehired some of the best men, paying them from maintenance rather than the construction funds.[75] This averted an immediate budgetary crisis, but did not resolve the larger question of financing development of the park for the Bicentennial. By now the Independence project was twenty years old, and some of the first flush of enthusiasm had worn off. Brooks decided that the key to obtaining the necessary funding was to present completion of the park as a fresh program that would again capture the

imagination of park service management and the Congress. Because of his sense of urgency and his awareness of the high level of planning that had already gone into Independence, he did not attempt to rethink the entire scope of what was to be accomplished. Rather he rearranged the priorities and packaged the result as a new five-year program for completion of the park in time for the Bicentennial. Reconstruction of the privy behind the Todd House had been at the top of the list. Brooks shifted it to the bottom, putting tasks related to Independence Hall at the top for the next three years.[76]

Once Brooks had established his program, he put a price tag of $30 million on it and persuaded National Park Service Director George Hartzog to support it. Hartzog was due to unveil the program in a speech at the dedication of the Supreme Court Room in Independence in April 1969. Although Hartzog had to cancel his appearance due to illness, his deputy, Harthorn Bill, delivered the speech with the $30 million program included. Brooks immediately sent a copy to Chief of Programs Glen Bean in Washington informing him that it was an official program.[77]

The next step was to win political support. Hartzog and Associate Director Edward A. Hummel refined the program and presented it to Senator Hugh D. Scott of Pennsylvania in June.[78] Scott, who was Judge Lewis's nephew, had long been a supporter of Independence, always willing to support legislation favoring the park. Another key element in winning Congressional support for the needed funding was the well-known author Catharine Drinker Bowen. Brooks was introduced to Bowen by Charles E. Peterson at the opening of "See What They Sawed," an exhibit of the park's architectural study collection, in October 1969. Bowen, who had recently been appointed a member

of the American Revolutionary Bicentennial Committee, agreed to present the case for Independence to that body. Bowen came back from Washington to report that a fellow member of that body, Congressman Ben Reifel of South Dakota, ranking minority member of the House Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations, had requested slides illustrating the program. Brooks sent the slides and followed up with a call to Reifel, suggesting that Bowen be invited to testify before the committee. Brooks believed that Bowen would make an especially appropriate witness. Not only was she articulate and an author with a national reputation, but she was a woman. The committee was also headed by a woman, Representative Julia Butler Hanson, who had succeeded its long-time chairman Michael J. Kirwan. Brooks's hunch was correct. Hanson, a former teacher of English, was a long-term admirer of Bowen's work. With strong support from Scott in the Senate and Hanson in the House, the Interior budget included a first-year appropriation of almost $2 million for planning at Independence. The Todd House privy, however, stayed at the bottom of the list and was never constructed.[80]

With funding assured it would be possible to begin planning the enormously complicated process of putting the program into effect. The program called not only for completion of the restoration of Independence Hall, but also of two other major buildings, Old City Hall and the Second Bank. In addition, there would be major new construction for Franklin Court and a Visitor Center. Two reconstruction projects were also programmed. One of these was City Tavern, whch had survived from the first master plan. The second was the Graff House at the corner of Market and Seventh Streets, where Jefferson had written the draft of the Declaration of Independence. Although not as strongly supported within the park service as City Tavern,

reconstruction of the Graff House had long been favored by the park's advisory commission. In addition, one large office building, the Irwin Building, along with two adjacent smaller structures, still stood at the northwest corner of Walnut and Fourth Streets. Acquisition and planning for use of the buildings and/or the site were important components of the program. Finally, the program called for construction of a new maintenance facility.[81]

The Visitor Center

Although reevaluation of the decision not to reconstruct Franklin's House was the first response to the unresolved questions raised by the draft master plan of 1968, Franklin Court was not the first major project to reach the stage of design and construction. Because the approach of the Bicentennial had made the question of how crowds could be handled at Independence appear urgent, priority was given to selection of a site and design for a Visitor Center. Quorum Five, the consultants retained by M.O. Anderson, had recommended locating this facility at the southwest corner of Second and Chestnut Streets, the site of the 1930s Custom House. The Visitor Center could be housed in the Custom House or in a new building on the site. The Independence National Historical Park Advisory Commission at first appeared to accept this recommendation, but then reversed itself and advised locating the Visitor Center on the southeast corner of Chestnut and Third Streets. This would replace surface automobile and bus parking. To accommodate the displaced spaces, as well as added parking, and to provide an

open area where visitors could assemble, they recommended acquisition of the block east of Second Street known as Area F.[82] They were not alone in this preference. Hartzog attended the commission's meeting in October 1969 and announced that the Visitor Center would be erected on the parking lot site.[83]

Once the decision on location was final, the park service moved quickly to select an architect to design the facility. By the 1960s the park service was committed to incorporating modern design of high quality in the parks. Although there had been some scattered examples of modern buildings erected earlier, the question of design philosophy acquired added importance in the early 1950s as Mission 66 was getting underway. A new generation of park service leadership was dissatisfied with what has been described variously as the "Early Alpine" or "Parkitecture" rusticity that had characterized most buildings erected in the parks in the pre-World War II era. The park service began to seek out and hire architects with an interest in designing in the modern mode. John "Bill" Cabot, the chief architect at EODC in Philadelphia in the 1950s, was one such man, as was a younger architect, Donald Benson. Although Benson began his park service career under Peterson, working on historic buildings and preparing the drawings for the early restoration work on the Bishop White House, essentially he was a modernist, designing one of the park service's early contemporary structures, an award-winning beach shelter at Cape Hatteras. Assigned to the Denver Service Center, he would have a voice in selecting the designers of new buildings at Independence.

The volume of work generated by the Mission 66 program was so great that it could not be carried out entirely by park service architects. Increasingly in the late 1950s and 1960s the service turned to outside firms.

One of the earliest products of this outreach was a Visitor Center at Dinosaur National Monument on the Utah-Colorado border, designed by the San Francisco firm of Anshen & Allen and opened in 1958. This was followed by the commissioning of buildings from such noted firms as Mitchell/Giurgola at the Wright Brothers National Memorial in North Carolina, Richard Neutra at Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, and Taliesin Associated Architects at Rocky Mountain National Park in Colorado.[84]

Even before the burst of creative energy unleashed by Mission 66, the park service had turned to a major architect, seeking excellence and innovative design for at least one project. This was the monument at Jefferson National Expansion Memorial in St. Louis, Missouri, for which a national design competition was held in 1948. The winner was Eero Saarinen, with a bold, sweeping arch rising over the city's Mississippi River front. However, groundbreaking was delayed until 1962. It was George Hartzog, then superintendent at Jefferson, who presided over its construction. Hartzog, however, had little interest in the details of producing a building. He turned over most of the task of day-to-day dealings with the architect to his chief historian, William C. Everhart, who accepted the assignment with enthuiasm. Everhart, who had also been supervising historian at Independence in the late 1950s, had then gone to San Francisco, and later transferred to St. Louis, in part because of the opportunity to work with Saarinen. The experience left him with an abiding interest in modern architecture.[85] His promotions in Hartzog's directorate, first to Chief of Interpretation and then to Assistant Director of the National Park Service, for a time gave him

the power to exercise the interests engendered by his experience at Jefferson in the choice of architects for visitor centers.

Further impetus to the search for excellence in design projects came from the establishment of selection and review committees at the Denver Service Center, instituted in the early 1970s by Connally, then serving as associate director for professional services. Everhart served on the committee for the Independence Visitor Center, which included some outside experts, including Edmund Bacon, Philadelphia's chief planner. Bacon pressed for the selection of a Philadelphia architect. According to Brooks, however, the choice would always have been made by a majority of one, that one being Everhart.[86] Everhart had first approached Kevin Roche/Dinkeloo, the successors to Saarinen, who found the budget too limiting. His other choice was the Boston area firm, Cambridge Seven, whose work he had admired at Expo '67 in Montreal and the Boston Aquarium. Cambridge Seven was not merely an architectural firm; they had produced integrated projects involving films, museum exhibits, and graphics, all of which would be wanted at Independence.[87]

The program for the building presented to Peter Chermayeff, Cambridge Seven's chief designer for the project, was a complicated one. First, and perhaps most important, the Visitor Center was to provide a new location for the Liberty Bell. For several years park service management had been convinced that the bell would have to be moved out of the stair tower at Independence Hall. As visitation to the park increased, the relatively small space within the tower could no longer accommodate the crowds wishing to see and touch the bell. Moving the bell to the Visitor Center would accomplish several purposes. It would relieve the crowding at Independence Hall; it

would improve general circulation patterns throughout the park by creating another focus of primary interest; and it would encourage visitors to begin their tour at the eastern end of the park, as had been intended ever since preparation of the first master plan in 1954. In addition the building was to provide a large exhibit and reception area. This would serve not only for orientation, but also provide space to accommodate the anticipated large crowds waiting to see an introductory film, which was to be shown on a staggered schedule in two theaters. It was made clear to the architect that the arrangement of the theaters, as well as the quality of the film should take the orientation center at Colonial Willimsburg as a prototype. Finally, the building would have to provide such practical necessities as rest rooms, water fountains, and information desks.[88]

The shape of the site also influenced the design. Chermayeff gave the building a trapezoidal footprint, picking up the straight lines of Chestnut and Third Street and the rear of the lot and the angle of Dock Street. In relating closely to the park, the building turns its back to the city, presenting a blank brick wall to Chestnut Street. One entrance, facing the First Bank of the United States across Third Street, is largely of tinted glass mirroring the grand colonnaded and pedimented facade of the bank. The doors are approached through a small plaza with a brick bell tower to the left. There is a second entrance, also of glass recessed between brick walls, on Dock Street. The center of the interior is occupied by a large exhibit space or pavilion covered by a saw-toothed glass roof. A ramp leads up from the exhibit space to a bridge across the front of the building, providing entrances to the rear of the two theaters.

Chermayeff understood the program thoroughly and relations with the park service appear to have proceeded smoothly during the design process. During 1971 there was no reason to believe that Cambridge Seven's work would meet with anything but general approbation. Although Brooks informed the park's advisory commission in February that the Liberty Bell would be moved, the commission appeared to be more interested in discussing the forthcoming acquisition of Area F. In November park staff explained the reasons for moving the bell to the commission in some detail. It was then anticipated that 20 million visitors would come to Independence in the Bicentennial year. Brooks, Sullivan and Yoelson had walked through the park three abreast, and determined that there were several areas that would be tight in congested circumstances. Moving the bell would alleviate the situation by helping to disperse the crowds focused on Independence Hall. Seemingly convinced, the commission passed a resolution favoring moving the bell either to the Visitor Center or to Independence Square.[89]

The commission's November meeting was also the occasion of introducing a new superintendent to its members. Brooks's accomplishments in preparing Independence for the Bicentennial had been so substantial that Hartzog had promoted him to Regional Director, charging him with getting the Bicentennial program moving in the rest of the northeast.[90] His replacement was Hobart G. Cawood. Handsome, with sparkling blue-gray eyes and a dimple in his chin, Cawood looked as if he had been picked for the part of superintendent by central casting. He spoke rapidly and fluently, with a down-home Kentucky accent and colorful turn of phrase. Ebullient and outgoing, he was well-fitted to continue Brooks's method of management by cocktail parties.[91] Nevertheless, Cawood's appointment was something of

a surprise, even to him, because of his youth and relatively short length of service. Yet he had had a range of experience that provided an excellent background for what needed to be done at Independence. He had entered the park service as a historian, and then became a planner in the Washington office, working on studies of the integration of the Eisenhower Farm into the park at Gettysburg Battlefield and on the LBJ Ranch. In Washington he had caught the eye of George Hartzog, and in Texas of Lady Bird Johnson, who on one occasion called Hartzog, requesting that Cawood be assigned as her driver and general factotum when she came to Washington. His first assignment to top management, in 1969, was at the Civil War battlefield on the outskirts of Richmond, Virginia. When Cawood arrived, it still had a 1930s master plan that had never been implemented. Within a short time he had brought the park from the pre-World War II stage into the Mission 66 era. He had also instituted a summer program for children from inner-city Richmond, which combined history, nature study and recreation. He did it on a shoestring budget, for example cajoling the Defense Supply Agency to make a pond available, the Fish and Wild Life Service to stock it, and volunteers to teach the children how to make fishing poles and use them.[92] His background in planning and in particular his success in interaction with an urban community, a rare experience in a still western-oriented park service, were undoubtedly important reasons for his selection for the superitendency of Independence.

Brooks also knew Cawood well and agreed wholeheartedly with his appointment. Committed as he was to seeing the program he had initiated for completion of the park in time for the Bicentennial brought to fruition, Brooks was helpful and supportive of his replacement, but never tried to

continue as the superintendent of Independence or tell Cawood how the park should be run. Although the two lived across from one another in park service quarters on Locust Street, there was no confusion or conflict about their respective roles. Because both were open, direct, and communicative, they could solve problems with a minimum of red tape. Like Brooks, Cawood believed in the importance of keeping his staff and the park's constituency informed. Where they differed was in decision-making. Brooks liked to arrive at decisions by consensus; Cawood, although he canvassed his staff's opinions, felt that only the superintendent could make the ultimate decisions.[93]

There were other differences as well. Despite Brooks's enjoyment of public appearances and bonhomie, his manner was quiet and he appeared relaxed. He intended to control his park, and later his region, but was content to let others, such as Arthur Kaufmann, receive recognition and credit.[94] Cawood's personality was more flamboyant than Brooks's; there was little doubt about who would be at center stage at Independence. His enthusiasm and drive to accomplish things quickly would be valuable assets, but could sometimes be interpreted as brashness or disregard for the opinions of others. These qualities, combined with his youth and relative inexperience, may have contributed to some of the clashes with the park's advisory commission that marked Cawood's early years at Independence. Judge Lewis and M.O. Anderson had always worked quietly behind the scenes. By the time an issue reached the advisory commission, the superintendent and the chairman usually presented a common viewpoint. Arthur Kaufmann, in contrast, did not always wait to reconcile his own strong views with those of the park's superintendent. At the same time, both Brooks and Cawood, unlike

Anderson, had considerable experience in planning and management within the park service before coming to Independence, and a strong sense of the manner in which their mission at the park should be carried out. Nevertheless, Brooks had managed to achieve a cordial relationship with Kaufmann. By the time Cawood arrived, however, a crisis was brewing. Within a month he was embroiled in a conflict of major dimensions.[95]

The advisory commission's seeming acquiescence to the moving of the Liberty Bell proved to be deceptive. Rumblings of their discontent must have been heard even before their special meeting in December 1971, because not only Cawood and Assistant Superintendent James Sullivan, but also Brooks and Ronald F. Lee, Hartzog's trouble-shooter, attended. The purpose of the meeting was to allow Peter Chermayeff to present his designs for the Visitor Center, and it quickly became apparent that several members of the commission liked neither the design of the building nor the concept of moving the Liberty Bell to its tower. Members particularly objected to the roof design and to the starkness of the tower walls. They asked whether Chermayeff could prepare some alternatives for their consideration. They also wanted to review the proposed film while it was still in the conceptual stage. Chermayeff replied that he would be pleased to meet with the commission, but not until after the script had been written and reviewed by the park service's historians. Chermayeff was not inclined to compromise on design issues. In his view, his client was the National Park Service, not the commission, and the client had accepted the design. His attitude did little to mollify the commission, already annoyed at having been presented with what they believed to be a fait accompli, rather than having been consulted in advance.[96]

To obtain support for his opposition to the Visitor Center, Kaufmann turned to City Hall. Arrangements were made for Kaufmann and Cawood to meet with Mayor Frank Rizzo. In the meantime, the two toured the park with City Representative Harry Belinger. Their reports on the tour diverged sharply. Kaufmann told the advisory commission that Belinger appeared shocked that the bell would be housed in anything but a colonial-style building. Cawood replied that when they approached the site, and he explained the new building's relationship to the First Bank and the compatability of the proposed materials, Belinger's objections appeared to diminish. Kaufmann pressed the commission to take a position on whether the building's design should be colonial or contemporary. Commission members Stanhope Browne, William L. Day, and John B. O'Hara all strongly favored a contemporary expression. In their opinion integration of contemporary and old buildings was working well in Society Hill, and could also be successful within the park. Although Kaufmann demurred, the commission passed a resolution approving the building's design.[97]

Moving the Liberty Bell to the Visitor Center was not so easily disposed of. Although Kaufmann and Cawood met with the mayor and obtained his approval of the design for the Visitor Center and moving the Liberty Bell, Kaufmann claimed that public objections to the projected move were growing. The commission again discussed the question in detail at its April meeting. Representative Belinger attended again, as did R. Damon Childs, executive director of the City Planning Commission. Childs pointed out that technically the bell was part of the contents of Independence Hall, catalogued simply as a "musical instrument." As such it was covered by the terms of the cooperative agreement, which permitted the park service to care

for and display objects owned by the city in the manner in which they saw fit. Moving the Liberty Bell did not require the city's approval as, for example, did restoration techniques or alterations to the buildings in Independence Square. Nevertheless, there was still disagreement among the commission members about whether the bell should be moved. Judge Lewis, who by this time rarely expressed strong opinions at commission meetings, opposed moving the bell to the Visitor Center. Although he pointed out that the resolution of approval passed at the commission's January meeting was legally binding, he hoped that an alternative location for the bell could be found. He reverted to a scheme that the Independence Hall Association had pursued in the 1940s, placing the bell in a bomb-proof shelter behind Independence Hall. However, he could garner no support for his position. Once again the commission voted to support Chermayeff's plan, including the Liberty Bell.[98]

That should have, but did not, end the controversy. If, as Brooks had noted, Everhart's single vote constituted a majority for selection of Cambridge Seven as the designers of the Visitor Center, Kaufmann's vote constituted a majority on the issue of moving the bell. Kaufmann was expressing his opinions not only in the forum of the advisory commission, but also in direct correspondence with Chermayeff and George Hartzog.[99] And he was certainly correct on one score. Public opposition to the move was increasing. Isidor Ostroff, who had been so active in lobbying for establishment of the park under the aegis of the Independence Hall Association, brought suit in Federal court to prevent the bell's move. Ostroff's name was unknown to Cawood. He checked with Marty Yoelson, who described Ostroff's role in the creation of the park and expressed the

opinion that he had eventually been "crowded out," presumably by Judge Lewis. Cawood thereupon wrote to Ostroff, explaining that he was new to the park, but had been informed of Ostroff's tremendous past contributions. He sympathized with Philadelphians' sentiments about separating the bell from Independence Hall, but explained why he believed the move was necessary. Ostroff responded by dropping into Cawood's office. "I want you to know," Cawood recalled him saying, "that that's one of the kindest letters I've ever received from anyone. But I'm still going to sue you to keep you from moving the bell."[100] Ostroff did, indeed, obtain a temporary injunction. But the case was never completed because it had become moot. Bowing to the strength of local opposition, the park service had begun investigating other possible locations for the Liberty Bell and alternative design solutions for the Visitor Center.[101]

One of the roots of the controversy over the Visitor Center was that under Hartzog's reorganization plans all design responsibility had been shifted to the centralized service center in Denver. Not only had Chermayeff's design been approved by Denver before the advisory commission had had a chance to comment, but also without consulting those in Philadelphia who would have to operate and maintain it. Nate Golub, associate regional director for operations, complained to Don Benson about what he believed, evidently because of the saw-tooth design of the roof, would be an "operational monster."

> You will also recall your surprise that I had no prior knowledge of this design. I assumed therefore that no one else had objected to the "built-in" operational problems inherent in the design. However, in a discussion this week with Superintendent Cawood, I was informed that the park had submitted similar comments on November 24, 1971. They have had

no acknowledgment or indication that they are being heard.

Golub went on to complain about architects who gave operational conditions little or no consideration.

> This Visitor Center is a case in point. It may be too late (from your standpoint) to "correct" the design element that will result in the onerous operational problems. The Cambridge Seven may achieve their monument but the poor slobs who will have to operate and maintain this structure will curse them for the life of the building. 102

The controversy over the Visitor Center thus arose for two reasons. One was systemic: the failure of the review process to account for the varied constituencies that wanted a voice at Independence. Cawood, as a new superintendent, was presented with a design that had already been approved, and given the task of presenting it to an advisory commission that had not been consulted previously. Members of the park and regional staffs had not been kept apprised or asked for comments during the design process. The second, perhaps less tangible, was the clash of strong personalities. Kaufmann, as vice-chairman of the advisory commission, had observed Judge Lewis during his tenure as chairman being consulted and deferred to. The consultation, if not perhaps the deferment, had continued when Brooks became superintendent. Cawood did not solicit Kaufmann's advice as assiduously, in part because he was unaware of past practice, in part because he did not choose to. The situation was exacerbated by Chermayeff's determination not to alter his design. Despite repeated requests from Kaufmann for possible alternatives, Chermayeff held firm. He had no intention of submitting alternative designs to the advisory commission, nor, as it turned out to the park service.[103]

Hartzog eventually became somewhat testy about the manner in which the entire issue had been handled. Not only was he being importuned by Kaufmann, but also it was affecting his usually excellent relationship with Congress. When he appeared before the Senate Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations, the staff produced a sheaf of adverse clippings from the Philadelphia papers. Rather than discussing his budget, the committee entered on a period of extended questioning about the Liberty Bell. Finally at the end of his patience, Hartzog announced that he didn't care much about where the "cotton-picking" Liberty Bell went; he needed a Visitor Center. That broke the tension. After the laughter subsided, the chairman of the committee, Senator Alan Bible, offered to excise Hartzog's last remark from the record. He suggested that Hartzog was capable of getting in enough trouble without having that appear in print.[104]

Although Hartzog continued to back his subordinates, he urged them to avoid future confrontations. He wrote to Brooks:

> In this connection, I am most concerned about the review of the whole solution of the Visitor Center and the Liberty Bell with the Advisory Commission. The information that I gathered from the park staff, as well as the Commission members and others with whom I discussed this matter, indicate to me that the Commission was confronted with either an approval or a rejection of a design. This is simply not the way to work with a Citizens Advisory group and we should be more sensitive in dealing with the Advisory Commissions.
>
> I counseled with Superintendent Cawood on this matter. As I pointed out to him, park management does not need to -- and surely must not -- abdicate to Citizen Advisory groups. We must, however, involve them in the process in order to produce a viable end product. 105

By the time an advisory design review committee met in Denver to reconsider the issue of the Visitor Center, the park service had to all intents and purposes abandoned the plan to move the Liberty Bell to Third Street. The committee was chaired by Ernest Allen Connally. Connally had never been entirely happy with the design for the Visitor Center. Trained as an architect

himself, he favored good modern architecture for the parks, but thought it should be subordinate to the historic buildings. The tower, he believed, competed with the towers and cupolas of Carpenters' Hall, the Merchants' Exchange, and Independence Hall. Chermayeff remained adamant, maintaining that the tower was an integral part of the design.[106]

He had, however, proposed one alternative that would justify retention of the tower -- indeed increase its height. This was to use it as belfry for a Bicentennial Bell to be cast by the same English firm, Whitechapel Foundry, that had cast the Liberty Bell. Chermayeff foresaw a great future for his tower and his bell. The Bicentennial Bell and the Liberty Bell would become a joint focus for the Bicentennial celebration. The enlarged tower, by the twenty-first century would become "a transitional pivot point," the vertical accent that would tie together an urban fabric consisting of buildings from four centuries. With no trace of false modesty he proclaimed that the bell tower would become a symbol and presence in Philadelphia "comparable to the great church towers and campaniles of the past."[107]

Others were not as sure that the solution was appropriate. J. R. Passonneau, FAIA wrote to Connally that Chermayeff's description of the tower as the "central pivot point" in the area disturbed him. Should not that distinction be reserved for Independence Hall? Passonneau admitted, however, that he was not familiar with the urban context and was therefore ambivalent. In the end he was persuaded to accept the solution by Chermayeff's eloquence.[108] Cawood also was not convinced. Describing himself as "somewhat uneasy" about the solutions proposed at the review board meeting, he wrote to Brooks:

> In the first place, Cambridge Seven was supposed to provide alternatives to the Visitor Center bell tower. It seems to me that to add 28 feet and a

> "Bicentennial bell" to the top of the tower is simply an extension of the same proposal and really not an alternative. I am not sure that the INHP Advisory Commission will feel that this is an alternative but rather a refinement of what they already did not like. 109

Cawood also was worried about the delays caused by continuing debate about the building's design. He suggested beginning construction without the tower, which could then be added or deleted depending on how the decision went. Ernest Connally, who also had doubts about constructing a tower without a bell, supported an advisory commission suggestion that bids should be requested for the building with and without the tower. If the bids with the tower came in over the budget, the decision would have been made in the marketplace rather than by the park service. Hartzog, however,decided to ask for only one bid, which included the tower.[110] The bid requests went out in the fall of 1972 and in December a construction contract in the amount of $3.3 million was awarded to Wintz Brothers, with construction getting underway in February 1973.[111] Nevertheless, the debate about the tower continued. Kaufmann was pushing his opposition to the tower and the Bicentennial bell, soliciting the support of the Pennsylvania Congressional delegation, the newspapers, and the Philadelphia architectural community.[112] In response, Chermayeff came up with further alternatives, a plain brick wall, or an open tower of the lower height of his original design. Finally, the commission, by a six to five vote, supported the tower.[113]

Meanwhile the concept of the Bicentennial bell was gaining momentum. Chermayeff had taken advantage of an accidental meeting with Secretary of the Interior Rogers C.B. Morton to persuade him of the merits of the idea, which included presentation of the bell as a Bicentennial gift from the people of Great Britain to the people of the United States. Morton was convinced and asked Barbara Burns, who was on the Department of Interior's international

affairs staff to pursue the project with British representatives in Washington. At the same time, Cawood established contact with the office of the British Consul General in Philadelphia and kept them informed of the project's status. It would, however, take considerable time before a firm decision could be expected from the British. Construction on the tower was continuing and the question of whether or not the tower would house a bell was becoming critical, because it affected the final details of the design and because casting the bell would take considerable time. Because there was no money for the cost of the bell in the budget, funds would have to come from an outside source. The park service's Washingon office persuaded the Boston-based John Hancock Insurance Company to serve as a back-up sponsor for the bell if the British government failed to approve the project. With funding guaranteed, it was possible to place an order for casting the bell at Whitechapel Foundry. One last issue was the nature of the inscription on the bell. The final choice, simple but appropriate, was "Let Freedom Ring."[114]

Cambridge Seven's design, the tower, and the Bicentennial bell were not the only areas of controversy delaying the Visitor Center. The form and content of the interpretive movie were also a source of trouble. The advisory commission had long wanted a film of high quality at Independence. Many of its members had been impressed by the orientation center and film at Williamsburg and desired something of equal quality. Hartzog was anxious to have their approval, because Arthur Kaufmann had offered to solicit private funding for the film. This was one of Hartzog's most powerful reasons for urging cooperation with Kaufmann on Brooks and Cawood.[115] Chermayeff, however, had resisted discussing his plans for the film with the commission. The objections to Cambridge Seven's concept came, therefore, not from the commission, which was unaware of what the concept was, but from the park staff. Cambridge Seven had determined that the

film would only deal with those events leading up to and culminating in the Declaration of Independence. The park staff believed that the full story of the park, extending at least through the Constitutional Convention, should be told. Everhart advised Cawood to trust the designer, unless he was introducing some "strangely discordant element."[116] Cawood took Everhart's advice to the extent of leaving the project in Cambridge Seven's hands, but must have requested an extension of the script's time frame.

In February 1973 Cambridge Seven presented its developed concept to a park service review committee meeting at Harper's Ferry.[117] Despite an expanded time frame that included the Constitutional Convention, the park service gave the proposal a frigid reception. Neither the technique nor the treatment were what they had envisioned. Rather than a technicolored motion picture with actors speaking their parts, Cambridge Seven proposed a series of sepia stills, given animation through movement of the camera over the pictures. Narration and dialogue would be provided by voice-overs. This technique, they believed, would provide both versimilitude and a sense of temporal distance from the events. Their viewpoint also called for what they described as a "strong sense of reality" and "sensitivity to its [American history's] human aspects." These would be conveyed by showing such details as the delegates' sweat-stained clothes and buzzing flies in the literally heated atmosphere of the debates over the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. The quality of social life in Philadelphia would be shown through scenes in drawing rooms and taverns, but also through such images as a dead dog lying in the streets, a woman emptying a chamber pot, a delegate walking carefully to avoid an open sewer, and Benjamin Franklin, on his return from England, waving a greeting to the inhabitants of a brothel.[118]

This revisionist view of history was not acceptable to the men of the park

service. Although they were prepared to accept a vision of the founding fathers that was something less than godlike, they intended to glorify and celebrate the events at Independence, not follow the radical historiography of the Viet Nam era. Cambridge Seven was relieved of responsibility for the film, and Carl Degen of the Audiovisual Division at Harper's Ferry was charged with preparing specifications to solicit proposals from a new contractor. The document, approved by the regional office and the park, set forth the concept of the film and provided that it was to be a motion picture in full color, with actors speaking their parts. Eleven firms responded to the proposal, with the contract being awarded to 20th Century-Fox in the spring of 1974. An important factor in the selection was the team assigned to the project by the movie company. John Huston would be the director, with Lyman Butterfield of the Massachusetts Historical Society as the historical consultant; responsibility for the script and the production was in the hands of Joyce and Lloyd Ritter. Marty Yoelson worked closely with the Ritters and Butterfield, providing them with guidance to available materials and checking the script for accuracy. Other members of the park staff were on the scene during the actual movie-making, most of which was filmed on location in the park. It was obviouly a team effort, but in Yoelson's opinion it was finally Huston's attitude and interpretation that produced a film the park could be proud of.

> What I liked about him so much was that when we took him through the park for the first time -- and this was his first visit to Independence -- he would stop every so often and look around the area, the environment. To me he seemed to be thinking about how he could show these scenes in the best manner. It wasn't something that he came upon in the park -- we are going to do this scene, do that one. He thought each one out before it was performed. He had that feeling for Independence. Over the years, whoever came into Independence Hall, whether they were militant or anything else, the change comes over them, and they have that great feeling, the awe of coming into a church, coming into Independence Hall, and this is what Huston had. 119

Even while the controversies over the Visitor Center and the Bicentennial bell were being resolved, another issue led to contention between Cawood and the advisory commission. Although the Bicentennial was still three years away, the crowds at Independence Hall had increased measurably by 1973. During the height of the visitation season, from April to October, between 4,000 and 6,000 people a day were passing through the building, with the numbers rising as high as 8,000 a day on weekends. The anticipation was that these numbers would double in 1976. To protect the building and its contents, and to try to provide a quality experience for all visitors, indiscriminate strolling through the building would no longer be allowed. Instead, beginning in March 1973, all visitors would be assembled into groups in the East Wing and taken on a conducted tour. The arrangement had elicited unfavorable editorial comment in the Philadelphia newspapers and on the radio, which was echoed by the commission; it violated what many Philadelphians regarded as their sacred right to stroll through the first floor of Independence Hall whenever they wished.

Visitors new to the park either favored the arrangement or accepted it without question.[120] In any event, the objections of the advisory commission had less force than they would have had previously, for their power had been severely curtailed. At the same meeting at which commission members voiced their grievances over the new arrangements for entry to Independence Hall, Cawood informed them of a new law defining and reducing the powers of Federal advisory commissions. The meat of the law appeared in Section 2, which stated

> the function of the advisory committee should be advisory only, and that all matters under their consideration should be determined, in accordance with law, by the official, agency or officer involved. 121

Passage of this act shifted the balance of power between park service staff and the advisory commission significantly. Although for public relations reasons the advice and counsel of the commission would still be sought, it was clear that the decisions would be made, depending on the magnitude of the case, by the superintendent, the regional director, or the director of the National Park Service. The commission and its members could still exercise influence, of course, through the normal channels open to private citizens, by appealing to the press or to appointed or elected officials. In the interest of maintaining harmony and insuring the support of the members of the commission, many of whom were influential for other reasons, Cawood would continue to attend their meetings, listen to their views, and keep them informed of the progress of park development. Gradually, however, the importance of the commission waned, and after 1976 it ceased meeting.

The Design for Franklin Court

Before the act was passed, there was at least one major project to which the advisory commission assented almost without a murmur, the design for Franklin Court. Whatever dissent there was took the form of a last hope, expressed by City Representative Belinger and Kaufmann, that the Thackara drawing could be found and the house reconstructed. Kaufmann went so far as to launch a publicity campaign, offering a prize of a trip to Philadelphia and a Franklin medal to anyone who could come up with either the drawing itself or at least a photograph.[122] Like past attempts to find this elusive view, this proved futile. If the house were not to be reconstructed, the advisory commission was content with the preliminary proposals for the site's development.

Just as the personality of Chermayeff may in part have influenced the commission's negative reactions to the Visitor Center, so undoubtedly did the personality of Franklin Court's architect facilitate the ready acceptance of his concepts. With the choice of an architect for Franklin Court coming in the midst of his difficulties with the Visitor Center, Cawood was determined that the commission would go to a Philadelphia architect.[123] The actual choice would be made by a design review committee from the Denver Service Center, but the superintendent's wishes in that regard would be respected. For a city of its size, Philadelphia has always had a surprisingly large number of excellent and well-known architectural firms, and the committee had a number from which to choose. At the recommendation of Lee Nelson and Penny Batcheler, they selected the firm of Venturi & Rauch.[124] It was not then one of the city's larger firms, but its principal, Robert Venturi, had a well-established national reputation as an innovative and thoughtful designer.

The choice of a local firm had obvious advantages. Local publicity for one of Philadelphia's own was apt to be more favorable than for an outsider. Communication would also be easier. If the program and design concepts could be developed in cooperation with the park's staff, it was more likely that differences could be resolved before they reached the confrontation stage that had characterized the progress of the Visitor Center.

As had been the case with the latter building, the park provided a set of guidelines and requirements for the architect. These were essentially the program that had been developed in early 1970 after the decision not to reconstruct the Franklin House had been made. The Market Street houses were to be restored fully on the exterior, but treated adaptively for interpretive purposes on the interior. Behind these houses, Franklin's garden was to be recreated, bounded by a brick wall. The house site was to be marked, with a

pavilion sheltering the archaeological remains, which were to be exposed to view. There would be a visitor's facility within the court as well. Its location had not been decided, but it must not impinge either on the garden or the house site. What was to be done had therefore been established. The question that remained was how it was to be done. Given the relatively short time available for decision, it might have been done well or badly. In the end it was done superbly.

Professorial in appearance and manner, with a willingness to hear the views of others and the patience to explain his own, Venturi proved a perfect choice to carry forward the complicated task of designing and implementing what proved to be a cooperative venture. Because Venturi & Rauch had no experience in the precise form of restoration that would be required for the Market Street houses, John Milner's firm, then known as National Heritage, was retained as a subconsultant. Although one reason for Venturi & Rauch's selection was that the firm were known for integrating architecture and exhibitry, specialists in the latter field would also be required. Not only would the project be subject to the normal park service reviews -- by the Denver Service Center, Harper's Ferry, and the Washington directorate, but it would be carried out in close collaboration with the park staff.

Interpretive programs for other sites at Independence largely had been based on the park staff's research and analysis. The task at most of the sites had been relatively simple, because so much of the historical fabric remained intact. At Independence Hall, for example, the main interpretive tool was the accurate restoration and frunishing of the interiors. These could then be presented as the setting for the great events that had transpired within the building's walls. Because the Franklin House would not be reconstructed, the solution at Franklin Court would necessarily be more abstract. Furthermore the

complexity of Franklin's personality demanded a highly sophisticated presentation. In their search for quality, the park turned to outside resources. In June 1972, at the recommendation of Nelson and Batcheler, a gathering of distinguished Franklin scholars convened, under park auspices, for a tour of Franklin Court and a discussion of the interpretive possibilities. The experts included Claude-Anne Lopez of the Franklin papers at Yale University, Whitfield Bell of the American Philosophical Society, Lyman Butterfield of the Massachusetts Historical Society, Edwin Wolf II of the Library Company of Philadelphia, Robert Spiller of the University of Pennylvania, and Philadelphians Catharine Drinker Bowen, Edgar P. Richardson, and Charles Coleman Sellers. Robert Venturi and John Rauch attended the meeting, as did David Vaughan, who would be project architect for their firm, and John Milner and Robert DeSilets of Milner's staff. Park service representatives included architects Nelson, Batcheler and Stuart MacDonald (who would later leave the park service and work on Franklin Court for Milner), archaeologist Barbara Liggett, historians Platt, Yoelson and David Dutcher (a recent addition to Yoelson's staff), Dorman from the curatorial staff, Alan Kent from Harper's Ferry, and Harry Pfanz from Washington. Almost all of these would have continuing participation in the project.

Assistant Superintendent James Sullivan chaired the meeting and opened by apologizing for the absence of Superintendent Cawood. Cawood was in Washington to receive the first installment of a $190,000 fund for the furnishing of the second floor of Independence Hall, donated by the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution. Almost as soon as the introductions were over, the assembled experts began to tackle their task with verve and a remarkable degree of agreement. All wished to see the site interpret Franklin the man, not the myth. All also agreed that he was a man of many facets --

printer, scholar, diplomat, scientist, civic leader, family man, politician, humorist, friend and neighbor -- but that these should not be compartmentalized. Franklin should be portrayed as a whole man, in the context of his times, his city, and a larger stage. Butterfield summed up their appraisal in the phrase "citizen of the world." After viewing Franklin Court, which some of them had never seen, the group began to arrive at some consensus on interpretive devices that would help explain the real Franklin and the site of his home. They suggested reconstruction of his print shop, an archaeological exhibit, a museum, and one or two movies. It began to be obvious that the site, and the Market Street houses in particular, might be too small to accommodate the desired program.[125]

Subsequently, there were additional long, although less formal, discussions of how these ideas could be given physical form. Batcheler recalls meetings at the Venturis' apartment at which the park architects and members of the firm's design team would exchange views. One great break-through came when Denise Scott-Brown, Venturi's wife and also a member of the firm, suggested placing the museum underground.[126] This would allow space for the ambitious interpretive program, at the same time that it would free the court for display of the house site and recreation of a garden evocative of the eighteenth century. The concept of what became Franklin Court's most celebrated feature, the "ghost house" evolved from similar discussions. As far back as Grant Simon's designs of 1954, the plan for the court had incorporated the concept of marking the plan of the house on the ground in some fashion. To this Batcheler had added, at the October 1969 meeting at which reconstruction of the house had been vetoed, some aboveground construction, helping to define the site. John Cotter traces the germination of the idea to an excavation photograph, which he showed to Venturi in the course of a conference between the architects and the

Independence staff. The photograph had been taken by James Deetz, then working for the National Park Service as a contract archaeologist at Wellfleet on Cape Cod. It showed the foundations and chimney base of a house, above which Deetz had drawn, in white ink, the skeleton frame of the building the foundations might have supported.[127]

Despite the complexity of the design and interpretive issues and the numerous meetings aimed at their resolution, Venturi & Rauch produced a basic design concept with remarkable speed. The Franklin scholars had met in mid-June. By mid-July the architects presented preliminary drawings and a model to the advisory commission. The basic solutions were already in place -- the restoration of the Market Street houses, the metal framework to give what was already characterized as a ghost-like impression of the Franklin House, the underground museum and theater, which would be reached by a ramp. There would also be a quiet garden, not a replica, since the design of Franklin's garden was unknown, but one that would evoke the spirit of the eighteenth century. R. Damon Childs, the head of the City Planning Commission, agreed to work to close Orianna Street as a public way, so that it could be incorporated into the design.[128]

There were, however, some demurrals when the conceptual plans were reviewed in Denver. Although the park service had been commissioning major modern buildings for at least a decade, Venturi's ideas were a radical departure from the conventional design philosophy. Besides, there were fears that the budget would be too high, that the park service simply could not afford such a complex project. Cawood and Brooks were supporting Venturi, but the decisive voice was that of Ernest Connally. Connally put the issue in a national perspective. Other giants of the era had their monuments -- Jefferson at Monticello, Washington at Mount Vernon. Franklin deserved something that could not be the

same as those great restored houses, but that should be of as high quality in its own fashion. His eloquence persuaded the group to favor the Venturi scheme .[129]

The relatively ready acceptance of the basic concept for Franklin Court eased what would still be the long and complex task of particularizing the design and the interpretation, constructing it and bringing it in on time. As Venturi recalled:

> Everyone seemed to like the idea early. This seldom happens with public work. It's wonderful when it does happen, because it then gives the architect the opportunity to develop his ideas instead of wasting and spending a lot of energy trying to sell the idea in the first place. Then he is so exhausted by the time the idea is sold that he doesn't have the time and the energy to develop it. And the development is just as important as the original concept. 130

One of the ideas the architects spent considerable time developing was that of the garden. Supplied by the park staff with information from Franklin's letters, they incorporated elements that were known to have adorned his grounds, such as the mulberry tree. At the same time, they determined that it would not be practicable to reconstruct an archaeologically correct eighteenth-century garden. For one thing, the evidence was too thin. For another, the open space that had served as a private garden for a small family in the eighteenth century would now have to accommodate up to 20,000 people a day. They decided instead to capture the spirit of an earlier garden by using formal and picturesque designs, both of which had been popular in the eighteenth century, but expressing them through heavier and chunkier elements. They combed estate gardens in Chestnut Hill and Germantown, where, earlier in the century, traditional Pennsylvania architecture and landscape had been adapted with an Edwardian amplitude of scale that suited their program for Franklin's

garden.[131] The result was a small but complex landscape, filled with references to the past, but also very much a product of its own times.

Fleshing out Franklin Court would require intensive activity on the part not only of the architects and their media consultant, but also of park service staff. Yoelson would be responsible for overseeing the interpretive materials on behalf of the park. He would provide the exhibit designers with information, edit scripts, and recommend specific spaces for interpretive purposes. He became, in Cawood's words, the park's "quality control." Because he was fulfilling these functions not only for Franklin Court, but also for the Visitor Center and other sites in the park, his staff was augmented. David Dutcher, who had been a historian under Cawood at Richmond Battlefield, would be Yoelson's chief deputy at Franklin Court. He would also develop an interpretive program for the First Bank of the United States, which was never implemented because of budgetary constraints. Joan Marshall, transferred from the curatorial staff, would monitor the reconstruction of the subscription office for Franklin's grandson's newspaper, the Aurora, in one of the Market Street houses.[132] Penny Batcheler would also put in long hours reviewing the further architectural investigations of the Market Street houses, and consulting with Venturi & Rauch on design issues and on interpretation of architectural and archaeological features. Although technically on the Denver Service Center staff, she remained assigned to Philadelphia. She too acquired additional staff, including Mary Mish, who had worked for Barbara Liggett as an archaeological draftsman.

There were hundreds of small and large decisions required before the final plans took shape, especially for the complicated multi-media interpretive program that was envisioned. By August 1972 Yoelson had come up with a draft listing of space allocation in the Market Street houses. These included a working print shop, a newspaper office, and a working post office. The interior

of the house at 318 Market Street, where the cellar was rich in archaeological data, would be stabilized and left open from cellar to third floor, so that visitors could see first hand the architectural and archaeological evidence on which restoration and interpretation were based. It would also reveal information about another aspect of Franklin's life, his role as an owner and developer of property. The upper floors of the other buildings would be adapted for office uses. The rest of the program was less firm. At a meeting in Harper's Ferry it was agreed that Venturi & Rauch would subcontract various aspects of the interpretive program to a media firm, with Claude-Anne Lopez of the Franklin Papers to be retained as a consultant.[134]

Meanwhile John Milner's firm and park service personnel had been carrying out detailed investigations of the surviving fabric of the Market Street houses. The easternmost of these, at 314 Market Street had never been owned by Franklin. Documentation showed that a building had been erected on the site c. 1720, which was entirely rebuilt in 1797. Architectural evidence for the c. 1720 building was minimal and inconclusive; for the 1797 building it was excellent, but the building had never existed in Franklin's lifetime. Since the proposed use was for public toilets and offices, Stuart MacDonald, a young architect on Lee Nelson's staff, recommended that what he termed reconstruction not be undertaken, but that a contemporary building be erected.[135] Merrill J. Mattes, manager of the historic preservation team at the Denver Service Center, agreed with this recommendation.[136]

Yoelson was outraged. He expressed his disapproval of the recommendation in a ten-point memorandum to Cawood. The 1797 building existed; its preservation was recommended in an approved Historic Structures Report. MacDonald was incorrect in referring to what was planned as a conjectural reconstruction; it was an exterior restoration. How, since the building was genuine, could the

park justify demolishing a historic structure to replace it with a modern one? Furthermore the cut-off date for the interpretation of the site was not Franklin's death in 1791, but 1800. Yoelson obviously also felt that the historical architects were treading on his toes. "I am also of the opinion," he noted, "that the park interpreters do the interpretation and the architects do the architectural investigations. If we were to construct a contemporary building, how do we interpret it?"[137] Cawood backed Yoelson, and after discussion with Mattes, Nelson, Henry Judd, and Lawrence B. [Burr] Coryell, Brooks's assistant director for Bicentennial projects, the restoration went forward.[138]

By the summer of 1973 Venturi & Rauch's media consultant deMartin-Marona Associates were refining their proposals for interpretive devices. The displays would include more complicated exhibitry than had ever been installed in a park service facility. In addition to such conventional devices as a gallery displaying some of Franklin's possessions, there would be a mirrored wall with flashing neon lights and two and three-dimensional images expressing Franklin's multi-faceted personality, a bank of telephones with recorded messages relaying famous persons' opinions of Franklin from his era to the present day, exhibits of Franklin's inventions and of civic projects in which he had been involved, a film, and a miniature theater in the round, "Franklin on the World Stage." The complexity and ambitious nature of the program overwhelmed Harper's Ferry. Reviewers thought there were too many "peaks" of experience, and also worried about cost and maintenance. Eventually the proposals were scaled down. Some video displays were omitted and it was determined that the figures in "Franklin on the World Stage" would be stationary with the effect of movement created through sound and light.[139]

As would be the case at the Visitor Center, the park staff did not like the

media consultants' first proposal for the film. Although in this case they found the techniques acceptable, the treatment was not.

> The response was in the negative since the treatment is somewhat of the Tom Sawyer-Huckleberry Finn flavor and does not add to the Franklin Court story. The incident in the story does not show insight into Benjamin Franklin, the man, but presents a caricature of him for which there is no need. He has been over-caricatured....
>
> It is our thought that the film present Franklin, the human being (the everyday man). In this we add Franklin the family man, his home, and sacrifices made.[140]

Although the letter conveying this disapproval was signed by Cawood, the language smacks of Yoelson. By now Yoelson had been steeped in Frankliniana for twenty years. He believed, and his superiors agreed, that he knew the man intimately and that interpretation of Franklin should be based on his knowledge. Although time was pressing and the schedule might be delayed by changes, the park upheld its commitment to quality. There would be a new film treatment. This time the concept of the film was discussed in advance with, among others, Yoelson, John Platt, and Lopez.[141] Yoelson continued to work closely with Mrs. Secondari, who had been retained by deMartin-Marona to produce the film. Also in almost daily contact with deMartin-Marona was Charles Dorman, who had to provide authentic furnishings and props, as well as advising on costumes. Indeed, from 1973 to 1975 Dorman advised on so many park service film productions, not only at Independence, that he began to describe himself in monthly reports as having "gone Hollywood." Dorman also worked on collecting authentic furnishings and quality reproductions that would be displayed both in exhibit cases and such reconstructed features as the print shop. This, too, was a massive job done at fever pitch, with hundreds of decisions to be made about

individual objects and "every meeting at Harper's Ferry disclosing more dangling problems.'[142] Other members of the park service staff also made notable contributions to the finished product. The engraving of quotations from the Franklin correspondence in the paving replicating the plan of the house grew out of discussions between Venturi & Rauch and the park service architects. Mary Mish then combed the research files for all the known quotations, with Yoelson making the final selection. Mish and Batcheler also worked closely with Milner's firm, who had retained Barbara Liggett as a consultant, on the interpretive features for the interior of 318 Market Street. Batcheler and Venturi prepared the text for the large signs along the west garden wall that describe the evolution of Franklin Court.[143]

In addition to the complex interpretive issues, Franklin Court posed tricky technical problems, many of which were solved by the consulting structural engineer, Nicholas Gianopulos, a principal in Keast & Hood. Gianopulos had cut his teeth on historic buildings at Independence, working under Sheldon Keast on Congress Hall and Independence Hall. He was responsible for the structure of the underground museum, for the stabilization of the Market Street buildings, and for the structural system for the skeletal steel ghost frames that would mark the sites of the Franklin House and the print shop that had once occupied the northern end of the court.[144]

Despite the scope and complexity of the project, its design was accomplished with remarkable speed. By August 1973 the project was sufficiently advanced for preparation of cost estimates and a construction schedule.[145] Construction was underway by the summer of 1974, and Franklin Court opened, in time for the Bicentennial, on April 20, 1976.[146] The faith of Brooks, Cawood, Connally and others in the park service was fully justified on several levels. Franklin Court is the third most popular attraction at Independence

National Historical Park; its attendance is topped only by that at the Liberty Bell and Independence Hall. On an artistic level, it has reaped almost universal accolades. It is the only park service project to have won an American Institute of Architects honor award, and in 1985 received from President Reagan the Presidential award for design excellence.

Franklin Court and the Visitor Center were the largest, most expensive, and, with one exception, most hotly debated of the Bicentennial projects at Independence. But they were by no means the only objects of planning and development in the period from 1972 to 1975. Additional projects that were certainly far more than minor were also going forward. The restoration of the second floor of Independence Hall continued into 1972, and the colossal clock on the exterior of the west wall was being reconstructed at the same time. Old City Hall was also undergoing restoration during this period, as was the First Bank of the United States, the Deshler-Morris House in Germantown, and the Thaddeus Kosciusko National Memorial at Third and Pine Streets, a gift to the Federal government from Edward J. Piszek. The Second Bank of the United States was also being restored by park service architects, and fitted up on the interior as a gallery for the park's portrait collection. Two major reconstructions, City Tavern and the Graff House, were also underway. Although both were based on research by park service staff, the working drawings were contracted to outside architects because the park service architectural staff could not have handled the additional work. John Dickey was selected as the architect for City Tavern, which would be turned over to what the park service dubs a "concessioner" to run as a restaurant. John Milner's firm, with Robert DeSilets as project architect, would design the Graff House. Both would be completed on an accelerated schedule, opening in the Fall of 1975.[147]

The park service had never accorded a high priority to reconstruction of

the Graff House, but it had always been a favored project of the interlocking directorate of the Independence Hall Association, the Philadelphia National Shrines Commission, and the Independence National Historical Park Advisory Commission. Despite its deletion from the original legislation authorizing the park, members of those various bodies continued to lobby for its inclusion. By 1964 they had succeeded in persuading Congress to authorize acquisition of the property, if private funds could be raised to pay for the reconstruction of the building. Judge Lewis gradually cooled, but when Arthur Kaufmann assumed control of the advisory commission, he began to push for the Graff House with great vigor. In 1967 he began to negotiate with the bank serving as trustee of the estate of Emily Balch, who had been left several million dollars to establish a Balch Institute and Library. By 1971, the Balch Estate had agreed to purchase the corner site at Seventh and Market Street and sell the portion where the Graff House had stood to the park service for $200,000, the sum authorized by Congress. With Kaufmann's assurances that matching funds to reconstruct the house could be raised privately, there was little the park service could do but acquiesce. Privately, however, some within the park service agreed with the adverse comment on the project being voiced by the Philadelphia historical community, who thought that what they termed a "fake" was an unsuitable memorial to Jefferson.[148]

There was also additional land acquisition to be negotiated. Authorization for purchase of the site on which the Irwin Building stood passed the Congress in November 1970, but it took several years of negotiation before all its tenants' leases could be terminated and demolition could proceed. This was finally accomplished in early 1974.[149] The legislation for Area F, the site for a proposed parking garage and other park development east of Second Street, came still later. Congressman James Byrnes, a member of the park's advisory

commission, introduced it twice in the House, only to see it die in the Senate. Brooks turned to Arthur Kaufmann for help. Kaufmann, whose lobbying efforts on the part of Independence were prodigious, persuaded the ever-helpful Senator Hugh Scott to take up the cudgels. Scott was successful; the bill authorizing acquisition was signed into law in November 1974. Kaufmann reported to the advisory commission, with evident relief, that he was glad to be out of the "legislative" business for the first time since he had joined that body in 1949. The legislation, however, provided no appropriation for acquisition or development.[150] Area F therefore would not be planned or developed in time for the Bicentennial.

Moving the Liberty Bell

There remained one development essential to preparing Independence for the Bicentennial. Park Service management had not lost its conviction that it was necessary to move the Liberty Bell out of Independence Hall. The decision not to incorporate the Liberty Bell into the Visitor Center had thus spawned a new cause for controversy. Where should it be placed? By this time the questions had been raised, although never so seriously, for fifty years. In the 1920s Jacques Greber had produced a plan for moving the bell to a shrine-like position across Chestnut Street from Independence Hall, in what would eventually become the first block of the Independence Mall State Park. During World War II the Independence Hall Association had proposed moving the bell to a bomb-proof shelter behind Independence Hall, a solution that Judge Lewis continued to advocate. These locations and others were discussed in the forum of the park's advisory commission during much of 1972 and 1973. This time Brooks wanted to

make sure that any decision gained the commission's support. Their assistance would be essential in convincing the city government and the general public to accept the move.

Having won its point on not placing the Liberty Bell in the Visitor Center, the commission was more than willing to cooperate. At first the commission appeared to agree on a location in the first block of the State Mall. However, this aroused fears that there would be danger to pedestrians crossing Chestnut Street. Although according to the city's plans Chestnut Street was to be a pedestrian mall west of Sixth Street, the city refused to close it to vehicular traffic east of that intersection. A site in Independence Square was also rejected, despite Lewis's advocacy. It would require relocation of a statue of Irish-born Commodore John Barry, celebrated as the father of the United States Navy. Commission members James Byrnes and Michael J. Bradley, both of Irish descent were vehemently opposed to such a course of action, as were the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, representing the Philadelphia Irish community. Clearly such a course would not be acceptable politically. The commission thereupon recommended the third block of the State Mall between Arch and Race Streets.[151]

Ex-Congressman Michael J. Bradley undertook the delicate job of negotiating the subject of the bell's move with Mayor Frank Rizzo. The mayor was invited to tour the park and see for himself the problems of congestion around the bell's location in the tower stair hall. A meeting was convened in Rizzo's office, including representatives of the National Park Service, the City of Philadelphia, and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. The group agreed that the first block of the mall would be the most appropriate location.[152] Although this solution seemed generally acceptable, it still posed some problems. The mall belonged to the state, not to the Federal government. The state, however,

was prepared to be cooperative. Maintenance of the mall was a strain on the state's resources; relief from this burden would be welcome. In late 1973 the Pennsylvania legislature voted to transfer the entire three blocks of the Independence Mall State Park to the Federal government. There was one remaining obstacle. Acquisition and construction of the mall had been funded with development bonds that would not mature until the 1990s. Once again a period of negotiations ensued, with the state and the bonding companies. Eventually agreement was reached. Because a portion of the bonds had been paid off, a strip in the center of the mall's first block would be deeded to the Federal government in fee in early 1975. This would provide the site for the Liberty Bell pavilion. The remainder of the mall would be leased to the National Park Service, which would operate and maintain it until the expiration of the bonds, at which time owership would be transferred.[153]

During these negotiations, solicitation of proposals for the design of a pavilion to house the Liberty Bell were underway. Again Brooks and Cawood felt that it would be politic to select a Philadelphia architect. In early 1974 the contract was awarded to Mitchell/Giurgola, which, although it maintained a New York City office, was perceived by the Philadelphia community as a local firm. The opening of the Bicentennial year was no less than two years away, but with careful scheduling the building could be erected and the bell installed in time. Cawood could thus go off on a visit to Russia as part of a park service exchange team in the belief that the last major impediment to completion of the park had been removed. Shortly after he left the carefully assembled mosaic almost fell apart. Chester Brooks received a telephone call from the mayor's office one morning saying that Mayor Frank Rizzo wished to come down to the park to view the site to which the Liberty Bell would be moved. Brooks met Rizzo, who was accompanied by reporters and television crews, at Independence Hall. The mayor

had changed his mind. The bell was not to be moved. Brooks thought fast. He escorted Rizzo into the tower stair hall. As tourists flowed past, he reminded the mayor that the city was predicting that 40 million people would come to Philadelphia in 1976. The park service had estimated that only 2 million could be accommodated in Independence Hall. If the mayor did not want the Liberty Bell moved, the park service would not move it; they would simply tell the remaining 38 million people that they could not see the bell because of the mayor's decision. Having made his point, Brooks quickly shifted to something he thought Rizzo could agree to, the limitations of other locations. He reminded Rizzo that Independence Square was impossible because of the Barry statue. Brooks then shepherded the group out through the front door and across Chestnut Street. Here Rizzo stopped and informed the reporters that this was where the bell would go. With a fine sense for drama and publicity, Rizzo, then considering running for governor, had put his imprimatur on the site that had been carefully and quietly negotiated several months before.[154]

Romaldo Giurgola worked smoothly with the park service in fulfilling their requirements for the Liberty Bell Pavilion. The building must not compete with Independence Hall, but become part of the vista. The bell must remain visually accessible at all times and within the building the bell must be accessible to the touch. The design must also provide shelter for the bell and for visitors waiting to see it. Giurgola investigated several different solutions for the design problem, including colonnades and arcades. In the end he chose a simple solution, a long low-lying building with its axis perpendicular to that of Independence Hall. Its footprint was analogous to a dumbbell, a large space at the north end in which people could gather, another at the south to house the Liberty Bell. The two would be linked by a long corridor, in which the lines of people waiting to see the bell would form. Large areas of the exterior cladding

would be glass. The bell itself would be set against a south wall entirely of glass. At any hour of the day, passersby could see the bell. From within the visitor would view the Liberty Bell against the backdrop of Independence Hall. Although the building thus assumed the function of a large exhibit case in which the bell would be placed, the design was not universally beloved. Comparisons to subway stations and branch banks were voiced when it was unveiled and have continued ever since. The client and architect, however, were well satisfied. In Cawood's opinion the building's simple and low-keyed contemporary design enhances the power of the object it was designed to house. Nor does Giurgola resent the comparisons. "I like that in a way," he has said. "It wants to be a building familiar in its form and adequate to trees around and a very simple kind of gesture during the day -- a memory to be awakened without too much pretense."[155]

Although the design process progressed smoothly, and construction also began in the Spring of 1975, paying for the Liberty Bell Pavilion required some ingenuity -- indeed creative juggling -- on the part of Brooks and Cawood. Only $225,000 had been appropriated for moving the Liberty Bell; the price tag for the building was close to $900,000. Going to Congress for a special appropriation might reopen debate on the controversial question of moving the Liberty Bell. It would be necessary to find the money elsewhere. Some could be obtained by using funds that had been appropriated for the design of a maintenance building, but this would still be far short of what was needed. Once again, as had been the case with Area F, Brooks and Cawood appealed to Arthur Kaufmann. True to his commitment, Kaufmann, through the Independence Hall Association had raised $500,000 for reconstruction of the Graff House. The check, however, had not yet been presented to the National Park Service. On the other hand, money for the Graff House construction had already been

sufficiently dignified. In the event, the planning went awry because of circumstances beyond Cawood's control. December 31, 1975 proved to be a night of cold rain and harsh winds. Rain soaked the uniformed children waiting to perform as the bell was moved across Chestnut Street. Gusts shook temporary wiring and interfered with lighting and television transmission.[158]

Nevertheless, as the Centennial Bell in the Independence Hall tower sounded the first stroke of midnight, the Chestnut Street door opened and the Liberty Bell began the short journey to its new home. It moved smoothly down a ramp on a special cart, held in a cradle designed for the occasion by scientists at the Franklin Institute. Dignitaries and park service staff accompanied it in procession. Among those marching with the bell was Louise Boggs. Boggs had gone to work for the City of Philadelphia, as what was then carried on the official roster as a charwoman, shortly before the transfer of Independence Square to the custody of the park service. Now a long-time member of the park's maintenance staff, she had cared for the Liberty Bell and other objects in Independence Hall, learning from the curators what cleaning methods and materials to use. Inside the Liberty Bell Pavilion she listened to the speeches and heard actor Lee. J. Cobb read a poem. As the ceremony ended, she stepped forward. Tears mingled with the raindrops on her face. Taking a soft cloth from her bag, she began to dry the rain from the bell she had so often cleaned.[159]

IX - CELEBRATING THE BICENTENNIAL

Although Judge Edwin O. Lewis began reminding the National Park Service of the impending approach of the Bicentennial in the late 1950s, it was not until 1969 that upper management began to devote serious attention to planning the park service's role in its celebration. During the mid-1960s the park service had concentrated on the rejuvenation of its physical holdings nation-wide through the Mission 66 program. With Mission 66 funds progress was made at Independence, albeit slowly, on completion of the park as it had been envisioned in master plans drawn in the 1950s. However, as Mission 66 wound down and the financial demands of fighting the Vietnam War rose, National Park Service budgets were cut. By the 1968 fiscal year the development budget for Independence was down to $505,000, with a cut to $203,000 anticipated for the 1969 fiscal year.[1] It was not until presentation of the draft master plan of 1968-1969, and Chester Brook's repackaging of its aims as a Bicentennial program, that money and staff were made available to prepare the park for the Bicentennial. By late 1970, perception of the rapid approach of the Bicentennial was more general, and the park service was beginning to plan for its celebration on a national basis. This would scatter the park service's resources so that its national constituency would be satisfied. Nevertheless, of twenty-five projects in the National Park System accorded Bicentennial priority, five were at Independence, a fact that rankled some of the regional directors and park superintendents in the west, who were accustomed to getting the largest share of any park service pie.[2] Gradually as it became apparent that the celebration at Independence would to a large extent <u>be</u> the Bicentennial

in the city where the Declaration of Independence had been drafted and signed, the program at Independence acquired even greater urgency.

There was little reason in the late 1960s to think that Independence would be more than a contributing factor, albeit an important one, to the national celebration of the Bicentennial. The City of Philadelphia, remembering its glorious hours as the setting for the Centennial Exhibition in 1876, had determined that this triumph could be repeated, although in a different key, in 1976. In the early 1960s various non-profit groups began to meet to formulate a "master exposition plan" for Philadelphia. By 1967 these groups had coalesced into the Philadelphia Bicentennial Corp., with a 50-man board headed by Jack Kelly (soon to resign) and Henderson Supplee Jr. The 1876 exposition had been a display of the United States' emerging industrial might. The most popular exhibit, outdrawing even the midway, was the 40-foot-high Corliss engine that powered the fair's machinery. The 1976 celebration, as the Bicentennial Corp. envisioned it, would capture the spirit of the occasion through a three-pronged approach. It would offer the traditional world's fair carnival atmosphere combined with a celebration of history. At the same time, the exposition was conceived in the heyday of Lyndon Johnson's Great Society and the civil rights movement. Its third component was a massive urban renewal program, aimed at redevelopment of black, industrial North Philadelphia, as well as completion of the still-lagging redevelopment of historic (and by now largely white) Society Hill. Transportation and other elements of the city's infrastructure would be renewed. A further contribution to the economic well-being of the city would be construction of a "megastructure" of permanent exhibition buildings above the 30th Street Railroad Station.[3] Although disapproving the megastructure component of the concept, Denise Scott-Brown and Robert Venturi articulated the

social purposes. With so much wrong in the United States, any celebration should address the major issues facing the country. "We have a war here," they declared, "against social injustice, poverty and prejudice." Wherever the Bicentennial was celebrated it should "provide jobs and opportunities for low-income residents; also, if there is to be an historical commemoration the ghetto should get its share. Its historical buildings and places should receive special attention and the Expo exhibits on black history should be located in the rehabilitated streets and buildings of the ghetto."[4]

Philadelphia's scheme was ambitious and costly, carrying a price tag of $1 to $2 billion. If it were to be realized, much of the money would have to come from the Federal government. The selection of Philadelphia as the site for the national celebration of the Bicentennial would depend, in part, on the recommendation of a 35-member American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, authorized by Congress in 1966. With ten years to go, however, the commission took little action. A reorganization in 1968, when members appointed by Lyndon Johnson resigned and were replaced by Richard Nixon's appointments, did little to hasten its deliberations. It was not until the summer of 1970 that the commission was prepared to hear proposals and make a recommendation. By this time other cities -- notably Boston, Washington, and Miami -- also were pressing claims to be the centerpiece of the Bicentennial. The commission's solution for resolving these conflicting proposals was to support all, or, in a sense to support none, since there were no recommendations for authorizing the almost $10 billion that the four taken together would cost. Briefly, however, it appeared that Philadelphia might still win out. The commission was persuaded to reconsider, probably by the White House, because Nixon wanted to boost Pennsylvania Senator Hugh Scott's reelection campaign. A revised recommendation

favored Philadelphia as a site for an international exposition, but the other three cities would also receive a share of the funds.[5]

By this time, however, the Philadelphia Bicentennial Corp. was crumbling under the combined effects of the dispersion of proposed federal support and internal dissension. Black members walked out of meetings, fearing that their concerns would be ignored when sufficient federal funding failed to materialize. Their pessimism proved justified. By the end of 1970, Philadelphia newspapers reported that Secretary of Commerce Maurice Stans had written, but never sent, a letter accusing the Bicentennial Corp. of using the exposition as a "whipsaw for every project in the city." A Commerce Department spokesman added, "We thought we were approving an exposition, not an urban renewal project."[6]

As the 1972 presidential election approached, it became increasingly clear that Philadelphia would have to scale down its plans. In May the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission recommended that there be no international exposition. Difficulties in selecting a site, as well as the costs, were cited as reasons for the cancellation. Cynics suggested that with an election approaching, scattering Bicentennial largesse around the country was good politics. Following the inaugural, the Nixon administration proposed and Congress accepted, abolition of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, which would be replaced by an American Revolution Bicentennial Administration. The latter would exist largely to oversee the distribution of federal grants to all fifty states and to selected cities. Philadelphia would be eligible to receive about $100 million. It was a far cry from the heady proposals of the previous decade, and Mayor Frank Rizzo predicted that the city's Bicentennial celebration could end up as nothing more than "a police band standing on the steps of Independence Hall playing 'The Star-Spangled Banner.'"[7] Gradually,

however, under the aegis of a new organization, Philadelphia '76, fresh, if more modest, plans for the Bicentennial began to emerge. They would depend on the city's existing institutions for exhibits, cultural activities, and major sporting events. The historical centerpiece for the celebration would be Independence National Historical Park.[8]

While the Philadelphia Bicentennial Corp. spun its elaborate plans in the late 1960s, the National Park Service drowsed. Bicentennial or no Bicentennial, the park service proceeded to go about master planning in its usual methodical way. A planning team produced a draft, which would then be subject to rounds of comment from the park, the region, various service centers, and the Washington directorate. The result would be a series of compromises, ensuring that all points of view would be accommodated. Those responsible for research, for interpreting a park to the public, and for operating and maintaining the park and all its facilities would all have their say. The National Park Service considers its purpose to preserve and maintain what it terms the resources with which it is entrusted, either natural or manmade, in perpetuity. In that context, the several years it may take to produce a master plan for a major park are relatively short. The process is one befitting an agency that takes a very long view, but is not efficient when the purpose shifts to preparing a facility for a specific occasion in a short time. The final 1971 master plan for Independence that was the product of this process was thus not completed until after several important decisions affecting the park's development had been made on an ad hoc basis. It was also, at the time, unique among park service master plans in relating the plan to the surrounding community and region. In contrast with previous plans for the park, it was not entirely the result of internal cogitation. Reflecting the new stress on urban areas within the National Park

Service that had evolved during the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, the master plan was prepared in consultation with agencies representing the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the City of Philadelphia. Less concerned than previous plans with specific blueprints for park development (much of which already existed or was underway), the plan acknowledged the need of

> multilateral action by the Service, the Commonwealth, the City and local interests in order to achieve adequate visitor services, proper access and circulation, parking facilities, revitalization and redevelopment of the surrounding area, Bicentennial arrangements, and historic preservation and interpretation of existing resources.

For the first time also the plan recognized the role of Independence as a catalyst in the redevelopment of Society Hill and in the slow rebirth of Center City as the cultural and entertainment center for the Philadelphia metropolitan area.[9]

Although work on the master plan began in 1968, it was not until Chester Brooks's arrival in January 1969 that Independence was galvanized, and an accelerated program to prepare the park for the Bicentennial was put into effect. In a little over two years as superintendent Brooks, with the assistance of his administrative officer, Howard LaRue, set firm schedules for completion of projects already underway, assembled and fought for an adequate budget, and shepherded the Bicentennial program for Independence through the park service directorate and Congress. By the time Hobie Cawood assumed the superintendency in the Fall of 1971, the framework for what needed to be done was in place. However, executing the program in time for the Bicentennial, and doing it as Cawood wanted, with "class," would require extraordinary dedication and teamwork.

No matter what the fate of the nation's or Philadelphia's Bicentennial plans, Cawood was determined that at Independence the occasion would be

celebrated with style. Cawood believed, and imbued all those concerned with the belief, that no matter what other events were scheduled, on July 4, 1976, the eyes of the world would be on Independence. Cawood had an enormous appetite for work, thriving on a schedule of twelve to fourteen hour days, six or seven days a week. His enthusiasm and ebullient personality were important ingredients in driving the complicated development plan to a successful conclusion. His blend of friendliness, courtliness, and down-home folksiness were novel, but effective, in staid Philadelphia. Even Britain's Princess Margaret, known as a stickler for formality and protocol, failed to take offense when Cawood opened the door of her limousine and the warm Kentucky voice said, "Hi, Princess Margaret. I'm Hobie Cawood."[10] It was more, however, than a matter of charm. Everyone who dealt with him became aware that Cawood genuinely believed that the United States was the best country in the world, believed in and would uphold the principles set forth in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, and believed that showing people the places where those principles had been formulated was a vitally important task.

Those beliefs were an important factor in keeping the Independence development program on target, despite the threats of strikes, materials shortages, and budget shortfalls. Thanks, in part, to Cawood's persuasivesness, contractors and workmen wanted to be a part of the Bicentennial effort. At every pre-construction meeting Cawood would deliver a patriotic oration, before turning over the floor to Fred Spenser, who would deal with day-to-day construction supervision. If delays were threatened or the quality was not up to the standard he wanted, Cawood would tackle the problem directly.

Dissatisfied with the brickwork at the Visitor Center, he went to the contractor and said,

> "Hey, buddy, your brick guy -- the guy's not putting good brick work into this. Let me talk to the guys." We'd sit down and talk, and I'd say, "This is going to be the centerpiece in the Bicentennial. You're going to bring your grandchildren to this Visitor Center one of these days. You want to say, 'I put those bricks in there,' and you want to be proud of it." And, you know, they responded to that.

In 1975, the city was building its living history center at the corner of Race and Fifth Streets at the same time that the park was building the Liberty Bell Pavilion. The city's project was shut down by an operating engineers' strike, while the park's project continued to proceed on schedule. William Rafsky of Philadelphia '76 called Cawood to ask how the park had managed to keep the construction crew at work. Cawood's reply was simple. "I asked them to do it and they did."[11]

But the force of one man's personality alone could never have accomplished the transformation of what Assistant Superintendent James Sullivan had called the "park of locked doors," because so few of its buildings were open to visitors, into a facility that was capable of accommodating 15 million people in 1976.[12] When Cawood became superintendent in the fall of 1971, the only buildings that were open on a regular schedule throughout the year were Independence Hall and Congress Hall. Restoration of the Todd House and the Bishop White House was complete, as was reconstruction of the Pemberton House and New Hall, but personnel to staff these buildings on a regular basis was lacking. Cawood would have to oversee not only completion of the construction of the remainder of the park, but also a program to interpret and provide access to all

the park's facilities. It was an effort that would require strong teamwork, and in which Cawood saw his major role as orchestrator and expediter. He understood the necessity of having good professionals available and taking their advice, while supplying them with the community support, the approvals, and the money that they needed to keep the program moving.[13]

There was already on hand at Independence a strong cadre of professionals who were thoroughly familiar with the park and plans for its completion. Marty Yoelson would shift from research to overseeing the content of the interpretive program, both in terms of exhibitry what is known in park service jargon as "personal interpretation," the conveying of information by guides. As movie scripts and exhibits were completed and installed in 1975, he and his staff undertook training of the expanded force of interpreters, the people who would guide tours, deliver explanatory talks, and answer visitors' questions. Lee Nelson left in 1972 to join the staff of the Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation in Washington, but Penny Batcheler remained to assume responsibility for restoration of the interior of Old City Hall, and to provide design support for the outside architects responsible for the other restoration and reconstruction projects. John Milley would supervise an expanded curatorial staff responsible for furnishing the newly-opened facilities and for finally mounting and exhibiting the great collection of portraits, primarily from the hand of Charles Willson Peale, of the leading figures of the Revolutionary and Federal eras.

What was needed was administrative staff to assist in moving the construction program forward and to maintain and expand the park's operation. Howard LaRue remained from Brooks's tenure to program construction schedules and

oversee issuance of specifications, bid documents, and contracts. In his first two years at Independence Cawood began to assemble the additional personnel he needed. One of the key slots was that of assistant superintendent. In 1972 Sullivan left to become superintendent of Colonial National Historical Park in Yorktown, Virginia. His replacement was Douglas Warnock, whom Cawood had requested, having made his acquaintance during a management training course. Like many of those who came to Independence in the early 1970s, Warnock had operations experience in the larger western parks. More diffident than Cawood in social situations, he assumed responsibility for much of the day-to-day operation at Independence, leaving Cawood free for the public contact at which he was so adept. Cawood could thus carry on public relations, seek political support, and engage in fund-raising, knowing that the park would continue to run smoothly. Contact between the two was constant and informal[14]. The superintendent's office at Independence occupies a three-room suite at the rear of park headquarters at 313 Walnut Street. The secretary shared by the superintendent and the assistant superintendent, during the Bicentennial years Doris Bean, has her desk in the outer office. The doors are always open. The occupants of all three spaces shout back and forth frequently and freely, or walk into one another's offices at will. There is rarely a day that goes by without all three knowing exactly what the others are doing. This informality extends to other facets of the park's management. Any supervisor can walk into the superintendent's office at virtually any time, and Cawood or his assistant superintendent drop in at other park offices to discuss a problem or seek the answer to a question. At Independence supervisors meet in weekly staff meetings, called squad meetings in the park service, where issues are discussed, and the park's solutions and policies are formulated. Each division leader is

then responsible for transmitting the conclusions of the meeting to his or her staff. Because of this constant oral communication, there are fewer memoranda or letters written than in earlier administrations.

In part the decrease in paperwork is the result of Cawood's management style, but it is also a trend that has affected the entire park service. With the advent of the Federal Telephone System in the late 1950s, and the increased possibility of air travel, personal and telephone communication has replaced much of the paper record through which issues formerly were discussed and decisions memorialized. The informality of decision-making extended to the relationship between Cawood and Brooks. Each believed in delegating authority and in supporting a trusted subordinate's decisions. Fortunately Cawood was already known to Brooks and enjoyed his confidence. Cawood often made decisions, which would normally first have been referred to the regional director for approval and told Brooks about them afterwards, in order to avoid delays in the tight construction schedule. Because each was open and communicative with his staff, others could also make on-the-spot decisions knowing that they were in accord with the overall program. In the absence of Cawood or Brooks, their deputies, Warnock and Assistant Regional Director George A. Palmer, usually were sufficiently informed about all aspects of the program to respond promptly. Although swift action was thus possible within the park and the regional office, bottlenecks were still encountered in dealing with other sectors of the park service and with outside suppliers. Brooks and Cawood convinced the director to appoint a special expediter for Bicentennial projects. Lawrence (Burr) Coryell arrived in Philadelphia in 1973, with authority to speak for the regional director in cutting red tape.[15] In Washington a

Bicentennial Action Group, promptly known in government fashion by the acronym BAG, was established with equally broad powers on the national level. Its leader, Russell Dickenson, later became director of the National Park Service.

Brooks and Cawood also found it necessary to perform some legerdemain with funds to keep projects moving on schedule. The ordinary five-year-long cycle of budget preparation and appropriation could not accommodate the rapid pace of development. Despite careful planning and estimating, there were budget shortfalls at Franklin Court and the Liberty Bell Pavilion. Brooks and Cawood, with the cooperation of Arthur Kaufmann, paid for the latter with funds appropriated and donated for reconstruction of the Graff House. Money that had been programmed for an exhibit at the First Bank of the United States went instead to Franklin Court. In error, a sum to reconstruct the clock on the west facade of Independence Hall was budgeted twice. With the silent consent of the Washington office, that too went to other projects at Independence.[16]

One of the most important aspects of the expanding park's operation would be dealing with its visitors, especially in view of the enormous crowds expected for the Bicentennial. In the early 1970s projections anticipated that 45 million people would come to Philadelphia in 1976 and that most of them would visit Independence. Park personnel would be responsible for the safety of those people and also for that of the park and its contents, as well as for ensuring that visitors had an experience that was both enjoyable and educational. These dual responsibilities were the purview of a Division of Interpretation and Resource Management, to head which Cawood recruited Clyde M. Lockwood. Lockwood came to Independence from Mount Rainier in the state of Washington. He brought with him what Cawood characterizes as "that old 'can do' attitude, the kind of thing that we like to think National Park Service people do all over the

service."[17] It is an attitude that looks upon working for the National Park Service as something more than a job or even a career, but indeed as a service to the parks and to the people. This viewpoint is carefully imbued in National Park Service personnel, especially in those whom their supervisors expect to rise in management, through policy manuals, carefully calculated transfers and promotions, and in-service training sessions. It includes willingness to put in more than a standard number of hours, and to do a job yourself if there is no other way to get it done. In 1974 the Philadelpha Convention and Vistors Bureau instituted a series of candlelight tours of the park and Society Hill. On evenings when the park could not afford to pay guides for the Todd House, it was Cawood and Lockwood who opened the building and showed it to visitors.[18]

When Lockwood arrived in the Spring of 1973, he viewed his first duty as bringing the protection program at Independence up to what he conceived of as National Park Service standards. The twelve men then employed for protection had for the most part been hired locally, and had never worked at a park other than Independence. They functioned primarily as guards and night watchmen. During the day they stood guard duty at fixed points; at night they made rounds, recording their stops at various checkpoints with watchmen's clocks. Lockwood oversaw the installation of added portable radio units and computerized alarm systems, so that the protection staff could respond quickly and efficiently to places where there were indications of trouble. He also added two guard dogs, the first in the National Park Service. With their handlers, trained at the Philadelphia Police Academy, King and Chuckie began to assist in night patrol, in "sweeping" Independence Hall before VIP visits, and in guarding the empty basement after the building was cleared.[19]

Training for the security staff, which would more than double in size in

the next two years, fell largely to Richard O'Guin, who was responsible for security under Lockwood. O'Guin had had police experience before joining the National Park Service, and had attended the FBI Academy. He sent some of his staff to the Philadelphia Police Academy, saw that all received training in first aid, and worked with all of them in groups and on a one-to-one basis. Part of their training included role-playing, in which their reactions to anticipated situations were observed and discussed. As visitors and staff increased, and the presence of every member of the staff was required on duty in the park, O'Guin instituted a buddy system, in which a new recruit would work in partnership with a well-trained veteran. Although highly conscious of security requirements, O'Guin expected his people to work in what he characterized as "the National Park Service way," in which education is more important than enforcement. "I'd rather do things the ranger way than the cop way, the police way. We don't bump heads. That isn't what we're interested in."[20]

The other aspect of Lockwood's job required oversight of the park's largest staffing requirement, for visitors' services. Out of a total staff of 421 in 1976, visitors' services would account for at least 200.[21] It included those people, in uniform and in costume, conducting tours of the park and of Independence Hall, greeting visitors at Congress Hall and Franklin Court, giving talks at the Liberty Bell, operating the desk at the Visitor Center, and even the projectionists showing the movies at Franklin Court and the Visitor Center. Brooks, LaRue and Sullivan had begun to develop figures reflecting manpower and funding needs for these functions before the latter's departure for Colonial. George Reeves, who was head of visitors' services from 1973 to 1975, fleshed out the program further, detailing, through his budget the precise numbers needed at each facility.[22]

It has always been easier for the National Park Service to obtain funding for acquisition and development than for operations. In 1975 it appeared that the Bicentennial year would be no exception. Citing inflation and budget constraints, National Park Service Director Gary Everhardt announced that the administrations's operating budget for 1975 would be $403.9 million. Congress had earmarked $9.1 million for Bicentennial activities, which was substantially less than the park service had asked for. Although Everhardt acknowledged that Independence would be the "focal point" of the park service's Bicentennial celebration, it was unlikely that the park would get all it had requested.[23] By the Spring of 1975, the dimensions of the gap at Independence were clear. The National Park Service had received authorization for fifty new positions nation-wide; of those twenty-seven had been apportioned to Independence, but 112 more were needed.[24]

Help came from several quarters. In March a regional directors' meeting, at which Everhardt was expected to be present, was scheduled to take place at Independence. Cawood had always enjoyed a cordial relationship with the Philadelphia press. He and Warnock were punctilious about returning reporters' calls and telling them the truth about what was going on at Independence. The support of the press proved particularly useful at this juncture. Hearing about the pending shortfall in staffing, Creed C. Black, editor of the Philadelphia Inquirer and a fellow Kentuckyian, called Cawood and asked whether he thought the newspaper could be helpful. Cawood said yes. When the director and regional directors arrived for their conference each found at his place a copy of the morning paper unfolded to the editorial page.[25] Headed "Independence National Park cannot be starved in '76," the editorial praised the progress of the development program in glowing terms, contrasting it with the disarray of

other Bicentennial plans. Under those circumstances, the paper found the failure to supply the park with needed personnel incomprehensible.

> In the normal course of things, it might be assumed that a project of this kind would proceed in three stages: planning, construction and operation. Thus far it has moved smoothly through planning, and construction is on or ahead of schedule.
>
> But operation is something else. To staff the expanded facilities, the Park Service asked that its personnel be increased from 125 to 227. That's an additional 102 people at a cost of $1.4 million a year.
>
> The Office of Management and Budget, however, has cut that back to only 27 more people. As just one example, the Park Service had asked for 20 new positions to staff Independence Mall, which it has just taken over from the state. It got none. Zero. Zilch. And that, fellow Americans, is where the Liberty Bell will be. 26

This was the opening salvo in a campaign to obtain adequate staffing for Independence. Arthur Kaufmann, who had thought his lobbying days were at last over, once again began to importune members of Congress on behalf of Independence. John O'Hara, managing partner of Price, Waterhouse's Philadelphia office, and also a member of the advisory commission and the Independence Hall Association, sent copies of the Inquirer editorial and other editorials supporting the park to every Senator and Congressman. Other citizens also wrote to their legislators. One staffer told Cawood that members of Congress had forwarded about twenty pounds of mail supporting the park's request to the Office of Management and Budget. As an employee of the executive branch, Cawood could not initiate direct contact with members of Congress asking them to contravene the administration's budget request. When he happened to encounter Congressman Joshua Eilberg one day in the lobby of the Bellevue-Stratford, he felt free, however, to answer Eilberg's question about how things were going at Independence in detail. Eilberg invited Cawood to Washington to brief his

staff, and Cawood took the opportunity to visit with other members of the local Congressional delegation. As always, Senator Hugh Scott was supportive in the upper house.[27] Eventually Independence received almost fifty additional new positions for 1975, for a total of seventy-six, and its full roster for 1976. In addition to coping with the crowds expected to visit Independence on a daily basis, the park would have to be prepared to accommodate an increased number of special events. Eventually Lockwood set up a three-person office to handle these under the leadership of Maria Burks. There would be approximately 2,000 special events at Independence in 1975-1976, most under the authorization of permits issued to outside groups. In addition, there was an unusually high number of visits from foreign heads-of-state. The first to come in January 1976 was Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin, followed in March by Prime Minister Liam Cosgrove of the Irish Republic, and in April by King Carl XVI Gustav of Sweden. In July, in addition to those present for the official celebrations, Norway's Crown Prince Harald and his Princess, and West German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt visited the park.[28]

By this time the procedure for escorting heads-of-state through the park was a well-established routine. Other events in which the park participated required extensive advance planning. The first major celebrations inaugurating the Bicentennial were held in 1974, commemorating the meeting of the First Continental Congress in Carpenters' Hall. In September and October Philadelphia '76 and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, with the cooperation of the Carpenters' Company and the National Park Service, sponsored a series of events. Some were meant to engender a festival atmosphere, including demonstrations of colonial crafts and military maneuvers on Independence Mall, street festivals in Old City and on the Benjamin Franklin Parkway, and movie and concert series.

Others were more directly targeted at celebrating the event. A lecture series by eminent historians, including Bernard Bailyn, Richard Morris, and Edmund Morgan, drew overflowing audiences. Pennsylvania's primary contribution was a two-day "reconvening" of the Continental Congress. Fifty-two delegates, including the governors of the thirteen original colonies, met on September 5 and 6 in Carpenters' Hall. Among them was a future President of the United States, then Governor of Georgia Jimmy Carter. On the evening of the first day the Carpenters' Company were hosts at a reception in the long gallery on the second floor of Independence Hall. The second day concluded with Pennylvania's dinner for 1500 people, served under tents on Independence Mall, then still the property of the state. President Gerald Ford was the principal speaker. The festivities ended with a fireworks display.[29] Ironically these celebrations, the inauguration of the commemoration of the Bicentennial, the purpose toward toward which so much of his effort on behalf of development of the park had been directed, coincided with the death of Judge Edwin O. Lewis on September 18.[30]

The park's own Bicentennial kick-off was scheduled for October 13 and 14, and revolved around the opening of the portrait gallery in the Second Bank of the United States. This event was the culmination of the work of the museum branch and, in particular of its chief, John Milley. There had been a curatorial function at Independence since the early 1950s. Like archaeology, the museum function initially was administratively under the aegis of the historians' office. Primarily it was charged with researching, acquiring, caring for, and displaying appropriate furnishings and decorative arts in the restored and reconstructed buildings. At the same time, the park service was well aware that in acquiring custody of the contents of the buildings on

Independence Square from the City of Philadelphia, it had assumed stewardship of a major collection of American paintings. These were a group of portraits, by Charles Willson Peale and members of the Sharples family, of the principal figures of the Revolutionary and Federal eras. In the late 1950s and early 1960s the staff at Independence included a conservator, Anne F. Clapp, whose duties included restoration of the portrait collection.[31] Clapp also performed analyses of paint samples from the historic buildings, teaching the techniques to Penny Batcheler, and restored the fresco that adorned the coved ceiling of the Senate Chamber in Congress Hall. When Clapp left, she was not replaced. Instead, the portraits were sent, a few at a time, to the Fogg Museum at Harvard University for restoration.[32]

In 1957 David W. Wallace joined the park staff as a historian. Wallace had training in the fine arts as well as history. Within a year he had shifted to the curatorial staff, becoming its supervisor in 1959. He began to prepare a systematic inventory of the city's collections, which included approximately 4,000 objects, as well as the Peale portraits.[33] Nevertheless, the emphasis continued to be on the furnishings program, which beginning with the first refurnishing of the Assembly Room in 1955, extended to the Bishop White and Todd Houses, Congress Hall, the refinement of the Assembly Room's contents before the fully restored space was reopened in 1965, the other rooms in Independence Hall, and City Tavern. It encompassed the fitting out of 50 period rooms and 70 exhibit areas, and the assemblage of a collection of approximately 18,000 pieces.[34]

The acquisition of appropriate pieces was both exciting and sometimes frustrating. Purchasing good objects on a limited budget required a thorough understanding of the antiques market and considerable knowledge of the

collectors and dealers through whose hands such pieces might pass. Fortunately during the 1960s and early 1970s, two people on the staff knew the antiques business. Fred Hanson, a Winterthur graduate, was the son of antiques dealers, and Charles Dorman had worked for a well-known dealer. Money, however, was always a problem. Some acquisition funds were included in the construction budgets, but were never sufficient. At Independence Hall this relative poverty was alleviated by large donations from outside organizations. In 1953 the General Federation of Women's Clubs gave over $215,000 towards the restoration of the first floor. Almost twenty years later, in 1972, thanks largely to the persuasive efforts of Dorman and Milley, the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution gave $190,000 for furnishing the second floor.[35] Owners of appropriate pieces were often generous, notably people and institutions related to Bishop White. Another private donor was a spinster from Richmond, Virginia, who wrote to the park saying she was willing to contribute some family furnishings with a Philadelphia history. As was routinely done, Dorman replied, asking for further information and photographs. There was no response. Several months later, however, Dorman, who was then placing furniture in the second floor of Independence Hall, was summoned by walkie-talkie. His sometime correspondent was in the park asking to see him. When they met, she told Dorman that a neighbor had offered her a ride to Philadelphia; so she had come, bringing one of the pieces. Dorman accompanied her back to the car. There, resting in majesty, was the finest eighteenth-century Philadelphia armchair he had ever seen. With the owner in tow, he returned to Independence Hall, placing the chair in a place of honor in the Governor's Council Chamber. Others of her family heirlooms proved to be of later date and lesser quality, and were gently rejected.[36]

Some cash donations were proffered to enable the park to acquire specific items. When a desk that had belonged to Benjamin Franklin was to be auctioned, the purchase price of $40,000 came partly from park service funds, and partly from contributions from the Eastern National Park and Monument Association and individuals.[37] Usually, however, there was no time to raise funds when an important piece came on the market. Milley was especially frustrated when a self-portrait of Charles Willson Peale was to be auctioned. Although at the last minute a private donor offered to purchase it for the park, it was too late. Furthermore, there was no budget for conservation, for accessions that would refine the collection, or for exhibits. In 1972 Milley decided that the only solution was formation of a private support group. He began to discuss the concept with a small group of people: Ann Rowland, who had offered to purchase the Peale portrait; Alice Lonsdorf and other women, who had long exhibited interest in the park through participation in the Junior League's guide program; and John O'Hara, a member of the park's advisory commission and of the Independence Hall Association. Assured of interest in such an organization and with Cawood's support, Milley proceeded to draft a constitution and by-laws for what would become the Friends of Independence National Historical Park.[38]

Meanwhile Milley was immersed in plans for mounting the portrait gallery in the great vaulted banking room of the Second Bank of the United States. This location for the portraits had been determined as early as 1960, after proposals to adapt the Second Bank for offices, a visitor center, or use by the city archives or Library Company had been considered and rejected.[39] Milley had come to Independence in 1962. After graduating from Boston University and the Winterthur program at the University of Delaware, he had done further graduate work at John Hopkins University, and then served for a year as a curatorial

assistant at the Abby Aldrich Folk Art collection at Williamsburg. He became curator of paintings at Independence in 1967.[40] This gave him primary responsibility for the eighty-five Peale portraits and forty-five portraits painted by various members of the Sharples family, owned by the City of Philadelphia and entrusted to the park's stewardship. The following year he received an internship for a year's study at the National Portrait Gallery, where he expanded his studies of Peale and the Sharples family, and also acquired familiarity with conservation and restoration techniques.[41]

Milley therefore had an extraordinarily high interest in the portraits, and thus viewed with trepidation the news that Clement Conger was arriving in Philadelphia to examine them. Conger was curator of the collections displayed in Washington in both the State Department's Diplomatic Reception Rooms and the White House. He had acquired a formidable reputation for gathering fine furnishings, decorative arts, and paintings. He obtained these through gifts, loan, and purchases made possible through donated funds, as well as by scouring the collections of other federal agencies, with the full force of Presidential backing. Brooks, then superintendent of Independence, and Milley conferred and decided that it would be the latter who would show Conger the collection, then in storage. However, at Brooks's suggestion Conger's view would be limited to the portraits belonging to the city. Thus the DuPlessis portrait of Franklin, a gift from the French nation transferred to the park by President Truman, was not among the paintings shown to Conger. While Milley was conducting Conger through the storage areas, he explained the park's plans for the portrait gallery. Conger meanwhile was making a list. When Milley asked him its purpose, Conger replied that he was listing the paintings he wanted for the White House. He ticked them off -- young Thomas Jefferson, Martha Washington, John Paul Jones,

and others, -- the jewels of the collection. Milley protested that their removal would severely diminish, if not destroy, the proposed portrait gallery. "Oh well," Milley recalled Conger saying, "we shan't treat you too badly." Conger then returned to Washington, confident that the paintings would soon follow.

Conger's confidence evidently stemmed from his belief that the portraits were federal property. In fact they were, of course, still the property of the City of Philadelphia, although they had been in the custody of the National Park Service for some twenty years. Milley had informed Conger that the proper procedure for requesting a loan of the paintings would be to address it in writing to the park's superintendent. When the request came, however, it was from the White House to National Park Service Director George Hartzog, who tranmitted it to Brooks, and took the form more of a directive than a request. Immediately after it was received, Milley arranged a meeting with the director of the Philadelphia Fine Arts Commission. Milley and the commission had already worked out a loan policy for the paintings that provided that only one at a time would go to any other gallery, for a period of no more than six months. There were no such limits on the order from the White House, which was for several paintings for an unspecified duration. Made aware of these conditions by Milley, the commission, as he had hoped, unanimously refused the loan, thus confirming their established policy.

Conger was not easily persuaded that the paintings were not his for the asking. The White House exerted considerable pressure on Hartzog, who, in turn, transferred the pressure to Brooks. Persuasion as well as pressure were employed. Brooks and Milley found themselves invited to the reception marking the restoration of the Blue Room at the White House, an honor not usually

accorded park superintendents or curators. As the pressure intensified, Brooks asked Milley to see whether the commission would reconsider. Milley refused as a matter of principle. At the conclusion of their conversation, Milley recalled Brooks saying, "John, damn it, you are right. I'm close enough to retirement. I think I can back it up too." To relieve the burden on Hartzog, Brooks wrote directly to Conger, reiterating the commission's policy and agreeing to loans if the White House would accede to that policy. There was no reply and the incident was finally closed.[42]

Conger eventually attended the party thrown by the Friends of Independence National Historical Park on the evening of October 13, 1974 to mark the opening of the portrait gallery, and graciously commented that, "It's the greatest event in American portraiture I can remember."[43] That accolade must have been particularly sweet to Milley, not only because the quality of portrait gallery depended in part on the frustration of Conger's attempt to remove its choicest components, but also because it recognized the value of Independence as a museum. Historically, the museum function was, and to some extent remains, one with which the National Park Service is not entirely comfortable. Objects and fine arts are on display at most park service properties not because of their intrinsic interest, quality, or beauty (although they may possess these characteristics), but because they contribute in some way to the park's interpretive program. This was an attitude that Milley found so unsympathetic that after he finished his museum internship at the National Portrait Gallery, he was undecided about returning to Independence. Milley believed that with collections of the quality of those at Independence the park required a staff that could care for them properly, perform research, plan for their improvement, and make them known to the museum community and the general public. A meeting

with Chester Brooks convinced him that this might be possible at Independence, and that the prospect of developing a museum in the Second Bank was exciting. After his return to Independence, he began to put time and effort into making himself known as a museum professional in Philadelphia, teaching courses in museum methods at Temple University and becoming active in the affairs of the city's Museum Council, including serving a term as its president. He instituted a program that brought students from Temple and the University of Pennsylvania to serve internships in the park. He also encouraged his staff to participate in professional activities in the museum world. To Milley this was his greatest accomplishment at Independence, establishing a professional museum staff that remains unique among national parks.[44]

The opening of the portrait gallery was the tangible expression of that professionalism. Milley had planned it down to the last detail. Working back from the target date, he had prepared a large chart several years before, noting when various phases of the restoration of the building must be accomplished, when restoration of the paintings and their frames would have to be completed, when the paintings would be hung, even on what date the invitations would be sent to the printer and when they would be mailed.[45]

The opening was also a triumph for the Friends of Independence National Historical Park, which arranged a benefit dinner for 650 people in the still unfinished Visitor Center and a cocktail reception for 1,500 at the Second Bank. The Philadelphia Inquirer's society columnist, Ruth Seltzer, thought that holding the dinner in the unfinished Visitor Center, where the guests picked their way to the entrance over construction debris and the unsheathed walls were hung with bright cloths, was "brilliant strategy. Partygoers felt that they were on the threshold of something new for historic Philadelphia."[46] The

Friends' party also symbolized the total acceptance of Independence by the social and economic leadership of Philadelphia. It offered renewed hope and confidence. Earlier schemes for celebrating the Bicentennial had failed. The opening of the Second Bank promised that at Independence, and by extension in Philadelphia, the Bicentennial would be a success.

By this time the Friends, under the active five-year chairmanship of Alice Lonsdorf, had more than fulfilled the hopes Milley and Cawood had entertained when they encouraged the organization's foundation. They were orchestrating social events, such as those associated with the opening of the portrait gallery, with style and grace, generating favorable publicity for the park not only in the public press, but also within the Washington hierarchy. They were sponsoring lectures, symposia, and publications that enhanced the park's didactic and scholarly functions. As they gained strength they would reach out to cooperate with the larger Philadelphia historical community to attract public support for its riches. They started in a small way with a program of special tours called Old Philadelphia Days, focusing on the park and Society Hill. Within a few years it had expanded to a month-long festival of tours and events, justifiably called, since it included the entire city, Philadelphia Open House.

Like most of the Friends' activities, this had a dual purpose -- to offer the public an experience of Philadelphia's historical places, and to raise money, in the case of Philadelphia Open House for both the Friends and the participating organizations. The Friends were thus able to carry out one of their primary purposes, to provide funds for the park that would not be available through the park service appropriations process. Their first major gift was a consequence of Milley's trip to England in the summer of 1972. One of the places he visited was the municipal art gallery in Bristol, which owns

the largest known collection of paintings by the Sharples family. Although the Bristol paintings are mostly of British subjects, there were among them a pair of portraits of James and Dolley Madison, painted in Philadelphia in 1796 or 1797. Milley found it not too difficult to persuade the museum's director to part with them for $20,000.[47] Emboldened by their success in raising the required funds, the Friends proceeded to more ambitious projects. In 1975 they provided $35,000 to pay for the installation of the architectural and archeological exhibit in the Franklin tenant house at 318 Market Street. In 1981 they were able to purchase the property that would become Welcome Park, the site of the Slate Roof House, for $675,000, and promptly set about raising another $750,000 for its development.[48]

These were, of course, largely volunteer efforts, although as the Friends grew they hired a small staff to organize and coordinate fund-raising and other programs. Many of the Friends also had long been or soon became involved in more conventional volunteer activities. Their garden committee provides fresh flowers for many of the park's buildings, and also assists in caring for garden areas within the park. The Friends operate a tea garden, just east of the Second Bank, which, during the warm months, dispenses ice cream and cool drinks. It is staffed partly by students, who are paid, and partly by volunteers for the Friends, who are not. Because participation in the Friends means more than giving money, it is not unusual to find members of some of Philadelphia's wealthiest families and leading businessmen scooping the visitors' ice cream cones on a summer weekend. Members of the Friends also serve, after a rigorous training program, as docents at the Second Bank. Many members of the Friends also participate in the Volunteers in the Parks guide program; conversely most of those in the program generally become members of the Friends.[49]

Volunteers in the Parks is a nation-wide program instituted in 1970.[50]. Nowhere in the National Park Service has it been accepted more warmly or been more successful over a long period of time than at Independence. So dedicated and professional are the volunteers that, in an emergency, they have even managed to operate the park for a brief period, with a skeleton staff of professionals. There are several reasons for the success of the program. Independence benefits, of course, from its urban location, which offers a large pool of potential volunteers. The revitalization of Society Hill has brought good candidates to the park's doorstep, so that volunteers are often within walking distance of their assigned posts. The building stock in Society Hill -- rowhouses and apartments -- has attracted large numbers of "empty-nesters," couples who, with children grown and often after retirement from business or profession, have chosen to move back to the city. Highly skilled and still seeking activity, many are interested in the opportunities for community service offered by the park. Independence, with good experiences with volunteers reaching back to the Junior League guides on Independence Square in the 1960s, had a history of welcoming volunteers and utilizing their services well. To assure volunteers of their importance to the park, Independence has established a well-organized structure. Volunteers are required to undergo training and be prepared to undergo retraining, both on the subjects of their interpretation and on such matters as emergency procedures. Their work is monitored and checked, just as that of the regular staff is. They must commit themselves to at least two four-hour stints per month, and their assignments, complete with breaks and lunch periods, become part of the park's personnel schedule. The corps of approximately 150 volunteers is thus treated like, and expected to behave like, the professionals alongside whom they work. They are assured that their work is

meaningful and essential to the park. The rewards lie in the work itself, in the opportunity to participate in special programs open to staff and volunteers, in parties, and in buttons or certificates representing the park's thanks for periods of service. The result has been a reliable cadre of volunteers, with a remarkably low turnover and an assumption of the park service's "can do" attitude.[51]

Despite the importance of their supplementary assistance, however, a sufficient and smoothly functioning staff is essential to providing a meaningful experience to the visitors at any park, especially at periods of peak visitation. At Independence this is provided year-round by the park technicians and rangers responsible for interpretation and protection, who are supplemented in the summer by what are known in the park service as "seasonals." Many of the latter are school teachers, an occupation well suited to summer work, and which also provides a ready-made background in conveying information to groups of people in a short period of time. Many of the seasonals return to Independence year after year and become extremely well-informed on all aspects of the interpretive program, sometimes in contrast to the "permanent" staff, some of whom are only at Independence for a relatively brief period before transferring elsewhere within the National Park System. Because Independence has an unusually large interpretive staff, it has become an "in-take" park, one where personnel beginning their park service jobs can obtain an entry-level post.

This was certainly true during the Bicentennial, when the park's staff doubled in two years, with over 200 people assigned to the interpretive function in 1976. Because it remained uncertain whether appropriations for such a large build-up would be forthcoming, finding and hiring them had to be done with some haste in the late winter and early spring. The task fell to the newly-appointed

Chief of Visitor Services Kathleen DiLonardo. Cawood kept urging haste on her, pushing her not to be so concerned with the quality of the applicants, but to fill the roster. While acting with appropriate speed, DiLonardo refused to compromise on selection standards, an attitude that ultimately won her increased respect from Cawood.[52]

The interpreters manning the park's buildings in 1975 and 1976 differed considerably from their counterparts of the early 1960s. They were no longer confined to "young ladies" dressed to emulate airline stewardesses. There were now men as well as women in the interpreters' ranks. Gone also were the specially designed outfits of the late 1960s and early 1970s. Men and women alike, except for a few who appeared in period costume, wore the standard park service olive-green uniform, with the "Smokey Bear" hat, gray felt in the winter and straw in the summer. The only differentiation was that the women could choose to wear skirts rather than trousers.

The training also was briefer and the scheduling more complicated. By now far more of the park was in operation, and the interpreters, under a supervising ranger, were assigned to one of its five districts: Independence Square; the Liberty Bell and the Graff House; the Second Bank, Pemberton House and New Hall; Franklin Court; and the Visitor Center, Todd House, Bishop White House, and Kosciuszko House. In an attempt to avoid monotony, they were rotated from building to building within their districts. New interpreters were given a week of training in interpretation, with David Dutcher and Joan Marshall as their primary instructors, and a second week in their districts, to learn how each of the buildings and other facilities operated and to become familiar with the schedules. They also received some training from the protection staff on such matters as first aid and other emergency measures, as well as from consultant

specialists in non-verbal communication and something called "interpretive contact". The park service, one supervising ranger commented, "is very much concerned about friendly figures."[53] There was perhaps more emphasis on how to interact with visitors and less on transmitting the fruits of the park's research program to interpreters than in the 1960s. Each interpreter received a packet of study materials and then had the freedom to develop his or her own presentation. Supervisors would listen to and critique the performance, as other interpreters often did in an informal manner. Interpreters were also encouraged to supplement the information in the packets with research in the park's library. Nevertheless, the training lacked some of the excitement and fire that had formerly been conveyed through direct contact between the interpreters and the historians, architects, and museum personnel. Mary Borov, who was the supervising ranger in the district covering the Graff House and the Liberty Bell, thought that the park service sometimes elevated form over substance by stressing details of appearance. "We have to worry about the content of the individual's talk, their scholarship...the way they handle crowds, the expression on their face, the shine on their shoes, the body language they use, and whether their hats are on straight."[54]

It proved to be fortunate that at least some of the increase in personnel at Independence was programmed for 1975 rather than 1976, because visitation to the park began to increase earlier than anticipated. By 1974 the number of visits had risen to 3.4 million from the previous year's 2.2 million. In 1975 it reached 3.9 million.[55] To observers in the park it appeared that many Americans had responded to forecasts of huge crowds of Bicentennial visitors at Independence by scheduling their trips a year or two early. The worst period came in February 1976. Approval of the park service budget came late that year,

and Cawood did not know until early in the month whether he would be able to afford the year-round and seasonal staff he believed he needed. The process of hiring additional staff had therefore not yet begun when "President's weekend" hit. This weekend in late February, devoted to the joint celebration of Washington's and Lincoln's birthdays, is always a busy one at Independence. In the depths of the late winter doldrums and faced with a holiday with a patriotic motif, thousands of parents simultaneously decide that it is a fine time to take the children to see Independence Hall and the Liberty Bell. With no seasonals on the roster to handle the extra people, the holiday is always a strain on the park's resources. The crowds in February 1976 were unexpectedly large. Over 200,000 people were counted in the park that month, with over 50,000 at the Liberty Bell on Presidents' weekend. They seemed to augur a year in which, even with an augmented staff, the park would be overwhelmed.[56]

In the event, the fears proved unjustified. The increased staff was more than adequate to handle the 6 million visits that were clocked at Independence in 1976. Nobody could pinpoint accurately why the 20 to 40 million visitors predicted for Philadelphia had failed to materialize. Evidently the predictions themselves had frightened many away, especially when coupled with Mayor Rizzo's forecasts of civic violence. The outbreak of Legionnaire's Disease that struck the American Legion convention in the spring may also have been a factor. Nevertheless, the pressures on the interpreters, the people in the front line, were intense at some locations. During the summer months, groups of 85 to 100 people started a tour of Independence Hall every ten minutes during the eleven hours a day the building was normally open. Often the crowds grew restive waiting in the long lines that snaked into Independence Square from the rear door of the orientation center in the east wing, where the tours began. In the

building itself, however, people tended to be quiet, awed by the almost sacred quality of the events it had witnessed.[58] They seemed to share a common emotion expressed by President Richard Nixon after a visit to Independence Hall.

> I remember my reactions, for example, when I visited Independence Hall in Philadelphia in 1972 to sign the new revenue sharing legislation. Walking into the building where that small group of patriots gathered some two centuries ago, I thought back to what it must have been like when the giants of our American heritage solemnly committed themselves and their children to liberty. The dilemmas they faced, the uncertainties they felt, the ideals they cherished -- all seemed more alive to me than ever before, and I came away with an even stronger appreciation for their courage and their vision. 59

The atmosphere at the Liberty Bell had more of a sense of carnival, and also sometimes became more unruly, especially since many people disliked, indeed were angry about, the design of the building in which it was housed.[60] The strain was so great on interpreters at both Independence Hall and the Liberty Bell that they were rotated often to quieter spots within their districts, to other stations on Independence Square in the first instance, to the Graff House in the second. The latter presented its own problems. So few visitors came to see it that the interpreters on duty there suffered from boredom.[61]

On the whole, however, the Bicentennial year was remarkably free of untoward incidents. The mood of most of the visitors was celebratory and joyous. Even waiting in line to see the Liberty Bell or enter Independence Hall they were usually patient and good-natured, happy to be participating in what seemed to be a reaffirmation of the country's purposes after the turbulence and doubts of the Viet Nam years. Those who worked at Independence shared the spirit of pride at participating in the rituals of marking 200 years of national liberty at its birthplace.[62]

The year, however, did not have a particularly auspicious beginning. Not only did a fierce rain storm mar the ceremonies attendant on moving the Liberty Bell on December 31, 1976/January 1, 1976, but both days were the occasion of bomb threats. Interpreters on duty at Independence Hall required all visitors to check parcels, and then searched women's handbags. Philadelphia police helicopters hovered over the neighborhood of the Liberty Bell Pavilion scanning the rooftops, which were manned by police sharpshooters. Fortunately, the threat proved to be an empty one.[63]

The celebration of the Fourth of July itself was comparatively calm, although once again there were bomb threats. However the weekend did have some uncomfortable moments. The Fourth fell on a Sunday, with the following Monday also an official holiday. Cawood had decided that Independence Hall and the Liberty Bell Pavilion would be open round the clock from Friday night until Monday. By late Saturday night a large crowd, mostly of young people, had gathered between Independence Hall and the Liberty Bell Pavilion, milling about or sitting on the stands that had been erected for spectators at the following day's ceremonies. Security was tight. Members of the park's supervisory staff, the park's protection force, and a special events protection team brought in from the west were all on patrol. Shortly before midnight it appeared to Chief of Protection Rich O'Guin that the crowd was becoming unruly, and he decided to close the building. Many in the crowd had been drinking, and some began to throw fireworks up at the wood-shingled roofs of the buildings, where O'Guin had stationed rangers with buckets of water to douse any incipient fires. O'Guin had misinterpreted the temper of the crowd. They did not mean to be destructive, but only to mark the occasion in a sometimes raucous manner. As midnight struck on the Centennial clock, the crowd's temper shifted. Almost

with one voice they began to sing "Happy Birthday, U.S.A.," repeating the refrain over and over. Reassured, O'Guin reopened the buildings and the rest of the night passed peacefully.[64]

The Fourth of July itself dawned bright and relatively cool, a perfect day for a celebration. There were a million people in the park that day, and one observer found them relaxed and amiable, chatting and looking out for one another's children.[65] They came to listen to President Gerald R. Ford speak and Marian Anderson sing, to hear music and to watch fireworks. There were people from all over the country and of all ages, including several governors and justices of the Supreme Court, as well as one who caught the attention of the crowd more than anyone else, movie actor Charlton Heston. There was one tense moment around four o'clock in the afternoon when the crowd began to show signs of restlessness. O'Guin asked the Philadelphia chief of police, who was on duty near Independence Hall, to move the crowd back. The police proceeded to do this, with the assistance of a providential brief rain shower. Again the moment of potential trouble passed quickly.[66]

In general, however, the crowd was tolerant and festive. Cawood, who believes in persuasion rather than force, describes one incident that, to him, typified the mood.

> In the evening watching fireworks, a guy with an open whiskey bottle was standing up on our walls. I didn't have my uniform on at the time, but I said, "Hey buddy, get down." And he said, "Who says so?" And I said, "Well, I think you ought to get down. I'm with the National Park Service, and even though I'm not in uniform, I'd like you to take my opinion, I mean my word, that I am with the National Park Service, and this is a national park, and we'd like you to get down." He crawled down and I thought he was going to hit me with the bottle, but he slung his arm around my neck, and he said, "God bless you National Park Service!" 67

Even with the Fourth of July behind them, there was very little rest for

those responsible for protection at Independence. For on Tuesday, July 6, the Queen of England was scheduled to visit the park. Once again large crowds were anticipated, with the potential that an untoward incident could have international implications. As always, when a visit from a head of state was planned, responsibility for security would be shared not only by the Philadelphia police, but also by the FBI and the Secret Service. Nevertheless, the occasion would be an additional strain on a security force already suffering from lack of sleep. O'Guin, for example, had worked for forty hours straight over the weekend.[68]

Knowing that their schedule at Independence would be a prelude to exhaustion, Cawood and O'Guin had earlier accepted an offer from security personnel in the regional office to send another special protection team to Independence from Fort McHenry for the Queen's visit. The team that had come in for the Fourth of July departed. The new team that came in on the night of July 5 had been assembled for these special assignments from many regions. Like the security force at Independence, they had been on duty through the long weekend, and tempers soon frayed. Hot and tired, the newly-arrived team objected strenuously to Cawood's directives that the summer uniform at Independence included neckties and that firearms would not be worn during the daytime. This had not been the case at Fort McHenry from which they had just come. Fort McHenry, although on an island, is close to Baltimore, so that urban crimes, such as mugging and pickpocketing, pose problems for the security force. Because of its isolated position, the park service at Fort McHenry cannot expect the type of cooperative arrangement with the metropolitan police force that Independence has long enjoyed. Having worn their guns, but not their neckties,

in Baltimore, the special security team intended to behave the same way in Philadelphia.

Telephone wires began to hum, as some of the men called their regional directors, who in turn called National Park Service Director Gary Everhardt. As the news of their attitude, and the phone calls, filtered back to Regional Director Chester Brooks and Cawood, it became evident that firm action would be needed. Accordingly Brooks and Cawood met with the group on the morning of July 6. Cawood had already been in consultation with the Secret Service and the Philadelphia police, who had assured him that they had more than enough firepower to handle any situation that might arise. He relayed this to the men, pointing out that he was prepared to obey whatever rules existed in the parks to which they were attached, but that he expected them to abide by his decision in the park in which he was in control. Most followed his directive, although some persisted in wearing their guns.[69]

The question of wearing firearms, and indeed how Cawood had handled the issue at Independence, came up in the course of a study, undertaken over the following few months, of law enforcement in the National Park Service. Crime was a topic to which the National Park Service was beginning to be forced to address itself. For the first sixty-five years of the agency's existence, law enforcement had played a minor role. The park service had dealt almost exclusively with a middle to upper middle class clientele, visiting the parks to see the wonders of the west or to commune with nature. The visitors and the rangers shared common attitudes toward preservation and care of the parks' resouces, as well a common respect for rules and authority. As the ability to travel became more widespread, and as more parks were established in or relatively accessible to urban areas, the pressures on their use intensified.

Crowd control began to be a problem, not only in the distinctively urban parks such as Independence or the parks in New York City, San Francisco, and Washington, D.C., but in some of the western parks as well. The situation was exacerbated by the anti-establishment stance adopted, especially by many young people, as a protest against the Viet Nam War and the Watergate scandal. The first major episode of violence occurred at Yosemite in 1972. What many both inside and outside the park service regarded as an invasion of hippies began to camp in the valley at Yosemite. Drinking, noise, and behavior many considered inappropriate to the pristine beauty of the setting led to a bloody confrontation between the young people and park personnel. By 1974 crime in the parks had led to the assignment to law enforcement of as much as twenty-five to thirty per cent of the personnel at some major parks. Park police, long a feature in Washington's parks, which were under the jurisdiction of National Capital Parks, a component of the National Park System, were being transferred to Gateway in New York and Golden Gate in San Francisco.[70]

The tension had not abated by the Bicentennial. The Weather Underground, a radical group, had threatened to "bring the fireworks" to Washington. Park police spent the spring of 1976 practising their response to such situations as a bomb threat at the Lincoln Memorial, a sniper firing from the top of the Washington monument, and the imprisonment of 90 hostages in the monument.[71] Although none of these dire possibilities came to fruition, debate about law enforcment within the National Park Service intensified. Rich O'Guin disagreed with Cawood's stricture against firearms in the daytime, although he honored it during his time at Independence. He believed that in cities, the protection staff should carry firearms. In his view, the potential for violence against persons was always present in urban settings. Properly trained law enforcement

personnel should be prepared to protect themselves and others by use of firearms if necessary. Besides, O'Guin believed that the presence of armed personnel was reassuring to the public. In his experience, visitors approached gun-carrying personnel by preference. The gun was a symbol that they were consulting someone with real authority[72]

It was this view that prevailed. In October Congress passed a General Authorities Act that clearly defined the law enforcement responsibilities of park service personnel. Among other provisions, it empowered the bearing and use of firearms.[73] To implement the law, the director of the National Park Service issued a policy statement making the bearing of sidearms by park protection forces mandatory. Independence protection personnel began to carry sidearms on their hips, as well as the ubiquitous walkie-talkies with which they communicate with their central office and the park's several districts.

For the Queen's visit, however, Cawood's sanguine predictions proved accurate. Once again the weather was beautiful, although warmer than on the Fourth, and so was the mood of the crowd. Royalty was to pay a long visit, and the arrangements for it had been worked out far in advance in considerable detail. Cawood's first inkling that the royal visit was a possibility came in January 1975 when Sir Peter Ramsbotham, the British ambassador, came to Philadelphia. Ramsbotham comfirmed that the Bicentennial bell, already ordered for the tower of the Visitor Center, would be a gift from the British people. Furthermore, the Queen was considering presenting the bell in person. In the summer of 1975 Ramsbotham came to Philadelphia once again, to walk through the park so that he would have some personal experience to convey to the Queen. He also requested a map of the park, brochures and other printed information, and photographs of the various buildings to take back to England. On his return to

the United States he confirmed to Cawood that the Queen would be coming to Independence to dedicate the bell. She had determined that she would walk through the entire park, with stops at Carpenters' Hall, the Second Bank, Independence Hall and the Liberty Bell. When Cawood commented that most heads of state followed a much more limited route through the park because of security considerations, Sir Peter quickly let him know that the decision on what she wanted to see had been the Queen's, and would not be countermanded.[74]

During the spring of 1976 representatives of security forces from the British Embassy, the Secret Service, and the Philadelphia Police Department began to meet regularly with the park's management and protection forces. To aid their planning, Sol Myzel, of the park's maintenance division, created a map, showing the exact route the Queen would follow through the park, where barricades would be placed to control crowds, how the seats would be arranged for the ceremonies attendant on the Queen's presentation of the Bicentennial bell. By the time the event transpired, every participant would know exactly where they and everyone else involved was to be at any given moment. They knew precisely who would be stationed at each building, when the royal party would arrive, who would open the door for the Queen, and who would greet her.[75] The preparations covered not only security arrangements, but also protocol. About a week before an important foreign visitor is expected in the park, the State Department sends a briefing book to the superintendent's office. It contains information about the visitor's country, as well as about what forms of behavior may or may not be acceptable to the particular visitors. There is a photograph of every member of the entourage, with brief biographical information, including interests and hobbies, so that conversation can be directed to what is most apt to engage the visitors. There are also

instructions on titles, and how visitors are to be addressed.[76] For Cawood, brought up in the south, it took little effort to remember to address the Queen of England as "Ma'am."[77]

The Queen and Prince Philip arrived at Penn's Landing on the royal yacht Britannia at nine o'clock on the morning of July 6. At ten o'clock they left to call at City Hall and pay their respects to Mayor Frank Rizzo. By eleven they had arrived at the park, where Cawood, Assistant Superintendent Warnock, and Secretary of the Interior Thomas S. Kleppe and Mrs. Kleppe were waiting to escort the party to the Liberty Bell. The Queen's party proceeded to the observation deck atop the Penn Mutual Tower, and then returned to the yacht for luncheon. At three o'clock they were back in the park for the dedication ceremony at the Bicentennial bell. A high school band from Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, entertained with stirring music, and then the Queen made a brief and gracious speech. Ruefully acknowledging that her ancestor George III had been mistaken, she expressed gratitude to the Founding Fathers for having taught the British "to respect the right of others to govern themselves in their own way." That lesson, she acknowledged, had enabled Britian to turn an empire into a commonwealth.[78] The speech has been inscribed on a bronze tablet set into the wall of the Visitor Center tower that houses the Bicentennial bell.

From the Visitor Center the royal party began a tour of Independence that lasted for an hour and a half. They formed a procession led by the Queen with Secretary Kleppe on her left and Cawood on her right. Behind them came Prince Philip, escorted by Mrs. Kleppe and Warnock, with the rest of the royal entourage following. Progess was slow because the Queen stopped to shake hands and chat with groups and individuals along the way -- a gathering of Girl Scouts representing the fifty states, a man whose Australian accent could be heard

above the murmuring of the crowd. Philip also paused often, to look at something that had attracted his interest, and to ask Warnock for additional information. The first stop was at Carpenters' Hall, where members of the Carpenters' Company were assembled to greet them. Charles E. Peterson, serving as the Company's historian, presented the royal couple with a specially bound copy of the Company's Bicentennial publication, Building Early America. The group then proceeded to the Second Bank, where John Milley provided a brief tour of the portrait gallery. The last stop was Independence Hall. There the solemnity of the proceedings was somewhat tempered by the behavior of Chuckie. As usual when an important visitor is expected, Independence Hall had been closed to the public, cleared by security forces, and sealed. As a last precaution, one of the park's guard dogs is left in the empty cellar. For Chuckie, it had been an unusually long wait and he protested. Cawood's explanatory remarks in the Assembly Room were therefore punctuated by the barks of an aggrieved German Shepherd.[79]

At the conclusion of the tour, the Queen and her party returned to the Britannia, where they proceeded to host a reception for a stream of dignitaries, including the governors of thirty-six states. Cawood and Warnock were among those in attendance. That night Mayor Rizzo and his wife were hosts at a gala dinner at the Philadelphia Museum of Art.[80] For Cawood it was the culmination of a perfect day. He not only had the opportunity to introduce his wife to the Queen, but also met the actor John Wayne, whom he had long admired.[81]

The four days embracing the Fourth of July weekend and the Queen's visit were the culmination of eight years of planning and frantic preparation, all targeted toward that period of ninety-six hours. The remainder of the summer at

Independence continued to be busy, although the crowds were never as large as had been anticipated. Because the level of staffing was so adequate, the park was able to provide an experience of unusually high quality, not only to dignitaries, but to all the visiting public. The extent of audiovisual presentations and other exhibitry was greater than had ever before been available in a national park, and except for unusually crowded weekends, there were ample personnel to answer visitors' questions and supplement the displays with personal interpretation.

After Labor Day, however, the crowds dwindled precipitately. The seasonals left after a round of parties. Independence drifted into its usual fall and winter somnolence. In the superintendent's office, the phone, once constantly busy with calls to and from contractors, the press, City Hall, the White House, and the British Embassy, rang far less often. The stacks of mail were no longer piled high on the desks. Now that the task was accomplished, the goal reached, there was a sense of let-down among those who had worked at fever pitch for so long.[82] Chester Brooks had anticipated the change. On July 4 he accompanied the director of the National Park Service on a flight by helicopter to Independence from Valley Forge. Overseeing the transfer of the latter from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to the National Park Service had been one of his accomplishments as regional director. On the way, he requested a transfer from the regional office back to superintendency of a park. "For eight years," he recalled, "I'd done nothing but get the parks ready for the Bicentennial, but when that ended, you know, we'd had the gravy train, money to do things with, and you knew that was coming to a sharp end, and I thought it was probably good then to break off and get out of there."[83] By the fall he had become superintendent at Rocky Mountain National Park in Colorado.

The management team Cawood had assembled gradually broke up. Warnock, Lockwood, and O'Guin all sought and received transfers back to western parks. Cawood remained. For a man with his energy and drive, it was a difficult period of adjustment. Instead of working fourteen hour days, six or seven days a week, he now could accomplish what needed to be done in five nine-hour days. He missed the excitement and the high level of activity. "We were used to living on adrenalin and working late," he remembered, and accomplishing so much more because we were pushed."[84] Now he would have to learn to adjust to a different type of superintendency.

All parks pass through three phases -- planning, development, and operation. Each of the phases embraces aspects of the others, but in successive stages one element predominates. At Independence, planning had been the preoccupation for over twenty years, beginning with the Shrines Commission's report of 1947 and culminating in the Master Plan of 1971. Development had also proceeded, albeit at a leisurely pace during those twenty years, and then been virtually completed, during Cawood's tenure, in a remarkably intense five-year period. From the time the National Park Service took possession, of course, the park had also been operated, beginning with only the buildings on Independence Square and gradually expanding as other facilities were completed. By the Bicentennial the operations had been tuned to a fine pitch, capable of exhibiting Independence as a showplace to anyone from the Queen of England to the millions of ordinary visitors from all over the United States and around the world. Now maintaining the park's precious physical resources and the quality of the visitors' experience would be the staff's task for the foreseeable future.

There were still a few development projects to accomplish. Construction of

a maintenance facility had been deferred in the interests of preparing the park's display facilities for the Bicentennial. By 1979 it would be built on park-owned land at the corner of Fifth and Manning Streets. A garage was also slated for construction, to be owned and operated by the city on park land in Area F east of Second Street,. With funds raised by the Friends of Independence National Historical Park, Welcome Park, a vest-pocket open space planned, like Franklin Court, by Robert Venturi's firm, was developed adjacent to the garage.

Cawood would continue to use all his political skills to obtain adequate funding for continuing preservation of the park's historic resources and to maintain its high level of visitors' services. In 1981, Penelope Hartshorne Batcheler transferred from the staff of the Denver Service Center to that of the park, to prepare a program of twenty-five-year cyclical maintenance for the park's buildings. The most dramatic manifestation of the program was the erection, in 1982, of scaffolding, so that the tower of Independence Hall could be repaired and repainted, a procedure that will be repeated every twenty years.

The eye of the public is still on Independence. When, on April Fool's Day, a newscaster on a Philadelphia television station reported that the scaffolding was up because the park service was going to clad the tower in aluminum siding, the telephone began to ring at a pace not seen since the Bicentennial. Cawood, Assistant Superintendent Bernard Goodman, and secretary Donna Reaves were kept busy explaining that the television announcement had been a joke. Nor has the public ceased to visit Independence. Visitation declined dramatically following the Bicentennial and then gradually began to rise steadily. By 1985 it was again approaching the level of 1976.[85] It will undoubtedly rise even higher

as a second Bicentennial, that of the Constitution of the United States, is celebrated in 1987.

The creation of Independence National Historical Park culminated in 1976. But the story of Independence has no end. As long as American democracy survives, and remains the envy of the people of the world, Independence will be a place of pilgrimage, a destination for the millions who want to see for themselves the place where liberty was born.

X - EPILOGUE

During the almost half century of planning for the creation and development of Independence National Historical Park, the project reflected and also influenced the philosophy and practice of historic preservation in the United States. The vision of a major park centered on Independence Hall and other nearby historic buildings was conceived, and to a large extent brought to fruition, by men born and educated in the nineteenth century. Their thinking was shaped by Beaux Arts classicism and the City Beautiful movement, by the wish to impose order on a grand scale on urban areas that had developed in a haphazard and untidy manner. Judge Edwin O. Lewis, the most powerful force behind the creation of Independence, often spoke almost wistfully of the broad boulevards and fountain-bedecked greenswards of the formal parks he had seen in Europe. He sincerely believed that formal landscaping, fountains, and statuary would be fitting enhancements for the historic monuments a park would preserve. Fittingly, his permanent monument at Independence is the Judge Lewis Edwin O. Lewis Fountain in the second block of Independence Mall north of Independence Hall. This mall is now administratively part of Independence National Historical Park, but the National Park Service had no part in its planning. It was financed by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and designed for the state by Roy Larson of the firm of Harbeson, Hough, Livingston, and Larson. More directly than the areas of the park for which the National Park Service was reponsible, it reflects late nineteenth and early twentieth century concepts of urban design and beautification.

Judge Lewis's vision was not a fresh beginning, but the culmination of earlier formalistic approaches to an appropriate setting for Independence Hall. In 1915 the solution proposed by architects Albert Kelsey and D. Knickerbacker Boyd would have created a formal plaza across Chestnut Street from Independence Hall, backed by a Colonnade of the Signers, a Palladian five-part construction with a central pavilion linked by curving passages to smaller end pavilions. In the 1920s more ambitious plans were put forward, linked with creation of the most prominent Beaux Arts contributions to Philadelphia's cityscape, the Benjamin Franklin Parkway and the Benjamin Franklin Bridge and its approach. At the same time others were propounding the concept of a mall linking Independence Hall with the historic buildings to its east. During and after World War II Judge Lewis, and his associates in the Independence Hall Association, adopted and combined these ideas, all calling for massive clearance of existing buildings and creation of monumental open spaces, focused on, if not necessarily related in scale to, the historic buildings.

These early schemes fell rather more in the realm of urban planning through redevelopment than that of historic preservation, although all embraced retention of the group of buildings on Independence Square, Carpenters' Hall, and a handful of other eighteenth and early nineteenth-century buildings. The preservation philosophy to be applied to these buildings was one that had been practiced in the United States since the mid-nineteenth century. They would be displayed, like the Liberty Bell on Jacques Greber's altar, as venerated but isolated artifacts, without regard for the nature of their original setting. By the time plans for Independence were actually being formulated in the late 1940s and early 1950s, however, other approaches to historic preservation had come to the fore. Primary among these was the example of Colonial Williamsburg. In

this pre-Revolutionary Virginia capital, Rockefeller money had made possible the preservation and restoration of an entire town. Williamsburg was still in the process of being recreated as it had stood in the eighteenth century, a process which incidentally included the ruthless excision of the physical remains of its later history. Standing eighteenth-century buildings were being restored, with accretions representing the changing taste of later generations removed; lost buildings were being reconstructed; and the historic ambience of the town was being recaptured through the recreation of antique streets, gardens, and public spaces.

Massively publicized, Colonial Williamsburg captured the imagination of the American public in the 1930s with an appeal to which the National Park Service, itself newly launched in historic preservation, was not immune. Indeed, many of the historians, and at least one of the historical architects, who helped formulate preservation philosophy and practice within the park service, worked in geographical and associational proximity to Williamburg at Jamestown and Yorktown. Like Colonial Williamsburg, the park service in the 1930s thought in terms of "cut-off dates." If Williamsburg was to be recreated as an eighteenth-century town, no nineteenth-century remains could intrude. So, too, at the few National Historical Parks, notably Colonial and Morristown, developed during the period, buildings and their landscapes would be returned to their appearance during the period in which they had acquired historical significance, and later buildings would be removed. Similar viewpoints influenced other preservation-related activities within the National Park Service. The National Survey of Historic Sites and Buildings, established by the Historic Sites Act of 1935 to identify potential additions to the National Park System, was charged with examining sites related to the broad stream of American history, but

categorized its subjects by themes and periods of signficance. The Historic American Buildings Survey, more focused on architecture and aesthetics than om history per se,nevertheless operated with an arbitrary (although occasionally exceeded) cut-off date of 1830.

Yet another strain of preservation-related activity originating in the 1930s would influence some of those involved in the planning and development of Independence. Concomitant with the introduction of zoning plans, a few cities, with Charleston and New Orleans as the earliest examples, instituted preservation districts. Because these encompassed not only major monuments, but lesser buildings and entire streetscapes, their proponents were more accepting of diversity and change over time than more traditional preservationists. The rationale behind creation of these districts was not so strictly the memorializing of particular personages, events or historical periods as was the case at museum houses and villages, including sites administered by the National Park Service. History was important, but so were the aesthetic effects and quality of life represented by the past. Districts were also viewed as presenting an opportunity for achieving civic purposes, as tools for not only preserving, but also revitalizing older urban areas. The potential of historic areas as keys to urban rebirth was one factor in garnering support for the establishment of Independence. Isidor Ostroff, who played an important early role in obtaining Congressional support for the project, had tried as early as 1938 to persuade realtor Albert M. Greenfield to spark a rebirth in the area of Independence Hall by constructing new moderate income apartments. Although he failed, he used their common interest in the neighborhood of Independence Hall to enlist Lewis's aid in working for state legislation enabling creation of a Philadelphia Redevelopment Authority, a crucial step in providing financing for

revitalization. By the time the creation of the park was under serious consideration in 1949, the Philadelphia City Planning Commission was committed to rehabilitation of the residential area south of Walnut Street, now known, as it was historically, as Society Hill. Although their plan called for considerable new construction, some of it of large scale, it also envisioned retention and restoration of hundreds of eighteenth and early nineteenth-century rowhouses. These would be interconnected through small-scale greenways. Edmund Bacon, the city's chief planner, saw the presence of a federal park north of Society Hill as a key factor guaranteeing long-term commitment to its stabilization and improvement. At the same time he hoped that planning for the park could be integrated with that for Society Hill and another proposed city project at Penn's Landing.

Still other voices would comment on and attempt to influence the course of the park's planning. By the early 1950s younger critics and scholars were beginning to challenge the fly-in-amber view of history and preservation epitomized by Colonial Williamsburg. Like Judge Lewis, many of them had been influenced by European cities, during wartime service or study afterwards. What they admired, however, was far different from what had so impressed the judge. While they could appreciate the order and majesty of the boulevards of Napoleon III's Paris or Bismarck's Berlin, they also liked the diversity and complexity of the many layers of Rome and the byways of London, the delight of the surprising vista opening at the end of a narrow alley, and the contrast produced by the random juxtaposition of buildings of different periods. Articulate and organized through professional and scholarly associations, they were not hesitant about commenting on the planning for Independence. Nevertheless, their influence was slight in the early years of the planning process. Their

criticisms of the Williamsburg approach was not widely shared, even among professionals. To many within the park service, and certainly to the layman, Williamsburg remained an excellent model. The Advisory Commission for Independence National Historical Park often cited it as an exemplar; in the late 1960s and early 1970s that body was still advocating provisions for visitors' orientation and an introductory movie based on similar facilities at Williamsburg.

As plans were developed in the 1950s for the major portion of Independence National Park east of Independence Square, the National Park Service maintained the posture and reality of assuming control over the outcome. The Philadelphia City Planning Commission, courted and consulted during the planning that preceded Congressional authorization of the park, was virtually ignored during the long master planning debates. Other than the advisory commission, which acted with considerable independence, there was no established channel of communication between the park service and city agencies. Whatever discussion with the city took place was generally conducted by Superintendent Melford O. Anderson or Judge Lewis, and any views expressed or decisions affecting the outcome were not recorded. Preoccupied with their own ambitious plans for Center City, Society Hill, and redevelopment of the blocks facing the state's mall, the city rarely commented on plans for Independence, except to complain about the slow pace of development. When they did protest a decision, they were politely, but firmly, told to mind their own business. This was certainly the case with the planning commission's objection to construction of a maintenance building on Marshall's Court. The park service was forced by political pressure to pay more heed to the Philadelphia Fine Arts Commission's wish to be heard on design issues, much to the annoyance of Director Conrad Wirth. It removed the

suggestion of accountability to the city by appointment of its own architectural advisory committee.

Nor was heed paid to the scholars and critics who hoped to see more buildings, more of the urban fabric preserved. Despite the delays in demolition brought about largely by the advocacy of the chief internal proponent of this viewpoint, Charles E. Peterson, the wholesale clearance of later buildings demanded by Judge Lewis prevailed. In part this decision matched the National Park Service's internal viewpoint, with its basic premise of preservation as a tool for interpreting particular historic periods and events. In part it was a matter of economics. The park service had few mechanisms for financing maintenance of buildings that it would not use for its own purposes.

Although Judge Lewis thus achieved a large part of his goal, the creation of an open park, with the historic buildings displayed like individual gems in a setting of lawns and trees, Independence escaped becoming a formal set piece adorned with fountains and statuary. (Two statues, already in place, did survive the creation of the park, that of Commodore John Barry behind Independence Hall and that of Robert Morris relocated behind the Second Bank of the United States; a third, an idealized Signer, a gift of the Independence Hall Association, was erected in 1982 at the corner of Chestnut and Fifth Streets.) In the ultimate design, a preservation plan derived from Williamsburg prevailed. Historians and architects argued for a plan that would suggest, and to some extent reproduce, the ambience of eighteenth-century Philadelphia. Old street and sidewalk patterns and materials were carefully reconstructed. Contouring suggested early land forms. Reconstruction of buildings recreated the sheltered character of Carpenters' Court. On Walnut Street, the early master plan had called for the restored Bishop White and Todd Houses to stand in splendid

isolation. By the end of the decade, the plan had been amended to permit rehabilitation of additional historic houses and reconstruction of others. The emphasis had shifted from the restoration of individual buildings to the recreation of an eighteenth-century streetscape. This view of the past, heavily influenced by Colonial Williamsburg, was one with which the park service was comfortable. Reconstruction, especially if it served the purposes of interpretation, was generally accepted, as long as the documentation of the historic appearance of the building was adequate. Had funding been available, additional buildings, such as Norris's Row at the corner of Fifth and Chestnut Streets, might well have been reconstructed in order to provide visitors with more of the flavor of the colonial city.

Financial strictures also led the park service to give more consideration to the uses of buildings than had ever been necessary before. The final decision to demolish such structures as the Jayne and Penn Mutual Buildings was made largely on interpretive and aesthetic grounds. Once the park's cut-off date was set at 1800, there was no defensible historical rationale for their presence. But the cut-off date was clearly flexible. Preservation of two early nineteenth-century buildings, the Merchants' Exchange and the Second Bank of the United States, was mandated in the legislation establishing the park. The essential difference was that in the 1950s these classically-inspired buildings were generally admired; the more flamboyant later examples were not. Nevertheless, a strong undercurrent in the decision-making was economic. There were no mechanisms available through which the park service could preserve the buildings and lease them for the commercial uses for which they were most suited.

Although no solution was found for the later nineteenth-century buildings, the park service was compelled to find suitable uses for a greater number of historic buildings than in any previous instance. The first interpretive program visualized most of these as museums, a conclusion that would have imposed impossible staffing and budgetary burdens. As the planning process continued through the decade, and the number of buildings to be maintained expanded, an increasing variety of adaptive uses was considered, including staff quarters, administrative and other park service facilities, libraries, and museum use or headquarters for other institutions. At times decisions on use were made because space was available at Independence. The move of the regional office to Philadelphia, and its location in the Merchants' Exchange, occurred in part because the building was there. Individually none of the uses was particularly innovative. Staff quarters and park administrative offices had been located in lesser historic buildings at other parks before. At Independence, however, the range and scale of adaptive use was greater than had previously been attempted. Much of this was accomplished by stretching the device of the cooperative agreement to its limit, with outside organizations occupying and maintaining the buildings at Carpenters' Court and many of those on Walnut Street. Independence demonstrated that it was feasible for the park service to become a landlord in order to preserve buildings that were not needed for park activities. In a decision that came far too late to save buildings like the Jayne and Penn Mutual, the park service in 1980 finally was given authority to lease buildings within parks to private enterprise for preservation purposes, although five years later no leases had yet been signed.

The change during the 1950s in the proposed treatment of the major portion of Independence between Chestnut and Walnut Streets from individual buildings

isolated in an alien setting toward an attempt to recreate the ambience of a particular period in the past reflected a shift in the philosophy of both preservation and urban design. Yet even as construction of the park began, scholars and preservationists were questioning the premise of erasing urban fabric in order to recapture a moment frozen in time. Like contemporary historians, who were beginning to look at the past as a seamless web rather than an accretion of discrete periods, younger preservationists viewed historic buildings as inextricably bound to their surroundings, acquiring added significance from the buildings around them, and from the process of change in that fabric. These ideas were embodied in the creation of the National Register of Historic Places under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. First proposed by Ronald F. Lee in 1960, the National Register expanded the Historic Sites Survey established in 1935. It recognized the importance of places of state and local, as well as those of national, significance and afforded them a measure of protection from federally-funded or assisted projects. To the individual sites and building complexes to which the older law applied, it added recognition of historic districts. Two of those who would be instrumental in overseeing implementation of the new law and the programs it established had received their park service initiation at Indpendence in the early 1950s. Dr. Ernest Allen Connally became chief of the Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation, while Dr. William J. Murtagh became the first keeper of the National Register. Both had undergraduate degrees in architecture as well as doctorates in architectural history. Both had been recruited for Historic American Buildings Survey teams at Independence by Charles E. Peterson. Both had witnessed and been disturbed by the clearance of nineteenth-century buildings that had marked the first stage of the park's development.

At Independence the impact of new preservation ideas was demonstrated most strongly in changing ideas about the treatment of Franklin Court. In 1954, when plans for its development were first broached, Peterson pleaded in vain for retention of the historic fabric along Market Street. Instead, considerations of cost, and lack of knowledge about the buildings' age, led to a decision for demolition. No action was taken, however, and by 1960 the park service had begun to agree with the city planning commission that the buildings should be saved. With passage of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, their preservation was virtually assured. The debates over other aspects of Franklin Court pitted the newer preservationists' philosophy against the views that had prevailed in the 1930s, epitomized by Colonial Williamsburg. The objective was now to preserve and rehabilitate what existed, not to recreate a vision of the past. The latter was considered false historicity, devaluing the genuinely old by surrounding it with meretricious copies. The park service had always been chary of reconstruction because of the possibility of error; now reconstruction would be viewed with even less favor as deceptive. Where infill in a historic area was required, the new preservationists advocated compatible contemporary design.

These attitudes influenced the final shape of Franklin Court, although there were compromises. They proved most telling in the treatment of the site of such vanished features as Franklin's house, his print shop and the surrounding garden. The facades of the Market Street Houses, however, were not interpreted in a modern idiom, but were reconstructed on the basis of solid evidence with some conjecture. Nor did the pendulum swing all the way in cases where other factors overruled a purist attitude opposing reconstruction. City Tavern and the Graff House were both reconstructed in the 1970s, the former

because it had been a key element in the interpretive plan since the early 1950s, the latter because it had long been a favored project of the Independence Hall Association, which garnered political and financial support for its authorization and construction. That organization and the closely-related advisory commission never adopted new attitudes toward preservation, maintaining a preference for individual "shrines" in well-landscaped grounds.

If Independence's preservation planning was reactive rather than initiative, this was not the case with its handling of major historic buildings. The park service architects, with Charles Peterson in charge during the formative years, built on the foundations of thorough documentary and physical research and use of historic precedent established at Williamsburg and other restorations of the 1930s. To these they added, as became clear in the course of the controversy over whether the buildings on Independence Square should be re-framed in steel, the principle that all of the historic fabric of a building, even that which was hidden from sight, was worthy of respect. Contrary to the precedent of Williamsburg, where the entire interior structure of the so-called Wren Building was rebuilt in steel and concrete, they argued successfully that the old timbers should be retained and reinforced. As the architects worked on the restorations at Independence they developed, sometimes through trial and error and learning from past mistakes, procedures and techniques that became standards for building restoration in the United States. Paint and mortar were analyzed not only for information about the original appearances of finishes, but also as aids in determining the dating of original fabric and subsequent alterations. Building technology and the history of such building components as nails were also studied for the same purpose. Peterson also insisted on leaving

intact the physical evidence on which conclusions were based, as well as maintaining a written, graphic, and photographic record.

That these advances in restoration practices did not become merely local or park service "arts and mysteries" was due largely to Peterson's fervor and persistence. A teacher by instinct, indeed a militant evangelist in the cause of old buildings, Peterson also had what Lee Nelson termed a strong sense of accountability. He believed that the public should know how its money was being spent on historic buildings, and what was being learned through that expenditure. From his earliest days in Philadelphia, in contrast to most of those on the park's staff, Peterson made a point of becoming known among the local historical and architectural communities. He already had a wide acquaintance among scholars and those engaged in preservation and restoration around the country. These contacts would serve him well as he proceeded to construct a restoration "academy" in Philadelphia, a center in which architects, scholars from other disciplines, and craftsmen could come together to learn from one another. To staff it he would depend in part on academics and architects from across the country, who would recommend bright young people for temporary or longer-term employment on the Independence restorations.

Independence from the late 1950s through the early 1970s became a national center for restoration for a variety of reasons. The major attraction, of course, was the restoration of a score of buildings, among them the most historically important building in the United States. Because of the associations of Independence Hall, its restoration attracted the attention of the popular press, enhancing public awareness of restoration processes and of what constituted authenticity. As the work on the buildings progressed, the park became a laboratory, in which the most advanced techniques for

investigating and rehabilitating historic buildings were developed and tested. In the process, and through the host of allied activities for which Peterson was the catalyst, a cadre of professionals received their training and formed their attitudes. Some of the students and young professionals he hired remained in the park service to become leaders in its emerging preservation activities. Through requirements for federal undertakings, and through grants-in-aid and tax incentives available to those outside the government, they codified and promulgated nation-wide preservation standards. Others, who worked at Independence, not only staff, but also consultants, architects, structural engineers and contractors, became principals in private firms specializing in restoration. As these people moved on from Independence, to other park service posts, to the burgeoning restoration scene in Society Hill, and to other areas in the country, they carried with them the principles they had absorbed: careful research, respect for the integrity of a building's historic fabric, and the necessity of leaving a record of what they had done for the future. Independence thus became the testing ground at which American restoration came of age.

It was not, of course, only preservation policy and practice that changed during the years of Independence's creation. Because of its size and importance as a historic site, Independence became the focus for new and sometimes experimental programs. The recruitment of women to serve as guides and interpreters, however sexist its original premises, opened the way to increased employment opportunities for women in the National Park Service. The need to tell the park's story to large numbers of people, especially as the Bicentennial approached, helped to encourage the park service to institute imaginative interpretive programs that went well beyond the guided tour or campfire talk to

sophisticated audiovisual devices, live drama, and participatory activities. Stewardship of the extraordinary collection of American portraits led to strengthening of the park service's museum function. In the 1970s policies directed toward enhancing the National Park Service's presence in urban areas, combined with the personalities of the park's superintendents, Chester Brooks and Hobart Cawood, led to closer integration with the surrounding community. Independence, which had remained studiously aloof from the city in which it was located while plans for its development were formulated, became communicative and cooperative. Park service personnel worked closely with the City of Philadelphia and local groups in fighting for a design for I-95 that would minimize damage to Society Hill and other historic areas along Philadelphia's waterfront, and in planning for the Bicentennial of the Declaration of Independence in Philadelphia. For the succeeding Bicentennial, that of the Constitution, Cawood became the chairman of the committee that would oversee its celebration. By now, Independence, while maintaining its national importance, has also become a cherished Philadelphia institution. Its volunteer support group is the envy of other components of the National Park System, and has reached out to assist other historic sites in the Philadelphia area.

There will never be another National Historical Park like Independence. For one thing, there is no other site, except perhaps for the Statue of Liberty, alone on its island, that is so meaningful to the American people. For another, the National Park Service can never destroy so much of the historic fabric of a city in order to create an artificial vision of the past. Even if such an approach were desired, legislation passed during the creation of Independence, would forbid it. Neither the National Preservation Act nor the National Environmental Act would permit the wholesale demolition that attended the

creation of Independence. Newer National Historical Parks, such as Boston or Lowell in Massachusetts, are very different, preserving their historic monuments within an existing context. Their buildings and areas, some older, most newer than the sites at Independence, are not set apart, but are integrated with the city around them, physically as well as socially. Yet they are, in a sense, the children of Independence, the heirs of philosophies and policies aired and argued in the years of its conception, birth, and maturation.

NOTE ON SOURCES

The major sources for this report fall into four categories. The first is written primary material generated by the National Park Service and held in several federal repositories: Independence National Historical Park Library and Archives, the Federal Record Centers at Wissahickon, Pennsylvania, and Suitlands, Maryland, and the National Park Service's Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation and Office of History in Washington, D.C.

Among the collections of papers that were of particular usefulness because of their long-term coverage of the development of the park are the monthly reports filed by the historians and interpreters. Although the office from which they were generated reflected organizational change in a sequence of names, these are generally referred to as the Interpretive Division Monthly Report. A nearly complete set of these reports is available in the park's archives. Although the superintendent's office also filed monthly reports, preservation of these has been fragmentary in papers at Wissahickon and Suitlands, and their contents are not as extensive. The second major source for the park's chronology is the Minutes of the Advisory Commission for Independence National Historical Park, copies of which are in the park's archives and headquarters. This group met at least quarterly, and often more frequently, from 1949 to 1976. The reports made to the members of this body, and their reactions and comments, illuminate most of the major issues in planning and development.

Another large group of useful records consisted of the park's copies of minutes, memoranda, and correspondence sent, as well as some original

correspondence received, from the 1950s through the early 1970s, which, when research for this project began, were stored in the attic at park headquarters. They are referred to in this report as Independence National Historical Park Headquarters Files. Unfortunately within the past three years these were inadvertently disposed of. However, notes on these, as well as copies of many, are in the author's files, which have been deposited in the park's archives. It is possible that duplicate copies of some material may exist in the files of the Washington office at the Federal Record Center at Suitlands or in regional files at the Federal Record Center at Wissahickon.

For activities leading up to the establishment of Independence as a National Historical Park, the most important sources are the papers of David Knickerbacker Boyd, Judge Edwin O. Lewis, and the Independence Hall Association, all of which have been deposited in the park's archives.

Other important groups of papers include the voluminous reports generated during the creation of Independence National Historical Park. These, along with the files of the historians, curators, archaeologists, and architects, as well as press clippings and reports of special events, are also in the park's archives. Additional architects' files and day books maintained during the investigations of the buildings are in the architects' office at Independence.

The second major category of information was the remembrance of the participants. Three major series of interviews related to Independence have been conducted and tape-recorded. The earliest was undertaken by the Columbia University Oral History Project and focused on the events leading up to the establishment of the park and on the early years of its formation. Transcripts of the interviews have been deposited in the park's archives; the tapes are held by Columbia University. The second set of interviews was conducted by George A.

Palmer, who retired as Deputy Regional Director of the Mid-Atlantic Region in 1973, having served in the Philadelphia regional office since 1955. Himself thoroughly familiar with the development of Independence, Palmer undertook his oral history project in 1976 and 1977, when the preparations for the Bicentennial and the events of its celebration were fresh in the minds of the participants. Copies of transcripts and tapes of Palmer's interviews are at both the Independence archives and the National Park Service Archives at Harper's Ferry, West Virginia. The author carried out a third series of interviews in preparation for this book. It consisted of formal, taped interviews, and informal consultation on particular questions. Tapes of the formal interviews, as well as transcripts of most of them, have been deposited in the archives at Independence.

A third source for the development of Independence is the graphic record. Several thousand drawings detail the master planning process, landscaping, and the construction, rehabilitation, and restoration of buildings. Prints of many drawings are in the files of the Mid-Atlantic Regional Office in Philadelphia, while originals are at the Denver Service Center. Drawings are also available on micro-fiche at the Mid-Atlantic Regional Office and, for buildings, in half-scale copies at the park's architects' office. Progress of clearance and demolition for the park, and of its subsequent development, as well as personnel and major events, are detailed in photographs taken by members of the staffs of the park and the Eastern Office of Design and Construction and by professional photographers. There are also a few reels of amateur and professional motion pictures. All are available through the park's library.

Finally, some published sources were of help in defining the background of preservation and National Park Service philosophy that influenced the

development of Independence National Historical Park. Particularly useful were: Charles B. Hosmer, Jr., Presevation Comes of Age (Charlottesville: The University Press of Virginia, 1981); Ronald F. Lee, Family Tree of the National Park System (Philadelphia: Eastern National Park and Monument Association, 1974); and Conrad L. Wirth, Parks, Politics, and the People (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1980).

The following abbreviations are used in the notes:

ACM	Minutes of the Independence National Historical Park Advisory Commission
FRCW	Federal Records Center, Wissahickon, PA.
FRCS	Federal Records Center, Suitlands, MD.
HBR	Historic Buildings Report
HGR	Historic Grounds Report
HSR	Historic Structures Report
IDMR	Interpretive Division Monthly Reports
INHPA	Independence National Historical Park Archives
INHPAO	Independence National Historical Park Architects' Office
INHPHQ	Indpendence National Historical Park Headquarters Files
INHPL	Independence National Historical Park Library
MARO	Mid-Atlantic Regional Office, National Park Service

Recorded oral history is cited in the following manner: John Smith, April 1, 1984, followed by initials identifying the interviewer. These are:

CMG Constance M. Greiff

CUOHP Columbia University Oral History Project

GAP George A. Palmer

Unrecorded interviews by the author are cited as: Interview with John Smith, April 1, 1984.

NOTES - CHAPTER II

1. Edwin Wolf 2nd, Philadelphia: Portrait of an American City, (Harrisburg: Stackpole Books, 1975), p. 14.

2. J[ohn] F[anning] Watson, Annals of Philadelphia, rev. and ed. by Willis P. Hazard, 3 vols., (Philadelphia: Leary, Stuart & Co., 1909), 1:133.

3. Ibid., 1:130, 132.

4. Hannah Benner Roach to Paul Sifton, July 24, 1963, INHP research cards.

5. William Penn, Letter...to the Committee of the Free Society of Traders , quoted in William E. Lingelbach, "William Penn and City Planning," Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography (hereafter PMHB), 68 (1944), 405-406.

6. Watson, Annals, 1:131.

7. Ibid., 1:232-233.

8. Abstract of letter from William Penn to Philip Ford, November 1, 1682, PMHB, VI (1882), 180.

9. Penn, Letter to the Free Society, in Lingelbach, p. 407.

10. Wolf, Philadelphia, p. 14.

11. Penn, A Further Account of the Province of Pennsylvania and Its Improvements (London: 1685), in PMHB, 9 (1885), 66-67.

12. Robert Turner to William Penn, August 3, 1685, in A Further Account, 74-75.

13. Richard Morris to William Penn, PMHB, 4 (1880) 200-201; Gabriel Thomas, An Historical and Geographical Account of the Province of Pensilvania ... (London: A. Baldwin, 1698), p. 5; Carl Bridenbaugh, Cities in the Wilderness (New York: Ronald Press, 1938), p. 143.

14. Wolf, Philadelphia, p. 17.

15. Bridenbaugh, Cities, p. 124.

16. Thomas J. Scharf and Thompson Westcott, History of Philadelphia: 1609-1884 (Philadelphia: L.H. Everts, 1884), 1:148.

17. Richard Morris to William Penn, PMHB 4 (1880), 200-201.

18. Thomas, Historical ... Account, p. 5.

19. Martin P. Snyder, City of Independence: Views of Philadelphia Before 1800

(New York: Praeger, 1975), pp. 27-29.

20. George B. Tatum, Penn's Great Town (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1961), p. 153.

21. Watson, Annals, 1:165.

22. Scharf and Westcott, History, 1:159n.

23. Watson, Annals, 1:375, quoting Alexander Graydon, Memoirs of His Own Time.

24. Scharf and Westcott, History, 1:181.

25. Mrs. Browne's Journal, 1754-1757, Virginia Historical Society.

26. This view, as well as all other eighteenth-century views cited in the text, is reproduced in Snyder, City of Independence.

27. Sam Bass Warner, Jr., The Private City (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1968), p. 11; Bridenbaugh, Cities, 363-363.

28. Chevalier d'Aumone, "Memoire," Correspondence Politique, Etats-Unis (Paris: Ministere Affaires Etranges), Vol. I.

29. Conclusions about the appearance of Philadelphia in the eighteenth century, unless otherwise credited, are derived from contemporary maps and views or from information about the city, its buildings, and their occupants contained in the research cards filed at the INHP Library. These contain data obtained from travellers accounts, deeds, insurance surveys, tax records, advertisements, and city directories.

30. [Unknown Frenchman], "Voiage au Continent americain par un francois en 1777," William and Mary Quarterly, XVI, 3 (july 1959), 383-384.

31. Idem.

32. Robert Earle Graham, "The Taverns of Colonial Philadelphia" Historic Philadelphia (Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1953), pp. 320-321.

33. The city directory for 1785 shows, for example, that Second Street housed shops purveying dry goods, "East Indian and European goods," and books, plus such artisans as a tailor, upholsterer, jeweler, and the cabinet-maker William Savery, a livery stable, taverns, boarding-houses, and the residences of James Logan and James Pemberton "gentlemen"; see also Warner, Private City, pp. 14-19.

34. John Adams, Diary and Autobiography of John Adams: The Adams Papers, L[yman] H. Butterfield, ed. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, Belknap Press, 1961), ser. 1, 2:116.

35. Warner, Private City, p. 16.

36. Matthew Carey, A Short account of the Malignant Fever ... (Philadelphia: Matthew Carey, 1793), pp. 9-11.

37. Harold Donaldson Eberlein, "190, High Street," Historic Philadelphia, p. 161.

38. James C. Massey, "Carpenters Court," rev. ed., 1954, INHP report.

39. William Bradford to Mrs. Sarah Bradford, January 24, 1794, Misc. mss. XVII, Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston, Mass.

40. These photographs are reproduced in Robert Looney, Old Philadelphia in Early Photographs: 1839-1914 (New York: Dover), 1976. The scenes shown in this publication, from the collections of the Free Library, along with others from the Library Company, reproduced in Kenneth Finkel, Nineteenth-Century Photography in Philadelphia (New York: Dover, 1980) convey the flavor of the city in the third quarter of the nineteenth century.

41. Scharf and Westcott, History, 1:511.

42. INHP staff, "Kidd House", HBR, May, 1958; "McIlvaine House," Historic Building Survey, 1958; "Fling House," HSR, June 1960; "Pemberton House," HSR, 1966.

43. R.A. Smith, Philadelphia as it is in 1852 (Philadelphia: Lindsay and Blakiston, 1852), pp. 421-422.

44. Watson, Annals, 1:348.

45. Agnes Addison Gilchrist, "Market Houses in High Street," Historic Philadelphia, p. 306.

46. Watson, Annals, 1: 225-226.

47. Smith, Philadelphia as it is, p. 113.

48. Ibid., p. 109.

49. Ibid., p. 421.

50. Tatum, Penn's Great Town, p. 178.

51. Nicholas B. Wainwright, Philadelphia in the Romantic Age of Lithography (Philadelphia: The Historical Society of Pennsylvania, 1958), p. 183.

52. Watson, Annals, 3:134. This volume consists of the additions and

corrections made by Willis P. Hazard.

53. Tatum, Penn's Great Town, p. 169.

54. A remarkable picture of Chestnut Street at mid-century is provided by Julio H. Rae's Philadelphia Pictorial Directory & Panoramic Advertiser, Chestnut Street from Second to Tenth Street of 1851. The line drawings in this publication show Chestnut Street block by block, building by building.

55. Scharf and Westcott, History, 1:695-696,721,703.

56. "Franklin's House," HSR, Part 1, December 1961.

57. No source as complete as Rae's Chestnut Street exists for the appearance of Market Street. However, because of the slow pace of development, Market Street in the period can be seen in the drawings, made in 1857 and updated until 1882, for [Dewitt C.] Baxter's Panoramic Business Directory of Philadelphia, Historical Society of Pennsylvania.

58. Lawrence Lafore and Sarah Lee Lippincott, Philadelphia: The Unexpected City (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1965) p.108.

59. Edwin O. Lewis, interview with Eleanor Prescott, January 16, 1970 CUOHP.

60. Smith, Philadelphia as it is, pp. 425-426; Scharf and Westcott, History, 1:159n.

61. For photographs of the demolition of the bank, see Finkel, Nineteenth-Century Photography, pp. 170; 171; "City Tavern," HSR, April, 1973.

62. Robert Earle Graham, "The Taverns of Colonial Philadelphia," Historic Philadelphia, p.320.

63. The City of Philadelphia as it Appears in the Year 1894 (Philadelphia: George S. Harris & Sons, 1894), 78.

64. "Chestnut Street," Miss Jane Campbell's Notebooks, Historical Society of Pennsylvania.

65. [Carroll Frey], The Independence Square Neighborhood (Philadelphia: The Penn Mutual Life Insurance Company, 1926), p.63. Among the surviving old houses were, of course, those on the north side of Walnut between Second and Third Streets, now a part of Independence National Historical Park. One, at least, the Kidd House, did indeed contain a "beautiful staircase," removed by the National Park Service in the course of rehabilitation. Portions of the staircase are preserved in the park's architectural study collection.

66. For views of the area in the first half of the twentieth century, see The Independence Square Neighborhood and the collection of photographs at the INHP Library.

NOTES - CHAPTER III

1. John D.R. Platt, and William M Campbell, David A. Kimball and Martin I. Yoelson, "Independence Hall," HSR, Part II, INHP, sec. 1, p. 74.

2. Ibid., pp. 75-78.

3. Ibid., pp. 82-83.

4. Ibid., p. 84.

5. Ibid., pp. 84, 87.

6. Ibid., p. 85, quoting a letter from John Read, Jr., to the City Commissioners, September 7, 1816, Box 5, John Read, Jr. Papers, Library Company of Philadelphia.

7. Ibid., quoting John Binns, Recollections of the Life of John Binns (Philadelphia: Printed and sold by author & by Parry & McMillan, 1854), p. 193.

8. Ibid., pp. 95-96.

9. Ibid., p. 101.

10. Philadelphia Public Ledger, December 7 1848. A photocopy of the engraving is in the files of the Historical Architect, INHP.

11. Thomas J. Scharf and Thompson Westcott, History of Philadelphia: 1609-1884 (Philadelphia: L.H. Everts, 1884), 3:1773.

12. Copies of plans and elevations for one version are in the office of the Historical Architect, INHP; a stereograph of the "adopted" design is in the park's museum collection.

13. "Independence Hall," HSR, 109-113.

14. Ibid., pp. 115-126.

15. Ibid., pp. 133-134; Lee H. Nelson, "Old City Hall," HSR, Architectural Data Section, June 1970, pp. 18-19.

16. James R. Sullivan, "State House Yard," HGR, Chapt. II, sec. 3, pp. 17-19.

17. It is not known who commissioned this study. A copy of the Boyd and Kelsey plan and an undated descriptive memorandum by Kelsey are in the Boyd Papers, INHPL.

18. Roy F. Larson, interview, January 25, 1969, CUOHP. Larson was unable to remember which group commissioned the sketches. Cret, trained at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts, came to Philadelphia in 1903 to head the University of Pennsylvania's Department of Architecture. In 1910 he launched his private practice by winning the competition for the design of the Pan-American Union in Washington, D.C., in association with Kelsey. In the 1920's he was Philadelphia's most prominent Beaux-Arts architect. The firm he founded evolved into Harbeson, Hough, Livingston and Larson, in which Roy Larson was a partner.

19. The original Cret sketches are at The Athenaeum of Philadelphia.

20. The original plan, dated January 1924, is at the American Philosophical Society.

21. Photocopies of a plan and rendering dated respectively July 1930 and August 1930, INHP photographic files.

22. Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, April 14, 1936.

23. Ibid., January 17, 1935.

24. Larson interview, p. 6.

25. "Plan for Redevelopment of Historic Area," photocopy, INHP photographic files.

26. "Proposed Congress Plaza and Improvement South Side of Chestnut St., 2nd to 5th Sts.," INHP photographic files.

27. Philadelphia Record, January 11, 1945.

28. Custis to Fred A. Seaton, March 21, 1960, FRCW, RG 79, A-3815.

29. "Development of Mall between Curtis Publishing Co., and New Custom House." Thalheimer and Weitz, Architects, INHP photoghraphic files.

30. Custis to Seaton, March 21, 1960, FRCW, RG 79, A-3815.

31. Ibid.; Philadelphia Record, January 11, 1945.

32. Ronald F. Lee, Family Tree of the National Park System (Philadelphia: Eastern National Park and Monument Association, 1974), pp. 44-52.

33. P.L. 74-292, Sec. 2 (d,f,h). Approved August 21, 1935.

34. Ibid., Sec. 2 (a,b,c,j).

35. Ibid., Sec. 2 (e).

36. "Chronological Outline of Events Leading to Establishment of Independence National Historical Park Project," December 29, 1951, Boyd Papers, INHP.

37. Ibid.

38. Interview with Nathaniel Burt, October 22, 1982.

39. Charles W. Hosmer, Preservation Comes of Age (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press for the Preservation Press, 1981), 2:704-705.

40. Idem.

41. Philadelphia Inquirer, March 17, 1938.

42. Hosmer, Preservation, 2:706.

43. Ibid., 2:707-711.

44. Ibid., 2:706.

45. Isidor Ostroff, interview, September 26, 1969, CUHOP, pp. 2-3.

46. Ibid., p. 1.

47. Ibid., p. 3.

48. Ostroff to Charles E. Peterson, April 8, 1953, FRCW, RG 79, H-14.

49. Idem.

50. "Petition to the Honorable Leon Sacks, Member of United States Congress," FRCW, RG 79, H-14.

51. Ostroff, Interview, p. 6..

52. Idem.

53. Ibid., p. 7.

54. Hosmer, Preservation, 2:717-718.

55. Cooperative agreement between the Corporation of Gloria Dei (Old Swedes') Church and the Secretary of the Interior, INHPHQ.

56. Charles E. Peterson, Interview, January 8, 1981, CMG, pp. 35-36.

57. Ostroff, Interview, p. 11.

58. Edwin O. Lewis, Interview with M.O. Anderson, August 7, 1956, tape at INHPL.

59. Roy Larson, Interview, p. 37.

60. Edmund Bacon, Interview, January 30, 1970, CUOHP, p. 33; Interview, September 17, 1982, CMG, p. 15.

61. Edwin O. Lewis, Interview, January 16, 1970, CUOHP, p. 9.

62. Lewis, Interview, August 7, 1956.

63. Lewis, Interview, January 16, 1970, p. 6.

64. Idem .

65. Lewis, Interview, January 2, 1969, CUOHP, p. 2.

66. The New York Times; New York Herald Tribune, February 22, 1944.

67. Elizabeth Boyd Borie, Interview, March 22, 1969, CUOHP, passim.

68. Ibid., p. 8

69. Lewis, Interview, January 2, 1969, p. 2.

70. "Chronological History."

71. Boyd to Lewis, May 14, 1942, IHA Papers.

72. "Informal History: Independence Hall Association," n.d., Boyd Papers, INHP; Lewis interview, January 2, 1969, p. 3.

73. Minutes of meeting, May 21, 1942, IHA Papers.

74. Idem.

75. "List of Those to Whom Notices were Sent for Meeting of May 21, 1942," IHA Papers.

76. Boyd, "To Those on Attached List," May 18, 1942, IHA Papers.

77. Minutes, May 21, 1942; "List, May 21."

78. Minutes, May 21, 1942.

79. "Summarized Minutes of a Meeting Held June 30, 1942, in The Hall of the American Philosophical Society." IHA Papers.

80. Minutes of Executive Committee, August 11, 1942, IHA Papers.

81. Summarized Minutes of Meeting of Committee on Research and Planning, August 6, 1945, IHA Papers.

82. Lawrence Vener, "Independence Hall as a National Shrine." January 1943, IHA Papers.

83. Minutes of meeting of Committee on Public Relations, September 23, 1942, IHA Papers.

84. Stevens to Lewis, August 12, 1942, IHA Papers.

85. Boyd to Kahler, August 15, 1942, IHA Papers.

86. Philadelphia Ordinance, DECEMBER 21, 1942.

87. Hosmer, Preservation, 2:770.

88. Lewis to Drury, January 11, 1943, IHA Papers.

89. Philadelphia Inquirer, January 12, 1943.

90. Drury to Lewis, February 8, 1943, IHA Papers.

91. Stevens to Drury, March 11, 1943; Lewis to Drury, March 17, 1943, IHA Papers.

92. "Chronological Outline."

93. Independence Hall: From Civic Center to National Shrine , exhibition catalog, 1943.

94. Boyd to Stevens, August 4, 1943, IHA Papers.

95. Hugh Scott, Congressional Record, April 28, 1942, A1566.

96. Boyd to Neeson, July 7, 1943, IHA Papers.

98. Lewis to Arthur Joyce, September 29, 1942, IHA Papers.

99. Boyd to Neeson, August 27, 1943, IHA Papers.

100. Philadelphia Inquirer, April 28, 1943.

101. John Diemand to Lewis, April 17, 1945, IHA Papers.

102. Ostroff to Lewis, April 17, 1945, IHA Papers.

103. Lewis to Ostroff, August 12, 1942, IHA Papers.

104. Ostroff, Interview, pp. 10-11.

105. Ibid ., p. 13.

106. Lewis, Interview, January 16, 1970, p 22.

107. Boyd to Lewis, February 18, 1944, IHA Papers.

108. Lewis, Interview, January 2, 1969, p. 2.

109. Executive Committee Minutes, July 14, 1942; Minutes of Committee on Public Relations, September 23, 1942, IHA Papers.

110. Samuel to Boyd, February 17, 1944, IHA Papers.

111. Boyd to Lewis, March 15, 1943, IHA Papers.

112. Ickes to Peterson, September 23, 1943, Boyd Papers, INHPL.

113. Boyd to Lewis, September 29, 1943, Boyd Papers.

114. Gallagher to Boyd, October 12, 1943, IHA Papers.

115. Demaray to Boyd, December 8, 1943, IHA Papers.

116. Ostroff to McGranery, January 21, 1944, IHA Papers.

117. Lewis to Biddle, May 2, 1944; Ostroff to McGranery, May 4, 1944, IHA Papers.

118. Lewis to Biddle, May 2, 1944, IHA Papers.

119. Peterson to Lewis, May 5, 1944, IHA Papers.

120. Tolson to Lewis, June 7, 1944, IHA Papers.

121. Ickes to Peterson, August 1, 1944, IHA Papers.

122. Ostroff to Bradley, September 16, 1944, IHA Papers.

123. Michael J. Bradley, Interview, October 24, 1969, CUOHP.

124. Ostroff to Guffey, November 2, 1944; Ostroff to Myers, November 2, 1944; Ostroff to Biddle, November 18, 1944, IHA Papers.

125. Ostroff to Lewis, December 16, 1944, IHA Papers.

126. Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, October 30, 1942.

127. Draft of speech prepared by Boyd for Lewis for meeting at House of Colonial Dames, March 14, 1943, IHA Papers; Larson interview; Minutes of Executive Committee, December 28, 1942, IHA Papers.

128. Independence Hall and Adjacent Historic Buildings: A Plan for Their Preservation and the Improvement of Their Surroundings (Philadelphia: Fairmount Park Art Association in collaboration with the Independence Hall Association, 1944).

129. Edwin O. Lewis, The Spoliation of American Cities, address delivered at the annual meeting of the Fairmount Park Association, January 25, 1944, (Philadelphia: Independence Hall Association,1944), p. 10.

130. New York Herald Tribune, February 22, 1944.

131. Lewis, Spoliation, p. 2; "Here Lies an Honest Lawyer: An Autobiography," typescript, 1974, pp. 74-75, IHA Papers.

132. Lewis, Interview, January 2, 1969, p. 10.

133. Idem.

134. Lewis to Martin, January 10, 1945, IHA Papers.

135. Ibid., January 23, 1945.

136. Ibid., October 31, 1945 and November 15, 1945.

137. Bradley to Lewis, June 27, 1945, Lewis Papers INHPL.

138. Bradley, Interview, p. 19.

139. Philadelphia Record, September 19, 1945; November 20, 1945.

140. Bradley to Lewis, December 20, 1945, Lewis Papers.

141. "Chronological outline."

142. Ibid.

143. Interview with Charles E. Peterson, June 9, 1983; Lewis interview, January 2, 1969, p, 11; Lewis to Drury, December 6, 1946, Lewis Papers.

144. Drury to Lewis, December 16, 1946, Lewis Papers.

145. Drury to Lewis, February 11, 1947, Lewis Papers.

146. Lewis to Drury, February 24, 1947, Lewis Papers.

147. Hosmer, Preservation, 1:583-584, 604-605.

148. Minutes of Meeting, February 22, 1947, Lewis Papers.

149. Minutes of Meeting, March 11, 1947, Lewis papers.

150. Peterson, Interview, January 8, 1981, p. 33.

151. Minutes of Meeting, March 11, 1947, Lewis Papers.

152. Excerpt, Lewis Papers. A note at the bottom states that the excerpt was requested by Peterson on April 8.

153. Demaray to Lewis, April 9, 1947, Lewis Papers.

154. Hosmer, Preservation, 1:583-584.

155. Minutes of Shrines Commission Meeting, April 18, 1947, IHA Papers.

156. "Report on Tour of Duty in Philadelphia, June 23-June 18, Philadelphia Shrines National Park Commission," September 30, 1947, p. 1, Appleman File, FRCW, Box 64.

157. Charles E. Peterson, Interview, October 24, 1969, CUOHP, pp. 1-2.

158. Roy E. Appleman, Interview, December 11, 1969, CUOHP, p. 16; Appleman to Palmer, September 10, 1981, author's files; conversation with Peterson.

159. Appleman to Palmer, September 10, 1981.

160. Appleman, Interview, pp. 2-4; 14-15.

161. Peterson, Interview, January 8, 1981, p. 27.

162. Peterson, Interview, October 24, 1969, p. 35.

163. Ibid., pp. 3-4.

164. Charles E. Peterson, "A Preliminary Report -- June 1947: The Philadelphia National Shrines Project," pp. 13-14, Charles E. Peterson Papers.

165. Ibid., pp. 9-12; 16-17.

166. Ibid., pp. 20-21; 40.

167. Simon to Lewis, July 24, 1947, Lewis Papers.

168. Appleman, "Report," pp. 8-17.

169. Independence Hall Association, Minutes, June 5, 1947, Lewis Papers.

170. Appleman, "Report," p. 16.

171. Edmund Bacon, Interview, June 25, 1970, CUOHP, p. 5.

172. Peterson, "Report," pp. 40-41.

173. Appleman, "Report," pp. 19-20; Appleman to Lewis, April 23, 1947, Lewis Papers.

174. Ibid.

175. Appleman, Interview, p. 4-5.

176. Appleman, "Report," pp. 18-19.

177. Appleman, "Report," pp. 20-21; Appleman to Lewis, April 23, 1947.

178. Appleman, Interview, pp. 14-15.

179. H. Joseph McCosker to Lewis, July 16, 1947, Lewis Papers.

180. Appleman, "Report," p. 17.

181. McCosker to Lewis, July 16, 1947; August 8, 1947, Lewis Papers.

182. Appleman to Dwight E. Lowell, January 31, 1950, Lewis Papers; Peterson, Interview, October 24, 1969, pp. 33-34.

183. Lewis, "Here Lies an Honest Lawyer," p. 69; Interview, January 2, 1969, p. 14; Interview, August 7, 1956.

184. Minutes, Meeting of Philadelphia National Shrines Park Commission, October 6, 1947, Lewis Papers.

185. It is not entirely clear who actually drafted the recommendations. A typed draft, heavily edited in Lewis's handwriting, is in his papers at INHPL. Certainly what was presented was in accord with his thinking.

186. Philadelphia National Shrines Park Commission, "Final Report to the Congress of the United States," December 29, 1947.

187. Simon to Lewis, April 22, 1947, Lewis Papers.

188. Photographic copies of most of Simon's drawings are in the photographic files, INHP.

189. Shrines Commission, "Report."

NOTES - CHAPTER IV

1. Chapman to Welch, February 27, 1948, "House Report no. 1819, April 26, 1948," United States Code, Congressional Service, 80th Congress, Second Session, 1948, pp. 2095-2098. The carbon copy of this letter in Lewis's files has the initials RFL and TAS typed in. The former is Lee, the latter probably the Department Solicitor who reviewed the bill.

2. Ibid., p. 2097.

3. Roy E. Appleman to George A. Palmer, September 10, 1981; Charles W. Porter III to Palmer, March 29, 1983, author's files.

4. Charles Hosmer, Preservation Comes of Age(Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1981) 1:614.

5. Ibid., 1: 485-490.

6. Ibid., 2:726-735.

7. Herbert E. Kahler, Memorandum, December 4, 1945, History Division Files, WASO, NPS.

8. Transcript, Committee on Public Lands, Subcommittee on Public Lands, H.R. 5053 and H.R. 5054, March 1, 1948, Lewis Papers.

9. Hardie Scott to Edwin O. Lewis, March 4, 1948, Lewis Papers.

10. Memorandum, Visit of Subcommittee on Public Lands, March 22, 1948, Lewis Papers.

11. Philadelphia Sunday Inquirer, April 11, 1948.

12. Transcript, Committee on Public Lands, H.R. 5053, April 21, 1948, Lewis Papers.

13. Edwin O. Lewis, Interview, January 2, 1969, CUOHP, p. 17.

14. Transcript, April 21, 1948.

15. Edwin O. Lewis, Interview, January 16, 1970, CUOHP, p.21.

16. Philadelphia Bulletin, June 19, 1948.

17. Philadelphia Inquirer, June 29, 1948.

18. Ibid., January 7, 1949.

19. Edmund Bacon, Interview, September 17, 1982, CMG, pp. 18-19.

20. Philadelphia Inquirer, January 7, 1949.

21. Drew Pearson, "Washington Merry-Go-Round," Philadelphia Bulletin, April 20, 1949.

22. Philadelphia Inquirer, March 31, 1949.

23. Ibid.

23. Letter from Lewis, for circulation, October 6, 1949, Lewis Papers.

24. "House Report no. 1819," p. 2098.

25. Philadelphia Inquirer, June 21, 1949.

26. Ibid., May 24, 1949.

27. Philadelphia Bulletin, November 16, 1949.

28. Superintendent's Monthly Report, February 13, 1951, FRCW, Box 64. This first official report from Independence summarized activities for the previous fifteen months.

29. Melford O. Anderson, Interview, March 22, 1982, CMG.

30. Philadelphia Bulletin, May 8, 1970.

31. Typescript biography of Melford O. Anderson, pp. 1-2, author's files.

32. Anderson, Interview, March 22, 1981, p. 1.

33. Hosmer, Preservation, pp. 503-509, 611.

34. Interview with Martin I. Yoelson, February 22, 1983.

35. Edward Riley, Interview, November 23, 1970, CUOHP, p. 7

36. Steel and Clark were not present. It is not clear whether they ever accepted their appointments. By 1950 they were replaced by Isaac W. Roberts and Frederic R. Mann.

37. ACM, November 29, 1949.

38. Superintendent's Monthly Report, February 13, 1951.

39. Cooperative agreement files, INHPHQ.

40. Superintendent's Monthly Report, February 13, 1951.

41. ACM, April 20, 1950.

42. Superintendent's Monthly Report, February 13, 1951.

43. Riley, Interview, p. 8.

44. Superintendent's Report, February 13, 1951.

45. Riley, Interview, p. 6.

46. Ibid., p. 17.

47. Lewis, Interview, January 2, 1969, p. 30; January 16, 1970, p. 23.

48. Riley, Interview, pp. 11-12.

49. Superintendent's Monthly Report, February 133, 1951.

50. Ibid.; Riley, Interview, p. 11.

51. Superintendent's Mpnthly Report, February 13, 1951.

52. Charles E. Peterson, Interview, January 8, 1981, CMG, p. 46.

53. Superintendent's Monthly Report, February 13, 1951.

54. Ibid.

55. Hosmer, Preservation, 2:742-743.

56. Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, January 24, 1950.

57. Herbert E. Kahler to Peterson, July 14, 1950, Lewis Papers.

58. Superintendent's Monthly Report, February 13, 1951.

59. Interview with George A. Palmer, March 1, 1983.

60. Peterson, Interview, p. 28.

61. Interview with George A. Palmer, March 1, 1983.

62. Conrad L. Wirth, Interview, January 26, 1982, CMG, p. 20; Interview with Charles E. Peterson, April 13, 1982.

63. Superintendent's Monthly Report, February 13, 1951.

64. Ibid.

65. Ibid. The report indicates that the event occurred on January 1. However, acceptances of invitations to attend, in the Lewis papers, give the date as January 2.

NOTES - CHAPTER V

1. Hobart G. Cawood, Interview, December 9, 1976, GAP, p. 20.

2. Martin I. Yoelson, Interview, March 12, 1981, CMG, pp. 1-2.

3. Ibid., p. 7.

4. IDMR, January 1951.

5. Ibid., February 1951.

6. Ibid., December 1951 - November 1952.

7. Conrad L. Wirth, Parks, Politics, and the People (University of Oklahoma Press: Norman, 1980), p. 60.

8. Charles E. Peterson, Interview, January 8, 1981, CMG, pp. 35, 38; Interview with Peterson, April 8, 1983.

9. Peterson, Interview, January 8, 1981, pp. 32, 33.

10. Charles E. Peterson, "Philadelphia's New National Park," Proceedings of the Eightieth Annual Meeting of the Fairmount Park Association (Philadelphia: Fairmount Park Association, 1952), pp. 32-36.

11. Interview with Peterson, April 8, 1983. The only known copy of the drawing was found in the drawing files of the Mid-Atlantic Region NPS. The drawing is not signed, but is clearly in Peterson's hand, and has been identified by him. Although a date in 1955 has been put on the title block, this may simply represent the date on which the copy was put into the files of the Eastern Office of Design and Construction. A copy of the drawing has now been filed at the National Park Service's Denver Service Center, and assigned the number 391/60,002.

12. Wirth, Parks, p. 285. During the 1940s Demaray often served as acting director and was, in effect, running the National Park Service.

13. Interview with Peterson, March 1, 1984.

14. P.L. 212 - 82nd Cong., October 26, 1951.

15. H.R. 6554, February 11, 1952.

16. Lewis to Chapman, March 25, 1952., Lewis Papers.

17. P.L. 497, 83rd Cong.

18. Lewis Correspondence, passim., Lewis Papers.

19. Wirth, Interview, January 26, 1982, pp. 1-2.

20. Lisle to Anderson, August 1, 1952, D1815 INDE, FRCW A3815.

21. "Recommendations for Proposed Redevelopment East of Third Street Independence National Historical Park Project," INHPOH. The report is unsigned and undated. However, the content and style are clearly Peterson's. The word "Draft" and the date "Aug. 10 '51" have been added in pencil to the title page.

22. Allen Evans to Anderson, December 4, 1951, RG 79, H 3015, INDE #2, 61362 #129, FRCS.

23. Wirth to Anderson, January 2, 1952, Ibid.

24. J. Somers Smith, Jr. to Lewis, November 16, 1951, Ibid.

25. O'Brien to J. Somers Smith, Jr., February 5, 1952, Ibid.

26. Morris W. Kolander to Frances Wister, August 16, 1952, Ibid.

27. Anderson to Wirth, August 18, 1952, Ibid.

28. Harold L. Peterson to Samuel E. Smith, August 29, 1952, Ibid.

29. Thomas Vint, Interview Herbert Evison, National Park Service Archives, Harper's Ferry, pp. 10-11.

30. Riley to Kahler, January 29, 1953, D18, D1815, FRCW.

31. Ibid.

32 Anderson to Wirth, February 16, 1953, D18, INHPHQ.

33. Vint to Peterson, February 16, 1953, D18 INHPHQ.

34. Anderson to Edmund Bacon, February 27, 1953; to Nathaniel F. Keith, Director of Slum Clearance and Redevelopment, Housing and Home Finance Agency, March 6, 1953, D1815 INDE, D18, FRCW.

35. Wirth to Milton Grigg, March 30, 1953, D18, INHPHQ.

36. Bannister to Wirth, May 13, 1953, Ibid.

37. Wirth to Bannister, May 29, 1953, Ibid.

38. Simon to Wirth, June 12, 1953, Ibid.

39. Simon to Bannister, May 16, 1953, Ibid.

40. Anderson to Peterson, January 12, 1954, Ibid.

41. Charles E. Peterson, "Carpenters' Court," Historic Philadelphia, Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1953, pp. 96-128.

42. Hodge Hanson to George A. Palmer, March 1981, author's files.

43. Drawing, NHP-IND 2011, March 9, 1954.

44. Master Plan Development Outline, Independence National Historical Park (Project), March 1954, Project Area A, 3, D18, INHPHQ.

45. Drawing, NHP-IND 2006, March 1954.

46. Peterson to Anderson, March 23, 1954, D1815, INHPHQ.

47. Peterson to Anderson, April 15, 1954, D18, FRCW.

48. Anderson to Cox, April 16, 1954, Ibid.

49. J.W. Holland, April 21, 1954, Ibid.

50. ACM, May 28, 1954.

51. Peterson to Anderson, March 23, 1954, D1815, Ibid.

52. Anderson to Wirth, March 30, 1954, Ibid.

53. Hillory Tolson to Cox, May 21, 1954, Ibid.

54. Summary of Total Estimated Preliminary Development Costs, Independence NHP, May 1954, Ibid.

55. Wirth to Cox, May 21, 1954, Ibid.

56. Idem.

57. Anderson to Cox, July 9, 1954, D18, FRCW.

58. Anderson to Cox, July 28, 1954, D18, INHPHQ.

59. Agnes Gilchrist to Riley, April 29, 1954, Ibid.

60. William J. Murtagh, Interview.

61. Anderson to Gilchrist, May 17, 1954, D18, INHPHQ.

62. Peterson to Anderson, June 8, 1954, Ibid.

63. Thomas J. Allen to Anderson, October 7, 1954, D18, FRCW.

64. Wirth to Anderson, October 12, 1954, D18, INHPHQ.

65. Wirth to Anderson, December 8, 1954, D18, FRCW.

66. George A. Palmer, Interview, June 30, 1980, Bernard Goodman, pp. 2-3.

67. Ibid., pp. 14-16.

68. Ibid., pp. 4-5.

69. Charles E. Peterson, Interview, January 8, 1981, CMG, p. 37.

70. Interview with George A. Palmer, January 7, 1981, CMG.

71. Conrad L. Wirth, Interview, January 26, 1982.

72. Revised Master Plan, July 21, 1955, INHP.

73. Drawing NHP-IND 2006A, September 28, 1955.

74. H.R. 3937, August 20, 1951.

75. Conrad L. Wirth, Parks, pp.234-238.

76. Ibid., pp. 238-261.

77. Wirth, Interview, pp. 20-21.

78. ACM, November 16, 1955. The interest of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick was solicited because of the building's occupancy by General Stephen Moylan after the widowed Dolley Todd married James Madison and sold the property.

79. Anderson to Tobin, March 26, 1956,INHPQ.

80. Tobin to Wirth, June 7, 1956, Ibid.

81. Wirth to Tobin, July 27, 1956, Ibid.

82. Carroll L.V. Meeks to Lewis, September 25, 1956, Ibid.

83. Philip Johnson to Lewis, September 19, 1956, Ibid.

84. Lewis to Johnson, September 25, 1956, Ibid.

85. Lewis to Anderson, September 28, 1956, Ibid.

86. Anderson to Lewis, October 5, 1956, Ibid.

87. Anderson to Tobin, October 8, 1956, Ibid.

88. Anderson to Tobin, November 27, 1956, Ibid.

89. Wirth to Edmund R. Purves, February 8, 1957, Ibid.

90. Lewis to Anderson, March 5, 1957, Ibid.

91. Anderson to Tobin, March 22, 1957, Ibid.

92. Wirth to Tobin, April 9, 1957, Ibid.

93. Thomas J. Allen to Regional Directors, March 30, 1956, D-22 Programs 1958, FRCW; Interview with Peterson, March 1, 1984.

94. Tobin to Wirth, April 6, 1956, Ibid.

95. Mission 66 Prospectus, Independence National Historical Park, April 23, 1957 (rev. May 10), INHPL. According to Charles Peterson, the decision on the buildings' structural condition was made in a rather casual manner. Walter Huber, an engineer and member of the National Park Service Advisory Board was visiting Independence, and was taken to see Marshall's Court by Anderson. On the basis of a brief look, he declared them unsound.

96. Ibid.

97. Lewis Mumford, The Sky Line: Philadelphia - I," New Yorker, November 17, 1956, pp. 132-142; "The Sky Line: Historic Philadelphia - II," Ibid., February 9, 1957, pp. 98-106; "The Sky Line: Historic Philadelphia - III," Ibid., April 6, 1957, pp. 120 -129; "The Sky Line: Historic Philadelphia - IV," Ibid., April 13, 1957, pp.143-150.

98. Mumford, "Historic Philadelphia - II," p. 98.

99. Mumford, "Historic Philadelphia - III," p.124.

100. ACM, April 30, 1957.

101. Zimmer to Anderson, August 6, 1957, D18 INHPHQ.

102. Drawing #NHP-IND-3018.

103. Kurjack to Tobin, September 9, 1957, D18, INHPHQ.

104. Drawing #NHP-IND-3018A. This drawing bearing the two dates, October 10 and October 15, evidently existed in an earlier form, which was available for the September 15 meeting in Wyoming. It appears to have been park service practice to work over or discard earlier versions of drawings unless major revisions were made, in which case a fresh drawing was prepared and given a new number.

105. Anderson to Tobin, October 15, 1957, D 18, INHPHQ.

106. Drawing #NHP-IND-3018A.

107. Anderson to Wirth, October 17, 1957, D18, INHPHQ.

108. Drawing #NHP-IND-3018B, August 26, 1957; approved November 11, 1957.

109. ACM, November 8, 1957.

110. Anderson to Tobin, April 17, 1958, D18, INHPHQ.

111. ACM, January 10, 1957.

112. ACM, April 30, 1957.

113. Anderson to Dilworth, June 13, 1958, D18, INHPHQ.

114. Lewis to Anderson, June 6, 1958, Ibid.

115. Anderson to Wirth, Nov. 4, 1957, A18, FRCW.

116. George A. Palmer, Interview, June 6, 1980, p. 15.

117. Anderson to Wirth, June 25, 1958, D18, INHPHQ.

118. Palmer to Wirth, October 3, 1958, Ibid.

119. Scoyen to Tobin, November 3, 1958, D22, FRCW.

120. HSR, Contributionship Stable.

121. Zimmer to Tobin, February 26, 1959, D18, INHPHQ.

122. Sutton to Zimmer, February 26, 1959, Ibid.

123. Public Law 746, August 27, 1958.

124. Lewis to Wirth, November 17, 1958, INDE A18, FRCW.

125. Wirth to Lewis, December 23, 1958, Ibid.

126. Drawing NHP-IND-2495, September 4, 1957, Architect's Files, INHP.

127. Lewis to Wirth, January 5, 1959, INDE A18, FRCW.

128. Wirth to Lewis, January 21, 1959, Ibid.

129. Bacon to Anderson, January 28, 1959, D3423, INHPHQ.

130. Anderson to Bacon, February 6, 1959, Ibid.

131. Ruth C. Roberts to Anderson, October 30, 1958, D18, INHPHQ.

132. Lewis to Wirth, November 17, 1958, INDE A18, FRCW.

133. Wirth to Lewis, December 23, 1958, Ibid.

134. "Minutes of the 556th Meeting of the Arts Commission," December 29, 1958, A18, INHPHQ.

135. Anderson to Tobin, January 26, 1959, A44, INHPHQ.

136. Tobin to Wirth, January 27, 1959, Ibid.

137. Wirth to Tobin, February 24, 1959, D18, INHPHQ.

138. Anderson to Tobin, March 6, 1959; Tobin to Wirth, March 18, 1959, D22, FRCW.

139. Philadelphia Inquirer, April 9, 1959.

140. ACM, April 29, 1959.

141. Ibid., May 25, 1959.

142. Ibid., September 28, 1959.

143. Ibid.

144. Wirth to Tobin, May 26, 1959, A18, FRCW.

145. Philip Price to Joseph S. Clark, July 23, 1959, A3815, FRCW.

146. Wirth to Clark, n.d. (probably September 1, 1959), Ibid.

147. James R. Sullivan, Interview, May 9, 1977, GAP, p. 17.

148. M.O. Anderson, Interview, March 22, 1982, CMG, pp. 25; 37-38.

149. Interview with Thomas Wistar, Jr., February 22, 1982.

150. Cabot to Anderson, November 11, 1958, D22, FRCW.

151. Zimmer to Anderson, April 2, 1959, D18, INHPHQ.

152. Hosmer, Preservation, 2:753-757.

153. Wistar interview.

154. Peterson, Interview, January 8, 1981, p. 43.

155. Zimmer to Anderson, April 2, 1959, D18, INHP.

156. Anderson to Dilworth, April 3, 1959, Ibid.

157. Ibid.

158. Anderson to Dilworth, April 20, 1959, Ibid.

159. Dilworth to Anderson, May 5, 1959, Ibid.

160. Communication with Jefferson Moak, Philadelphia Historical Commission, January 18, 1984.

161. Wistar to Zimmer, May 5, 1959, architect's files, INHPL.

162. Wistar to Harbeson, June 18, 1959, Ibid.

163. Minutes of Meeting of Historic Architectural Committee on June 23, 1959, June 25, 1959, Ibid.

164. Interview with Nicholas Gianopulos, April 30, 1982.

165. Ibid.

166. ACM, September 28, 1959

167. Kurjack to Anderson, October 19, 1959, D18, INHPHQ.

168. Platt to Kurjack, February 24, 1960, Ibid.

169. Anderson to Tobin, October 13, 1959, Ibid.

170. Tobin to Anderson, October 23, 1959, Ibid.

171. Zimmer to Anderson, November 17, 1959, Ibid.

172. Summary Notes, Conference, Independence NHP., March 9-10,1960, D18, INHPHQ.

173. William C. Everhart, Interview, April 23, 1981, CMG.

174. Philadelphia Inquirer, January 13, 1960.

NOTES - CHAPTER VI

1. Neg. # 5734, INHPL, courtesy Historical Society of Pennsylvania.

2. Neg. # 2168, INHPL.

3. Charles E. Peterson to Editor, Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Architect's Files, INHPL.

4. Walter H. Stowe to Peterson, October 17, 1947, Ibid.

5. Rev. Dr. James A. Montgomery to Peterson, November 4, 1947, Ibid.

6. Neg. # 217-232, October 1950, INHPL.

7. One of the Fawcitt photographs, #220, shows a shutter face down on the basement floor. Charles E. Peterson (interview, March 1, 1984) remembers finding the front door used in a similar manner.

8. Peterson to M.O. Anderson, April 19, 1951, architects' files, INHPL.

9. Historic Structures Report, Part II, Supplement I, January 1961, Foreword (by Charles E. Peterson).

10. Neg. # 331-379, INHPL.

11. Historic Building Report, Part I, April 1958, III 2, 4 (by Charles S. Grossman).

12. Notebook, "Bishop White House," architects' files, INHPL. This notebook, kept in several hands, provides a rough chronology of work and findings at the Bishop White House in the late 1950s. Benson's drawing for the cornice is NHP-IND 2254.

13. Thomas Allen to Regional Directors, March 30, 1956, Programs 1958, FRCW. At that time the 1958 fiscal year would have begun on July 1, 1957.

14. Anderson to Daniel Tobin, March 26, 1956, D1815, INHPHQ.

15. Tobin to Region V Superintendents, July 13, 1956, Ibid.

16. Interview with William M. Campbell, November 18, 1980.

17. Interview with Penelope Hartshorne Batcheler, February 2, 1984. Hartshorne married George Batcheler in 1968. In this manuscript she is referred to by the name she signed to documents or drawings at the time they were produced.

18. Interview with Penelope Hartshorne Batcheler, April 5, 1984.

19. Penelope Hartshorne Batcheler, Interview, November 20, 1980, pp. 6-7.

20. Batcheler, Interview, October 23, 1980, p. 9.

21. Batcheler, Interview, November 20, 1980, p. 7.

22. HBR, Part I, April 1958, II 2, 1-5 (David Wallace).

23. Data on 309 Walnut Street, gathered by William M. Campbell, October 21, 1955, October 21, 1955, architects' files, INHPL.

24. Philadelphia Exchange - following material collected by Wm. J. Murtagh & Samuel Edgerton, Summer 1956, INHPAO; William J. Murtagh, Interview, February 18, 1981, 3.

25. Notebook; Drawings, NP-IND 2449, 1-12, 1955-1958.

26. Paul J.F. Schumacher, Archeological Field Notes, Archeological Project, Bishop White House Basement - 309 Walnut Street, October 12, 1956, INHPL.

27. Neg. #s 157.186 and 157.182, INHPL.

28. William M. Campbell, Notes, Bishop White House, architects' files, INHPL.

29. Ibid.; HBR, Part I, April 1958, III, 1, 3.

30. The architectural study collection has now grown to include over 1,000 items, most of them accurately dated. Since 1961 it has been professionally catalogued. During the 1950s it was exhibited in the McIlvaine House, which, for a time was considered as a permanent museum to house the collection. From 1970 to 1972 a selection of items from the collection formed the basis for an exhibit entitled "See What They Sawed," displayed at the First Bank of the United States. The items were then returned to storage, where they remained for a number of years. Since 1981 a portion of the collection has been installed in the cellar of the First Bank, where it is open to view by appointment. Other items in the collection are available for study by scholars on request.

31. Batcheler, Interview, October 23, 1980; interview with Batcheler, April 5, 1984.

32. George L. Wrenn III, Architectural Research and Restoration Notes. Bishop White, Todd, Hibbard-Griffiths Houses, 1961-1963, architects' office, INHP.

33. Drawings NHP-IND 2449, 1-12, 1955-1958.

34. Willam M. Campbell, office calendar, history files, INHPL.

35. Randall J. Biallas, AIA, "Evolution of Historic Structure Reports," CRM Bulletin, VII, 1 (April 1984), 19.

36. David H. Wallace, office calendar, history files, INHPL.

37. Minutes of Master Plan Meeting, March 9-10, 1960, D18, INHPHQ.

38. Campbell, office calendar; Drawings NHP-IND 2550, 1-45.

39. Historic Structure Report, Part II, Supplement I, on restoration of the Bishop White House, January 1961, ii, (Henry A. Judd, Norman M. Souder, and George L. Wrenn).

40. Anderson to Tobin, October 28, 1958, H-30, INHPQ.

41. Memorandum, Charles E. Peterson to Conrad Wirth, February 14, 1962. This memorandum, a copy of which was given to the author by Mr. Peterson, describes his reasons for retiring from the National Park Service and, while accounting for the frustrations leading to his decision, details the type of organization he had tried to build at EODC.

42. William M. Campbell, Interview, November 18, 1980, p. 16.

43. George A. Palmer to Wirth, Septemebr 7, 1960, A18, INHPHQ.

44. HSR, Part II, Supplement I, January 1961.

45. Wrenn, Notes.

46. HSR, Part II, Supp. I, iii; 1.

47. Anderson to Lee, January 30, 1961. This copy of the memorandum is bound into MARO's copy of the January 1961 supplement to the HSR.

48. Anderson to Lee, June 20, 1961. This memorandum is bound in the same volume.

49. Wrenn, Notes.

50. Ibid.; Interview with Batcheler, April 4, 1984.

51. Wrenn, Notes.

52. Charles Dorman, Interview, March 12, 1981, 1-5.

53. Ibid., 5.

54. Ibid., 6.

55. Ibid., 8.

56. Furnishing Plan for the Bishop White House, December 1961, C, 5-6, (David A. Kimball and Charles G. Dorman).

57. Ibid., B, 1-9.

58. Ibid., D.

59. Penelope Hartshorne, Paint Color Research and Restoration, Technical Leaflet 15, American Association for State and Local History (1968).

60. Hartshorne, draft of report on paint color research at the Bishop White House, June 26, 1964, history files, INHPL.

61. Batcheler, Interview, October 23, 1980, p. 17.

62. architects' files, INHPL.

63. Drawing NPS-IND 3302.

64. Batcheler, Interview, October 23, 1980, p. 13.

65. ACM, November 3, 1967.

66. Quoted in National Park Service, The Restoration and Refurnishing of Independence Hall 1953-1963, 1963.

67. John B. Lukens, Report of the 1951 Rehabilitation Work on the Buildings at Independence Square, July 13, 1951, architect's files, INHP.

68. Memorandum, Hartshorne to file, May 11, 1960, bound in HSR, Part III, Repainting of Interior - Entrance Hall and Tower Stairhall, architect's office copy, INHP.

69. Anderson to Clement Storm, William L. Clements Library, August 30, 1954, H2215, FRCW.

70. Analysis of the Historical Research Program at Independence National Historical Park, August 11, 1953, Ibid.

71. Anderson to Tobin, December 11, 1953, Ibid.

72. Far less had been established at this time about the documentation for Congress Hall, and almost nothing about Old City Hall.

73. Draft, Report on Furnishings for Independence Hall, December 11, 1953, H-2215 FRCW.

74. Restoration and Refurnishing.

75. Lee to Cox, September 16, 1954, H-2215 FRCW.

76. Anderson to Wirth, November 22, 1954, Ibid.

77. IDMR, February, March, April, May 1954, INHPL.

78. Minutes, Advisory Commission Meeting on Selection of Furnishings for Independence Hall, December 15, 1954, H-2215 FRCW. There are two versions of these minutes, which differ in detail but not in substance.

79. IDMR, September 1954, INHPL.

80. Lee to Cox, September 16, 1954, H-2215 FRCW.

81. Cox to Lee, September 21, 1954, Ibid.

82. Riley, "The Independence Hall Group," p. 17, n. 75; p. 20. Riley was not yet willing to accept the acccuracy of the Pine-Savage painting because it had been executed a decade after the event. By 1954, however, the staff at Independence had generally accepted the painting, and the engraving of it made by Savage, as the most authentic representation of the Assembly Room in the crucial period.

83. Ibid. p. 23, n. 119.

84. Lee to Cox, September 16, 1954., H-2215 FRCW.

85. Anderson to Wirth, November 22, 1954, A24 FRCW.

86. Nelligan to Anderson, February 8, 1955, Ibid.

87. Restoration and Refurnishing.

88. Nelligan to Anderson, February 28, 1955, A24 FRCW.

89. Nelligan to Anderson, March 21, 1955, Ibid.

90. Ibid.

91. Wirth to Mrs. Robert I.C. Prout, April 18, 1957, Ibid.

92. Log of Restoration of Independence Hall: 1954, 1956, 1957, 1959, Assembly Room, architect's office, INHP, hereafter referred to as A Room Log. During the late 1950s a separate log or daybook was kept by the architects for each of the spaces on the first floor of Independence Hall. The entries in the A Room log were made by Charles Grossman in 1954 and by Penelope Hartshorne thereafter.

93. Quoted in Riley, "The Independence Hall Group," p. 34.

94. Ibid., p. 34, n. 11. According to the sometimes reliable John F. Watson in Annals of Philadelphia, much of the original paneling had been stored in the attic of Independence Hall and Haviland only had to eke it out with

new work. Other earlier nineteenth-century accounts found subsequently by the park service historians indicated, however, that the original paneling had been destroyed.

95. A Room Log, November 22, 1954.

96. Ibid. , November 8 and November 18, 1954.

97. Ibid, November 25 and December 1, 1954.

98. Minutes, Advisory Commission on ...Furnishings, December 15, 1954.

99. James M. Mulcahy, "Congress Voting Independence," The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography, LXXX, 1 (January 1956), 74-92.

100. Research cards, INHPL.

101. Nelligan to Anderson, February 28, 1955, H-2215 FRCW.

102. Log of Restoration of Independence Hall: 1955, 1956, 1957, 1959, Supreme Court Room, architect's office, INHP, hereafter SC Log.

103. Log of Restoration of Independence Hall: 1956, 1957, Center Hall, architect's office, INHP, January, February 9 and 10, 1956, hereafter CH Log.

104. Penelope Hartshorne Batcheler, "Independence Hall: Its Appearance Restored," Building Early America, Philadelphia: Chilton Book Company (1976), p. 306.

105. CH Log, March 12, 1956.

106. Ibid., March 13, 1956; A Room Log, March 15, 1956.

107. Ibid., March 16, 1956.

108. SC Log, March 14, 1956.

109. Ibid., April 13, 1956; A Room Log, April 5 and April 13, 1956.

110. Log of Restoration of Independence Hall: 1956, 1957, 1958, Exterior, architect's office, INHP, May 11, June 5 and June 29, 1956, hereafter Ext. Log.

111. Ibid.

112. The company, Finnaren & Haley, produced a line of paint based on the restorations in the park. Some, such as Supreme Court Yellow and Todd House Red, like Independence Hall White, are based on actual colors found in the course of paint research. Other paints in the line, such as Woodford Green, are derived from other historic buildings in Philadelphia;

the collection is supplemented with other colors that have not been authenticated.

113. SC Log, June and August 1, 1956.

114. Log of Restoration of Independence Hall: 1957, 1958, 1959, 1960, Tower Stair Hall, architect's office, INHP, November 28, 1956, herafter TSH Log.

115. Batcheler, "Independence Hall: Its Appearance Restored", pp. 305, 308.

116. TSH Log, November 26 and November 28, 1956.

117. Ibid., December 26 and December 27, 1956; February 1957.

118. Ibid., February 20 and October 17, 1957.

119. Ibid., June 15 and May 15, 1957.

120. Ibid., January 6, 1958.

121. Ibid., July 23 and August 12, 1958.

122. Grossman to Anderson, August 29, 1957, D18, INHPHQ.

123. Ext. Log, October 2 and December 26, 1957, January 22, 1958.

124. A Room Log, October 25, October 28, October 29, 1956.

125. Batcheler, "Independence Hall: Its Appearance Restored," p. 310; Architectural Report on the Assembly Room, Independence National Historical Park, Maintenance Devision, second rough draft, 1958, architects' files, INHP.

126. Historic Structures Report, Congress Hall, Part II, 1960,III, II, 110.

127. Anderson to Tobin, October 28, 1958, H-2215, FRCW.

128. Peterson to Zimmer, March 27, 1959, architects' files, INHPL.

129. Anderson to Tobin, October 28, 1958, D18, INHPHQ.

130. Anderson to Tobin, November 21, 1958, Ibid.

131. Zimmer to Vint, April 1, 1959, Ibid.

132. TSH Log, April 25, 1960.

133. Contract files, MARO.

134. Judd to Acting Director EODC, June 14, 1961, D18, INHPHQ.

135. Lee H. Nelson, Interview, March 24, 1981, page 3.

136. Ibid.

137. Hall to Anderson, July 20, 1961, D18, INHPHQ.

138. Interview with Blaine Cliver, November, 1984.

139. Nelson, Interview, p. 5.

140. Hall to Anderson, July 20, 1961; Lee H.Nelson, "Independence Hall: Its Fabric Reinforced," Building Early America, Philadelphia: Chilton Book Company (1976), pp. 290, 293. Photographs of the interior of the Assembly Room show that the furnishings, which had been removed in December 1955, had been reinstalled in 1956.

141. Nelson, Interview, p. 5.

142. Philadelphia Inquirer, January 8, 1961.

143. Interview with Nicholas L. Gianopulos, April 30, 1982.

144. Hall to Anderson, July 14, 1961, D18, INHPHQ.

145. Nelson, "Independence Hall: Its Fabric Reinforced," 290-291.

146. Peterson to Hall, July 19, 1961, D18, INHPHQ.

147. Nelson, "Independence Hall: Its Fabric Reinforced," passim.

148. Peterson to Wirth, February 14, 1962, Peterson Papers.

149. Conrad L. Wirth, Parks, Politics, and the People, Norman: University of Oklahoma Press (1980), pp. 296-310.

150. David Kimball to Dennis Kurjack, August 19, 1961, architects' files, INHP.

151. Interview with Martin I. Yoelson, November 26, 1980.

152. HSR, Independence Hall, Part II, Architectural Data Section, July 1964, p. ii, (Lee H. Nelson). The Haviland paneling, which belongs to the City of Philadelphia, was first stored in the Second Bank of the United States at Independence and then transferred to a National Park Service storage area in Springfield, Virginia. According to Penelope Hartshorne Batcheler, when the park service informed the city in the early 1970s that there was no longer room for the paneling in Springfield, the Penn Mutual Insurance Company expressed interest in acquiring the woodwork for installation in a visitors' facility in its new skyscraper on Walnut Street. The company's exhibit designer, however, did not consider it suitable for the proposed use, and it was then moved to the basement of another commercial building in Philadelphia, while the Philadelphia College of Art considered reusing

it in a restoration of its Haviland building. At present its fate is still undetermined.

153. A Room Log, passim.; Batcheler, "Independence Hall: Its Fabric Restored," passim.

154. Peterson to Theodore Sizer, November 2, 1962, architects' files. The drawing has since been given to The Athenaeum of Philadelphia.

155. George Vaux to Robert G. Hall, January 7, 1965, Ibid.

156. Lee H. Nelson, "Restoration in Independence Hall," offprint from The Magazine Antiques, July 1966.

157. Wilman Spawn to Nelson, May 6, 1963, architects' files.

158. FBI to Hall, October 24, 1963, Ibid.

159. Tate to Lewis, July 1, 1964; Lewis to Anderson, July 2, 1964; Ronald F. Lee to George Hartzog, July 8, 1964, D-18, INHPHQ.

160. Robert E. Smith to Lawrence B. Coryell and Henry Judd, January 5, 1965, Ibid.

161. Nelson and Joseph Petrak to Anderson, March 30, 1967, Ibid.

162. Philadelphia Inquirer, June 24, 1965.

163. The progress of construction is recorded in photographs in the INHP collection. See, for example, neg. #s 157.1810, 157.1879, 157.1853, 157.1864.

164. Philadelphia Inquirer, June 24, 1965.

165. Ibid.

166. HSR, Independence Hall, Part II, Tower Stairway, Exterior and Steeple, 1965, Lee H. Nelson and Joseph Petrak.

167. HSR, Independence Hall, Part II, "Paving" in the Central Hall and Tower Stairhall and Related Exterior Doorways, Sills, Steps and Pavements, Febraury 1966, pp. 1-17 (Lee H. Nelson).

168. Ibid., pp. 21-50. See also Appendix C, Summary of Archeological Cooperative Work, (John L. Cotter and B. Bruce Powell).

169. HSR, Independence Hall, Part III, Repainting of Interior: Entrance Hall and Tower Stairhall, November 1960, pp. 1-2, (Penelope Hartshorne). Although its recognition as a problem may be relatively recent, air pollution is certainly not a modern phenomenon. In the eighteenth century Independence Hall was lighted entirely by candles and warmed by open fires

and stoves. The smoke and fumes from these sources would certainly have contributed to the discoloration of the interior finishes. Hartshorne at this time does not appear to have been compensating for the bleaching effect of sunlight, another factor later recognized as diminishing the vividness of paint colors.

170. Hartshorne to Benson Acting Chief Architect, Historic Structures, June 22, 1959, H30, FRCW.

171. HSR, Painting of Interiors, p. 3.

172. Ibid., pp. 13-15.

173. HSR, Independence Hall, Supreme Court Ceiling, Entablature and Wall Paneling, August 1966, Lee H. Nelson.

174. In studying nails as a dating tool, Nelson was refining the pioneering work of Henry Mercer of Doylestown, Pennsylvania. In 1923 Mercer published a pamphlet entitled The Dating of Old Houses in which he illustrated and described dated examples of paneling, hardware, and nails.

175. HSR, Independence Hall, Supreme Court Ceiling..., Appendix B. The illustrations for this section of the report along with a text by Nelson, were reissued as a pamphlet, entitled Nail Chronology by the American Association for State and Local History in 1968. The pamphlet has often been cited by others as supportive of dates for nails, or even for buildings. However, as Nelson has often reiterated, nails alone, without supporting evidence, are insufficient for dating purposes. Additionally, the data applies only to Philadelphia and its immediate environs. The development of nail technology in other parts of the country may have followed a somewhat different course.

176. Interview with Penelope Hartshorne Batcheler, August 16, 1984.

177. Architectural Analysis of the Supreme Court Room of Independence Hall, April 1959, Penelope Hartshorne, architects' files, INHP.

178. Drawings NHP-IND 3425, 1-50.

179. James C. Massey, Interview, March 26, 1981, p. 22.

180. HSR, Supreme Court Ceiling....

181. Minutes, General Meeting on Independence Development Program, January 27, 1966, D-22, FRCW.

182. Minutes, March 21, 1966, Ibid.

183. Smith to Garrison, May 10, 1966, Ibid.

184. Petrak to Anderson, August 3, 1966, architects' files, INHP.

185. The latter report is dated September 1966.

186. Coryell to Smith, November 3, 1966, architects' files, INHP.

187. Michael P. Koper to Price and Dickey, November 15, 1966, Ibid.

188. Nelson and Petrak to Anderson, March 30, 1967, Ibid.

189. Review Sheet, February 11 [1966], Ibid.

190. Anderson to Garrison, March 31, 1967, Ibid.

191. Nelson to Judd, August 24, 1967, Ibid.

192. Memorandum of meeting, August 30, 1967, Ibid.

193. Historic Furnishings Report, Supreme Court Chamber of Independence Hall, August 1979, Appendix A, pp. 7-15, (Daniel Joseph Sharp).

194. Drawing NHP-IND 3425-8.

195. Garrison to Connally, May 14, 1968, architects' files, INHP.

196. Nelson to Petrak, May 17, 1968, D18, INHPHQ. Because of the pressure to produce construction documents, the reports were never prepared.

197. ACM, November 3, 1967 and March 26, 1968.

198. Interview with Chester L. Brooks, March 19, 1982; Howard H. LaRue, Interview, April 13, 1977, GAP, p. 13; George A. Palmer, Interview, July 18, 1980, Bernard Goodman, P. 10.

199. Notes in preparation for meeting with Judd, architects' files, INHP.

200. Independence Hall, Second Floor, Draft, September 18, 1969, (Lee Nelson and Penelope Hartshorne Batcheler).

201. Interview with Brooks.

202. Ibid.

203. Ibid. ; Summary of Meeting at Independence National Historical Park, May 22, 1970, architects' files, INHP; Interview with Ernest A. Connally, February 4, 1981.

204. Although formal reports were not prepared, the work, and the rationale behind it are well documented by evidence drawings and photographs, as well as manuscript notes in the architects' files at INHP.

205. Larue, Interview, pp. 9-10.

206. Historic Furnishings Report, Supreme Court Chamber, Appendix E.

207. Interview with Penelope Hartshorne Batcheler, August 27, 1984.

208. Interview with Gianopulos.

209. The progress of the restoration of the second floor is thoroughly recorded in photographs in the park's architectural files, with neg. #s 157.2400ff.]

210. Nelson, Interview, pp. 9-10.

211. Charles E. Peterson, Interview, January 8, 1981, CMG, p. 28.

212. James C. Massey, Interview, March 26, 1981, CMG, p. 15.

213. Charles E. Peterson, "HABS - In and Out of Philadelphia," in Richard J. Webster, Philadelphia Preserved, Philadelphia: Temple University Press (1972), pp. xxxiii-xxxiv.

214. Massey, Interview.

215. Peterson, "HABS," p. xxxv.

216. Carol C. Smith, Fifty Years of the Historic American Buildings Survey, Alexandria, Virginia: Historic American Buildings Survey Foundation (1983), p. 10.

217. Massey, Interview, p. 2.

218. Interview with Penelope Hartshorne Batcheler, August 17, 1984; Nelson, Interview, p. 8.

219. Martin I. Yoelson, Interview, March 12, 1981, pp. 12-13.

220. Nelson, Interview, pp. 8-10.

221. See Neg. # 157.2394 for exhibit as it looked on opening day, October 19, 1970.

NOTES - CHAPTER VII

1. Although McCullough lacked formal historical or curatorial training, long familiarity had given him considerable knowledge of Independence Hall and its contents. Both Charles E. Peterson and William Everhart believe that the park service never took proper advantage of McCullough's talents and experience.

2. IDMR, January-December 1950.

3. Ibid., January-February 1951.

4. Priority List for Research at Independence National Historical Park, October 10, 1951, H-2215, FRCW.

5. IDMR, December 1951.

6. Ibid., October 1951.

7. Ibid., February, May, June 1951.

8. Ibid., July 1951.

9. Ibid., October 1953.

10. Ibid., June 1955.

11. Ibid., May 1951; Martin I. Yoelson, Interview, September 23, 1981, CMG, p. 28.

12. IDMR, January, April, August, October 1952.

13. Priority List, July 8, 1952, H-2215, FRCW.

14. Priority List, June 1, 1954, Ibid.

15. Analysis of the Historical Research Program at Independence National Historical Park, August 11, 1953, Ibid.

16. IDMR, May 1953. With increasing visitation by school groups, there was little time for research activity during the warm months, although by the summer of 1953 ten seasonal Ranger-Historians augmented the park staff in conducting group tours.

17. Analysis of the Historical Research Program.

18. M. O. Anderson to Regional Director, Region One (Cox?), December 7, 1954, H-2215, FRCW.

19. IDMR, March 1954.

20. IDMR, June, July, August 1954.

21. Anderson to Reg. Dir., December 7, 1954.

22. Dennis Kurjack, Interview, June 18, 1970, CUOHP, pp. 27-28

23. Martin I. Yoelson, Interview, March 12, 1981, CMG, pp. 5-6.

24. IDMR, June 1955.

25. Yoelson, Interview, March 12, 1981, p. 6; William C. Everhart, Interview,, CMG, p. 6.

26. Anderson to Tobin, March 14, 1957, H-2215, FRCW.

27. Interview with David A. Kimball, April 13, 1982.

28. Anderson to Tobin, July 5, 1957, H-2215, FRCW

29. Research for Non-Service Individuals at Independence National Historical Park, submitted with accompanying memo from Kurjack to Tobin, March 5, 1958, Ibid. Kahler had requested reports from all the regional directors as part of a study concerning research in the National Park Service. The study had evidently been prompted by requests from Congress about the park service's research programs, the methods by which these programs were carried out, and the facilities available for research. Kahler to Regional Directors, February 12, 1958, Ibid.

30. John D. R. Platt, Interview, April 24, 1981, CMG, pp. 1-2.

31. Ibid., pp. 5-6.

32. Edward A. Riley, Interview, November 23, 1970, CUOHP, p. 38.

33. Interview with Kimball.

34. IDMR, December 1956; March, May 1958. The Historic Grounds Reports included those on Carpenters' Hall and the First Bank of the United States, as well as the entire block bounded by Walnut and Chestnut and Third and Fourth Streets.

35. Yoelson, Interview, March 12, 1981, p. 16

36. See Chapter V.

37. Historical Research & Planning, and Personnel Estimate, June 30, 1958, H-2215, FRCW. The repositories to be visited were: Library of Congress, National Archives, Philadelphia City Archives, American Philosophical Society, Yale University Library, Long Island Historical Society, New York State Library, Massachusetts State Archives, Boston Public Library,

Massachusetts Historical Society, Houghton Library and Baker Library (Harvard University), Connecticut Historical Society, Connecticut State Library, Rhode Island State Archives, Rhode Island Historical Society, Maine Historical Society, New Hampshire State Archives, New Hampshire Historical Society, Maryland Historical Society, Maryland State Archives, Virginia Historical Society, Virginia State Library, Wisconsin State Historical Society, South Carolina Historical Society, Sheldon Museum (Middleburg, Vt.), Vermont Historical Society, Huntington Library (California), New-York Historical Society, American Antiquarian Society (Worcester, Mass.), Swarthmore College Library, New York Public Library, a private collection near Philadelphia, Girard College, Dedham Historical Society (Dedham, Mass.), Public Record Office (London), Bibliotheque Nationale (Paris). The monetary magnitude of the project is more comprehensible if it is remembered that the salary of the chief historian was $8,330, while the most junior historians were paid $4,980.

38. Summary: Special Park Development Research & Planning Project, July 3, 1958, Ibid. Architectural research accounted for $444,808 of the $1,012,469 budget. It called for twenty-one architects, three engineers, and one supervising architect. Then, as now, architects were generally better paid than historians. The lowest salary was $6,285, the highest $10,130.

39. Palmer to Garrison, July 11, 1958, Ibid.

40. Coryell memorandum, July 14, 1958; Nelligan to Garrison, July 31, 1958, Ibid.

41. Tobin Memorandum, August 21, 1958, Ibid.

42. Anderson to Tobin, September 12, 1958, Ibid.

43. Palmer to Wirth, October 3, 1958, Ibid.

44. Anderson to Tobin, October 28, 1958; October 31, 1958, Ibid.

45. IDMR, April 1959.

46. Interview with John D.R. Platt, October 18, 1984. The microfilm copy of the research cards is now stored for safekeeping in the park's museum vaults.

47. Yoelson, Interview, March 12, 1981, p. 17.

48. Research Program, Independence National Historical Park, For Fiscal Year 1959, INHPL. This report, summarizing research for the fiscal year beginning in July 1958 and ending in June 1959, was attractively presented and illustrated. Prepared by Yoelson, it was the only such report produced by the park.

49. Historic Structures Report, Part II, Congress Hall, Independence National

Historical Park, February 26, 1960.

50. Ibid., Ch. I, Sec. 1, 14.

51. IDMR, November 1959.

52. Interview with Martin I. Yoelson, October 8, 1984.

53. IDMR, December 1959.

54. HSR, Part I, Congress Hall, Ch. 2, Sec. 3, p. 7, May 1959.

55. HSR, Part II, Congress Hall, Ch. 4, pp. 1-2, April 1960.

56. Zimmer to Lee, March 14, 1960, Architects' files, INHPL.

57. Peterson to Zimmer, November 28, 1961, Ibid.

58. Hartshorne to Peterson, March 8, 1961 Ibid.

59. Interview with Platt, November 22, 1983.

60. Anderson to Tobin, September 12, 1958, H-2215, FRCW.

61. Wirth to Lee, n.d., D-22, FRCW. Although the memorandum is undated, internal evidence indicates that it was written in mid-March 1961.

62. Zimmer to Lee, March 14, 1960, Architects' files, INHPL

63. Interview with Platt, November 22, 1983.

64. When Congress met in Independence Hall in 1776, the first steeple, erected in 1753, was still in place. In 1781 this steeple was removed, and the brick tower capped with a pyramidal roof. Thus, during the Constitutional Convention and the Federal era, there was no steeple on Independence Hall.

65. Drawing #s NHP-IND 2006A, September 28, 1955; NHP-IND 3018B, August 26, 1957; NHP-IND 3114, April 27, 1959.

66. Interview with Kimball.

67. Interview with Platt, November 22, 1983.

68. IDMR, 1960-1965, passim.

69. Ibid.

70. Interview with Platt, October 18, 1984.

71. Associate Director Stratton to all field offices, September 7, 1965, H-2215, FRCW.

72. IDMR, November-December 1950.

73. Ibid., February - April 1951.

74. Ibid., October 1952, December 1952, April 1953.

75. Anderson to Lee, February 17, 1961, K1815, FRCW.

76. IDMR, April 1953.

77. Lee to Lisle, August 18, 1954, K1815, INHPHQ.

78. Nelligan to Anderson, October 8, 1954, Ibid.

79. Anderson to Lee, February 17, 1961, K1815, FRCW; IDMR, December 1955.

80. Interview with William C. Everhart, April 23, 1981; IDMR, June 1956.

81. IDMR, March 1956.

82. IDMR, July 1956; Anderson to Lee, February 17, 1961, K1815, FRCW.

83. Ibid.

84. Charles Dorman, Interview, March 12, 1981, p. 17.

85. The Evening Bulletin, September 3, 1950.

86. George A. Palmer, Interview, February 22, 1982, CMG, pp. 34-35.

87. Interview with Platt, October 18, 1984.

88. Anderson to Lee, February 17, 1961, FRCW.

89. Palmer, Interview, February 22, 1982, pp. 36-37.

90. Wirth to Tobin, June 2, 1959, K1815, INHPHQ.

91. Interpretive Survey, Independence National Historical Park, June 1959, INHPL.

92. Tobin to Anderson, July 10, 1959, K1815, INHPL.

93. IDMR, March 1960.

94. Interview with Platt, October 18, 1984.

95. Appleman to Lee, September 26, 1960, INHPL.

96. Anderson to Lee, February 17, 1961, FRCW.

97. A Report on the Employment of Women as Guides at Independence National Historical Park, June 1962 INHPL.

98. Pearl Millman, untitled manuscript, INHPHQ.

99. Sullivan to Hostess Supervisor, American Airlines, June 8, 1961; J.J. Kuber to Sullivan, June 22, 1961; Elaine LaFave to Sullivan, July 6, 1961, INHPL.

100. Martin I. Yoelson, Interview, September 23, 1981, CMG, p. 2.

101. T. Sutton Jett, Regional Director, National Capitol Region to Lee, October 20, 1965, K2623, FRCW.

102. IDMR March 1963; Yoelson, Interview, September 23, 1981, pp. 3-4; Interview, March 22, 1977, GAP, pp. 8-10; James R. Sullivan, Interview, May 9, 1977, GAP, pp. 8-14.

103. IDMR February 1961; ACM March 15, 1960.

104. Brooks to Regional Director, February 14, 1969, K1815, FRCW.

105. ACM, September 28, 1959.

106. So deeply imbued was the campfire program in National Park Service philosophy that master plan outlines called for the placement of campfire pits. Accordingly Independence eventually acquired two such features, one north of Walnut Street between Fourth and Fifth Streets, the other in front of the Visitor Center on Third Street. These "pits" are sunken brick rectangles, with tiers of seating around them. No one can remember their having having been used for a campfire.

107. Wirth to John P. Robin, February 19, 1960, attached to ACM, March 15, 1960.

108. ACM, June 16, 1960.

109. Ibid., December 7, 1960.

110. ACM, October 27, 1961.

111. Ibid., February 21, 1962.

112. IDMR, June 1963.

113. ACM, July 16, 1964.

114. Ibid., April 25, 1966; IDMR, September, 1965.

115. ACM, March 27, 1969.

116. Special Events Files, INHPL; ACM November 16, 1955; IDMR, May 1951, July

1951, December 1954, April 1958, May 1961.

117. Philadelphia Inquirer, February 17, 1965.

118. Ibid., April 4, 1966.

119. Superintendent's Reports, October 1965, January 1966, July 1966, August 1966, May 1967; Yoelson, Interview, September 23, 1981, pp. 16-17.

120. Interview with Platt, October 18, 1984.

121. The Historian and Historic Preservation, Platt Files, INHPL.

122. Yoelson, Interview, March 12, 1981, p. 16.

NOTES - CHAPTER VIII

1. ACM, November 3, 1967.

2. Interview with Arthur C. Kaufmann, April 30, 1982.

3. Kaufmann was manager of Gimbel's Philadelphia area operations.

4. ACM, March 28, 1968.

5. Alan E. Kent to Chief, Office of Resource Planning, Philadelphia Service Center, February 5, 1968; February 15, 1968, D18, INHPHQ.

6. Howard Larue, Interview, April 13, 1977, GAP, pp. 17-18.

7. John W. Bright to Chief, Office of Resource Planning, Washington Service Center, October 17, 1968, D18, INHPHQ.

8. ACM, June 20, 1968; October 10, 1968. At the earlier meeting, the advisory commission approved the Quorum 5 recommendation for locating the visitor center at the site of the Custom House, that is the southwest corner of Chestnut and Second Streets. By the later meeting, however, the commission passed a stiff resolution calling for a new building at the southeast corner of Chestnut and Third Streets.

9. Interview with Kaufmann.

10. Chester Brooks, Interview, Match 19, 1982, CMG, pp. 1,8.

11. William C. Everhart, Interview, April 23, 1982, CMG, pp. 2-3.; Interview with David A. Kimball, April 13, 1982; James C. Massey, Interview, March 26, 1981, p; Martin I. Yoelson, Interview April 22, 1981.

12. Brooks, Interview, p. 4.

13. Ibid., p. 13.

14. Ibid., pp. 2-3.

15. James R. Sullivan, Interview, May 9, 1977, GAP, p.18.

16. Ibid., p. 21.

17. Brooks, Interview, pp. 2-5.

18. Edward M. Riley, Preliminary Historical Report: Franklin Court, March 1950, INHPL.

19. Anderson to Regional Director, Region One (Cox or Lisle), February 20, 1953, D18, FRCW.

20. P.J.F. Schumacher, Preliminary Exploration of Franklin Court; Archeological Project No. 4, May-Sept. 1953, September 1956, pp. 1-2.

21. Unsigned memorandum, February 16, 1953, INHPL.

22. Schumacher, p. 42.

23. Historic Structures Report, Franklin House, Part I (1961), iv, 2, 1.

24. Ibid., iv, 3, 3; B. Bruce Powell, The Archaeology of Franklin Court; Independence National Historical Park, 1962, p.3.

25. Interview with John F. Cotter, January 15, 1985.

26. Riley, 1950.

27. Anderson to Tolson, February 16, 1953, D18, INHPHQ, Dwg. #NHP-IND 2097, MARO.

28. Anderson to Tolson, April 24, 1953, D18, INHPHQ.

29. Peterson to Anderson, May 14, 1953, History Files, INHPL.

30. Anderson to Tolson, June 25, 1953, D18, FRCW.

31. Dwg. #NHP-IND 2009, Wirth to Lisle, May 21, 1954, D18, FRCW.

32. IDMR, October 1956, January 1958, March 1959.

33. Interview with Cotter.

34. IDMR, September, December 1959, January 1960.

35. Ibid., December 1958, March, April, August 1959.

36. Ibid., October, November 1959.

37. Ibid., December 1959, January 1960.

38. Ibid., July, August, September 1960; Interim HSR Part I, November 1960, iii, 1, 2-3.

39. ACM, December 7, 1960.

40. HSR Part I, December 1961, iv, 1, 1.

41. IDMR, May 1961.

42. HSR Part I, December 1961, iv, 3, 5; 4, 1; B. Bruce Powell, The Archaeology of Franklin Court, 1962.

43. IDMR, October 1961.

44. Edward M. Riley, "Franklin's House," Historic Philadelphia , American Philosophical Society (Philadelphia, 1953).

45. IDMR, October 1961.

46. Williams to Kurjack, November 8, 1961, OAHP Files.

47. Lee to Anderson, September 26, 1961, D22, FRCW.

48. John D.R Platt, Interview, May 18, 1979, GAP, p. 7; Interview with Penelope H. Batcheler, February 21, 1985.

49. HSR, 318 Market Street, Part I, ii,3,2.

50. Lee to Bacon, March 23, 1962, D18, INHPHQ.

51. IDMR, February, May 1961, September 1963.

52. ACM, March 28, 1968.

53. Philadelphia Inquirer, July 14, 1968.

54. Kent to Chief, Office of Resource Planning, PSC, February 5, 1968, D18, INHPHQ.

55. John W. Bright, Chief, Division of Park Planning to Chief, Office of Resource Planning, WSC, October 17, 1968, Ibid.

56. John L. Cotter Interview, June 8, 1977, p. 6, GAP.

57. John D. R. Platt, Interview, May 18, 1979, p.8, GAP.

58. In addition to a distinguished career in the National Park Service, Cotter had served as Adjunct Professor at the University of Pennsylvania since 1960. In 1977 he received the Distinguished Service Award of the National Park Service.

59. Cotter to Hartzog, September 11, 1968, History Files, INHPL.

60. Lee to Hartzog, November 25, 1968, OAHP Files. Yoelson and George A. Palmer both believe that after Lee retired, his interest in research grew stronger.

61. Minutes of Special Committee on Historic Preservation, March 17, 1969, OAHP Files.

62. Report No. 1 on Franklin Court Study, March 27, 1969, Ibid.

63. Interview with John D.R. Platt.

64. Penelope Hartshorne Batcheler, Ar Architectural Summary of Franklin Court and Benjamin Franklin's House, Septemebr 18, 1969, Ibid.

65. Cotter to Brooks, September 19, 1969, Ibid.

66. Utley to Connally, September 26, 1969, Ibid.

67. Connally to Lee, October 2, 1969, Ibid.

68. Charles B. Hosmer, Jr. Preservation Comes of Age, Charlottesville: The University Press of Virginia, 1981, I, 478-493.

69. Ibid.,Ernest A. Connally, Interview, February 4, 1981, CMG, pp. 13-15; II, 1008-1111.

70. Administrative Policies for Historical Areas of the National Park System, 1968, p. 9. The full text is:
Reconstruction
Reconstruction should be authorized only when the following conditions are met:
a) All or almost all traces of a structure have disappeared and its recreation is essential for public understanding and appreciation of the historical associations for which the park was established.
b) Sufficient historical, archeological and architectural data exist to permit an accurate reproduction.
c) The structure can be erected on the original site or in a setting appropriate to the significance of the area as in a pioneer community or living farm, where the exact site of structures may not be identifiable through research.

71. Charles G. Dorman, The Furnishings of Franklin Court: 1765-1790, July 1969; Memorandum, Watterson to Connally, October 13, 1969, OAHP Files; Tape of afternoon meeting, October 9, 1969, INHPL.

72. Connally to Hartzog, February 9, 1970, Architects' Files, INHP.

73. Barbara Liggett, Archaeology at Franklin Court, Eastern National Park and Monument Association, 1973.

74. ACM, March 28, 1968.

75. Interview with Chester A. Brooks, March 19, 1982, CMG.

76. Ibid.

77. Brooks, Response to questions from George A. Palmer, January 3, 1978, p.2.

78. Hummel to Scott, June 9, 1969, History Files, INHPL.

79. Brooks, Response, p. 3. Interview, March 19, 1982.

80. Ibid.

81. Hummel to Scott, June 9, 1969.

82. ACM, June 20, 1968; October 10, 1968.

83. ACM, October 27, 1969.

84. Carleton Knight III, "The Park service as Client: II," Architecture (December 1984), 48-55.

85. William C. Everhart, Interview, April 23, 1981, CMG, p. 11.

86. Brooks, Interview.

87. Everhart, Interview, p. 12.

88. Peter Chermayeff, Transcript of Architects in the Park program, Fevruary 24, 1979.

89. ACM, November 3, 1971.

90. Brooks, Interview.

91. Both Brooks and Cawood have referred to the role played by cocktail parties and other social events in garnering support for various aspects of the Independence program. Over the years this has become a well-known internal joke at Independence. Particular point was added to the joke because Douglas Warnock, the assistant superintendent during the Bicentennial, era is a teetotaler. When Warnock was moving on to his new assignment in the southwest region, he stopped in Hot Springs, Arkansas, to meet his replacement, Bernard Goodman, then superintendent there. He called Cawood in great glee to report that Goodman didn't drink either.

92. Hobart G. Cawood, Interview, February 17, 1982, CMG, pp. 2-4, 9; Interview with David Dutcher, June 16, 1982.

93. Cawood, Interview, February 17, 1982, p. 6.

94. Brooks interview.

95. Ibid., Cawood, Interview, p. 23.

96. Ibid., p. ; ACM December 19, 1971.

97. Ibid., January 19, 1972.

98. Ibid., April 30, 1972.

99. Ibid.,; Chermayeff to Kaufmann, February 14, 1972, D-18 INHPHQ.

100. Cawood, Interview, February 17, 1982, p. 27.

101. ACM, May 30, 1972.

102. Golub to Benson, March 7, 1972, D-18, INHPHQ.

103. Cawood, Interview, February 17, 1982, pp. 23-24, 26; Brooks Interview; Connally Interview.

104. Connally, Interview, p. 22.

105. Hartzog to Brooks, July 14, 1972, D-18, INHPHQ.

106. Connally, Interview, p. 22.

107. Cambridge Seven Associates, Inc., Memorandum, Bicentennial Bell and Tower, February 1972, D-18, INHPHQ.

108. J. R. Passoneau to Connally, August 1, 1972, D-18, INHPHQ.

109. Cawood to Brooks, July 31, 1972, D-18, INHOHQ.

110. Connally, Interview, p. 23; ACM April 12, 1973.

111. Ibid., March 28, 1973; Cawood to James Stuart, January 19, 1973, D-18, INHPHQ.

112. Peter Shepheard to Chermayeff, May 17, 1973, D-18, INHPHQ; ACM May 17, 1973.

113. Ibid.

114. Cawood, Interview, January 27, 1977, GAP, pp. 76-82; February 17, 1982, pp. 51-52; Connally, Interview, pp. 23-25.

115. Hartzog to Brooks, July 14, 1972, D-18, INHPHQ.

116. Everhart to Cawood, March 8, 1972, Ibid.

117. At various times Everhart and members of his staff, Benson representing the Denver Service Center, Cawood, Brooks, Warnock, and Yoelson reviewed concepts and sample segments of the film.

118. Cambridge Seven and Chris Dickey, Independence National Historical Park Visitor Center, Film Treatment, January 1973, D-18, INHPHQ.

119. Martin I. Yoelson, Interview, April 23, 1977, GAP, pp. 30-44; William C. Everhart, Interview, April 23, 1981, CMG, pp. 13-15.

120. ACM, March 28, 1973; June 26, 1973.

121. Federal Advisory Commission Act, P.L. 92-463.

122. Philadelphia Inquirer, July 18, 1972.

123. Cawood, Interview, February 17, 1982, p. 49.

124. Connally, Interview.

125. Transcript, Franklin Scholars Meeting, June 1972, INHPL.

126. Penelope Hartshorne Batcheler, Memorandum, February 1985, Architects' Files, INHP.

127. Ibid.; Cotter to Robert W. Craig, March 29, 1982, author's files.

128. ACM, July 18, 1972.

129. Cawood, February 17, 1982.

130. Robert Venturi, Transcript, Architects in the Park, February 24, 1979, p. 6.

131. Ibid., pp. 8-9.

132. Cawood, Interview, December 9, 1976, pp. 19-20; Yoelson, Interview, Septemebr 23, 1981.

133. Penelope Hartshorne Batcheler and Mary Mish, Interview, July 6, 1977, GAP, p. 7.

134. Alen E. Kent to Everhart, August 14, 1972, D-18, INHPHQ.

135. MacDonald to Nelson, August 18, 1972, Ibid.

136. Mattes to Cawood, Septemebr 5, 1972, Ibid.

137. Yoelson to Cawood, September 22, 1972, Ibid.

138. Cawood to Brooks, April 3, 1973, Ibid.

139. Venturi & Rauch, Memorandum Number One, July 20, 1973; Kent to Brooks, August 10, 1973; Alexander Cranstoun (deMartin-Marona) to Kent, August 10, 1973; Venturi & Rauch, Memorandum Number Two, August 13, 1973; Memorandum Number Three, August 27, 1973, Ibid.

140. Cawood to Cranstoun, August 16, 1973.

141. Venturi & Rauch, Memorandum Number Five, November 6, 1973.

142. Yoelson, Interview, April 22, 1977, GAP, pp. 44-50; IDMR, August 1973, March 1975, April 1975.

143. Batcheler and Mish, Interview, July 6, 1977, pp. 2-6.

144. Ibid., p. 18; Venturi, Transcript, p. 10; Venturi & Rauch, Memorandum Number Three, Memorandum Number Five.

145. Venturi & Rauch, Memorandum Number Three.

146. ACM, August 22, 1974; March 25, 1976.

147. Ibid., April 10, 1974, August 22, 1974, October 28, 1975; Current Authorized Construction Projects, Independence National Historical Park, ACM February 20, 1975.

148. Ibid., May 23, 1963, June 20, 1964, April 6, 1965, November 3, 1967, March 28, 1968, August 4, 1971; Philadelphia Inquirer, July 29, 1968, August 23, 1968, November 4, 1972.

149. Ibid., June 26, 1973, January 9, 1974.

150. Ibid., May 18, 1972, Janaury 9, 1974, August 22, 1974, Novemebr 6, 1974; Brooks, Interview, p. 37.

151. ACM, May 30, 1972, October 6, 1972, August 14, 1973.

152. Ibid. , September 27, 1973; Brooks, Interview, p. 32; Cawood, Interview, February 17, 1982, p. 28; Cawood, Interview, January 27, 1977, p. 69.

153. ACM, November 15, 1973; Cawood, Interview, February 17, 1982, pp. 28-29; Brooks, Interview, pp. 33-34.

154. Ibid.

155. Cawood, Interview, January 27, 1977, pp. 73-75; Romaldo Giurgola, Transcript, Architects in the Park, February 24, 1979.

156. Current Authorized Projects; Cawood, Interview, January 27, 1977, pp. 70-71; February 17, 1982, pp. 46-47; Brooks, Interview, pp. 35-36.

157. Cawood, Interview, December 9, 1976, p. 16.

158. ACM, October 28, 1975; Cawood, Interview, January 27, 1977, pp. 72-73.

159. Louise Boggs, Interview, October 27, 1977, GAP, pp. 14-16.

NOTES - CHAPTER IX

1. ACM, March 26, 1968.

2. Ibid., October 16, 1970.

3. "A Dispirited '76 for Philadelphia," Business Week, (January 16, 1971), 109-110.

4. Denise Scott Brown and Robert Venturi, "The Bicentennial Commemoration 1976," Architectural Forum, 31 (October 1967), 66-69.

5. "Great Scott, It's Philadelphia!," Newsweek, (August 3, 1970), 22-23.

6. "A Dispirited '76."

7. "An Overhaul for '76 Bicentennial," U.S. News and World Report, (February 12, 1973), 80-81.

8. "Do-It-Yourself Bicentennial: Philadelphia Sets a Pattern," U.S. News and World Report, (March 25, 1974), 60-61.

9. National Park Service, "Master Plan, Independence National Historical Park, 1971."

10. Philadelphia Bulletin, April 1976, clipping, INHPL.

11. Howard LaRue, Interview, April 13, 1977, GAP, p. 28; Hobart G. Cawood, Interview, December 9, 1976, GAP, p. 38; Interview, February 17, 1982, CMG, p. 40. Palmer's interview with Cawood extended over several sessions: December 9 and December 20, 1976, January 27, 1977, and July 27, 1978. However, they were transcribed with continuous paging to form a single document. References will therefore be cited under the December 9, 1976 date.

12. James R. Sullivan, Interview, May 9, 1977, GAP, p. 15.

13. Cawood, Interview, December 9, 1976, p. 15.

14. Ibid., pp. 18-19.

15. Ibid., pp. 14, 38; February 17, 1982, p. 5; George A. Palmer, Interview, February 22, 1982, CMG, pp. 5-6.

16. Cawood, Interview, December 9, 1976, pp.5-6; February 17, 1982, p. 46; Howard LaRue, Interview, April 13, 1977, GAP, p. 32.

17. Cawood, Interview, December 9, 1976, p. 27.

18. Ibid., p. 29; Philadelphia Bulletin, July 26, July 30, 1974.

19. Clyde M. Lockwood, Interview, February 18, 1977, GAP, pp. 2-13.

20. Richard O'Guin, Interview, June 28, 1977, GAP, pp. 2-8, 35, 38.

21. Cawood, Interview, December 9, 1976, p. 28.

22. Lockwood, Interview, pp. 30-38.

23. Undated newspaper clipping, INHPL.

24. ACM, February 20, 1975; April 3, 1975.

25. Cawood, Interview, February 17, 1982, p. 20.

26. Philadelphia Inquirer, March 21, 1975.

27. Cawood, February 17, 1982, p. 21.

28. Philadelphia Bulletin, January 18, July 2, July 18, 1976; Philadelphia Daily News, March 22, 1976, April 27, 1976.

29. Philadelphia Inquirer, September 5, September 13, 1976; Philadelphia Bulletin, September 1, 1974; ACM August 22, 1974; IDMR October 1974.

30. ACM November 6, 1974.

31. David H. Wallace, Interview, April 18, 1978, GAP, p. 9.

32. John C. Milley, Interview, April 8, 1982, CMG, p. 3.

33. Wallace, Interview, pp. 2-3.

34. Milley, Interview, April 8, 1982, pp. 13-14.

35. Milley, Interview, March 7, 1977, GAP, pp. 23-34.

36. Charles Dorman, Interview, March 12, 1981, CMG, 17-18.

37. Wallace, Interview, pp. 19-20.

38. Milley, Interview, April 8, 1982, pp. 9-11; Adelaide W. Cawood, Interview, February 17, 1982, CMG, pp. 12-13; IDMR March 1972.

39. See Chapter 5.

40. IDMR, March 1967; Milley, Interview, March 7, 1977, pp. 1-2.

41. Ibid., pp. 17-19.

42. Ibid., pp. 60-62; Milley, Interview, April 8, 1982, pp. 5-9; Brooks,

Interview, March 19, 1982, CMG, pp. 15-18.

43. Philadelphia Bulletin, October 14, 1974.

44. Milley, Interview, March 7, 1977, pp. 20, 26-29; Milley, Interview, April 8, 1982, pp. 2, 14-15.

45. Ibid., p. 5; Brooks, Interview, p. 18.

46. Philadelphia Inquirer, October 15, 1974.

47. Milley, Interview, March 7, 1977, pp. 67-68; Interview, April 8, 1982, pp. 17-18; Adelaide W. Cawood, Interview, p. 13.

48. Ibid., pp. 13-14.

49. Ibid., pp. 17-21.

50. The Volunteers in the Parks Act of 1969, passed July 29, 1970 (84-Stat-472), authorized the appropriation of a modest sum to implement such a program throughout the National Park System.

51. Adelaide W. Cawood, Interview, pp. 22-26.

52. Cawood, Interview, December 9, 1976, pp. 30-31; February 17, 1982, pp. 19-20.

53. Mary Borov, Interview, June 15, 1977, GAP, pp. 41, 45.

54. Genevieve M. Bell, Interview, June 15, 1977, GAP, pp. 11, 43.

55. The figures on annual visits are on file at the superintendent's office. They afford a good comparative, but not necessarily accurate, count of the numbers of visitors to Independence in given years. They are derived from counting those who enter Independence Hall, the Liberty Bell Pavilion, the Visitor Center and Franklin Court. Thus a single visitor may be counted as many as four times. Conversely those who come to the park and do not enter the buildings are not counted. The tally thus omits those who pay a brief visit, not waiting on line to enter Independence Hall and looking at the Liberty Bell only through the pavilion's glass wall. It also excludes those visitors who come to the park to watch the Fourth of July fireworks, hear a speech, or simply sit in the sunshine.

56. Cawood, Interview, February 17, 1982, p. 19; Bell, Interview, p. 19; Philadelphia Daily News, March 22, 1976; Philadelphia Inquirer, February 29, 1976.

57. Lockwood, Interview, p. 48.

58. Bell, Interview, , pp. 10, 14, 27-28.

59. Richard M. Nixon, Foreword in Rebert G. Ferris, ed., Signers of the Declaration, Washington: National Park Service, 1973.

60. Bell, Interview, pp. 27-28, 74-75.

61. Ibid. , p. 84.

62. Borov, Interview, pp. 59-61.

63. Cawood, Interview, December 9, 1976; O'Guin, Interview

64. Philadelphia Bulletin, July 8, 1976.

65. Cawood, Interview, December 9, 1976, pp. 110-111.

66. Cawood, Interview, February 17, 1982, pp. 37-38.

67. O'Guin, Interview, p. 18.

68. Cawood, Interview, February 17, 1982, pp. 14-15; Cawood, Interview, December 9, 1976, pp. 114-116.

69. Philadelphia Bulletin, June 10, 1074.

70. Ibid., April 12, 1976.

71. O'Guin, Interview, pp. 39-40.

72. Public Law 94-458, October 7, 1976.

73. Cawood, Interview, December 9, 1976, pp. 83-83.

74. Ibid., p. 87.

75. Cawood, Interview, February 17, 1982, pp. 17-18.

76. Philadelphia Bulletin, undated clipping (1976).

77. Philadelphia Daily News, July 7, 1976.

78. Cawood, Interview, December 9, 1976, pp. 88-94; February 17, 1982, pp. 18, 34.

79. Philadelphia Daily News, July 7, 1976.

80. Cawood, Interview, December 9, 1976, pp. 93-94.

81. Ibid., 117; February 17, 1982, p. 39.

82. Brooks, Interview, p. 58.

83. Cawood, Interview, February 17, 1982, p. 39.

84. Visitation in 1985 is estimated to reach 5.5 million, over twice as many, for example, as visit Yellowstone National Park, another of the "jewels" of the National Park System.

INDEX

Adams, John, 4, 6, 14, 24, 43, 94, 101; house of, 16
Advisory Commission, 191, 196, 199-200, 201-2, 203, 354, 359, 365, 366, 369, 370, 379, 399, 404, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 414, 415, 418, 419, 420, 432-3, 434, 438, 456, 461, 492, 498, 503
Affleck, Thomas, 14
Albright, Horace M., 137
Allen, Thomas J., 125, 165
American Association for State and Local History, 310
"American Bell, The", 356
American Hotel, 51
American Institute of Architects, 90, 149, 150, 179, 307, 332, 431; Philadelphia Chapter of, 62, 63, 66, 76, 77, 78, 203, 255
American Philosophical Society, 10-11, 14, 26, 45, 54, 77, 79, 96, 101-2, 116, 128, 130, 140, 149, 153, 159, 163, 186, 190, 199, 254, 285, 309, 373, 374, 380, 385, 422
American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, 443, 444
American Street, 193
Anderson, Marian, 475
Anderson, Melford O., 358, 365, 368, 370-2, 376, 379, 382, 385, 399, 406, 407, 492
Appleman, Roy, 93, 94-95, 99, 102, 103, 104, 105, 115, 128, 131, 348-49, 350; concept for park of, 100-01
Arcade of 1826, 51
Arch Street, 24, 26, 41, 51, 86, 87, 434
Arch Street Meeting, 156
Archaelogists. See:
Cotter, John L.
Liggett, Barbara
Moore, Jackson W., Jr.
Powell, B. Bruce
Schumacher, Paul J.F.
Archaelogy: Bishop White House, 231-32; Carpenter's Court, 378; Congress Hall Portico, 334-35, 378; Contributionship Stable, 378; Franklin Court, 374-76, 378-80, 381, 394-96; Independence Hall, 287-89; Independence Square, 343
Architects, selection of, 400-02, 420, 435. See also:
Bacon, Edmund
Batcheler, Penelope H.
Benson, Donald
Boeshore, Frank
Boyd, D. Knickerbacker
Brumbaugh, Edward, Jr.
Cabot, John
Campbell, William M.
Chermayeff, Peter
Connally, Ernest Allen
Connor, David
Cope, Thomas Pym
Cret, Paul Phillipe

DeSilets, Robert
DeSilets, Eugene
Dickey, John
Dysert, Gary
Everett, J.M.
Fraser, Joseph T., Jr.
Furness, Frank
Gibbs, James
Giurgola, Romaldo
Greber, Jacques
Grigg, Milton
Grossman, Charles
Hanson, Hodge
Harbeson, John
Hartshorne, Penelope
Haviland, John
Johnson, Philip
Johnston, William
Kelsey, Albert
Larson, Roy F.
Latrobe, Benjamin Henry
L'Enfant, Pierre
Lovett, George I., Jr.
Lukens, John B.
McArthur, John, Jr.
MacDonald, Stuart
Magaziner, Louis
Martin, Sydney E.
Massey, James C.
Mills, Robert
Milner, John
Mitchell/Giurgola
Neblett, Nathaniel
Nelson, Lee H
Nutt, Donald
Passoneau, J.R.
Pepper, George Wharton
Peterson, Charles E.
Poppeliers, John
Raley, Robert
Rauch, John
Rogers, T. Mellon
Scott-Brown, Denise
Silverman, Edwin H.
Simon, Grant
Sims, Joseph Patterson
Smith, Robert
Souder, Norman M.
Stevenson, Markley
Strickland, William
Sullivan, Louis
Sutton, Richard
Thalheimer & Weitz
Vaughan, David

Venturi, Robert
Venturi & Rauch
Walter, T.U.
Wirth, Conrad L.
Wistar, Thomas, Jr.
Wrenn, George L.
Zimmer, Edward
Architectural review committee, 203, 204, 205
Architectural study collection, 234-35, 250, 311
Area A, 107, 138, 149, 150, 153, 165, 169, 194, 196, 212, 215; plan of, 187, 188, 211. See also Project A
Area B, 140, 145, 149, 150, 165, 194, 195; plan of, 187. See also Project B
Area C, 149, 215. See also Project C
Area E, 149. See also Project E
Area F, 400, 404, 432-33, 437, 485
Army-Navy Museum, 9
Assembly Room. See Independence Hall
Association of U.S. Army & Navy League, 26
Athenaeum, The, 60
Atcheson, Philip, 262
"Aurora" print shop, 17, 426
Avalon Foundation, 355

Bache, Benjamin Franklin, 17, 395
Bacon, Edmund, 74, 93, 94, 99, 125, 197, 354, 384, 402, 491
Balch, Emily, estate of, 432
Balch Institute, 432
Bank of North America, 50
Bank of Pennsylvania, 46, 50, 54
Bank Row, 50, 55
Bank Street, 38
Bannister, Turpin C., 96-97, 148-49, 150-51, 152, 158
Barnes, Frank, 297, 313, 392
Barnum's Museum, 51
Barrett, Representative, 117
Barry, John: statue of 24, 434, 436, 493
Bartram, John, 7
Batcheler, Penelope Hartshorne, ii, 302, 303, 304, 305, 310, 311, 368, 388, 389-90, 392-94, 420, 422, 423, 426, 430, 449, 459, 485
Batten, Harry A., 355
Bean, Doris, 450
Bean, Glen, 397
Belinger, Harry, 408, 419
Bell, Whitfield, 323, 422
Benjamin Franklin Bridge, 64, 65, 488
Benjamin Franklin Parkway, 488
Ben-Gurion, David, 318, 360
Benson, Donald, 150, 224, 400, 410
"Better Philadelphia Exhibition", 100
Bicentennial, conclusion of, 482-83; construction for, 399, 428, 430, 431, 435, 438; events of, 457-58, 474-76, 479-83; plan-

ning for, 16, 365, 366, 396-97, 404, 405, 418, 433, 441-48, 455, 466; staffing for, 452-54, 456-57, 469-72
Bicentennial bell, 6, 413-14, 415, 418, 479, 480, 481
Biddle, Edward M., 104
Biddle, Francis, 84
Biddle, Nicholas, 10, 70
Bill, Harthorn, 397
Binns, John, 59
Birch, Thomas and William, 46-47, 289
Bishop White House, 20, 21, 48, 94, 107, 112, 156, 161, 175, 183, 190, 212, 214, 219, 238, 239, 274, 282, 331, 400, 448, 470, 493; archaelogy at, 231-32, 235, 246; condition of, 220-21, 223-24; furnishing, 237, 244-48, 459, 460; interpretation, 236, 237; investigation of, 225, 227, 228, 229, 230, 235, 240, 248-49, 264; restoration of, 241-43, 250-51; stabilization, 223-24
Black, Creed. C., 455
Blimm, Miriam Quinn, 281, 295, 340, 380
Blue Anchor Tavern, 35
Boeshore, Frank, 225-26, 237, 238
Boggs, Louise, 439
Bok Foundation, 166, 179
Bonaparte, Joseph, 25
Borie, Mrs. Henry P., 116
Borov, Mary, 471
Bowen, Catharine Drinker, 397-98, 422
Boyd, David Knickerbacker, 63, 76-77, 79, 82, 83, 85, 87, 488, 504
Bradford, Sydney, 321, 322
Bradford, William, 46
Bradley, Michael J., 85, 88, 123, 355, 434
Brew, Joseph, 388
Broad Street, 36, 48
Brooks, Chester, 302, 303-04, 305, 371-73, 388, 392, 396-97, 398, 402, 404, 405-07, 409, 411, 413, 415, 424, 428, 430, 433, 435, 436, 437, 441, 446, 449, 451, 452, 454, 462, 463-64, 465, 477, 483, 501
Browne, Stanhope, 408
Brumbaugh, Edward, Jr., 210, 211
Buckley, Thomas, 123
Budd's Long Row, 35, 36, 37
"Building Early America", 311, 482
Burks, Maria, 457
Burns, Barbara, 414
Burr, Aaron, 20, 45
Burt, Struthers, 69, 72
Butterfield, Lyman, 417, 422, 423
Byrnes, James, 181, 432-33, 434

Cabot, John, 168, 201, 206, 210, 273, 400
Cadwalader, Lambert, 88
Cadwalader House, 106
Cadwalader, Sophie, 95

Callowhill Street, 51
Cammerer, Arno B., 70, 72
Cambridge Seven. See Chermayeff, Peter
Campbell, William M., 154, 223, 225-26, 227, 228, 229, 231, 234, 235, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 244, 329, 340, 380, 381, 384
Carey, Matthew, 44
Carl Schurz Foundation, 21, 71, 89, 163, 164, 166, 175, 192, 213
Carpenter, Horace, 78
Carpenter, Joshua, 40, 51
Carpenter, Samuel, 37, 39, 40
Carpenters' Company, 8, 9, 17, 26, 45, 70, 78, 101, 112, 122, 123, 126, 145, 166, 173, 240, 311, 373, 457, 458, 482
Carpenters' Court, 6, 8, 9, 48, 55, 139, 145, 153, 155, 160, 162, 164, 173, 175, 179, 183, 195, 198, 199, 202, 216, 493, 495
Carpenters' Hall, 7, 8, 9, 11, 26, 43, 57, 66, 86, 106, 112, 127, 149, 156, 157, 176, 179, 185, 188, 193, 195, 198, 202, 253, 331, 341, 413, 457, 458, 480, 482, 488
Carradine, John, 358
Carter Houses, 139, 181
Carter, Jimmy, 458
Cawood, Hobart G., ii, 404-7, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 418, 419, 420, 422, 424, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 435, 437, 438, 439, 446-48, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 455, 456-57, 461, 466, 469, 472, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 484, 485, 501
Centennial Bell, 439
Centennial Clock, 474
Center Square, 55, 60
Chamber of Commerce Building, 54
Chapman, Oscar L., 111, 124, 125, 132, 133, 134, 139, 140, 302
Chermayeff, Peter, 402, 403, 404, 407, 409, 410, 411, 413, 414, 415, 420
Chestnut Street, 9, 27, 39, 40, 41, 43, 44, 45, 46, 48, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 63, 73, 76, 86, 88, 94, 97, 99, 100, 102, 106, 107, 117, 123, 127, 137, 142, 145, 146, 149, 161, 164, 169, 173, 174, 177, 179, 181, 187, 188, 193, 198, 199, 212, 215, 217, 339, 365, 369, 373, 377, 399, 403, 433, 436, 439, 488, 493, 494, 495
Chestnut Street Theatre, 51
Childs, R. Damon, 408, 424
Christ Church, 20, 24, 40, 86, 100, 103, 104, 106, 112, 117, 127, 149, 157, 159, 161, 175, 221, 223; Cemetery, 24, 156
Christian Street, 29; houses on, 338
City Almshouse, 43
City Hall, 55, 60, 136, 209, 361, 481. See also Old City Hall
City Tavern, 4, 5, 42, 46, 54, 141, 144, 149, 156, 157, 183, 185, 319, 338, 341, 368, 398, 431, 459, 497-98
Clapp, Anne F., 249, 459
Clark Hall, 39, 43, 49, 55; garden, 46
Clark, Joseph S., Jr., 123, 192, 204
Clarkson-Biddle Map, 41
Cliver, Blaine, 276-77
Cobb, Lee J., 439

Commonwealth Title Co. of Philadelphia, 127
Company of Military Historians, 160, 163, 166, 175
Conger, Clement, 462-64
Congress Hall, 13-14, 45, 52, 60, 62, 63, 64, 127, 134, 157, 209, 210, 211, 239, 249, 250, 266, 281, 330, 331, 332-35, 336, 347, 365, 430, 448, 454, 459; structural repair and condition of, 205-07, 208, 272, 274, 332
Congress Hall Hotel, 50
Congress Plaza, 66
Connally, Ernest Allen, 154, 299-300, 304-05, 308, 367, 387, 388, 390, 391, 392, 393, 402, 412-13, 414, 424, 430, 496
Connor, David, 231
Conolo, Clement, 116
Constitutional Convention, 6, 12, 314, 416
Construction: progress of, 190.91, 201, 217-18
Continental Congress: First, 4, 8, 12, 40 156, 341, 457, 458; Second, 6, 12, 40, 339
Contributionship Garden, 106; stable in, 195, 196, 331
Cooke, Jacob, 323
Cooke's Building, 46
Cooper, Albert, 286
Cooperative agreements, 24-27, 71, 72, 73-74, 80, 112, 126-27, 131, 408, 495
Cope, Thomas Pym, 82
Cornell, Harvey, 167
Coryell, Lawrence B., 328, 428, 451
Cosgrove, Liam, 457
Cotter, John L., 287, 297-98, 378, 386-87, 388, 389, 390, 392, 423
Cox, Elbert, 148, 257
Cret, Paul Phillipe, 64, 86
Cross Keys and Anvil tavern, 50
Crowninshield, Mrs. Francis B., 257
Currie, William, house, 165, 181
Curtis, Cyrus H.K., 67
Curtis Mall, 118
Custis, Emerson C., 67, 118
Custom House, 139, 151, 193, 369, 374, 399. See also Second Bank of the United States

Daly, John, 358
Day, William, 408
"Day labor force", 239, 250, 286, 295, 299, 303; see also:
Ernst, William A.
Pecoraio, John
Deetz, James, 424
Degen, Carl, 417
Delaware Avenue, 29, 51
Delaware River, 4, 22, 35, 36, 38, 41, 66
Demaray, A.E., 84, 93, 132, 138-39, 143, 144
deMartin-Marona Associates, 428, 429
Demolition, 159, 173-74, 175-82, 493, 501
Demonstrations, political, 360-62

Descendents of the Signers of the Declaration of Independence, 357
Deshler, David, 23
Deshler-Morris House, 23, 26, 131, 431
Design, issues of new, 184, 185, 197, 201, 203, 205
DeSilets, Eugene, 167
DeSilets, Robert, 422, 431
Dickenson, Russell, 452
Dickey, John, 296, 299, 431
DiLonardo, Kathleen, 470
Dilworth, Richardson, 191, 200, 201, 208, 213, 301, 353, 354, 370
Distinguished Daughters of Pennsylvania, 175
Dock Creek, 4, 7, 35, 39, 41, 43, 45, 138, 139, 187, 194, 216, 232
Dock Street, 5, 49, 50, 73, 107, 139, 142, 157, 158, 169, 187, 188, 193, 196, 293, 403
Dorman, Charles G., 244-46, 248, 344, 368, 388, 392, 422, 429, 460
Draemel, Milo F., 121, 123, 127
Drexel Building, 54, 102
Drinker, Edward, 35
Drury, Newton, 72, 80, 81, 90, 91, 114, 116, 118, 125
Duane, Morris, 134
Duff, James, 92
Duplessis, Joseph S., 360, 462
Dutcher, David, ii, 422, 426, 470
Dysert, Gary, 278, 281, 282

Eastern National Parks and Monuments Association, 21, 321, 461
Eastern Office of Design and Construction (EODC), 160, 162, 167, 168, 189, 238, 239, 273, 294, 308, 328, 329; relationship with park staff, 241-42
Eban, Abba, 360
Edgerton, Samuel, Jr., 229
Egbert, Seneca, 65
Eighth Street, 41, 43, 44, 45
Eilberg, Joshua, 456
Ernst, Roger, 201
Ernst, William A., 239
Etting, Frank M., 61, 63
Evans, Allen, 143
Events, 2-3, 356, 357, 360, 457, 466, 476; Fourth of July, 358-59, 475
Everett, J.M., 277
Everhardt, Gary, 455, 477
Everhart, William C., 236, 321, 322, 324, 325, 343-45, 368, 401-02, 409
Ewing, George M., Company, 206-08, 209, 210, 211
Exhibits, 341, 343, 397, 449, 428

Facenda, John, 344
Fairmount Park Art Association, 92, 93, 127, 138, 143

Farmers & Mechanics Bank, 51
Fawcitt House, 173, 203
Fifth Street, 10, 11, 13, 14, 24, 26, 41, 43, 44, 45, 51, 86, 88, 100, 101, 102, 106, 123, 127, 130, 140, 149, 159, 161, 165, 169, 188, 190, 192, 198, 199, 212, 217, 365, 378, 448, 485, 493, 494
Films: at Franklin Court, 429-29, 454; at Visitor Center, 6, 403, 407, 415-17, 454
Fire, in nineteenth century, 51-52; threat of, 117-18, 173
First Bank of the United States, 6, 7, 9, 46, 49, 66, 86, 112, 151, 156, 157, 166, 212, 213, 311, 368, 403, 408, 426, 431, 452
Fling House, 20, 26, 48, 214, 215
Fling, Joseph, 48
Ford, Gerald, 458, 475
Fourth of July. See Events: Fourth of July
Fourth Street, 20, 25, 45, 54, 106, 139, 140, 145, 159, 169, 189, 195, 373, 399
Franklin, Benjamin, 6, 7, 10, 16-17, 40, 52, 53, 75, 89, 128, 157, 323, 332, 343, 359, 360, 373, 380, 381, 383, 385, 387, 390, 392, 393, 394, 416, 422-23, 427, 428, 429, 461, 462
Franklin Court, 16, 52, 100, 106, 108, 119, 127, 149, 156, 215, 217, 306, 315, 316, 368, 369, 373,374, 375-77, 379-96, 398, 399, 419-31, 452, 454, 470, 485, 497; Batcheler's concept of, 392-394; Venturi's design of, 423-27. See also Market Street, houses on
Franklin Fire Insurance Company, 51
Franklin House, 18, 52, 94, 108, 112, 199, 149, 338, 369, 375, 76, 379, 380-82, 424, 430, 497; controversy over proposed reconstruction of, 373-74, 377, 382, 384-94, 399, 420-21
Franklin House Hotel, 50
Franklin Institute, 439
Franks, Isaac, 23
Fraser, Joseph T., Jr., 203
Free Quaker Meeting, 26, 86, 156
Free Society of Traders, 22, 36
Freeman, Douglas Southall, 323
Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, 175, 434
Friends of Independence National Historical Park, 21, 461, 464, 465-66, 467, 485
Front Store, 145, 153, 158
Front Street, 22, 38, 39, 41, 42, 49, 54, 161, 164
Frost, Ralph, 262
Funding, 105-06, 115, 120-21, 122, 131-32, 140, 157, 161, 169-70, 171, 174, 178, 180, 181, 190, 191, 201, 217, 255-56, 321, 326-28, 329, 396-7, 398, 415, 422, 432, 435, 437-38, 441, 452, 454, 455, 460, 461, 494
Furcolo, Foster, 122
Furness, Frank, 55, 164, 176, 177, 179, 184
Furnishings, advisory committee on, 258, 264; Assembly Room, 12-13, 258-59, 260-62, 277, 459; Bishop White House, 20, 222, 223, 237, 244-48, 250, 459, 460; City Tavern, 459; Congress Hall, 14, 459; Governor's Council Chamber, 13, 460; Independence Hall, 256, 319, 320, 357, 460; Long Gallery, 13;

program, 458, 459-61; Supreme Court Room, 264, 322; Todd House, 20, 459
Gallagher, James, 83-84, 85
Garden Clubs of America, 130, 163
Gardens, 21-22, 26, 212, 425-6, 467
Garrison, Lon, 294, 295, 298, 300
Gates, Thomas S., Jr., 116, 118, 202
General Accident, 121
General Federation of Women's Clubs, 255-56, 259, 261, 262, 264, 319, 321, 322, 357, 460
German Reformed Church, 41
Germantown, 23, 131, 431
Germantown Historical Society, 23, 26, 131
Gianopulos, Nicholas L., 278, 306, 430
Gibbs, James, 283
Gibson, Benjamin Franklin, 252
Gilchrist, Agnes, 164
Girard's Bank, 6
Girard Estate Building, 54
Girard House hotel, 51
Girard Life Insurance Company, 51
Girard, Stephen, 7
Giurgola, Romaldo, 436, 437
Gloria Dei Church. See Old Swedes Church
Golub, Nate, 410-11
Goodman, Bernard, ii, 485
Graff House, 23, 94, 100, 104, 119, 140, 398-99, 431-32, 437-38, 452, 470, 471, 473, 497-98
Graff, Jacob, Jr., 23
Gravelle, William H., 78
Great Meeting House, 38
Greber, Jacques, 64, 65, 433, 488
Greenfield, Albert M., 73, 89, 116, 119, 121, 123, 173, 490
Grigg, Milton, 150
Grossman, Charles, 178, 201, 210, 226-27, 234, 237, 256, 262, 263, 264, 265, 270, 271, 272, 274, 291, 328, 383
Grounds. See Landscaping
Guarantee Safe Deposit and Trust Company (Tradesmen's Bank), 55, 164, 173, 176, 179, 184
Guffey, Joseph E., 69, 85

HABS, 90, 153-54, 155, 293, 299, 307-08, 309, 311, 367, 490, 496
Hagan, Mary Anne
Hallahan, John p., 78, 123, 173
Hamilton, Alexander, 339
Hanson, Fred, 333, 460
Hanson, Hodge, 155-56, 167
Hanson, Julia Butler, 398
Harbeson, John, 203
Harbeson Hough Livingston & Larson, 136, 487
Harding, Samuel, 265, 266, 269
Harmony Street, 189

Hartshorne, Penelope, 196, 226-27, 229, 234, 235, 237, 238, 239, 243, 247, 248-49, 250, 264, 266, 267, 269, 272, 273, 274, 277, 281, 289, 290-91, 292, 293, 294, 295, 295, 298, 300, 302, 303, 306, 322, 335, 340, 383. See also Penelope Hartshorne Batcheler
Hartzog, George, 302, 303, 339, 340, 366, 369, 370, 371, 386, 387, 388, 397, 401, 404, 405, 407, 409, 410, 412, 414, 415, 463, 464
Haviland, John, 51, 59, 60, 255, 262, 263, 265, 272, 281
Head House, 144
Heath, Ferry K., 67
Henkels, George J., 51
Herbach, Louis, 121
Heston, Charlton, 475
Hibbard-Griffith Houses, 235
High Street. See Market Street
Hills, John, map of Philadelphia, 44
Historic American Buildings Survey. See HABS
Historic Grounds Reports, 326, 337
Historic Sites Act, 69, 72, 154, 489
Historic Structures Reports, 124, 195, 202, 235-36, 239, 274, 276, 281, 295, 298, 300, 303, 326, 332, 333, 334, 335, 383, 427
Historic Structures Training Conferences, 310
Historical Society of Pennsylvania, 116, 255, 258, 309
History office, 25, 315-16, 321, 329-30
Holland, J.W., 158
Holme, Thomas, 5, 36, 38; plan of, 41, 42
Hope Lodge, 283
Hopkinson, Edward, Jr., 104, 106, 107, 116, 118, 119, 120, 123
Hornor, William McPherson, 258
Hummel, Edward A., 132, 397
Humphrey, Hubert, 359
Huston, John, 6, 417
Huth, Hans, 96, 257

Ickes, Harold, 70, 81, 84, 85
"Independence" (film). See Films: at Visitor Center
Independence Hall, 11, 12-13, 14, 15, 25, 27, 40, 41, 43, 45, 57, 58, 60, 61, 62, 63, 65, 69, 72, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 86, 106, 112, 117, 127, 133, 134, 135, 156, 169, 187, 191, 193, 194, 202, 204, 205, 219, 227, 249, 250, 266, 268, 276, 307, 313, 315, 317, 319, 330, 332, 336, 341, 341, 343, 344, 345, 347, 356, 357, 358, 361, 362, 365, 368, 374, 396, 397, 404, 408, 410, 413, 417, 418, 421, 430, 431, 433, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 444, 448, 453, 454, 460, 472, 473, 474, 480, 482, 487, 488, 490; archaelogy at, 287; Assembly Room, 6, 12, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 258, 260, 261-64, 265, 266, 267, 277, 282-85, 291, 296, 302, 324, 326, 333, 357, 358, 459; center hall, 270, 274, 287, 313; committee room, 12, 302; custody of, 58, 81; delays in completion, 274, 285-86, 296-300; Governor's Council Chamber, 13, 302, 460; Long Room, 12, 13, 302, 458; preservation of, 58-63, 71-72, 80-82; research, 253-54, 256-58; restoration of, 61-62, 251-312,

336-37, 398, 431, 452, 499; second floor, 303, 304, 305, 306, 460; structural condition and repair of, 270, 272, 274, 278, 279-80; Supreme Court Room, 12, 57, 61, 62, 227, 264, 265, 266, 268, 274, 283, 289, 291, 292, 293-94, 295, 296, 298, 299, 300-01, 302, 304, 305, 322, 323, 343, 397; Tower, 485; Tower Stair Hall, 268-69, 274, 287, 434, 436; Wings, 12, 130, 136, 157, 183, 334, 337, 341, 343, 357,418
Independence Hall Association, 24, 79-80, 82, 83, 85, 87, 92, 93, 100, 108, 116, 122, 123, 129, 365, 409, 432, 433, 437, 456, 461, 488, 493, 498, 504; exhibition, 81-82, 103
Independence Hall Neighborhood Association, 143
Independence Mall, 14, 27, 85, 86, 87, 88, 92, 121, 150, 185, 187, 215, 361, 433, 434-35, 438, 457, 458, 487; early schemes for, 64
Independence National Historical Park Advisory Commission. See Advisory Commission
Independence Square, 11, 14, 25, 26, 27, 45, 47, 51, 55, 56, 57, 58, 60, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 72, 81, 86, 97, 100, 102, 104, 127, 129, 130, 131, 132, 134, 135, 137, 156, 157, 183, 185, 187, 188, 198, 199, 203, 205, 206, 207, 217, 255, 273, 319, 331, 336, 337-38, 343, 351, 354, 356, 357, 358, 361, 369, 404, 434, 436, 439, 467, 470-71, 472, 488
Indian Queen tavern, 42
Insurance Company of North America, 77, 103
Interpretation, 146, 147, 148, 156, 268, 313, 318-19, 340-1, 343, 344, 345-47, 348, 351, 352, 376, 386, 421-23, 426-27, 428, 449, 464, 469, 470-71, 494
Irwin Building, 140, 149, 368, 369, 399, 432

Jackson, Andrew, 10, 70
Jackson, Joseph, 78
Jail, 43
Jayne Building, 50, 94, 120, 129, 138, 139, 142, 143, 148, 150, 157, 158, 161, 162, 163, 164, 169, 173, 174, 176, 178, 179, 180, 181, 183, 184, 193, 217, 369, 494, 495
Jefferson, Thomas, 10, 14, 23-24, 94, 106, 119, 398, 432; house, 16; portrait of, 462
Jenkins, Charles F., 116, 118
Jersey Market, 49
John's Tailor Shop, 139, 161, 181, 192
Johnson, Lyndon B., 359, 443
Johnson, Philip, 176
Johnston, William, 50
Jones, John Paul, portrait of, 462
Judd, Henry A., 239, 242, 243, 244, 277, 298, 299, 300, 302, 304, 368, 388, 428
Junior League. See Volunteers: Junior League

Kahler, Herbert E., 80, 114, 115, 125, 146, 148, 167, 188, 201, 216, 323, 328, 388
Katzenbach, Nicholas deB., 359
Kaufmann, Arthur C., 123, 203, 301-02, 365-66, 368, 369, 370,

406, 407, 408, 409, 411, 412, 414, 415, 419, 432, 433, 437-38, 452, 456
Keast & Hood, 430
Keast, Sheldon, 210-11, 274, 278, 279, 280, 306, 430
Kelly, John B., Jr., 442
Kelsey, Albert, 63, 488
Kennedy, John F., 280, 359
Kennedy, Robert F., 359
Kent, Alan E., 485-86, 422
Kidd Houses, 20, 26, 139, 148, 164, 175, 183, 213, 214. See also Walnut Street: Houses on
Kimball, David A., 247, 321, 423, 325, 326, 329, 330
Kimball, Fiske, 70, 71, 86, 131, 391
King Carl XVI Gustav, 457
Kirkbride, Beatrice, 242
Kirwan, Michael J., 171-72, 398
Kleppe, Thomas S., 481
Knights of Columbus, 438
Kolander, Morris W., 144
Kosciuzko, Thaddeus, National Memorial, 30, 431, 470
Krider Gun Shop, 144-45, 148, 161, 181
Kurjack, Dennis, 136, 173, 187, 210, 211-12, 236, 254, 257, 316, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 329, 341, 343, 345-46, 356, 365, 372-73, 381, 388

Lafayette, Marquis de, visit of, 59, 62
Lamberton, Mayor, 72
Land acquisition, 111, 112, 115, 120, 123-24, 126, 127-28, 130, 132, 133
Land Title Bank & Trust Company, 127
Landell, George A., 78
Landmarks Society, 95, 144
Landscaping, 7, 63; design of, 157, 186-89, 194-95, 382; maintenance of, 31-33; reports on, 331
Lang, Phil., 281
Langenheim, William and Frederick, photographs, 47
Larson, Roy F., 66, 74, 78, 79, 80, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 92, 98, 99, 119, 125, 126, 198, 208, 209, 487
LaRue, Howard, 305, 446, 449, 454
Latrobe, Benjamin Henry, 46, 50, 51
LeCompte, Congressman, 119
Lee, Richard Henry, 6
Lee, Ronald F., 70, 71, 72, 91-92, 93, 111, 113, 114, 116, 125, 126, 148, 167, 188, 214, 257, 258, 275, 294, 328, 335, 337, 342, 355, 356, 382, 384, 387-88, 390, 391, 392, 393, 407, 496, 506
Legislation, 73, 77, 82, 83-84, 102, 111-120, 139-40, 198, 367, 418-19, 432-33, 435, 479, 490, 496, 501
Lehman, Harry, 135, 315, 319, 320
L'Enfant, Pierre, 45
Lewis, Edwin O., 53, 74-76, 77, 79, 80, 81, 82-83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 91, 93, 95, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 108, 114, 116-17, 118, 119, 120, 123, 125, 126, 128, 134,

137, 140, 141, 144, 151, 172, 173, 176-77, 178, 180, 186, 191, 192, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 202, 216, 285, 301-02, 317, 326, 327, 355, 365-66, 370, 397, 406, 409, 410, 411, 432, 433, 434, 441, 458, 487, 488, 490, 491, 493, 504; concept for park of, 137, 176-77, 191-92, 198-9, 206, 487-88, 491, 493
Liberty Bell, 6, 15-16, 25, 60, 65, 77, 82, 119, 169, 268, 314, 339, 341, 344, 353, 360, 361, 362, 413, 431, 439, 454, 470, 471, 472, 473, 480, 481, 488; move of, 16, 368, 402, 404, 407, 408-09, 410, 412, 433-39, 474; Pavilion, 15, 435, 436-37, 439, 448, 452, 474
Library Company, 10, 11, 26, 45, 49, 54, 190, 192, 195, 212, 213, 215, 331, 422, 461
Library Hall, 10, 11, 102, 130, 140, 141, 149, 159, 186, 190
Library Street, 10, 43, 139, 212
Liggett, Barbara, 394-95, 422, 426, 430
Lincoln Civil War Society of Philadelphia, 163
Lingelbach, William E., 78, 79, 93, 95, 101-02, 125, 128, 315, 357
Lisle, E.M., 141, 148
Lobbying, 77, 118-19, 120, 140-41, 196, 433, 456
Lockwood, Clyde M., 452-53, 454, 457, 484
Locust Street, 161; houses on, 22, 206, 274, 331, 406
Logan, James, 39
Lombard, Maria, 348-49
Lombard Street, 94
London Coffee House, 42, 54
Lonsdorf, Alice, 461, 466
Lopez, Claude-Anne, 422, 427, 429
Lovatt, George I., Jr., 199, 203, 208, 209, 210
Lowell, Dwight, 104
Lukens, John B., 253
Lumadrama, Inc., 355, 356
Lyon-Griswold fight, 33

McAneny, George, 89, 104, 116, 119
McArthur, John, Jr., 60-61
McBee, Croswell, 78
McCosker, Joseph, 80, 95, 102, 103, 104, 105, 116, 119
McCollough, Warren, 133, 252, 253, 315, 344
McCormack, John, 88
MacDonald, Stuart, 422, 427
McGarvey, Robert N., 89, 104
McIlvaine House, 20-21, 48, 139, 148, 156, 164, 175, 183, 190, 213, 214, 215, 311
McKean, Thomas, Jr., house, 165, 181
MacLeish, Archibald, 355
Madison, Dolley Payne Todd, 20, 22, 219, 467
Madison, James, 20, 467
Magaziner, Louis, 92, 93
Maintenance, 31-33, 485
Man Full of Trouble Tavern, 250
Manning Street, 120, 130, 485

Manucy, Albert, 346
Market Street, 17, 23, 36, 38-39, 40, 41, 44, 45, 46, 47,49, 51, 52, 54, 63, 65, 94, 101, 106, 108, 123, 140, 373, 398, 432; houses on, 14, 331-32, 338, 376-77, 382-83, 384, 385, 386, 393, 394, 420, 421, 423, 424, 426, 427, 430, 497
Market Street Businessmen's Association, 92-93
Marshall, Charles, 182
Marshall, Joan, 426, 470
Marshall, John, 15
Marshall's Court, houses in, 161, 181-82, 197, 201, 331, 492
Martin, Edward, 88
Martin, Sydney E., 78, 92, 93, 98, 99, 104, 119, 123, 173, 203
Massey, James C., 153, 155, 242, 293, 309, 311
Mattes, Merrill J., 427, 428
Meeks, Carroll, 176
Mercantile Library, 54
Merchants' Exchange, 5, 9, 19, 49, 55-56, 66, 67, 102, 112, 151, 156, 162, 164, 165, 169, 174, 183, 185, 189, 191, 192, 193, 202, 228-29, 274, 326, 331, 365, 367, 413, 494, 495
Mikveh Israel, Cemetery, 25; Synagogue, 159, 163
Miller, Hugh 285, 286
Milley, John, 449, 458, 460, 461-62, 463-65, 466, 467, 482
Mills Robert, 334
Milner, John, 155, 293, 299, 300, 301, 421, 422, 427, 430, 431
Mish, Mary, 426, 430
Mission 66. See National Park Service: Mission 66
Mitchell, Robert E., 93, 98, 116
Mitchell/Giurgola, 435
Montgomery, Charles, 257, 260, 261
Montgomery, James A., 222
Moon & Seven Stars tavern, 50
Moore, Jackson W., Jr., 334, 378, 379
Morison, Samuel Eliot, 323
Morris, Hugh Martin, 93, 104
Morris, Marriott C., 131
Morris, Richard, 38
Morris, Robert, 45, 50; house, 94, 101; statue of, 493
Morton, Rogers C.B., 414
Movies. See Films
Mulcahy, James M., 136, 258, 260, 263, 316, 318, 319, 326, 341
Mullaly, James, 330
Mumford, Lewis, 184-86, 198
Murphy, Charles Abell, 78
Murphy, Quigley & Co., 286
Murtagh, William J., 155, 165, 229, 308, 367, 496
Myers, Francis J., 85, 89, 123
Myzel, Sol, 480

Nagel, Charles, 257, 260
National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, 308, 367, 496, 497, 501
National Museum, 61
National Park Service: Bicentennial preparations, 365; decision-

making in, 148, 235, 335-37; personnel, 27-33, 280-81, 469-72; Mid-Atlantic Regional Office, 5, 162; Mission 66, 171, 172, 181, 182-83, 190, 224, 309, 321, 327, 396, 400, 401, 441; Philadelphia, City of, relationships with, 80-81, 197-205, 285, 317-18, 408-09, 492-93, 501; preservation, role in, 68-69, 112-15, 158, 367, 391-92, 487-490, 494-502; relationships between people in, 167-68, 325-26; reorganizations of, 160-61, 238-89, 273, 294, 299-300, 339-340, 348, 365-68; Shrines Commission, relationships with, 90, 91-93; women in, 28, 349-53, 500
National Register of Historic Places, 496
National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, 22, 61, 153, 165, 357, 422, 460
Neblett, Nathaniel, 144
Nelligan, Murray, 188, 256, 260-61, 320, 321, 328, 342-43, 345, 388
Nelson, Lee H., 275-76, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 285, 286, 287, 288, 291, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 310, 311, 313, 340, 368, 420, 422, 427, 428, 449, 499
Nevell, Thomas, 265
New Hall, 9, 26, 45, 145, 153, 158, 160, 166, 175, 179, 183, 185, 191, 198, 199, 200, 202, 203, 204, 205, 209, 326, 448, 470
Nichols, Roy F., 129, 203, 315, 321
Nitzche, George E., 66, 69, 79-80, 108
Nixon, Richard, 358, 443, 473
Norris family, 49; house, 43; garden 44, 45, 49
Norris' Alley, 39, 43; Row, 49, 54, 97, 147, 149, 199, 494
Nutt, Donald, 355

O'Brien, Joseph M., 123, 124, 127, 135, 144
Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation, 299, 367, 386, 390, 449, 496
Office of History and Historical Architecture, 30
O'Guin, Richard, 454, 474-75, 475, 478-79, 484
O'Hara, John B., 408, 456, 461
Old City Hall, 13, 14, 45, 60, 62, 64, 102 ,127, 156, 164, 205, 270, 272, 274, 276, 331, 342, 347, 398, 431, 449; structural condition, 205-07
Old Philadelphia Development Corporation, 354, 355
Old Swedes Church, 29, 38, 73-74, 79, 112, 338
Operations, 27-33, 132-33
Orianna Street, 106, 235, 373, 374, 424
Ostroff, Isidor, 72-73, 74, 82-83, 84, 85, 119, 159, 409-10, 490

Paint, as a research tool, 248-50, 266-67, 269, 271-72, 289-91, 459
Palmer, George A., i, 132, 167, 188, 193, 300, 328, 329, 345, 346, 392, 451, 504-05
Parking, 174, 366, 369-70, 399-400
Passon, Morris, 93, 121
Passonneau, J.R., 413

Peale, Charles Willson, 57, 259, 449, 459, 461, 461
Peale Collection, 193, 324
Peale, Rembrandt, 57
Peale's Museum, 57, 58, 60
Pecoraio, John, 281, 286
Pemberton family, 43
Pemberton, Joseph, 9; House, 9, 26, 48, 55, 173, 179, 202, 203, 331, 338, 470
Penn, Richard, 45
Penn, Thomas, 13
Penn, William, 21, 22, 24, 35, 36, 39, 107; statue of, 5; tree, 7
Penn, William, Foundation, 438
Penn Mutual Building, 50, 129, 139, 142, 143, 148, 150, 157, 158, 161, 162, 163, 164, 169, 173, 174, 176, 178, 179, 183, 184, 193, 217, 369, 494, 495
Pennsylvania, Commonwealth of, 14, 26, 121, 136, 434, 446, 487; Archives, 317; Bicentennial celebration, 457
Pennsylvania Horticultural Society, 20, 21, 26, 160, 163, 175, 213
Pennsylvania Hospital, 43
Pennsylvania Society for the Promotion of Agriculture, 175
Pepper, George Wharton, 82
Peterson, Charles E., i, 74, 91, 93, 94, 95, 103, 104, 105, 114, 120, 123, 128, 132, 142, 143, 145, 146, 150, 152, 153, 154, 155, 157-58, 160, 165, 167, 168, 177, 178, 180, 185, 189, 194, 195, 206, 207, 209, 215, 220, 221, 222, 223, 225, 226, 234, 240, 242, 243, 244, 252, 253, 256, 276, 284, 293, 299, 307-08, 335, 364, 374, 377, 397, 400, 482, 496, 500; choice of staff, 238-39, 273, 275; concept for park of, 96-98, 100-01, 129-30, 137-39, 216-17, 493, 497; early career of, 90, 124, 235; influence of, 309-12, 498-500; resignation of, 280-81
Peterson, Harold L., 145
Peterson, J. Hardin, 84, 85
Petrak, Joseph, 286, 296, 298, 300, 304
Pfanz, Harry, 422
Philadelphia, City of, 56, 58, 68, 126, 127, 134, 147, 203, 217, 252, 358, 434, 438, 439, 442, 446, 448, 462, 463, 501; Archives, 163, 166, 190, 212, 317, 318, 461; Bicentennial planning, 442-44; cooperative agreements with, 25, 80, 112, 199, 208, 408-09; Fine Arts Commission, 198, 199, 200, 204, 205, 209, 463, 492; Historical Commission, 197, 202, 234, 242, 307; Planning Commission, 94, 98, 99, 100, 104, 105, 106, 107, 114, 116, 126, 197, 199, 384, 408, 424, 491, 492; Police Department, 480; Redevelopment Authority, 490
Philadelphia Bank, 50, 54
Philadelphia Bicentennial Corporation, 442, 444, 445
Philadelphia Contributionship, 136, 144, 195
Philadelphia National Shrines Park Commission, 89-90, 91, 92, 93, 96, 98, 99, 100, 101, 114, 365, 432; report of, 95, 102-03, 105, 108, 111, 117, 137, 173, 484
Philadelphia Dispensary & Surgeons Hall, 45
Philadelphia Inquirer, 455, 465
Philadelphia Museum Council, 465

Philadelphia Open House, 466
Philadelphia Public Ledger Building, 50, 55
"Philadelphia 76", 445, 448, 457
Philadelphia Society for the Promotion of Agriculture, 213
Pine-Savage painting of Assembly Room, 258, 260, 263, 266, 283, 284, 326, 333
Pine Street, 22, 30, 43, 106, 112, 120, 144, 431
Pine Street Presbyterian Church, 106
Piszek, Edward, 431
Planning, 92-102, 367; concept of in National Park Service, 136-37; criticism of, 184-86, 197-201; development philossphy, 141, 162-63, 182, early schemes for park, 63-68, 433, 487-88; Independence Hall Association, 79-82, 85-86,; master plans of 1952-54, 141-170, 376-77; under Mission 66, 172-73; of 1957-60, 187-218; of 1968-71, 368-71, 376, 377, 384-86, 398-99; Shrines Commission, 102-108
Platt, John D.R., 201, 212, 324, 325, 326, 329, 330, 335, 336, 339, 340, 345, 346, 348, 363, 364, 368, 383, 388, 389, 392, 422, 429
Poe, Edgar Allen, National Historical Site, 30
Poppeliers, John, 311
Portraits, 60, 458-59, 461, 462-64, 401
Powell, B. Bruce, 287, 378-80, 394, 395
Presbyterian Church, 46
Preservation, 70, 71, 112, 126, 487-99; attitudes of National Park Service toward, 158, 164-65, 205, 212-15, 427-28, 494, 495-96, 497-98; of buildings, debates over, 93, 102, 141-53, 164-65, 172-81, 205-11; influence of Independence National Historical Park on 499-501; National Park Service role in, 68-69, 112-15, 158, 367, 391-92, 487-90, 494-502
Price, Jackson, 116
Prince Harold, of Norway, 457
Price, Philip, 204
Prince Philip, 481-82
Princess Margaret, 447
Produce Exchange. See Merchants Exchange
Project A, 105, 127. See also Area A
Project B, 106, 108, 112, 114, 117, 119, 120, 127, 128, 130, 144. See also Area B
Project C, 106, 127, 128. See also Area C
Project D, 106, 119, 120
Project E, 106, 112, 115, 117, 119, 120, 127. See also Area E
Protection, 453-54, 474-49, 480
Protestant Episcopal Church Historial Society, 163, 175
Purves, Edmund R., 179
Pusey, Caleb, 339

Quaker Almshouse, 43
Quaker meeting houses, 38
Queen Elizabeth, visit of, 476, 479-81, 484
Quorom Five, 369, 399

Rabin, Yitzhak, 457
Race Street, 66, 86, 434, 448
Raff, A. Raymond, 66; Company, 279
Rafsky, William, 448
Raley, Robert, 155
Ramsbotham, Sir Peter, 479-80
Randolph, Benjamin, 339
Rauch, John, 422
Rayburn, Sam., 88
Read, George, 339
Read House, 17
Read, John, 380; Jr., 59
Reagan, Ronald, 431
Reaves, Donna, 485
Reeves, George, 454
Reconstruction, 141, 190, 213, 369, 419, 423, 493-94, 497; criticism of, 185-86, 198-99, 386-93
Reifel, Ben, 398
Research, 128-30, 135-36, 143, 144, 155, 195, 225, 227, 228-31, 233-34, 313-18, 320-26, 377, 380-83; cooperative program, 129, 315, 320, 321; priorities of, 318-20; purposes of, 320
Restoration, 124, 141; influence of, 147-48, 268, 498-500; issues of, 203-11, 240-44, 335-38; methodology, 224-36, 262-66, 270, 271-74, 281-92; policy on, 219, 236
Rhea, John, 51
Richardson, Edgar P., 422
Riley, Edward M., 123, 124-25, 127-28, 129, 136, 141, 146, 147, 164, 184, 216, 252, 254, 255, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 325, 330, 342, 363, 373-74, 376, 380, 381
Riley, Walter, 279
Rittenhouse, David, 10
Rittenhouse Square, 52
Ritter, Joyce, 417
Ritter, Lloyd, 417
Rizzo, Frank, 408, 434, 435-46, 444, 472, 481, 482
Roache, F. Spencer, 136
Roache, Hannah Benner, 136
Robin, John P., 355
Rogers, T. Mellon, 61-62, 262-63, 266, 279, 332
Rohm & Haas Company, 121
Ronalds, Francis J., 125, 131
Rose, Robert H., 346
Rowland, Ann, 461
Rush, William, 60
Rusk, Dean, 359

Sacks, Leon, 73, 77, 79
St. George's Methodist Church, 25
St. Joseph's Catholic Church, 24-25, 106
St. Mary's Roman Catholic Church, 106, 117, 156, 159; Cemetery, 108, 120
St. Peter's Church, 20, 143, 221
Samuel, Bernard, 80, 83, 89, 92, 106, 119, 123, 134

Sansom house, 48
Sansom sketch of Assembly Room, 284-85, 326
Sansom Street, 48, 67, 73
Sartain, John, painting of Bishop White's study by, 222, 233
Scanlon, Carole, 352
Schmidt, Helmut, 457
Schumacher, Paul J.F., 231, 232, 233, 374-76, 378, 379
Schuylkill River, 22, 36, 47
Scott, Hardie, 111, 116, 118, 121, 131
Scott, Hugh D., Jr., 78, 79, 111, 201, 204, 397, 433, 443, 457
Scott-Brown, Denise, 423, 442-43
Scoyen, Eivind T., 188
Scull & Heap, map, 40
Seaton, Fred. A., 200, 201
Second Bank of the United States, 9, 10, 43, 49, 51, 66, 70, 86, 89, 94, 97, 99, 102, 123, 130, 131, 135, 139, 151, 156, 157, 163, 164, 165, 166, 169, 175, 190, 192, 193, 199, 212, 213, 215, 219, 229, 317, 318, 331, 398, 431, 458, 461, 465, 466, 467, 470, 479, 482, 493, 494; 1940 restoration of, 70-72
Second Presbyterian Church, 41
Second Street, 24, 35, 38, 40, 41, 42, 44, 45, 49, 51, 54, 73, 88, 94, 100, 104, 127, 139, 142, 144, 169, 183, 189, 192, 193, 215, 369, 374, 399, 400, 432
Secondari, Mrs., 429
Security. See Protection
"See What They Sawed" Exhibit, 311, 397
Sellers, Charles Coleman, 422
Sellers, Horace Wells, 62, 255
Sells, Laura, 352
Seltzer, Ruth, 465
Setting, Plans for, 65-66, 78
Seventh Street, 23, 30, 106, 140, 398, 432
Sharples family, 459, 462, 467
Sharples, Joseph, 324
Shippen, Edward, house, 40
Shippen-Wistar House, 106
Shoemaker, R.W., 136, 316, 319
Shrines Commission. See Philadelphia National Shrines Park Commission
Sifton, Paul G., 281, 330, 380
Sign of the Confederation tavern, 50
Silberholz, Joseph, 270
Silverman, Edwin H., 78
Simon, Grant M., 90, 91, 96, 99, 100, 104, 105, 106, 119, 125, 137, 148, 149, 151-2, 173, 201, 203, 210, 355; plan for park by, 92-93, 94, 97, 98, 146; plan for Franklin Court by, 376-77, 423
Sims, Joseph Patterson, 89-90
Sixth Street, 22, 44, 46, 49, 51, 52, 55, 67, 73, 123, 339, 434
Slate Roof House, 5, 39, 54, 144, 467
Smith, H. Reese, 294, 295
Smith, J. Somers, Jr., 144
Smith, Robert, 390
Smith, Robert E., 285

Smith, Samuel E., 145
Society Hill, 19, 22-23, 36, 52, 72, 98, 107, 119, 182, 187, 189, 197, 234, 268, 310, 312, 408, 442, 446, 453, 466, 467, 491, 492, 500, 501
Sons of the American Revolution, 77, 82
Souder, Norman M., 239, 250
Sound and light, 353-56, 385
South Street, 22
Spenser, Fred, 447
Spiller, Robert, 422
Spring Garden Street, 30
Spruce Street, 22, 38, 197
Stans, Maurice, 444
State House. See Independence Hall
State House Yard. See Independence Square
Stauffer, Alvin P., 70
Steele, A.G.B., 123
Stevens, Sylvester K., 80, 81, 128
Stevenson, Markley, 82
Stewart, Robert G., 256
Stocker, John Clement, House, 240
Stockwell, David, 258, 260, 261
Stockwell, Joseph F., 79
Streets, restoration of, 8, 188-89, 194. See also individual streets
Strickland, William, 5, 9, 49, 51, 59, 94, 164, 228, 337
Sullivan, James R., 330, 346, 348, 351, 352, 356, 372, 373, 388, 407, 422, 448, 450, 454
Sullivan, Louis, 143
Supplee, Henderson, Jr., 442
Supreme Court Building. See Old City Hall
Sutton, Richard, 92, 148, 328
Swaims Building, 51
Syng, Philip, 259

Tate, James H., Jr., 285, 326
Tate, Thaddeus W., 320, 321
Tenancy policy. See Uses of building: Tenancy policy
Tenth Street, 44
Thackara, John, drawings, 381-82, 388, 419
Thalheimer & Weitz, 67
Third Street, 6, 21, 30, 39, 41, 42, 45, 46, 50, 55, 66, 137, 139, 142, 145, 159, 169, 187, 189, 193, 195, 339, 365, 368, 369, 373, 399, 403, 412, 431
Thorndike, Oliver, 358
Tobin, Daniel, 167, 172, 175, 181, 187, 188, 195, 200, 201, 213, 214, 328, 346, 347
Todd House, 20, 21, 22, 94, 107, 112, 156, 175, 183, 189-90, 212-23, 214, 219, 235, 242, 243, 249, 339, 397, 398, 448, 453, 459, 470, 493
Todd, John, 20
Tolson, Hillory, 116, 188
Tours, 19, 418, 449, 453, 454, 466

Town House, 39, 40, 49
Truman, Harry S., 359, 452
Trumble, Francis, 258, 260, 261
Trumbull, John, 255, 258, 284
Truscott, Frank F., 125
Turello, David, 368
Tyler, Richard, 380

Ulrich, E. Hubert, 116
U.S. Fidelity & Guaranty Company, 130
United States Hotel, 51
U.S. Marine Corps Museum, 26, 166, 175, 179
U.S. Navy, 202
Uses of buildings, proposed, 149, 156-57, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163-64, 165-66, 169, 174-75, 181, 183, 189, 192, 206, 212-15; tenancy policy, 160, 166
Utley, Robert M., 390

Van Doren, Carl, 89, 104, 105
Van Dyke Building, 50
Vaughan, David, 422
Venturi, Robert, 420-21, 422, 424, 430, 442-43, 485
Venturi & Rauch, 420, 424, 426, 427, 428, 430
Vine Street, 38, 41, 51
Vint, Thomas C., 125, 137, 138, 146, 148, 150, 168, 188, 280, 309, 328
Visitation, 342, 352, 402, 404, 418, 431, 436, 452, 471-73, 485. See also Interpretation
Visitor Center, 6, 19, 20, 366, 396, 398, 402, 404, 409, 428, 431, 433, 434, 448, 454, 465, 470, 479, 481; design of, 399, 400, 402-03, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413-14, 415, 418, 420; location of, 193, 212, 215, 341, 368, 369, 399, 400, 461
Volunteers, 28, 352-53, 461, 467-69, 501

Wadsworth, Jeremiah, 324
Waite, John, 155
Wallace David H., 236, 347, 368, 459
Walter, Francis E., 116
Walter, T.U., 50, 60
Walnut Street, 8, 22, 26, 35, 36, 43, 44, 48, 49, 55, 73, 86, 88, 94, 98, 99, 100, 101, 104, 106, 107, 112, 119, 120, 127, 130, 137, 139, 140, 144, 145, 146, 148, 149, 157, 160, 161, 169, 175, 187, 189, 212, 214, 216, 240, 338, 339, 365, 378, 399, 491, 493, 495; houses on, 19-20, 107, 183, 192, 195, 213, 215, 250, 274, 365, 396
Warnock, Douglas, 450, 451, 455, 481, 482, 484
Warren, Earl, 360
Washington, George, 6, 12, 23, 24, 94, 101, 131, 247, 323, 383; birthplace, 391; house, 16; portrait, 259; statue of, 60
Washington, Martha, portrait, 462

Washington Square, 55
Washington Square East Development Project, 189
Water Street, 49
Watterson, Joseph, 392
Wayne, John, 482
Welch, Richard J., 111, 119
Welcome Park, 5, 467, 485
Wesleyan Church, 41
Western Bank, 51
Wetherill, S. Price, 78
Whitby Hall, 283
White, William, 20, 221, 223, 227, 246, 247-48
Whitlock, Edmund, 305, 306
Whittington, Gordon, 276, 306
Williams, Carl, 381-82, 388-89
Williams, E. Norris, 104
Williamsburg, Colonial, influence of, 350, 351, 403, 488-89, 491-92, 497, 498
Willings Alley, 24
Wills, H.W., 78
Wirth, Conrad L., 125, 141, 144, 145, 147-48, 150, 151, 152, 153, 159, 160, 161-62, 165, 168, 170-71, 172, 176, 178-80, 181, 186, 188, 189, 192, 193, 196, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 209, 213, 235-36, 256, 261, 280, 281, 302, 336, 337, 339, 345, 347, 354, 370, 377, 382, 492, 506
Wistar, Thomas, Jr., 206, 207, 209, 239, 273, 277, 281
Wister, Frances, 78, 79, 95, 144, 145
Wolf, Edwin, II, 422
Wood, R.D., Building, 54
Wooley, Edmund, 265
World War II, effect of, 71, 72, 73
Wrenn, George L., 239-40, 242, 243, 250

Yoelson, Martin I., ii, 135-36, 227, 257, 263, 281, 315, 316, 318, 319, 322, 326, 329, 339, 340, 342, 368, 379, 380, 381, 384, 388, 409, 417, 422, 426, 427-28, 429, 430, 449
Yoh Building, 190, 213, 215

Zantzinger, C.C., 78
Zimmer, Edward, 148, 155-56, 167-68, 187, 195, 201, 207, 209, 214, 280, 328, 335, 337