(History)
INDE.168 09
CRBIB#001952
391/133068

10-23
(June 1941)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

---------- NATIONAL PARK

FILE NO.

PHILADELPHIA SHRINES NATIONAL PARK PROJECT

June 23 - July 18, 1947

by:
Roy E. Appleman,
Regional Historian.
September 30, 1947.

IMPORTANT

This file constitutes a part of the official records of the National Park Service and should not be separated or papers withdrawn without express authority of the official in charge.

All Files should be returned promptly to the File Room.

Officials and employees will be held responsible for failure to observe these rules, which are necessary to protect the integrity of the official records.

NEWTON B. DRURY,
Director.

U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE 16—22371

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
REGION ONE
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

September 30, 1947.

MEMORANDUM for the Regional Director.

Subject: Report on Tour of Duty in Philadelphia - June 23 - July 18
Philadelphia Shrines National Park Commission

In accordance with instructions, I spent four weeks in Philadelphia (June 23 - July 18) assisting Judge Edwin O. Lewis and the Philadelphia Shrines National Park Commission in assembling data for the preparation of a report to Congress this year. Most of my time was occupied in research relating to maps, photographs, and documentary material pertaining to historic sites within the proposed Federal area of the Philadelphia Shrines project. The research notes, assembled in the course of this work, have been typed and the original copy forwarded to Judge Lewis on August 13. Copies of these research notes were distributed at the same time to the Director, Associate Director, and the Regional Director.

The following comments will report on other aspects of my work in Philadelphia during the period indicated. The delay in submitting this report has been occasioned by the press

of other work, and the knowledge that it could be deferred for a time without harmful results.

Meeting Called by Judge Lewis - June 24

On June 24, Judge Lewis called a meeting to be held at the Historical Society of Pennsylvania for the purpose of considering details of the report to Congress the Commission wished to have prepared during July and August. Mr. M. J. McCosker, Curator, Atwater Kent Museum, had been employed by Judge Lewis to prepare this report. Attending this meeting were the following persons:

Judge Edwin O. Lewis, Chairman,
Philadelphia National Shrines Park Commission
Mr. M. J. McCosker, Curator, Atwater Kent Museum
Mr. H. Morris Williams, Director,
Pennsylvania Historical Society
Mr. Grant Simon, Architect Consultant,
Philadelphia National Shrines Park Commission
Mr. Charles E. Peterson, National Park Service
Mr. Ray E. Appleman, National Park Service

Mr. McCosker presented a tentative outline of a report, which was then discussed by the members present. There was considerable criticism of the outline, with the result that Judge Lewis instructed Mr. McCosker to proceed with the preparation of the report along the lines suggested by the group. This was to the effect that the report should deal specifically with the historic sites within the proposed Federal area.

At the request of Mr. Lowell in Judge Lewis' office, I prepared a brief summary of this meeting for Mr. Lowell's file. A copy of this memorandum for Mr. Lowell, dated June 25, is attached as Appendix "A" and will make unnecessary further comment in this place respecting the June 24 meeting.

Judge Lewis left Philadelphia on June 25 for a summer vacation at East Harbor, Maine. He indicated that he did not expect to be back in Philadelphia until the first of September, but stated that he could be reached through his office and that any matters relating to the Commission's report that should be brought to his attention were to be left with Mr. Urquhart, who would be in his office through June and until about July 20, at which time Mr. Lowell would return to the office and be there through the remainder of July and August.

On June 25, before leaving, Judge Lewis showed me a letter just received from Mr. Carl Van Doren, replying to Judge Lewis' suggestion that he prepare a preface for the Commission's report. Mr. Van Doren stated that he had just finished a long and hard period of work on a book which was to be published July 1, that he was badly in need of a vacation, and could not soon take on any lengthy job of writing. Judge Lewis indicated to me that he intended to reply to Mr. Van Doren, suggesting that he write a 400 - 600 word statement which could

be used in the report and yet would not entail the expenditure of any great amount of his time.

Meeting Called by Mr. McCosker - July 1

During the month I was in Philadelphia, Mr. McCosker called two meetings after Judge Lewis' departure from the city. The first of these meetings was on July 1, and was attended by the following persons:

Mr. E. Morris Williams
Mr. Grant Simon
Mr. Charles E. Peterson
Mr. Roy E. Appleman

At this meeting Mr. McCosker presented what he thought might be a typical writeup of an historic site within the proposed Federal area. Following this, there was considerable discussion among the group as to the list of sites to be included, the organization of the report, and the use of illustrations and maps.

There is attached as Appendix "B", Progress Report #1 prepared by Mr. McCosker, covering the results of this meeting. There are two or three statements in this report on which there was not agreement, although so indicated by Mr. McCosker. I will comment on this later.

Conference of Mr. McCosker with Mr. Demaray and Representatives of the Government Printing Office -July 2.

In the meeting of June 25, Judge Lewis indicated to Mr. McCosker that he wanted him and Mr. Simon to go to Washington to confer with Mr. Demaray and Mr. Lee, and also representatives of the Government Printing Office, with respect to the possibility of getting the Commission's report printed by the Government Printing Office. Arrangements were completed for this trip, and on July 2 Mr. McCosker and Mr. Simon, accompanied by Mr. Peterson, went to Washington where conferences were held with Mr. Demaray and others in the Washington Liaison Office and, subsequently, with representatives of the Government Printing Office. The results of these conferences in Washington are reported by Mr. McCosker in Progress Report #2, dated July 2. A copy of this report is included as Appendix "C" to this report.

Mr. McCosker was to provide certain information and estimates to the Government Printing Office, after which that office would submit to him estimates as to the cost of printing, depending upon the size of the edition. At the time of my departure from Philadelphia on July 18, these estimates had not been obtained from the Government Printing Office, so far as I know. Neither do I know whether Mr. McCosker had submitted his estimates to the Government Printing Office. It was my understanding that

Judge Lewis was anxious to have the report printed by the Government Printing Office without cost to the Commission. In pursuance of this objective, Judge Lewis indicated that he might write a letter to President Truman on this subject. I do not know whether any such letter was sent to the President.

Meeting Called by Mr. McCosker - July 10

In a meeting called by Mr. McCosker at the Pennsylvania Historical Society on July 10, the following persons were present:

Mr. M. J. McCosker
Mr. Grant Simon
Mr. Charles E. Peterson
Mr. Roy E. Appleman

Mr. R. Norris Williams was out of town and could not attend the meeting. At this time, Mr. McCosker presented his Progress Reports #1 and #2, which have already been mentioned. There was considerable discussion on the subject of the content and the organization of the Commission's report. I objected to the proposal that photographs and texts relating to non-existing structures should be shown four to a page. I pointed out that this was altogether inadequate space for most of the sites concerned. I also corrected what might be the wrong implication in a statement contained in Progress Report #1, next to the last

paragraph, relative to a "too elaborate report." My view was that the report should be informative, well illustrated, and relate to the Act of Congress establishing the Commission and the submittal of a report in a specific manner and in such a way that anyone interested in the subject would have not only the recommendations of the Commission but considerable information, both textual and by illustration, from which opinion could be formed. Revision in the plan to conform to these comments resulted from the discussion.

Letter of Judge Lewis to Governor Duff

Mr. Urquhart showed me a copy of a letter that Judge Lewis had sent from East Harbor, Maine, to Governor Duff of Pennsylvania, suggesting that the Governor have someone prepare a section for the Commission's report which would outline what the state planned to do in that part of the city of Philadelphia adjacent to Independence Square. This had reference principally to the proposed state mall extending north from Independence Square to the approaches of the Delaware River Bridge. Judge Lewis suggested to the Governor that if he had no one on his staff for the writing of this section of the report, that Mr. Roy Larson would be a good one to do it. I saw a copy of the letter on July 19, but I did not make a note at the time of the date of the letter. My

recollection of it is that it was on or about July 6 - 8. I do not know what reply Governor Duff made to this communication.

Meeting Called by the Philadelphia City Planning Commission - July 11

A meeting was called for the afternoon of July 11 in the offices of the Philadelphia City Planning Commission. Those in attendance were as follow:

Robert E. Mitchell, Executive Secretary,
City Planning Commission
Edmin Bacon, Senior Planner,
City Planning Commission
Sidney Martin, President,
Fairmont Park Art Association
Roy Larson, Architect: Vice President,
Independence Hall Association
Grant Simon, Architect,
Philadelphia Shrines National Park Commission
Charles E. Peterson, National Park Service
Roy E. Appleman, National Park Service

This meeting was arranged by Mr. Simon and Mr. Mitchell for the purpose of a thorough discussion of the drawings Mr. Simon was preparing for the Commission. The drawings necessarily represented the major recommendations of the Commission.

It soon became apparent that the City Planning Commission was interested in keeping thoroughly informed of the Philadelphia Shrines National Park Commission's plans. It also developed that

the City Planning Commission was a bit mistrustful of what it feared Judge Lewis might recommend in his report to Congress. The following comments on this meeting are based on notes I made at the time. The following major points developed during the conference:

1. Mr. Hopkinson, Chairman of the Philadelphia City Planning Commission, had instructed Mr. Mitchell to communicate to Judge Lewis and the Philadelphia Shrines National Park Commission the fact that the City Planning Commission was interested in maintaining existing street integrity in the proposed Federal area. Mr. Mitchell said that this related particularly to Walnut Street and that the City Planning Commission was anxious that provisions be made to continue in existence the present businesses now located along Walnut and Chestnut Streets.

2. Mr. Larson expressed a view that the area should be so developed that structures would be either retained or rebuilt adjacent to the historic structures. As an example, he stated that he thought buildings should be erected on either side of the present Old Customs House, as it was designed with existing buildings on either side of it. Mr. Larson thought that many of the non-historic buildings should be continued in

use for business purposes. Mr. Mitchell and Mr. Mason agreed. Mr. Sidney Martin did not altogether agree with this viewpoint. He veered toward the viewpoint expressed by Judge Lewis on other occasions that the area should have a park-like character, and that there should be extensive expanses of lawn and trees. He did state, however, that a compromise between the two viewpoints could be reached, and certain buildings retained or rebuilt which could serve modern-day usages.

Mr. Mitchell asked whether the National Park Service would have any policy on this question. In response, I stated that, while I could not speak for the Service on the matter, it was my opinion that the Service had not yet formulated a policy on the question; that the Director and the Service would approach the question with an open mind and would study carefully all the various points of view that might develop; and that there probably would be great elasticity of mind in considering and formulating policy of development on this subject. I indicated that in the field of historical conservation, the National Park Service did not consider it had ready answers for all problems that arose and that in such a matter as the conservation and development of the Philadelphia Shrines National Park project, should it be established, the problems would be so difficult, and many of them new to the National Park Service, that unquestionably a lot of

thought and study would have to be given to them before any conclusions were reached. I indicated that the Service unquestionably would welcome suggestions and comments from interested bodies, such as the City Planning Commission. Mr. Mitchell seemed to be somewhat relieved to know that the National Park Service did not already have a hard and fast policy established in regard to the proposed Philadelphia Shrines National Park project.

3. Mr. Bacon was called on to present the City Planning Commission's proposals for improvement in the Independence Square area. He presented several large rendered drawings embodying plans, which are summarized as follows:

> A mall treatment east from Independence Square to the Delaware River. Buildings on either side of the mall, facing Walnut and Chestnut Streets, would not be disturbed. There would be a subsidiary mall south from the Old Customs House to the Contributionship Garden, the Wistar House, east to the Powell House, and south to St. Peter's Church. There would be a plaza along the Delaware River area which is now occupied by wholesale produce businesses. There would be underground parking facilities

at the plaza. Dock Street would be retained, extending to the river, and given suitable memorial treatment. The buildings on Elfreth's Alley would be retained. There would be a covered way from the Municipal Pier on the Delaware River to the subways about two blocks west. An area around Christ Church would be cleared of old business structures for the purpose of giving the church a better setting and of providing a fire-break. Encourage the rebuilding of businesses along Market Street. There are current negotiations in progress between business men along Market Street and officials of Christ Church toward the working out of an agreement that is mutually agreeable. This is favored by the Philadelphia City Planning Commission. (It will be observed that the City Planning Commission's proposals for city improvement in this area differs materially from those proposed by the Philadelphia Shrines National Park Project Commission.)

4. It developed that the architects in the meeting not connected with the Shrines Commission -- Mr. Martin, Mr.

Mitchell, Mr. Bacon, and Mr. Larson -- favored a screen of buildings along Chestnut and Walnut Streets. They seemed opposed in general to removing all of the modern-day business structures and converting the area into lawns and park. This seems to be the principal fear in the minds of officials of the Philadelphia City Planning Commission. The City Planning Commission definitely favors business use of the street frontages on Walnut and Chestnut Streets in any development of the area.

Mr. Mitchell said that the City Planning Commission would not publicly oppose Judge Lewis and the Shrines Commission report, once it has been made, no matter what their private views might be. The implication was that there might be considerable behind the scenes objection if the report differed considerably from views held by the City Planning Commission. Mr. Larson and Mr. Martin both stated they felt that general agreement of the City Planning Commission and unanimity of interested bodies in the city with the Shrines Commission were necessary in promoting the project.

In connection with the view that modern-day usages should be allowed to exist in the proposed Federal area, it was suggested that a suitable post office sub-station might be erected on the southeast corner of Chestnut and 3rd Streets, where a building is now leased for that purpose.

5. Mr. Mitchell and Mr. Martin both felt very strongly that the Drexel building is the worst structure in the area and should be the first to come down, if the project is undertaken. This building, they felt, should be in any minimum-taking line for the proposed Federal area. (I know that Judge Lewis feels the same way about this.)

6. Mr. Martin, Mr. Larson, and Mr. Mitchell stated that they were in favor of taking solid blocks in the proposed boundaries for the Federal area, but that wording of the bill to be introduced in Congress should contain clauses stating that in the future development of the area, street frontages, particularly on Chestnut and Walnut Streets, should be available for the erection of new structures. These might be buildings to serve as inns, taverns, and other public usages which will be required in the area, as well as other business usages. These recommended provisions are prompted by the viewpoint already expressed that the City Planning Commission is opposed to an open park area retaining only the present historical structures — they want to see modern business activities continuing in the area.

Mr. Mitchell stated that he would write to Judge Lewis requesting that the bill which the Commission will prepare for submission to Congress include provisions which will permit

buildings along street frontages, and that the drawings to accompany the Commission's report show this. Mr. Mitchell said if this were done the City Planning Commission would present a united front with Judge Lewis and the Philadelphia Shrines National Park Commission.

- - - -

Throughout the discussion Mr. Sidney Martin took a leading part and acted as a wise conciliator to obtain support of the City Planning Commission for the proposed Federal area. Mr. Martin, it seemed to me, guided the discussions in such a way that what might have been a meeting ending with considerable opposition by the City Planning Commission actually terminated with general agreement to the principal proposals of the Shrines Commission, as represented by Mr. Simon's drawings. Mr. Simon showed tact and ability in presenting Judge Lewis' ideas, as represented in the drawings he has in preparation for the report. I consider this meeting as very important. I believe that as a result of it, Judge Lewis and the Commission will be able to obtain the support of Mr. Martin, Mr. Larsen, and the Philadelphia City Planning Commission. It should be noted, however, that there are certain viewpoints among influential Philadelphians that might not be in agreement with what Judge

Lewis and the Commission recommends, or for that matter, what the Service might consider to be the appropriate development of the proposed Shrines area.

Better Philadelphia Exhibition
September 8 - October 15

It has been mentioned in a previous report, but will be repeated here, that the Philadelphia City Planning Commission will hold what is to be called a "Better Philadelphia Exhibition" -- September 8 - October 15 -- on the 5th floor of Gimbel's department store in Philadelphia. More than an acre of floor space will be used. The exhibits have been planned for permanent use in another place after the Gimbel showing ends October 15. This is the first city planning exhibition in Philadelphia, and it has been stated that it is the largest and most elaborate city planning exhibition ever held anywhere. This exhibition includes improvements recommended by the City Planning Commission and scheduled for the period 1947 - 1952 at a cost of $302,400,000. Among the proposals are those outlined by the Planning Commission for the area around Independence Square. It may be expected that a large number of people in Philadelphia will be influenced by this exhibit, and possibly public support for civic improvement in the Independence Square area might result. Mr. Mitchell

stated that the City Planning Commission was anxious to have this exhibit conform as closely as possible to the proposals of Judge Lewis and the National Shrines Park Commission for the Independence Square area.

Miscellaneous

I was informed by Mr. Peterson that he had been told by Mr. Grant Simon that the Insurance Company of North America was going to copyright the historical map of the proposed Federal area in Philadelphia and adjacent sections of the city which Mr. Simon is preparing for the Commission's report. It appears that the Insurance Company of North America intends to publish and sell, and perhaps otherwise distribute, this map. Mr. Diamant is President of the Insurance Company of North America. He has contributed considerably to the financial support of the Independence Square project. I have been informed that Mr. Diamant has made two contributions of $5,000 and $4,000 for defraying expenses of the Independence Hall Association and the Philadelphia Shrines National Park Commission. The last gift of $4,000 was made in June and it is this sum that is being used to defray the salary of Mr. McCosker, who has been employed by Judge Lewis to prepare the Commission's report. I do not know whether any agreement

has been reached between Judge Lewis and Mr. Diament on this matter. It seems to me that the historical map Mr. Sisson is preparing for the Commission, and all other materials prepared for this report for the Commission, are United States Government property, since the Commission has been established and its work authorized by an act of Congress. A question of legality might be involved in this matter, even were it determined that benefits would arise from printing of the map in question by the Insurance Company of North America. In any event, I do not think that the Insurance Company should have a copyright to the map.

Checking of the historical data on Mr. Sisson's historical map by personnel of the Pennsylvania Historical Society has not progressed satisfactorily. Mr. Williams, Director of the Society, told me that he was doubtful that it would be completed in time to meet the September 1 deadline for the report material.

I discussed with Dr. Lingelbach of the American Philosophical Society matters pertaining to the proposed Shrines project on two occasions during my stay in Philadelphia. Dr. Lingelbach is a warm supporter of the project and very well informed on the historical assets of the area involved. He is an influential person who will exercise considerable

weight, I believe, in the final recommendations to be made by Judge Lewis and the Commission.

Mr. Charles Peterson has made the suggestion that a reception center be located and built on Chestnut Street, opposite Independence Hall. This is in the square immediately north of Independence Square and within the area proposed for the state mall. I am in general agreement with Mr. Peterson that a reception center will be needed in the area, if it is established as proposed. I am not so sure that the reception center should be placed immediately opposite Independence Hall at the street front. This matter, I think, needs considerable further study and no doubt will receive it if Congress takes favorable action toward establishing the site.

Boundaries

I wish to re-state at this time my conviction, which has strengthened since my report of May 2, that the boundaries of the proposed Federal area in Philadelphia should include the entire block north of Independence Square. This area has been proposed as part of the state mall. I think it is essential that this city block be acquired for the Federal project in order to give the proper approach and setting for

Independence Square and to control this key area in developing the site. This block also contains several historic sites which should be included in the Federal area. Foremost among these is the Robert Morris House, which was used by George Washington and John Adams as their residence, or the "White House" of the new nation, between 1790 and 1800. It is very likely also that any reception center which the Service might wish to build for the area would be located some place in this block. I recommend, therefore, that the National Park Service have the acquisition of this city block as one of its objectives in considering the entire proposal. The boundaries should also encompass all the area between Walnut and Chestnut Streets from Second to Sixth Streets. The site of the Jacob Graff, Jr. House at the Southwest corner of Market and Seventh Streets, where Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence, should be acquired for Federal ownership and be part of the Shrines project.

Development and Interpretive Program

I shall not attempt in this report to enter into the subject of development and an interpretive program. It is a large and complicated one for the area under consideration.

Should it be considered desirable, I shall be glad to set down what thoughts I have on the matter in a separate report. It is my thought, however, that this subject should be left for further and more mature study in the event Congress takes favorable action on the establishment of the proposed site. I think that any bill which is submitted to Congress relative to the establishment of the Philadelphia Shrines National Park should make certain that there are liberal powers granted the National Park Service in this respect. It would be a mistake, in my opinion, for the bill to be specific regarding the development and interpretation of the area. Powers granted the Park Service on this subject should be broad, and should enable the Service, after study, to proceed with what is considered to be the proper course in this matter.

- - - -

A few photographs showing present conditions in the proposed Federal area, are incorporated as Appendix "D" to this report.

Roy E. Appleman

Roy E. Appleman,
Regional Historian.

cc: Director
Washington

Appendix "A" -

c
o
p
y

344 City Hall
Philadelphia, Pa.
June 25, 1947

MEMORANDUM for Mr. Lowell.

At your suggestion the following summary of the meeting (June 24) at the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, with respect to the report of the Philadelphia National Shrines Park Commission, is submitted.

Present: Judge Edwin O. Lewis, Mr. Williams, Mr. Simon, Mr. Peterson, Mr. McCosker, and myself.

Mr. McCosker displayed his dummy layout of the proposed report. He proposed a format size similar to Life Magazine. Judge Lewis approved this size if the Government Printing Office approves and will do the printing job on that basis. Mr. McCosker and Mr. Simon are to go to Washington next week to discuss this matter with the Government Printing Office. Arrangements will be made through Mr. Demaray's office.

Mr. McCosker's presentation emphasized pictures and catchy titles with little text. The material was grouped along lines of social and economic history of Philadelphia. Some attention was given to political life of the period. Very little attention was given to the proposed Federal Area or the sites and physical remains within it.

Beginning with Mr. Williams, others at the meeting commented on Mr. McCosker's presentation. All comments by Mr. Williams, Mr. Peterson, Mr. Simon, and myself were in general agreement. We thought the report should be more serious, should have more text, fewer illustrations (still to be well illustrated), should relate more specifically to the Federal area and sites and remains, should contain an architectural history of important historical structures still standing, an evaluation of the sites and physical remains within the proposed area for historical purposes; in short, that the report should provide a basis for studying and evaluating the historical value of the proposed area and its historical and architectural remains. The sections to be devoted to the state and city plans should be brief. Judge Lewis instructed Mr. McCosker to proceed with the report along these lines. The illustrations were to be selected to illustrate the arguments and points made by the text. The printed report is not to be documented, but the original manuscript will be fully documented, giving reasons for opinions stated when controversial point is involved or where matter is doubtful, and cite the sources consulted and relied on or rejected. All the notes, manuscript material, maps, sketches and drawings assembled in the course of the Commission Report work will remain in the files of the Commission and be transferred to the Federal Government upon the expiration of the life of the Commission.

c
o
p
y

Appendix "A" - cont'd.

Mr. Sisson will proceed with the completion of several maps and drawings he has in progress. The work is to be completed by August 31, 1947, so that the members of the Commission may then review the draft.

Judge Lewis will prepare the section of the report setting forth the recommendations of the Commission.

(SGD.) ROY E. APPLEMAN
Roy E. Appleman

c
o
p
y

Appendix "B"

c
o
p
y

July 1st, 1947

#1 PROGRESS REPORT:

At a meeting held in the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Messrs. Williams, Simon, Appleman, Peterson and McCosker discussed various phases of the book from the standpoint of its subject matter and order. Mr. McCosker submitted a sample chapter on an historical site and, as a result, was able to get definitive ideas on the kind of treatment deemed best.

The order of subject matter in the book, and its sequential arrangement, was discussed. The following was agreed upon:

1. Frontispiece
2. Table of Contents
3. Report of Commission - by Hon. Edwin O. Lewis
4. Historic sites in the proposed park area, having buildings still in existence.
   a. arranged in order of their importance.
   b. divided into pre 1800 and post 1800 sections.
   c. containing photos and brief evaluation of site's present condition within or adjoining the essay and photos relating to the historic nature of the site.
5. Historic sites in the proposed park area whose original physical structures have disappeared.
   a. arranged in order of their importance.
   b. containing photo and brief evaluation of site's present condition.

Appendix "H" - cont'd.

6. Perimeter: A pictorial and textual review of sites near and adjoining but not inside the proposed Federal area, arranged in the following order:

   a. Franklin, Jefferson, and Washington homes.
   b. Others

7. Commonwealth report on North Hall.
8. City Planning Commission report
9. City of Philadelphia report
10. Map study of proposed Federal area.

Comments:

It was generally agreed that many sites could be represented pictorially by personalities or pictures of events in places where this kind of material bolstered the story.

It was generally agreed that present photos of sites could be placed with old pictures of sites in order to give Congressional readers a quick appraisal of the whole.

It was generally agreed - under advice by Messrs. Peterson and Appleman - that a too elaborate report would create a negative state of mind, particularly among economy-minded Congressmen.

It was generally agreed that the physical sites would be presented in unbalanced form, due to an abundance of material in some instances, contrasted with scarcity of material in others; it was

c o p y

further agreed that non-physical sites could probably be shown pictorially four to a page.

CONCLUSION -

It was agreed that the original estimate of the number of pages in the book would necessarily be cut down drastically as a result of the revised recommendations.

c o p y

Appendix "C" -

c
o
p
y

#2 PROGRESS REPORT

Messrs. Simon, Peterson, and McCosker journeyed to Washington.

a. to interview Mr. Demaray, Associate Director of the National Park Service, upon appointment arranged by Mr. McCosker.

b. to interview a Government Printing Office representative, appointment arranged by Mr. Demaray's office through Congressman Hugh Scott's office.

In Washington, at Mr. Demaray's office, Mr. McCosker read Mr. Demaray's letter to Judge Lewis of June 20th, which follows:

My dear Judge Lewis:

Regarding the publishing of the Commission's report, the Government Printing Office can undoubtedly handle the printing as a Commission document, but will have to be reimbursed from the Commission's funds for the cost. It will be possible for this Office to secure a rough estimate of the cost provided detailed specifications of the document are furnished to us for use in discussions with the Government Printing Office.

There is another possible way of arranging for publication of the report which might be handled as a House or Senate Document without obligating Commission funds for the purpose. This would have to be arranged by the introduction and passage through either body of a resolution for the purpose. This possibility is discussed in Director Drury's letter dated May 29 to you, copy attached.

If you will advise me whether the Commission has sufficient funds to pay the cost of printing, or whether you would prefer to consider the second alternative, this Office will endeavor to assist you in carrying out the plan you select.

Sincerely yours,

A. E. Demaray

c
o
p
y

Appendix "C" - cont'd.

Mr. Demaray replied that perhaps his office had been "brash" in writing this letter. He foresaw many obstacles.

The Government-Document, without obligating commission funds, seemed feasible although it was highly dubious that it could be enabled by Congress at the present session. Might need to wait until Congress reconvenes.

Mr. McCosker: But the Commission report needs to be submitted by the end of the year.

Mr. Demaray: The Commission report can be submitted in typescript form, if it is not printed.

Mr. Demaray looked at layout, printer's dummy, and map. Said that GPO (Government Printing Office) was restricted as to size, format, and style in many documents (later, at GPO, we found that this could be circumvented.)

Mr. Demaray asked for copy of Commission's organization by Congress . . . Mr. McCosker asked if "printing and binding" clause did not enable the Commission to use $10,000 for that purpose. Mr. Demaray said he thought so although it would require some study to see if the Interior Department could channelize the use of this $10,000

c o p y

for the purposes of printing the Commission's report. It could be done by GPO, he added, or it could be let by GPO - through waiver - to a printing contractor.

Mr. Demaray said that he would do all within his power to help the Commission in its efforts to print the report.

Messrs. Simon, Peterson, and McCosker were taken by Messrs. Lee and Evison of the National Park Service to see Mr. Brody of GPO who heard us briefly and turned us over to Messrs. L. E. Shemette and H. Richards, of the GPO Division of Typography and Design. These gentlemen were extremely helpful and went over our production problems carefully.

As a result of this conference, it was agreed that:

1. It would be possible to use money already appropriated by Congress for printing the book.

2. It would be possible to get a Congressional resolution drawn, in which the Commission's report could be given wide latitude in matters of printing, design, and format. A copy of similar resolutions will be obtained by Mr. Lee of the National Park Service and forwarded to Philadelphia so that we can prepare something similar.

3. The size of the book - from the more practical standpoint of printing - will be 6½ x 11 3/8. Mr. Simon agreed, upon being shown that the maps will be published and folded effectively.

c o p y

Appendix "C" - cont'd.

c o p y

4. Information pertaining to the book in its new size is to be forwarded to Harry Herold, Director of Planning Service, GPO, Washington, D. C. This information is to include number of pages and number of photo-engravings needed according to size. Mr. Herold will, in turn, make an informal estimate on the work in the number of 1000 and additional quantities in thousand lots.

Recommendation by M. J. McCosker:

1. We send information relating to printing estimate to Mr. Herold as soon as possible. I am now preparing same.

2. We take immediate steps to be assured by National Park Service that the $10,000 allocated for "printing and binding" the Commission's report be ear-marked and held available for GPO.

3. That the proper Governmental steps be taken, with the help of National Park Service, to get the report printed as prepared by the Commission and designed by the GPO Division of Typography and Design. Mr. Shumette impressed me as a man who is top-flight in handling production and design problems - I would recommend that we try to direct our work under his supervision at the stage of laying-out and designing the book.

c o p y

Appendix "D" - Photographs

Philadelphia Shrines National Park Project



No. 1. View looking northwest across Independence Square from northwest corner of Walnut and Fifth Streets. Independence Hall (old State House) in center. Public ledger building at left across square on Sixth Street and Chestnut. The American Philosophical Society Building is at right. Originally this was a two story building. The third floor is a modern addition which the Society now plans to remove in restoring the structure to its early Republic appearance.



No. 2. View looking southeast at Independence Hall, across Chestnut Street. Originally, there was a clock tower at end where the white appearing outside shaft is seen and the arcades did not open through to the inside of the square. On the other side of the arcade passageway, there was originally a solid brick wall. The Drexel Building shows beyond Independence Hall in left distance, at corner of Chestnut and Fifth Streets.



No. 3. View looking northwest from Fifth Street, across northern end of Independence Square. Congress Hall can be seen between Independence Hall and Public Ledger Building in left background.



No. 4. View looking southwest across Chestnut Street at Old Custom House. Statue of Robert Morris on steps. The Drexel Building is up street and beyond Old Custom House. Independence Square is just beyond Drexel Building. It will be noted that this building is only one separating Old Custom House from Independence Square. The Public Ledger Building can be seen up street in distance at corner of Chestnut and Fifth Streets just beyond Congress Hall, the white cupola of which can be seen.



No. 5. View looking northeast across auto parking lot and Library Street to south end of Old Custom House. Corner of Drexel Building shows at left.



No. 6. View looking east down Library Street from a point just west of Old U. S. Custom House, which shows at left. Carpenters' Hall and steeple can be seen in middle distance beyond end of street. In the far distance the New U. S. Custom House rises over neighboring buildings. It is on Second Street south of Chestnut. Note the fine iron fence at south entrance of Old Custom House. This view gives a good idea of conditions through the heart of the Federal project. Independence Square is about one-half city block back of camera point.



No. 7. View looking west from Dock Street between Third and Second Streets. At left in dark shadows Merchants' Exchange Building shows partially. The First Bank of the United States can be seen partially at right across Third Street. In the middle distance Carpenters' Hall shows. In the center distance the Drexel Building forms a barrier beyond Carpenters' Hall, shutting off Independence Square from view. This view looks westward from near the eastern edge of the proposed Federal project.



No. 8. View looking east down curving Dock Street toward Front Street and the Deleware River beyond. This area is the heart of the produce and commission business of Philadelphia -- a center of activity at night; relatively quiet during the day. Second Street, the eastern edge of the proposed Federal project is just back of camera point.



No. 9. View looking southwest across Market Street to the southwest corner of Market and Seventh Streets. The Tom Thumb and Penn Jewelers fronting on Market Street, and the parking lot behind them, are on the site of the Jacob Graff, Jr., House, in which Thomas Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence. Stern Brothers Department Store, which owns the site and plans to extend their building to the corner, can be seen at right.



No. 10. View looking northwest across Seventh Street to parking lot which occupies site of Jacob Graff, Jr., House, in which Thomas Jefferson wrote Declaration of Independence. Market Street is next street intersection. Stern Brothers Department Store is at left of parking area.



No. 11. Entrance archway on Market Street between number 316 and number 318 to Franklin Court area. This view looks south from Market Street along South Orianna Street. Site of Franklin Court is across Orianna Street and on either side of it about point where sunlit area shows. During Franklin's time this passageway did not go through to Chestnut Street, which it does today.



No. 12. View looking north along S. Orianna Street, approximate location of Franklin Court in foreground, to archway opening on to Market Street.



No. 13. Old Crider Gun Shop on northeast corner of Walnut and Second Street. Two mail boxes stand in front of building. This is one of oldest buildings in Philadelphia. The ground floor has been altered from the original.



No. 14. The four story house on the left is the Cadwalader House, 240 South Fourth Street. The house immediately to the right, on the corner, is the Wistar House, 238 South Fourth Street. These two houses and the Powell House, illustrated by Photograph No. 15, are situated in section known in Colonial days as Society Hill, a few blocks south of the proposed Federal project.



No. 15. The Powell House, 244 South Third Street, is the building in the center with white doorway and white window blinds. This house dates from 1765 and is considered one of the best of the pre-Revolutionary Period. It has been restored by the Philadelphia Society for the Preservation of Landmarks, and is open to the public.



No. 16. A view of the back side of old Colonial houses as seen from St. Mary's Churchyard, Fourth Street near Locust, about two blocks from proposed Federal Area.