

## CRM Bulletin

### HISTORY—A MULTI-DISCIPLINE APPROACH

Mary Maruca

Matters that concern National Park Service historians usually concern the other professional disciplines involved in cultural resources. Each discipline specialist provides a particular outlook on units of the National Park System. Aided by those perspectives, Park Service managers can better perform their conservation responsibilities. The archeologist offers the manager a better understanding of the buried past; the anthropologist of the living present; the historical architect of the fabric of a structure; the curator of the proper care of objects that remain; and the historian of the past, people, events, and forces associated with a specific site left to the American people.

This is the second installment of the CRM BULLETIN which concerns itself with matters of historical interest. Historians across the Service have contributed their thoughts on topics relevant to the History Program and to the other disciplines as well.

Barry Mackintosh, a historian in the Washington Office, deals with the importance of well-researched administrative histories -- how they serve as planning tools and influence management decisions.

A very different approach is the one taken by John Tiff, historian at LBJ, in his article on oral history. An oral history approach can add a rich new direction to a park's interpretative program. John Tiff, no stranger to the complexities of oral history, gives a step-by-step account of how to plan and execute a thorough oral history program.

Allan Comp, a historian and experienced program manager, examines another tool which influences the workload of the historian. His article concerns successful use of inventory procedures in the Pacific Northwest's large natural parks.

The Park Service is celebrating several important anniversaries this year. In the last issue of the CRM BULLETIN, Tom Lucke examined ways of commemorating the German Tricentennial. In this issue, John Paige discusses the beginnings of the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC), now celebrating its 50th anniversary. The CCC contributed a specific architectural identity to many national park areas, and left behind structures which the NPS is only beginning to evaluate and preserve.

In 1987, the Constitution of the United States will be celebrating its 200th anniversary also. To prepare for this event, Independence NHP has already begun long-range planning efforts which involve park historians. Coxe Toogood discusses some of those efforts the park has initiated.

The two remaining articles by Hugh Miller and Kathleen Georg make good companion pieces. Both are concerned with the changing physical integrity of monuments and memorials. Miller approaches the topic from a policy standpoint and Georg from a park specific position. Kathleen Georg investigates changes which have altered the face of the Soldiers' National Cemetery at Gettysburg. Describing the thinking behind the initial cemetery design, she argues for a return to that concept despite intervening changes, and calls for the restoration of the original plan. Hugh Miller makes an important contribution to our understanding of monuments, statues, and memorials in the Park System and elaborates on the Service's policies on the treatment of these important cultural resources.

Given the number of historians in the Service and the various projects they each spend time on, no two issues can begin to encompass the Bureau's History Program. What follows is only a sampling of some interesting topics and subject matter that historians confront.

# THE CCC: IT GAVE A NEW FACE TO THE NPS

John Paige

On March 4, 1933, Franklin Delano Roosevelt took the oath of office as the thirty-second president of the United States. Three and a half years had passed since the Wall Street Stock Market crash of October 29, 1929 triggered the onset of the Great Depression. Roosevelt had promised during the election that he would put Americans back to work and revive the economic life of the nation. Accordingly, in the next one hundred days, Congress passed a variety of relief and economic measures signed by the president. One of these bills created the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) which became one of the most popular of all the New Deal programs.

The intellectual origin of the CCC can be traced back to William James's essay entitled, *The Moral Equivalent of War*, published in 1910. James proposed that youth be conscripted for work camps dedicated to performing public service through manual labor. Precedent for such camps came from Europe where, after World War I, work camps were established in France to rebuild those regions devastated by the war. Later, youth work camps were instituted in Italy, Germany, Switzerland, Great Britain, and the Scandinavian countries.

President Roosevelt knew of the ideas expressed by James and of the European youth camps. He also believed in the need for conservation of America's natural resources. Five days after his inauguration, he conferred with the Secretaries of Interior, War, and Agriculture, the Director of the Budget, the Army Judge Advocate-General, and the solicitor for the Department of the Interior. During this meeting, the president outlined his plan for placing one-half million men to work on conservation projects under the auspices of the assembled departments. Roosevelt directed the group to draw up the necessary legislation for submittal to Congress. The result was a bill for the relief of the unemployed through the performance of useful public works. The bill quickly passed both houses of Congress and was signed into law on March 31, 1933.

Full implementation of the legislation occurred through a series of executive orders beginning with one on April 5 which designated Robert Fechner as the Director of the Emergency Conservation Work (ECW) and officially established the CCC. Fechner and his staff were responsible for the policy and coordination of all ECW programs among the participating agencies. An advisory council consisting of representatives from the executive Departments of Agriculture, Interior, Labor, and War was created to resolve any difficulties arising among agencies and to report on the progress of the various CCC programs. Later, a representative was appointed from the Veterans' Administration to join the advisory council.

To efficiently administer the National Park Service (NPS) aspects of the CCC program, NPS Director Horace Albright appointed Chief Forester John D. Coffman to supervise CCC work carried out in NPS areas. He also appointed Conrad L. Wirth, Chief of the Branch of Planning, to administer the ECW within the state parks program, placed under NPS auspices. In 1936, Director Arno B. Cammerer consolidated administration of all CCC programs under Wirth.

The thrust of the CCC program within the NPS was to conserve natural resources, preserve historical and archeological resources, and develop recreational resources within park areas. These goals were accomplished through programs such as fire-fighting, archeological surveys and excavations, ruins stabilization, road and trail conservation, reforestation, erosion control, exhibit building, research and guide services, insect control, campground developments, and construction of recreational facilities.

When the state parks program was instituted, few states had any type of parks system. The state parks program sought to accomplish conservation work, recreational development, and preservation work in those areas which would eventually form the nucleus for a state parks system or, if nationally significant, become part of the National Park System. The

work undertaken by the state park CCC camps resembled that accomplished by these in the national park areas except that CCC camps received more latitude in developing recreational areas. State park units developed outdoor amphitheaters, created artificial lakes, and constructed swimming pools and other recreational facilities, usually not sanctioned in NPS areas. Among the areas in the state parks program which eventually became part of NPS were Big Bend National Park, San Antonio Missions National Historical Park, Buffalo National River, and Everglades National Park.

The first enrollment period for the CCC began on April 1, 1933, and lasted until September 30, 1933. During this period, 70 CCC camps were installed in various state areas under NPS administration. Most

of these camps, each consisting of approximately 200 men, became fully operational after May, 1933. The Department of Labor recruited and selected enrollees, while the War Department processed them and supervised the camps. For those camps established within existing park areas and for a few state camps, NPS park superintendents determined project formulation, and supervised the quality of work performed, as well as the project's completion. Prior to each enrollment period, park superintendents submitted project lists to the Washington office for national prioritization. The Washington office then selected these projects to be completed during the next enrollment period. Originally, work estimates in park areas prophesied completion in 20 years; however, the CCC finished all these projects within the first three years of its existence.

Initially, many inside and outside the NPS expressed concern about the CCC program. A number of citizen and business groups objected to the location of the CCC camps near their communities. They called the CCC recruits tramps, and contended that the CCC presence would result in increased crime, and threaten community stability. These fears proved groundless. The location of camps near towns proved an economic benefit and studies found that little or no increase in crime resulted.

Within the NPS, park superintendents felt the CCC program would result in park overdevelopment and in irretrievable losses of natural and cultural resources. Therefore, a system of Project review was instituted by which all proposed CCC work was submitted for Washington office approval by landscape architects, engineers, historians, archeologists, and wildlife experts. These professionals Judged each project on appropriateness and potential impact on park resources. Through this process, a number of proposed projects were rejected as having adverse impacts upon either natural or historical resources.

After the first enrollment period, the Roosevelt Administration decided to continue the CCC program. Quarterly recruiting operations provided a ready pool of applicants for enrollment. The authorized number of camps fluctuated every enrollment period. The NPS operated a larger number of summer camps than winter camps, because a majority of park areas, such as Isle Royale National Park, could be occupied only in the summer months, while a minority, such as Death Valley National Monument, could be used only in winter.

By 1935, the NPS operated camps not only within the United States, but also in the Virgin Islands and Hawaii. Later, a CCC camp opened at Mount McKinley National Park in Alaska Territory. Besides these traditional areas, the NPS administered the Recreational Demonstration Areas. Such sites were purchased with Resettlement Administration funds and turned over to the NPS for recreational development. Erosion control, drainage, and reforestation were accomplished on the sites, if required, followed by the construction of trails, swimming pools, ski facilities, picnic areas, campgrounds and other recreational facilities. Eventually, most of these areas were turned over to federal, state, county or city governments for continued operation and maintenance. Catoctin and Prince William Forest entered the Service through this program.

The Washington office in 1935 organized a separate Branch of Historic Sites and Buildings to direct the comprehensive planning and development needs posed by an expanding NPS historical program after 1933. During the next several years, this branch lacked adequate staffing, and so personnel were hired using ECW funds. Later, many of these temporary Jobs were converted to permanent positions.

The year of 1935 represented the high water mark for CCC employment by the NPS. In that year, the NPS operated 115 CCC camps in national park areas and administered another 475 camps through the state parks program. At this point, the Roosevelt Administration decided to start phasing out the temporary New Deal employment programs. Consequently, a reduction of CCC camps and enrollment was ordered. In 1937, a small expansion in CCC camps and enrollment was allowed, only to be followed by increasing cutbacks by the program. The beginning of World War II in Europe prompted a further reduction in CCC enrollment and the conversion of camps to defense-related projects. This process greatly accelerated in December, 1941, when the United States entered the war. In the next few months, Congress passed a resolution which terminated funding for the CCC after July 1, 1942. During the last enrollment period, only 19 camps operated in national park areas; 70 were administered under the state parks program, with 50 of those on military reservations performing defense-related work.

In less than ten years, the CCC program left an indelible mark on NPS history. Many of the presently existing trails, roads and park facilities in national park areas originated as CCC projects. The corps dramatically developed and altered the national park areas. Today, CCC work is gradually being altered or destroyed, with only scattered examples of this monumental work being preserved. The National Park Service has begun to recognize the historical importance of many of these structures. In the Western Region and to some extent in other regions, an examination of the rustic architecture of CCC construction has already been made. However, a systematic evaluation of CCC contribution to individual parks remains to be accomplished on this fiftieth anniversary of its establishment.

John Paige is a historian with the Denver Service Center.

# ADMINISTRATIVE HISTORY

Barry Mackintosh

Most National Park Service historians concentrate on identifying, documenting, preserving, and interpreting the historic sites, structures, and objects of the National Park System and similar resources addressed by the Service's external preservation programs. But recently we have devoted greater attention to the history of the Service itself. We call this administrative history," to distinguish it from the history that goes into preservation and interpretation.

The primary intended audience for administrative history is NPS management and staff. Because most of our people are concerned with individual parks and specific programs, the emphasis on park and program histories rather than a single broad history of the Service overall. Why are they needed? Personnel transfers often bring superintendents and other key officials to new areas with which they are largely unfamiliar. Although many elements of park administration are interchangeable, many more are unique to each park and relate to its particular origins and evolution. The time needed for a new arrival to gain the essential local background is greatly reduced by the availability of a good park history.. For those of longer tenure, such a history is equally valuable as a reference.

A typical park history begins by exploring the movement leading to establishment of the park. Who was involved? What were their motives? What political bargains were struck or compromises made? The legislative background as revealed in congressional bills, hearings, reports, and floor debate is especially significant in identifying issues and objectives. Following establishment, attention turns to park development, administration, and use. Land acquisition, master planning, construction of physical facilities, natural and cultural resources management, interpretation, visitor use -- these are among the topics that may be addressed in greater or lesser detail, depending on the nature of the area. Copies of key legislation, cooperative agreements, personnel rosters, and other pertinent data are appended.

In addition to their basic orientation and reference functions, administrative histories often shed new light on old parks and programs. A North Carolina congressman wrote last year in behalf of a constituent who recalled and sought commemoration of a national soaring site" for gliders designated somewhere along the Blue Ridge in the 1930's. A review of the Shenandoah National Park history revealed its existence there at Big Meadows, after all other attempts to identify it had failed. The site can now be suitably recognized.

At Antietam National Battlefield, the Victorian gatehouse at the national cemetery was long admired for its picturesque Italianate architecture, but no one suspected that it was more than locally significant. Historian Charles W. Snell's recent research for an administrative history of the battlefield and cemetery disclosed that its designer was Paul J. Pelz, who later achieved national prominence as architect of the Library of Congress. This discovery adds a new dimension of interest to the little Antietam structure and underscores the importance of its preservation.

Legislation enacted in 1889 to protect the prehistoric Casa Grande ruin in Arizona has traditionally been cited as the first deliberate action of the Federal Government for historic preservation. A recent Service report on the Castillo de San Marcos in St. Augustine made reference to a congressional appropriation in 1884 to restore that Spanish colonial fortification, later a national monument. When the report was reviewed in an administrative history context, the pioneering nature and significance of that action was realized.

The Service has recognized the value of administrative history at least since 1951, when Director Arthur E. Demaray asked each park to prepare an account of its establishment and development. Because many areas lacked staff with historical training, the early results can most charitably be described as mixed. Histories of Statue of Liberty National Monument and Shiloh National Military Park were later prepared and distributed as examples, and by 1980,

about a hundred field areas had followed suit. Some histories were accomplished by park staff, some by NPS historians in central offices, and some by graduate students as theses and dissertations.

The program received new impetus when a bureau historian position was created in the Washington Office. Its occupant would have the specific charge of preparing, promoting, and coordinating Service administrative histories. After taking the Job in early 1982, I first took stock of what had been accomplished since the Demaray directive and then proceeded to prepare a new model park history. Assateague Island National Seashore became my subject; its records were readily available, and I wanted to avoid the historian's bias toward historical areas. The completed Assateague history went out to all parks in January 1983 with a memorandum from Director Dickinson urging them to follow the example -- either on their own or with outside assistance. The Director described administrative histories as among our most useful management documents.

The Assateague history has enjoyed a positive response. Several more parks have announced intentions of undertaking similar projects. The former director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, whose wildlife refuge on Assateague plays a prominent role in the history, wrote to affirm its value to management and advocate more such efforts. The study attracted the most favorable comment for its candor in dealing with controversy: there was much pleasant surprise that an in-house history did not have to resemble a public relations document.

The bureau historian's second major assignment was a model history of a significant Service program or activity transcending a particular park. Several possible topics presented themselves, including land acquisition, concessions management, and the science program and its role in natural resource management. After much consultation, we decided on a history of visitor fees in the National Park System.

This seemingly dreary subject soon became fascinating as I delved into the controversies surrounding the activity since 1908, when fees were first charged for entry to a national park. Faced with growing deficits, both the last and the present national administrations have supported heavier reliance on visitor fees to offset park costs. Congress has reacted by freezing entrance fees, and the competing forces are now in deadlock. Director Dickinson characterized visitor fees as the Service's foremost legislative priority for 1983, making the topic most timely. Illustrative of what can be done for other service programs, the fee history has been sent to all regional offices and most parks.

To overcome any impression that our administrative history program is a one-man show and at the risk of offending those not mentioned, let me at least acknowledge here some of the excellent recent and current work by others in and outside the Service. Harlan Unrau and Frank Willis of the Denver Service Center have completed a study of the great expansion of the Service during the 1930's, and Frank is now engaged in documenting the Service's involvement in the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act of 1980. Jerome Greene and John Paige of DSC have turned out a fine history of the first national military park, Chickamauga and Chattanooga. Ron Cockrell of the Midwest Regional Office has successfully addressed Grand Portage National Monument. Loretta Ryan is doing a doctoral dissertation at Columbia on the establishment of Lowell National Historical Park. A history of the U.S.S. Arizona Memorial by Michael Slackman, a park technician at the memorial, will be published by the Arizona Memorial Museum Association. Former Superintendent Albert Banton is at work on an administrative history of Lincoln Home National Historic Site, and Constance Greiff is undertaking a major publication on the history of Independence National Historical Park with funding from the Eastern National Park and Monument Association.

Some of these studies will appeal beyond the in-Service audience to which the administrative history program is primarily directed. Most administrative historians, however, will be doing their duty amply by the contributions they make to park and program management. Although they cannot promise solutions to today's and tomorrow's

management problems, their products cannot fail to assist managers in addressing them. To quote from another article touting the program:

Possession and use of an administrative history affords no guarantee that a manager will make the right decisions-- only more informed decisions. If you don't know where you've come from, it's harder to know and get where you're going. For a sense of direction it helps to be able to look back (even when you don't want to go back). Administrative history makes this possible.

Barry Mackintosh is Bureau Historian with the National Park Service, WASO.

# THE CULTURAL RESOURCES INVENTORY COMES TO THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST REGION

Allen Comp

For the first 10 years of my career in historic preservation, I helped Federal agencies -- including the National Park Service -- meet their responsibilities under Section 106 of the Historic Preservation Act of 1966 and Executive Order 11593. One of the most frequent problems was highway departments charged with protecting public safety while saddled with old and potentially historic bridges. The solution could not be a case-by-case evaluation because there simply was not time to do so, nor was there any context of information within which to do it. Instead, the Historic American Engineering Record (HAER) developed an inventory form that asked for all the necessary evaluative information, and an inventory process that culminated in a statewide determination of eligibility for all bridges in the state more than 50 years old. Result: a comprehensive approach to resource evaluation that allowed the highway department to know what WAS and what WAS NOT eligible for the National Register, and, therefore, what did or did not require compliance under Section 106, 4F and the rest. They could plan years ahead, knowing in advance where their compliance responsibilities were and where they were not.

In the last year, I moved to the other side of that table, directing the efforts of the Pacific Northwest Region in meeting its compliance responsibilities within the parks. At that time, the Pacific Northwest Region had undertaken two major projects, a Historic Resource Study (HRS) and a Historic Structure Preservation Guide (HSPG) in two Major parks, Olympic and Rainier, yet in neither did we have a definitive sense of what was formally a cultural resource and what was not.

Both projects started with a summer effort to complete an inventory of every building in the park more than 40 years old. We chose 40 so the park could have some planning time before structures hit the magic 50, and we used an adaptation of the old HAER inventory form because it asked for the data we needed to prepare a blanket determination of eligibility. In both parks, teams of summer temporaries, both students and professionals, spread throughout the park, covering every structure no matter how inconvenient or apparently unimportant. They worked hard, had a wonderful summer, and finished the Job for a remarkably small amount of money. Every building was researched, field inspected and photographed, verbally described, and historically evaluated against National Register criteria. We now have 150 cards in Mount Rainier and 240 in Olympic, both numbers significantly larger than we initially anticipated. In both cases, the cost per completed card ran about \$60.

More importantly, we now have a complete inventory, a complete base for assessment. Every card carries adequate photographs and information on the history of the building, sources of that information, and its relative significance to all other structures in the inventory. For the HSPG in Rainier, the Regional staff completed an assessment of structures more than 50 years old and is submitting that determination to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) in a blanket determination of eligibility to be followed by a Multiple Resource Nomination. For the HRS in Olympic, we retained one of the summer employees to complete the study which will include both a National Register nomination and a historical base map.

In both cases, the completed inventory creates a management tool, one useful to both the park and the regional office. And in both cases, we will go through a blanket determination for ALL structures more than 50 years of age, thus formally defining with SHPO agreement which structures are cultural resources and which are not; which are eligible and which are not. Those determined eligible will be entered on the List of Classified Structures with management categories ranging from A to D. Those less than 50 years old

that appear to be eligible will also be put on the List of Classified Structures. Park managers will know exactly which buildings to call cultural resources and why, and they will already have in hand the data most often required for the development of Form XXX and other CRM forms. Equally important are those buildings more than 50 years old which have been determined ineligible and therefore outside of formal responsibility or interest. There will be no more chasing after every potential brush fire. Now we will work on formally designated cultural resources. As a historian, I am now comfortable with our ability to make contextual Judgments of relative significance and to do so with solid, current data gathered in both a field inspection and during a thorough research process.

There are three additional spin-offs that merit mention. As a cultural resource management tool, the inventory data makes possible the efficient evaluation of structures, the development of XXX and other compliance forms, the concentration of the HSPG on formally defined cultural resources, the inclusion in the HRS of all structures determined eligible and therefore of local significance to the history and architecture of the park, and a solid planning document for budget development in the park and in the Region. The LCS, at least as I found the list in the Pacific Northwest Region, does not allow this level of efficiency.

Second, by more closely conforming to standard Federal cultural resource management methods, our relationships with SHPOs and our ability to pick up temporary personnel already knowledgeable and experienced is significantly enhanced. Historians and others who have worked for the Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, the Corps of Engineers, and others, have already acquired a standard Federal vocabulary of compliance methods. We can now tap into that reservoir of experience. Also, since NPS, in its National Register Programs offices, still dictates and enforces this methodology and vocabulary, we may find an easier time in all our work with these offices and a somewhat more comfortable position as the "model" preservation agency we are supposed to be.

Third, there is nothing so effective as a team of bright, hard-working, determined students and young professionals to learn what is really going on in a park and to work to change some traditional attitudes. In both parks, we went in under significant suspicion regarding our utility as well as our capability. In both cases, we left with a reputation for both well established. Management more clearly understands the nature of research and evaluation in cultural resources management. The region more clearly understands management problems (both natural and manmade) associated with the buildings And we may both be starting to more fully understand the real role and function of historic structures in a wilderness environment.

One final point. All of the above might be interpreted as an inwardly directed effort at making rules and then following them, thus creating some kind of bureaucratic perpetual motion that rarely spills out into areas of public benefit. The inventory cards can help alter that situation because they provide data sought by park interpreters and visitors as well as CRM personnel. Duplicated in sets by district and sub-district, the cards are a resource base for interpreters, and a way to answer visitor inquiries. They also provide the basis for some solid historical work that can be published by the cooperating association, or other interested publishers. But that story, I hope, is for next year.

Alan Comp is Chief, Cultural Resources, Pacific Northwest Region.

EDITOR'S NOTE The List of Classified Structures is defined in *Management Policies and Cultural Resource Management Guideline (NPS-28)* as a centralized inventory of all historic and prehistoric structures in units of the System in which the Service has or will acquire any legal interest. Included on the LCS are all structures that meet the criteria of the National Register of Historic Places and those structures which have archeological, historical, architectural/engineering, or cultural value, but which are specifically excluded by the Register criteria (i.e., cemeteries, birthplaces, or graves of historical figures, properties

owned by religious institutions or used for religious purposes, structures that have been moved from their original locations, reconstructed historic buildings, properties primarily commemorative in nature, and properties that have achieved significance within the past 50 years). This centralized inventory contains a number of types of information that relate to management of the structures

# THE THREE-DIMENSIONALITY OF STATUES, MONUMENTS, AND MEMORIALS

Hugh C. Miller, AIA

Statues, monuments and memorials range from the most obvious -- Statue of Liberty, Washington Monument, St. Louis Arch -- to the smallest and most overlooked -- the obelisk commemorating completion of the C&O Canal, the Bear Paw Monument at Custer Battlefield. Yet each of them has a three-dimensionality unconnected with size. They represent an activity in history and an artistic act of memorialization as well as a physical fabric to be preserved. Despite this multi-faceted significance, they are often the most ignored of cultural resources in the National Park System. The NPS cares for over 2,200 statues, monuments, and memorials. After buildings, they represent our largest body of historic structures. Nevertheless, we tend to ignore their preservation treatment. Except for occasional cleaning of some bronze and atone statues, the preservation program has been sporadic at best. In fact, some managers and CRM professionals give credibility to the myth that the NPS has no policy on statues or monuments.

In reality, the NPS has shown concern for this important cultural resource since the NPS policies were first written. The policy and guidelines clearly lay out principles and procedures for management and preservation of historic structures, which include monuments, statues, and memorials. Even the curators and conservators have policy and guidelines including management and preservation principles for such structures. In addition, a growing general awareness of these cultural resources seems to be evidenced throughout the Service -- perhaps as a response to press notices about acid rain or perhaps because certain monuments will be celebrating an important anniversary. At the same time, questions are being asked about the conditions of specific statues and memorials. In spite of the fact that the Secretary of Interior's standards stress the use of the least harsh cleaning method, the "how of accomplishing this may sometimes seem obscure at the park level.

The condition of statues, monuments, and memorials in the National Park System ranges from very good to very poor. Causes of deterioration can be related to weathering (specifically moisture damage to atone and metal), vandalism, neglect (including deferred maintenance), ill-advised previous maintenance treatments, and faulty original design. Some decay results from pollution, including acid rain. However, pollution is not a new phenomenon. Most statues in urban areas have been exposed to industrial and auto pollution for most of their lives. The deterioration we now see is an accumulated effect of the statue's history, including climate, total exposure to pollution, and cleaning methods and schedules. We now need to apply the knowledge we have to better manage this large body of cultural resources under our protection.

While most NPS statues, monuments, and memorials have been inventoried and entered in the List of Classified Structures, little has been done to document their history and evaluate their condition. In the case of major works, this means a Historic Structures Report and a Historic Structures Preservation Guide, including a condition and treatment file. In the case of small places, a structures file of all available data for management, interpretation, and treatment should be kept. Where similar monuments exist in the same area, these records can be combined into a master file with common information.

A Historic Structures Report should include a synthesis of historical fact; of architectural, artistic, and archeological evidence; and of physical condition. The history data is important for understanding management, interpretation, and preservation of the place. This should include a brief history of the event commemorated and a history of the planning, design, and dedication of the memorial or statue, including authorization, funding, and selection of artist/architects, site, and design. An administrative and treatment history of what has happened to the statue, monument or memorial since its dedication is also important. This

records changes of attitude, site, and condition, and includes major treatments. Such an 'administrative history records previous essential decisions, important in making new decisions for management and treatment.

The treatment of statues, monuments, and memorials has been confused by misunderstandings over the weathering of stone and metal, and confusion about what these places should look like. The "restored-as-new" appearance may not be possible or even desirable as a preservation goal. Much confusion exists about the efficacy of modern cleaning and preservation methods also. Many modern practices and materials have been found too harsh. Recent surveys indicate that some park managers have wisely prohibited the use of certain chemical cleaning methods; however, other harsh cleaning practices also need to be addressed.

The distinction between metal and stone monuments is an important one. Routine, cyclic care of these materials is very different. The removal of patinas is not recommended for metal statuary. In some cases, gently cleaning accretions with walnut shells under low pressure is appropriate. The use of corrosion inhibitors may be useful before waxing. Care of bronze statues is similar to taking care of a car; routine washing and waxing is in order. This is not true for stone. Washing stone, often with acids to remove dirt and graffiti, tends to rinse away the surface of the material being preserved. Stone statues subjected to frequent acid cleaning lose their sheen quite rapidly. Once the polish of stone deteriorates, a host of undesirable deterioration processes can occur, thought to be accelerated in polluted environments. Cleaning stone using water mists without acids or detergents has been successful in Europe and is now being used in the United States.

The recommended preservation treatments of inspection, washing, and, in the case of metals, waxing are not often followed in the NPS because necessary skills, equipment, and materials are not normally found in parks or because this service is too expensive. However, specific technical guidance exists in a variety of sources. The National Park Service has prepared a series of publications that discuss such principles of cleaning and preserving:

1. "Preservation Briefs: The Cleaning and Waterproof Coating of Masonry Buildings" (1975) describes methods for cleaning masonry structures, which are applicable to stone statues and monuments as well.

2. Manual for Museums (1976) discusses cleaning statuary.

3. Metals in America's Historic Buildings (1980) includes details on the care and repair of specific types of metal alloys and components.

Currently, the NPS has no technical guide specifically directed to the preservation treatment of monuments, memorials, and statues, but we have begun a study of maintenance practices and developed training programs for the inspection and maintenance of such structures.

National Capital Region held a two-day workshop for maintenance staff this August to discuss the "do's and don'ts" of stone and metal maintenance. Nicholas F. Veloz, Jr. conducted the workshop, referring to his experiences with graffiti removal, cleaning methods and waxing bronze, developed on the George Washington Parkway during the past five years. In October, the Mid-Atlantic Region will hold a workshop at Gettysburg on cleaning, repairing, and maintaining bronze statues. Some of the cleaning methods such as glass bead peening or a proprietary cleaning and coating are no longer recommended since they remove the patina and may damage the surface of the metal. This workshop will evaluate the aesthetic and conservation issues associated with the problem and focus on achievable preservation maintenance solutions.

The Southeast Cultural Preservation Center, outside Atlanta, Georgia, has organized a course, also in the fall, at Chickamauga/Chattanooga NMP. The course will emphasize the significance of these memorials and the unique problems of their conservation, as a response to a recognized desire for appropriate maintenance activities. The use of gentle water wash, hand removal of old mortar, and repointing with lime mortar will be stressed. In all these programs the principles of reversibility and minimal intervention are of paramount importance.

At the same time, the Divisions of History and Park Historic Architecture in WASO, and the Division of Conservation at the Harpers Ferry Center are coordinating efforts Servicewide pertaining to statues, monuments, and memorials, and gathering information on condition and treatments. The Federal Acid Rain program will address questions about metal and stone deterioration; their monitoring efforts will include NPS statues and monuments. History studies and interpretive booklets by art historians such as Wayne Craven's work about the monuments of Gettysburg are being encouraged and funded. Scholars are finding that NPS sites are rich laboratories for serious study of American sculpture; graduate students are being directed to concentrate theses and dissertations on NPS areas.

Interest, knowledge, and concern abounds for our important sculptural heritage. As we work more with these special resources, polices, guidelines, and technical manuals will become very specific to park needs and the needs of outdoor art in other places. For now, we know enough to get a good start.

Hugh Miller is the Chief Historic Architect in the Washington Office.

# GETTYSBURG: THE NATIONAL CEMETERY AS A CULTURAL RESOURCE

Kathleen R. Georg

When two massive armies struggle against each other, they are bound to leave behind them visible reminders of their deadly contest. At Gettysburg in 1863, these reminders were various and plentiful -- burned or damaged buildings, trampled crops, splintered woodlots and orchards, dropped accouterments and weapons, entrenchments and lunettes of earth and wood. The most grisly yet poignant witnesses of the results were to be the graves of the fallen.

Gettysburg had experienced the same seeds of destruction and death sown in the previous two years in the states south of the Mason-Dixon line. But until the battle, most of the Union's sons had fallen on enemy soil, making it not only a matter of distance but also hazards overcome to recover the bodies.

The Battle of Gettysburg, however, was fought over Northern farms and in Pennsylvania streets. The survivors of those Union soldiers who died at Gettysburg expected something better and easier in the recovery of their loved one's remains. Agents of the various Northern governors arrived in Gettysburg to help families locate graves, arrange disinterments and transportation, and maintain records of those graves and personal possessions of the Union dead. Repeatedly, they heard that relatives lacked funds to return the dead to their home towns. The agents concluded that the states themselves should bear the burden of properly interring the Union dead. To purchase a tract of land as a cemetery, preferably on that battlefield where the soldiers had died, seemed most appropriate. Through negotiations headed by Pennsylvania's agent, a plot of almost seventeen acres on Cemetery Hill was procured for that purpose.

In August, 1863, Pennsylvania's treasury purchased the land. All the other Northern states were invited to assist financially in the development and maintenance of the grounds. For the first time in our nation's history, a cemetery was established and funded through the efforts of all those states whose sons fell under the National colors. Being a multi-state effort to honor the common soldier, the cemetery was pronounced the Soldiers' National Cemetery.

Those three words should provide the key to the interpretation, preservation, and understanding of this paramount cultural resource. Unique in our nation's history, it represented the first effort to systematically and collectively bury the dead from one Civil War battlefield. One of only fourteen national cemeteries under the care of the National Park Service, it is associated with one of our country's most historical places and moments; yet, it has continued to grow, until its enclosures have embraced the dead of not only the Civil War, but also those subsequent to and including the Spanish-American War. Within its seventeen acres can be found markers commemorating a regimental commander mortally wounded at Gettysburg, who wished to be buried on the field with "the boys"; a brigadier general who helped Dwight D. Eisenhower chart war plane in Europe during World War II and who managed Ike's retirement farm at Gettysburg years later; two Medal-of-Honor winners; and thousands of fellow Americans who served or died for their country.

As a national cemetery, it attracted more than local interest at its dedication. Featured on its program were national and state officials, including the Chief Executive of the United States. Its dedication provided the occasion for one of this country's most eloquent and powerful defenses of the Union as well as the rights of man -- Lincoln's address delivered on November 19, 1863. Now, hundreds of thousands of people annually visit the site, including many foreigners who read the address in another language. In this sense, the site symbolizes the importance of self government, not only to our native-born Americans, but foreign visitors as well.

The Civil War graves were republican in their arrangement. William Saunders, a landscape architect and botanist employed by the Department of Agriculture, undertook the formal arrangement of the graves, the landscaping, and other plans, at the government's request, within two months of the battle. Saunders' vision of the Union was so akin to Lincoln's that the war-time President declared Saunders' plan "admirable and befitting." The graves were arranged in sections by state (although some state agents believed unity of purpose would be served better if the dead were interred regardless of state origin). They radiate equally in a grand arc from a common center. Like spokes of a wheel, the burial sections represented the strength and unity of purpose of the entire wheel, each providing a measure of strength for a common purpose.

Saunders used his landscaping abilities to honor the soldier, in the same way he arranged the cemetery to represent and honor the Union. Through his system of plantings and the establishing of avenues, he directed attention to the cemetery itself. The intrusions of the living world were screened out by evergreens and deciduous trees to effectively limit the view to the "hallowed ground." Segmented granite arcs quarried from the battlefield itself comprised the graves. Officers and enlisted men rested side by side with their simple inscriptions at the head -- name, rank, and unit -- their heroic deaths and devotion to the Union a common leveler. The larger part of the cemetery was enclosed by a substantial stone wall, likewise of Gettysburg granite, reminiscent of defense works built by these soldiers.

The graves of the unidentified dead waited a number of years to be properly marked. Without names to identify them, these unknown Union soldiers would be designated by number only as a means of signally honoring those who sacrificed everything to their country, including their identities, the cemetery board ordered marble posts instead of the cheaper local granite, giving those who would never be identified a separate and honorable identity within the cemetery itself.

A final, visible tribute to the fallen soldier was the plot Saunders reserved for the hub of the graves. Here, a monument emphasized the significance of the struggle, and commemorated the Union victory at Gettysburg. Allegorical in nature, the monument combined Old World symbols with American motifs. Foremost among the Italian marble statues at the base of the column was one depicting the soldier, relating his triumphant sacrifices to the muse of history who would faithfully record them. The agrarian and manufacturing prosperity of the country were most appropriately depicted by Plenty and Peace -- with a strong-armed mechanic ready to once again shoulder the progress of the country at the side of those who harvested the crops and marketable products. This monumental shaft was surmounted by a marble image of that quality most precious to all Americans -- Liberty.

As years passed, changes occurred, both philosophical and physical, which altered visitor participation at the site. Visitors to the Soldiers' National Monument perceived it as a memorial designating the location of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address. In 1912, the erection of the Speech Memorial reinforced the bond between Lincoln's address and the site.

Further changes developed to accommodate a new type of visitor to the cemetery -- one with an automobile covering farther and farther distances to visit the site. Enclosed, the national cemetery had served as an effective witness to the cost of the war. The graves remained constant silent reminders of the 1863 battlefield destruction, long since replaced by pastures, well-groomed lawns, paved avenues, heroic monuments, and reconstructed earthworks and buildings. The opening of a gate at the opposite end of the cemetery from the original gate made it possible to drive straight through the grounds, instead of around them to enter and exit, thus connecting the national cemetery with the battlefield rather than leaving it as a separate entity. With the opening of the new gateway, the cemetery became a less contemplative spot to remember the dead and more a part of an abbreviated, continuous battlefield tour.

Even Saunders' original plan toppled under the constraints of modern maintenance. Indeed, the once dominant stones of the Civil War dead themselves were lowered flush with the ground during this century to simplify the task of mechanized mowing. Deciduous trees,

once so imperative to Saunders' plan of directing movement and vision, were replaced by evergreens to eliminate the necessity of raking leaves in the autumn. And the screening evergreen trees which once effectively enclosed the national cemetery were removed to provide the visitor with a view of the town and the mountains, in direct opposition to the original purpose of the designs for this national cemetery.

The approved GMP for the cemetery advocates a return to the original character and purpose of Saunders' plan to appropriately preserve and portray this cultural resource.

A return to the original intent of the burial ground, both in theme and appearance, may help to rekindle the original spirit of the site. Perhaps it is for us to recognize that the Soldiers' National Cemetery is not only a cultural resource, but also a human resource, composed of the graves of men once quite alive and of the ideas in which they believed, as expressed by Lincoln. Whereas the headstones, the landscaping, and the Gettysburg Address contribute to the national cemetery's identity as a cultural resource, it is the deeds and memory of the men within this resource that we must strive to commemorate, interpret, and preserve. If we can remember and appropriately honor the sacrifices of those dead, the ideals for which they died, and the identities of the heroes themselves, we will be better able to preserve, interpret, and perpetuate this most important of our cultural resources at Gettysburg. We will have given it the significance it was historically meant to have.

Kathleen Georg is a historian at the park.

# ORAL HISTORY: NOT TO BE TAKEN LIGHTLY

John Tiff

No area in the National Park Service has made more extensive use of oral history than Lyndon B. Johnson National Historical Park. The project owes its inception to the personal interest of President Lyndon B. Johnson and the intervention of then Director, George B. Hartzog. These men recognized what an important cultural resource an effective oral history program could be. Under their direction, during the lifetime of the president, the program collected significant data concerning LBJ and the Texas Hill Country, an effort which still continues. Certainly, LBJ NHP benefited by the currentness of its subject matter. Many people who understand this special era of our history still live and like to talk about it. Nevertheless, the basic principles of interviewing which follow may benefit some of the other parks in the Service.

The Oral History project began at LBJ NHP in 1972 when Ed Bearss, then Supervisory Historian, Denver Service Center, taped interviews pertaining to President Lyndon B. Johnson. The project has continued by fits and starts ever since. My association began in 1975 as site historian for the park. The information which follows is derived from my own observations and experiences, along with the sources listed at the end of this article.

A professionally conducted oral history project involves more than turning on a tape recorder. The first prerequisite is good planning. Large amounts of time and money keep such projects going, and only good planning convinces management that such effort should be expended. First, determine project goals and objectives: purpose and importance of the project, specific information to be obtained, and the ultimate use of this information, as well as how and where it will be preserved and archived once taped. Next decide how to finance it and who will handle the work. Do not minimize either the time involved ( 2 - 3 times your best estimate) or the expense. Both generally exceed expectations. Minimum personnel to plan for include one supervisor/interviewer, one full time interviewer, and one clerk/ typist. The amount of money involved depends on employee grade level, type of equipment purchased, amount of travel, etc. Most importantly, the project should be justified in the Resources Management Plan, thus giving it a firm planning base before presenting it to management.

Following this advance planning process, you are ready to present the project to management. This is a crucial step. I urge you sincerely not to embark upon any but the smallest projects without a firm commitment of support from park management. While you may start a project with cooperating association seed money or other support outside the park, eventually park resources will have to be expended on the project. If it is not forthcoming when needed, the project will lose hard won credibility with your informants and may slow down at a critical point. Once stopped, it is very difficult to restart.

An oral history project is generally divided into four sections: planning, collection, processing, and dissemination. Collection necessitates gathering the recollections of persons connected with the park and its story. Selecting the right people and persuading them to record their memories can be more difficult. Initial contacts probably will come from one's own personal knowledge and previous research, others from staff recommendations and from interviews. Generally, those interviewed mention 2 - 3 new names to be investigated. Begin by preparing a prospective interview file with essential information such as: name, address, phone number, and synopses of informant's possible knowledge. Place the prospects in priority order: anticipated information, age and state of health, etc.

Since initial contacts influence later ones, carefully think through what you want to say and how you choose to represent yourself before meeting the person you plan to interview. Carry this through when the two of you meet. Outline the project and discuss how they can help. Do not be discouraged by initial refusals. Maintain contact with them as the project

develops. Once you and the project establish credibility, they may change their mind. People from our first project list, developed back in 1972, consented to interviews as recently as 1980 and 1981.

Once an interview is scheduled, the interviewer starts the pre-interview research. This may take 15 minutes to several days. Review biographical data on the informant, as well as books, documents, etc., bearing on the interview subject. Do not neglect to review interviews of the same person completed by your project or other projects. As you go through this phase, make an outline or list of questions to be used later. I prefer a general outline of subjects to be covered, as this seems more flexible than a list of specific questions.

The interview itself should be conducted in a quiet, comfortable place. Be especially aware of background noise. Do not record an interview on an active construction site, or near lawn mowers, radio, music, traffic noise, telephones, and typewriters. Try to put the narrator at ease. The microphone and recorder cause some people to feel self-conscious, but this generally wears off as the interview progresses. During the interview, try to ask leading questions. Who, what, when, where, why, and how questions are best. Remember the narrator's knowledge and information are important, not the interviewer's. Refrain from long comments and statements. Keep a log during the interview and include the most important subjects discussed. This will form the beginning of the post-interview work. As the interview progresses, you will probably discover that the narrator knows more than you thought. You may want to encourage the discussion of subjects not on your outline. If not relevant, tactfully redirect the conversation. The maximum length of a single interview is approximately two hours, the average about one hour. If you need more time, schedule another interview before you leave.

Immediately label reels used during the interview with the narrator's name and the date. Then label both the reel and the box to prevent using the same reel twice. Use only one side of the tape. Recordings should be made at 7.5 I.P.S. Using seven-inch reels at this speed, each reel will equal one half hour of interview time.

Sometimes narrators use photograph albums and other documents to aid recall. When possible, we have borrowed these items for copying, then given a receipt for the items and returned them as quickly as possible. Include a line item in your budget for photo work and copying from the onset of the project.

The post-interview processing starts once all the material, both written and oral, has been collected. Everything concerning the interview is placed in a single file. If possible, the tapes should be audited at this time and a list made of major subjects discussed to supplement the tape log. We label the tape storage box with the narrator's name, the date, and a number, i.e., Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson, 8/6/78, 308:1. This indicates that interview 308 is with Mrs. Johnson, that it is located on reel one, and that it was taped August 6, 1978. Subsequent reels would be labeled 308:2, 308:3, etc. Make sure the corresponding reel is really in the box marked with the corresponding number, then filed in numerical order.

The Oral History Project also makes two finding aids: a running list of interviews by number, and a card file by name alphabetically. Our interview files are maintained alphabetically by name.

Ultimately each interview should be transcribed, but not always immediately. To date, the project has transcribed only those interviews where the narrator requests the transcript before signing the Release. The reason for this is the expense. A good typist requires 8 - 10 hours to finish a transcript of one hour of tape. In addition, do not transcribe from original recordings. Rather, the original reels along with a set of labels and the requisite number of one hour cassettes go to the Harpers Ferry Center where they are copied. The originals are stored at HFC, and the copies returned to the park. This retains the quality and greatly reduces the wear and tear on the original, though it is an additional expense and time factor.

The usual sequence in transcribing is: a) rough draft, b) editing, c) another draft, d) possible further editing, and 3) final transcript. Our principal goal in transcribing is translating the spoken word into a readable document. The best source for information and details on transcribing is Transcribing and Editing Oral History by Willa K. Baum, available

from the American Association of State and Local History. For information on tape recorders, tape, and other equipment, contact Blair Hubbard at Harpers Ferry Center. Before the park uses the information in the taped interview, the narrator must give permission and donate a statement to the U.S. Government. This is known as a "gift of personal statement" or the "release." As no official form exists for this, the Oral History project made up its own, based on the one used by the LBJ Presidential Library.

Donors may restrict the use of their materials for a given number of years or until their death, or reserve literary property rights. But once the release is signed, both parties are bound by its provisions. The legalities of this are outlined in 41 CFR Part 105, Subsection 61.2: Public Use of Records, Donated Materials and Facilities in the National Archives and Record Service. Subpart 105-61.2 deals with public use of donated historical materials, and subjects them to the donor's restrictions, implying they are not subject to the Freedom of Information Act.

Is the end product worth the price? Yes, it is. With oral history, you obtain information unavailable in any other way. A good oral history has all the excitement and immediacy of an eyewitness account. The solitary stipulation is that the historian take into account the personal biases of the narrator and a tendency to overexaggerate his/her role. The historian also must check the oral history against known primary and secondary sources. But once these elements are balanced, the collection is quite useful.

Our collection has been used in research studies, interpretive training, audio station tapes, movie and slide show sound tracks, and tour audio tapes. In fact, most of the recent LBJ biographers have used our collection in their research.

The following books are available from the American Association of State and Local History. I have found them to be very helpful.

Oral History From Tape to Type by Davis, Back and MacLean.

The Preservation and Restoration of Sound Recordings by McWilliams.

The Collection, Use and Care of Historical Photographs by Weinstein and Booth.

If I can be of assistance, contact me at Lyndon B. Johnson NHP, P.O. Box 329, Johnson City, Texas 78636; telephone: (512) 868-7128, or FTS 7705123 or 5124.

John Tiff is the historian at LBJ NHP.

# Fort Hunt—The Forgotten Story

Sandra Weber

Visit Fort Hunt on a warm summer evening and you will find yourself in the midst of several hundred picnickers cheerfully munching on Mom's fried chicken or enjoying a game of cards in the shade of the pavilion. Except for the crumbling remains of four Endicott-era batteries, the decrepit shell of an old fire control station, and an 80-year-old house now used as NPS quarters, there is nothing to indicate that Fort Hunt's 105 grassy acres have ever witnessed anything more exciting than a leisurely game of Frisbee.

In fact, however, Fort Hunt has been the scene of a constantly shifting panorama of people and activities which mirror the major social and political trends of the first half of this century. Seldom has one geographical area been put to so many different uses as has Fort Hunt. During its relatively short lifetime, it has seen service as a farm, a coastal defense fort, an Army Finance School, a supply depot, a brigade headquarters, an ROTC training camp, a hospital for indigent Bonus Marchers, a CCC camp, an NPS exhibits lab, a monitoring station for the Army Signal Corps, a top secret interrogation center for German prisoners of war, and a film storage vault for the National Archives. Physical evidence of such activities are gone, and, until a year ago, largely forgotten. Research concerning the fort's past has evolved a story most thought non-existent, given a new importance to the landscape, and evolved new interpretive thrusts.

Fort Hunt's diverse history largely resulted from its proximity to Washington where it served as a convenient plot of federal property to be used whenever short-term needs might arise. Its history vividly dramatizes the social trends of the early twentieth century. From the optimism of the 1890's, to the isolationism of the 1920's, and the deep despair of the 1930's, this dynamic reflection of the national mood is a particularly rewarding site for political and social study.

On the Potomac River, 11 1/2 miles south of Washington, D.C., Fort Hunt was begun in 1897 as part of an ambitious plan to modernize the nation's coastal defenses. Hastily garrisoned in 1898, in response to the Spanish American War, the fort never fired its bright new guns at an enemy. In common with all of its subsequent manifestations, Fort Hunt's life as a coastal fortification was short-lived. Just as the jingoistic spirit that had inspired it began to fade, so too did Fort Hunt's usefulness. By World War I, its guns had been dismantled and transferred to other forts. In the 1920's, the prevailing isolationist mood of the country affected Fort Hunt, along with all other military installations. After an initial period of expansion immediately following the war, the Army was reduced in 1923, and Fort Hunt lost the Finance School which had taken up residence there two years before.

In 1930, the straitened War Department transferred the property to the Office of Public Buildings and Public Parks to be developed into a recreational area along the newly established George Washington Memorial Parkway. Before the work could be well begun, however, public events once again engulfed Fort Hunt. In 1932, the 20,000 strong "Bonus Army" converged on Washington. Concerned about the health of the impoverished marchers, the War Department transferred Fort Hunt to the Veteran's Administration for the summer, so that a hospital might be maintained there for their care.

Fort Hunt continued to be involved in the government's new social welfare plans, with the establishment of a CCC camp in 1933 under the aegis of the National Park Service, then overseer of the area. The Fort Hunt camp was a premier showcase for President Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal policies. He eagerly showed it off to visiting dignitaries, including King George VI of England who came to visit in August, 1939.

With the mobilization of the country during World War II, Fort Hunt once again returned to the Army. A combined Army/Navy Intelligence group set up operations at the fort and began the systematic questioning of more than 3,400 German prisoners of war. Through

the use of "stool pigeons," hidden microphones in the prisoners' cells, and formal interrogations, intelligence operations gained valuable information on German technical advances, military tactics, and enemy morale.

By November, 1964, the last prisoner had left Fort Hunt. The Army closed up shop and returned the property to the National Park Service, which resumed its interrupted plans to develop the area as a recreational site. All traces of the veterans' hospital, the CCC camp, and the interrogation center were removed. Today, not a single vestige remains of the buildings which housed the thousands of men who at one time or another called Fort Hunt their home. Bonus Marchers, CCC workers, and prisoners of war have all disappeared without a trace.

In an effort to recognize their role in our national story, the interpretive staff of the George Washington Memorial Parkway has begun to highlight Fort Hunt's historical as well as recreational value. CCC crews recently cleared the vegetation from the remains of the 1890's batteries.

An interpretive sign explaining some of the area's diverse and intriguing history also is scheduled to be posted soon.

The initial steps that the Park Service has taken to present Fort Hunt's story have had a pleasant and totally unexpected result. As the public begins to realize that we are interested in Fort Hunt's past, individuals who were once a part of that past have begun appearing, offering invaluable personal stories and reminiscences. A workman who helped to build the World War II interrogation center, for instance, introduced himself after the park sponsored a lecture on the POW operations there, and a woman whose father was incarcerated at the center was discovered living next to the park. Personnel in other recreational sites may also find that they have intriguing and important past histories which have been lost over time. Though the results of the initial research may appear insignificant or inconclusive, sharing those results with the public may spark their interest or reawaken slumbering memories, resulting in an abundance of new historical and cultural information on seemingly "non-historic" sites. Most places in our country have witnessed some drama, however small, which helps us to better understand ourselves and our nation's development.

Sandra Weber is Program Director, Clara Barton NHS.

## FORT HUNT IN WORLD WAR II

Records of the World War II intelligence operations at Fort Hunt have only recently been declassified; we are just now beginning to learn details of activities there. The installation was not a regular POW camp, but a top-secret, illegal interrogation center where recently captured German prisoners, usually U-boat personnel, were systematically questioned, then transferred to a recognized POW camp.

The average stay for a prisoner was about three months, during which time he was questioned several times a day. The interrogating officers soon found, however, that they learned more from their guests by listening in to their private conversations over microphones hidden in the cells, than they did in the formal interrogation sessions.

Of course, some of the Germans quickly suspected the presence of listening devices, and whiled away the long tedious hours with animal imitations, songs, and obscene stories for the benefit of the GI listening at the other end. Less discerning prisoners spoke freely with each other, providing the Allies with a wealth of information on the inner workings of the German submarine service.

In this way, the U.S. learned of the hapless radio man who accidentally dissolved his code books when he spilled water in them, of U-118 which carried 85,000 cigarettes and 300 phonograph records along with its eight torpedoes, and of the boat whose captain continuously played American jazz records over the intercom system much to the dismay of his less sophisticated crew.

Many of the prisoners held at Fort Hunt were only 18-22 years old, and quite willing to cooperate with the Americans to the best of their limited abilities. Most were so relieved to be out of the fighting that they viewed captivity as a welcome respite from the suicidal submarine war. One young radio operator confessed to his cellmate that:

I am glad that we have a place like this to eat and sleep. We haven't had such an opportunity for a long time and we've earned it. Rest. I've had my five trips, so one can say all right, that I've had my share of experiences. One of my brothers is in Russia and the other is about to be called up. He's not 16 yet... I'm already looking forward to breakfast. They are going to have eggs again tomorrow.

(translated from the

origin-l German)

# THE 1987 BICENTENNIAL AT INDEPENDENCE NHP

Coxey Toogood

Independence National Historical Park plans to celebrate a score of bicentennials during the next seventeen years, but none so significant as the one in 1987 to commemorate the anniversary of the Federal Convention in Philadelphia and the United States Constitution that it led to. Of course, this is not the first bicentennial the park has celebrated nor the first to require a significant historical perspective. The recent 1776 Bicentennial gave us hands-on experience with the complexities of preparing for such an occasion. As a result, planning has been an important aspect of the park's approach to the upcoming celebration.

Preparation for the 1987 Bicentennial began in September 1982 when division chiefs met to brainstorm specific recommendations. In a multi-discipline approach, Kathy Dilanardo, Chief of Interpretation and Visitor Services, John Milley, Chief of Museum Services, and David Dutcher, Chief of History and Historic Architecture, shared with Superintendent Cawood their experiences in planning for the 1776 Bicentennial at Independence NHP. All felt that the Constitution posed new and difficult problems of interpretation. Whereas data about the American Revolution had helped popularize the Declaration of Independence, the legal and political concepts of the Constitution made it less penetrable by the visitor. To overcome this without diminishing the national significance of the subject, the park approached three historic Philadelphia institutions -- the Library Company, the American Philosophical Society, and the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, as well as other important groups and individuals. Having evaluated their responses, the park developed three major plans for the Constitution's Bicentennial.

First, a computer exhibit was planned to encourage visitor participation in the Constitution's interpretation. The IBM Corporation has expressed interest in funding the exhibit, while the concept is being developed at Harpers Ferry Center from information provided by the park.

Second, the park plans to host a document exhibit on the Constitution co-sponsored by the Library Company, the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, and the American Philosophical Society. Significant manuscript collections relating to the Constitution at the three institutions have been proposed for display at the park. Among these documents are copies of the Constitution owned and annotated by the Federal Convention delegates, and letters by each of the thirty-nine signers, including one from George Washington thanking the Library Company for opening its library to the delegates.

The park plans to renew its historical research efforts also. A team of historians will be responsible for culling the historical documents pertaining to the Federal Convention. The Office of History and Historic Architecture already has an edge on the research needed. Between 1955-1965, a team of park historians developed a research note card file drawing on primary materials from record centers across the country. The roughly 150,000 research cards offer a wealth of information on the Federal Convention, Philadelphia, during the 18th century, the delegates to the Continental Congress, and other significant aspects related to the creation of the country's Constitution. The park library also holds some 500 reels of microfilm, many of which contain local, state and federal records, as well as valuable private papers potentially relevant to the bicentennial. In addition, the library offers a wide selection of biographies and published papers on the Foundling Fathers, as well as official documents of the Continental Congresses and the Federal Convention. Finally, the library maintains an extensive photographic and photostat collection covering the individuals, events, and sites bearing on the park's history.

Besides park resources, the historians have ready access to the enormous library and manuscript collections of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, the Library Company of Philadelphia, and the American Philosophical Society, all of which are within walking

distance from the History Office. The latter two scholarly institutions were founded by Benjamin Franklin more than forty years before the Federal Convention of 1787.

A daybook, a summary of the daily events and individuals of 1787, will also be available to park visitors. Research for this daily calendar, as well as the relevant happenings that preceded or followed the Federal Convention, have already gotten underway. Each historian will contribute to this daybook effort while collecting research material on assigned projects, such as reports on the Federal Convention, the Supreme Court (1790-1800), the Executive Branch (1790-1800), and an historical base map of the park area in 1787.

The research program at the park aims to provide in-depth information on the Constitution, its history and impact, without duplicating research completed or underway elsewhere in the scholarly community. Moreover, such research will directly relate to the physical resources of the park, so that the Interpretation and Visitor Services staff can offer the Bicentennial public the most relevant and interesting information possible during the park tours. Under consideration is the installation of computers to help coordinate the collection of resource materials. Placing all the research material on park computers, including, ultimately, the library's note card file, would streamline any future research efforts and simplify the one presently underway.

Finally, the park hopes to inspire local, national, and even international involvement in the 1987 celebrations. At the Superintendent's recommendation, Mayor William Green III has already appointed a city-wide Bicentennial Commission called, We the People 200. The commission has invited some 500 legal associations from around the country to convene in Philadelphia in 1987 to commemorate the creation of the U.S. Constitution.

Such local and national participation, it is hoped, will underscore and enliven the political, historical, and philosophical importance of the Constitution for the visitor. Through the park's creative application of historical documentation, visitors to the bicentennial may look forward to an enjoyable experience as well as an educational one.

Coxey Toogood is a historian with Independence NHP.

## A RESPONSE TO "TRICENTENNIAL OF GERMAN SETTLEMENT"

By THOMAS LUCKE, Vol. 6 No. 2

This article began on a fine and fructuous premise: to give recognition to an under-recognized group of ethnic Americans. It failed to fulfill its goal, which, in a way is almost un-American!

Previous to the massive immigrations of the 19th century, German-speaking Europeans settled in North and South Carolina and other parts of the South-- not Just in Pennsylvania, Ohio, Texas, etc. Their descendants, and later arrived cousins, fought for the Confederacy with all of the valor and steadfastness demonstrated by their northern cousins for the Union. In the meantime, the Salzburgers and other early German arrivals had made substantial contributions to the structuring and development of the southern colonies and later to their struggle for independence.

Listed below (courtesy of Bob Krlck, FRSP) are some of the all-German units which served with the Confederated States of America:

Co. "G" 8th Alabama Infantry

Co. "I" 1st Georgia Infantry

Co. "A" 8th North Carolina Infantry

Co. "A" 18th North Carolina Infantry

Co. "G" 3rd South Carolina Cavalry

Co. "I" 17th South Carolina Infantry

Co. "A" 27th South Carolina Infantry

Norden's Artillery Battalion

(South Carolina)

Beardman's Artillery Battalion

(South Carolina)

Co. "K" 1st Virginia Infantry

Co. "A" 5th Virginia Infantry

.and last, if not least:

Co. "B" 3rd Texas Infantry

Co. "F" 3rd Texas Infantry

Co. "G" 3rd Texas Infantry Co. "K" 3rd Texas Infantry Co. "E" 16th Texas Infantry  
Co. "H" 17th Texas Infantry Co. "A" 9th Texas Infantry Co. "B" 9th Texas Infantry Co.  
"C" 9th Texas Infantry Co. "B" 2nd Texas Cavalry.

To present the story of the German-American as Mr. Lucke has is to imply that only those who participated in northern and western ventures made worthwhile contributions; a latter-day waving of the bloody shirt-- with a Teutonic accent.

J W Moore  
Senior Archeologist  
WASO