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<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSC</td>
<td>Denver Service Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRSP</td>
<td>Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania National Military Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FVC</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEWA</td>
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<tr>
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<td>National Archives and Records Administration</td>
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<tr>
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</tr>
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MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

A review of the history of Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania National Military Park suggests the following recommendations for management to move the park forward for the next several years. These recommendations take into account the full sweep of the park’s history and recognize the park’s accomplishments as of 2011.

DEVELOP A FORMAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

Janice Frye served as the park’s educational coordinator from 1993 until 2009, after which she retired from the National Park Service. She made contacts with the local school districts, developed interpretive programs for field trips, and loaned out traveling exhibits, such as a traveling trunk and a traveling haversack, to reach classes that might not visit the park. She worked with the schools and other organizations to apply for grants, such as with the Teaching Using Historic Places and Teaching American History. She offered teacher training that excited participants about using the park’s resources and local history to meet state educational requirements. Frye tried to adapt interpretive programming to meet the Virginia State Standards of Learning. She accomplished all of this educational work while also serving as the park’s curator and running the Chancellorsville Visitor Center. The Park has yet to assign a new educational coordinator.

The park needs additional funds to support a fulltime educational coordinator, preferably with hands-on experience in the Virginia school system. This coordinator would have the resources to develop curriculum-appropriate programming and promote the park’s interest in hosting school groups. The park has a large potential school-aged audience from its location in five school districts and its proximity to northern Virginia’s schools. School budgets are tight, and the number of field trips has decreased due to funding issues and the need to ensure that students meet state Standards of Learning (SOL) requirements with adequate instructional time in the classrooms. A core component of SOLs in history and civics refers to the Civil War and key historical figures of the era (many of whom visited areas associated with the park), a fact that the park should use to its advantage.

An educational coordinator could develop specific field trips for various grades that directly addressed the SOLs for history and civics, including classroom materials to aid preparing for the visit and follow-up afterward. Alternatively, Virginia’s Civil War battlefield parks could partner with the Civil War Trust and/or other organizations and develop such curriculum-based programming that could be personalized to each park. In either case, Fredericksburg would use its educational coordinator to develop ties with the nearby school districts and make a visit to the park an easy and educationally pertinent endeavor. Such site visits would be matched with the traveling trunk example Frye used during her tenure. Hands-on learning, with examples of clothing, personal effects, utensils for meals, and soldier equipment, and specific teaching tools for teachers would educate school children
about the park’s resources and encourage them to visit. Regular teacher training to encourage teachers to visit the park and use its resources would aid in visibility.

A web presence specifically geared to different school grades would also serve the park’s aim to build an all-ages educational focus. Web pages for different school grades would incorporate the SOL curriculum requirements while also emphasizing the important resources at the park. Story lines about particular soldiers in a battle, tactics used by generals, use of house sites and other civilian spots for hospitals and battle headquarters, geographical conditions that shaped battle plans and results, and other details about the battles fought at the park would engage web viewers and invite them to see for themselves. These web pages would draw from the park’s extensive interpretive programming, photographs, exhibits, blog postings, and work on educational programming.

Educating today’s area children promises to help park outreach and management in the future. The park’s efforts to argue against the Super Walmart in recent years indicated that the park did not have broad public understanding about its mission and values. Reaching youth now and having them tour the park, hear its stories, and learn about its value will go a long way toward building support in the future.

CONTINUE TO ATTRACT DIVERSE AUDIENCES OF ALL AGES

Park Chief Historian John Hennessy has moved the park’s overall interpretive programming forward with new media, waysides, and the beginnings of new exhibits. His efforts have reached tech savvy new audiences through his regular blog postings and have informed park visitors about updated historical research and approaches to Civil War interpretation with the waysides and exhibits. Hennessy supports interpretation that both recognizes the larger causes and consequences of the Civil War, including the plight of blacks as slaves and freed people, and describes the individual battles fought and commemorated at the park.

The park could continue its innovations in interpretation by capturing a diverse young adult audience who might not initially think about touring a Civil War battlefield park. Innovative programming and continued Internet usage would help this effort. A new blog could step away from the strong factual basis of the park’s original blogs to one with an impressionistic feel (but still historically accurate). What makes Fredericksburg a “cool” place to visit in the 2010s? What battlefield stories intrigue and chill the listener? What lessons come from the battlefield experience? The park could also host non-traditional interpretive opportunities such as Segway tours, jog and chat tours (what the National Mall is doing this summer), foodie tours (in partnership with a local restaurant or historical reenactment group), or bike tours. In partnership with Friends of the Rappahannock, the park could do a tour in canoes and kayaks on the river, tracing the historical events from the perspective of the water. The overall approach in each of these tours would be to balance the historical details about battles with take-away messages about how those past experiences have shaped Americans today.
These innovations in programming would continue the park’s efforts to meet Director John Jarvis’s call for relevancy in the national park system. Civil War battlefield parks have a devout following of people intrigued by the history of the war, the specifics about the battles, and the touch and feel of the actual landscape. The sesquicentennial events happening across the nation will entice more people to attend special events, but how many of these people will represent entirely new audiences who would never have thought to walk a battlefield? The commemorative exercises can serve as opportunities to try new programming to reach a wider demographic than might previously had visited. Forums on the aftermath of the Civil War and the long road from Civil War to civil rights through the Jim Crow era could bring in new visitors. The park could bolster its offerings that highlight the civilian population, both black and white, and trace changes during and after the war, and the implications for how the region developed over the past 150 years. New programming with a clear tie to its relevancy to the present-day would likely attract attention from new potential visitors.

**CONSIDER ADDITIONAL WAYS TO INCORPORATE THE PARK’S HISTORY INTO INTERPRETATION**

The park has with this finalized administrative history a chronicle of the preservation and management decisions made to establish and perpetuate this national battlefield. The federal government has spent many millions of dollars to acquire land, build roads and visitor facilities, and restore historic sites and landscapes. People have visited this park and been engrossed by its many stories and engaged to act toward the park’s continued defense against encroachment. The modern-day preservation battles, and the less spectacular work of laying out the park, provide lessons for local communities and national organizations to move forward with their own planning. Park history has relevancy today, and the park could take slices of its history to reach out to new audiences and provide a forum for discussion and engagement about the future of national parks in urbanizing areas, as an example.

The park superintendent and historians already use the park’s history in blog postings, slide talks, and History at Sunset summer programs. Building an audience participation factor into these talks would aid the park in engaging residents and visitors and promoting the park’s mission and values. An evening talk, with slides, might share how the National Park Service, following the initial work of the War Department, put its mark on the park through the Civilian Conservation Corps program. Discussion points might look at issues of race and include information about the separate camps for whites and blacks, community reception to the black camp, and how white CCC enlistees served as park interpreters although blacks could not. Another talk could chart land acquisition, describing what lands people donated to the park, what lands came in earlier versus later in the park’s history, and how decisions about land acquisition were made over time. The park could gather personal memories from family members who remember land acquisition of family lands or of neighboring lands. The park, in a separate program, could focus upon the well-known and loved diorama in the Fredericksburg Visitor Center, examining what the park
wanted to accomplish with the diorama when first commissioned and how historical knowledge has provided new ways to interpret the diorama today. An interpretive program with audience feedback could focus on Stonewall Jackson and how the park has commemorated his actions at Chancellorsville over time. Such a program would include acquisition of the Shrine and its restoration, the building of the Jackson Trails East and West, monuments to Jackson, the memorial flower garden, the final resting place of his arm at Ellwood, and other physical sites associated with his presence. This program would also benefit from a presentation about interpreting Jackson’s role at Chancellorsville and how that interpretation has shifted over time. Any of these ideas could also become web-based exhibits or temporary exhibits for the visitor centers.

The park could partner with Historic Fredericksburg Foundation to develop a special exhibit, or series of small traveling exhibits and web features, about the relationship of the park to the local community over time. This exhibit could chronicle how local residents rallied to support park establishment and proved crucial for early land acquisition. Photographs and maps could trace how the region has changed over time, looking at key places such as Salem Church or Wilderness Battlefield, and how development has transformed the landscape. The park could use the exhibit as an opportunity to educate people about its related lands work and approach toward assessing development proposals for the impacts they would have and how to mitigate those impacts, instead of simply opposing all development. Special talks and walking tours might result from the exhibit, again done in partnership with the local historic preservation community.

EXTEND OUTREACH ON THE RELATED LANDS APPROACH

Related lands has three components. The related lands data base, one aspect, uses historical scholarship and on-the-ground surveys to identify historic sites related to the Civil War near the battlefield park. Related lands vocabulary, a second aspect, provides managers with a way to address development proposals for the impacts they would have on key park resources, rather than simply opposing the proposal itself. Related lands partnerships, the third aspect, bring together park representatives, government officials, individuals, and developers in a collaborative environment to determine future land use around the park. These components all work together to make park managers strong advocates for the park and enthusiastic partners for negotiating outcomes that would affect the park.

The park superintendent and other staff members continue to use the related lands approach to advocate for the park. The superintendent served on the committees that wrote the first-ever historic preservation plans for Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania County. He is currently working with the Regional Planning Commission to help develop a vision for the area. The park routinely provides substantial comments on each local jurisdiction’s comprehensive plan. Eastern National, the park’s cooperating association and sales arm, has funded an important study to develop recommendations for compatible development in the Wilderness battlefield, in direct response to the Walmart controversy. The National Park
Service has recently signed a national programmatic agreement with the Army Corps of Engineers, a continued signal of the value of the related lands approach beyond the park.

Other possibilities exist to extend this important work. Spotsylvania County contracted with the National Park Service to complete the original four-volume data base. Subsequent research has uncovered other potential sites, and an update of the original data base would ensure its effectiveness as a resource. Related lands with Civil War resources also exist beyond Spotsylvania County. The park could establish an agreement with the City of Fredericksburg and other jurisdictions to identify other Civil War-related historic sites and document them in similar data bases. This work could use electronic technology to establish an actual data base with searching capabilities and links to associated resources. The park could also partner with local historical societies and research institutions to expand the Civil War focus of the data base to other historic periods, helping to ensure their protection. The data base itself could become an educational tool. Partnering with local schools could result in virtual tours of the historic sites and opportunities to educate students and adults about their value.

Related lands vocabulary relies upon having the data to address development proposals. Park managers need to have accurate studies of the park’s resources and how different developments might affect them. The park could partner with local research institutions and volunteer groups to measure traffic through the park, air and water quality, and other characteristics that would provide real data when the next developer makes a proposal. Additional needs include maps charting the elevation changes in the park’s landscape, determination of wetlands locations, accurate counts of wildlife, identification of plant and animal endangered species, and other resource characteristics that would provide park managers with the baseline information they need.

**BE CREATIVE ABOUT ACCESSIBILITY**

The park faces two important issues with regard to accessibility. First, people with disabilities need access to public spaces to understand and appreciate the park’s many resources. Second, anyone visiting the park needs honest and helpful recommendations for navigating the far-flung nature of the park. The park’s webpage can help address, though not fully satisfy, these two issues. Accessibility to the Fredericksburg Visitor Center’s lower level exhibits continues to plague people with disabilities. The park needs funds to build an elevator, with placement taking into account the historic nature of the building. Until such funding is available, the park could create a web presence with images and text capturing the exhibits on the lower level. A small computer station on the main floor of the visitor center could display this web page to interested parties, at least informing them of the lower level exhibits. On busy weekends, park interpreters could also set up a touch table with examples (copies) of artifacts downstairs for people to look at and feel. Similar steps could be taken to aid access to the upstairs of Ellwood or the Shrine.

Accessibility around the park’s far-flung locations would benefit from additions to the park’s webpage and a simple publication to go with the park folder. The park
encompasses four battlefields and additional historic sites that cross over five jurisdictions in an urbanized area. The simple act of driving between the two visitor centers at Fredericksburg and Chancellorsville requires fortitude and patience along busy Route 3’s commercial and residential developments. Once at a battlefield, visitors must carefully navigate unfamiliar roads while constantly watching for local residents intent on getting to their own destinations as quickly as possible. It can be frustrating for park staff and regular visitors and dangerous for first timers. Except for Spotsylvania battlefield and the Prospect Hill side of Fredericksburg battlefield, the park does not have a mass of land concentrated in a single space that allows visitors to explore without too many worries about traffic. The park has done well in the recent past tailoring the driving tour into sections so that visitors essentially pick a battlefield and drive it, not worrying about seeing the entire park in a single afternoon. The current web page does warn visitors that it takes two full days to see the park, and it encourages people to first stop at a park visitor center and then choose a driving tour.

An honest and realistic set of recommendations for visiting the park would enhance the visitor experience. Amusement parks and even some museums have suggestions on how best to tackle their spaces given heavy visitation. Fredericksburg could do the same with regard to traffic and distances. The park web site could provide expected travel times between battlefields for certain times of day. Descriptions of the big commercial developments at Route 3 and I-95 would help people recognize potential areas of congestion. Alternative routes, containing local historic and natural areas, would give drivers options. Hints on how best to navigate Chancellorsville, for example, and its crisscrossing of high-speed Route 3, would help visitors understand that the seemingly rural area is anything but. A single sheet handed out with the park folder at the visitor centers could encapsulate these suggestions for people ready to tour.

Accessibility of Chancellorsville battlefield remains a concern. The park tour at times follows along Route 3, where speeds often exceed 60 miles per hour, or crosses Route 3 without stop lights or stop signs. It would be helpful for visitors but prohibitively expensive (and probably disruptive to historic and archeological sites) to build a frontage road along Route 3 that would separate tourist traffic from local and through traffic. The Virginia Department of Transportation has recently agreed to place intersection warning signs at entrances to Chancellorsville along Route 3. Additional flashing yellow lights at key intersections might further aid this effort and even a tongue-in-cheek sign saying “Warning: Tourist Crossing” might get some chuckles and awareness from travelers along Route 3. Speed enforcement by appropriate bodies would help. Regular pull offs, well signed and with ample parking space, would provide a needed respite for frustrated drivers wanting to get away from aggressive drivers. Reducing the speed limit along Routes 3 and 20 would go a long way toward making those roads friendly to park visitors.
INCREASE THE PARK’S OPERATIONAL BUDGET

Nearly all parks are struggling, and have been struggling, with reduced budgets and increased demands for park services. Fredericksburg’s park superintendent currently works with 97% fixed costs and five vacancies out of what he considers the park’s bare minimum work force of 48 (not counting seasonal employees, which have also been reduced in number over the years). Fredericksburg is not alone, but it has special circumstances that require increasing its bare minimum budget to address the park’s reality of being four parks combined into one administrative unit. Geographic proximity put the four Civil War battlefields (and three additional historic sites of Chatham, Salem Church, and Stonewall Jackson Shrine) together as a single national park, but operationally and interpretively they stand as independent entities. Wilderness and Spotsylvania Court House share a similar interpretive story since they commemorate battles that happened one directly after another. They differ in terms of geography and current legal jurisdictions, with Wilderness having a substantial section of its battlefield in Orange County while Spotsylvania Court House resides entirely in Spotsylvania County. Fredericksburg battlefield, within that city’s limits plus Stafford County for Chatham, represents another interpretive story line and the challenges of managing a park within an urban environment. Chancellorsville battlefield and Salem Church in Spotsylvania County and the Stonewall Jackson Shrine in Caroline County, requires telling a dramatic story across an extended landscape. All of the park’s units face threats from traffic, residential incursions, commercial development, and associated pollution.

The four parks-in-one situation at Fredericksburg requires operational funding to meet visitor needs and preservation mandates. Visitors, as indicated in a previous recommendation, need assistance in traveling among the battlefields safely. They also need a regular interpretive ranger presence at each battlefield to encourage visitation and ensure that the battlefield stories and overall park mission are communicated. Preservation issues require continued vigilance of park staff to address new development threats and work cooperatively with local communities to avoid future Walmarts or other bug developments. The park’s superintendent and others are stretched thin in addressing these preservation issues while also managing their daily duties. Additional staffing would keep the park ahead of potentially threatening developments.
# INTRODUCTION

Crossroads is an apt term to use in describing the history of Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania National Military Park. The four Civil War battlefields encompassed by the park sit literally at the crossroads of the Federal capitol in Washington, DC, and the Confederate capitol in Richmond, VA. Men fought and died on this land due to its geographic location between these two centers of power.

With the park’s establishment in 1927 and moving forward in time, crossroads has taken on symbolic meanings. Preservation of battlefield land has often crossed paths with demands for outside development. This symbolic crossroads of preservation versus development has taken shape in an expanding and often threatening environment. Examples include widening roads on Park Service land, building residential subdivisions immediately adjacent to park authorized boundaries, and placing commercial establishments so that they attract more and more disruptive traffic through the preserved land. Park managers have responded by educating the local communities about the park’s key values and working in a cooperative and collaborative way to ensure preservation of the park’s mission while also meeting the demands of modern society.

Another crossroads confronts the park with regard to interpretation. Since the opening of the original museum and administration building at Fredericksburg during the New Deal era of the 1930s, the park’s historian interpreters have embraced a dual approach. They have focused upon military tactics and maneuvers while also presenting a largely reconciliationist and Lost Cause perspective on the four battles fought within the park’s borders. This approach to interpretation educated visitors about specifics without delving into the larger causes and consequences of the Civil War, including slavery. The park’s exhibits and waysides also made much of the daring and strategic success of Gen. Robert E. Lee and Lt. Gen. Stonewall Jackson without also giving attention to Lt. Gen. Ulysses Grant and other Federal commanders. The park’s historian interpreters now sit at a new crossroads, using recent scholarship on the black experience in the Fredericksburg area and popular interest in local and civilian history to frame nuanced and engaging stories that set the battlefield maneuvers within a larger context than had been attempted in the past. Work in developing new exhibits and waysides, joining multimedia efforts and blogging, promises ways to broaden the stories told at Fredericksburg.

Crossroads represent challenges and opportunities. Park superintendents and their staffs over the years have never sat quietly in the face of outside development pressures and interpretive demands to update services and meet visitor needs. They have sought engagement, with varying levels of acceptance and success. The story of Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania National Military Park remains remarkable for this steadfast approach to working with the local communities to obtain meaningful results.
CHAPTER ONE

A VAST MEMORIAL, SACRED IN ITS NATURE¹

As late as 1968, more than one hundred years after the Civil War, no stop light stood in the way of travelers as they headed west along the Plank Road, or Route 3, from then-named Mary Washington College in downtown Fredericksburg, through Spotsylvania County, and into Culpeper County. Near the crossroads with Interstate 95, a Sheraton Motor Inn and golf course welcomed visitors. A nursing home stood a little further west. Salem Church, the site of 1863 fighting and a field hospital, sat surrounded by farmlands. More farms edged the roadway and swept out across the rolling landscape watered by the Rappahannock and Rapidan Rivers to the north and North Anna and Matta Rivers to the south. The historic scrub forest of the Wilderness punctuated the far western edge of Spotsylvania County. A driver with a little imagination could turn the asphalt road into planks and erase the overhead power lines, transforming the experience into a late 19th-century carriage ride out to see the earthworks and lands associated with Civil War fighting.²

Signs of change intruded, though. The National Park Service opened in 1963 the Chancellorsville Visitor Center at the Stonewall Jackson wounding site and an unmanned exhibit shelter along Route 20 in the Wilderness battlefield. Park roads, parking areas, waysides, and trails served visitors in their quest to see earthwork remains and learn about the Civil War battles. Less promising changes, from the point of view of the park and its mission, joined these for the park. Lake of the Woods, a 2,600-acre tract of recreational homes begun in 1966 at Routes 3 and 20, would be almost completely sold out by 1971. This successful example spurred other developers who recognized the double value of Spotsylvania’s lack of zoning laws and the proximity to historic and natural landscapes that would attract buyers. Lake Wilderness, with its 1,200 lots in its 1,000-acre community, opened in 1969, sandwiching the thin line of Federal earthworks preserved by the park and bumping up against the Confederate trench remains also owned by the park. More developments, such as the 300-acre Forest Walk on Virginia 621 and the 409-acre Battlefield Estates, sat adjacent to park battlefield lands in this area. Developers of the Wilderness camping resort next to the Chancellorsville battlefield opted to maintain a 50-foot buffer between camping sites and park land and not use park roads for access to their property, effectively isolating their users and maintaining the desired “wilderness” experience.³

These early signs of burgeoning development around Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania National Military Park may not have elicited strong concerns if the park itself

¹“Keep the Park As It Is,” Free Lance-Star, 8 June 1933.
²Jerry Marcus, oral history interview with the author, 27 May 2010, 3, FRSP Archives.
could tell the stories it was tasked to do using the lands and protections already under its care. The park’s enabling legislation, however, rested upon the assumption that the federal government only needed to own the earthwork remains where key fighting had occurred while the surrounding countryside would remain privately owned and farmed as it had been at the time of the war. This approach was known as the Antietam plan, after the park where this idea first saw fruition. Visitors to Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania would thus see the earthworks in the historic setting but the federal government would not have to take on the expense of ownership and maintenance of the adjacent lands. Lack of zoning laws and improved transportation with interstate highways and later commuter railways connecting the Fredericksburg area to Washington, DC, and Richmond, Virginia, meant that Spotsylvania County in particular served as a development magnet, starting in the mid-1960s and accelerating through the 1990s. When in 1971 Chief Ranger Donald L. Jackson noted that the park existed “at the good graces of our neighbors,” he touched on the tip of the iceberg of challenges that the park faced as it looked beyond the Civil War centennial.4

This book chronicles the events leading to the 1927 establishment of Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania National Military Park, its development under the War Department until 1933, and its management under the National Park Service from 1933 to the present. Land protection, looking at how much and where, serves as a key theme throughout this history. An interlocking theme is interpretation and how park personnel developed and changed the interpretive message to address new historical information and approaches, new land acquisitions, technological improvements, and social demands. An underlying question throughout this history addresses why not? Why not include certain lands from the start? Why not tell certain stories to park visitors? Why not develop the park strictly conforming to the enabling legislation? These themes and basic questions find answers in this book.

The first two chapters benefit from the research and intimate knowledge of Ralph Happel, the park’s first longtime historian. Happel wrote a well-regarded administrative history in 1955 that described the land, prehistoric life, arrival of explorers from Europe, colonial life, the Civil War battles, and steps taken to commemorate and preserve the battlefields. His history also recorded actions taken by the War Department and the National Park Service to acquire land, build roads, and develop interpretation through the mid-1950s. This current history does not try to duplicate Happel’s work. Rather, this history takes Happel’s work and analyzes the events and actions taken to help draw out conclusions about how these early steps in protection, interpretation, and development shaped the park in later years. This history also does not detail the Civil War battles commemorated in the park but describes key actions and locations. Readers will gain understanding of why park supporters and park managers chose certain lands for preservation and interpretation.

---

4 Jackson, as quoted by Nancy Moore in Ibid.
THE COCKPIT

Promoters and supporters of a national park in and around Fredericksburg, Virginia, never considered, at least on paper, commemorating the battlefields in separate parks. They referred to the entire geographic area as the center or “cockpit” of the Civil War and saw the events of December 1862 to May 1864 as interconnected.\(^5\) Fredericksburg’s “crossroads” location halfway between the federal capital of Washington, DC, and the Confederate capital of Richmond, Virginia, ensured that its soil would see fighting. The Rappahannock River served as an unofficial north-south dividing line, which one Confederate soldier called the “Dare Mark.” Below this “dare” line, as historian Daniel Sutherland has noted, the Confederates safely secured many of their food resources and railroad transportation outlets. The Army of Northern Virginia, under the command of Gen. Robert E. Lee, also called south of the Rappahannock home. Whether the Federals saw victory over Lee’s army or Richmond as key to a successful end of the war, northern commanders had to cross the river somewhere within the vicinity of Fredericksburg and fight.\(^6\)

Gen. Ambrose E. Burnside directed the first river crossing. He had hoped to surprise Lee by marching his 120,000-strong Army of the Potomac south from its Warrenton, Virginia, camps to Stafford Heights, overlooking Fredericksburg, cross the river on pontoon bridges, and deliver a fatal blow to the Army of Northern Virginia. Burnside’s men completed the 40-mile march in two days, arriving on 17 November 1862. Lee had not anticipated such quick movement to this destination and had divided his army, with Lt. Gen. Thomas J. “Stonewall” Jackson in the Shenandoah Valley and Lt. Gen. James Longstreet in Culpeper. But, Burnside’s speedy arrival came without the required support: bridges. Civilian bridges into Fredericksburg had been destroyed earlier in the war, and Burnside had requested pontoon equipment to meet him at the heights. Poor communication, inefficient government bureaucracy, and bad weather delayed the arrival of the bridge-building materials until November 25. By then, Lee’s army had assembled in strategically defensible locations on the other side of the river.

Burnside faced a difficult situation. He had only been placed in charge of his army on 7 November, relieving Maj. Gen. George B. McClellan, who many of the soldiers and commanders highly respected. President Abraham Lincoln had tired of McClellan’s continued reluctance to engage the enemy in a fight, and Lincoln turned to Burnside, hoping for action. Burnside willingly tried to oblige, but the pontoon fiasco only hinted at his difficulties. The threat of winter weather urged action before the men would be forced into quarters until spring. Burnside’s relationship with his subordinates also needed time to develop. The historical record had long emphasized that Burnside’s subordinates lacked

---


\(^6\) Daniel E. Sutherland, *Fredericksburg and Chancellorsville: The Dare Mark Campaign* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998), 1.
confidence in his plan of attack and saw him as incompetent. More recent scholarship has poked holes into this view, indicating that Burnside did have supporters who believed his plan of attack had merit. Prior accounts had been based upon statements by McClellan supporters wanting to downplay Burnside's actions and by others who did not record their recollections until later in life, when few others involved were still alive to argue otherwise, and they could use hindsight to recognize the folly of Burnside's plans.7

Burnside decided to build two river crossings into Fredericksburg itself and a third one a mile downstream, expecting to overwhelm Lee’s defenses with his superior numbers. Lee had spread his men as much as twenty miles along the southern shore of the Rappahannock, not certain where Burnside would attack, leaving Longstreet and Jackson widely separated. When pontoon bridge building met with sniper resistance from town, Burnside ordered his 150 heavy-gun artillery to fire from Stafford Heights for nearly two hours into Fredericksburg. Still, snipers attacked as the engineers proceeded again with their work. Burnside authorized volunteers to cross on boats and engage the snipers, who fought back until retiring behind Confederate defenses. The engineers completed the bridges and that evening, 11 December, the Army of the Potomac entered Fredericksburg. The Federals did not attack the next day, instead sacking the town, destroying personal property and stealing items from homes and shops. This pillaging stood out from what Federals had done previously, heightening Confederate hatred and distrust and losing the Federals valuable strategic time for an eventual attack.8

The battle on 13 December demonstrated Lee’s strategic superiority in using the high ground around Fredericksburg to Confederate advantage and Burnside’s tentativeness in following through with his battle plan. Lee set his command post on Telegraph Hill, later to be called Lee Hill, and watched the events pass across the Fredericksburg landscape. Burnside first sent his Left Grand Division to attack Jackson’s Corps downstream of Fredericksburg. Lack of clear instructions meant that only Maj. Gen. George B. Meade’s 4,500 men were initially sent against Jackson and his 30,000-strong infantry with powerful artillery concealed within trees at Prospect Hill. Meade’s men made a temporary incursion into a gap in Jackson’s line, but Jackson sealed this gap quickly when he ordered the firing of his guns. Meade’s men, joined by Brig. Gen. John Gibbon’s division, had failed to roll up Jackson’s corps, but Burnside proceeded with the next phase of his plan, assaulting the town itself at Marye’s Heights. Longstreet’s artillery secured the high ground while sharpshooters stood ready, using a stone wall for protection. Federals advanced in wave after wave between noon and nightfall over a 15-foot wide and 5-foot deep canal ditch and across a


8 William A. Blair, “Barbarians at Fredericksburg’s Gate: The Impact of the Union Army on Civilians,” in Gallagher, ed., Fredericksburg Campaign, 142-44, 153-58; Rable, Fredericksburg!, 156-84.
landscape with hardly a fence or tree for protection, before falling in front of a well-worn Sunken Road next to the stone wall of Marye’s Heights. Fifteen units fell with no Federal soldier touching the stone wall. The agonizing cries of the wounded echoed through the night, and the next day a Southern soldier, Sgt. Richard Kirkland of the Second South Carolina Infantry, risked death by bringing water to the thirsty wounded in front of the stone wall.

Burnside considered a renewed attack that next day, but his subordinates counseled otherwise. The Federals successfully withdrew on 14-15 December, taking their pontoon bridge material with them. Numbers lost included 12,600 Federals killed, wounded, or missing, with almost two-thirds that number fallen at the stone wall. Lee’s Army suffered 5,300 casualties, but these losses and needed supplies proved harder to replace in the resources-strapped South than in the plentiful North. Plus, Lee had not gained any ground from the battle by decisively hitting Burnside in retreat. Both armies went into winter quarters and waited for the spring and renewed action to determine the outcome.9

1862 also saw the exodus of many of the slaves in the Fredericksburg area. The Federals had established a presence in the spring and summer of that year in Falmouth, across the Rappahannock River from Fredericksburg. Federal troops worked on securing a communication and supply line to Washington, restoring the telegraph line, repairing railroad track and rebuilding bridges, rebuilding the Aquia wharf, and maintaining roads between the river crossings and the expected Federal headquarters. Slaves, recognizing that the Federals represented freedom, left their owners. The Federal commanders encouraged this desertion, promising to offer protection and support once they reached Federal lines. One commander sent a local black out to the countryside to spread the word, and some slaves came from 60 miles away. Runaway slaves became known as “contraband” property subject to seizure by federal authorities without compensating owners. The able-bodied men stayed with the Federal camps, earning money as servants or working in gangs to help with repair work on the railroad. Others gained employment as cooks, guides, or informants. Women, children, and aged men continued traveling north to Washington, though many found disappointment with no jobs and headed back to Falmouth. Once the Federals retreated that summer, more slaves saw this movement as a last chance to gain freedom and escaped with the northern army.10

Events in 1863 brought the Federals back to the Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania crossroads area. Lincoln replaced Burnside in late January 1863 with Maj. Gen. Joseph


(“Fighting Joe”) Hooker. Hooker reinvigorated the Army of the Potomac by returning to a system of corps organization, instead of Burnside’s three grand divisions. He reorganized the cavalry into a single separate corps to match the Confederate model, improved food, granted furloughs, and instilled pride by having each corps design its own insignia badge. Spring weather revealed Hooker’s ambitious plan to defeat Lee. He knew that the Army of Northern Virginia had built a long line of trenches along the banks of the Rappahannock River around Fredericksburg to thwart crossings. He decided to surprise Lee with a far upriver crossing. During the last few days of April, he divided his army into three. He sent 10,000 cavalry across the Rappahannock and south to cut Lee’s supply lines. Another 70,000 infantry crossed upriver of Lee’s left flank while 40,000 were sent to Fredericksburg to keep Lee in place while the infantry would hit Lee in his left and rear. By 30 April, Hooker’s 70,000-strong infantry had successfully crossed the Rappahannock and Rapidan Rivers and waited in the vicinity of the Chancellor House facing the Orange Turnpike (now Route 3). Hooker had achieved his goal of surprising Lee in crossing and massing his troops without heavy fighting.11

Lee faced a considerable foe which vastly outnumbered his Army of Northern Virginia in terms of supplies and men. Lee responded by strategically defying Hooker’s initial achievement. He correctly gauged that his main assault had to focus on Chancellorsville, the crossroads where the Chancellor House sat, and thus kept only 10,000 infantry at Fredericksburg. The rest of his army went west and engaged Hooker’s advance troops on 1 May a couple of miles east of Chancellorsville. Hooker, perhaps expecting that Lee would instead have started a retreat to Richmond in response to Hooker’s initial success, fell back defensively to Chancellorsville and the nearby woods, known as the Wilderness. Lee saw a psychological advantage shine and pressed it to his advantage. He met with Stonewall Jackson the night of 1 May to discuss their next steps. Receiving word that Hooker’s right flank sat without natural protection three miles west of Chancellorsville, Lee and Jackson recognized their window of opportunity. Jackson used a local resident, plus sketchy maps, to guide his force along a track used to haul charcoal for an iron-smelting furnace, through the Wilderness of scrub oak and thorny undergrowth. The 30,000 Confederate infantry and artillery dangerously traveled in hidden fashion 12 miles along the enemy’s front while Lee faced the equally unnerving prospect of possibly having to fight Hooker’s main arm with only 15,000 men. Lee banked on Hooker staying put, and Hooker obeyed, despite reports about Jackson’s movement. Hooker believed that Jackson’s cavalry was actually retreating an idea Jackson encouraged with two fake rights to the south during his march. Some heavy fighting on Jackson’s rear, near Catharine Furnace, served as the only Federal response until Jackson chose to strike.12


Jackson waited until his full force could line up battle-ready stretching two miles behind Hooker’s unsuspecting right flank. A bugle then pierced the air as the rebel soldiers ran out from the Wilderness canopy towards the surprised Federals, whose artillery all faced the opposite direction of the attackers. Many units of the 11th Corps fought with determination, but without adequate protection or readiness, each eventually fell under the Confederate attack. Jackson called off further action at sunset and went around his lines to identify how best to thwart any attempts by Hooker to retreat across the Rappahannock. When riding back to his headquarters, a North Carolina regiment mistook his small group for Federal cavalry and fired. Three shots hit Jackson in his left arm, forcing its amputation (the severed arm was buried in a marked site at Ellwood, one of the Lacy family homes). Jackson was later transported to Guinea Station, where he died eight days later of pneumonia.  

On 3 May, Hooker ordered the 6th Corps to hit Fredericksburg, take Marye’s Heights, and push behind Lee’s rear at Chancellorsville. This Second Battle of Fredericksburg threatened to duplicate the first, with Confederate Gen. Jubal Early’s artillery pummeling the Federal’s first two attempts. But, on the third try, using a bayonet charge, the Federals under Maj. Gen. John Sedgwick routed the Confederates, taking a thousand prisoners. In the meantime, Hooker had furthered his defensive posture around the Chancellor House by giving up one piece of high ground at Hazel Grove, which allowed Lee and Maj. Gen. James Ewell Brown (Jeb) Stuart to reunite their two wings and put their own artillery on the hill. Intense and ferocious fighting surrounded the Chancellor House, where the Federals had built protective trenches, until Stuart’s artillery got into place and began pounding the Federals. Hooker, at one point, was knocked unconscious from a cannon ball, and when he regained consciousness, he ordered further defensive measures, moving his troops closer to the Rappahannock River in a contracted line. The Chancellor House sustained several fires from the artillery attack. The Wilderness undergrowth also caught fire and consumed many of the wounded and dead that the armies could not reach in time. Sedgwick’s corps continued to move west from its success at Fredericksburg, but Lee, recognizing this clear threat to his rear, moved quickly and sent a division to slow down Sedgwick at Salem Church. More fighting occurred, with the Confederates using natural cover effectively. With another division the next day, 4 May, Lee effectively stalled further movement by the Federals. Sedgwick retreated across the Rappahannock River that night, knowing that Hooker had given up the fight. Hooker ordered a retreat of the rest of his army the next night, despite arguments by his subordinates to press ahead with another attack.  

---


The Federals suffered more than 17,000 casualties, or 13 percent of the Army of the Potomac’s full strength. Lee had 13,000 casualties but 22 percent of his total force. The Federals had the ability to recoup its losses while the Confederates still struggled with limited resources. Lee had commanded a daring and stunning victory with Jackson’s Flank Attack, the artillery shelling at Hazel Grove, and his success at Salem Church, but Hooker’s army had not used 40,000 troops, making clear that Hooker had not been vanquished. Lee used his victory, though, to convince Confederate President Jefferson Davis to move north and attack. Within six weeks, Lee would meet the Federals again, at Gettysburg. This time, the Army of Northern Virginia suffered a resounding defeat to the Army of the Potomac, and Lee took his men back across the Rappahannock River to fight a defensive war. Lee’s army fought hard and with distinction despite its continuing grave disadvantages in troops and supplies.15

Lee faced off a new commander when the two armies met again in early May 1864. Meade, who had replaced Hooker and led the Gettysburg attack, remained on paper in charge of the Army of the Potomac, but Lincoln plucked Ulysses S. Grant from his decisive western victories at Vicksburg and Chattanooga and named him general-in-chief of all Union armies. Grant, now given the esteemed title of lieutenant general, kept his headquarters with the Army of the Potomac. He designed a coordinated advance across the South. He sent Brig. Gen. William Tecumseh Sherman to disable Gen. Joseph Johnston’s army, move into the southern interior, and inflict as much damage as possible on Confederate war resources. He gave Meade the orders that wherever Lee went, Meade must follow. Meade took his men across the Rapidan River on 4 May and entered the Wilderness.16

Fighting began on 5 May with Lee trying to neutralize the almost 2-to-1 Federal advantage in numbers (115,000 to 64,000) by sending troops up the parallel routes of the Orange Turnpike and the Orange Plank Road. He wanted to attack in the confined spaces of the Wilderness, helping to equalize the numerical disadvantage of soldiers, as opposed to allowing Grant the advantage on open terrain further south. The Confederates following the Orange Turnpike chose the forested western edge of Saunders’s Field, an open corn field, to send the first volleys of the campaign toward Maj. Gen. Gouverneur K. Warren’s troops. Warren, from his headquarters at Ellwood (the Lacy plantation house), quickly sent in more troops, and savage fighting commenced along a mile-wide front. The woods and then the farm field caught fire, and the smoke and flames added to the confusion and misery of the situation. Casualties that could not be retrieved suffered cremation. Meanwhile, the Confederates marching up the Orange Plank Road sought to take the Brock Road intersection, thereby isolating and neutralizing one of Grant’s corps. Grant responded by sending in additional troops, and fierce fighting ensued. Both engagements, with heavy casualties, ended in stalemate at dusk. Warren’s Fifth Corps threw up a defensive line of dirt


and logs the afternoon of 5 May while Burnside’s 9th Corps, after fighting the afternoon of 6 May, extended the trench line. Confederates built their own trench line near Lee’s headquarters, located at Widow Tapp Farm.17

The Federals recommenced fighting at the Brock Road intersection early on 6 May, overwhelming the unprepared and exhausted Confederates who had expected reinforcements from Longstreet. Longstreet’s corps, which had been in Tennessee, had ten miles to march in the evening between 5 and 6 May. They arrived around the area of Lee’s headquarters, which was under assault from Federal skirmishers and troops. Lee himself rode around the incoming troops, urging them forward, as they lined up and prepared to assault the Federals, causing a Texas brigade to call out for Lee to go back, go to the rear, as they readied for action. Longstreet’s corps halted the Federal surge and almost sent them back to their morning starting point. One of Longstreet’s subordinates knew of an unmarked unfinished railroad bed that ran, choked with vines and other vegetation, past the Federal left flank. Longstreet sent four brigades along this route, and they attacked the surprised Federals with stunning success. But, then tragedy hit. The Confederates hitting the flank ended up attacking at right angles with the rest of Longstreet’s corps. A Confederate, in the confusion and amidst the dense undergrowth of the Wilderness, shot Longstreet in the right shoulder, echoing the events of one year before with Stonewall Jackson. Longstreet eventually recovered, but he could not help his troops further at this battle. Lee straightened out the lines and fighting continued until night fall without a clear victor.18

Grant proved his determination as events further unfolded that evening. Confederate Brig. Gen. John B. Gordon led another flank attack, this time to Grant’s right, after dark on 6 May. The surprised Federals drew back about a mile, and they lost two generals to capture. Grant steadied the resulting panic and planned for his next move. If he followed the typical Federal response to Lee and his daring flank attacks, he would move his army back across the Rappahannock and Rapidan Rivers. But, Grant chose his own course. Despite heavy losses, with 17,500 casualties to Lee’s almost 8,000, he used 7 May to prepare. That evening, he turned his men south toward Spotsylvania Court House, recognizing that if he secured this crossroads, he would stand between Lee and Richmond and force Lee to fight or retreat. The soldiers of the Army of the Potomac began to sing when they realized they were going to keep fighting. This would not be another Chancellorsville.19


They did not reach Spotsylvania Court House first but met Maj. Gen Richard Anderson, who replaced Longstreet, and his artillery and rifles. Both armies settled into the landscape, building elaborate networks of trenches. At the Wilderness, engineers had largely built the trenches on 6 and 7 May following the heaviest fighting but while the enemy was still within striking distance. At Spotsylvania Court House, though, both sides waited to fight until after they had the cover of protective trenches. Confederate earthworks, in particular, displayed ingenuity with their two foot-deep trench behind and two foot-tall log and wood construction, topped with a head log to give a sight line for shooting but protect the shooter’s head. Abatis, or felled branches, laying directly in front of the earthworks would slow down foot soldiers enough to give time to aim from behind the trenches. One Confederate corps, building their earthworks in the dark and matching them to the natural terrain near the McCoull House, ended up with a huge salient, or bulge, facing north toward the Federal line. The soldiers dubbed it the Mule Shoe.20

The Federals had to find a way to assault these earthworks. Col. Emory Upton argued for lightning strikes, in which a mass of men would charge the entrenchments without stopping to fire, reload, and fire again. Once they gained entry into the trenches, reinforcements could broaden the assault. Grant was willing to give it a try. Upton took twelve hand-picked regiments on the evening of 10 May, divided them into four lines, and sent them one after the other across 200 yards of open ground, yelling and fighting like wild beasts. The first line breached the defenses, the second line attacked the second defensive line, and the next two Federal lines gathered stunned Confederate prisoners. Returning artillery fire, however, convinced the division that was supposed to back-up Upton’s men to retreat. Without this support, Upton’s regiments had to fall back.21

Upton’s tactics had merit, Grant acknowledged, and on 11 May, he prepared for a whole corps to make lightning strikes with more follow-up troops attacking along the entire line. Lee misread the movement of Federal supply wagons to the rear and removed 22 guns to prepare for what he thought would be a flanking move. At dawn on 12 May, in a cold rain, another wild yell and a mass rush of Federals at the Confederate trenches signaled Grant’s true intent. Lee had the guns replaced just in time for the Federals to capture them. Lee’s army split in two from the direct hit on the Mule Shoe salient, and Lee tried once again to rally his troops as he had at the Wilderness until his soldiers called for him to go back and stay to the rear. The Confederates pushed back effectively while the Federals tried to control the mayhem as officers lost control of their mixed up units, their men gathering prizes and prisoners in the trenches. Federal attacks on the left and right flanks failed to make an impression. The Federal Sixth Corps joined the fray, and then began some of the most horrific fighting of the entire Civil War. For 18 hours in the rain, from early morning until after midnight, soldiers fought in grisly hand-to-hand combat at a slight bend in the


21 Rhea, Battles of Spotsylvania Court House, 163-77; McPherson, Battle Cry of Freedom, 728-29.
earthworks west of the apex, now known as the Bloody Angle. The defenders finally retreated at 2 AM to earthworks that Confederate engineers had hastily constructed about a half-mile to their rear. Federal soldiers found only corpses when they investigated the next morning. Days of heavy rain and the realization that Lee had settled into a new strong defensive line made clear that Grant could not defeat Lee at Spotsylvania. He sent on 20 May one corps further south towards Guinea Station, and the rest of his army followed the next day. Lee reacted by positioning his men between Grant and Richmond, continuing his defensive approach until finally in April 1865 he ceded at Appomattox. Losses at Spotsylvania were staggering, with 18,000 Federal casualties and nearly 10,000 Confederate ones.  

Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania’s four Civil War battlefields steered the course of the Civil War, with at least one congressional member calling it the cockpit. Lee’s stunning victories at Fredericksburg and Chancellorsville convinced him to attack on northern soil, at Gettysburg. His equally stunning loss there meant that Lee would resolutely defend his native soil, south of the Rappahannock, until either he could demoralize the North enough to win southern freedom or be forced to surrender after depleting every available resource. He demonstrated his skill and determination at defense and even aggression at the Wilderness and Spotsylvania Court House, despite troop numbers and supplies that begged for more. Unlike Burnside and Hooker, though, Grant showed an equal willingness to engage and fight. He did not turn back at the crossroads but rather kept Lee moving and defending as they edged closer and closer to Richmond. Ultimately, Virginia became the final frontier of the war, and Lee versus Grant became the generals who would decide the nation’s fate. This characterization is admittedly simplistic, but the battle wounds at Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania make clear the high stakes involved and the high cost of the war for both sides.

Here is the bloodiest geographic area in all of North America, with more than 15,000 killed and 85,000 wounded. Some of the hastily buried or forgotten remains of bodies are hidden under the farm fields later turned into residential subdivisions, shopping centers, and park lands. Gently sloping mounds of earth stretching across the landscape remain as tangible reminders of the fierce fighting. These earthworks, covered with low-lying vegetation and punctuated sometimes with trees or bushes, became the focus of attention for later travelers and promoters interested in visiting sites associated with the battles and preserving them. People wanted to see the places where so many men lost their lives fighting for their causes. And, the trench traces became the focal point for those visitors.

AFTER THE WAR

What did people come back to when they left the battlefields and returned to their homes in Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania County? How did they adjust to a post-

---

emancipation society? To what extent did people want to remember the Civil War years, and especially the battles fought around their homes? How did people, black and white, commemorate those who had fought on either side? To what extent did people step away from their antebellum prejudices or validate those assumptions? Answers to these questions help to set the stage for the national park movement. Sources of information come from census records and historical studies of Virginia, though specifics about the area of Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania are limited. Newspaper accounts provide some local flavor.

Virginia, and specifically the crossroads area between Washington and Richmond, had experienced destruction and devastation during the war. Two huge armies had lived off the farm fields and waters of Spotsylvania County between winter 1862 and spring 1864, leaving the landscape largely plundered and barren. Fredericksburg stood as a shell of its former bustling self, with buildings damaged or destroyed from cannon fire and many personal items taken during the Federal looting of December 1862. Population figures attest to the human toll the Civil War took upon this area. Spotsylvania County had just over 16,000 total inhabitants in 1860, but after the war that number dropped to under 12,000, with much of the population loss from blacks leaving the area. Slight increases between 1880 and 1890 left the population hovering around 14,000, but the numbers dropped again to below 10,000 at the turn of the 20th century. Spotsylvania (and the figures include Fredericksburg) did not regain its pre-Civil War population level until more than one hundred years after the war, when in the 1970 census it reached 16,400.23

Reconstruction and recovery in Virginia involved two ultimately conflicting issues: political restoration of state government under the United States and placement of newly freed slaves within that government. Virginia became the first state of the former Confederacy to pass (in 1869) a constitution allowing suffrage for black men, thereby freeing the state from further military rule. Blacks flocked to the polls, electing 27 blacks to the Virginia General Assembly. But the Conservative Party, which effectively consolidated its power in the 1869 election, worked to assert white supremacy while also favoring business and railroad interests to those of small farmers and rural residents. Conservatives in the state legislature, joined with the governor, committed the state to repaying its full $45 million pre-Civil War debt, plus wartime interest, for investments in railroad and canal building. With the official loss of West Virginia, declining land values, and the end of slavery as a source of capital, the state had to struggle using higher taxes and severely reduced state services to support this Funding Act. Public education in particular lost. The state’s financial situation worsened with the 1873 financial panic that hit the entire country. The state’s surplus became a deficit by the mid-1870s, and it could no longer pay its debts. Angry voters
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coalesced behind the Readjuster Party and its leader, former Confederate general and slaveholder William Mahone. Mahone, who had his own railroad interests that had been thwarted by the Conservative Party, brought together black and white Republicans and others in a successful though short-lived attempt to bring the state out of its debt-ridden financial straits and promote social reformation along liberal lines. Readjusters in four years of control of the state government (1879-1883) restructured the state debt downward, thereby ending the onerous Funding Act. They also reduced property taxes but increased assessments on railroads and other businesses to return a surplus to the state. Public schools won, with black and white schools funded and a black college established. Readjusters repealed the poll tax and abolished the whipping post, a punishment that had led to disenfranchisement. This black-majority party promoted black citizenship, suffrage, office holding, and jury service, all rights that the Conservative Party had tried to diminish.24

This apogee of black rights in Virginia ended once voters had won the repeal of the Funding Act (which had brought this diverse group together), and the Conservative Party, soon to be named the Democratic Party, re-asserted its power by pulling the race card. Its political nominee asked if Virginians wanted social equality between blacks and whites, miscegenation, and racial mixing in the schools, all threats the new Democrats said would come from continued Readjuster power in the state house. White voters said no, and segregation and the stifling of black political power began. The 1894 Walton Act required voters to cross out the names of the candidates they did not support, an idea that relied upon literacy. This law allowed special constables to assist illiterate voters, but in practice those constables were largely only available in primarily white districts. Democrats wanted more control, though, and by using support from the cities and the southern rural counties (which contained whites staunchly opposed to any integration efforts), they managed to get a referendum passed for the state to hold a constitutional convention. The purpose of that convention, according to one of its leaders, was legally to remove as many black voters as possible from the rolls while not reducing the number of white voters. The new state constitution (1902), declared as law without having voters ratify it, used literacy and understanding tests that registrars could apply indiscriminately to allow illiterate whites the voting privilege and still deny the same to blacks. A later poll tax all but removed blacks from the voter rolls (the numbers of black voters in Fredericksburg in 1902 decreased from 353 to 65 as a result of these voting requirements). The ironic result of this new constitution and the Democratic machine’s power in Virginia was that few whites voted either. Between 1905 and 1948, state employees and office holders accounted for one-third of voters in state elections,

meaning that those most interested in the results voted and thus significantly shaped the results.  

Social segregation, legalized by the United States Supreme Court in *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1896), followed the exclusion of black voters. Virginia did not readily institute Jim Crow laws, as its other southern states did, to delineate segregated spaces. Instead, white elites under the Democratic party first relied upon paternalism to keep blacks in control. This paternalism drew upon a perceived antebellum past that saw slaveholders as benevolent keepers of blacks who promoted their best interests so long as blacks kept to their servile positions. White elites largely did not resort to violence and physical coercion from the end of the Civil War to the 1920s and even uplifted blacks by providing basic services and access to education and economic opportunities. In exchange, Virginia’s white elites expected from blacks complete deference and redress for grievances through white-labeled acceptable channels. This method of control relied upon regular individual interaction between the races, which a rural or small-town setting provided. As Virginia’s manufacturing possibilities expanded, especially in the southwestern coal-mining counties, and cities grew increasingly urbanized, those interactions decreased and paternalism itself proved ineffective for whites to control blacks. Richmond passed a key segregation ordinance in 1929, marking the end of paternalism as an approach to Virginia’s black-white relations.

Southern whites, as former Confederates, lifted themselves up after the resounding defeat of their wartime fight for separation from the United States, even as they crushed blacks into further servility, by inventing what has since been remembered as the Lost Cause tradition. The Lost Cause tradition elevated the South’s soldiers and officers, along with the home-front supporters, while refusing to acknowledge secession or losing the war. The South, according to this tradition, had defended itself against Northern aggression during the war and had been simply overwhelmed by superior numbers of soldiers and supplies. The tradition also rejected any connection of slavery to the cause of the war, arguing instead that Southerners were asserting states rights and individual rights to uphold a way of life. This Lost Cause tradition, joined to white supremacy, and promoted by former Confederates, such as Jefferson Davis, and Confederate associations, such as the United Confederate Veterans and the United Daughters of the Confederacy, shaped commemorations of the Civil War, helped further cement the Democratic Party’s political power in Virginia, and kept blacks on the defensive as second-class citizens within the South. Women, through
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traditional roles encouraged during this time period, ensured the endurance of this tradition through educational efforts aimed at young children.27

What specifically happened in Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania after the war? Most wealthy whites continued to own land, but they had little money. Land owners needed farm laborers, but owners could not afford to pay, and blacks, one significant source of labor, often refused to work for token amounts. Bartering and other attempts at exchange helped, but in many cases, blacks responded to advertisements for work in the sugar and cotton fields of Louisiana and Mississippi and left the area. Others headed to urban locations further north, such as Baltimore. Those who stayed often ended up living in poverty conditions long after the war had ended. But other blacks did find the resources to buy land and established farms near where they had been slaves. All farmers faced tough economic conditions. Prices for corn and wheat dropped precipitously, and Virginia's overall farm income dropped from one-third to one-half. The numbers of farms tripled, but that situation resulted from larger farms being split up, forcing each farmer to get as much production out of less land as possible.28

Blacks in the Fredericksburg area enthusiastically embraced their voting privileges in the immediate postwar period and organized black political groups, including a Republican Readjuster club in 1881. When the 1902 constitution stripped away their voting privileges, educated blacks still submitted to the rigorous and intimidating procedures to obtain voting privileges. They oftentimes failed, even after taking their cases to court. Blacks could shop in all Fredericksburg stores, with restrictions, but all other public facilities were segregated, including the railroad depot, with separate white and colored waiting rooms. Although the Ku Klux Klan began organizing in Fredericksburg in the early 1920s, staging torchlight parades and other public events, for the most part newspaper accounts and personal recollections affirm a calm, accepting attitude toward segregation and race relations. Neighbors, black and white, helped each other in hard times, and friendly relations seemed to predominate. This situation, described in more detail in studies of Richmond, resulted from conscious negotiation by blacks to maintain peace and social harmony while also pushing discretely within the social constrictions of deference and segregation to effect small but important changes in healthcare, education, and other public services. Blacks in


28 Fitzgerald, Different Story, 101, 150-53; Heinemann, History of Virginia, 272-74; Smith, Managing White Supremacy, 32-33.
Fredericksburg, for example, joined with whites in 1915 in establishing a separate ward for black patients in an expanded facility of Mary Washington Hospital.29

White supremacy, segregation, and the creation of the Lost Cause tradition all combined to shape how Americans, North and South, commemorated the Civil War. By the end of Reconstruction, southerners had tired of military rule, in an angry and defiant way, and people in both halves of the country were anxious to move beyond the war and pursue profitable endeavors. Economic hardships nationwide from the 1873 panic, plus the rising tide of immigration, which brought more foreign people with different cultures and languages than the United States had seen previously, challenged many people. Reassurance of times past and the return to the unifying themes of fighting for honor, devotion to worthy causes, sacrifice for those causes, and love of one’s country made the Blue and Gray reunions starting in the 1880s important. Historian David Blight has argued that these commemorative acts brought together two groups and excised a third one. Reconciliationists, wanting to move forward as a unified country, joined hands with white supremacists to remember and honor Civil War veterans while rejecting the promise held out by emancipationists, who supported black citizenship and voting rights as delineated under the 14th and 15th Amendments. This decision, fueled by racial prejudice, meant that the North turned a blind eye to the restricted and dangerous plight of blacks in the South even as northerners instituted their own segregated social systems, delineating where blacks could live and what types of jobs they could hold.30

Commemoration at Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania honored the dead and those who had fought by building cemeteries and placing markers and monuments across the battlefields. Actions at Fredericksburg echoed the events of the nation as northerners and southerners struggled to reunify and move forward even as they largely left blacks behind. Sometimes, those steps forward were halting. Grand Army of the Republic national commander Gen. John Logan officially began Decoration Day, now Memorial Day, when he declared 30 May 1868 as the day to decorate the graves of Union fallen. Blacks from Richmond and Washington, DC, joined those in Fredericksburg to honor the dead that year and in subsequent ones. In 1871, two Decoration Day events signaled the continued racial difficulties. White northern settlers in the area invited the John A. Rawlins post of the GAR out of Washington to lead the Decoration Day services at the newly opened national cemetery in Fredericksburg. White southerners shunned the exercise, but blacks helped organize and participate in the ceremonies, with bands playing and speeches made. Two weeks later, though, blacks held a separate ceremony, one that they had been conducting for the past few years but unannounced to the newly appointed national cemetery superintendent. A scuffle broke out when the superintendent tried to assert his authority to
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30 Blight, Race and Reunion, 206, 209. See also Kevin Boyle, Arc of Justice: A Saga of Race, Civil Rights, and Murder in the Jazz Age (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 2004) for a description of Detroit’s segregated housing and working conditions for blacks in the first half of the twentieth century.
maintain order and decorum in the cemetery. Some onlookers threw stones and someone even drew a pistol as the blacks eventually retreated from the cemetery grounds, but authorities managed to regain control. Blacks returned in 1872, without incident, and in 1874 a white orator spoke to a biracial crowd. By the mid-1880s, though, blacks started commemorating Decoration Day separately, at one of their churches and cemeteries. Whites took over decorating graves at the national cemetery. 31

The GAR’s participation in the 1871 Fredericksburg Decoration Day did not mark early reconciliation and reunification in this Virginia town. Even as the northerners, joined by area blacks, marched and spoke at the ceremony that day, at least one newspaper editor vilified the entire affair, asking

Who are these “heroes” whose graves you invite this community, white and black, unitedly, to “honor?” Are they not some of them, the men who bombarded and destroyed one half of Fredericksburg? who sacked our houses? who profaned and polluted our homes and firesides and most sacred relics of the past?

He went on to repeat the emerging canon of the Lost Cause, saying

Did they not overwhelm us at last by more "brute force of numbers," after the Confederates, man for man, had whipped and destroyed them two to one? All these things are history, and will not be denied by any but the ignorant or the depraved. 32

Members of the GAR most probably felt the icy reception that Decoration Day and did not return until 1884, when the psychological and emotional wounds had had more time to heal. Planners for a Gettysburg 1874 reunion encountered a similar reluctance to have the Blue and Gray join together in reunion. But eventually these gatherings did occur at many different battlefields. The 1884 Fredericksburg gathering epitomized the joining of white supremacists with reconciliationists, as historian Blight has argued. GAR members and Confederate veterans, including Judge John Goolrick (who would speak at many Memorial Day events and the placement of many monuments on area battlefields) read poems and gave speeches that emphasized unity and brotherhood across sectional lines. Confederates made exclusion of blacks from the ceremony a condition for their participation, which the GAR accepted. The editor for the Fredericksburg Star commended this decision, noting that southerners, and probably northerners, too, were gratified to have an all-white ceremony. He encouraged the GAR to return, under the same conditions most likely, laying the foundation for future segregated exercises. 33

Blacks found other ways to exert their presence in commemorative acts even as they were excluded from the official Memorial Day ceremonies at the Fredericksburg national cemetery. Historian W. Fitzhugh Brundage notes that groups exert cultural authority by

32 Editor of the Fredericksburg News, as quoted by Pfanz, Where Valor Proudly Sleeps, 203.
33 Ibid., 205. See also Blight, Race and Reunion, 202-10; and Paul A. Shackel, Memory in Black and White: Race, Commemoration, and the Post-Bellum Landscape (Walnut Creek, CA: Alta Mira Press, 2003), 28-37.
inserting their memories into public spaces, as whites did by taking over remembrance holidays or placing monuments on battlefields. Blacks exerted cultural resistance through their own commemorative acts. They paraded through the streets of Fredericksburg to celebrate Emancipation Day and rang a symbolic Liberty Bell at the homes of prominent white officials until those individuals stepped outside and saluted the celebrants. The lack of financial resources and high illiteracy rates, according to Brundage, meant that blacks did not place permanent Civil War markers honoring the sacrifices of their own soldiers. They also did not have sufficient public power, according to historian Kirk Savage, to gain public consent to place such markers. Blacks chose instead to use pageants, parades, and other public events to celebrate the important people and actions of their past. These ephemeral remembrances lacked the gravitas of marble and granite, but they served black communities by educating young and old, through actions, words, and songs, about the struggles of their past and their efforts to achieve freedom and respect.34

Virginia’s black and white used commemoration and public memory to remember the Civil War and move forward with their lives. These acts of remembrance each contained elements of negotiation and assertions of power. White southerners had to negotiate how to honor their Confederate soldiers and their failed war effort even as they rejoined the United States and agreed to submit to its laws and customs. Southern blacks had to find ways to assert their memories of the Civil War era, and their joy to be free from slavery, without threatening their existence within the segregated and sometimes violent South. Various acts of remembrance, described throughout this chapter, demonstrate that commemoration does not exist in a vacuum of pure memory but instead is a public act to define and shape memories. Public memory itself is a fluid and flexible construct that people and groups shape, according to historian Michael Kammen, to meet their present circumstances and needs. Placing a monument on a battlefield or marching in a parade to celebrate Emancipation Day each represents attempts to extract parts of the past and draw upon that memory to shape the present and future. And, as time proceeds, those monuments or parades may take on different meanings and significance, as historian James Young has argued, to meet new circumstances. Add a national battlefield park to the mixture and the

34 W. Fitzhugh Brundage, The Southern Past: A Clash of Race and Memory (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2005), 6-7, 59-72. See also Shackel, Memory in Black and White, 31-37; and Kirk Savage, “The Politics of Memory: Black Emancipation and the Civil War Monument,” in Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity, ed. John R. Gillis (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994), 135-36. By the time of World War I, there were three known Civil War monuments that included black soldiers, all of them located in the North. Two of them displayed a single black soldier in multifigure combat groups. The third one, by Augustus Saint-Gaudens and Charles McKim in Boston shows white commander Robert Gould Shaw on a horse in front of a procession of black soldiers from the 54th Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, the first all-black regiment to go into battle during the Civil War. Blacks now embrace this monument, once considered celebratory of the white commander, because it is one of only a few works that celebrate the achievements of black soldiers during the war. See Shackel, 113-44 and Savage, 135-36.
layers of meaning and attempts to control that meaning and significance multiply in an array of combinations and possibilities.\textsuperscript{35}

**NATIONAL CEMETERY AND FIRST MONUMENTS**

Properly burying all the dead from the four battles at Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania became the first act of commemoration. The United States Congress, through a series of legislative actions begun as early as September 1861, authorized the establishment of national cemeteries for Federal dead, and then later for all honorably discharged veterans, their spouses, minor children, and for Confederate veterans. The Quartermaster Department first assumed duty for burying the dead, and in July 1862 Congress authorized the President to identify locations, purchase land, and erect enclosures around the cemeteries. The War Department became, immediately following the end of the Civil War, the primary agency for locating the cemeteries and interring the dead. By 1870, the department had buried nearly 300,000 Federal soldiers in 73 national cemeteries around the country. Significantly, at each of these cemeteries, the government buried the dead in identified individualized graves with headstones, as possible, or placed small numbers of unknown dead together in identified graves. Post-Civil War Americans went beyond using a single monument to the war dead, as practiced in the past, to honor those who had fought. The military cemeteries themselves laid out the graves in ordered designs with internal roadways to allow access. These quiet and contemplative settings mimicked what planners had laid out in local cemeteries and parks during the first part of the 19\textsuperscript{th} century. They honored the sacrifices of the soldiers and gave voice to the belief in these men that they had been heroes for fighting for their cause.\textsuperscript{36}

The War Department located Fredericksburg National Cemetery on Willis Hill at the southern end of Marye’s Heights. Local boosters had lobbied for the federal government to choose the grounds of the Agricultural Fair Grounds, where many Federal dead already lay
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buried. Concerns over the low water table prompted the decision to have the cemetery on higher ground on Marye’s Heights, although this location was where the Confederates had established their artillery presence during both Fredericksburg engagements. The government initially condemned eight acres in 1866 on the hill and settled out of court in 1868 for a price of $250 per acre. Another four and a half acres was acquired in 1867 so that the government could prevent erosion on the hill’s eastern slope. The cemetery, on a gently undulating plateau, has an asymmetrical shape rising 100 feet above the plain. Parallel terraces between eight and ten feet tall cut into the hill and have bases about 14 and 17 feet wide. (Figure 1) These terraces encouraged water to erode the sides, and the cemetery first used brick gutters at the base of each terrace to remove excess water. After discovering a natural stream that threatened to undermine the entire terracing system from below, army engineers installed underground sewers to handle drainage problems.³⁷

The look of the cemetery changed in its first decades. Its wood gate, fence, headstones, and lodge for the superintendent were replaced in the 1870s with materials more impervious to the elements. The stone lodge, built in 1871 with three rooms in a single story, grew two years later with a second story and Mansard roof. (Figure 2) The government added in 1905 a kitchen downstairs and a large bathroom upstairs (an indoor toilet came in 1921). When central heat was added in 1929, the government built a cellar to accommodate the coal furnace and 30-gallon hot water tank. The original wood toolhouse and privy were placed in 1881 in a brick maintenance building with a separate entrance for the privy.³⁸

Monuments and markers of various types soon adorned the grounds and commemorated the Civil War beginnings of the national cemetery.³⁹ Early on, four upright Columbiad cannon tubes were placed alongside the flagstaff mound, located at the center of the cemetery. (Figure 3) Four pyramids of cannonballs also marked the mound, though they were probably moved in 1901 to sit next to the Butterfield, or Fifth Corps, monument. Officials moved in 1905 the flagpole to the brow of the hill, its present location, and added two pyramids of cannonballs. Groups or individuals placed three monuments in the cemetery before 1927, when the federal government established the national military park. Gen. Daniel Butterfield, who had commanded the Fifth Corps at Fredericksburg, privately funded a monument to those men. (Figure 4) The Society of the Army of the Potomac, which held its 31st reunion at Fredericksburg in 1900, placed the cornerstone to the monument on the first day of that reunion, and then in 1901, the Federal veterans dedicated the monument. The Doric columned monument topped with a flaming ball stands 38-feet tall in granite. In 1906, the 127th Pennsylvania veterans placed a monument to honor this nine-month regiment that had fought at Fredericksburg. This gray-granite monument has a stepped base and pedimented top with a palm branch and clover leaf. Finally, the Pennsylvania legislature

³⁹ The following description of monuments in the national cemetery focuses upon those not specifically marking graves. There are two private headstones, for Col. Joseph A. Moesch and Sgt. Edward L. Townsend, for Civil War soldiers who died during the war.
appropriated money to have sculptor Herbert Adams design and build a monument to Gen. Andrew A. Humphreys, who commanded eight regiments of the Fifth Corps. This elegantly crafted monument, on a pink granite base with bronze statue of Humphreys holding his hat in one hand and the hilt of his sword in the other, stands in the original location of the flagpole and has become a symbol of the cemetery. (Figure 5)\textsuperscript{40}

The Sedgwick Memorial became the first publically commemorated monument placed on battlefield lands eventually incorporated into the park. (Figure 6) Gen. John Sedgwick died on 9 May 1864 from a sharpshooter’s bullet at the Battle of Spotsylvania Court House. He had been a well-respected and popular commander, and within seven months of his death, officers from the Sixth Corps who had served under him had begun talking about erecting a monument, though not necessarily at the site of his death. Nothing further came from these initial discussions. Renewed efforts began in earnest in 1886 when Union veterans touring the Spotsylvania battlefield found to their dismay that no marker there memorialized Sedgwick’s death. The group acted with determination and speed, and on the 23\textsuperscript{rd} anniversary of the fighting at Bloody Angle, 12 May 1887, a special trainload of 300 guests came out to the battlefield and dedicated the monument. Thousands of local residents attended the ceremony. The nine-foot tall granite monument has a square battenment topped with a square Greek cross (symbol for the Sixth Corps) facing each direction and inscriptions on each face.\textsuperscript{41}

Interest in honoring Confederate Gen. Stonewall Jackson in a manner similar to that of Sedgwick quickly took root. The editor of the Fredericksburg Star had called for such action in February 1887, and he spread the word to solicit support and money through newspapers throughout the south. Further impetus came from a local man, John Lewis, who pleaded with his fellow southerners on the day of the dedication of the Sedgwick Memorial to raise a monument to Jackson. As many as 5,000 people, many of them local residents, attended the 13 June 1888 dedication ceremony for the Jackson Monument. (Figure 7) This monument, composed of gray Virginia granite rough-cut blocks, stands 14 feet on a two-tiered base with a square column and pointed square cap. Jackson’s name is chiseled into the lower base facing the north side of the Orange Plank Road (now Route 3), on a slightly elevated patch of ground near the then-believed site where Jackson received his mortal wound. Another marker, the Jackson Rock, had been placed nearby at some date prior to the Jackson Monument, possibly as early as 1876 or at least around 1880-81. (Figure 8) Stories conflict about who was involved in setting this marker, a white quartz boulder just over three feet tall with no inscription. All sources agree that this boulder honored Jackson and stands

\textsuperscript{40} Pfanz, Where Valor Proudly Sleeps, 135-37, 145-48. Donald C. Pfanz, History through Eyes of Stone: A Survey of Civil War Monuments near Fredericksburg, Virginia (FRSP, September 2006), 61-65, 70-87. One other cemetery marker was placed in 1973 to honor Capt. William W. Parker’s Virginia battery, which had defended Marye’s Heights during Second Fredericksburg. It is the only Confederate marker in the national cemetery, the only marker in the park dedicated to a Virginia military unit, and the only marker memorializing Second Fredericksburg.

\textsuperscript{41} Pfanz, History through Eyes of Stone, 203-10.
50 feet north of the Orange Plank Road. It may be considered the oldest monument in the battlefield park.\textsuperscript{42}

These early monuments either went inside the national cemetery or on land donated or purchased for the sole purpose of accommodating them. In the case of Confederate Brig. Gen. Thomas Cobb, however, the idea of a park developed briefly. An effort began to convince the State of Georgia, whom Cobb served, to buy the Martha Stephens House, near where Cobb had fallen, establish a small park, and erect a monument to Cobb. His family did not want to attract jealousies through a public fundraising campaign and instead placed in 1888 a simple three-foot tall smooth granite shaft at the base of the stone wall along the Sunken Road, at the spot believed to be where he received a mortal wound during the December 1862 Fredericksburg battle. Most battlefield monuments sat on small land parcels, but in one case, a person sought a larger acreage, though there is no indication that he intended to establish a park. Charles E. Phelps, who had commanded the Maryland Seventh regiment during the Battle of Spotsylvania and been wounded and captured during that fighting, returned to Spotsylvania in 1885 and purchased 15.25 acres of land. He intended to install markers for his regiment and the others in the Maryland brigade. He placed the simple two-foot tall gray granite Maryland Brigade marker at the farthest advance point of the Maryland Infantry on 8 May 1864. The exact date of installation of the marker is unknown, with park staff historian Donald Pfanz noting an approximate date of 1903.\textsuperscript{43}

The early steps taken to memorialize the Civil War battles at Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania share some key characteristics. First, people from the North and South used specific places to remember the Civil War battles. Veterans and home supporters placed great meaning on the specific places where fighting occurred or where a person fell in the line of duty. They wanted to commemorate person, action, and place, in combination. They erected monuments as close as possible to the exact location where, for example, Jackson was mortally wounded or where Lee’s men had shouted out to him to go to the back, as in the case of the approximately 1891 Lee-to-the-rear quartz stone at the Widow Tapp farm on the Wilderness battlefield. (Figure 9) The so-called Smith markers, placed by Lt. James Power Smith who formerly served on Jackson’s staff, connect specific places with actions or people associated with the Confederate war effort. These ten markers, made from clear blue Fredericksburg granite and standing two and a half feet high, note the locations of Lee Hill, the Bivouac site of Lee and Jackson during the Battle of Chancellorsville, and where Jackson died at Guinea Station, among other locations. The three Civil War monuments in the national cemetery honor individuals or troops that fought at Fredericksburg, where the cemetery stands, again connecting place with remembrance. Significantly, veterans of neither the South nor the North erected monuments on a town square or other such central location as part of their tribute to the war. One early such attempt, by a group of Federals who had settled in Fredericksburg after the war, failed to see fruition. This group, known as

\textsuperscript{42} Ibid., 120-132.

\textsuperscript{43} Ibid., 57-60, 220-23.
the Soldiers Monument Association, organized before the establishment of the national cemetery. They wanted to ensure the proper burial of Federal dead and envisioned having a tall stone column placed at the proposed burial site below the Sunken Road. The national cemetery canceled the need for the burial effort, but cemetery officials designated a space in the cemetery for the proposed soldier's monument. The monument association, however, never delivered a monument. Park historian Donald Pfanz argues that the association’s leaders wanted to place the monument prominently in town as a constant reminder of the ultimate Union victory. No matter the reason, a soldier’s monument without specific reference to a person, place, or group did not attract enough support for its installation.44

People honoring the Civil War battles and those who fought in them shared another characteristic: they placed their markers close to roads and other transportation routes. Access to key locations meant that visitors and those who had fought or lived through the battles could return. Access also meant that the battlefields might have a life beyond the Civil War and serve as touring sites. The Jackson Monument is specifically placed so his name faces the Orange Plank Road. Each of the five markers placed in 1927 by the Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania chapter of the United Daughters of the Confederacy sit beside roads or at intersections. Their heavy bronze tablets atop white granite block bases mark, for example, the Battle of Salem Church (originally sited in the southwest corner of the Orange Turnpike and Salem Church Road), the Battle of Chancellorsville at the Chancellor House ruins (sited at the intersection of the Orange Turnpike and Ely’s Ford Road), and the Battle of the Wilderness, originally located adjacent to Route 20. The 1898 Meade Pyramid sits along the Richmond, Fredericksburg, and Potomac Railroad line close to where Meade’s division had broken through the Confederate line during the 1862 Battle of Fredericksburg. (Figure 10) Members of the Confederate Memorial Literary Society had asked railroad companies across the state to mark places along their lines of significance to the Civil War. The RF&P’s president agreed if the society would accept the donation of a half-acre parcel from a local resident. The society concurred, thinking that the railroad would erect a sign that riders could read as they passed the historic site. They also expected the sign to commemorate where Jackson’s headquarters had been. Instead, the railroad president had his staff build a 24-foot tall pyramid, made of Virginia granite stones collected along the railroad right-of-way. Its location being much closer to that of Meade’s division than to Jackson’s led with time to its designation as the Meade Pyramid.45

No single person or group led the effort to install these early battlefield monuments, a third common characteristic. Individuals or groups from veteran’s organizations to women’s societies raised awareness and money for specific monuments, as noted above.

44 Ibid., 10-19, 170-73, 287. Pfanz, Where Valor Proudly Rests, 62-69, 143-45. Southerners, starting in the mid-1880s, did place monuments, often of a Civil War soldier, in town squares. This step reflected a change in cultural perception of the war, marking the end of a bereavement period (when people placed monuments in cemeteries) and moving on to a celebration of the Lost Cause and the Confederacy. See Shackel, Memory in Black and White, 37.
45 Pfanz, History through Eyes of Stone, 24-29, 66-69.
Local residents, many of whom had served during the war, contributed their own expertise or interest. Many of these people went on to help establish the national park, though no one served as a sole promoter for the effort. Rufus Merchant, as editor of the Fredericksburg Star, promoted the idea for the Jackson Monument in southern newspapers and also suggested to the Georgia legislature that it establish a small park along the Sunken Road with a monument to Gen. Cobb. Judge John T. Goolrick, and sometimes his relative C. O’Conor Goolrick (who served in the Virginia statehouse as both a delegate and senator and later served as mayor of Fredericksburg), spoke at many of the dedication ceremonies for markers placed during the first three decades of the 20th century. Judge Goolrick is named on the marker as an organizer for the association installing the Mathew Maury birthplace monument. He also tried to spearhead an effort to raise money for a marker for the Martha Stephens house. Vesuvian Chancellor oftentimes served as a guide for groups trying to locate a site for a proposed marker, plus he assisted with choosing the location of the Jackson Monument.46

TWO BATTLEFIELD PARK ASSOCIATIONS

The first effort to set aside battlefield lands for public commemoration started with the Chancellorsville Battlefield Association, incorporated in 1891 by Federal and Confederate veterans. Newspaper man Rufus Merchant served as vice president, and Ves Chancellor was a director. This organization bought up farmland around Chancellorsville and Spotsylvania Court House with the intention of selling shares of stock to individuals. Each share would entitle the owner to a deed in fee for a 25 x 100-foot lot and the right to share in the profits from mineral development, or mining, on the property. These lots, within the restrictions set by the association, could serve owners as homes or places of business and manufacturing. Two companies, according to the association’s prospectus, had already begun sinking shafts and exploring for valuable minerals. This development work, along with the sale of shares, would help to finance the memorial goals of the organization.47

The battlefield association used language associated with tourism and health to appeal to 19th-century Americans, despite the acknowledgment of a manufacturing potential with mining. The association justified its approach for selling shares, as opposed to having state and national governments control the land, so that travelers and old soldiers could have, in tourist language, “some souvenir of this sacred soil.” People could visit these lands, every acre of which was considered “fraught with thrilling interest” thanks to the “deeds of

46 Judge John T. Goolrick spoke at the dedication ceremonies for the Martha Stephens stone (p. 21), the Fifth Corps Monument (73), the Humphreys Monument (84), the 23rd New Jersey Monument (146), Hays Memorial (180), Soldier’s Monument in the Spotsylvania Confederate Cemetery (252). He was supposed to speak at the 1st Massachusetts Heavy Artillery monument dedication, but he experienced transportation difficulties (213); C. O’Conor Goolrick spoke at ceremonies for the UDC markers (25), Maury birthplace marker (152), and MOLLUS (Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States) Monument (231), all page references from Pfanz, History through Eyes of Stone.

daring” performed by so many heroes. These words emphasized action and had an inviting and appealing tone.48 Miles of breastworks, batteries, and rifle pits remained remarkably preserved, needing only some clearing and marking with monuments so that former soldiers and other students of the battles could walk the lines and “study intelligently” the battles. Visitors would be awed by the undulating landscape and its “ever-changing beauty,” attractive to those wanting to see more than the battlefields alone.49 Planners, paying attention to transportation issues, intended to lay out main streets, avenues, and circles to encourage easy and comfortable access.50 Advertisers made clear that visitors could reach the battlefields conveniently, with a roundtrip in one day, by using rail lines and hired guides for the last half mile.51 Association officers purchased substantial acreage around the Chancellor House, which they planned to fit with a war museum filled with relics from the battlefields. Plans also included building a “comfortable hotel” near the Chancellorsville mineral spring, known for its “health-restoring qualities.” Virginia’s climate, according to the prospectus, encouraged “salubrity and healthfulness” in both summer and winter.52

The Chancellorsville Battlefield Association used the words “popular resort” in describing their project to ensure that potential visitors understood the combination of historical, tourism, and healthful attractions promised. They did not see their venture as simply a memorial park meant to preserve the battlefield remains and educate visitors about the fighting that had taken place there. They drew upon a longstanding vocabulary, referring to the perceived healthful benefits of spas and mineral springs, first developed in the early 18th century in Europe and mimicked in late 18th-century and 19th-century America. These trips to soak in the waters to cure or even prevent diseases turned into elaborate visits that with time would be called vacations. Places in the United States, such as Saratoga Springs (NY), Berkeley Springs (VA), and Cape May (NJ) provided respite and comfort as early as the 1820s. With the completion of the transcontinental railroad and conclusion of the Civil War, western cities, such as Colorado Springs (CO) and Monterey (CA), attracted new attention. They hosted travelers wanting healthful recreational outlets set in stunning scenery that promoters often cloaked in European references. Eastern resorts lost some appeal with this new competition. Battlefield association organizers, wanting to maximize the potential of their venture, easily adopted the then-existing language of tourism, with

48 Chancellorsville Battlefield Association, Prospectus, long version, 1.
49 Quotes from Chancellorsville Battlefield Association, Prospectus, short version, no date, 1, File Chancellorsville Battlefield Association, Eric Mink Files, FRSP. See also Jno. Marye to Rufus Merchant, 31 August 1891, File Chancellorsville Battlefield Association, Eric Mink Files, FRSP.
50 Chancellorsville Battlefield Association, Prospectus, long version, 1.
51 Chancellorsville Battlefield Association, To Our Agents, 3 May 1892, 2, File Chancellorsville Battlefield Association, Eric Mink Files, FRSP.
references to health, climate, and resorts. They tried to distinguish themselves with the historical associations.53

This advertising approach ultimately failed. The Chancellorsville property in 1910 reverted back to the heirs of the original owners of the land under court order. The association in 1918 let go the McCoull tract at Spotsylvania Court House. Lack of funds and, by connection, lack of interest, led to the ultimate dissolution of the Chancellorsville Battlefield Association. A new effort took its place.44

The Fredericksburg City Council pursued designation of the nearby battlefields as a national park. On 21 February 1896, it established a committee of council members and citizens to lobby Congress. This committee organized a huge meeting in April of that year to publicize their work and invited congressmen from Virginia and Wisconsin, representing veterans from both sides of the Civil War, to speak. A common theme for the speakers and resolutions passed referred to the unity of North and South, echoing what speakers said at Blue and Gray Reunions. Fredericksburg mayor and chairman of the committee A. P. Rowe, in his opening address, identified the local battles as leading to an “indissoluble union of indestructible States” with “liberty and union now forever one and inseparable.”55 Approved resolutions asked that the Grand Army of the Republic and the United Camp of Confederate Veterans join together in hearty cooperation advocating for this park whose object was to commemorate the valor of both sides. The April 1896 meeting also emphasized the need for immediate action. Both Reps. James A. Walker (R-VA) and John J. Jenkins (R-WI) urged the local residents to pursue national park status vigorously. Walker noted that the battlefields would remain geographically, but details about positions and movements would fade unless action was taken. The resolutions warned that the “effacing finger of time” threatened to sweep away all traces from the fields and memories from the survivors of the battles unless Congress marked and preserved the lands. Rep. William A. Jones (D-VA) made clear that he had heard this idea proposed two years previously from J. Horace Lacy, but without “concerted action” taken by the citizens to push the park forward, nothing had resulted. He hoped this meeting would spur success.56

The meeting did generate positive action. Within two years, the now-named Battlefield Park Commission had produced a brochure to advertise their reasons for the park, had attracted positive attention from both North and South veterans organizations, and had defined their vision for the park. They had also seen related bills presented to the Virginia state legislature and the United States Congress. The brochure, titled “A Few Among Many Reasons” for establishing a national battlefield park, noted that every state had

54 Happel, FRSP Admin History, 28-29.
55 Rowe, as quoted in “Battlefield Park Meeting,” Daily Star [Fredericksburg], 17 April 1896.
56 Resolutions and Jones quoted in Ibid.
had “valiant sons” who had fought and died at the battles in and around Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania County. Pushing the unity theme further, the brochure also told the story of a Union and Confederate soldier who died together, hands clasped, at the Bloody Angle while a second Union soldier fulfilled their dying wishes before joining them in death. What more suitable space, asked the brochure, could there be for raising a monument to patriotism and the “blessings of peace and a re-united nation?”57 This unity theme, of course, referred only to white soldiers from the North and South.

Veterans organizations from the North and South assigned committees to investigate the proposal for the battlefield park. They reported back with enthusiasm for the park. Committee members for the Grand Army of the Republic, after touring the battlefields and talking to planners, expressed their full-fledged support, noting the “unanimity of sentiment” of local residents for the idea and the lack of any speculation or desire for personal profit driving the effort.58 The United Confederate Veterans, after referral to its monument committee, quickly adopted a resolution of support at its July 1896 reunion in Fredericksburg.59 Even the former capitol of the Confederacy, Richmond, used the unity theme as a reason to support the battlefield park. An editorial from January 1900 stated directly that “we might as well open our eyes to the fact—for fact it is—that the United States is now a nation.” All the men who fought on those battlefields, whether from North or South, displayed heroism and all those “buried under the sod are the soldiers of the Nation.”60

Early park promoters, bolstered by this wide-ranging support, developed ideas about how the park would look. The early brochure recommended that the federal government secure the fields where the fighting had occurred and connect them with macadamized roadways. They wanted visitors to “easily and pleasantly” tour the battlefields in one day. They also emphasized the picturesque and interesting locale, a nod to attracting future tourists.61 Further refinements of this vision appear by 1897 when the Grand Army of the Republic reported its support for the park. The battlefield park commission, as described by the GAR, did not want the United States government to buy tens of thousands of acres, as had been done for other national parks. Instead, the commission argued for the purchase of 40 to 50 acres at each battlefield, plus adding the existing lines of breastworks and

57 “A Few Among Many Reasons Why There Should Be Established at and near Fredericksburg, in the State of Virginia, a National Battlefield Park,” no date [1896-1897], quotes on pages 5 and 10, respectively, No file name, Eric Mink Files, FRSP. See Happel, FRSP Admin History, 35, about the date of the brochure.

58 Quote from “National Battlefield Park,” Free Lance, 28 August 1897. See also Grand Army of the Republic, Journal of the Thirtieth National Encampment, 2-4 September 1896, 227, No file name, Eric Mink Files, FRSP.


60 “Our National Park,” Daily Star, 11 January 1900, quoting an editorial from the Richmond Times of the same date.

fortifications. The parcels would then be connected with roads, county roads if possible, for easy access. The commission wanted the earthworks restored as much as possible, and the lines preserved intact. Initially, 2,500 acres seemed sufficient for the park for the acreage, breastworks, and possibility of park roads, but as the battlefield park commission began drawing maps and tallying acreage, the number grew to 6,500 acres. Planners designated for inclusion in the Chancellorsville area the house, Fairview, Hazel Grove, and sites associated with Lee and Jackson’s last meeting, Lee’s headquarters, and the Jackson monument. Wilderness included north of the Orange Turnpike where Lt. Gen. Richard S. Ewell had fought the Federals, between the turnpike and Orange Plank Road where Wadsworth had fought and died, and the area south of the Plank Road where Maj. Gen. Winfield S. Hancock and Lt. Gen. A. P. Hill had fought, Longstreet had been wounded, and Longstreet had ordered the attack on Hancock. Spotsylvania Court House included the Bloody Angle and the oak tree that had been shot down while the Fredericksburg part of the proposed battlefield park included the Sunken Road, Stone Wall, Marye’s Heights, and the land over which the Federals had charged. Planners also identified Hamilton’s Crossing and the area where Meade’s troops almost broke through the Confederate line. The Salem Church area had the places where Sedgwick attacked the Confederates. The Stafford side included the pontoon crossing sites and Lacy House, or Chatham.62

Legislative action at the state and federal levels started in 1898. The Virginia state legislature adopted in February of that year a resolution which the governor signed incorporating the Fredericksburg and Adjacent National Battlefields Memorial Park Association of Virginia. This law contained three important features: the right of condemnation, the exclusion of members of the commission from any monetary interest, and the exemption of park lands from state or local taxation.63 These features would reassure any doubters that the park idea was driven by speculation or that the state had any reservations about the idea of a battlefield park honoring both southerners and northerners. Most initial members of the association had been veterans, representing both sides of the war and from a range of geographic areas, though Virginians, and in particular those from the Fredericksburg area, certainly held a prominent number of positions. The state authorized the association to mark and preserve the battlefields with memorial stones, tablets, or monuments to commemorate the “valor displayed by the American soldier.” The association had the right to buy or acquire land and construct roads.64

The Virginia act also charged the association with taking whatever steps necessary to “induce the congress of the United States to do all the necessary work appertaining thereto.”65

---

64 Happel, FRSP Admin History, 31, 33. Quotes Virginia state law regarding the association on p. 33.
65 Ibid., 33.
commemorated with a national battlefield park. They saw the 1890 establishment of Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park as an example to follow.66 Chickamauga and Chattanooga was meant to be a western Gettysburg, with the battle lines of both sides marked and roads placed to ensure access to all sites (Gettysburg initially only marked the Federal troop positions). Chickamauga-Chattanooga would educate visitors and military professionals about the impressive military tactics used and the great natural difficulties the armies faced from the geographical surroundings. Its legislation gave existing owners the ability to remain on their land, so long as they preserved the historical buildings and roads, plus maintained the historical look of the forests and fields.67

Advocates for Fredericksburg adopted these key points from the Chickamauga-Chattanooga act in the first bills entered for their cause. Sen. William J. Sewell (R-NJ), who had assumed command of a brigade at Chancellorsville, and Rep. Amos J. Cummings (D-NY), a sergeant major for the 26th New Jersey regiment in the Army of the Potomac, each submitted in 1898 the first bills to establish the Fredericksburg and Adjacent Battlefields Memorial Park. These identical bills set aside lands in each of the four battlefields to preserve and suitably mark for “historical and professional military study” the lands where, declared the late Federal general John C. Newton, more great battles had been fought, “more men engaged, and more execution done than on any other spot of similar area in the world.” This language justified the need for the park and expressed the importance of saving these lands. The bills gave the option, as with the Chickamauga-Chattanooga act, for landowners to remain if they preserved the historical landscape, buildings, and breastworks, plus assisted in the care of any markers placed on their lands. A commission of three, composed of those who had fought at one or more of the Fredericksburg area battles, would work under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of War (this commission is another similarity with the Chickamauga-Chattanooga act). Commissioners would handle the park’s affairs, including opening and improving roads and marking the lines of all the troops who had fought on the battlefields. The Secretary had the authority to make regulations for park upkeep and condemn land for acquisition. Any persons found guilty of willful destruction of park property, including monuments and markers, could be fined with half that amount going directly to the park, the other half to the informer.68

The Senate Committee on Military Affairs ordered printed a copy of the Grand Army of the Republic’s report on the park proposal. This document emphasized the unified support for the park, across sectional lines, and the “patriotism and national pride”

---

expressed for adoption of the legislation. It also compared favorably the Fredericksburg bill, in terms of acreage identified for acquisition, with the Chickamauga-Chattanooga act. The GAR urged park establishment as an example of “grand national cooperation” in “preserving to posterity the proud heritage” of the United States. The Senate Committee, by reproducing this report as an official document of the legislation, thereby expressed its support for enactment. But, no further action followed, and the first bills died.69

PARK LEGISLATION

Through 1919, members of Congress submitted nearly successive bills for a battlefield park at Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania. But passage stalled. Fredericksburg park backers had many competitors lobbying for other military parks (as many as 14 bills for military parks in 1902), and the War Department and Congress quickly recognized that they needed some policy or method to address all of these park proposals. Plus, by 1899, five national military parks, Chickamauga-Chattanooga (1890), Antietam (1890), Shiloh (1894), Gettysburg (1895), and Vicksburg (1899), existed. Congress surmised that each park, and each park commission appointed to acquire lands and develop roads, added up to extensive sums of money to finance and maintain these park lands. Secretary of War Daniel S. Lamont (under President Grover Cleveland) rein in some spending by ordering the Shiloh commission to use roads in existence at the time of the Civil War battle and not develop new ones simply to provide access to troop positions. This approach also remained sensitive to the historical landscape. Secretary of War Elihu Root (under Presidents William McKinley and Theodore Roosevelt) streamlined the multiple park commissions by cutting several lower level positions.70

Some members of Congress expressed concern about the proliferation of park proposals. The House Committee on Military Affairs reported positively in 1902 for a military park around Fredericksburg, but a minority on the committee (all Republicans representing Northern states) judged otherwise. They argued that with 14 bills before Congress that year for military parks, with aggregate appropriations necessitating at least $1.8 million dollars for land acquisition alone, it was “not thought fair” that Congress consider each park singly. The minority believed that the entire national park system (the National Park Service itself was not established until 1916 but some national parks, such as Yellowstone and Yosemite, did exist by 1902) should come under review. Congress should look at points of historical interest, natural beauty, and other features to determine a “plan that should harmonize and complete a system of national military parks.” A “single system of control” would end the “haphazard plan of separate commissions,” another point of concern

69 Fredericksburg and Adjacent Battlefield Memorial Park of Virginia, S. Doc. 261, 55th Cong., 2d. sess., 10 May 1898, 1, 4, 5. Quotes on pp. 4-5.

70 Congress members did not submit bills for a Fredericksburg military park in 1904-1907 and 1918. See Edmund B. Rogers, ed., History of Legislation Relating to the National Park Service through the 82d Congress, (NPS, 1958), 2-10, Superintendent’s Office, FRSP. Smith, Golden Age, 38-39, 43-44.
for this minority group and Secretaries of War who in 1902 kept adding up the dollars these separate park commissions spent.  

The minority then turned their criticism to the Fredericksburg park proposal itself, exposing issues that ultimately would plague the established military park. They argued the practical aspects of the proposal, noting that the park would be composed of “six patches of land, isolated portions of the battlefields,” each separated from the other by four to ten miles. Visitors would have to drive 42 miles on a circuit drive to see all of the park lands. “Such parcels do not constitute a park,” the minority group proclaimed. In the end, they warned, more land would be requested, requiring further expenses. Land prices were low, and the minority suggested that instead of obtaining small parcels, the federal government purchase enough land at relatively small cost for one of the military campgrounds proposed by the Secretary of War. Otherwise, they argued that purchasing a small fraction of what ultimately may be included in the park was “a most useless expenditure of public money.” They did not describe where within Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania such a military camp might go, but clearly they had in mind a utilitarian space for the United States military to practice maneuvers as opposed to land set aside for preservation and commemoration purposes. The minority ended their report by emphasizing the need for a “properly organized and orderly system of parks” without making decisions on one park in exclusion of all other proposals.

This minority view signaled an end to congressional review of a Fredericksburg military park until the mid-1920s. Congress, in the meantime, grappled with an overall approach to battlefield preservation, and Antietam served as a possible model. Lamont and others in the War Department prior to the turn of the 20th century had suggested such an idea. A House Committee on Military Affairs hearing in 1902 convincingly brought the Antietam Plan forward as a guiding influence for future park legislation. But what was the Antietam Plan? Rep. Louis McComas (R-MD) had pursued in 1890 designation of the Antietam battlefield as a military park. He submitted a bill for this purpose, but he did not generate interest, so he inserted language into a House sundry civil appropriations bill to survey, mark, and purchase sites for placing tablets on lands associated with both the Federal and Confederate troop positions at Antietam. This section survived through congressional debates and conference reports. President Benjamin Harrison signed the appropriations bill in August 1890, effectively establishing an Antietam National Battlefield Park. McComas tried to expand upon the park’s enabling legislation, and the House Committee on Military Affairs, agreed, reporting in 1891 on McComas’ follow-up bill that Antietam should follow the general plans of Gettysburg and Chickamauga-Chattanooga. This bill died without further action, and McComas lost his bid for re-election (he became a US Senator in 1899). House action instead reverted to annual appropriations to sustain the initial legislation.

---

71 The three Representatives expressing dissension from the committee majority are Richard W. Parker (R-NJ), J. H. Ketcham (R-NY), and F. C. Stevens (R-MN). House Committee on Military Affairs, Fredericksburg and Adjacent National Battlefields Memorial Park: Report and Views of the Minority, 57th Cong., 1st sess., 6 March 1902, H. Rep. 771, I, 8. Quotes from p. 8.

72 Ibid., 10.
Antietam, by default and without specific debate about the shape and consequences of its legislation, attained park status but at a decidedly lower status than the other military parks established in the 1890s. When the first spurt of land acquisition and marker placement ended in 1897, Antietam contained strips of land and a road system to take visitors through the battlefield and view the more than 400 markers, plus additional monuments, identifying troop positions. The 1898 report to Congress does not include exact land acreages acquired, but the report does state that the appointed board spent less than $3,400 on land. Other sources indicate that the government expected to pay between $50 and $100 per acre, suggesting that Antietam consisted of only about 34 to 68 acres when the government completed the park establishment phase. This amount contrasted dramatically with Chickamauga-Chattanooga’s almost 6,000 acres acquired within its first three years of existence.\textsuperscript{73}

Serious consideration of the Antietam approach to military park design came before the House Committee on Military Affairs in April 1902 when Brig. Gen. George B. Davis presented testimony. Davis argued that Congress was entirely correct in establishing the large military park in the West at Chickamauga and Chattanooga and a separate large park in the East at Gettysburg. These parks served the country well, in Davis’ opinion, for historical purposes and for providing encampment and maneuver space for military officers and their troops. He did not believe that the country needed any further military parks encompassing large areas. He worried that such parks would lose appropriations and interest after the original veterans passed away, making them attractions for tramps. Or, he conjectured, landscape designers might take over and turn them into Central Park-type parklands, effacing the military lines and earthworks. Davis instead argued that the other battlefields should remain as they had been in the 1860s, as farm lands. He stated that Congress “should undertake to perpetuate an agricultural community…furnishing subsistence to its owners.” Congress should only purchase narrow lanes, Davis said, fence them, and place monuments and markers along those lanes. Davis noted that the area around Antietam, as an example, would “never become valuable for manufacturing purposes” and it would probably continue for “several centuries to be an agricultural community.”\textsuperscript{74}

The Antietam Plan offered at the start of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century a viable alternative to large, costly military parks. Davis and others believed that the battlefields would remain agricultural, and the best way to preserve those farmlands, in their minds, was to let the farmers continue working the lands. They did not foretell the explosive use of automobiles and the building of roads to support their expanded use. The beginnings of concrete road building seemed a help to their preservation efforts because these new roads gave easy access to the military parks. They also did not recognize the beginnings of the second industrial


\textsuperscript{74} House Subcommittee on Parks of the Committee on Military Affairs, \textit{Establishment of Military Parks}, 57\textsuperscript{th} Cong., 1\textsuperscript{st} sess., April 1902, 1-2. Quotes on p. 2. See also Smith, \textit{Golden Age}, 42-46.
revolution, with its technological, social, and cultural developments. The combination of events and changes would make the Antietam Plan less effective as a preservation tool as the 20th century unwound.

The Fredericksburg military park and other similar proposals remained visions of their supporters but not actual federal parks. Continued worries about finances played a role. Congress also debated the value of establishing a single battlefield park commission to oversee all parks, as opposed to having separate commissions for each park, acting on their own with supervision from the Secretary of War. Other forces also influenced new park establishment. Civil War military parks, both those already created and those in-waiting, saw interest in them and their influence diminish as the nation plunged into the 20th century. More and more Civil War veterans died, and the parks thus lost their most vocal proponents. The United States entered the global stage militarily with the 1898 Spanish-American War, which resulted in American colonial expansion into Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Philippines. More military involvement in Latin America during the so-called Banana Wars and then the Great War (World War I) meant that Congress and the War Department spent less and less time worrying about the establishment and administration of military parks. The Secretary of War put the Quartermaster General in charge of the parks in the 1920s, signaling their reduced visibility.  

Attention on Fredericksburg after the Great War helped bring Congress back to the task of determining the battlefield park’s fate. More than four thousand Marines from the Quantico base marched in September 1921 to Fredericksburg and then the Wilderness area to undertake a huge maneuver. The military undertook such annual events, in places like Gettysburg in 1922, to improve readiness. Although the Wilderness military exercise focused upon modern tactics and technology, including practice night bombings from aircraft, publicity naturally drew upon the location’s Civil War heritage. President Warren G. Harding, joined by the Secretaries of Navy and Agriculture, witnessed the third day of the exercise (an attack on an imaginary battleship in the middle of the farmland). Civil War veterans in their faded uniforms greeted him. Harding spent the night in a five-room tented White House and joined in Sunday religious services and speeches.  

No further bills or other action included the Fredericksburg park until 1924 when Rep. Schuyler O. Bland (D-VA) and Sen. Claude Swanson (D-VA) introduced bills using a new tactic, to inspect the battlefields around Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania. These bills would eventually usher in success for the long awaited military park. The relatively simple and straightforward language of these bills set in motion the ultimate shape of the military park. H.R. 5567 and S. 3263 provided for a commission, composed of one commissioned officer from the Army Corps of Engineers, a Confederate veteran, and a Federal veteran, to

75 Smith, Golden Age, 47-49.
inspect the battlefields around Fredericksburg to determine the feasibility of “preserving and marking for historical and professional military study” the fields.\textsuperscript{77}

Both House and Senate Committees on Military Affairs reported favorably (the Senate issued a copy of the House report for its own), arguing that “thousands of tourists pass these spots yearly” and that the “lessons of valor, of patriotism, and of military strategy” warrant park establishment. Action was needed now because the “old breastworks are being destroyed daily” and will disappear unless Congress acted expeditiously.\textsuperscript{78} Secretary of War John W. Weeks (under President Calvin Coolidge) did not object to the bill for inspection of the battlefields, though he did not support any further military parks until Congress had developed a plan of national scope for assessing those battlefields worthy of such distinction. The Army War College began this process in 1925 by reviewing past legislative actions on military parks and setting forth a proposed comprehensive classification system of battlefields. The Secretary of War approved this scheme for rating proposed preservation steps of battlefields based on the relative importance of the historic military action. Congress eventually followed through in 1926 and tasked the War Department with completing a full-fledged survey and classification method for the federal government to use in making decisions about new parks. This classification scheme, still in preliminary form when the Fredericksburg inspection bill went before Congress, may have eased concerns about action at Fredericksburg. A few other future parks, including Chalmette and Yorktown, had also been given the go-ahead for inspection surveys. Congress in the post-Great War days seemed amenable to park-making. Congress passed, and President Coolidge signed the Fredericksburg inspection bill in June 1924.\textsuperscript{79}

The act’s language of “preserving and marking” the battlefields shaped the commission’s report to Congress and the final park enabling legislation. The three commissioners (Maj. Gen. John Clem, Vivian M. Fleming, and Maj. J. A. O’Connor) noted in their report that in considering how to mark and preserve the Fredericksburg battlefields, they also had to compare these battlefields with other Civil War ones. Using the Army War College’s 1925 preliminary classification scheme, the Fredericksburg inspection commission called Gettysburg, Vicksburg, and Chickamauga-Chattanooga Class I battlefields. These battlefields, as preserved by Congress, were marked to preserve battle lines and set aside as

\textsuperscript{77} Report on Inspection of Battle Fields in and around Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania Court House, Virginia, 1 December 1925, 2. No file name, FRSP Superintendent’s Files. The quotes come from the original act, as reproduced in the report, p. 2. Both House and Senate reports also include this language: House Committee on Military Affairs, \textit{Inspection of the Battle Fields in and around Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania Courthouse, Va.}, 68\textsuperscript{th} Cong., 1\textsuperscript{st} sess., 2 May 1924, H. Rep. 634, 1; and Senate Committee on Military Affairs, \textit{Inspection of the Battle Fields in and around Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania Courthouse, Va.}, 68\textsuperscript{th} Cong., 1\textsuperscript{st} sess., 14 May 1924, S. Rep. 555, 1.

\textsuperscript{78} House Committee on Military Affairs, \textit{Inspection of the Battle Fields}, 68\textsuperscript{th} Cong., 1\textsuperscript{st} sess., 2 May 1924, H. Rep. 634, 2; and Senate Committee on Military Affairs, \textit{Inspection of the Battle Fields}, 68\textsuperscript{th} Cong., 1\textsuperscript{st} sess., 14 May 1924, S. Rep. 555, 2.

memorials to the armies who had fought there. This dual purpose for these Class I battlefields justified large acreages to create a memorial setting, which the commissioners labeled the Gettysburg system. Class II battlefields, according to the Fredericksburg commission, were second in importance only to the Class I set and included Antietam and all of the Fredericksburg-Spotsylvania battlefields. Congress had already set aside Antietam, not along the memorial system, but rather in the more modest fashion of preserving narrow lines and placing tablets to mark troop positions. The commissioners emphasized that since Congress did not include language in the inspection act for a memorial feature in the Fredericksburg area battlefields, they believed that marking and preserving the lines in a manner similar to the Antietam example was sufficient. They also argued that since the Army of the Potomac and the Army of Northern Virginia already had a park memorializing them in Gettysburg, another one at Fredericksburg-Spotsylvania was unnecessary.\(^80\)

The commissioners laid out how following the Antietam plan would apply to the crossroads area of Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania. They estimated that the entire proposed park would encompass 535 acres. The government should not acquire land at Chancellorsville (nor at Salem Church) because there were “very few recognizable trench locations,” and of those visible, they were not at the most strategic areas. The commissioners stated that markers could be placed along public roads within sufficient vicinity of key points. They also noted that “any development that will prevent access to the battle lines is unlikely” and thus land acquisition was unnecessary at Chancellorsville. Spotsylvania Court House had the most land, 275 acres, recommended for acquisition at a single battlefield. The inspection report recommended enough land to make the battlefield “reasonably accessible” and permitted preservation of the trenches and landmarks. At Wilderness, the commissioners proposed acquiring 150 acres, including large areas where trenches ran representing the Federal Warren versus the Confederate Hill, even though this acquisition “may be considered a memorial feature.” However, the commissioners did not think acquisition would extend beyond strips more than 200 feet wide, again indicating an Antietam design more than a Gettysburg memorial plan. Commissioners identified 110 acres for acquisition around the Fredericksburg battlefield, including the Sunken Road and stone wall. They recommended building a road along Confederate positions between Lee Hill and Hamilton’s Crossing, preserving entrenchments along the roadside. The proposed plan would have roads built in battlefields where no public roads provided sufficient visitor access to key areas. A total of 20 miles of roads would meet this need for all the battlefields, according to the report. Tablets and markers, surveys, studies, and contingency planning, in addition to the land and roads, would make the total cost for a Fredericksburg and area military park under $500,000, with an estimated annual maintenance fee of about $25,000.\(^81\)


Perhaps because the commission report recommended such a reduced acreage to original proposals for the military park, which in the late 19\textsuperscript{th} and early 20\textsuperscript{th} centuries had considered acquiring 6,000 acres, the House Committee on Military Affairs displayed a unanimous sentiment of support when debating the 1926 bill submitted by Rep. Schuyler O. Bland. Rep. Harry M. Wurzbach (R-TX) posed the most questions, and these focused upon how best to word the bill to allow for a total appropriation of $470,000, while allowing for the Secretary of War to obtain funding on an immediate basis for land acquisition. No one questioned the validity of having the park when so many other park proposals required action. The fact that Congress was working on a bill to have the Secretary of War study and classify all battlefields to aid in preservation efforts probably eased the pressure on Fredericksburg.\footnote{House Committee on Military Affairs, \textit{National Military Park near Fredericksburg, Va.: Hearings on H.R. 6756}, 69\textsuperscript{th} Cong., 1\textsuperscript{st} sess., 8 February 1926, 10-11.}

A range of witnesses, all from Fredericksburg, spoke at the 8 February 1926 House Committee hearing and emphasized the same ideas for park establishment that had been used since the 1890s. Dr. S. L. Scott argued the need to “commemorate the deeds of valor of the people, both North and South.” Scott also reminded the congressional members that men from every state had fought and died on the Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania battlefields, and it was time for the federal government to give back to Virginia “some visible, tangible thing that we may show the world.” Capt. G. M. Harrison stated that preservation would help people “learn a military lesson” from the battlefields.\footnote{Ibid., 14-16. Quotes, in order, pp. 14-15.}

Rep. Bland laid out the key reasons for the battlefield park. Here was the “cockpit of the Civil War,” where battles were fought over and over on the same land. More than 700,000 soldiers had engaged in the four battles, and more armies maneuvered here and fought than on any other similar area in the United States. This land also had been the land of George Washington and many other Revolutionary War American patriots, adding to the historic nature of the area. A popular highway, United States Route 1, stretching from Maine to Florida and passing through Fredericksburg promised easy access for countless visitors. The people of Fredericksburg were “all behind the project,” and some expected to donate their historic lands to the military park. But, “there is development going on all over our country,” Bland warned, and many Civil War veterans, and their memories of these battles, were passing quickly. The government needed to act now. He argued that here the young and old could learn about the valor of the men who had “struggled and died for great principles and who were willing to die for their convictions.” By visiting this military park, Bland believed that Americans would become “better citizens and men more devoted to their country and its valor and glorious memories and traditions.”\footnote{Ibid., 4-10. Quotes, in order, pp. 4, 6, 6, 10, 10.}
His fellow members of Congress agreed, and on 14 February 1927, President Coolidge signed the bill into law.85 This act had many similarities with the original bill presented to Congress in 1898. Both bills gave supervisory duties and the power to make regulations to the Secretary of War, and commission members would survey and mark troop lines, construct and maintain roads, and place markers or other features to help visitors understand the battles. The three-person commission, under the final act, would consist of Army officers, civilians, or both. Given the year of the law, it could not require that a Federal and Confederate veteran serve as commissioners, as the 1898 bill had stipulated. Both bills also allowed for present owners to cultivate their holdings so long as they preserved the existing earthworks and agreed to help care for tablets and other markers. Right of condemnation remained from the 1898 bill, plus the section giving the government the right to prosecute and obtain fines from any persons who willfully destroyed or damaged park property without prior consent of the Secretary of War.

Two major differences with the 1898 bill deserve attention. First, Congress appropriated $50,000 to the Secretary of War to start the survey and land acquisition work, and “such additional sums” (Section 11) as necessary to complete the work. The 1898 bill never mentioned appropriations, and the fact that the Fredericksburg act did not place limits on appropriations gave the park commissioners flexibility to proceed. That flexibility is also apparent in the first section of the 1927 act. Congress made clear that the battlefield park would use the 1925 inspection report, and its Antietam plan, as the guide for designing the park. But it also gave the Secretary of War important wiggle room, stating that the Secretary should acquire lands as delineated by the inspection report, “or so much thereof as he may deem necessary . . . whether shown on said index map sheet [that had accompanied the 1925 report] or not, and together also with such additional land” (Section 1) as deemed necessary for placing markers, roads, highways, or other general purposes of the act. This act did not delineate specific lands, as the 1898 bill had done, nor did it limit acreage to the 500-plus acres recommended by the inspection team. This crucial flexibility would serve the early park administrators and planners well. But, the call to use the overall model of the Antietam plan for Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania County Battle Fields Memorial National Military Park, as officially named in the 1927 act, would ultimately prove a hindrance as encroachment problems plagued the park.

**WAR DEPARTMENT**

The War Department led the first push to acquire land, build roads, and mark the four battlefields until the National Park Service obtained authority under an executive order in 1933. The bulk of this work fell to the appointed regular army officer, which changed hands three times in the five years of War Department authority. This army officer served with two other appointees on the Commission to direct the park’s development. The War
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Department appointed the first army officer, Capt. George Hobson, in January 1928, right after the park received its first appropriation. Hobson would eventually be relieved by Col. Tenney Ross in 1929, and Maj. (later Lt. Col.) Arthur Wilbourn in 1930. The first Commission, made up of Hobson, Vivian Fleming (who had served as a Confederate artilleryman in December 1862 at Fredericksburg and later settled in the town), and Maj. Gen. John Clem (who had been the famous 12-year old drummer boy of Shiloh who had killed a Confederate colonel during that battle) met for the first time in late January 1928. The group readily agreed that the park should hold a dedicatory ceremony as the first significant order of business.86

Speakers at that dedication ceremony on 19 October 1928 used language associated with the Blue and Gray reunions, including the Lost Cause tradition, to celebrate the park’s establishment. This language connected the battlefield park to continuing efforts to move beyond the war, connect the two halves of the country in brotherly union, and move the nation into a positive future. As had been done with Civil War reunions of the 1890s, the park dedication ceremony emphasized reconciliation and reunion along with an underlying emphasis upon white supremacy, even though this 1928 ceremony came nearly 40 years after the first reunions. President Calvin Coolidge focused upon unity between North and South and the prosperity resulting from that unity. Through the “most terrible and appalling sacrifice” of two contending armies, Coolidge declared, “the deeds of immortal valor” from both sides helped forge a “common country [that] has been greatly blessed.” Those blessings, arrived at from a “common progress which has accrued to the whole Nation,” helped the United States succeed in 1898 in the Spanish-American War, contribute in a positive way to the World War, and make it possible for the nation to expand its highway system and air travel while maintaining a strong financial foundation.87 He closed by reiterating that the nation rested on progress, prosperity, and peace. “Our country,” Coolidge said, is “still loyal to the faith of the past, still inspired by the hope of the future.”88

Judge Edgar J. Rich, a Bostonian who after the war embraced the South’s Lost Cause tradition, made the presentation address for a plaque on a rough boulder standing at the northern entrance of Lee Drive. This Coolidge Memorial marked the dedication of the battlefield park. (Figure 11) Rich followed in the tradition of James Ford Rhodes and Charles Francis Adams II, both northerners who studied and wrote about the Civil War at the turn of the twentieth century from a decidedly southern perspective.89 Rich expounded upon the “unsurpassed military skill of the Southern generals,” focusing in particular upon “that noblest of the earth’s great” Lee who as a “mighty warrior” committed “mighty deeds” and made the Army of Northern Virginia “the greatest army that ever went into battle.” Rich

86 Happel, FRSP Admin History, 45-50.
87 Ibid., 51. Most of Coolidge’s speech is also reproduced in “American Prosperity Unequaled in History, Coolidge Declares,” Reading [PA] Eagle, 19 October 1928.
88 “American Prosperity Unequaled,” Reading Eagle, 19 October 1928.
89 Blight, Race and Reunion, 354-61.
emphasized that despite his military victories, Lee laid down his “terrible sword” at Appomattox and preached a “message of peace, understanding, and love.” The battlefield park would allow northerners to understand and appreciate the South’s “intense love of independence.” But, Rich did allow that southerners should also gain a fuller knowledge of the North than they might already have, and he described Abraham Lincoln, who Rich said never “utter[ed] a single unkind word about the South” and considered southerners his fellow countrymen. Rich also argued that Lincoln was the South’s “best and most powerful friend,” his life cut short at the critical time of Reconstruction when the United States debated how to incorporate the southern states back into the nation. Rich alludes that this hated period, from the South’s perspective, may have gone more smoothly if Lincoln had lived.  

This Lost Cause-inspired speech emphasized southern glory and said not a word about the South’s black populations and their love of newfound independence. Newspaper accounts do not provide any clues about the size or composition of the audience at the dedication, but blacks did not figure in the presentations or speeches. President Coolidge made only a passing reference to “the question of universal freedom” as a cause of the Civil War. No other recorded remarks indicate slavery as a cause for the war, and the dedication plaque refers only to the more than 100,000 men who fell in battle at the four battlefields, not the slaves freed by the war. Rich closed his part of the ceremony by stating that they all joined that day to consecrate the battlefields, in the spirit of Lee and Lincoln, to promote understanding and “an abundant increase in brotherly love.”

The real work of making the park began. Commission secretaries Ross and then Wilbourn, both of whom lived in Fredericksburg (the first secretary, Hobson, had stayed in Washington) and led the most visible aspects of the War Department effort, used the research and military strategy skills of the newly formed Army War College in Carlisle, PA, to determine troop positions. The 1925 battlefield park report, which had served as the basis for the park’s enabling legislation, had provided a map recommending which trenches and gun placements to acquire versus mark. Further investigation, though, made clear that the landscape and trench remains differed from what that map presented. Many trenches and battle lines, not included on the 1925 map, were in excellent states of preservation and had historic interest, necessitating surveying all trenches in the vicinity to ensure that no important ones were left outside the park. Plus, the park planners could not state definitively in markers what action had occurred where without further research. Once the Army War College’s Historical Research division completed this research, the park planners could verify the troop position maps with the actual landscape and begin determining which lands the park should acquire. They developed reports recommending which specific lands the
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90 Address of Edgar J. Rich, 19 October 1928, 5-11, File 871 Fredericksburg Commission, Box 2487, RG 79 NPS Central Classified Files 1933-1949, NARA-Archives II. Quotes, in order, pp. 6, 6, 7, 9, 8, 8, 9, 10, 10. See also Happel, FRSP Admin History, 51-54.

91 Coolidge, as quoted in Happel, FRSP Admin History, 51; Rich address, 19 October 1928, 11.

92 Both men also worked on developing the Petersburg national military park.
government should acquire, and the War Department reviewed and approved these plans. Wilbourn, a Virginia native who had graduated from Virginia Military Institute and West Point, and had special historical training, especially took the effort to conduct research and tramp the fields to ensure the accuracy of the maps and reports. Planners also had to lay out park road locations, adding to the land acquisition total. These roads would go close to the trench remains and make it possible for visitors to tour each battlefield with relative ease.93

Lands identified for acquisition largely followed the guidelines of the enabling legislation, with the exception of Chancellorsville. As early as July 1929, the battlefield park commission reported that it did not agree with the 1925 battlefield park report’s recommendation that markers along public roadways at Chancellorsville and Salem Church would sufficiently inform visitors about that 1863 battle. The commissioners argued that military students and others would want to “stand upon the actual site” and not rely upon signs pointing a thousand yards one way or the other. They noted that property owners would also object to people trespassing in those areas. The best approach was acquisition and building of roads as had been proposed in the other battlefields. The War Department agreed, and park planners surveyed and started land acquisition negotiations within the year. This action indicated that the War Department allowed for expanding the park’s acreage beyond the initial estimates of the 1925 report and its reliance upon the Antietam Plan.94

A counter example, though, illustrates the War Department’s continued attempts to try to stay within the limited land acquisition strategy as intended by the park’s enabling legislation. Hugh Willis owned 1,500 acres between the Orange Turnpike and Orange Plank Road, right in the middle of the Wilderness battlefield. In spring 1929, a fire started on a portion of this land and burned about $5,000 worth of timber, according to Willis. He argued that War Department surveyors, out on his land, had started the fire, and he wanted reimbursement for his lost timber. The War Department stated after an investigation that the surveyors had been one mile west from where the fire had started at the time it began, and thus they could not be held responsible. Willis, who was a law professor at Indiana University, turned to his Indiana members of Congress for action. In addition to the fire
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94 Quote from Fleming, Progress Report, 30 July 1929, 10. See also Tenney Ross to Howard L. Landers, 6 November 1929, File Colonel Ross, Cabinet 6, Drawer 1, FRSP Basement Files. Jonathon Clem to Quartermaster General, War Department, 7 April 1930, with attached concurrence by Quartermaster General, 13 June 1930, 5, File FRSP, Box 29, Entry 5, War Department Records, RG 79, NARA-Archives II.
damage, Willis argued that the taking of two narrow strips running diagonally across his land, where Federal and Confederate trenches remained, would “cut my land up into such irregular shapes as to make each of them undesirable.” Senator James E. Watson (R-IN) submitted in 1930 first one bill to reimburse Willis for the timber loss and then another bill to have the federal government buy Willis’ entire farm for the battlefield park. The War Department responded that approval of the latter bill would “result in a complete change” in the legislative direction for the park, forcing the park to accept many more acres than the enabling act allowed. The Secretary of War stated that including lands where troops advanced or retired “would add nothing of historical value” and would unnecessarily increase land acquisition and maintenance costs. The Secretary also feared that approval of this bill would open the door to similar bills since many local landowners had lands where troops crossed. The Secretary closed by declaring without hesitation that the Antietam plan as applied to Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania “is the most practicable and economical, and no change” should be contemplated.

The bills did not pass Congress, and the War Department proceeded with negotiations with Willis to obtain the trench lines. Willis continued to resist, arguing that the 96 acres identified for the park cut his land up in a way he did not want. He also fumed over the idea of the government building park roads to allow visitors access to the trenches. He would welcome roads if he could use them for heavy farm hauling, but such would not be allowed. He preferred to sell all of his land at a reasonable price, but since the government rejected that idea, he stuck to a price for the trench lines that would in part compensate him for the damage to the rest of his farm. Negotiations stalled, with Willis writing to one of his US Senators that the War Department had tried to “bulldoze me” into selling at their preferred price. The government requested and received condemnation authority, obtaining title in May 1932 at a price close to what Willis had demanded.

Land negotiations during the War Department years generally proceeded without the acrimony exhibited by Willis. Some landowners opted to donate land outright to the park. S. L. Pritchett and E. M. Thompson made a total donation of a little more than 11 acres at Spotsylvania Court House, from land associated with the May 8-9, 1864, fighting where Warren’s Union 5th Corps had entrenched and Hancock’s Union 2nd Corps had tried to position itself against Lee’s left flank. The Stuart family donated just under four acres that
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95 Hugh E. Willis to Rep. William Robert Wood, 21 February 1930, 1, File FRSP, Box 29, Entry 5, War Department Records, RG 79, NARA-Archives II.

96 Quotes from Secretary of War to Sen. David Reed, no date [7 March 1930], 2, File FRSP, Box 29, Entry 5, War Department Records, RG 79, NARA-Archives II. See also For the Relief of Hugh E. Willis, S. 3689, 71st Cong., 2d sess., 24 February 1930; and For the Purchase for the Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania County Battle Fields Memorial Park of the Farm of Hugh E. Willis in Orange and Spotsylvania Counties, Va., S. 3690, 71st Cong., 2d sess., 24 February 1930. Secretary of War to Sen. R. B. Howell, 16 April 1930, 1, File FRSP, Box 29, Entry 5, War Department Records, RG 79, NARA-Archives II.

included the famous Bloody Angle at Spotsylvania. Land owners at the Wilderness battlefield donated more than 65 acres, in parcels ranging in size from six acres to 35 acres.98

The War Department pursued surveying and land acquisition at the Fredericksburg battlefield first, and five of the nine identified landowners agreed to prices acceptable to the government. The other four properties went into condemnation, with the park taking immediate possession and a jury deciding on the final price. In some cases, condemnation simply allowed clearing of title. Park planners tried to obtain a small amount of land on the east side of the Sunken Road in Fredericksburg to prevent a highway with houses abutting it from being developed there. High land prices and dramatically reduced appropriations by 1932 kept the park from obtaining this land, beginning a long cycle of attempts to control the Sunken Road for park purposes. Wilbourn, after he came to the park, had tried to expand the acreage in the Fredericksburg battlefield, noting that those who had originally drawn up the plans had apparently “forgot[ten] that any other than the Confederate army” had fought there. He had wanted to obtain land in front of the Sunken Road, along the river banks where the Federal pontoon crossings had occurred, and on the heights in Stafford County where the Federals had staged their attack. Wilbourn had obtained permission to draw up plans for such an expansion, but he had only had time to make a tentative plan, with his “mind focused on economy.”99

Local help came from different fronts. Fredericksburg city manager L. J. Houston aided negotiations at that battlefield because he was a well-known and trusted figure who acted between the landowners and the government to settle amicably on prices. An active committee of local residents in the Wilderness-Spotsylvania area also facilitated land negotiations there. A battlefield association of local residents, started in 1928, helped to raise visibility of the park and keep the momentum going for government land acquisition and road building. They also worked to interest states and soldier groups in building memorials at the new park and ask for donations from these groups to support land acquisition.100

The War Department in total acquired more than 2,100 acres of land in all four battlefields. Wilbourn argued that still more should be purchased around the Landrum House at Spotsylvania and where May 5-6 fighting had occurred on the Wilderness battlefield. He also wanted to secure the property where the Chancellorsville House had stood, but the owners asked for an “exorbitant price.” He finally recommended adding

---


99 Quotes from Wilbourn to A. E. Demaray, 11 August 1933, 2, File Commission, Members of, Cabinet 6, Drawer 1, FRSP Basement Files. See also Happel, FRSP Admin History, 56. Unsigned letter to William Gibson, 19 November 1929, 2, File Colonel Ross, Cabinet 6, Drawer 1, FRSP Basement Files. Fleming, Progress Report, 30 July 1929, 5.

Todd’s Tavern area, where trenches remained in excellent preservation, to capture the story of the cavalry fight there. The 1929 stock market crash and onset of what would become the Great Depression ultimately meant that the park’s land acquisition efforts halted by 1932. Yet, the battlefield park encompassed four times as much land as the original battlefields park commission in its 1925 report had identified. The park still kept to the Antietam system of obtaining only earthworks and land to place roads without capturing great swaths of land between. Historically grounded troop position maps to ensure that land associated with major fighting was acquired, careful re-surveys that corrected problems with the 1925 map, and the decision to acquire lands at Chancellorsville increased the land holdings.  

Road building and land acquisition went hand-in-hand, with road construction fueled in part by a specific $215,000 appropriation, a pre-New Deal unemployment relief effort. On 11 November 1931, the park officially dedicated its first road, Lee Drive. Lee Drive snaked next to the narrow line of Confederate trenches from Richmond Road (Route 1) across Lansdowne Valley Road to Hamilton’s Crossing at Mine Road. Park staff had cleared undergrowth along the trench lines, making the trenches clearly visible along what the local newspaper described as a “beautiful drive.” A year later, a five-mile road through Chancellorsville connected key sites, including Fairview and Hazel Grove and the place of Jackson and Lee’s last bivouac. A road in the Wilderness battlefield, opened in spring 1933, followed the Confederate trenches to Chewning Farm and on to the Lee to the Rear marker. Additional roads for Spotsylvania Court House were planned once funds became available. The park could only afford temporary wooden markers along each road, though research had produced extensive plans for bronze tablets, relief maps, and troop position markers. These signs focused upon the actual battles, locating which troops fought where, and did not provide any historical context for the different encounters or the Civil War itself. The signs along Lee Drive explained some key battle actions beyond simply locating troop movements, as signs in the other battlefields did.

The War Department’s role in shaping Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania ended in June 1933 when President Franklin Roosevelt signed an executive order transferring all military parks, national monuments, and battlefield sites to the Interior Department’s
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National Park Service. Locals did not immediately embrace this change in administration. City manager Houston wrote to acting National Park Service director Arthur Demaray that Fredericksburgers were “vitally interested” in the preservation of the battlefields as a military park. Houston asked that a military officer continue to supervise park development, and most hopefully, Houston requested that Wilbourn, whose work was “so marked with progress and good judgment,” be transferred to the new agency and left in charge of the battlefield park.103 The *Free Lance-Star* agreed, describing Wilbourn as having “done wonders.” He had walked over every trench and field, read all the official reports, and located all the significant points of interest. The local paper opined that transferring a man with such intimate knowledge would “endanger the park plan” and lead to potentially “disastrous” results.104

Concerns about what the Park Service would do to the battlefield park underlay these requests to keep Wilbourn. Rep. Bland, who had been influential in establishing the park, had argued against the National Park Service taking the military parks from the War Department. Bland had said at one of the congressional hearings on the idea that transfer of the military parks made "as much sense . . . as putting military instruction in a medical school."105 A local editorial noted that the Park Service had been the keeper of scattered parks across the nation that largely served, in the eyes of the editor, as recreation centers. These parks provided spaces for people to camp, fish, hunt, and picnic. Fredericksburgers, according to the newspaper editor, did not want their battlefield park to become a place where traveling sightseers could pitch their tents. People in Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania wanted to ensure that their park remained “a vast memorial, sacred in its nature” because of the hallowed ground where more than 100,000 men had fought and shed their blood “for principles that each deemed to be the right.” The reconciliation language is largely gone from this plea, but the underlying mission of having the military park remember soldiers from both the South and North and the sacrifices they made remained. Wilbourn did not stay at Fredericksburg, and the National Park Service quickly made its mark in alleviating local apprehension about its ability to develop a military park along the lines envisioned by its first supporters.106

**ANALYSIS**

Preservation of the battlefields at Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania, as embodied in the actions of supporters and in the enabling legislation, encompassed key characteristics.
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103 L. J. Houston, Jr., to A. E. Demaray, 5 August 1933, 1, File 0-31 Fred-Spot County, Box 2464, CCF 1933-1949, RG 79, NARA-Archives II.


First, the battlefield park was meant to memorialize both the Federal and Confederate soldiers who fought on this landscape. Supporters often stressed in their calls for the battlefield park that citizens of every state in the country, North and South, had fought and died in those four battles. They wanted a park that honored the valor and dedication of both sides. Second, the park’s legislation assumed that the land surrounding the earthworks and visible remains of the battles would stay agricultural into perpetuity, thus obviating the necessity for federal ownership. Implicit in this approach is the view that owners sensitive to the historical associations of the land would care for this farmland. The fear of losing the earthworks to time certainly prompted action to have some federal ownership around the battlefields, and one must assume that further losses would have validated further land acquisition. Congress members could not be blamed for not fully predicting the rush of development that would encompass much of the four battlefields later in the 20th century. But, the Park Service also should not be blamed for reflexively trying to acquire more land as that development threatened the integrity of the lands already protected in the battlefield park and those just outside actual park boundaries that were still needed to tell the Civil War story.

The park’s enabling legislation gives little guidance with respect to interpreting the battlefields. Commemoration served as a primary reason for marking and preserving the earthworks and historic traces. No discrimination would be allowed for honoring one side over the other. The language of reconciliation flavored the appeals of supporters for the legislation and the October 1928 dedication ceremony. The emphasis upon troop movements and mapping the battlefields by the Army War College and War Department indicated that military maneuvers and actions helped determine which lands to acquire. The War Department also placed temporary signs to indicate those battle movements for visitors. Does this early action in interpretation thus determine how the park should always be presented to visitors? Certainly battle maneuvers are important for understanding why certain lands were significant and how the results of those battles shaped the larger war effort and its outcome. The legislation’s call for honoring both sides, however, fails to account for the black slaves who had been the reason for the war (the Confederacy’s desire to maintain slavery) and who benefitted from the war’s outcome with the end of slavery. The plight of blacks in and around Fredericksburg during the course of the battles and in adjusting to life afterwards also deserves telling as a way to honor an entire segment of the larger population. The Lost Cause tradition and white supremacy, both of which worked to remove blacks from any discussion of the Civil War and its aftereffects, shaped the park’s legislation and its establishment.
**Figure 1.** The National Cemetery at Fredericksburg, shown here before 1890, contained terraces cut into Willis Hill at the southern end of Marye's Heights. Photo courtesy of Donald C. Pfanz, Where Valor Proudly Sleeps, 2007.
Figure 2. The two-story stone lodge with Mansard roof, shown here around 1906, provided housing for the cemetery’s superintendent. Photo courtesy of Donald C. Pfanz, Where Valor Proudly Sleeps, 2007.
Figure 3. This 1890 view of the national cemetery flagstaff shows the four upright Columbiad cannon tubes and four pyramids of cannonballs. Photo courtesy of Donald C. Pfanz, Where Valor Proudly Sleeps, 2007.
Figure 4. Gen. Daniel Butterfield funded this monument as a tribute to his men, the Federal Fifth Corps. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, 1935.
Figure 5. The Humphreys Monument, designed by sculptor Herbert Adams, honors Gen. Andrew Humphreys and his command of eight regiments of the Fifth Corps. Photo courtesy of Donald C. Pfanz, History Through Eyes of Stone, 2006.
Figure 6. The 1887 Sedgwick Memorial honored Gen. John Sedgwick, a respected and popular commander of the Federal Sixth Corps who had fallen to a sharpshooter's bullet at Spotsylvania Court House. Photo courtesy of Donald C. Pfanz, History Through Eyes of Stone, 2006.
Figure 7. The Jackson Monument, dedicated in 1888, stands near the spot where Gen. Stonewall Jackson received his mortal wound at Chancellorsville. Photo courtesy of Donald C. Pfanz, History Through Eyes of Stone, 2006.
Figure 8. This white quartz boulder, known as the Jackson Rock and placed between 1876 and 1881, stands close to the site of Stonewall Jackson’s wounding. Photo courtesy of Donald C. Pfanz, History Through Eyes of Stone, 2006.
Figure 9. This stone marks the approximate spot where Lee’s men called him to the rear during the Wilderness battle. Photo courtesy of Donald C. Pfanz, History Through Eyes of Stone, 2006.
Figure 10. The Richmond, Fredericksburg, and Potomac Railroad built this pyramid of Virginia granite along its line near the site where Meade’s men briefly broke through the Confederate line at the 1862 Fredericksburg battle. Photo courtesy of Donald C. Pfanz, History Through Eyes of Stone, 2006.
Figure 11. This rough boulder with plaque, known as the Coolidge Memorial, served to mark the occasion of the park’s October 1928 dedication by President Calvin Coolidge. Photo courtesy of Donald C. Pfanz, *History Through Eyes of Stone*, 2006.
CHAPTER TWO

THE FIELDS THEMSELVES, THE LIVING MUSEUM¹

1933 presented the National Park Service with seemingly endless possibilities, and development of Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania National Military Park provided one large canvas with which to put those possibilities into action. President Franklin Delano Roosevelt's executive order in the summer of 1933² assigned the War Department's national military parks and historic sites to the Park Service. Now the agency known for Yellowstone and Yosemite would also embrace Gettysburg and Shiloh, Yorktown and the Statue of Liberty. Horace Albright, second director of the agency, had tried since the 1916 establishment of the Park Service to widen its jurisdiction to include historical sites. He understood that the fledgling agency, whose monumental parks sat far west of the majority of the American citizenry, needed a presence east of the Mississippi River to help ensure stability as an independent governmental organization. The military parks, located predominantly along the eastern seaboard, offered an important entry point and connection to average Americans. Plus, Albright and Stephen Mather, the agency's first director, had strong interests in history and wanted to expand upon the prehistoric holdings, such as Mesa Verde, already under the Park Service's administration.³

Albright had his golden opportunity one Sunday afternoon in April 1933 when Roosevelt invited him to join a presidential party on a tour through Virginia. They drove out to Shenandoah National Park,⁴ where they saw the remarkable road building and stone workmanship of bridges and retaining walls completed under one of President Herbert Hoover's relief programs. On the way back, they saw the lands where Confederate and Federal troops had fought at the Second Battle of Manassas, not yet a battlefield park.

¹ Paraphrase from Ralph Happel, History and Description of FRSP and Four Self-Guide Tours, no date [1936], 7.
² Roosevelt issued the first executive order (No. 6166) on 10 June 1933 and allowed 61 days before it became effective. He clarified 6166 with a second executive order (No. 6228) on 28 July 1933, specifically naming which sites would transfer to NPS and removing some national cemeteries (most notably Arlington and those in foreign lands). Roosevelt also briefly renamed the National Park Service the Office of National Parks, Buildings, and Reservations. The original name returned within two years. See Lary M. Dilsaver, ed., America’s National Park System: The Critical Documents (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 1994), 116-21.
⁴ Shenandoah National Park was authorized in 1926 and established, after land acquisition, in 1935.
Roosevelt, who was also a history buff, agreed with Albright’s ideas and said expanding the Park Service to include historical sites should be done. When Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania military park transferred to the Park Service in August 1933, along with the others, the agency took on the responsibility of applying its expertise in natural resource management, preservation, and education to historical areas.⁵

Roosevelt also took the key step and granted the Park Service the money and manpower to make long-term development of these historic sites possible. On the last day of March 1933, he signed an act for the relief of unemployment through the performance of useful public work and established what became known as the Civilian Conservation Corps. Roosevelt insisted that the corps start up that summer, and Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania park eventually gained three camps with about 200 men each. A fourth camp stood in the Fredericksburg area, off park property and dedicated to local initiatives. The federal government between 1933 and 1940 dedicated more than $200 million to emergency conservation work under the CCC, Public Works Administration, Works Progress Administration, and other similar relief agencies. This crucial money, which helped individuals, families, and local communities across the United States survive the effects of the Great Depression, went toward clearing out forests of fire hazards, restoring landscapes, building roads and trails, constructing buildings, and even providing some interpretation and visitor services. Fredericksburg obtained more than $1 million of that money, and ended the 1930s with a new administration and museum building, 21 miles of park roads, 19 miles of foot trails, 11 miles of bridle trails, contact stations at each of the four battlefields, trench and scene restoration across the park landscape, and more than 100,000 new trees. The Park Service, with the staff at Fredericksburg participating actively considered what it wanted to accomplish with the new historic sites under its care and how it wanted to address its preservation and education responsibilities in these new venues. The 1930s became a time for experimentation and action to set forward a new vision for national parks, broadly conceived beyond the large natural western areas. Studying Fredericksburg gives an insightful glimpse into the discussions and ideas within the larger agency.⁶

Many people contributed to the success of the relief work at Fredericksburg, but one person, Branch Spalding, stands out as a key leader. Spalding served as park superintendent and then coordinating superintendent for the Virginia Civil War parks from 1934 through 1942. He also served between 1936 and 1938 as the acting director of the Branch of Historic Sites and Buildings in the NPS Washington Office. He had started with the Service in 1933 as a historical technician at Petersburg National Battlefield Park (established in 1926) and had developed successful public relations between that park and its host city to attract attention

---

⁵ Albright, Origins of NPS Administration of Historic Sites.

at Fredericksburg, which needed help. Spalding had the scholarly credentials to serve at a historical park, having received his MA from University of Virginia and gone on to do additional graduate work at Marburg University in Germany and Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore. But he had also taken 13 years to receive his bachelor’s, with time away to serve in France during the Great War, pilot ships through Virginia’s waterways, and run an automobile, oil, and hauling business in New Mexico. He knew the prominent historian Douglas Southall Freeman, who was an authority on Lee, and could use his Virginia roots (he was born and raised in Roanoke) to good advantage during his first days at Fredericksburg. At this critical time in National Park Service history, Spalding brought vision and the ability to act on that vision to the parks under his control.\(^7\)

Fredericksburg may serve as an example for how the Park Service incorporated historical parks into its oeuvre, but this Virginia Civil War military park also acted in concert with southern customs and traditions of the time period. Park managers at Fredericksburg (as at other southern parks, but not northern national park sites) stalwartly opted to go along with the segregated practices of separate restrooms, picnic areas, and other public spaces. The government established at the park a separate Civilian Conservation Corps camp for blacks, following a trend originated in southern parks and later adopted throughout the CCC. The park’s interpretive focus also suggested sympathy for the southern presentation of the war. This situation is not surprising when considering that all but one of the park’s key historians came from Virginia, and the one northerner did not last two years before being sent North again. The park, as with all national military parks no matter their geographic location, also relied upon battle tactics and military maneuvers to shape their interpretive programs, a step that helped Civil War parks sidestep issues about causes and consequences of the war.

**NATIONAL PARK SERVICE TAKES OVER**

The summer and fall of 1933 represented transition for the military park. The War Department’s representative, Col. Arthur Wilbourn, remained until August ostensibly in charge. He chose the location for the first relief camp, at the Bloody Angle in Spotsylvania Court House. George Palmer, who until June 1933 had been a history graduate student at the University of Minnesota, entered the National Park Service under the Civilian Conservation Corps program and arrived at Fredericksburg to take the reins once Wilbourn left. Officially, Phil Hough, who was stationed at George Washington Birthplace National Monument, located about 40 miles east of the military park, served as superintendent of both sites. T.

---

Sutton Jett, another graduate student in history but at William & Mary, joined the Park Service at the same time as Palmer. Jett arrived that summer and lived at the Bloody Angle camp, providing an important link between Palmer in Fredericksburg and the CCC workers. Verne Chatelain, newly appointed Chief Historian for the Park Service, provided overall guidance and direction. The CCC camps had their own internal organization and supervision, but each park superintendent, in consultation with other agency professionals in forestry, roads, interpretation, and design and planning, determined what work each set of CCC enrollees would do.  

The Park Service, though less than 20 years old in 1933, had already established its own identity as an agency in how it preserved and managed the lands under its care. This identity came in part from the history of the early parks, which had been established in the late 19th century with little federal government supervision or appropriations. Evidence that concessionaires were developing properties within the parks without concern for the natural features and wildlife led former Civil War Gen. Phillip Sheridan to advocate for bringing in the cavalry and establishing military protection. This military model eventually translated into a ranger corps who wore distinctive uniforms and shared a sense of camaraderie and identity with the new National Park Service, established in 1916. First directors Mather and Albright sought to expand support for the parks, and thus ensure the longevity of the agency and protection for the parks under its care, by advocating for more parks, expanding the types of parks, and endlessly promoting national parks. Sometimes these promotions, like allowing bear feedings, smack today of environmental stewardship gone dangerously awry. But other promotional approaches, such as connecting national parks to the larger concepts of patriotism and nationalism, cemented the parks to the larger American social and cultural fabric.


For example, Ethan Carr describes Daniel Hull’s and Thomas C. Vint’s contributions to landscape architecture in the early years, in his *Wilderness By Design: Landscape Architecture and the National Park Service* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998). Conrad Wirth started in the agency as the first land planner, then led the state and federal CCC camp development, and eventually became director of the NPS. See his *Parks, Politics, and the People* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1980). See Sellars, *Preserving Nature in the National Parks* for examples of how wildlife biologists and others helped professionalize natural resource management.

And Park Service planners did not initially like all that they saw at Fredericksburg. The War Department had acquired more than 2,000 acres of land and laid out roads through the battlefields, providing the foundation for developing an actual military park. NPS forester Fred Arnold, however, pointed at the severe thinning of trees the War Department had done. He did not like the effect in the Chancellorsville battlefield of strips extending from roadways meant to open up views of the Civil War trench lines. Beyond these drastic cuts, a straight line of heavily forested trees created “a most unsatisfactory landscape effect.”

Arnold noted that the War Department had left stumps that needed grubbing and blasting to keep new growth from sprouting. Also, the “stiff walled-in effect” in the vista where the line of trees marked the end of the clearing needed new growth in an “irregular fashion” to allow for “blending” between the clearing and the forest beyond.

Chief Historian Chatelain noted in addition that the Bureau of Public Roads, working during the War Department administration, had run the Spotsylvania Court House battlefield loop road
through the Bloody Angle area and visibly altered the appearance of the terrain. This road construction, in Chatelain’s mind, made it “beyond the ability of the average visitor to visualize” its original appearance. The landscape architect working at Fredericksburg made a special effort, according to George Palmer’s later memories, to soften this jarring road alignment.  

Chatelain wanted the Park Service to establish its presence at Fredericksburg and “with an eye to our own standards,” develop the park “along proper lines.” He tasked Palmer (prematurely, within two months of his arrival at the park) to develop a historical policy for national military parks, and he urged Palmer and Jett to publicize the battlefield park and reassure the anxious local community which still favored the War Department over the unknown Park Service. Palmer quickly discovered with the policy he was treading in unfamiliar waters, and with publicity he was treading in both unfamiliar and soon-to-be hostile waters. For the historical policy, he emphasized the value of the terrain itself in shaping the battles and telling the story of those battles to visitors. To tell these stories, he called for a program of research using all available authentic records to secure facts, “without drawing inferences or praising or censoring” any person or group. He wanted visitors to view the tangible remains of battles, learn the stories associated with those battles, and step away realizing the “significance of the War experience” in national life. Palmer himself considered his attempt at a policy unsatisfactory, but he did articulate ideas that would continue to percolate within the park and the larger agency.

Palmer soon became enmeshed in more difficult issues than the crafting of a historical policy, and the shape of the dispute, and its resolution, provides important clues about the development of the military park at Fredericksburg. President Roosevelt’s early relief programs worked to give people jobs, as opposed to handouts, to maintain self esteem. One aspect of this effort involved authorizing local governing bodies to establish work programs and assign workers, based on need, to them. The National Park Service readily agreed to support some of these work programs, and at Fredericksburg, Palmer identified the need to have workers transcribe old records for the research program. The Fredericksburg employment governing body sent the park a needy man who Palmer put to work copying records. The man’s writing, according to Palmer, was worse than the original, and after some pleading, the employment board responded and sent the park two women, one of whom was the daughter of the City Manager, presumably not really in need. A county judge, as Palmer
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13 Quote, p. 2, from Verne Chatelain, Memorandum on Fredericksburg, 1-2, attached to Chatelain to H. J. Eckenrode, 24 August 1933, File Fred-Spot County 0-31, Box 2464, RG 79 Central Classified Files 1933-49, NARA-Archives II; See also Palmer, Memories of his time at Fredericksburg, 6.

14 Chatelain, Memorandum on Fredericksburg, 2 (handwritten notes).

15 Palmer’s emphasis upon the terrain to tell the story coincides with the Park Service’s long-time view that the resource was the prime feature for educating the public. This idea will receive more thorough consideration in the later section of this chapter on interpretation. George Palmer to Verne Chatelain, 21 August 1933, and attached Memorandum upon a Historical Policy for National Military Parks, 3, File 0-31 Fred-Spot County, Box 2464, RG 79 Central Classified Files 1933-49, NARA-Archives II. Quotes on p. 3 of Memorandum upon a Historical Policy.
later remembered, wrote an indignant letter to the local newspaper, making a special point that the Park Service supervisor was a Yankee. Palmer went to park superintendent Hough at George Washington Birthplace for advice and agreed not to respond to the furor that erupted from the inflammatory letter in the newspaper. Hough emphasized to Palmer and privately to the county judge that the Park Service had to take whomever the local employment board chose and that the local community had to resolve the issue, which it did by reconfiguring the employment board and ousting both newly appointed women. Palmer reflected later in life that the episode helped bring attention to the Park Service at Fredericksburg (all publicity is good publicity, as the saying goes), a goal Chatelain and others had wanted to advance.16

The episode importantly sheds light onto the park and the community at this fragile time of transition. Palmer readily acknowledged that he was the odd man in the area. He remembered at his boarding house having to “bear the brunt of considerable laughter” at his Midwestern speech. He took it all well, considering the experience a great opportunity to familiarize himself with Virginia traditions and people.17 Within the city, though, Palmer’s approach of being friendly to all proved disastrous. He soon discovered that this small city in terms of population harbored huge local factions that would not work together. Branch Spalding, in assessing the outrage expressed at Palmer over the hiring of the city manager’s daughter, noted that the three distinct factions operating in Fredericksburg played a “political football game” with Palmer as the ball. Palmer had unintentionally dissatisfied one local faction in the episode and all three factions had relished kicking him about “in accordance with its own selfish interest,” according to Spalding. Palmer had demonstrated courage and integrity in his response to the sad situation, but Spalding correctly recognized that the “historical work has been greatly hampered.” A man with “mature judgment and prestige,” with the “firm backing” of the Park Service, should instead take over for Palmer, Spalding argued to Chatelain. Such a person would “go along . . . a good distance” with the local community, but in the end that person would “firmly say no” and make clear who was in charge of the park. Spalding believed optimistically that the community would show a “surprising capacity for being agreeable” under such circumstances.18

Spalding was probably not so obliquely recommending himself to replace Palmer. Spalding had established excellent public relations between Petersburg National Battlefield Park and the town, which Palmer recognized when touring the area, stating “the city is

16 The author has been unsuccessful in finding the inflammatory letter as published in the newspaper. Palmer, Memories of his time at Fredericksburg, 8-9; Memorandum, Palmer to Chatelain, 6 January 1934, 2, File Branch of Historic Sites, Fredericksburg Monthly Reports, Goolrick, Box 2466, RG 79 Central Classified Files 1933-49, NARA-Archives II. Memorandum, Branch Spalding to Chatelain, 16 January 1934, 1, File 0-31 Fred-Spot County, Box 2464, RG 79 Central Classified Files 1933-49, NARA-Archives II.
18 Memorandum, Spalding to Chatelain, 16 January 1934, 1-2.
wholeheartedly behind Mr. Spalding.”

Spalding had the advantage of being a slightly older man with diverse life experiences that certainly would have provided him with tools for addressing various concerns raised by local residents. He also had been born and raised in Virginia, understood its customs and eccentricities, and could assert control without offending or provoking fellow Virginians. Local residents could accept him ultimately as one of their own, not as a northerner who might try to challenge their beliefs about the Civil War or usurp their land and property, referring back to the carpetbagger days of Reconstruction. The National Park Service ultimately agreed. Spalding transferred to Fredericksburg by June 1934, and Palmer moved to more hospitable northern climes with an assignment at the Statue of Liberty.  

Spalding put into place his own public relations approach, remaining courteous and pleasant to all, accepting invitations from none whenever possible, and proceeding as slowly as possible to avoid being linked to any one faction. He cautiously predicted in August 1934 that a “new day may be dawning in public relations” in Fredericksburg.  

This entire incident marks the emergence of Branch Spalding as a positive force in shaping the early development of Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania park. (Figure 12) It also gives a hint of an underlying thread, an uncomfortable one from today’s perspective. The Park Service worked hard to maintain friendly relations with its southern hosts, even if that approach accepted segregation and avoided anything that might provoke anger or resentment. The rest of this chapter will describe important building projects and interpretive programs adopted at the park, made possible through the Civilian Conservation Corps and federal relief money, but with an eye toward looking at what choices the Park Service made given the southern location of the park.

THE CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS

The battlefield park hosted three CCC camps by October 1933, the first one (known originally as Military Park or MP-1) at the Bloody Angle at Spotsylvania Court House battlefield and the other two just north of the Chancellorsville house ruins at the Chancellorsville battlefield (MP-3, later designated NP-11) and at Sauber’s Field at the Wilderness battlefield (MP-4, later NP-24).  

Wood buildings quickly replaced the tents

---

19 Memorandum, Palmer to Chatelain, 16 March 1934, 3, File Branch of Historic Sites FRSP, Monthly Reports, Palmer, Box 2467, RG 79 Central Classified Files 1933-49, NARA-Archives II.

20 Spalding first served as Historical Technician, the same title he had at Peters burg. He was named acting superintendent of Fredericksburg on 15 October 1934 and Coordinating Superintendent of all Civil War battle areas in Virginia on 15 March 1936. See Ralph Happel, History and Description of the Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania National Military Park and Four Self-Guide Tours, no date [post-April 1936], 6, File 11, Box Unarranged Records1, Collection Happel 14117, Chancellorsville Visitor Center (CVC), FRSP.

21 Quote from Memorandum, Spalding to Chatelain, 2 August 1934, 2, File Memoranda to Mr. Chatelain, Cabinet 10, Drawer 1, FRSP Basement Files. See also Palmer, Memories of his time at Fredericksburg, 13.

22 Camp MP-3 began briefly as a white camp, then became a black camp between August 1934 and December 1940. Enrollees at MP-4 then transferred from the Wilderness camp to the Chancellorsville
initially used to house enrollees, encompassing barracks, officer quarters, mess hall, recreation hall, hospital, administrative space, maintenance structures, and garages. (Figure 13) Enrollees generally fell within the ages of 17 and 25, were without employment, and had families registered for relief help. 23 (Figure 14) A Cleveland study of about 270 enrollees from that area provides some background about typical CCC enrollees. The study found that about 70 percent had completed 10th grade, many leaving before graduation due to economic pressures (having to find work to help support their families) or a dislike of school or a teacher. A little more than 70 percent of the young Ohio men had found jobs at one point, but lay-offs and business failures had left three-quarters of these young men jobless by the time they joined the CCC. Those with jobs often worked under difficult working conditions, making the CCC a more promising opportunity than their current employment. Financial need, a desire to get away from home, and the idea of embarking on an adventure motivated the majority of these young men from Ohio to try the conservation corps. The CCC program required each enrollee to allow for up to $25 of their $30 monthly pay to go to their families, made possible because the federal government provided room and board, clothing, and health care. This arrangement gave material benefit to a large network of communities. When these Ohio young men returned (on average across the CCC experience, young men left after 10 months service in the CCC but they could serve up to two years) to their homes, they admitted that the experience broadened their perspective, made them feel confident about facing life, and encouraged them to think ahead about their goals and what actions they should take toward achieving them. 24

All new enrollees, beyond what the Ohio men underwent, went first to a conditioning camp for about two weeks before being sent to their assigned camp location. Although run by the military, these conditioning camps focused not upon drilling and arms but upon calisthenics, participant activities, and manual labor. Once settled in the barracks of their assigned camp, the daily routine involved reveille at 6 AM, calisthenics and a heavy breakfast, then off to their job site by 8 AM. Crews had about a half hour for lunch, generally where they were working that day. The young men were transported back to their camps starting at 4 PM, making the maximum work day eight hours within a 40 hour work week. Bad weather might force campers to work extra hours on Saturdays. Sundays often included transporting youth to their respective religious institutions. Free time consisted of participating in recreational activities, including competitive team sports, publishing a camp newsletter,
attending dances and other social activities with local residents, watching movies onsite, and reading books from the camp library. An evening meal between 5 and 5:30 PM consisted of plain but hearty food in large quantities. The Cleveland study found that almost all their studied enrollees gained weight, making them feel more solid, stronger, and healthier. After-dinner time often encompassed training and educational programs, whether in topics directly related to the work campers did or of a more academic or trade nature. The Cleveland study found that 30 percent of the men did not take the courses, but of those that did, about half found them interesting and useful. The major complaints focused upon lack of equipment (learning about engines from a book, not a real engine) and untrained teachers. At least during the first session at the first camp in Spotsylvania Court House, historian T. Sutton Jett purposefully gave short but informative talks to CCC enrollees at night to educate them about the Civil War battlefields and how their work contributed to the larger goal of establishing the park.²⁵

Many local communities welcomed the CCC camps and the promise of economic windfalls, since much of the perishable food and supplies were purchased from nearby sources. Resistance did flare, though. In Luray, VA, residents opposed establishment of a camp because the proposed location of the camp, they argued, would endanger the water supply and bring in a social menace. Some CCC enrollees staged strikes, refusing to eat what they considered bad food or refusing to work if they felt the working conditions were extreme as a way to protest. These acts usually ended peacefully and addressed concerns. But Shenandoah National Park experienced an extreme form of protest when five of its camps in November 1937 revolted, resulting in 100 dismissals. Differences in backgrounds of enrollees at the camps, whether northern versus southern or city versus rural contributed to this isolated but well-publicized revolt. Other camps learned to solve their problems quietly, and young men from the Cleveland study noted that they learned to get along to fit in within their camps. The city boys sometimes felt superior to the rural ones, but, according to the Cleveland study, those same city boys quickly realized and appreciated the practical knowledge that their rural comrades had about the forests and natural areas in which they had to work.²⁶

Residents of Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania demonstrated support for their CCC camps, except when the white camp at Chancellorsville switched in 1934 to an all-black camp. Formal protests quickly erupted from Chamber of Commerce representatives, city


officials, and prominent residents of Spotsylvania County. The Free Lance-Star newspaper noted that blacks from northern CCC camps would move to the camp, and state senator C. O’Conor Goolrick argued that the protests were waged against having “outsiders” brought in, not specifically about their race. He emphasized that if the blacks had been “Southerners no objections would have been raised.”27 The Park Service at first considered other options for placing the blacks elsewhere but without success. Agency officials gave an ultimatum to the Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania area, threatening to abolish the camp entirely, ending its expected $10,000 monthly operations allowance which aided the area. They also warned that park development would suffer without the camp.28 The next day, on 8 August 1934, 190 black recruits arrived via train and were taken by truck to their Chancellorsville camp. The Free Lance-Star quietly acknowledged that the men came from Richmond, Norfolk, and other areas of Virginia and “are used to our ways and our customs.”29 A few minor disturbances made the papers during the first few months, but otherwise the Park Service and the local community agreed by the time the black camp closed in December 1940 that the CCC men had performed useful and important tasks, including acting quickly to combat forest fires and avoiding serious damage to local property.30

The black experience at Fredericksburg mirrored what happened nationally. The CCC enabling legislation stated that there would be no discrimination based on race, color, and creed, and early camps had both black and white enrollees, though they used separate facilities and blacks worked separately from whites. CCC Director Robert Fechner, a labor union leader born and raised in Tennessee, however, directed the creation of separate camps for blacks, except in those areas where black enrollment was slight and could not sustain a full camp. Even in the “integrated” camps, blacks slept and ate separately from whites. In effect, he supported a separate but equal policy for the CCC camps. Local residents bitterly protested proposed establishment of black camps in their areas, and Fechner called in 1934 for the Army to survey the existing camps to determine black enrollment and placement. The Army reported that southern camps had strictly established segregated camps, but other regions had a mix of segregated camps and some camps with blacks attached to white companies. Fechner, possibly drawing upon his own southern heritage and its segregationist


29 Quote made by T. C. Walker, as quoted in “Colored C.C.C. Men at Camp in County,” Free Lance-Star, 8 August 1934.

30 “CCC Boys Warned To Be Less Noisy,” 16 August 1934; “Seeking Ten Who Injured CCC Man,” 13 September 1934 [about a black CCC man in the hospital from injuries by black local residents during a dance]; “Negro Camp Men Given 60 Days,” 29 October 1934 [for intent to commit robbery]; “Negro Draws Year in Assault on Girl,” 23 September 1934 [for drunken behavior]; and “Negro CCC Camp due To Be Moved,” 30 November 1940, all in Free Lance-Star. One camp inspector noted in 1938 that “Community relations are very good. At first towns seem a little cool toward the boys, but this feeling has changed and relations are far more favorable.” See Supplementary Report, 3 March 1938, in BV-347-02.pdf from NARA-Archives II, RG 35, Entry 115. Memorandum, Fred Johnston to Director, 11 December 1940, in BV-348-03.pdf from Entry 65, RG 79, NARA-Archives II.
policy, ordered that all blacks be moved to segregated camps in their home states. He stated that such a move would reduce racial violence in the camps, though in reality such violence had been negligible. This directive limited the possibility for expanding the number of spaces for blacks since blacks could only replace openings in black camps in their home states. Black unemployment during the Depression was double that of whites, in part because whites took jobs traditionally relegated to blacks. States essentially resorted to quotas to determine the number of blacks who could participate in the CCC, and since blacks on average stayed longer than whites in the program, a fewer spaces became available over time. The CCC enrolled about 2.5 million men during its nine-year life span, and between 200,000 and 300,000 of those were black. Blacks at the time made up about ten percent of the United States population, and Fechner had made clear his intention that black enrollment should equal that number.

Blacks largely had similar experiences in their segregated CCC camps as whites, although they initially could not advance to leadership positions beyond that of educational advisors. Whites supervised the black camps, in part to reassure local communities. Blacks had access to the same kinds of food, clothing, shelter, and expectations for work as their white counterparts. The black Chancellorsville camp (at this location from August 1934 to December 1940) provided athletic and recreational opportunities, including pool tables, ping pong tables, organized sporting competitions between barracks, and monthly dances. They saw movies in the Recreation Hall, read books and periodicals in the library, and had regular weekly transport to town for religious services and entertainment. Educational programming required illiterate enrollees to take classes to learn to read and write, and the camp hosted commencement exercises every three months to honor those who succeeded. Other educational activities focused upon providing the black campers with practical training for future employment in industry. The two white camps appear, by reviewing the limited sources, to have had a greater range of educational programming than the black camp, but all the camps generally set aside the same amount of time for educational activities, four days a week for about two hours each day. White camps also provided remedial reading and writing teaching for illiterates. Historians at the battlefield park provided one kind of educational training for specially identified white enrollees from the Wilderness and Spotsylvania Court House camps. These white young men received training and then
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31 Blacks may have stayed longer because racial prejudices still gave whites an advantage over blacks in getting jobs while jobs remained few in number. See Paige, *The CCC and the NPS Admin History*, Chapter Three, Section Problems and Challenges: Black Enrollment.


34 Ibid.
worked as educational guides to assist park visitors. Black enrollees did not have the option to participate in such work.  

All the camps completed manual labor that developed and maintained the battlefield park. The listing of work for each camp over the course of the nine years of CCC existence fail to distinguish if the black enrollees completed particularly back-breaking, menial labor as opposed to the white men. The black campers built foot bridges, fences, and guard rails. (Figure 15) They moved trees, planted trees, watered trees. They seeded and sodded trenches. They practiced fire suppression techniques by removing fire hazards. White enrollees also completed these tasks. (Figure 16) Each camp completed tasks identified by the park superintendent and overseen by the camp commander.

**CCC WORK IN THE PARK**

Looking simply at a list of CCC activities might suggest that the enrollees completed large manual labor jobs, like moving and planting thousands of trees or clearing underbrush from miles of trenches, which kept the young men working and the park busy with people doing something. In reality, the CCC men, under direction of the National Park Service, transformed the four battlefields of this crossroads area into a coherent and developed park open to visitors from around the world. This New Deal relief project provided the critical money and manpower to make Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania National Military Park. The Park Service focused its attention upon educating the public, with recreation a secondary aim, in making decisions about what to do where. NPS planners and designers, engineers, foresters, and historians all collaborated in determining the physical development of the park, such as placement of roads and trails or restoration of trenches. Their goal was not simply to lead visitors through a “beautiful scene, but to a point of historical interest . . . to further the telling of a story.”

All of these experts drew upon a philosophy of park development that has roots in 17th-century European landscape painting and 18th-century British landscape architecture. Artists Claude Lorrain, who painted places of pastoral beauty, and Salvator Rosa, who introduced danger and suspense in his sublime paintings, manipulated nature to create scenes meeting
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35 Charles H. Kenlan, Report on Camp MP-3, Colored Company No. 362, 25 February 1936; Kenlan, Supplementary Report Camp MP-3, 18 November 1936; Kenlan, Supplementary Report Camp MP-3, 21 September 1937; Camp MP-3 Other Facilities Report, 3 March 1938; C. Porterfield Harris, MP-3 CCC Camp Educational Report, 7 June 1939; Luther C. McRae, Camp NP-11 CCC Camp Educational Report, 5 May 1941 [now a white junior camp, for comparison purposes]; and Ross Abare to Charles Kenlan, 29 March 1941, 1, in BV-347-02.pdf from NARA-Archives II, RG 35, Entry 115. Memorandum, Branch Spalding to Director, 30 August 1935, 2, File CCC, Box 207, Entry P-84 Branch of Forestry Correspondence, RG 79, NARA-Archives II.


37 Branch Spalding, Speech at dinner in Fredericksburg, 21 September 1934, 1-2, File 0-31 Fred-Spot County, Box 2464, RG 79 Central Classified Files 1933-1949, NARA-Archives II.
their artistic ideals and evoke an emotional response from viewers. British landscape architects, such as William Kent, Lancelot “Capability” Brown, and Humphry Repton, captured similar sentiments, plus an added idea which became known as the picturesque, by manipulating three-dimensional nature on vast acres of private estates. A curved embankment might embrace spouting fountains, placid pools, and a singular statue to set a scene of beauty while a regularized row of architectural columns and arches might evoke a somber and rational response. Kent, Brown, Repton, and others, carefully controlled the landscape and how people encountered it through plantings, road and trail placement, and use of natural and manmade features. They created an integrated and harmonious whole in the process. The writings of British aesthetician John Ruskin and the paintings of 18th-century British artist Joseph Mallord William Turner brought these influences forward in time and before an international audience. American landscape painters of the 19th century read Ruskin’s 5-volume series Modern Painters and carefully studied engravings of Turner’s paintings until they could travel to Europe and see the originals.38

Nineteenth-century landscape designers and park planners along the Atlantic seaboard used cemeteries first and then emerging public parks in urban settings as their canvas for translating these British and European ideas for American audiences. Key figures were Andrew Jackson Downing first, with his pattern books and horticultural planting schemes for middle-class homes, and then most famously Frederick Law Olmsted and Calvert Vaux, who worked together to design New York City’s Central Park. Central Park used trails, roads, bridges, extensive plantings, water features, and open space to create varied scenes of pastoral beauty and rural quaintness, of quiet and rowdy enthusiasm, of physical exertion and steady contemplation. The overall harmonious effect, despite these different scenes of encounter, was to engage and delight people in all their senses. Soon, parkways, designed to give drivers and their passengers a comfortable ride by passing through pleasantly landscaped areas along convenient but effortless roads, connected parks in urban areas. Increasing urbanization led to continued reliance upon intentional landscape design to integrate parks and open spaces into daily urban life.

Twentieth-century landscape architects and planners, including Frank Waugh (who would train eventual NPS Director Conrad Wirth), adopted naturalistic techniques and native vegetation in their designs. A naturalistic, rustic style of architecture also emerged by the late 19th century, evident from its use of native stones roughly hewn, hefty logs left unfinished and visible as architectural elements, and careful siting of structures to blend into the landscape. Landscape designers continued to frame “scenes” with the intent of evoking emotional responses through manipulating the natural environment, but they did so with an eye toward hiding or diminishing the human role. Their work, though, accomplished a larger goal than bringing people into the parks. Historian Ethan Carr has argued that whether

applied to Central Park or Yosemite National Park (or Fredericksburg battlefield park), landscape architecture became a tool to preserve natural (and historical) features while also providing access (and education). This intentional approach of manipulating the landscape (and its natural and manmade features) to control development shaped planning in the National Park Service.  

The expanded scope of the agency’s responsibilities and new locations across the United States during the New Deal required reliance upon the tried and tested approaches combined with a flexibility to adopt regional styles and customs. Master plans, introduced by NPS chief planner Thomas Vint in the early days of the agency, unified what road engineers, trail builders, construction designers, landscape architects, and others all wanted to do in a park. Park officials from the branch of Plans and Designs working in collaboration with the Branch of Historic Sites and Buildings developed Fredericksburg’s master plan, approved by the director in 1936. These NPS planners appreciated what the War Department had accomplished in acquiring land and establishing the first park roads, but they also cringed at severe landscaping attempts and destructive road designs that cut through historic earthworks. They had their own ideas, drawing upon the history set by Olmsted and his predecessors in landscape architecture and painting, and they put them to work at Fredericksburg.  

The battlefield park’s historic trenches received full consideration as ideas became CCC work projects. NPS Forester F. H. Arnold noted that their preservation, first, and access, using roads and trails, second, guided how the park laid out its landscaping plans. Location of trenches determined their treatment. Those close to roads required clearing to give visitors a sense of their shape, but clearing also hastened erosion. In response, the park investigated different possible vegetative covers, each with its own benefits and disadvantages. Possibilities included planting sod or grasses (expensive to maintain), honeysuckle (needing regular cutting to keep visible trench shape), laying pine needles on top (requiring many more needles than in the park and not longlasting), or using moss (uncertain results requiring special growing conditions). The Park Service often chose wild fescue grasses for sodding the earthworks, noting that these grasses prevented erosion and gave a “natural effect.” Trenches away from the main roads and in wooded areas required less clearing. Dead and downed wood was removed, and light thinning of live material was ordered to remove “poor forms” diseased or undesirable trees, especially small trees and

39 Carr, Wilderness by Design, 5-9, 16-27; McClelland, Building the National Parks, 2-8, Part I.
40 Carr, Wilderness by Design, 203-04, 284-85; McClelland, Building the National Parks, 291-313.
41 E.I. Carner, Camp MP-4 Quarterly Narrative Report 1 October-31 December 1934, 31 December 1934, [no page numbering], BV-348-02.pdf, from Entry 42, RG 79, NARA-Archives II.
Foot paths and trails led visitors to see these earthworks, and the Park Service carefully designed bridges and steps, with a rustic effect, that “add[ed] to the scenery.” The Park Service wanted visitors to walk freely through wooded areas, to feel invited to explore an area with a natural woods appearance.

The 70-year old trenches had naturally compacted and dwindled in size over time, and park historians soon determined that visitors had difficulty imagining them being deep enough and providing protection for soldiers during the battles. Spalding and his historians began investigating selected trench restorations at each battlefield. They conducted extensive research in the primary sources, plus in specialized books on military fortifications. They also discussed whether the restorations should be along historic lines, thereby altering the remains, or where trenches did not exist originally. They decided on the former approach, noting that additional trench lines would confuse visitors independently studying battle lines.

CCC workers (probably from the black Chancellorsville camp) completed the first restoration efforts near the Bloody Angle by December 1935. Cross trenches into the original earthworks established their depth by examining the difference in soil texture. (Figure 17) Workers then dug a 100-foot stretch at 2 feet 3 inches deep. Another team of workers removed the earth of the parapet, taking two feet where the trench ditch began. They placed vertical logs at about seven-foot intervals and horizontal logs to give the necessary height. The workers used block wedges under the top horizontal log to place the head log—to protect the soldier’s head while aiming. Workers cleared trees in front of the restored trenches and laid abatis, entangling smaller branches. The Park Service applied creosote to the logs to extend their lifetimes, plus salt to keep new growth from taking hold and hidden wire to ensure stability. Another restoration, at the east face of the salient at the Bloody Angle, involved digging to establish the depth using the difference in soil texture and then forming the three-sided square earthwork with dirt and horizontal logs. (Figure 18) Workers used the existing remains to determine the width and length of the pit. They estimated the total height of the trench by comparing a man’s height standing inside the trench ditch and the top of the work. They filled in holes with the excavated soil and treated the logs to extend the lifetime of the restoration. They also lay abatis. The Park Service followed on the success of the Spotsylvania Court House work and had CCC enrollees

---

42 Arnold, Forestry Policy for Fredericksburg, 5 October 1933, 3.
45 T. Sutton Jett, Trench Restoration, no date [early 1936], 1-5, File Trench Restoration, Box 2467, RG 79 Central Classified Files 1933-49, NARA-Archives II.
restore trenches in the Wilderness and Chancellorville battlefields by the end of summer 1936. (Figure 19) The Chancellorville restoration showed an artillery position at Fairview. This collection of restorations provided visitors with examples of different earthwork constructions used during the battles and served an important educational role. 46

Relief workers from the Bureau of Public Roads, coordinated through the Park Service’s Branch of Plans and Designs, set park roads, and CCC workers added trails and landscaped the finished areas. Spalding enthusiastically praised the final product, noting that visitors "constantly” commented upon the “exceptionally beautiful drives.” 47 Thinning around trenches along Lee Drive in the Fredericksburg battlefield had allowed the dogwoods, some present from before the time of the Park Service and others added later, to flourish. Locals made annual springtime drives to see these blossoms. 48 The Park Service relocated and redesigned some roads, such as five miles of Lee Drive at Fredericksburg and near the east salient at Spotsylvania Court House, from those originally installed by the War Department. Spalding and others had noted that some War Department roads had cut directly through earthworks or were inappropriately designed for a historical park. 49 All main battlefield roads were resurfaced and maintained in good condition throughout the New Deal period. (Figure 20)

CCC workers came in after the road crews and cleared debris, fine graded and seeded the embankments, and planted trees and shrubs to enhance the beauty of the driving experience. 50 Planting plans drawn up by the NPS Eastern Division of Plans and Designs

---

46 Ibid, 5-10. Spalding assigned trench restoration work to Camp MP-3 in his justification for work. See Memorandum, Spalding to Director, 30 August 1935, 4, File CCC, Box 207, Entry P-84 Branch of Forestry Correspondence, RG 79, NARA-Archives II. FRSP Annual Report, 1936, 4; and FRSP Annual Report, 1937, 4, both in File 207-01.4 Superintendent’s Annual Report, Box 2468, RG 79 Central Classified Files 1933-49, NARA-Archives II. Raleigh Taylor. Museum Report for July 1936, 5 August 1936, 2, File Branch of Historic Sites FRSP Monthly Reports Jett, Box 2466, RG 79 Central Classified Files 1933-49, NARA-Archives II.

47 FRSP Annual Report, Fiscal Year 1938, 4, File 207 Reports, Box 2468, RG 79 Central Classified Files 1933-49, NARA-Archives II.

48 FRSP Annual Report, 1940, 5, File 207-01 Fredericksburg Annual Reports, Box 2468, RG 79 Central Classified Files 1933-49, NARA-Archives II. “Unofficial Dogwood Show Soon To Be on in Local Park,” 3 May 1934; and “The Dogwood Show,” 13 April 1939, both in Free Lance-Star.

49 Memorandum, Spalding to Director, 3 December 1934, 1,File 630-Part 1 Roads, Box 2483, RG 79 Central Classified Files 1933-49, NARA-Archives II. FRSP Annual Report, 1936, 2-3; FRSP Annual Report, 1937, 2. William K. Howard, MP-1 Camp Narrative Report for period 1 October 1934-31 March 1935, 30 March 1935, 2; and William K. Howard, MP-1 Camp Narrative Report for period October, November December 1934, [no date], 2; both in BV-349-02.pdf from Entry 115, RG 35, NARA-Archives II. Chatelain to Eckenrode, 24 August 1933 and attached Memorandum on Fredericksburg, 1. Looking at the maps from the War Department and the NPS between 1930 and 1940, one can see, especially at Spotsylvania Court House, how the Park Service re-located the roads around earthworks, as opposed to through them. Maps available in the FRSP map collection.

guided workers on which types of trees would go where. These plans directed that trees be brought up a bank in one place, scattered across a field elsewhere, or not used to keep a long view in place near a visitor area. The careful notes and indications of what types of trees and grasses should go where testify to the overall landscape design envisioned for the park.\textsuperscript{51} Documentation does not indicate to what extent the historians, conducting research on the battles, and the landscape architects, designing the park lands, communicated. The park’s 1940 annual report, though, does note that CCC workers restored the landscape around the Landram tract at Sylvania Court House, removing timber that had grown up after the wartime period.\textsuperscript{52} A vast majority of the planted trees came to the park as a result of donations from local residents (indicating the good will between the park and park neighbors) or transplants from other areas within the park.\textsuperscript{53} Individual reports provide some sense of the sheer magnitude of tree planting. The 1936 park annual report identified more than 54,000 trees planted, the 1937 report stated that nearly 58,000 trees and shrubs were transplanted, and the 1938 report named another 15,000 trees and shrubs planted along roads.\textsuperscript{54}

Foot trails and bridle paths provided access to earthworks in the interior of the park and addressed recreational needs. (Figures 21-26) Picnic areas, with separate areas designated for white or black visitors, provided wooden tables and fireplaces to keep visitors comfortable during their stays. CCC workers built numerous trails, cutting through undergrowth, removing dead wood, and fording streams and low spots with simple bridges. The park named these trails based on which officer lines the earthworks represented. The Warren-Wadsworth Foot Trail followed the narrow line of Federal earthworks owned by the park in the Wilderness battlefield. Another foot trail, called the Wright-Humphrey Foot Trail, connected to the Warren-Wadsworth one across the Orange Turnpike, and in total the two trails extended for just over four miles. Two shorter trails along Confederate trenches

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{115} RG 35, NARA-Archives II. E. I. Carner, MP-4 Quarterly Narrative Report, 29 September 1934, 2, in BV-348-02.pdf from Entry 42, RG 79, NARA-Archives II.
\item \textsuperscript{51} Planting plans 326-1071 and 326-1072 [Sylvania Court House], 1935; 326-1079 [Wilderness], 1935; 326-1081, 1081 A, 1081b [Jackson Monument, Chancellorsville], 1936; 326-2063 [Lee Drive], 1937, all in TIC.
\item \textsuperscript{52} FRSP Annual Report, 1940, 4.
\item \textsuperscript{53} [No author], MP-3 Camp Narrative Report for Fourth Enrollment Period, no date [October 1934-March 1935], 1, BV-347-03.pdf from Entry 42, RG 79, NARA-Archives II. One forester noted that the park was fortunate to secure all its trees and shrubs for the period he reported on from park neighbors at no cost. He believed this situation was possible due to the “extreme good will” between park and community and the fact that locals served as supervisory personnel for the CCC camps. See J. LeRoy Duford, Report to Chief Forester, 5 November 1935, 1, File CCC, Box 207, Entry P-84 Branch of Forestry Correspondence, RG 79, NARA-Archives II.
\item \textsuperscript{54} FRSP Annual Report, 1936, 2-3; FRSP Annual Report, 1937, 2-3; FRSP Annual Report, 1938, 3. FRSP Annual Report, 1939, 4-5. One associate forester noted in his report to Spalding that the park should be commended on the “almost phenomenal success” achieved with plantings. See Memorandum, J. LeRoy Duford to Spalding, 11 September 1935, 1, File CCC, Box 207, File P-84 Branch of Forestry Correspondence, RG 79, NARA-Archives II.
\end{itemize}
connected the Orange Plank Road to the park’s Hill-Ewell Drive, with Poague’s Battery Foot Trail crossing near the Lee-to-the-Rear marker and the Heth-Field Foot Trail passing a long line of trenches near the Widow Tapp farm. Spotsylvania Court House had several foot trails, including the one-mile Infantrymen Trail along Lee’s last line and Heth’s salient, used by Confederates 10-21 May 1864. Separate Upton, Barlow, and Burnside foot trails all followed along Federal positions while Kershaw’s trail, in honor of the Confederates, led from the Maryland monument down to the Po River crossing site. The Mott-Carr and Dimmick foot trails in Chancellorsville led visitors along an extensive array of Federal earthworks while the short loop Archer-Thomas trail took visitors around Catharine Furnace. Some foot trails could also be used by horseback riders, but the park completed in 1937 the Meade Bridle Path in the Fredericksburg battlefield as a specific resource for horses.

The Park Service chose in some locations to use gravel roads instead of paved ones or foot trails to take visitors into key areas. Hancock Road at Spotsylvania Court House battlefield stretched along this Federal line as a gravel road. The Park Service identified Chancellorsville’s Mineral Spring Road, originally paved, for being changed to gravel surfacing. The most historically significant gravel road in the park followed Jackson’s hidden route in front of the Federals before his surprise attack during the Battle of Chancellorsville. This land came entirely under park ownership by donation, thanks largely to the efforts of members of the Fredericksburg Battlefield Commission. Spalding argued from the start that the Park Service should not use modern road principles of grade and curvature. He wanted the road to “conform as nearly to the character of the original” trail, allowing for two-car width. Spalding initially allowed for paving the road, but further discussions led to the decision to keep it as gravel. CCC labor did much of the work, but when that labor left the park by 1942, the Engineer Corps from A. P. Hill Military Reservation came in to finish the trail in 1943 as a training exercise.

---

55 Locations of trails based on 1930s and 1940s maps in FRSP map archives. Park annual reports from the 1930s provide general information about total length of foot trails completed throughout the park within a year’s time. The same maps indicate locations of picnic areas and sometimes reference which areas were meant for whites or blacks. See also William K. Howard, Narrative Report, Camp MP-1, for Fifth Period, 2, in BV-349-02.pdf from Entry 115, RG 35, NARA-Archives II.


57 Spalding, as quoted in Spalding, Memorandum on the Prospective Acquisition of the Remainder of the Jackson Trail, 18 November 1934, File 630 Part I Roads, Box 2483.; and Memorandum, Spalding to Director, 19 February 1935, and attached Memorandum on Donation of Land for Jackson Trail, 1. File 601 Part I Lands, Box 2480, both in RG 79 Central Classified Files 1933-49, NARA-Archives II. See also FRSP Annual Report, 1936, 4; FRSP Annual Report, 1937, 6; FRSP Annual Report, 1939, 2; FRSP Annual Report, 1938, 6; FRSP Annual Report, 1940, 5. FRSP Annual Report, 1941, 3; and FRSP Annual Report, 1943, 2, both in Box 207-01 Fred Annual Reports, Box 2468, RG 79 Central Classified Files 1933-49, NARA-Archives II. Jackson Trail Plans, 6 sheets, 1939, 326-2074, TIC. Maps for Spotsylvania Court House and Chancellorsville 1930s-1940s, FRSP map collection.
INTERPRETATION AND THE CCC

The National Park Service lost no time in establishing an interpretive program at the park, using CCC enrollees both to build facilities and provide visitor services. The Park Service used the same headquarters building that the War Department had used on Princess Anne Street. The park also used as a contact station a small wooden building, a reconstruction of Washington’s Surveying Office and owned by the local chamber of commerce, at the northern end of Princess Anne. Guides stood at Hamilton’s Crossing at the Fredericksburg battlefield and at Chancellorsville during the fall of 1933, greeting visitors when weather permitted. The park followed on this idea and inaugurated a temporary ranger service in summer 1934 to educate visitors about the battlefields, again dependent upon weather conditions. This spotty availability led the Park Service and its battlefield commission membersto advocate for permanent contact stations on all four battlefields. Spalding argued that the experience of having guides at key locations on the battlefields had worked well for meeting visitors and directing them throughout the park. These guides, however, did not have maps, battle studies, or other aids, nor did they have shelter during inclement weather, reducing their effectiveness. CCC workers built two stations, at Fredericksburg and Chancellorsville in 1935, and the result proved desirable enough to have two more stations, at the other two battlefields, built in 1936.58

These stations measured about 17 feet long and 12 feet wide. They had stone fireplaces (brick on the upper half of the chimney) to supply heat, windows with wood shutters, and doors front and back. Roofs had wood shingles, and exterior walls had vertical board-and-batten siding. The interiors housed simple tables and chairs, plus shelves for keeping books and relics. Each contact station had a porch with roof overhang. (Figure 27) The Fredericksburg station sat at Prospect Hill near Hamilton’s Crossing. (Figure 28) The Chancellorsville station sat directly off Route 3 next to the Jackson Monument. (Figure 29) The Wilderness station sat on Orange Turnpike directly opposite to the start of Hill-Ewell Drive. (Figure 30) Spotsylvania Court House’s contact station sat at the Bloody Angle near the Grant Drive West intersection. (Figure 31) CCC workers also constructed parking areas and approach roads, and they landscaped around the buildings, all in an effort to make the information areas easily accessible and inviting. Concrete relief maps, some with shelters, maps mounted in wood frames, and orientation discs, stood in key places. (Figure 32)

maps allowed visitors on their own to understand battle action, such as at the intersection of Brock Road and Orange Plank Road at the Wilderness battlefield, or where contact stations had rangers to use the relief maps as an additional interpretive device, such as at Hamilton’s Crossing and Spotsylvania Court House. (Figure 33) The park also had an enclosed map shelter built at Sedgwick’s Monument at the entrance to Spotsylvania Court House battlefield, with two maps inside to describe the battles on 8 and 10 May. (Figure 34) The orientation discs, about four feet in diameter and flush with the ground, gave directions and overland distances related to the appropriate battle story.59

The contact stations generally appeared rustic, a common design adopted in the national parks from before the time of the establishment of the National Park Service. This rustic architectural approach ranged in detail from the simple Yosemite Valley Museum Building (1926) to the elaborate twisted wood six-story Swiss chalet-type design of the Old Faithful Inn (1903) at Yellowstone. Use of wood often in its gnarled or rough state, unfinished stones and large rocks, and generally compact buildings meant to fit within the landscape characterized this architectural style. Park architects took into account the specific natural surroundings when designing buildings, making appropriate adoptions to the rustic style. Museum and administration buildings in southwestern parks, for example, adopted a rustic style that fit within the arid and open rolling landscape, using the Indian pueblo as a model. The Casa Grande National Monument administration building (1931) echoed the park’s pueblo ruins with adobe walls and flat roofs. Petrified Forest’s administration building (1931), on the other hand, took the low shape of the pueblo but adapted it by using hand cut stone in a regularized pattern, echoing Arizona’s mesas. All of these examples necessarily come from the western states, location of the first national park sites. When the Park Service took over management of the battlefields and military parks of the eastern half of the nation, designers embraced further adaptations to their style manual for park buildings. Rustic architecture continued to serve for such smaller buildings as the contact stations at Fredericksburg, but when considering a signature building for greeting visitors, educating them about the park overall, and providing administrative space for staff, the National Park

59Interior photos provide information about what the Park Service kept inside the contact stations, see File Wilderness Contact Station, Wilderness Box 1, FRSP Photo Collection. See also FRSP Monthly Report, October 1935, photos of contact stations, File ECW 207 Reports, Box 2468, RG 79 Central Classified Files 1933-49, NARA-Archives II. Designs for relief maps and their shelters at 326-2026, 326-2027, 326-2064, Denver Technical Information Center electronic collection [TIC]. For the map shelter at the Sedgwick Monument, see 326-1100A Map Shelter Drawing, 5 December 1935; 326-1100 Map Shelter Drawing preliminary sketch, 21 October 1935; 326-1034 Ranger Contact Station, 1 April 1935, all in TIC. Report on Outdoor Orientation Maps and Discs, 9 October 1936, 1-4, 6, File Report on Outdoor Maps and Discs, Box 2467, RG 79 Central Classified Files 1933-49, NARA-Archives II. Photos of relief maps in Spotsylvania Box 1, File Spotsylvania Contact Station Bloody Angle; Fredericksburg Box 1, File Fredericksburg Prospect Hill Contact Station, both in FRSP Photo Collection. FRSP Annual Report, 1936, 3; FRSP Annual Report, 1937, 4-5.
Service instead turned to architectural styles consonant with the time period remembered by the park, the antebellum and Civil War years.60

Park officials and the battlefield commission all agreed early on for the need of a museum and administration building for Fredericksburg. Discussion instead turned to the location. The park’s existing temporary headquarters on Princess Anne Street demonstrated the benefit of having a permanent presence on this key street where visitors went. The park did not own any land along this street, though, and no tracts looked promising for donation (preferred) or purchase in the near future. Spalding therefore argued as early as October 1934 that the Park Service should use the Public Works Administration funds already allocated and ready to use to build the museum on land owned by the agency, at the corner of the Sunken Road and Route 1, an important highway through town. He admitted that this location was not ideal, both from the point of view of contacting visitors and of constructing buildings where the park would rather have fewer modern intrusions on the historic scene. But Spalding was a pragmatist who did not want these precious funds diverted and therefore lost from the park. Directional signs would bring visitors in the door, and park interpreters would have easy access to stage their talks and walks about the December 1862 battle. George Palmer remembered much later that he had also advocated for the Sunken Road location, and that other park officials had considered Lee Drive as a possibility. The Park Service chose the Sunken Road, and design and construction commenced in 1935.61

The NPS Chief Architect, Thomas Vint, and his office chose a late Georgian style residential design for the Fredericksburg museum and administration building, with the view of it “harmonizing” with the city’s predominant architectural style62 and keeping with the “fine manor houses” of the latter part of the eighteenth century.63 The central two-story portion contained the main entrance hall and upstairs office space for the superintendent and staff while the one-story wings on either side of the main building, all symmetrically balanced, housed the lecture hall and museum space. (Figure 35) The basement contained additional exhibition space, restroom facilities for white visitors, and storage and office space. Workers also completed an architecturally complimentary one-and-a-half story service building, providing storage and work space for park trucks, plus restroom facilities for blacks. (Figure 36) (Figure 37) Park designers chose a special handmade brick of a dull red color to form the solid brick exterior walls for both buildings. Both buildings sported


62 Memorandum, Spalding to Director, 14 December 1939, File 620-Part 1 Buildings, Box 2483, RG 79 Central Classified Files 1933-49, NARA-Archives II.

two exterior chimneys and white wood details, with the service building displaying Doric pilasters between each garage bay and the museum building topped by a pediment with dentil molding along the cornice and having a fanlight and sidelights surround the main entrance door. Keystones and shutters marked each window on the museum building and slate covered the roofs on both buildings.\footnote{Denton, Final Construction Report Administration and Service Buildings, 3-4.}

The Park Service intentionally designed the museum building’s main floor interior to impress visitors. Architectural details, taken from the best examples of the antebellum period, graced the public spaces. (Figure 38) People walked into a grand entrance hall, extending the full length of the central section of the building, with its “beautifully molded” white wood wainscots and cornice and large crystal chandeliers. The lecture room also had paneled wainscots and cornice while the museum room remained fairly simple, but both side rooms displayed crystal chandeliers. (Figure 39) Park designers chose polished brass hardware to echo the architectural style. Bold white and black rubber tile covered the main floor while random-width oak served the upstairs office space.\footnote{Ibid., 4-5. Quote on p. 4.} Spalding noted in 1939 that when one husband and wife first stepped into the entrance hall, the wife turned and asked, “Is this an old residence?” Spalding considered this comment a compliment to Vint’s office in achieving their desired result.\footnote{Memorandum, Spalding to Director, 14 December 1939.} Outside contractors, largely using relief workers assigned by the National Reemployment Agency based in Fredericksburg, completed the construction of the buildings, plus the driveways and parking areas. CCC workers came in afterwards and cleaned up the work sites, placed sod, and landscaped the area, using Park Service plans that continued the late eighteenth-century theme.\footnote{Final Construction Report Project 1 and 2 Driveways at FRSP Administration Building, 15 September 1937, 10, File Final Construction Report, Break Room Cabinets, FRSP. FRSP Annual Report, 1937, 4.} Spalding noted in the 1938 park annual report that this “masterly job of landscaping” provoked much favorable comment from park visitors and local residents.\footnote{FRSP Annual Report, 1938, 4.}

When deciding on an architectural style for the superintendent’s residence, the Park Service chose the same late Georgian example as the museum and administration building. (Figure 40) Started in 1938 and completed the following year, the house and garage sported a handmade brick exterior in Flemish bond and white wood detailing. The interior showcased carved mantles and massive ceiling moldings. The downstairs floors sported random width natural heartwood of yellow pine. The residence was surrounded by dogwood, redbud, tulip, poplar, hickory, oak, and pine trees. People would eventually call the superintendent’s residence the Branch House, honoring the park’s first superintendent.\footnote{FRSP Annual Report, 1938, 5; FRSP Annual Report, 1939, 6. Happel, FRSP Admin History, 65. “Park Residence, Garden Open,” \textit{Free Lance-Star}, 15 April 1968.}
Just across from the new museum and administration building, the Park Service charged CCC enrollees with reconstructing a section of the Stone Wall that had long before disappeared. Park historians first examined a Civil War-era photograph of the wall to determine its basic appearance. They also studied a remaining section of the wall, off Park Service property, and prepared a research report to accompany the funding request. The report and review of the application determined that the restored wall should be “rough” in appearance, and that unskilled CCC labor could handle the assignment. These men, from the black Chancellorsville camp, completed the job in 1939. (Figure 41) One NPS landscape architect later argued that the rough wall used too much mortar for stability, detracting from the original dry masonry technique. Park historian Happel defended the CCC work, stating that they had “carried out our intention to a reasonable degree.” He believed that the wall should represent a post-war condition, taking into account the effects of the battle and natural conditions wearing down the wall.\(^{70}\)

**PARK INTERPRETATION**

The museum and administration building’s southern antebellum architectural style did not necessarily translate into efficient space for the building’s functions. But park officials, especially Spalding, did not consider this situation a difficulty. He admitted in a lecture at a meeting of the American Association of Museums that while the park’s museum impressed people with its attention to architectural details, the “superfluity of windows, misplaced lights, unstudied wall spaces” and other features made clear that this new building was “built with museum purposes only secondarily in mind.” He easily dismissed this seemingly unfortunate situation, declaring that the entire interpretive program at Fredericksburg was still in an experimental stage and that the museum building was an adjunct to the larger museum of the park itself.\(^{71}\) He thought that what the Park Service was doing at Fredericksburg and other battlefield parks represented a “new kind of educational movement” where history was taught “through the medium of the physical site” as opposed to the printed page. This idea of the historical resource being primary in any educational programming, helping to “re-vitaliz[e]” history and helping visitors “re-live History,” framed

\(^{70}\) Memorandum, Ralph Happel to Spalding, 22 August 1939, 1-2, File 630 Part 1 Roads, Box 2483, RG 79 Central Classified Files 1933-49, NARA-Archives II. Quotes on pp. 1-2. See also Memorandum, Walter H. Sheffield to Regional landscape Architect, 8 August 1939; and Memorandum, Spalding to Regional Director, Region One, 22 August 1939; Memorandum, Robert F. Stevens to Spalding, 23 August 1939, all in File 630 Part 1 Roads, Box 2483, RG 79 Central Classified Files 1933-49, NARA-Archives II. Ralph Happel, “Finish Rebuilding Part of Famed Stonewall which Hid Confederates in Crucial Battle,” *Free Lance-Star*, 26 June 1939.

\(^{71}\) Branch Spalding, Lecture on FRSP Museum to be delivered at American Association of Museums, 20 May 1938, 2, File 833-05 Museums, Box 2486, RG 79 Central Classified Files 1933-49, NARA-Archives II.
how park officials approached interpretation at Fredericksburg, as well as within the entire National Park Service.\footnote{Spalding to William H. Wranek, Jr., 16 March 1936, and attached article for the University of Virginia alumni association, 1, File 504 Part 1 Publicity, Box 2478, RG 79 Central Classified Files 1933-49, NARA- Archives II. Quote from article.}

George Palmer remembered about his time at Fredericksburg that when he first met NPS Chief Historian Verne Chatelain, Chatelain gave him a copy of Harold C. Bryant and W.C. Atwood Jr.’s \textit{Research and Education in the National Park Service}, which summarized the agency’s interpretive approach to 1932, thus focusing upon the natural and prehistoric resources of the western half of the United States.\footnote{Palmer, Memories of His Time at FRSP, 14 April 1982, 10.} This handbook served as the initial guide for developing educational programs in the historical and military parks. A key aspect focused upon the resource itself. Bryant and Atwood open with four general policies for interpretation, with the first two emphasizing that education focus upon the major features of a park, the “real thing” as opposed to academic approaches. The latter two policies stressed that highly trained and knowledgeable Park Service personnel, or rangers, using carefully researched facts convey key information to visitors.\footnote{Harold C. Bryant and W.C. Atwood, Jr., \textit{Research and Education in the National Park Service} (Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office, 1932), Part I Introduction, accessed September 2010 at http://www.nps.gov/history/history/online_books/resedu/resedu1.htm.} Practical manifestations of this policy meant that parks would have informed and engaging rangers lead walks, give campfire talks, and serve at stations at key interest areas, near the significant park features, to answer questions and point out interesting facts.\footnote{Barry Mackintosh, \textit{Interpretation and the National Park Service} (Washington, DC: National Park Service, 1986), Chapter 1, Section The Park Service Assumes Responsibility, accessed September 2010 at http://www.nps.gov/history/history/online_books/mackintosh2/origns_nps_assumes_responsibility.htm.}

Palmer immediately translated the example presented in this handbook to Fredericksburg, stationing guides on the battlefields even before he had contact stations to protect them in adverse weather. He also started, and Spalding continued as early as summer 1934, a temporary ranger service to take people out into the battlefields. The four trained historians assigned to the park (all were originally part of the relief agencies as opposed to National Park Service staff directly) identified promising white CCC enrollees and trained them to serve as uniformed guides at the newly built contact stations. Eventually, educational specialists working at the CCC camps trained the CCC guides. This training had to continue across enrollment cycles since enrollees could not serve more than two years within the CCC, and many opted to leave before that time ended. These CCC men served, along with the trained park historians, as the rangers that visitors saw and interacted with during the park’s New Deal period.\footnote{Palmer to Julius Klein, 28 February 1934, 2, File 101-02 Historical Programs, Box 2465; T. Sutton Jett to Spalding, 22 June 1934, 1, File 0-31 FRSP, Box 2464; Jett, Monthly Report for January 1935, 1 February 1935, 4, File Branch of Historic Sites FRSP Monthly Reports Jett, Box 2466; Jett, Monthly Report for October 1935, 5 November 1935, 5, File Branch of Historic Sites FRSP Monthly Reports Jett, Box 2466; Hubert A. Gurney, Monthly Report for December 1937, 2, File Branch of Historic Sites FRSP Monthly} (Figure 42) Spalding pointed to the success of this
work by describing how these ranger guides acted as “historical salesmen” (avoiding the offensive implications of the term) who successfully swayed some misplaced visitors looking to buy baby wear, for example, into “buying Historic Fredericksburg.”

Further indication of this success came in 1940 when the park inaugurated guided tours on the Fredericksburg battlefield. A “cordial” warm response from visitors prompted Spalding to consider expanding the service to the other battlefields. He saw the value of teaching history “by use of the terrain” and “disseminat[ing] the National Park idea.” Plus the tours allowed the historical staff to flex their interpretive muscles and pursue further development of their abilities. Visitors who took these tours often offered to pay the ranger guides at the end, which the guides refused, and praised the walks and talks for “enlarging the interest, understanding, and appreciation of our people for their country.” Many people also gave suggestions on how to improve the talks to further the cause of “good citizenship education,” which they saw as necessary in light of the current crisis erupting across the world.

The CCC men who served as ranger guides all came from white camps at the park. After the April 1936 closing of the white veterans camp at Bloody Angle, Spalding and his historians had to rely upon CCC enrollees at the white Wilderness camp to aid the park’s interpretive program. When in late 1939 and early 1940 the Wilderness camp looked like it might close, Spalding urgently asked that the black Chancellorsville camp be replaced by a white one. He argued that “unfavorable public reaction” to black guides “makes it impossible” to use the black enrollees. His entire educational program would stay “virtually at a standstill” if he had no white CCC camp from which to draw guides. The black camp closed in 1940, and the white Wilderness camp moved to the Chancellorsville location. The

Reports Gurney, Box 2466, all in RG 79 Central Classified Files 1933-49, NARA-Archives II. Spalding, talk in Fredericksburg, 21 September 1934, 3-4. Memorandum, Spalding to Director, 30 August 1935, 2. FRSP Annual Report, 1936, 1. By 1938, the historical staff appears to be assigned as NPS employees. See FRSP Annual Report, 1938, 1.

77 Spalding, talk in Fredericksburg, 21 September 1934, 4.

78 Quotes from FRSP Annual Report, 1940, 1, File 207-01 Fred Annual Reports, Box 2468, RG 70 Central Classified Files 1933-49, NARA-Archives II. See also Memorandum, Spalding to Director, 16 July 1940, File 867 Tours, Box 2487, RG 79 Central Classified Files 1933-49, NARA-Archives II. Of course, once the CCC camps were disbanded in 1942, the park no longer had the extra staff to support these guided tours. Northington noted in 1948 as park superintendent that “a long road back would have to be travelled” before achieving the success of the CCC years with park interpretation. See FRSP Annual Report, 1948, File 207-01.4 Superintendent’s Annual Reports, Box 2468, RG 79 Central Classified Files, NARA-Archives II.

79 Spalding, Letters of Praise Park Service, 22 November 1940, File 840 Educational Activities and Methods, Box 2487, RG 79 Central Classified Files 1933-49, NARA-Archives II. Quotes on pp. 2, 1, consecutively.

80 Quotes from Herbert Evison to Stanton Smith, 5 August 1938, BV-348-03.pdf from Entry 65, RG 79, NARA-Archives II. Evison was repeating what Spalding had stated to him, as in Memorandum, Spalding to Regional Director, Region 1, 2 February 1940, BV-348-03.pdf from Entry 65, RG 79, NARA-Archives II.
park had white CCC enrollees for a little longer until the entire program shut down with the
onslaught of American participation in World War II.

Spalding embraced a strong research component to the interpretive program. The park
established a research library and steadily acquired key primary and secondary works to aid
research and understanding about the battles fought in the area and about the Civil War and
history of Virginia more generally. (Figure 43) Local residents and other park supporters
donated many of these books.81 Spalding hoped that this Civil War library, a pet project of
his, would become a “logical center for serious study” of the Virginia battles.82 He also
inaugurated seminars, similar to what graduate school programs did in the universities. The
park historians and CCC guides met bi-weekly to exchange ideas, ask questions, and share
knowledge. Spalding invited historians from the Park Service’s Washington headquarters to
give short talks on specific topics of interest to all. He saw these seminars as a way to “meet
an intellectual need” and “quicken our minds” to ultimately aid service to the public.83 He
did not want the park historians to narrow their research to a single area, though. He wanted
all of this research and discussion to better serve visitors, ultimately. He also wanted to avoid
“any appearance of partiality” when addressing potentially controversial topics, using the
strong research base as a foundation.84 Junior Historian Oscar Northington (who would go
on to become a longtime superintendent of the park) presented one historical conference, as
the seminars came to be called, on his research on the Catharine Furnace, using both
documentary and excavation (archeological) sources. CCC guide James Kolinski used his
research on the field and in his documentary study of the Official Records to describe at
another conference Gordon’s flank attack of 6 May 1864.85 The historical staff and some
CCC guides also wrote articles and even books and guide books that saw publication in an
array of venues. Spalding and a few others routinely gave slide talks to outside groups and

81 FRSP Annual Report, 1938, 3; FRSP Annual Report, 1939, 4; FRSP Annual Report, 1940, 3-4; FRSP
Annual Report, 1941, 2-3; FRSP Annual Report, 1943, 3. Manassas to Appomattox: The Year in the
National Battlefield Parks of Virginia, 1938, 1. File 504 Part 1 Publicity, Box 2478, RG 79 Central
Classified Files 1933-49, NARA-Archives II.

82 Spalding to Col. G. L. McEntee, 9 December 1939, 2, attached to memorandum, Spalding to Regional
Director, Region 1, 9 December 1939, File 504 Part 1 Publicity, Box 2478, RG 79 Central Classified Files
1933-49, NARA-Archives II.

83 Memorandum, Spalding to Chatelain, 8 August 1934, File Memoranda to Mr. Chatelain, Cabinet 10,
Drawer 1, FRSP Basement Files.

84 Memorandum, Spalding to Director, 8 June 1939, 1, File 840 Educational Activities and Meetings, Box
2487, RG 79 Central Classified Files, NARA-Archives II.

85 Jett, Monthly Report November 1935, 4 December 1935, 3; and Jett, Monthly Report for December
1935, 9 January 1936, 4, both in File Branch of Historic Sites FRSP Monthly Reports Jett, Box 2466, RG
79 Central Classified Files 1933-49, NARA-Archives II. Memorandum, Spalding to Director, 8 June 1939,
1, File 840 Educational Activities and Methods, Box 2487, RG 79 Central Classified Files 1933-49,
NARA-Archives II.
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professional organizations, further publicizing the park but also instituting a strong historical foundation to the park’s interpretive program.\textsuperscript{86}

The new museum’s exhibit space reflected this attention to historical research and Spalding’s view of NPS interpretation that the land itself, the historical resource, was the primary focus of the park’s educational program. The exhibits, he believed, should be expository, not narrative, in form to explain components of the park’s story rather than tell the entire story. That story, Spalding believed, should be told to visitors while they toured the park lands with a uniformed ranger or when they read the many markers and maps placed for self-guided tours.\textsuperscript{87} Ranger historian Ralph Happel, who would stay at the park until his 1972 retirement, echoed Spalding’s viewpoint, writing that “the fields themselves are the real, the living museum” while the museum itself was the “orientation point for the fields.”\textsuperscript{88} The museum exhibits, largely done in-house due to funding constraints, focused upon the overall theme of the effect of war upon the development of a culture, about man in war. The eight initial display cases targeted different aspects of this theme, looking at camp life for a typical soldier, artillery firing mechanisms, the number of casualties for both sides during the battles, the development of relief organizations to aid wounded soldiers, surgical practices, and the logistics of moving troops and supplies for the battles. (Figure 44) One case also looked at the development of photography and its role in chronicling different wars. (Figure 45) A case displayed a collection of small arms purchased by the City of Fredericksburg for display in the park museum.\textsuperscript{89} (Figure 46) A diorama (completed by the Morristown Modeling Laboratory) recreated the intersection of Hanover and George Streets after the December 1862 bombing by the Federals, showing the “cold desolation, destruction” and “grim implications” to serve as an “eloquent commentary upon war.”\textsuperscript{90} Many visitors, according to later reporting, reacted positively to this diorama, displaying “wonder and admiration”\textsuperscript{91} at its realistic and detailed depiction. A large terrain model of the

\textsuperscript{86} FRSP Annual Report, 1936, 5-7; FRSP Annual Report, 1937, 8-9; FRSP Annual Report, 1938, 7; Manassas to Appomattox, 1938, 2; FRSP Annual Report, 1939, 7; FRSP Annual Report, 1940, 7.

\textsuperscript{87} Spalding, Lecture on Museum, 20 May 1938. Interestingly, Spalding’s intention to have the museum exhibits be expository, not narrative, was ahead of what the NPS did at first at its historical parks. Not until the Mission 66 era did historical parks across the system adopt this approach. See Mackintosh, Interpretation in NPS, Chapter 3, section New Directions: Museum Visitor Centers and the New Look, accessed September 2010 at http://www.nps.gov/history/history/online_books/mackintosh2/directions_museums.htm.

\textsuperscript{88} Ralph Happel, History and Description of FRSP and Four Self-Guide Tours, no date [1936], 7, File 11, Box Unarranged Records 1, Collection Happel 14117, CVC, FRSP.

\textsuperscript{89} 1936 Exhibit Plan, unpaginated; and Introduction to the Museum Plan of FRSP, 1936, unpaginated, both in File D6215 FVC Exhibit Plan 1936, Cabinet 10, Drawer 1, FRSP Basement Files. Spalding, Lecture on Museum, 20 May 1938. FRSP Annual Report, 1937, 5; FRSP Annual Report, 1939, 3. Memorandum, Spalding to Director, 27 July 1937, 1, File 833-05 Museums, Box 2486, RG 79 Central Classified Files 1933-49, NARA-Archives II.

\textsuperscript{90} Quotes from Spalding, Lecture on Museum, 20 May 1938, 6. See also T. Sutton Jett, Museum Report, 5 February 1936, 14, File D6215 FVC Exhibit Plan 1936, Cabinet 10, Drawer 1, FRSP Basement Files.

\textsuperscript{91} Happel, FRSP Admin History, 62.
Fredericksburg-Wilderness area (completed by the Fort Hunt Model Laboratory) indicated the relationship of each battle to the other and how the terrain determined battle location and fighting techniques. (Figure 47) The park also installed a relic museum in the basement area, recognizing a lingering demand of visitors to see the “rust and dust of age.”

The National Park Service operated in a deferential mode with respect to the language and themes presented in exhibits at Fredericksburg and other Virginia Civil War battlefield parks. Park Service officials reviewed the proposed exhibit texts, but they also asked the Virginia state historian, H. J. Eckenrode, and eminent Lee scholar Douglas Southall Freeman to read them. Eckenrode published in 1934 an unflattering biography of James Longstreet, perpetuating the post-Civil War Southern rejection of this central general in the Confederacy. The Park Service’s reliance upon these outside reviewers, each with their veneration for the Confederate cause, ensured that national park exhibits throughout the state stayed away from controversial topics such as slavery and the causes of the war. This approach also aided the Park Service in checking the historical accuracy of interpretive texts.

The park constructed a different kind of interpretive tool near the Stonewall Jackson monument at Chancellorsville. Many natural parks within the NPS system used wildflower displays inside museums to highlight the diversity of plant life. The 1932 handbook on interpretation recorded the value of such displays. Spalding decided to take the botanical display idea a step further and had a two-acre wildflower preserve built in memory of Jackson near the place he received his mortal wound. (Figure 48) In total, the preserve contained at its height 175 varieties native to the area set in a naturalistic setting. A trail led through the preserve and a foot bridge crossed a marshy area. Spalding wrote that the flowers were “silent witnesses” to the “unintentional blow which felled a mighty warrior” whom Spalding compared to Beowulf. These flowers, “beautiful in sentiment and substance” possibly served as a more fitting memorial than a bronze or granite monument because they were “to the taste of the simple and devout figure” they commemorated. Spalding saw the wildflower preserve as an interpretive device, but he also seems to have had a soft spot for Jackson. He wrote a documented article-length piece in 1938 arguing that Jackson may have purposefully left his line open during the Fredericksburg 1862 battle, allowing the Federal I Corps to slip in and then get routed in what Spalding considered a “deliberate trap.”

---

94 Bryant and Atwood, Research and Education in the National Parks, Part I, Section Wild-Flower Displays, accessed September 2010 at http://www.nps.gov/history/history/online_books/resedu/resedu1e.htm.
95 Spalding, “Flowers to Jackson’s Memory,” September 1935, copied from The Commonwealth, No File, Cabinet 7, Drawer 1, FRSP Basement Files.
Spalding noted that such a trap would have been “perfectly Jacksonian” and “worked superbly.”

An array of passive information sources supplemented the ranger guide service, museum exhibits, and wildflower display. As noted previously, concrete maps, relief maps, markers, and orientation discs dotted the battlefield landscape and provided visitors with succinct statements about battle action. (Figure 49) If visitors happened to stop at the museum or even caught an information display in Fredericksburg itself, they could also pick up a free brochure describing the Civil War battles and mapping out the lay of the park. George Palmer remembered that, in response to NPS Chief Historian Chatelain’s urging to publicize the parks to the local community, he worked with T. Sutton Jett on a one-fold leaflet. The text and map became the first informational literature distributed in one of the military parks. More formal and extensive brochures followed, including a special 1939 two-column 30-page booklet (probably not free but available at a low cost) describing all of the Virginia national battlefield parks.

Some special events rounded out the park’s interpretive program during the New Deal years. George Palmer and T. Sutton Jett planned a bonfire program on the anniversary of Lee and Jackson’s last meeting, the night before Jackson’s famous flank attack at the 1863 Battle of Chancellorsville. According to Palmer, Jett convinced the president of the local chapter of the Daughters of the Confederacy to co-sponsor the affair, and Spalding, who knew the prominent historian Douglas Southall Freeman, asked Freeman to participate. Freeman agreed to speak without charging a fee. Palmer later remembered that he, Palmer, arrived at the program after dinner and had to walk a mile, thanks to all of the traffic, to get to the site. He arrived too late to witness the event, but clearly a number of people from around the area attended.

Between 30,000 and 50,000 people attended the 2 May 1935 Chancellorsville reenactment held at the park. Freeman returned and addressed the crowd before the sham battle action undertaken by members of the Fifth United States Marines, representing Federal forces; the Cadet Corps of the Virginia Military Institute, representing Confederate forces; and the Third United States Cavalry, representing the cavalry for both sides. (Figure 50) Spalding reported that from the perspective of “education, memorialization, and park publicity,” the event was a thorough success. The morning section of the program included Freeman’s narrative of the military operations, using huge maps, and a reenactment of Jackson’s march in front of Hooker’s line. (Figure 51) In the afternoon, the venue switched

---

96 Spalding, Jackson’s Fredericksburg Tactics, Spring 1938, 5, No File, Cabinet 7, Drawer 1, FRSP Basement Files. Spalding also suggested the idea for a statue of Stonewall Jackson at Manassas National Battlefield Park. See Zenzen, Battling for Manassas, 27.
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99 Spalding, Memorandum to Director, Monthly Report for May 1935, 8 June 1935, 1, File Admin History, Eric Mink Files, FRSP.
to Fairview Heights where Freeman concluded his address and then the three military units that were participating in the reenactment proceeded to act out the key engagements, leading to the climactic moment when the Confederates took and held the Federal line. A local newspaper reported that the cheers from the audience “echoed for miles.” This same paper noted that the “Lost Cause” was “hymned and mourned,” and the Stars and Bars of the Confederacy “waved bravely.”

Graying Confederate soldiers from the battle sat beside Governor George C. Perry of Virginia. Sue Chancellor, who had watched the battle from the Chancellor House, attended. Official dignitaries included NPS Director Arno B. Cammerer and Hon. Frederic A. Delano, representing President Roosevelt. An exhibition cavalry drill capped the day’s events, with music, rodeo, and machine gun drill. Thirty-six Marine airplanes performed intricate stunts and dropped flowers onto the graves of the 19,000 who had died at the 1863 battle. The Park Service worked with a group of ten local leaders, members of the Fredericksburg National Battlefield Park Association, to organize the free event. Newspapers, radio stations, and news reels publicized the reenactment nationally.

All of this programming and development of park lands translated into steadily increasing numbers of visitors at the park. Spalding reported numbers of people annually, though he does not provide information about how the staff counted. Were these actual contacts by rangers at the various stations on the battlefields and at the museum building or were these estimates based on distinct time periods of counting and then extrapolated for the entire year? As of the war years in the early 1940s, the park counted based on personal contacts at the museum and administration building, plus using a traffic counter on Lee Drive in the Fredericksburg battlefield. No counters kept track of visitation at the other battlefields. The traffic counter would have included the many local residents using the drive for recreational purposes or simply as a road to get to their destination. No matter the methods used, the reported numbers jumped, from 25,000 in 1934 to around 100,000 through the rest of the decade. This dramatic change suggests that park development made a profound difference in how many people visited.

LAND ACQUISITION AND OUTSIDE DEVELOPMENT

Some special events marked key land acquisitions. A ceremony on 23 October 1937 honored the transfer of the Jackson Shrine from the Richmond, Fredericksburg, and Potomac Railroad to the National Park Service. (Figure 52) This event also officially opened

---

100 Quote from Blair Bolles, “Chancellorsville Rings to ‘Rebel Yell’ in Brilliant Re-Enactment,” as copied in Memorandum, Spalding to Director, Monthly Report for May 1935, 8 June 1935, unpaginated. See also Battle of Chancellorsville, 2 May 1935, brochure, Folder 9, Box 11, Drawer 4, Cabinet 8, CVC FRSP Archives.
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the new Fredericksburg museum and administration building to the public. The day began at
the park headquarters, moved on to the Lee-Jackson bivouac point, where historian Freeman
spoke, and then concluded at the Jackson Shrine. The late William H. White, former
president of the railroad and one of the VMI cadets who had served in the Battle of New
Market during the Civil War, had acquired in 1909 for the railroad the land and structures
associated with Stonewall Jackson’s last days after the Chancellorsville battle. Following
White’s passing in 1920, his successor, the late Eppa Hunton, Jr., son and namesake of the
Confederate brigadier general, began negotiations with the federal government for transfer
of the property while also instituting repairs of the cottage where Jackson had died. The
railroad donated the property in 1937 to the Park Service.\footnote{103}

Acting Secretary of the Interior Charles West formally accepted the donation and spoke
at the ceremony. He noted that conservation of historic sites such as the shrine preserved
and deepened knowledge about America’s past. He also emphasized the idea of
reconciliation and unity, stating that the United States government’s acceptance of a shrine
for a southern hero represented a “concrete example of the equal honor” paid to heroes of
both the North and South. West pointed to the “spirit of cooperation” between the two
sides when they later fought together in the Spanish-American War and the World War. He
also argued, tangential to his main purpose, that everyone could now “all acknowledge” that
Reconstruction had been carried out in a “spirit of vindictiveness” that “accentuated
sectional misunderstanding” and postponed regional unity. He accepted the property in
“sacred trust” with the understanding that the United States would maintain it as a memorial
to the “valor and character” of Jackson.\footnote{104} The Park Service would not complete a full
architectural survey and restoration of the property until the early 1960s.

The Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States, Philadelphia, donated the
162-acre Landram tract at Spotsylvania Court House in a special ceremony in May 1940.
Edward T. Stuart, a banker originally from Spotsylvania but then living in Philadelphia,
played a key role in this donation. He had previously donated from his land holdings the
Bloody Angle. He gave the Loyal Legion about 21 acres of the original Landram tract,
specifying that the land go to the park. The legion then purchased the rest of the tract and
donated the whole to the park. The formal ceremony tendering the donation to the park, on
11 May, brought 250 Philadelphians down to Fredericksburg on a special train, arranged by
the Fredericksburg National Park Battlefield Association. They toured the museum and then
took cars to the Spotsylvania battlefield. A total of 800 people attended the event, with
Virginia Governor James Price, NPS regional director Minor R. Tillotson, and two

\footnote{103} “Railroad Chief Presents Deed,” Free Lance-Star, 25 October 1937. Ralph Happel to Editor, Richmond
Times-Dispatch, 22 April 1958, Deed # 98, FRSP Lands Files. Happel, FRSP Admin History, 64.

\footnote{104} Charles West, his speech is quoted in entirety in “Jackson Shrine Accepted on Behalf of Government,”
Free Lance-Star, 27 October 1937. See also transcript of West speech in File FRSP Correspondence 1941-1942, NRHE Files.
Philadelphia giving addresses. This donation made an important contribution of keeping adverse development, already a concern by 1940, outside of this battlefield.105

More land donations came to the Wilderness battlefield in the 1940s. Rep. James Wadsworth (R-NY) had toured the battlefield in 1936 and expressed dismay by the NPS sign marking the spot where his grandfather Federal Gen. James R. Wadsworth had been fatally hit by a Confederate bullet. The congressman asked the Park Service to verify the exact location where his grandfather had fallen, and research indicated that the spot lay off Park Service land. Wadsworth had a monument placed on this new site, just north of the Plank Road and east of the park’s Hill-Ewell Drive. (Figure 53) The monument contains a bronze tablet with a left profile bas relief of the fallen general set in an 8 ½-foot rough stone column on an eight-inch stone base. He later asked that the park accept his donation of the land and memorial. Spalding initially resisted, since the marker sat off park land, but by 1940, he recognized that additional lands were coming into the park in that area, and he agreed. Wadsworth’s sister formally transferred the land and memorial to the park in 1941. The other lands added in the same vicinity came from the New Jersey legislature. Alvin S. Crispin of Woodstown, NJ, had long wanted a monument built to remember the 12th New Jersey Volunteers, which had been raised in his same county and had as a member one of his ancestors. He convinced the president of the New Jersey Senate to support an appropriation for a marker and associated lands, and the senate secured $700. Some discussion resulted as to the location for the marker, with the final decision made to buy 20 acres at the Wilderness battlefield at the southwest corner of the Brock-Plank Roads. The marker stands almost five feet tall with a bronze plaque set into a dark shale rough-faced boulder. (Figure 54) Crispin planned an elaborate dedication ceremony, involving an itinerary with travel to other sites within the battlefield park, but the war emergency led supporters who had planned to attend to urge frugality. Crispin canceled the planned 1942 event, hoping to hold it after the war, which did not happen.106

Spalding and subsequent superintendents became increasingly alarmed about development threats encroaching upon battlefield land outside the park’s boundaries. Park lands stood increasingly at the crossroads of incoming development proposals. Spalding noted in his 1941 annual report that the two recent Wilderness acquisitions would “extend protection to extremely important historic lands” not included in the “very inadequate

105 FRSP Annual Report, 1940, 2. Happel, FRSP Admin History, 65-68. “Park To Get 152 Acres in Bloody Angle Area,” Free Lance-Star, 10 April 1939. Memorandum, Spalding to Director, 16 March 1940, and attached draft memorandum by Ralph Happel, File 601 Part 2 lands, Box 2480, RG 79 Central Classified Files 1933-49, NARA-Archives II. The draft was then finalized as Memorandum, Herbert Kahler to Director, 27 March 1940, File 871 Fredericksburg Commission, Box 2487, RG 79 Central Classified Files 1933-49, NARA-Archives II. When Stuart passed away in December 1940, his family donated the bulk of his book collection to the park library. See FRSP Annual Report, 1941, 2.

original acquisition” for the park.\textsuperscript{107} He began working with potential donors, such as Crispin from New Jersey and the ultimately important donor John Lee Pratt (who would later will Chatham to the park), with an eye toward acquiring not just earthworks but also land where fighting actually occurred. He noted in one plea to Pratt that he hoped he could convince someone friendly to the park to buy Wilderness land while the price per acre was still low. “It hurts my soul,” Spalding wrote, “to think of our waiting” until it was too late.\textsuperscript{108}

The wartime demand for raw resources, such as timber, combined with the post-war boom in residential and commercial building, played out in excruciating detail around the park. Spalding warned in October 1940 that “this is not static agricultural area” as the original sponsors for establishment of the battlefield park had supposed.\textsuperscript{109} Within two weeks of this statement, he wrote to NPS Director Arno B. Cammerer that one land owner in the Wilderness intended to clear cut timber along a strip about two miles long and about a half-mile to three-quarters mile wide, coming within a few feet of the park-owned earthworks and Warren-Wadsworth foot trail developed by CCC labor. This action, which Spalding later reported would be twice as extensive as originally believed, would “denude an area” which had been at the time of the Civil War and continued to be (until the clear cutting) “densely forested.” It would transform the historic scene, in a negative way, Spalding cautioned.\textsuperscript{110}

Housing developments, lumbering operations, and access road requests multiplied. Spalding noted that in former times, farmers asked for occasional access roads onto park roads to allow for infrequent timbering operations, for example. These access roads would link private property and park roads, bringing local traffic into parklands. Oftentimes when the park acquired land, it gave access rights to the original land owners to allow access to the remaining private land. These access rights would later plague the Park Service, providing entry locations through parklands to private developments. By the 1940s, for example, developers started using access rights to park roads for housing projects, and Spalding knew that these new roads would “be used constantly.”\textsuperscript{111} The Fredericksburg battlefield area, along Lee Drive, saw the first incursions of invasive development. Spalding urged to have screen planting put up as early as 1940 to block views from the road into a new subdivision.\textsuperscript{112} Immediately following World War II, more housing units appeared, with a
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Francis Wilshin, Interpretive Section of the Development Outline for the FRSP Master Plan, 11 January 1952, 2, 9, File D1815 Historic Base Map, Cabinet 10, Drawer 1, FRSP Basement Files.

Memorandum, Ronald F. Lee to Director, 5 June 1946, 1, File 601 Part 2 Lands, Box 2480, RG 79 Central Classified Files 1933-49, NARA-Archives II.

Memorandum, O. F. Northington, Jr., to Ronald F. Lee, 9 August 1946, File FRSP Correspondence 1943-53, NRHE Files.

Memorandum, Tyler B. Keiner to Regional Director, Region One, 30 October 1945, 2, File 601 Part 2 Lands, Box 2480, RG 79 Central Classified Files 1933-49, NARA-Archives II.

The growing reality of these development threats made clear the inadequacy of the park’s enabling legislation. The Antietam plan, acquiring only the earthworks and narrow lanes for park roads to provide access, leaving the rest of the land private, wrongly predicted that the land would remain passively agricultural. Tyler Kiener, who served briefly as park superintendent during the war years, warned that rapidly growing numbers of developments around park boundaries meant that historic land acquisitions would “gradually become more difficult, if not impossible” to complete. NPS Chief Historian Ronald Lee, who succeeded Verne Chatelain, proclaimed to NPS Director Newton B. Drury that the original reliance upon the Antietam plan was proving in 1946 “to be a hazardous and completely inadequate plan for permanently protecting the values” for which Fredericksburg was established. This plan may have worked for the first twenty years of the park’s existence, but “it is no longer adequate.” Army War College officers had even expressed “marked concern over the impending loss” from development of associated battle sites. For the immediate period, Lee urged that the park pursue acquisition of a 215-acre tract in the Fredericksburg battlefield, including the Meade Pyramid, to keep the land safe from development and preserve “the only Union positions exhibited in the park.” He also recommended that the Park Service pursue in subsequent years further land acquisition at Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania, otherwise “much that has been accomplished [in developing the park] will be negated.” He warned that these postwar developments might well “ruin the effort and investment of the
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past decades." Initial steps to address these concerns resulted in the development of a revised park boundary map in 1951, but actual land acquisition remained stalled.

STAFFING

Branch Spalding left Fredericksburg and the National Park Service in 1942, moving to the University of Virginia to head the alumni association. He had re-established good relations between the park and local community following the difficulties George Palmer had encountered with the different town factions. He had, more importantly, set a foundation for administration of the park and interpretation for visitors. He strengthened his administrative capabilities when he served (beginning in March 1936) as coordinating superintendent of all the Virginia national battlefield parks, and then when he served (September 1936 to February 1938) as the acting assistant director of the Branch of Historic Sites and Buildings, following passage of the 1935 Historic Sites Act and the resignation of chief historian Verne Chatelain. Spalding’s emphasis upon historical research at Fredericksburg, with development of the park library and use of research seminars to share ideas and improve understanding, would continue to shape the park through the 20th century. Spalding also expanded the visitor services that Palmer had initiated, arguing for the importance of contact stations at each battlefield and initiating guided tours on the Fredericksburg battlefield. He saw the new museum building and its exhibits as an opportunity to experiment with educating the public. He had his staff try different approaches, with exhibit displays focusing on central aspects of battlefield tactics and soldier and civilian life, as opposed to narrating specific details about the battles themselves.

He had a superb staff. Ralph Happel, who would go on to become a fixture in the interpretive division, started around the time Palmer left in 1934. Happel was a Fredericksburg native and had completed his undergraduate and graduate degrees at the University of Virginia. He had an interest in journalism and humor, but he chose history as his profession. Oscar Northington, another early member of the park’s historical team, would become park superintendent in 1946, staying in that role until 1967. Francis Wilshin, who joined the Fredericksburg historical team in 1942, stayed until 1955 when he transferred to Manassas as superintendent. Each of these historians channeled their research efforts into historical papers and gave talks beyond the park boundaries to school groups, community groups, and others. Happel took it upon himself to be the park photographer, and his carefully taken and labeled collection of photos remains an important resource. Wilshin, a native Virginian with a master’s degree from Columbia University who had previously served

---

118 Memorandum, Lee to Director, 5 June 1946, 1-2.
119 Memorandum, Conrad L. Wirth to Regional Director, Region One, 19 October 1951, 1, File L1417 FRSP, Box 1630, Entry P-11, RG 79, NARA-Archives II.
120 Happel, FRSP Admin History, 57, 62. Hosmer, Preservation Comes of Age, 603-04.
at Vicksburg and Saratoga before coming to Fredericksburg, helped shape early revisions of
the park’s master plan interpretive statements.121

At the height of the CCC presence, Spalding had the staff to give growing numbers
of visitors a personalized experience while learning about the four Civil War battles. He also
had the roads, trails, and public buildings to accommodate visitors. World War II with its
severe rationing and reduction of personnel, including leaving the park with no maintenance
staff, challenged short-lived superintendents Edward Hummel and Tyler Kiener (Hummel
returned for a short time after his World War II service, but then he was transferred to
Colonial NHP as superintendent) in their efforts to maintain basic visitor programming and
address increasing development demands. Many of those visitors actually came from the
armed services, as was the case in many national parks during the war. The soldiers surveyed
the landscape and studied the battle tactics, part of a larger effort to learn from past wars
while preparing for the current one. Some soldiers also came simply to enjoy a brief reprieve
from their duties and gain a strengthened patriotic sense of the reasons for which they
fought. With the end of the war, the park (and the entire National Park Service) remained at
wartime staffing and appropriations while the public celebrated victory in part by traveling
again. Fredericksburg the city and Spotsylvania the county exhibited growing pains, and
Fredericksburg the park documented growing development threats, without the staff and
money to adequately address them. One important new innovation in the park museum
appeared in 1954, an electric map to help visitors appreciate the unfolding Fredericksburg
battle story. The inauguration of Mission 66, a 10-year park improvement program initiated
in 1956 and set to end on the National Park Service’s 50th anniversary in 1966, offered hope
for struggling parks like Fredericksburg.122

ANALYSIS

The National Park Service transformed the narrow collection of land with connecting
park roads spread across four battlefields into a cohesive and engaging educational and
recreational experience. Strong leadership skills by Spalding, indispensable funding and
labor supplied by the Civilian Conservation Corps, and careful historical research by park
historians (and to some extent CCC guides) made this stunning achievement possible. This

information on Wilshin can be found in Joan M. Zenzen, Battling for Manassas: The Fifty-Year
Preservation Struggle at Manassas National Battlefield Park (University Park: Pennsylvania State
University Press, 1998), 52. Wilshin, Interpretive Section of the Development Outline of the FRSP Master
Plan, 11 January 1952.

122 Happel had to transfer to Petersburg during part of the war years due to lack of funding to keep him at
FRSP. The park during this time also had no maintenance force, either in person or on paper. See FRSP
Annual Report, 1945, 2, 6, File 207-01.4 Superintendent’s Annual Report, Box 2468, RG 79 Central
Classified Files 1933-49, NARA-Archives II. For information about the parks during World War II, see
Janet A. McDonnell, “World War II: Defending Park Values and Resources,” The Public Historian 29
(Fall 2007): 15-33. On Army visits to the park, see FRSP Annual Report 1941, 5; and FRSP Annual
date, File D6215 Electric Map Program FVC, Cabinet 15, Drawer 4, FRSP Basement Files.
accomplishment determined the shape and future of the park for years to come. The importance of these New Deal years in shaping the park’s future requires analysis. Historical research, including further development of the park library and archival collection about the Civil War battles, would continue to be a defining characteristic. Having the interpretive staff considered historians, and trained as such, also distinguishes Fredericksburg battlefield park, especially as other historical parks within the national park system lost their historians and used instead specially trained interpreters of different educational backgrounds. Park managers also quickly recognized the dangers of adhering closely to the Antietam model for land acquisition and sought to increase park lands to ensure that the park could tell its stories. Interpretation, based on historical research, made the land itself primary and encouraged visitors to interact with trained guides, as available, at each battlefield. Reconstructing trenches, restoring sections of key fields, and building trails and roads to provide access all ensured that visitors had an opportunity to experience the battlefields and take home an understanding of how the battles played out on the ground.

These accomplishments took place, though, within a mindset of southern traditions and cultural norms, especially with respect to race. Spalding, Happel, Wilshin, Jett, Northington, and probably others all came from Virginia and thus were knowledgeable about its customs. The NPS Washington headquarters allowed the construction of separate rest rooms and picnic areas for blacks and whites. Whites used rest rooms in the museum building basement, but blacks had to go to the garage next door. The museum and headquarters building itself suggested southern racial customs. The late Georgian architectural style for this public space recalled not only the typical architecture of the antebellum and Civil War era, but it also reminded people, probably unconsciously, of the power relations that would have resided within such well-to-do antebellum homes. Wealthy whites would have owned such a home, and blacks would have served as slaves. The glass chandeliers, elaborate white woodworking, and other architectural details reinforced the impression that this public museum was meant to look like a former wealthy antebellum residence.123

The stories told, or not told, within the museum reinforced the southern white tradition, especially its reverence for the Lost Cause tradition and the ideas of reconciliation and reunion. All exhibits were reviewed not just by the National Park Service but also by the Virginia state historian and by Douglas Southall Freeman, who had many contacts with and talks at the park. These reviews ensured that only certain story lines, focused on the fighting and not slavery and the causes of the war, found a voice at the park museum. The diorama,

---

123 Although he does not examine national park architecture, Robert Weyeneth does provide some important examples of how whites segregated public spaces and how blacks negotiated those spaces, serving as an example for the situation at national parks like FRSP. See Robert R. Weyeneth, “The Architecture of Racial Segregation: The Challenges of Preserving the Problematical Past,” The Public Historian, 27 (Fall 2005): 11-44. See also Seth C. Bruggeman, Here, George Washington Was Born: Memory, Material Culture, and the Public History of a National Monument (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2008), 151-52. Bruggeman shows that Phil Hough, who served as superintendent of FRSP in the first months of NPS control of the park, displayed strong negative racial attitudes towards blacks at his primary park, George Washington Birthplace.
in particular, stands out as a justification for the Lost Cause. Spalding had written that this diorama was meant to reinforce the destruction and desolation of war, an appropriate and worthy goal. It displays a shattered street corner in Fredericksburg after the Federal December 1862 bombardment (although subsequent research has determined that the destruction actually came from Confederate forces responding to Federal bombardment). This bombardment and subsequent ransacking by Federal forces caused significant personal property damage, though not much in terms of Confederate human losses. When considered in light of the 10,000 Federal wounded and dead before the Stone Wall after repeated Federal assaults and deadly aim by well-situated Confederate forces on Marye’s Heights, though, the street corner scene fails to relay the full force of the brutality of war. The diorama instead makes the Federal bombardment seem like an overly aggressive attack upon innocent people who had done and were to do no harm, a Lost Cause perspective.

A major story not told in the museum exhibits revolved around the reasons for the battles fought around Fredericksburg. These reasons include why Americans fought in a civil war in the first place, including the slavery issue, but also recognizing the political breakdown between northern and southern states, the economic divisions that isolated the South, technological inequalities between the two regions (with regard to industrialization and transportation), and cultural differences. Exhibits did place some attention on geography, noting that Fredericksburg sat halfway between the Federal capital in Washington, DC, and the Confederate capital in Richmond, VA, at the crossroads between North and South. But the museum plan does not indicate that the exhibits addressed why battles happened when they did and where they did, based on even the larger story of the Civil War. The Fredericksburg park is seen in isolation from the larger Civil War story, at least in terms of the museum exhibits. Some park brochures, especially the one from 1938 that gave information about each Virginia national battlefield park, provided some context. Instead, the specified look at the battles in the museum exhibits helps to reinforce the idea that Federal troops aggressively invaded and attacked the area four times, making Virginia look like the wounded martyr, further reinforcing the Lost Cause tradition.

124 Recent historical scholarship has noted that the diorama scene probably displays the results of Confederate bombing on the city, not Federal, based on the direction of the damage. The looted scene, however, continues to focus upon Confederate losses as opposed to Federal. Russ Smith, email correspondence with the author, 28 February 2011, FRSP Admin History Files.

125 Peter Carmichael, transcript of oral history interview with the author, 1 September 2010, 19, FRSP Archives.

This analysis of the park’s interpretation necessarily uses a 21st-century perspective, and some recognition should be made of the times in which Fredericksburg’s historian interpreters operated. Blacks faced segregation and inequality throughout the United States, whether it was legally enacted with Jim Crow laws in the South or made all but legal through housing covenants and discriminatory job practices in the North. Popular culture, with Gone with the Wind as the most visible but not singular example, embraced the Lost Cause perspective and ensured that Americans of all regions looked with sympathy at the antebellum South and its plight during and after the Civil War. At the same time, National Park Service interpretation, throughout the system, focused upon the land itself and considered parklands as the essential classrooms. Interpreters were and are trained to talk specifically about the natural, prehistoric, and historical gems within the parks and to engage visitors with the majesty and meaning of these landscapes. Fredericksburg’s interpreters, by focusing upon the individual battles and historic sites within the park’s boundaries, were meeting the expectations and requirements of the Park Service. They completed their tasks with professionalism and shared their intricate knowledge of the Civil War battles with curious visitors. The fact that the park’s interpreters also operated within a racially charged environment that influenced their approach needs recognition but their actions do not warrant condemnation.\(^{127}\)

Land acquisition during the period of this chapter leaves one wondering if the park focused upon the southern perspective or if other factors played out. Lands owned by the park to tell the story of the 1862 Fredericksburg battle largely enveloped Confederate positions, not Federal ones. Visitors would see the national cemetery and Marye’s Heights, the elegant antebellum residence known as Brompton (home for the president of Mary Washington College), the Stone Wall, and Sunken Road (still used as a thoroughfare). The plain in front of the Stone Wall, where all those Federal soldiers lay dead and dying, was largely private property. This lack of ownership hailed mainly from the fact that this location was well within the urban area of the city, with high land prices and unavailability of historic property associated from the war. Land associated with important Federal positions along Lee Drive, though, did exist that could be bought and preserved. One such property, encompassing the Meade pyramid, generated internal NPS conversations in the 1940s, without consensus on whether the park should acquire the land. Park superintendent Tyler Kiener argued in 1945 that while he agreed to the land’s historic significance, he could not endorse acquisition. The park had no means to care for the property, he argued, even though the Confederate Memorial Literary Society of Richmond, owner of the land, offered to donate it. The park did eventually acquire the Meade marker, but not until the late 1950s.

---

The park did not jump at the opportunity to receive a donation of key land associated with a Federal position during the Fredericksburg battle.\textsuperscript{128}

And then there is Stonewall Jackson. George Palmer and T. Sutton Jett planned a bonfire their first year at the park, commemorating Jackson and Lee’s last meeting before the famous flank attack at the Battle of Chancellorsville. The park hosted in 1935 a huge battle reenactment on the anniversary of that battle, including a recreation of the hidden march in front of Hooker’s lines. The park opened the Jackson Trail, preserving the path along which Jackson took his men. Spalding had the CCC enrollees build a Jackson Memorial Wildflower display near the Jackson monument. He personally tried to justify Jackson’s open lines during the December 1862 battle, trying to heighten Jackson’s already legendary tactical abilities. When the park celebrated in October 1937 the opening of the new museum building and the transfer of Jackson Shrine, the celebration included an obligatory stop at the Jackson monument at Chancellorsville. At Jackson Shrine for that transfer ceremony, the Interior Department’s Acting Director Charles West went far off topic and argued that Reconstruction had delayed reconciliation and reunion because of its spirit of vindictiveness. Keeping the name Jackson Shrine meant that the park perpetuated the idea of Jackson’s death having significance beyond the worldly affairs of the Civil War.

Historian Douglas Southall Freeman, who knew Spalding well enough to donate his time to at least the bonfire event, spoke at every one of these programs. A Virginian who served as editor (1915-1949) of the \textit{Richmond News Leader}, Freeman devoted his career to perpetuating the Lost Cause tradition while also aggressively pursuing a genteel paternalism to maintain and strengthen Virginia’s segregation laws. His four-volume biography of Robert E. Lee won him the Pulitzer Prize in 1935. He went on to write about Lee’s Lieutenants and later researched and wrote a seven-volume biography of George Washington, for which he posthumously won the Pulitzer again. He emphasized the military leaders as opposed to the common soldier and in particular held in mystic admiration Virginia’s Confederate heroes. It is not difficult to imagine that Freeman’s interpretations of the Civil War, and especially the battles fought around Fredericksburg, made their way into ranger talks and other interpretive programming.\textsuperscript{129}

Land acquisition may have had a southern focus, but another perspective is possible. The park, in trying to follow the intent of its enabling legislation, may have tuned its land acquisition to visible remains, such as fortifications. For the 1862 Fredericksburg battle, the Federals did not build trenches, thus providing no physical reminders for the park to acquire. The World War I experience of extensive trenches may have also reinforced the effort of acquiring these reminders of the battles as opposed to the lands where fighting occurred. Certainly, the park did acquire the federal line of trenches at the Wilderness battlefield (as

\textsuperscript{128} Memorandum, Thomas J. Allen to Director, 24 September 1945, and attached Memorandum, Tyler Kiener to Regional Director, Region One, 19 September 1945, 1, File 610 Part 1 Private Holdings, Box 2482, RG 79 Central Classified Files 1933-49, NARA-Archives II.

described in chapter one), refusing to leave that land in private hands despite the owner’s negative attitude toward the acquisition. The park also refused to obtain more land beyond the fortifications, indicating its emphasis upon visible remains and its attempts to stay within the guidelines of the enabling legislation.
Figure 12. Branch Spalding, in the center, and some of his staff, including Junior historian Hubert Guerney on the far right, stand in 1938 on the steps of the new administration and museum building. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Box Park Personnel, File Park Personnel, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 13. This 1944 view shows the tool house in the foreground and barracks in the background at the Chancellorsville CCC camp. Photo courtesy National Park Service, Chancellorsville Box 1, File Chancellorsville CCC Buildings, FRSP Photo Archives.
**Figure 14.** These CCC enrollees served at the Wilderness Camp. Photo courtesy National Park Service, Wilderness Box 1, File Wilderness CCC Buildings, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 15. Black CCC enrollees clean up a drainage ditch along Lee Drive near the Meade bridle trail crossing. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Fredericksburg Box 1, File Lee Hill.
Figure 16. White CCC enrollees seeded trenches along Early’s line at Wilderness battlefield. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Wilderness Box 1, File Wilderness Trenches, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 17. This photo indicates the height of the 1935 trench restoration at Spotsylvania Court House. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Spotsylvania Box 3, File Spotsylvania Trench Restoration, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 18. The park displayed a wartime view (in the wooden frame) of this Spotsylvania trench as an aid to visitors when they viewed the 1935 restoration. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Spotsylvania Box 1, File Spotsylvania Trench Restoration, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 19. CCC workers restored in 1936 a section of Early's trenches at Wilderness battlefield. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Wilderness Box 1, File Wilderness Trenches, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 20. Drivers found a pleasing landscaped appearance as they entered Hill-Ewell Drive at Wilderness following 1935 road construction. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Wilderness Box 3, File Wilderness Hill-Ewell Drive, FRSP Photo Archives.
The following sequence of maps, dating from 1940 to 1951, provide guidance on where the Park Service placed roads, trails, buildings, and other visitor services. All maps courtesy National Park Service, Denver Technical Information Center.

**Figure 21.** 1940s map of the park, FRSP_326_2112.pdf
Figure 22. 1940 map of Fredericksburg battlefield, FRSP_326_2113.pdf
Figure 23. 1940 map of Chancellorville, FRSP_326_2114.pdf
Figure 25. 1940 map of Spotsylvania Court House, FRSP_326_2116.pdf
Figure 26. 1951 map of the park, FRSP_326_2031A.pdf
Figure 27. The interior of the CCC contact stations contained simple furniture, a stone hearth for warmth, and shelves for books and artifacts. Photo courtesy National Park Service, Wilderness Box 1, File Wilderness Contact Station, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 28. The Fredericksburg CCC contact station sat at Hamilton’s Crossing. Photo courtesy National Park Service, Fredericksburg Box 1, File Fredericksburg Prospect Hill Contact Station, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 29. The Chancellorsville CCC contact station sat directly off Route 3, then a country road of a single dual-way lane. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Chancellorsville Box 10, File Chancellorsville Contact Station, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 30. The Wilderness CCC contact station, shown in this 1938 photo, sat at the entrance to Hill-Ewell Drive. Photo courtesy National Park Service, Wilderness Box 1, File Wilderness Contact Station, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 31. The Spotsylvania Court House CCC contact Station sat at the Bloody Angle. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Spotsylvania Box 1, File Spotsylvania Contact Station Bloody Angle, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 32. Visitors to Hamilton’s Crossing at Fredericksburg battlefield could use orientation maps to understand the historic landscape. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Fredericksburg Box 1, File Fredericksburg Prospect Hill Contact Station, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 33. A Ranger Historian provides information in 1938 to visitors at the Spotsylvania Court House CCC contact station. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Spotsylvania Box 1, File Spotsylvania Contact Station, Bloody Angle, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 34. Two maps protected in this map shelter guided visitors from the Sedgwick Monument area through Spotsylvania Court House battlefield. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Denver Technical Information Center.
Figure 35. The Fredericksburg Museum and Administration Building, shown here in 1938, blended architecturally with the antebellum manor houses of the area. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Fredericksburg Box 4, File Fredericksburg Visitor Center, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 36. The Fredericksburg service building, which stood at the back of the museum and administration building, provided storage and work space for vehicles and also restroom facilities for black visitors. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Fredericksburg Box 4, File Fredericksburg Visitor Center Garage, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 37. This close-up of the side door to the service building shows the entrance to the colored women’s restroom. Photo courtesy of National Park Service.
Figure 38. The museum room impressed visitors with its crystal chandelier, crown molding, and bold checkered flooring. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Fredericksburg Box 6, File Fredericksburg Visitor Center Exhibits, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 39. The lecture room had paneled wainscoting and two crystal chandeliers. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Fredericksburg Box 6, File Fredericksburg Visitor Center Exhibits, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 40. The superintendent's residence echoed the same architectural style and grace of the museum and administration building. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Contemporary Photos Box 6, File Superintendent's House, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 41. Black CCC workers in 1939 rebuilt part of the Sunken Road. Photo courtesy of National Park Service.
Figure 42. A Ranger Historian waits in 1942 to help visitors at the Jackson Monument site at Chancellorsville battlefield. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Chancellorsville Box 10, File Chancellorsville Contact Station, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 43. The research library at the Fredericksburg museum and administration building benefited from donations of books and other materials from park supporters from the local area and beyond. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Fredericksburg Box 6, Fredericksburg Visitor Center Exhibits, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 44. This Soldier Life exhibit case described everyday life in camp and displayed a few artifacts soldiers would have carried or used. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Contemporary Photos Box 3, File Fredericksburg Visitor Center Displays, FRSP Photo Archives.
**Figure 45.** This exhibit case, photographed in 1937, described the role of photography during wars and displayed examples of artillery shells. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Contemporary Photos Box 3, File Fredericksburg Visitor Center Displays, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 46. The City of Fredericksburg purchased this small arms collection and lent it to the park for display. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Fredericksburg Box 6, File Weapons Collection Display, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 47. The large terrain model in the foreground and the diorama in the background gave visitors opportunities to learn about the battles. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Contemporary Photos Box 3, File Fredericksburg Visitor Center Displays, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 48. Superintendent Spalding had the park build a two-acre wildflower preserve to honor Stonewall Jackson. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Chancellorsville Box 4, File Chancellorsville Wildflower Preserve, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 49. Visitors had many opportunities to read signs, maps, and view paintings while they toured the park, including near the Caretaker’s Lodge at the National Cemetery. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Fredericksburg Box 2, File Fredericksburg National Cemetery, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 50. Members of the Fifth United States Marines, the Third United States Cavalry, and the Cadet Corps from the Virginia Military Institute participated in the 1935 reenactment of the 1863 Battle of Chancellorsville. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Chancellorsville Box 9, File Chancellorsville Battle Celebration 1935, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 51. Dr. Douglas Southall Freeman narrated the 1935 reenactment of the Battle of Chancellorsville. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Chancellorsville Box 9, File Chancellorsville Battle Celebration 1935, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 52. The Richmond, Fredericksburg, and Potomac Railroad donated Jackson Shrine, where Stonewall Jackson died, to the National Park Service during a special 1937 ceremony. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Jackson Shrine Historic Structures Report Part I, 1962.
Figure 53. Rep. James Wadsworth (R-NY) had the Wadsworth Monument placed near the intersection of Plank Road and Hill-Ewell Drive to honor his grandfather who had been fatally hit by a Confederate bullet. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Donald C. Pfanz, History through Eyes of Stone, 2006.
Figure 54. The New Jersey state senate, under the urging of Alvin Crispin, bought 20 acres of land at Wilderness and placed a five-foot tall marker to honor the 12th New Jersey Volunteers. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Donald C. Pfanz, *History through Eyes of Stone*, 2006.
CHAPTER THREE

MISSION 66 MODERNISM AND CENTENNIAL REMEMBRANCES

“A long road back will have to be traveled,” Oscar Northington wrote in a wistful nostalgic mood in his 1948 park annual report, “before the excellence of 1934-39 can be reached.” He remembered how the Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania military park absolutely hummed with energy and purpose as Civilian Conservation Corps enrollees built individual contact stations on each battlefield. The enrollees also received training to serve as guides for visitors as they crisscrossed the area to learn about the Civil War battles.

Northington had served as one of the first junior historians at the park. Originally from southern Virginia, he had earned his undergraduate and master’s degrees at William & Mary and continued graduate work in history at University of Virginia. He first joined the National Park Service in 1933 at Petersburg National Battlefield Park, then a year later came to Fredericksburg, where he focused on excavation projects at Catharine Furnace and some other archeological projects in nearby national parks. He returned to Petersburg in July 1938 to serve as superintendent before becoming superintendent of Fredericksburg, beginning in July 1946. He stayed in that position until his retirement in December 1966. As he entered duty as park superintendent at Fredericksburg, in the aftermath of the World War II years, he recognized all too well that times had changed, and he needed to find ways to address those changes and meet the needs of a new crop of visitors.

He no longer had the services of hundreds of young men to build, maintain, restore, and interpret the park’s landscape. He no longer had the appropriations to hire a full complement of personnel to complete a similar amount of work. He admitted in one monthly report, many years later while the park still struggled with what he considered an inadequate number of personnel, that his ranger protection force remained limited, completing tasks “through grit and determination” while also “closing eyes and ears and hoping for the best.” Development threats posed a huge problem for that protection force, with having to address new housing, road accesses using national park roads, and continued logging operations on nearby lands. Numbers of visitors also started to creep upward after wartime lows of less than 30,000 to a surge by 1947 of just over 100,000. That number more than doubled by 1952 and doubled again by 1960, where it hit 413,000.

---

1 FRSP Annual Report, 1948, 1, File 207-01.4 Superintendent’s Annual Report, Box 2468, RG 79 Central Classified Files, NARA-Archives II.

2 “Park Official Here: Northington Marks 30th Year,” 23 January 1964; “Northington Will Head Local Park,” 19 June 1946, both in Free Lance-Star.

3 Memorandum, Northington to Director, 7 June 1960, Superintendent’s Monthly Report, May 1960, 5, File A2823 Jan 1960-Dec 1961 FRSP, Box 188, Entry P-11, RG 79, NARA-Archives II.

4 FRSP Visitor stats as accessed October 2010 at www.nature.nps.gov/stats/viewReport.cfm.
Northington, in truth, could not travel backward to the CCC days and its emphasis upon personal service to handle those increasing numbers of post-World War II visitors. He needed a new approach to welcome visitors, introduce them to the key stories related to the battles, and ensure their comfort and safety as they toured the battlefields on their own. What Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania needed, the entire national park system also desperately required. NPS Director Conrad Wirth responded with his 10-year parks improvement proposal, Mission 66, set to end on the 50th anniversary of the agency in 1966. Fredericksburg would benefit with a new visitor center at Chancellorsville and interpretive shelters, with exhibits, at Wilderness and Spotsylvania Court House. Concurrent planning for the Civil War Centennial provided an impetus to remember the battles with special programming and even some “new” historic structures and memorials. These commemorative activities and development projects within the park, however, belied the rising storm happening around the park’s edges. Postwar economic growth, combined with the lack of adequate local zoning laws, brought modern America up to the park’s boundaries and left Northington and others wanting to acquire more land and preserve what bits of the battlefield he could before it was too late. The park had miles and miles of earthworks, but the lands inbetween, where much of the fighting ensued, remained outside park control. Mission 66, however, did not provide the park with land acquisition funds, and some tracts slipped out of Northington’s frustrated hands. He could show visitors an improved and inviting park inside its boundaries, but he constantly worried about what was happening on the outside, at the crossroads between preservation and outside development.

**WHY MISSION 66?**

Numbers tell the story. The American population, especially in urban and suburban areas, grew from 132 million in 1940 to 180 million in 1960. Accumulated wartime personal savings, as much as $44 billion in total, provided Americans with the financial means to buy new cars and other consumer goods and go on trips. Individual average earnings more than tripled from $1,300 to $4,700 even while the United States adopted the 40-hour work week, translating into more time and money for recreational pursuits. A 1949 Department of Commerce survey substantiated this situation, reporting that 62 percent of all Americans took vacation trips, with the average trip lasting 10.5 days. People in the United States registered 52 million automobiles by 1955 (up from 27 million in 1940) and took those new cars onto the roads, spending more than $14 billion on recreation (compared to $4 billion in 1940). Transportation improved during this same time period, with the United States first focusing in the 1940s on improving secondary and feeder roads. Then the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 launched the Interstate Highway System with its proposed 42,500 miles of limited access roadways. Transportation engineers oftentimes upgraded existing roads to meet federal standards for the new highways, speeding access. People across the country chose national parks as a destination for their vacation travels, and national park visitation.
systemwide surged from 6 million during the war years to more than 21 million in 1946 and 56.5 million in 1950.\(^5\)

The National Park Service, on the other hand, revealed telling numbers of its own. Wartime exigencies led Congress to cut park appropriations from $21 million in 1940 to $5 million in 1943, where it stayed for the next three years. Congress gave a temporary reprieve in 1947 with a $26 million appropriation, but the following year reverted back to $10 million, even as visitation had gone up almost four times between 1942 and 1946. Congress did finally provide modest gains for the national park budget, with appropriations amounting to about $30 million in 1950 and almost $33 million in 1955. This funding increase, though, could not tackle the on-the-ground work confronting the agency. The wartime emergency depleted the parks of trained staff, and the numbers did not rebound following the war. The situation, in fact, worsened because the same reduction from the 48-hour to the 40-hour work week that gave Americans time to travel also required the Park Service to hire more staff to handle the same work load. Plus, Congress established 21 new units by 1950, requiring even more staff members to develop and manage these new park units while also addressing the existing ones.\(^6\)

Journalist Bernard DeVoto captured the resulting trauma the parks experienced when he wrote in October 1953 his provocative article “Let’s Close the National Parks” for his regular “Easy Chair” column in Harper’s Magazine. DeVoto described conditions in Grand Teton National Park, with the campground toilets clogged, campsites overcrowded, and the sweet mountain air overpowered by clouds of dirt. He reported that “car-killer” potholes threatened to swallow unsuspecting cars and their passengers. Visitors, left to their own devices without sufficient NPS personnel, had taken to carving their names into rock faces and tree trunks. Employee housing resembled the “Hoovervilles of 1931” due to their age and poor condition. Other parks exhibited equally bleak conditions because, as DeVoto stated, the National Park Service had to “operate a big plant on a hot-dog stand budget.” Sewage dumped into Lake Yellowstone because of inadequate water and trash facilities. Mesa Verde kept repairing its main road even though unstable strata required its relocation.

---


The park did not have the money to undertake such a project. Everywhere, visitors toured parks without informational brochures or park ranger guidance for lack of funds.\(^7\)

DeVoto answered this deplorable situation by advocating for the closing of some of the nation’s most iconic parks, daringly naming Yellowstone, Yosemite, Rocky Mountain, and Grand Canyon. An Army detachment at each closed park would secure its features until sufficient funds became available. In the meantime, DeVoto recommended distributing the freed staff and extra appropriations to the remaining parks in the system. If necessary, the Park Service could close additional parks to obtain enough money to administer those parks remaining open. DeVoto knew that his proposal would elicit an avalanche of letters from angry constituents and force congressional attention and hopefully action. He wanted to provoke to achieve the desired results.\(^8\)

No one understood the situation more keenly than Conrad Wirth, appointed NPS Director in 1951. Wirth was a second-generation “park man;” his father Theodore had first worked in the 1880s under Calvert Vaux in Central Park, and then had gone on to supervise New York’s Riverside Park and later the municipal parks in Hartford, CT. He established himself as a leader in the American park movement by overseeing the management and expansion of the Minneapolis park system between 1906 and 1935, turning it into one of the most remarkable municipal park systems in the country. Conrad (or Connie as his friends called him) Wirth followed in his father’s footsteps, going to what became known as the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, to study under his father’s choice of teachers, Frank Waugh, another important landscape architect. Wirth finished his studies, completed an internship in California, and then started a landscape architecture firm with a partner in New Orleans. When the housing boom in that region busted, Wirth’s business folded. His father’s contacts landed him first a job in the National Capital Park and Planning Commission. Then in 1931 Horace Albright hired him to serve as assistant director of the NPS Branch of Lands. Wirth effectively became the chief land planner for the Park Service, identifying lands for possible inclusion in the park system. This role expanded when Roosevelt launched his New Deal programs. Wirth worked with state and local governments to ensure that their efforts to establish parks, by buying land at Depression-era prices and using CCC labor to develop them, fit within standards he established. If local and state governments did not follow these standards, they risked losing the precious CCC camps to develop the new parks. More than 560 state and local parks resulted by 1941 from Wirth’s work on this program.\(^9\)

Wirth’s experience in developing state and local parks pointed to a larger vision he held, of providing adequate recreational outlets for people while also respecting and conserving natural resources. He saw the two goals as interdependent but separate in space from each other. His father had ensured that every child in Minneapolis was within a quarter


\(^8\) Ibid., 51-52.

\(^9\) Carr, Mission 66, 39-41. Wirth, Parks, Politics, and the People, 4-7, 11-12, 113, 166, 170-71.
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mile of a park and each family within a half mile of a community center, to provide access to recreational outlets. But his father also landscaped and planned the municipal park system so that different areas served different functions, not all related to recreation. Wirth the son extended his father’s example to a national level, stating that parks should be either for conservation or recreation, and the two may sit next to each other or one may surround the other. But, the landscapes of each should remain separate, in Wirth’s mind, because of their very different purposes. Skeptics attacked Wirth’s New Deal work in developing state and local parks, fearing that he was emphasizing recreation over conservation and using developments to harm or overwhelm the natural resources. Wirth, however, saw carefully planned development as essential for ensuring that park resources remained protected and enjoyed by visitors.\(^{10}\)

This vision of park planning shaped how Wirth faced the postwar plight of the national park system. He had unsuccessfully advocated each year in the early 1950s for Congress to appropriate more money for the parks. This annual tug of war for money left an unsatisfied taste in his mouth. He could never predict if one year Congress might be generous and then the next year Congress might pull back, leaving the agency without a clear idea of how to plan and allocate its hard-fought for appropriations. As he recounted later, he spent a Saturday in early February 1955 pondering this situation when he reasoned that Congress required a well-developed long-term plan for understanding what the National Park Service needed to do to make the parks safe and enjoyable with its ever increasing visitation. He also allowed that individual congressional members would appreciate knowing that specific parks in their jurisdictions would benefit from the plan and would thus become supporters. Wirth spent that Sunday putting together estimates of the amount of money and how it might be used to improve the parks, then he presented his initial ideas that Monday morning to his branch heads. They expressed enthusiasm for the idea, and as they all discussed the program’s goals, they also debated a name that would easily capture the meaning behind this work. Mission 66 resulted, referring to the sense of mission they felt in addressing problems in the parks and marking the National Park Service’s 50th anniversary in 1966. This 10-year period seemed to give enough time to realize the program’s goals.\(^{11}\)

Wirth encouraged and institutionalized in Mission 66 planning a modern, thinking-outside-the-box approach to planning and implementation of the program. One of his early memorandums called for anyone to communicate their ideas about the program directly to the planning committee without regard for normal channels of communication. When the core staff began conceptualizing Mission 66, they went back to the founding documents and legislation with a critical eye, recognizing that what had worked in the 1880s or 1930s did not necessarily work in the 1950s. The underlying meaning and significance of national parks served as a guide, but honoring parks and making them work for mid-20th century visitors


required new approaches and ideas. Nothing would be held sacred except the ultimate aim of serving visitors while protecting the resources.12

This modernist thinking and acceptance of change, translated into the adoption of modernist answers in terms of planning and design. The Park Service startled many park followers when it adopted modern architectural designs and materials for the myriad new facilities built in the parks. Cecil Doty, a leading architect in the NPS Western Office of Design and Construction, encapsulated this new thinking. He had used rustic design parameters in 1937 with the Santa Fe headquarters building, but by the mid-1950s, he recognized the need for something else. He remarked almost in disbelief at the critics that “We couldn’t help but change. . . . I can’t understand how anyone could think otherwise, how it could keep from changing.”13 These changes meant that the Park Service adopted low-cost materials, such as concrete, steel, and glass, in designs with geometric massing, rooflines echoing the surrounding landscape, and large windows for efficient and highly functional visitor facilities and employee housing built as inexpensively and quickly as possible. The Park Service still had only 10 years and a limited budget to accomplish its goals. This modern architectural statement provided one way to meet the demand while also embodying within its very design key tenets of the modernist sensibility of progress, health, efficiency, and innovation, which Mission 66 embraced.14

Mission 66 visitor centers served as the most visible embodiment of this modernist turn in park architecture and planning. Examination of parks and their interpretive facilities demonstrated that the original small museum buildings failed to accommodate the increased numbers of people stopping for information and comfort services. Parks needed a new design and expanded function for this visitor building. Visitor centers, a term specifically chosen by Wirth, resulted. They embraced an open design that channeled visitors to discreet areas, including information and contact area, exhibits, and rest room facilities. Visitor centers in larger areas also boasted bookstores and food services. Some centers contained small auditoriums. They “fit the bill” for national park development in the post-war era with their combined orientation and information functions. Usually placed near a park entrance or along a major roadway, visitor centers became the control center for national parks. Since the multitude of visitors entering a park in a given day could not obtain personal services with rangers guiding them around park features (as Fredericksburg CCC guides did in the 1930s), they could walk into a visitor center, be greeted by a uniformed ranger at the information desk, receive the key information they needed to understand the major features of the park and their locations, and stop to use the rest room facilities before embarking on

12 Appleman, History of NPS Mission 66, 16-17, 33-34.
their own. The Park Service built about 110 visitor centers during the Mission 66 period. As an indication of success, the idea of a central visitor servicing area expanded beyond the national parks to other federal agencies, used in the interstate highway system, for example. Plus state agencies and even private businesses adopted the visitor center model.\(^\text{15}\)

Some outstanding examples of Mission 66 visitor centers make clear their utility and design. The Dinosaur National Monument (UT) quarry location visitor center (1958 by architects S. Robert Anshen and William Stephen Allen) combined a sloping concrete ramp, circular two-floor lobby set into a rock face, and angled roof line with floor-to-ceiling windows to bring visitors up close to an actual archeological dig site still containing embedded fossils of prehistoric animals. Yellowstone’s Canyon Village Visitor Center (1966) used an expansive front entrance with a glass wall of windows and central pediment to draw people inside to the museum exhibits on geology and volcanic activity. Architects Richard Neutra and Robert Alexander’s Gettysburg visitor center and cyclorama (1962) minimized the building’s presence on the historic battlefield through low massing and use of stone masonry. Visitors inside viewed the historic painting which circled them in the cyclorama before proceeding to a rooftop terrace to view the battlefield itself. Mitchell/Giurgola’s Wright Brothers visitor center (1957-1960) used a modernist take on the dome shape to re-create for visitors the sense of flight and airiness remembered at the North Carolina site of the first flight.\(^\text{16}\) NPS chief architect John Cabot believed that these and other Mission 66 visitor centers created “a pleasant human response,” taking people out of the “humdrum and combin[ing] recreation with stimulation.”\(^\text{17}\)

Visitor centers met the needs of the mid-20\(^{th}\) century visitor, but traditionalists decried their design and embodiment of increased development in national parks. Devereux Butcher, founding editor of National Parks magazine and executive director (1942-1950) of the National Parks Association (now National Parks Conservation Association), lambasted the modernist visitor centers and other new park buildings as “colossal,” “freakish,” and the “ugliest” additions to the national park landscape. Ernest Swift of the National Wildlife Federation joined in Butcher’s disgust, saying that Jackson Lake Lodge in Grand Teton, one of the first modernist structures built under Mission 66, was a “concrete monstrosity.”\(^\text{18}\)

These men and other critics worried that the building of visitor centers, new roads, comfort stations, employee housing, and other developments in national parks threatened the natural and historic features parks were meant to preserve. These critics compared unfavorably this modernist architecture in the parks to the emerging suburban shopping centers and track-


\(^{16}\) Zenzen, “Promoting National Parks,” 357-80; Carr, Mission 66, 157-65; Allaback, Mission 66 Visitor Centers, chapters 1-3.


\(^{18}\) Butcher and Swift quoted by Carr, Mission 66, 158-59.
housing gobbling up land around urban areas across the country. They did not want the parks as another victim of poor land use planning. Wirth and others within the Park Service, however, believed that the parks already had been gobbled up by uncontrolled use and abuse by visitors. Careful placement of suitable facilities away from the most fragile and significant features would minimize the intrusion of millions of visitors while also ensuring those same visitors had the information and the comfort services they needed to enjoy their visits and, importantly, support the national parks in the future.\textsuperscript{19}

**MISSION 66 PLANNING AT FREDERICKSBURG**

Each national park unit started its Mission 66 development with a prospectus, which officials carefully reviewed in the regional office and higher ups ultimately approved in the National Park Service’s Washington, DC, office. Park managers certainly had room for making suggestions and offering important revisions, but Mission 66 planning had an overall structure and vision that all plans had to meet. Northington and his staff, at Fredericksburg, with input from the NPS Washington office, spent a couple of years finalizing their ideas of how to develop Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania. (Figure 55) Visitor centers—how many and where—became a key discussion point throughout development of this prospectus. The original Fredericksburg museum and administrative headquarters building prompted much discussion. This building may have succeeded at recalling antebellum times with its architectural details, but Northington and his staff soon realized that its size was “totally inadequate” as an interpretive space. The museum needed new, more, and better arranged exhibits than the handmade ones dating from the 1930s, and Northington advocated for either adding onto the existing structure or building a new one.\textsuperscript{20} Deciding this seemingly simple question would continue to confound National Park Service officials into the 21\textsuperscript{st} century. In 1955, people in the Eastern Office of Design and Construction, plus some in the regional office, recommended constructing a suitable museum on Alternate US Route 1 (the then-new Fredericksburg bypass) near Virginia Route 3. They argued that traffic levels along this main thoroughfare would dramatically increase the park’s visibility and make it easy for travelers to find and visit the park. Northington quickly pointed out the problems with such a location. Aside from the fact that the park did not own any of that land and would have to pay close to $5,000 per acre, plus contend with almost certain commercial developments surrounding such a visitor center, he noted that an overhead bridge and fast through-traffic made the location difficult to build on and have visitors maneuver around it.\textsuperscript{21}

\textsuperscript{19} The passage of the Wilderness Act of 1964 assuaged some of these fears, providing people with the opportunity to explore land where built facilities and roads did not intrude.

\textsuperscript{20} Memorandum, Northington to Director, 15 July 1955 and attached Mission 66 Outline, 3, File A-98-CP Mission 66, Cabinet 15, Drawer 2, FRSP Basement Files.

\textsuperscript{21} Memorandum, Elbert Cox to Northington, 22 July 1955; Memorandum, Edward Zimmer to Northington, 26 July 1955; Memorandum, Northington to Regional Director, Region One, 26 July 1955, 1, all in File A-98-CP Mission 66, Cabinet 15, Drawer 2, FRSP Basement Files.
Other possible ideas for addressing the inadequate space at the original museum building floated during this time period. When the chief of the eastern design office looked carefully at the museum building and the park’s associated land, he acknowledged that space limitations and the Georgian architectural style posed significant problems. The park could add to the back of the building without severely disrupting the symmetrical design, but such construction would require removing the back part of the circulatory road and finding a new access to the rear parking lot, an access not immediately apparent to him. Or, the park could devote the entire existing building to administration and build a new visitor center at another Fredericksburg location, either on Marye’s Heights or along Lee Drive near the old US Route 1. Northington, his staff, and some members of the Park Service study group working to resolve the visitor center question preferred the Lee Hill site because this location afforded an important overlook of the battlefield. The park’s chief historian noted that the Lee Hill site was “the most important interpretive location in the whole park” because viewers could see the Union Army-occupied land and almost the entire battlefield itself. The limited amount of land available (a housing development stood just below on the opposite side of the hill) and the threat that a visitor center might produce “violence to the site” due to difficult terrain combined to rule out this location.

NPS Director Conrad Wirth made the final determination that the existing museum and administration building, with some possible modifications, would serve as the Fredericksburg visitor center. A small exhibit shelter would stand on Lee Hill to allow visitors the view of the entire battlefield. Park engineers first explored building a road to connect the shelter to a parking area on Lee Drive. Consideration of severe landscape destruction that would result from such a road, and the awkward and potentially dangerous turn the road would have to make within the limited available space, determined, however, that a trail would instead connect the parking lot and shelter.

---

22 Memorandum, Edward Zimmer to Director, 9 November 1956, File A 98-CP Mission 66; and Memorandum, E. T. Scoyen to Regional Director, Region One, 9 January 1957, and attached Notice of Approval, 2, File A 98 Mission 66 Booklets, both in Cabinet 15, Drawer 2, FRSP Basement Files. Correspondence does not indicate any further discussion of Marye’s Heights for the visitor center, but this location would be considered again in later years.

23 Quote from Memorandum, Albert Dillahunty to Northington, 19 November 1959, 1, File 14, Box Unarranged Records 2, Collection Happel 14117, CVC Archives. See also Memorandum, Northington to Director, 18 March 1957, 2, File A98 Prospectus FRSP, Box 733, Entry P-11, NARA-Archives II.

24 Quote in Memorandum, Leo Diederich to Chief, Division of Recreation Resource Planning, 19 March 1957, File 20 601 General Correspondence, Box 7, NRG-079-00-293, RG 79, NARA-Denver. The park would return to the idea of a Lee Hill visitor center in later years. See also Memorandum, Harvey Cornell to Northington, 2 April 1957, 1, File FRSP, Box 3, NRG-079-275, RG 79, NARA-Denver.

25 Memorandum, W. G. Carnes to Regional Director, Region One, 18 June 1957, 1, File A 98 Mission 66 Booklets, Cabinet 15, Drawer 2, FRSP Basement Files. Memorandum, Dick Sutton to Chief, Eastern Office, Division of Design and Construction [EODC], 21 June 1957; Memorandum, Northington to Chief, EODC, 23 August 1957; Memorandum, John A. Reshoft to Chief, EODC, 9 September 1957, 1; Memorandum, Northington to Chief, EODC, 4 November 1957; Memorandum, John Cabot to Director, 30 December 1957; File FRSP, Box 3, NRG-079-00-275, RG 79, NARA-Denver.
Park Service officials settled on the existing building at Fredericksburg in part because they had also decided to construct a full-service visitor center at Chancellorsville.\(^{26}\) Having two (and maybe more such visitor centers, as discussions considered centers at Spotsylvania Court House and possibly even Wilderness) visitor centers within the park meant that the interpretive program had room to educate visitors about the key stories and themes embodied in the battlefield landscape. The NPS Washington chiefs of interpretation and design and construction made this point clear when they stated that the situation at the park “is perhaps unique” within the entire national park system. The park commemorated four major Civil War battlefields, and “all were critical engagements.” The park, however, did not have the space at the Fredericksburg museum building to educate visitors about all four battles, requiring an additional visitor center at Chancellorsville to describe the other three battles and “tie together the entire campaign.”\(^ {27}\) Chancellorsville made sense for this second visitor center for two reasons. First, as Northington noted, Chancellorsville had the second-most level of visitation of the park, and in the future, he would not be surprised if visitation at Chancellorsville “readily outstrip[ped] all others.”\(^ {28}\) Second, the Chancellorsville visitor center could provide key accessibility and visibility at the initial location that Northington proposed, at the junction of Route 3 and Bullock Road, on the north side near the Jackson Monument. Route 3 was a well-traveled major state highway, and the Jackson Monument had long been a drawing card for visitors.\(^ {29}\)

A master plan review in 1957 resulted in moving the Chancellorsville visitor center south of Route 3 onto Stuart Drive. (Figure 56) Various circumstances contributed to this change. The Park Service wanted to build residences, a utility building, and the visitor center in the same vicinity, and the park owned a substantial plot of land south of Route 3 to accommodate such development. Director Wirth in particular wanted the residences and utility building close to the visitor center to ensure security, reduce travel between sites, and facilitate supervision of operations. Another factor in the move revolved around the state highway department. The state began discussions with the park regarding widening Route 3 through Chancellorsville (see chapter four for a full discussion of the Route 3 widening). One possible early scenario involved having to move the Jackson Monument due to adding a new lane. If the state planned to widen Route 3 north of its present location, then the Park

\(^{26}\) The park’s cultural resources manager, Eric Mink, has laid out in a four-part blog posting the essentials of the Chancellorsville visitor center discussion, focusing particularly on location. See [http://npsfrsp.wordpress.com/2010/05/17/park-development-chancellorsville-battlefield-visitor-center/](http://npsfrsp.wordpress.com/2010/05/17/park-development-chancellorsville-battlefield-visitor-center/) and the other three blog postings. Initial NPS ideas for Chancellorsville probably had only an information shelter, as indicated in the cost estimate of only $20,000 in the April 1956 Mission 66 Prospectus, but a full-fledged facility soon became an accepted and expected addition. See Final Mission 66 Prospectus, FRSP, 13 April 1956, 8, 19, File A 98 Mission 66 Booklets, Cabinet 15, Drawer 2, FRSP Basement Files.

\(^{27}\) Memorandum, Chief, Design and Construction and Chief, Division of Interpretation, 3 April 1960, 1, File D3415 Chancellorsville Visitor Center [CVC], Cabinet 8, Drawer 4, FRSP Basement Files.

\(^{28}\) Memorandum, Northington to Director, 15 July 1955, and attached Mission 66 Outline, 4.

\(^{29}\) Ibid. Memorandum, E. M. Lisle to Director, 9 August 1956, File A 98-CP Mission 66, Cabinet 15, Drawer 2, FRSP Basement Files.
Service reasoned it should build south of the highway to avoid any conflicts. The agency planned to have an underpass so that visitors could safely cross Route 3 and see the Jackson Monument and other battlefield remains. By the end of 1957, further discussions with the state highway determined that the highway addition would go south of the original, not requiring moving the Jackson Monument. Park Service plans, however, continued to place the visitor center south of Route 3, though moved slightly to allow visitors a view overlooking the monument.30

Northington and his historians began questioning in late 1958 the Route 3 and Stuart Drive location for the visitor center. They argued against having such extensive development in the heart of the battlefield and instead revisited the idea of building the visitor center near the Jackson Monument, north of Route 3 along Bullock Road. They especially recommended moving the residences and utility building to the former location of the CCC camp, reducing the development footprint near the historic wounding site.31 Both Ralph Happel and Albert Dillahunty, the park’s two permanent historians, agreed that land on either side of Route 3 had strong historical associations with the Chancellorsville 1863 battle. They argued instead that from the point of view of the tour route and strong visitor interest, the visitor center should stand near the Jackson wounding site. Happel stated without hesitation that “the plum in the pie thereabouts, the dramatic point which people want to see and walk around” was the wounding location.32 Dillahunty noted that once the state had widened Route 3 on the south side of its present location, as plans currently stood, the proposed Stuart Drive visitor center development would have to get pushed farther back into the historic woods, blocking any view of the Jackson Monument and providing only a stark vista of the new divided highway.33 The NPS chief of the eastern design office expressed initial surprise over the concerns raised by Northington and his historians, thinking that the 1957 master plan meeting had decided the location.34

30 Memorandum, Northington to Director, 18 March 1958, 2. Memorandum, Harvey Cornell to Northington, 2 April 1957, 2; and Memorandum, Robert White to Director, 24 February 1958; Memorandum, Robert White to Director, 24 February 1958, all in File FRSP, Box 3. NRG-079-00-275, RG 79, NARA-Denver. Memorandum, Thomas Vint to Regional Director, Region, 4 March 1959; and Memorandum, Vint to Chief EODC, 13 October 1959, both in File 27 FRSP Master Plan Correspondence, NRG-079-00-004, RG 79, NARA-Denver. Memorandum, Elbert Cox to Chief, EODC, 12 December 1957, File D18 Master Plan CVC, Cabinet 7, Drawer 1, FRSP Basement Files. Map, Preliminary Plan, Chancellorsville, 1957, FRSP_326_3006.pdf; and Map, Chancellorsville Development Plan, 1957, FRSP_326_3006A.pdf, both from Denver Technical Information Center [TIC].

31 Northington first asked for consideration of moving the residences and utility building away from the Stuart Drive visitor center in Memorandum, Northington to Chief, EODC, 16 April 1957, 3, File FRSP, Box 3, NRG-079-00-275, RG 79, NARA-Denver. Memorandum, Northington to Regional Director, Region One, 3 November 1958, 1; Memorandum, Happel to Northington, 22 December 1958; and Memorandum, Albert Dillahunty to Superintendent, 24 December 1958, all in File D18 Master Plan CVC, Cabinet 7, Drawer 1, FRSP Basement Files.

32 Memorandum, Happel to Northington, 22 December 1958, 3.

33 Memorandum, Dillahunty to Superintendent, 24 December 1958, 3.

34 Memorandum, Edward Zimmer to Regional Director, Region One, 19 November 1958, File FRSP, Box 3, NRG-079-00-275, RG 79, NARA-Denver.
The regional director ordered a restudy, and this effort resulted in moving all development to the north of the state highway, near Bullock Road. (Figure 57) The three employee residences and utility-maintenance building went to the location of the former CCC camp initially, but Director Wirth and the NPS chief of design and construction, Thomas Vint, continued to argue for a close proximity between the visitor center and other buildings. The final approved plan placed the Chancellorsville visitor center just behind the Jackson Monument on the south side of Bullock Road (north of Route 3) while the three residences and utility area sat north of Bullock Road, hidden by trees, about 1500 feet from the intersection with Route 3. The park planned to obliterate the former pullout on Route 3 where the CCC contact station stood, having visitors instead enter the visitor center area to see the Jackson monument.35

What interpretive facility the Park Service chose for Chancellorsville influenced the ultimate decisions for what should go at Wilderness and Spotsylvania Court House.36 Northington had long argued for the full-fledged visitor center at Chancellorsville and then permanent structures for the two 1864 battlefields, operated in spring and summer months by uniformed personnel. The Park Service instructed the park in 1956 that visitor reception centers should stand at Wilderness and Spotsylvania Court House, at an estimated cost of $20,000 per center (this cost estimate clearly did not suggest a full-fledged building). By early 1957, planning had shifted to have a full-service visitor center at Spotsylvania Court House in addition to the new one at Chancellorsville. Wilderness would continue to have a seasonally operated shelter, initially proposed for the west side of Hill-Ewell Drive south of the intersection with Virginia Route 20.37

The Spotsylvania Court House visitor center, as proposed, would go on the battlefield near the Bloody Angle, considered an “extremely effective” location with a “broad

35 Memorandum, Vint to Regional Director, Region, 4 March 1959; and Memorandum, Vint to Chief EODC, 13 October 1959. Memorandum, H. Reese Smith to Director, 28 January 1959, File D18 Master Plan CVC, Cabinet 7, Drawer 1, FRSP Basement Files. Memorandum, Edward Zimmer to Chief EODC, 26 August 1959, 1; Memorandum, E. M. Lisle to Chief EODC, 23 October 1959; Memorandum, John Cabot to Chief EODC, 30 October 1959, all in File 27 FRSP Correspondence, Box 3, NRG-079-01-004, RG 79, NARA-Denver. See also Map, Final Approved Plan, Chancellorsville Visitor Center and Utility Area, 1959, FRSP Map Collection.

36 During the process of deciding the final size of the Chancellorsville Visitor Center, the park learned that the CVC might be significantly reduced in size. The park’s historians and superintendent all argued strenuously for having a visitor center large enough to interpret the battlefields beyond Fredericksburg and have room for storage. See Memorandum, Northington to Regional Director, 19 November 1959, in CVC Exhibit Plan, Janice Frye’s Files, CVC, FRSP; Memorandum, Dillahunty to Northington, 19 November 1959, File 14, Box Unarranged Records 2, Collection Happel 14117, CVC, FRSP.

view” of the landscape.\textsuperscript{38} (Figure 58) Northington incorporated this new visitor center in his updated Mission 66 prospectus, although he argued that development on any of the battlefields “must be compact, practical, and as comprehensive as possible” with “little intrusion” upon the historic lands.\textsuperscript{39} His concerns, and those of his staff, about development on the battlefields eventually resulted in arguments against any interpretive stations at the Bloody Angle. Northington noted in early 1958 that “more mature thought” had convinced him and his staff that this one remaining largely undisturbed battlefield “should not be molested” or “imposed upon” but instead restored as a unique experience for visitors. Visitor numbers to this battlefield remained fairly low, justifying in his mind the substitution of an exhibit shelter for the full-fledged facility.\textsuperscript{40} Wanting the shelter off the most historic battlefield lands, the park recommended, and received approval, to place the exhibit shelter at the start of the tour route through Spotsylvania Court House at Grant Drive West and Brock Road.\textsuperscript{41} (Figure 59)

Park officials always had in mind an exhibit shelter at Wilderness, but its exact location shifted upon further consideration. (Figure 60) Northington wrote with exasperation in early 1958 that traffic control had gone from bad to worse on Hill-Ewell Drive, thanks to increasing numbers of road accesses (private owners holding legal access points to park roads due to prior land acquisition), two temporary lumber hauling permits, and a permanent milk pickup permit. In frustration, he suggested abandoning the park road or at least giving it to the state. He recommended moving the shelter from the west side of Hill-Ewell Drive to the north side of Route 20 about 300 feet east of the intersection with Hill-Ewell. (Figure 61) This location promised strategic visibility along Route 20 and removal from the traffic congestion near the Hill-Ewell Drive entrance. This location also sat near the former entrance to the Wilderness CCC camp, and a nearby utility building from the CCC days remained standing off in Saunders Field.\textsuperscript{42}

\textsuperscript{38} Quotes from Memorandum, Harvey Cornell to Northington, 2 April 1957, 1-2. See also Memorandum, Northington to Director, 18 March 1957, 3.

\textsuperscript{39} Memorandum, Northington to Regional Director, Region One, 5 June 1957, and attached Mission 66 for FRSP, 3, 5, 8, File A 98-CP Mission 66, Cabinet 15, Drawer 2, FRSP Basement Files. Quotes on p. 3.

\textsuperscript{40} Quote from Memorandum, Northington to Regional Director, Region One, 4 February 1958, File A-98-CP Mission 66, Cabinet 15, Drawer 2, FRSP Basement Files. See also Memorandum, Northington to Regional Director, Region One, 16 January 1958, File A-98-CP Mission 66, Cabinet 15, Drawer 2, FRSP Basement Files.

\textsuperscript{41} Memorandum, Northington to Chief, EODC, 28 December 1962, File A 98-CP Mission 66, Cabinet 15, Drawer 2, FRSP Basement Files. Memorandum, Northington to Regional Director, Region One, 8 March 1963, 1, File D66 FRSP 1964-66, Box 42, Entry P-82 Phila Planning and Service Center, RG 79, NARA-Archives II.

\textsuperscript{42} Memorandum, Northington to Regional Director, Region One, 13 January 1958; and Memorandum, Northington to Regional Director, Region One, 13 January 1958, both in File A 98-CP Mission 66, Cabinet 15, Drawer 2, FRSP Basement Files. Memorandum, Northington to Regional Director, Region One, 8 March 1963, 1. Exhibit Shelters, Wilderness and Spotsylvania, Design Plans, 1962, File D32 Plans Wilderness and Spotsylvania 1962, Cabinet 8, Drawer 4, FRSP Basement Files.
Some ideas proposed under Mission 66 failed to gain support. Northington recommended erecting a memorial or monument on Marye’s Heights in Fredericksburg to honor Federal and Confederate casualties while also serving visitors as an observation tower and interpretive location. The regional office flatly rejected this idea, based upon unnamed but universally believed poor experience with similar towers at other national park sites. Northington suggested another overlook possibility, from Stafford Heights and the Federal attacking point, which would have required additional land acquisition. The regional office also rejected this idea, stating such an isolated tract would pose more operational problems than interpretive benefits.\(^{43}\) Traffic concerns prompted Northington and others to propose closing some roads with turnarounds, making them attractive only to people touring the battlefields. Lee Drive had already become a favorite through-road for Fredericksburgers, resulting in consideration of a turnaround at Hamilton’s Crossing, the south end of Lee Drive. Public opinion split, with groups such as the United Daughters of the Confederacy and the Civil War Round Table in favor of the proposal while most local residents and local organizations, including the Kenmore Association and Historic Fredericksburg Foundation, loudly protesting the idea. Regional Director Elbert Cox ultimately decided to keep Lee Drive open to traffic but have gates close the south end at nighttime to try to check vandalism. Another proposal to make turnarounds at the end of Grant Drive East and Grant Drive West at Spotsylvania Court House would have focused road development along Anderson, Gordon, and Bloody Angle Drives, with Anderson providing the only access through that battlefield. County opposition and the inability to obtain a release from the property owner of both ends of Grant Drive to build the turnarounds shut down this proposal. Northington did recommend a new road, along the Federal Warren-Wadsworth line at Wilderness, to provide access to this long string of park land that sat without further protection on either side. Park Service review rejected this road proposal, recommending instead construction of a good foot path with parking. This latter decision would leave this Federal line of earthworks effectively isolated from the rest of the battlefield and dangerously unprotected.\(^{44}\)

\(^{43}\) The park would eventually get such an overlook from Stafford Heights when John Lee Pratt left Chatham in his will to the park, realized in the mid-1970s. See chapter six for a full discussion of this acquisition.

\(^{44}\) Memorandum, Northington to Director, 15 July 1955, 3-5; Memorandum, Elbert Cox to Northington, 22 July 1955; Memorandum, Director to Regional Director, Region One, 18 December 1959, 1, File FRSP Correspondence 1954-59, NRHE Files. Elbert Cox to W. Cary Orismond, 16 March 1960. File 27 FRSP Master Plan Correspondence, Box 3, NRG-079-01-004, RG 79, NARA-Denver. Memorandum, Northington to Regional Director, Region One, 16 January 1958; Memorandum, Northington to Regional Director, Region One, 31 July 1957, 2; Memorandum, E. T. Scoyen to Northington, 13 February 1956, 2, all in File A 98-CP Mission 66, Cabinet 15, Drawer 2, FRSP Basement Files. Memorandum, Northington to Director, 18 March 1957, 3, File A98 Prospectus FRSP, Box 733, Entry P-11, RG 79, NARA-Archives II. The Hamilton’s Crossing debate began when the state highway department and the Richmond, Fredericksburg and Potomac Railroad debated moving the railroad crossing and having a connection built between the park road and Mine Run Road. See Herman Swanson to Conrad Wirth, 14 November 1959; Memorandum, Northington to Regional Director, Region One, 23 November 1959, and attached resolution, Board of County Supervisors, Spotsylvania County, 10 November 1959; Annie Fleming Smith to E. T Scoyen, 27 November 1959; Memorandum, Elbert Cox to Director, 10 December 1959, all in File D30
MISSION 66 INTERPRETATION

The development projects fostered under Mission 66, specifically the Chancellorsville visitor center and the three exhibit shelters at Lee Hill, Wilderness, and Spotsylvania Court House, not only transformed the battlefield landscape with new buildings; these projects also transformed how visitors experienced the park. A regional office study of Fredericksburg’s operations just before Mission 66 came into effect describes the limitations of its then-existing interpretive program. The key was a doorbell at the Fredericksburg museum and administration building. This building remained locked during the day, with the two historians (Ralph Happel, Francis Wilshin, and then Albert Dillahunty in 1955 after Wilshin transferred to the Manassas superintendency) working inside on research and writing projects. Visitors had to ring the doorbell for entrance. One of the two historians would then leave his work and answer the door. Many times visitors wanted directions and left once satisfied. If they wanted to tour the museum, they had to pay the 25-cent admission fee, and then the historian would personally walk them through the building and give a talk, based on the visitors’ level of interest, at the electric map. If the doorbell rang again, the historian had to address the next set of visitors, too. Busy times meant that both historians focused on visitor service and could not complete their other assignments.

Electric map presentations occurred on a “catch-as-catch-can basis,” often to small groups. Museum hours officially went from 8:30 AM to 5 PM seven days a week, but if the historians were in the building early or after hours, and the doorbell rang, they often accommodated visitors. Northington assigned a seasonal historian (many times a high school teacher) at the Chancellorsville contact station (still in use from the CCC days) for two months during high summer visitation. He had a protection ranger who was also a trained historian provide intermittent visitor interpretation at the Prospect Hill contact station (also from CCC days). An administrative aid served at the Jackson Shrine. Maintenance personnel and stenographers rounded out the lean staffing at Fredericksburg, with the clerks “pinch-hit[ting]” in the museum as needed throughout the year.

Increased visitation and an expanded number of facilities required a new approach to interpretation. The doorbell had to go. The regional office study team recommended placing an information-receptionist at the front desk in the museum lobby. That person would receive visitors and take the admission fee. During quiet times, the receptionist could complete typing tasks and other office-related duties. The lower-ranking historian would

FRSP, Box 1052, Entry P-11, RG 79, NARA-Archives II. Memorandum, Northington to Director, November 1959 Monthly Narrative Report, 2, 4; and Memorandum, Northington to Director, 8 April 1960, Monthly Narrative Report March 1960, 1-2, both in File A2823 Jul 57- Dec 59 FRSP, Box 188, Entry P-11, RG 79, NARA-Archives II.


46 Master Plan Development Outline, FRSP, 1955 with sections of different dates, Operation section dated March 1952, 3 of 12, File D1815 Development Outline Master Plan Superintendent, Cabinet 7, Drawer 1, FRSP Basement Files.
have time to devote to interpretation as opposed to answering the doorbell, and the upper-ranking historian could focus on the necessary research tasks. Once Mission 66 crystallized with a new visitor center at Chancellorsville, the park obtained additional funding to hire more personnel, both permanent and seasonal. Historian Thomas Harrison, who replaced Dillahunty when he took a superintendency at Ocmulgee National Monument (GA), reported in 1964 that the park had two historians, two park guides, a clerk in the newly renamed Fredericksburg Visitor Center, and two seasonal park historians, assisted by three park rangers.47

A self-guided auto tour through the four battlefields provided an additional mechanism for meeting visitor demands while updating interpretation. Begun before Mission 66 as one of Historian Wilshin’s final contributions before moving on to Manassas, the tour encompassed 42 stops and 71 miles, with optional stops at Salem Church and the Jackson Shrine. (Figure 62) (Figure 63) (Figure 64) (Figure 65) Eastern National, a non-profit cooperating association devoted to supporting national parks through the sale of interpretive and educational materials at the parks and disbursement of net profits to the parks, donated funds to supplement appropriations to purchase 90 aluminum tour markers, designed in color. Plus, the park obtained funding to erect 69 narrative markers, 29 maps, 8 bronze and masonry orientation discs, and 56 aluminum identification and place name markers, all permanent and meant to replace the wooden ones erected during the War Department and CCC eras. (Figure 66) The aluminum maps used multicolored baked enamel, an innovative approach at the time which won an incentive award for the park historian, probably Happel, who designed them. (Figure 67) All of this signage helped visitors navigate the battlefields and understand on their own the significant actions and movements of the opposing armies. A booklet available from the visitor centers (and initially free in 1956 when the park opened the auto tour) laid out the entire route and explained each stop.48 Northington reported that scholars and casual visitors all responded “enthusiastically” to this interpretive enhancement, with some preferring the self-guided tour over personal guide service. He also believed that the new tour kept more people in the vicinity for a longer period of time than had been the case previously.49

---


48 Memorandum, Albert Dillahunty to Northington, 15 January 1957, 2, File K2621 Annual Report Interpretation and Information 1953-, Cabinet 9, Drawer 3, FRSP Basement Files. Memorandum, Northington to Regional Director, Region One, 1 July 1954, plus individual tour plans for each battlefield dating 12 August 1954, File D1815 Tour Plans Master Plan, Cabinet 7, Drawer 1, FRSP Basement Files. Northington to Mrs. H. H. Smith, Sr., 14 November 1960, 1, File A 98a Mission 66 Publicity Part I, Cabinet 15, Drawer 2, FRSP Basement Files. See also Map, Interpretive Tour Plan, Part of the Master Plan, approved 1955, FRSP Map Collection.

49 Northington to Hon. Harold Purcell, 30 March 1969; and Northington to Freeman Funk, 2 April 1957 [uses term “with enthusiasm”]; both in File A 98a Mission 66 Publicity Part 1; and Northington to Cary
Northington and his staff considered the auto tour route as a practical method for encouraging visitors to see the entire park. Tour stops used sequential numbers, across the four battlefields, as a gentle way to encourage driving from Fredericksburg all the way to Spotsylvania Court House, following the course of the Civil War as represented in the park. Three tour maps placed at the Fredericksburg battlefield also encouraged “a concept of the whole” by showing the relationship of this battlefield to the other three, suggesting touring the entire park. And this idea was possible. Traffic on individual roads may have increased, and some housing developments may have sprouted up near park boundaries, but overall visitors so inclined could still drive the park in a single day. Wilshin carefully clocked the mileage and driving time in his narrative descriptions of each tour, including how long it would take to go from Brompton at Fredericksburg to the Lee-Jackson Bivouac site at Chancellorsville. He timed this 9.6 miles (with two stops made between) at 20 minutes, going at a speed of 35 to 40 miles per hour. Such driving times would not have been possible if development, with accompanying stop lights and traffic, routinely hindered progress along the Route 3 stretch. When later development engulfed Route 3 at the Interstate 95 junction and spread beyond, the park would have to recast its driving tour.

The park historians wanted to build an interpretive program to educate a growing population of visitors about the significance of the events commemorated at Fredericksburg. New facilities and the auto tour helped to accommodate increased visitor numbers. But, Northington, his staff, and Park Service designers had to devise exhibits in the buildings and along the battlefield landscape that reached out to visitors and helped them understand the significance of the stories told and the land preserved. Some overriding considerations framed their approach. First, exhibits would convey military maneuvers and tactics in general form, leaving details to uniformed staff, the electric map, and trailside exhibits at specific points along the tour route. Second, exhibits would focus upon both the military and civilian people affected by the fighting. The 1959 Fredericksburg and Chancellorsville museum prospectuses argued that a “meaningful story of the Civil War period” would

---

Crismond, 22 December 1960, 1-2, File A 98b Mission 66 Publicity Part II, all documents in Cabinet 15, Drawer 2, FRSP Basement Files. Dillahunty also used the word “enthusiastic” in describing visitor reaction to the auto tour. See Memorandum, Albert Dillahunty to Northington, 15 January 1957, 2. Lem Houston to Northington, 25 July 1958, File A 98a Mission 66 Publicity Part I, Cabinet 15, Drawer 2, FRSP Basement Files. Memorandum, Northington to Director, 10 July 1956, June Monthly Narrative Report, 3, File A2823 Jan 54-Jul 57 FRSP. Box 188, Entry P-11, RG 79, NARA-Archives II.

50 Northington to Crismond, 22 December 1960, 1; Map, Interpretive Tour Plan, Part of the Master Plan, approved 1955.

51 Narrative, Construct and install maps and markers, Project B-5, [1964], 1, File Signs, Markers, and Memorials Completion Report FRSP 1-1-64 to 12-31-64, Box 3, NRG 079-00-276, RG 79, NARA-Denver.

52 The 1959 Fredericksburg Visitor Center Museum Prospectus admits that the “average tourist cannot see all of the park,” but the hope remained that many motivated visitors would drive throughout the four battlefields. See Museum Prospectus, Fredericksburg Visitor Center, 13 March 1959, 86, FRSP Library.

53 Francis Wilshin, Self-Guided Tour of the Chancellorsville Battlefield, 10 June 1954, 1-2, File D1815 Tour Plans Master Plan, Cabinet 7, Drawer 1, FRSP Basement Files.

54 Museum Prospectus for FRSP, Fredericksburg Visitor Center [FVC], 13 March 1959, 45, FRSP Library.
result by emphasizing “human interest elements.”

Third, prompted by a recommendation of one of the park’s clerk-stenographers, the historians tried to incorporate story lines that would appeal to “our lady visitors.” Northington admitted that in the past, many women had opted to wait in the lobby while their husbands finished touring the Fredericksburg battlefield museum. He hoped fewer women would follow this example with the new exhibits. NPS Chief Historian Ross Holland favorably reviewed the park’s overall exhibit approach, stating that visitors will be “carried back to the period” with exhibits “showing the soldier as a human being.” Holland believed that visitors will “establish a bond of kinship” through this “personalized’ treatment” of the Civil War military combatants and civilians.

Workers improved the Fredericksburg Visitor Center and installed the new exhibits between 1961 and 1962. The building gained a new fresh-air ventilation system, waterproofing around the basement exterior, acoustical tile ceilings, and new floors in the basement. An automated electric map moved into the lecture room, allowing the park to schedule specific times to run the program instead of relying upon the former catch-as-catch-can approach. (Figure 68) Display cases in the main exhibit room chronicled specific aspects of the fighting during the December 1862 battle, including the lay of the land, the river crossing by pontoon bridges, and an examination of what shot and shell both sides used. (Figure 69) (Figure 70) The 1930s diorama of a street scene in Fredericksburg after the Federal bombing remained. Other cases told stories about the soldier and civilian experiences, including what the soldiers wore, how they spent their pastimes, how doctors and nurses cared for the wounded, and what relief societies aided them. (Figure 71) (Figure 72) One case examined women and the war, demonstrating how they took over management of the homesteads and donated items for the war effort. The basement exhibit room contained the small arms collection owned by the City of Fredericksburg that had previously been displayed upstairs in the main exhibit room. The new exhibits had a professional look in comparison to the 1930s handmade ones, and the Mission 66 exhibits outnumbered the former CCC ones, but the overall storylines remained similar. The park’s historians

---

55 Museum Prospectus for FRSP, Chancellorsville Visitor Center [CVC], 29 October 1959, 3, FRSP Library.
56 Memorandum, Northington to Director, 10 July 1956, Monthly Narrative Report, 3, File A2823 Jan 54-Jul 57 FRSP, Box 188, Entry P-11, RG 79, NARA-Archives II.
57 Ross Holland, as quoted by Elbert Cox in Memorandum, Cox to Director, 22 May 1959, 2, File D6215 Museum Prospectus Fredericksburg, Cabinet 9, Drawer 1, FRSP Basement Files.
58 Completion Report, FVC, Lee Hill Shelter, and CVC construction work, 8 November 1963, 1, File D3423 Completion Report FRSP 7 CVC, Break Room Cabinets.
59 Happel wrote the text for the electric map. See Memorandum, Weldon Land to Director, 14 March 1962, 2, File A2615 Monthly Narrative Historians’ Copy 1961-65, Cabinet 10, Drawer 1, FRSP Basement Files. The electric map initially had operational problems with overheating, requiring further adjustments. See Memorandum, Joseph Cullen to Northington, 30 August 1962, File Historian’s Reading File 6/5/62-10/63, Cabinet 3, Drawer 1, FRSP Basement Files. Park historians had hoped to have three electric maps instead of just the one, to tailor to the different parts of the battlefield story. See Memorandum, Chief, Division of Interpretation to Regional Director, Region One, 22 September 1959, 1-2, File D6215 Museum Prospectus Fredericksburg, Cabinet 9, Drawer 1, FRSP Basement Files.
continued to focus upon key military aspects of the 1862 battle without details and provide a glimpse of the life of soldiers and civilians.  

The Chancellorsville Visitor Center offered new ground for interpreting this battlefield while also giving visitors some background about the Wilderness and Spotsylvania Court House conflicts. The building itself made a bold architectural statement in direct contrast to the residential design of the Fredericksburg Georgian-styled center. A cantilevered roof extended over the front patio of the Chancellorsville center and gave the entire building an angular appearance. (Figure 73) Its single story (with finished basement), covered in brick, kept a low-profile that, as trees matured around it, blended with the surrounding landscape. The building consisted of two main sections, a large auditorium surrounded by a U-shaped exhibit area and a smaller service area with restrooms, ranger and historian offices, and downstairs curatorial and storage space. (Figure 74) The lobby connected the exhibit/auditorium and office/restroom areas. (Figure 75) Floor-to-ceiling windows along the entrance way created an open and inviting space for welcoming visitors. Not everyone, however, embraced the modernist statement made by the new visitor center. Assistant Interior secretary John A. Carver, Jr., who spoke at the 6 May 1963 building dedication, shared his unflattering notes (which he decided not to say at the ceremony) about the architectural style with a reporter from the Free Lance-Star. He called the building in his notes an example of “mass produced functionalism” which did not connote, in his mind, the “warmth and friendliness” that National Park Service buildings should display to visitors. He did say to audience members at the dedication that the great majority of people stopping at the visitor center would more than likely “remember Chancellorsville by the visitor center itself” instead of by walking the battlefield. For this reason, Carver admitted he was “less than enthusiastic about the modernness of this particular structure.”

Interpretable exhibits and a slide show for the auditorium informed visitors about the Chancellorsville, Wilderness, and Spotsylvania Court House battles. The 48-slide program used narrative, music, and song to describe Fredericksburg and the Civil War. Display cases were set inside the exterior walls of the auditorium, taking a roughly chronological course starting at the far end of the building and moving clockwise around the U-shaped space ending closest to the visitor center entrance. The storyline had a strong Confederate focus detailing the “formation of one of the most brilliant battle plans of the War” with the Stonewall Jackson flank attack, his fall and eventual death from friendly fire (shown in a diorama), and Lee’s important divide and conquer attack against the Federals at Salem

---

60 Memorandum, Dillahunty to Northington, 29 January 1959, 3; and Memorandum, J. P. Cullen to Northington, 3 January 1963, 2, both in File K2621 Annual Report-Interpretation and Information 1953-, Cabinet 9, Drawer 3, FRSP Basement Files. Museum Prospectus, FVC, 13 March 1959, 45-56.


Church. An “Over the River” case described Hooker’s “activities (or inactivities)” leading to his retreat, and Jackson’s crossing the river “to rest under the shade of the trees,” repeating his last words.63 Succeeding exhibits looked at arms used by both sides, corps badges adopted by Federals to ease identification of units and develop an “esprit de corps,” and use of the cavalry. Exhibits on harness-making, using artifacts donated to the park by the grandson of a harness-maker under Jackson’s command, and iron furnaces in the vicinity that smelted ore for the Confederacy, gave a local flair.64

The last set of exhibits told the Wilderness and Spotsylvania Court House stories. The original museum prospectus had continued the strong Confederate focus with little to no mention of Grant’s entrance into the Virginia battle landscape or of the actual fighting at Wilderness except to tell “one of the most dramatic episodes in the Civil War,” in which Lee men’s yelled out “Lee to the rear!” to protect him. The original prospectus had then proposed a single diorama on the Bloody Angle episode from the Spotsylvania Court House battle.65 Acting Chief Historian Roy Appleman recommended “a little more emphasis” on the Wilderness-Spotsylvania Court House battles, but he did not point out concerns about the Confederate slant to the exhibits.66 The Region One Chief of Interpretation specifically recommended putting Grant into the story and having an exhibit case about the Wilderness battle. As finally installed, an exhibit case described Grant’s plan against Lee and another gave an overview of that battle’s fighting.67 The planned Lee to the Rear diorama, to present dramatically this famous incident, showing “Lee’s bravery and daring and the genuine concern” of the Confederate soldiers for Lee’s welfare, was cut in the end due to funding shortages.68 The remaining exhibit cases gave background about the armies and their movement from Wilderness to Spotsylvania Court House, leading up to a diorama of Bloody Angle, considered by many as “the most desperate struggle of the entire war.”69 (Figure 76) One case reviewed how sharp shooters felled important officers, and another case explained how the Federals had superior artillery, but the Confederates used their artillery to greater advantage.70 (Figure 77)

---

63 Quotes, in order, from FRSP CVC Exhibit Plan, no date [1962], no page numbering [Exhibit Number Five; Exhibit Number Eleven], FRSP Library.
64 Ibid., no page numbering [Exhibit Numbers 12-16]; CVC Museum Prospectus, 29 October 1959, 46-48.
65 CVC Museum Prospectus, 29 October 1959, 50 [Exhibit Number 13].
66 Memorandum, Roy Appleman to Chief, Division of Interpretation, 2 December 1959, 1, FRSP Library, with 1959 CVC Museum Prospectus.
67 Memorandum, Region One Chief, Division of Interpretation, Prospectus for Chancellorsville Battlefield, Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania, no date, FRSP Library, with 1959 CVC Museum Prospectus. CVC Exhibit Plan, no date [1962], no page numbering [Exhibit Numbers 17-18].
68 Quote from CVC Exhibit Plan, no date [1962], no page numbering, [Exhibit Number 19]. See also FRSP, Interpretive Prospectus, 1973, 13, FRSP Library.
69 Ibid., [Exhibit Number 22].
70 Ibid., [Exhibit Numbers 23-24].
By the time the Chancellorsville Visitor Center had been in operation for a full year, Thomas Harrison had stepped in as the park’s chief historian. Harrison had not been part of the discussions on where to locate the visitor center nor had he had a significant role in developing the museum exhibit plan. (Figure 78) He did raise serious concerns about the building after its opening. He wondered why the building stood astride the old Colonial Mountain Road and within the historic site of two Civil War markers, arguably infringing upon historically important ground. (Figure 79) He also raised concerns about the building’s location vis-à-vis the park’s auto tour route, in the middle of the Chancellorsville battlefield part of the tour. This situation, according to Harrison, “causes several interpretive tour problems” in directing visitors to the visitor center and integrating the center with the rest of the tour.71 Harrison noted that though the center sat within 125 feet of Route 3, its facing and signage did not attract people from the highway. On the other hand, he argued that having the floor-to-ceiling lobby windows face the highway seemed incongruent with the historical setting, and that the building should have been turned to face the Wilderness and the Jackson monument instead. Another incongruity in Harrison’s mind involved the arrangement of the exhibit cases, going from right-to-left when visitor flow across the lobby suggested that the exhibits should instead start left of the auditorium and proceed counterclockwise to the right. An exhibit on Confederate and Federal money had to be moved from the lobby to keep from hindering visitor flow. Nothing could be done to address these structural concerns, and Harrison did admit that the facility was large enough to handle the number of users. He added potted plants and rearranged seating to make the lobby more inviting. He appreciated the use of background music tapes, usually classical music, to make a relaxing atmosphere and cover up the noise of groups and the heating/air conditioning system blowers.72

The Lee Hill shelter, completed in 1962, provided visitors with both a wide-stretching view and interior exhibit panels explaining Lee’s position at both Fredericksburg battles. This brick, three-sided building with angled roof opened to the vista overlooking the city and battle positions. (Figure 80) A 30-pound Parrott cannon, the largest of the Confederate Army’s guns, sat next to the shelter. Exhibit panels focused entirely upon Lee and his army, explaining his command post location and its importance to directing the Army of Northern Virginia, what artillery the Confederates used and how, a detailed description of the importance of the Parrott gun, and the use of pick-and-shovel men from each regiment who dug earthworks and cleared a field of fire in front of artillery positions. (Figure 81) A final panel described Lee’s position during the Second Battle of Fredericksburg. (Figure 82) A metal relief map inside the shelter gave visitors an on-the-ground appreciation of the battle. A modernist sitting area, comprised of layered concrete disks in an asymmetric formation, gave people some respite after they climbed the steep foot path to reach the

71 Thomas Harrison, First Year Operational Report CVC, April 1965, 1, File D3415 Buildings CVC Operational Report, Cabinet 8, Drawer 4, FRSP Basement Files.
shelter. (Figure 83) The park completed extensive clearing in front of the shelter to open the view.\(^73\) (Figure 84) Despite the climb, Happel reported within the first year’s opening that the shelter “is consistently visited.” He just wished that the open front had a protective overhang to reduce reflections from the sun. The Wilderness and Spotsylvania Court House shelters would incorporate such a protective overhang, plus skylights to bring in natural light.\(^74\)

Two more exhibit shelters rounded out the Mission 66 interpretive program at Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania. The Wilderness shelter, placed near the former CCC camp at Sauner’s Field on Route 20, used an angled roof with overhang and skylights to control light in the three-sided brick structure with restroom facilities. (Figure 85) Exhibit panels placed the Wilderness battle within the context of Lee’s retreat from Gettysburg the previous summer and the appointment of Grant to lead all Federal armies. The panels described the Wilderness landscape and recounted the major fighting on 5 and 6 May 1864, ending with the horror of the burning woods engulfing the dead and wounded who could not get away from the fires.\(^75\) Review of visitation trends at the Wilderness shelter indicated by 1965 few travelers stopping to view the exhibits. To encourage use, the park placed a cannon and carriage on the grounds and added signage.\(^76\) The Spotsylvania Court House shelter, also a three-sided brick structure with angled roof overhang and skylights, restrooms in the back, sat near the Sedgwick Monument at the entrance to the battlefield off Brock Road. (Figure 86) The shelter used exhibit panels to orient visitors to this battlefield. The panels described the movement of both armies to this location and then detailed the fighting, with a panel on


\(^74\) Quote from Memorandum, Happel to Northington, 15 October 1963, File D6215 Exhibit Plan-Lee Hill Shelter 1960, Cabinet 10, Drawer 1, FRSP Basement Files. See also Memorandum, Northington to Assistant Regional Director, Midwest Region, 15 October 1963, File D66 Interpretive Devices and Procedures 1963 Memo, Cabinet 10, Drawer 1, FRSP Basement Files.

\(^75\) Exhibit Shelters, Wilderness and Spotsylvania, Design Plans, 1962. Exhibit Plan, Wilderness and Spotsylvania Shelters, July 1963, no page numbering [Wilderness Exhibits], File D6215 Exhibit Plan Spotsylvania and Wilderness Exhibit Shelters 1963, Cabinet 10, Drawer 1, FRSP Basement Files. Museum Prospectus for Wilderness Battlefield, 31 January 1960, 27-28, FRSP Library. The earlier museum prospectus did not have an explicit panel about Grant and his entry in the battlefield but rather incorporated his strategy into overall panels describing the fighting at the Turnpike and Plank Road. An overriding theme in the original Wilderness museum prospectus considered this battle “the beginning of the end for the Confederacy.” See 1960 Wilderness Museum Prospectus, 8. The Park Service tempered this thematic approach in the final exhibit panels.

\(^76\) Memorandum, Northington to Director, 8 September 1965, 3, File Historian’s Reading Files 7/1/65-12/31/65, Cabinet 3, Drawer 1, FRSP Basement Files.
the events leading up to the fighting at the Bloody Angle, the fighting that day on 12 May 1864, and the subsequent maneuvering and counter-manuvering until leaving the area. Another exhibit panel told of the officers killed at this battle and the other men who went on to fame after the war. Visitation at this shelter also lagged behind expectations, and the park explored signage and other ways to attract people.

Artist Sidney King provided one more important element to the park’s interpretive program. He painted paintings and maps that served as orientation exhibits for visitors. An early painting displayed the fighting at Marye’s Heights during the December 1862 battle. (Figure 87) People could press a button to an audiotape description of the scene, then sit on a comfortable bench and look at the King painting while hearing the three-minute talk. Northington believed that this trailside exhibit was “one of the most effective interpretive devices in the National Park Service.”

Park historian Albert Dillahunty reported that historian Allan Nevins considered it “the most outstanding field exhibit” he had seen. King also completed seven tour maps for the park during the Mission 66 period, plus a painting for the Jackson Shrine (described later in this chapter). The maps provided context about the landscape in relationship to where the fighting took place. King prided himself on his careful historical research, and he wanted his paintings to have rich details so that Americans could learn about their history while traveling.

King’s beginnings as an artist encouraged his interest in making history accessible. Born in Dorchester, MA, King trained at the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, among other institutions, and studied under famed artist John Singer Sargent. He opened his own art studio, but when that closed during the Depression, he traveled the United States in his Model T Ford and painted scenes in watercolor. In 1939, he ended up in Fredericksburg,

---


78 Northington to Cary Crismond, 22 December 1960, 1.

79 Memorandum, Dillahunty to Northington, 29 January 1959, 3, File K2621 Annual Report Interpretation and Information 1953-, Cabinet 9, Drawer 3, FRSP Basement Files. Happel described the King painting and audio device as turning back time to “portray the desperate charges of December 13, 1862, when Ambrose E. Burnside threw away thousands of gallant Federals against an impregnable Confederate position.” See Happel to Donald Millikin, 18 September 1962, and attached story for the Waynesboro News Virginian, 2, File 8, Box 1, Collection Happel 14117, CVC Collection, FRSP.

80 Memorandum, Dillahunty to Northington, 29 January 1959, 4; and Memorandum, Dillahunty to Northington, 15 January 1960, 3, both in File K2621 Annual Report Interpretation and Information 1953-, Cabinet 9, Drawer 3, FRSP Basement Files.

81 Salem Church Interpretation and Use, January 1977, no pagination, File A8215 Salem Church Dedication 1977, Cabinet 8, Drawer 3, FRSP Basement Files. Betty Hayden Snider, “Caroline Painter Leaves behind Legacy,” Free Lance-Star, 26 April 2002. Caroline County, Virginia, historian Herbert Collins stated upon King’s death in 2002 (at age 95) that King had the ability to “re resurrect life onto canvas,” making viewers feel like they were right there in the action. Herbert Collins, as quoted by Betty Hayden Snider in “Caroline Painter Leaves behind Legacy,” Free Lance-Star, 26 April 2002.
VA, almost penniless. He painted signs, drew newspaper advertisements, and went to Quantico to camouflage combat planes and design aircraft insignia. He eventually hooked up with the National Park Service after the war and began painting signs and then paintings. He charged affordable prices and had an easy-to-work-with manner that assured him success in gaining repeated Park Service commissions. He also had a deep appreciation for his Christian faith, and he painted scenes for many different churches around the country. His mural “Creation” for the Mormon Information Center in Salt Lake City, UT, may have been North America’s largest of its kind, at 400-feet by 75-feet. He routinely painted baptismal scenes for Virginia churches.82 King’s paintings for the national parks became synonymous with the agency, with an elemental quality that simply but effectively conveyed the historical scenes. John Hennessy, park chief historian for Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania, described King’s paintings as “classically Park Service,” an indication of how well they fit within the park’s interpretive program.83

**CIVIL WAR CENTENNIAL**

The Mission 66 program coincided with the nation’s commemoration of the centennial of the Civil War, providing beneficial funding and direction to the battlefield parks as they marked this historic occasion. Centennial planning on an official national scale began in 1957 when President Dwight D. Eisenhower signed into law a joint congressional resolution establishing the United States Civil War Centennial Commission. Eisenhower and other federal officials saw the centennial as an opportunity to further the cause of nationalism and patriotism in the face of Cold War realities, using the brave deeds of the 19th century as inspiration against Communism in the mid-20th century.84 Ret. Maj. Gen. U. S. Grant, 3rd, appointed chairman of the commission, wrote that the centennial would encourage a shared “value of complete dedication to the principles upon which our Nation was founded” and remind Americans to “look to the future with democratic and national ideals more profoundly avowed than ever before.”85 The commission relied upon local and state organizations to embrace and plan individual events, with the commission itself serving as a clearing house for information and publicity.

The National Park Service itself used Mission 66 as a way to complete visitor services before the Centennial commemorations began at each battlefield park. NPS Director Wirth asked superintendents of Civil War parks to cooperate with groups wanting to stage “high


quality pageants and re-enactments” on national parklands.\textsuperscript{86} Francis Wilshin, who had left Fredericksburg to become superintendent at Manassas, obliged by leading an effort to host a reenactment of the First Battle of Manassas in July 1961. He and other supporters established the non-profit organization First Manassas Corporation, Incorporated, and the National Park Service signed a formal cooperative agreement with this group to assist in the planning and staging of the weekend production. This event succeeded in bringing more than 120,000 people over three days to the battlefield park to witness the cannon firings, charging men, and flying dirt and battle flags. Concerns for preservation of the historic landscape and the desire to avoid any events that could devolve into sheer commercialism led Wirth to establish a new Park Service policy banning future reenactments on parklands. The agency would honor a previous commitment to host a reenactment at Antietam in September 1961, but the Park Service would not host any other similar events. Wirth recommended musket firing demonstrations or flag presentations and parades in period costumes as suitable alternatives to full-scale reenactments.\textsuperscript{87}

Fredericksburg centennial observances, organized by the city’s Civil War Centennial Committee with National Park Service cooperation, began in December 1962 with a weeklong commemoration of that battle. Special museum exhibits opened, free of charge, across town displaying Currier & Ives Civil War prints; a 100-year history of railroading; and personal items associated with Clara Barton, founder of the American Red Cross and battlefield nurse during the war. The local Little Theatre group performed \textit{The Lady of Lyons}, which had originally been presented days before the 1862 battle. A plantation cookery contest, using recipes from ante-bellum days, tested the skills of high school students. Several different historians gave talks about such topics as Confederate commander John S. Mosby and his role in the battle, Civil War medicine, and Yankee raiders in the South. NPS Historian Joseph Cullen spoke about the Battle of Fredericksburg, focusing on its portrayal in prose and poetry over the years. James Brewer, a history professor at Virginia State College, talked to high school students about Virginia blacks during the Civil War. The president of the American National Red Cross served as a guest speaker and honored guest on Friday, 14 December, at the dedication of a memorial plaque to Clara Barton on the grounds of the local Presbyterian Church. The National Park Service waived its admission charge to the newly remodeled Fredericksburg Visitor Center during the week and then offered battlefield tours on the Fredericksburg battlefield on that Friday and at Chancellorsville, Wilderness, and Spotsylvania Court House on that Saturday. On Wednesday, 12 December, the park hosted a bit of pageantry, with a wreath-laying on the Stone Wall and the Quantico Band and Mary Washington College Choir providing stirring music. Poor weather (too cold to be outside) kept some events indoors, but on Sunday, 16

\textsuperscript{86} Allyn Bursley to Charles Collier, 6 May 1959, File A20 CW Centennial Part 2, Box 17, Entry P-11 General Records Admin Files, RG 79, NARA-Archives II.

December, the Reactivated Company K 17th Virginia Infantry marched, bivouacked, and performed other exercises on the 1862 battlefield. 88

Commemorations of the Battle of Chancellorsville followed in late April and early May 1963. The weeklong event, co-sponsored by the Fredericksburg Civil War Centennial Committee and the Spotsylvania Civil War Centennial Commission, with Park Service help, included display of the “General,” the famous Civil War locomotive, and historic talks about the battle. Some historic homes, including Ellwood, opened to the public. Representatives from the United Daughters of the Confederacy rededicated the Lee-Jackson Marker in Fredericksburg. The North-South Skirmishers presented a Grand Review on Saturday, 4 May, followed by a Blue and Gray encampment that evening. On 5 May, the Park Service officially opened and dedicated the Chancellorsville Visitor Center, with speeches by the Executive Director of the United States Civil War Centennial Commission, James Robertson, and Assistant Interior Secretary John Carver, who made the unflattering remarks about the visitor center’s modern architectural style. The Quantico Marine Corps Band played again at the ceremonies. The Spotsylvania Civil War Centennial Commission also offered special tours later in May, beginning at Zion Church and proceeding to the Chancellorsville Visitor Center and battlefield. Civil War Round Table members shared information with tour participants at 12 stations throughout the historic area. 89

Ralph Happel drafted remarks for Director Wirth if he attended the Chancellorsville Visitor Center dedication (Carver spoke in his place using his own remarks). Happel’s draft remarks provide further clues into the park’s interpretive program and major themes emphasized. Happel argued that Mission 66 encompassed a conservation program and a mandate to bring interpretive facilities up to date, with the park’s visitor centers and exhibit shelters as key examples. These interpretive devices would help visitors, according to Happel, “attain a clearer insight, a fuller knowledge of the sacrifices that built the United States of America.” 90 Happel also noted that visitors, by using the park’s interpretive facilities, would recognize the valor of both sides in the Civil War battles fought in the area and recognize that “we are a reunited nation.” The language of reunion, similar to that used
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89 Civil War Centennial Committee of Fredericksburg, Virginia, Program, Centennial of the Battle of Chancellorsville; and Spotsylvania Civil War Centennial Commission, Program, Centennial of the Campaign of Chancellorsville, both in File 3, Box 1, Collection Happel 14117, CVC, FRSP. Suggested Draft for Remarks by the Director, Dedication of CVC, 5 May 1963, File 15, Box Unarranged Records 2, Collection Happel 14117, CVC, FRSP. Memorandum, Harrison to Northington, 3, File K2621 Annual Report Interpretation and Information 1953-, Cabinet 9, Drawer 3, FRSP Basement Files. “Three Units Accept Battle Invitations,” Free Lance-Star, 27 April 1963.

90 Mission 66 remarks, attached to Suggested Draft for Remarks by the Director, Dedication of CVC, 5 May 1963, no pagination, [last page], File 15, Box Unarranged Records 2, Collection Happel 14117, CVC, FRSP.
when the War Department first acquired land for the park, joined with the Lost Cause tradition. Happel wrote in the opening paragraph of the draft remarks that Lee’s failure in Gettysburg resulted from the loss of his “brilliant subordinate” Stonewall Jackson at Chancellorsville. He closed the same remarks by referring to the Jackson Shrine, saying that “quite a few historians think that the course of History changed in that cottage” where Jackson died. Happel’s draft remarks mirror what the Chancellorsville Visitor Center’s exhibits focused largely upon, with the Lee-Jackson story taking priority over an account of both the Confederate and Federal strategies and actions during the battle.91

Both in 1961 and 1964, the New Jersey Civil War Centennial Commission joined arms with the Park Service to hold commemorative exercises. The 1961 event, held at the new Salem Church building due to pouring rain, rededicated the 23rd New Jersey monument on the church grounds. This monument, paid for by the New Jersey legislature and erected 44 years after the 1863 battle, honored both sides, New Jersey and Alabama, who had been locked in combat at the historic Salem Church. (Figure 88) Superintendent Northington spoke about the Chancellorsville campaign, and New Jersey Attorney General David Furman described the colorful personalities in the engagement. The New Jersey National Guard appeared in dress uniforms of the Civil War era, and Ladies of the Spotsylvania Civil War Committee, in period costumes, served as docents at the historic Salem Church building, where some artifacts were displayed. Although not officially part of the program, the nearby 15th New Jersey monument also attracted attention during this same time period. The state highway administration had begun moving the tall granite monument so that Route 3 could be widened.92

The 1964 Centennial events, which the New Jersey, Fredericksburg, and Spotsylvania County centennial committees co-sponsored, culminated with the rededication of the four New Jersey monuments at the Spotsylvania Court House battlefield.93 (Figure 89) Similar language referring to unity and the Lost Cause characterized speeches at this 16 May 1964 ceremony. NPS Regional Director Elbert Cox ended his opening remarks by stating that the battlefields contribute “toward national unity of loyalty and purpose” and not the “rancor of sectional prejudice.” Ralph Happel emphasized Grant’s strategy of never retreating after each stalemate battle. Grant kept sidestepping and moving onward against Lee, until “Lee, completely used up” could no longer hinder Grant and surrendered at Appomattox. This

91 Suggested Draft Remarks by the Director, 5 May 1963, 1, 6.
92 Memorandum, Northington to Director, 13 June 1961, 2, 5, File A2823 Jan 1960-Dec 1961 FRSP, Box 188, Entry P-11, RG 79, NARA-Archives II. “Monument Rededication Scheduled Tomorrow,” 5 May 1961; “Battle Flag to Stay Nearby,” 8 May 1961, both in Free Lance-Star. Northington explained that a host of reasons not pertinent to his monthly report influenced the decision to have the rededication in 1961 as opposed to 1963, on the actual anniversary. Chapter four will discuss in further detail the Route 3 widening and moving of the 15th New Jersey Monument.
93 In addition to the rededication ceremony, the US Postal Service issued on 5 May 1864 a Wilderness stamp. The park also hosted tours of the Wilderness and Spotsylvania Court House battlefields. See Memorandum, Northington to Director, 10 June 1964, 2, File A2615 Monthly Narrative Reports Historian’s Copy 1961-65, Cabinet 10, Drawer 1, FRSP Basement Files.
Lost Cause interpretation focused upon Lee not having the supplies and manpower to continue fighting Grant, who seemed to have unlimited resources. Virgil Carrington Jones, a Virginian who was a noted author and historian, continued to develop this argument in his speech. Jones emphasized that the Civil War resulted from the intense debate of whether a state had the right to secede from the Union, with “each side [fighting] for political purposes they thought right.” This fighting at the Bloody Angle, where the 1964 ceremony took place, “helped to bring us back together,” according to Jones. In keeping with the reconciliation perspective and Lost Cause tradition, he focused upon the rights of individual states and the valor of each side. Brig. Gen. John Read, the Deputy Chief of Staff for the New Jersey Department of Defense, closed with only the slightest possible reference to slavery as a cause for the war, an idea rejected by Lost Cause adherents. Read stated that “on this battlefield, men of the North and the South fought to preserve the traditions they cherished.” He then quickly shifted gears, embracing reconciliation, and referred to North and South as “one nation,” a “greater nation today” because of the battles fought one hundred years earlier.94

Happel added a serious but restrained element to the rededication speeches. He called the Civil War a “violent folly” of brother fighting brother. He went on to note that spring covered “the bloody ditches of yesteryear” and made “old pain and past suffering seem ineffably remote.” “An invisible monument,” he said, “broods over this scene of present tranquility. It is beyond our dedication or rededication.” He went on, stating that all of them gathered together in 1964 could not know what the dead from 1864 wanted future generations to learn from the past battle, but Happel urged “all mankind to remember with compassion and to persevere in the green fields of peace.” Here, Happel moved beyond the Lost Cause tradition and unity or reconciliation theme and spoke for peace and understanding among all peoples. This sentiment may have been prompted by the swirling Civil Rights campaign being waged by people like the Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., just as the nation commemorated the centennial of the Civil War. King had marched on Washington and given his “I Have a Dream” speech in August 1963. Violence and brutality seemed ever-present as Freedom Riders, largely northern whites, had joined hands with blacks to transcend racial boundaries in the South, even as many southern whites fought back with fire hoses, angry dogs, and murders. Beyond America’s boundaries, the Vietnam War had begun to escalate, with intense guerilla fighting and deadly airpower strikes. These very real and dangerously tumultuous events both on American soil and in foreign lands in some ways overshadowed the Civil War commemorations. Happel’s exact intentions in this speech cannot be known, but he may have wanted to use current events to bring a dose of relevance to the New Jersey monuments rededication.95

The Civil War Centennial did not take place in a vacuum, with social and cultural forces intruding upon the events, as much as some states wished otherwise. Commemorative
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94 Quotes, in order, from Proceedings of Rededication Program, 16 May 1964, 4, 5, 7-9, File 5, Box 1, Collection Happel 14117, CVC, FRSP.
events at Fredericksburg need to be considered within this larger context to understand why certain events happened and how visitors may have reacted to them. For example, the battlefield park during the Centennial focused upon rededication of monuments and commemorations of specific battles fought on park land. This approach fit within the park’s interpretive program, with its emphasis upon battle tactics and military maneuvers. Plus, park interpreters could use this focus to sidestep controversial topics such as causes and consequences of the Civil War.

Two examples from the period make clear that the nation grappled with socially charged issues even as it honored its Civil War past, representing a symbolic crossroads. The New Jersey Centennial Commission, which helped staff at the Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania military park organize two important centennial events, came up against the Civil Rights debate. This commission included a black woman, Madaline A. Williams, who was denied entrance to the hotel in April 1961 where state commissions met in Charleston, South Carolina. The entire New Jersey commission walked out on the proceedings in protest until desegregated housing was provided. The Virginia Civil War Commission, on the other hand, perpetuated the Lost Cause tradition in its delineation of the purposes for the state’s centennial commemorations. The commission’s listing of purposes argued that Virginia in early 1861 had initially called for a peace convention to work toward reconciliation in the face of the growing sectional crisis. When Virginians did vote to secede, according to the listing of purposes, they fought for freedom (using a quote from Lee as proof), and then after defeat, Virginians followed Lee again in ending the bitterness and working toward restoration of the country and reestablishing peace. This view of the historical timeline made Virginians of the Civil War era appear as non-aggressors who reluctantly fought for freedom only, with no mention of slavery, economic interests, western expansion, or other issues as causes, and quickly laid down arms to rebuild the nation at the end of the war. The Virginia centennial commission planned to honor those who had fought in the Civil War and educate the public about the campaigns, shrines, and personalities associated with the war in Virginia. The commission also encouraged historical research “to heal old wounds rather than reopen them.” It would work to preserve monuments, graves, and artifacts associated with the time period.

Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania joined with the state of Virginia and closed out the Civil War centennial with the dedication of a new monument, to Richard Kirkland, near the Sunken Road and behind the Fredericksburg Visitor Center. This memorial honored Sgt. Richard Kirkland of the Second South Carolina Volunteers under Gen. Joseph Kershaw’s

96 Cook, Troubled Commemoration, chapter 5. “Monument Rededication Scheduled Tomorrow,” Free Lance-Star, 5 May 1961. Alabama did not send a delegation to the rededication of the New Jersey Monument, which some members of the New Jersey delegation believed was in reaction to the South Carolina incident against its black commission member. See “Battle Flag to Stay Nearby,” Free Lance-Star, 8 May 1961.

Brigade for his bravery and compassion in giving water to wounded Federal soldiers following the December 1862 battle. (Figure 90) The historical record provided by Kershaw later in life and others identified Kirkland, though others may have joined him, who defied the threat of death from the two opposing armies still holding opposite sides of the field, and brought water to the wounded crying out for help. This story of the Angel of Marye’s Heights, as Kirkland was later called, and carried forward by succeeding generations, influenced Dr. Richard Lanier, a South Carolinian who had a dental practice in Fredericksburg. Lanier admitted that whenever he found himself in close situations or needed help, he would recall the bravery of Kirkland and gain the courage to do what needed to be done. He told the story to his children and wanted to help erect a memorial to Kirkland as a permanent reminder. Lanier worked for four years to raise funds for the memorial. He obtained crucial contributions of $15,000 each from the states of Virginia and South Carolina for the bronze and stone monument. He also led efforts to obtain private donations, and when money ran short, he obtained another $5,000 from Virginia.  

Other people also helped make the memorial a reality. Another member of the Kirkland Memorial Committee, Lawrence Hoes, had an acquaintance with the sculptor Felix de Weldon, who had completed the powerful Iwo Jima flag-raising monument. De Weldon agreed to design and fabricate the Kirkland statue for a nominal $25,000 fee once he heard the moving story. He carefully researched Civil War uniforms and other details before completing his design. The completed statue, bronze atop a black marble base, shows Kirkland bending over a wounded Federal soldier, with one hand offering a canteen and the other one clasping the wounded man’s hand in a symbolic form of brotherhood. Debate arose concerning the location for the statue. Possible sites included in front of the Fredericksburg Visitor Center, behind the visitor center on National Park Service land, or on other land close to the Sunken Road and Stone Wall, where Kirkland had given his aid. The Park Service land was not close to the historic site, but Mary Washington College, through the efforts of memorial committee member and colleague teacher Raiford Sumner, agreed to have the monument placed on a small parcel of land it owned next to the Sunken Road. The college generously agreed to oversee continuing maintenance of the statue and the small park surrounding it.  

Dr. Lanier did not live to see the dedication of the memorial on 29 September 1965, but some 200 spectators and a host of honored speakers paid homage to Kirkland and the valiant story he represented. The Quantico Marine Band opened the ceremony, Virginia


99 Pfanz, Monument Study, Kirkland Memorial section. Covering Brief, James Holland to Regional Director, Southeast Region, no date [1964]. Memorandum, Northington to Director, 8 September 1965, 2, File Historian’s Reading Files 7/1/65-12/31/65, Cabinet 3, Drawer 1, FRSP Basement Files.
Governor Albertis S. Harrison, Jr., welcomed guests, and Ret. Maj. Gen. L. G. Merritt represented the state of South Carolina. Harrison noted that Kirkland’s courage was important, but “when mercy is added to courage there can be no question of its rightness.” Ambassador William P. Fay, from the Republic of Ireland, served as the main speaker. He emphasized that Kirkland’s action to help the enemy wounded “was an unspoken protest against the horrors of war” made even more resonant in 1965 after the two world wars of the 20th century. Ralph Happel, who had served as the key National Park Service liaison and resource for the memorial committee’s work, conducted additional research on the Kirkland story and wrote a biographical tribute to Kirkland for the dedication’s program. Happel’s account laid out the tense military situation with Burnside’s troops not yet retreating from the scene and the sprawling landscape covered with crying and screaming Federal wounded, left unaided for fear of Confederate sharpshooters. Happel described Kirkland as excited, determined, and cheerful in his task, despite the fact Kershaw would not let him hold a white flag as protection from Federal sharpshooters. Happel wrote that Kirkland’s act had “in the midst of strife... acknowledged the bonds of humanity.” Happel ended by noting that Kirkland, after serving at Fredericksburg, Chancellorville, and Gettysburg, fell mortally wounded as a lieutenant at Chickamauga. The monument would serve to “perpetuate the memory of the ‘Angel of Marye’s Heights’ and his spontaneous affirmation of the brotherhood of man.”

**JACKSON SHRINE**

Restoration of the Jackson Shrine, in Guinea, Virginia, on the grounds of the former Thornton Plantation of “Fairfield,” represented a combined program under Mission 66 (which provided the funding) and the Civil War Centennial (which honored Stonewall Jackson’s role in shaping the course of the war). Happel began the work in 1961 by researching and writing about the building and its historical beginnings and associations. He made a public call for any photographs that people may have of the Shrine over the years, to aid in documenting what the office “cottage” had looked like during Jackson’s last days in the building. A key photograph, found at the Library of Congress, provided a soon-after-the-Civil-War view of the structure. (Figure 91) This 1880 photograph helped point out the places, such as height of chimneys and location of a porch, where a 1927 restoration by the Richmond, Fredericksburg, and Potomac Railroad had erred. The railroad had completed
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102 Ralph Happel, “Richard Kirkland” in program for the Dedication of the Memorial to Sergeant Richard Kirkland, 29 September 1965, File 1, Box 1, Collection Happel 14117, CVC, FRSP.
its own restoration of the Shrine just before deeding the building and land to the National Park Service in 1928.103

NPS historical architect Orville Carroll arrived in summer 1962 to start the National Park Service restoration. (Figure 92) Carroll had trained in modern architectural design at the University of Oregon, his home state, but he quickly found his passion in historic architecture when he went east following his graduation. He served for a summer measuring and drawing the buildings at Fort McHenry National Monument and Historic Shrine in Baltimore, Maryland, under a Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) program. He then accepted a full-time position in the National Park Service and received important training from HABS founder and American Institute of Architects fellow Charles Peterson. After his work on the Jackson Shrine and at Appomattox Court House, Carroll would go on to make important contributions to NPS historic restoration work at Minute Man National Historical Park (MA), where he completed several building restorations in the late 1960s and 1970s, and at Fort Stanwix National Monument (NY), where in the mid-1970s he designed the fort reconstruction.104

Carroll began each of his historic architecture projects with the same approach. When he arrived at Fredericksburg in August 1962, he first evaluated the existing material that made up the building for its age and composition and then completed measured drawings, with the help of an assistant, for deposit in the Library of Congress’s HABS collection. He compared the building in 1962 to the historic record and also to buildings of similar age in the vicinity. He then described the existing structure and his proposed plans for its restoration in separate historic structures reports, following NPS protocol. Carroll was always attentive to details, and he spied quickly that the railroad’s restoration had inserted much new material, such as uniform-width floor boards on the main level of the structure. He also noted that the railroad had probably swapped out the original fireplace mantel in the Jackson room with an updated one and added crown molding. The railroad had replaced weatherboarding and window and door trim on the exterior, while also extending the porch across the length of the double doorways.105

Carroll and others within the agency understood that the railroad’s 1927 restoration, which included removal of much of the historic fabric, complicated the Park Service’s attempts to return the building to its 1863 appearance. NPS Architect Henry Judd noted in his foreword to Carroll’s report that “If the work in the first restoration is not properly done, it is almost impossible to do a correct future restoration.” Judd quickly argued, though, that

Carroll’s report “is surprisingly complete considering the [existing] condition” of the Shrine.\textsuperscript{106} That confidence in Carroll’s work came from such careful steps as removing the modern weatherboarding from an exterior wall and looking for the nail patterns for the original siding in the studding. Carroll then compared the spacing for the nail holes with how many rows of siding the Library of Congress 1880 photograph showed. He could then say with documentation what the width of the new siding should be. Carroll also looked at cornices at other vintage structures in the region to determine if the Shrine cornice details needed adjustment. He found similar examples of the canted crown and bed molding, leading him to decide to keep the cornice details as they currently existed. He also considered the larger former estate when conjecturing about architectural features. He recommended using wooden board and batten shutters only two-thirds the size of the Shrine’s windows, following what the 1880 photograph showed. Carroll conjectured that, based on the historical documentation, the plantation owners had salvaged and reused these shutters from a small colonial house that was demolished around 1854 (and replaced with an impressive two-story brick home). These details and more added to the successful restoration project.\textsuperscript{107}

Mission 66 funding, and the park’s master plan, supported restoration of the Shrine as a memorial, not the reconstruction of any additional buildings. Carroll argued, and Happel and Northington joined him, that reconstructing a few nearby buildings, including a lean-to, smokehouse, ice house, and log outbuilding would help to “provide the visual context for telling the Jackson story.” Carroll believed that such building additions would “lend some credence to the already bleak landscape” and “give more authenticity to the scene.”\textsuperscript{108} Happel agreed, noting that the single Shrine building appeared to visitors as a “lone ship in a sea of grass.” He wanted to “give a hint of the [plantation] complex” as a “starting point, as it were, for the [visitors’] imagination.” He saw rebuilding the log outbuilding, for example, as an opportunity to restore the architectural landscape while also providing a comfort station for visitors.\textsuperscript{109} The regional director largely disagreed, referring back to the park’s master plan that did not have an allowance for either a comfort station or the addition of subsidiary buildings on the site. The final project restored the Shrine and a still-standing old wooden well-house. Carroll did receive permission to reconstruct the lean-to, probably because it was attached to the Shrine itself.\textsuperscript{110}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[107] Ibid., 1-7.
\item[108] Ibid., 3.
\item[109] Memorandum, Happel to Northington, 14 March 1963, 1, attached to Memorandum, Northington to Regional Director, Southeast Region, 15 March 1963, File H30 FRSP, Box 1462, Entry P-11, RG 79, NARA-Archives II.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Northington described Carroll’s finished restoration “a masterpiece.”\textsuperscript{111} The work involved dismantling much of the building’s outer layers, including the weatherboarding, front porch, metal roof, window sash and frames, cornice, modern brick work found in the chimneys and building foundation, existing electrical wiring and outlets, first-floor metal lath and plaster, and any interior modern additions, such as molding and mantels. (Figure 93) Insulux fireproofing between walls and roof rafters, inserted by the railroad and the cause of moisture build-up, was also removed. (Figure 94) The Park Service jacked up the stripped-down building so that the modern addition to the foundation wall could be removed and replaced with handmade brick laid in common bond to match the original. (Figure 95) To ventilate the crawl space, Carroll inserted an air vent into the foundation, located where it would be hidden by the reconstructed porch. Wood sills all were replaced due to wood borer damage, and the southwest section of studding also was replaced due to termite damage. Carroll used new poplar weatherboarding, but had it hand planed to remove modern saw marks. A combination of historic photographs and excavation work to identify locations of foundations aided Carroll in reconstructing the lean-to and porch. The Shrine roof received 44 courses of wood shingles treated with a water repellent.\textsuperscript{112}

Inside, Carroll showed his continued ingenuity. He scouted and found a mid-19th-century plantation house called “Nyard” that had been built by the same family that had owned the Shrine. Through personal communication and negotiation (Happel likely proved useful in this effort), Carroll obtained old-growth white pine boards from Nyland’s attic to replace the incorrect floor boards that the railroad had installed in 1927. The Jackson room, on the second floor of the Shrine, had original flooring, though additional joists were needed. Carroll had the floors hand planed and scraped, as they would have been in the 19th century. He also removed some modern structural features, including the east window in the Jackson room and a door between the two rear rooms. He changed a window into a door in the east room leading to the lean-to. The two mantels, which the railroad had installed, were removed and replaced with copies of the originals, using historic photographs as a guide. Carroll used old glass from the Nyland plantation house to replace the modern window lights in the Shrine. New plastering over fiberglass insulation finished the interior walls. The reconstructed lean-to was divided into two rooms, with one room holding the plumbing equipment and the other room the heating system.\textsuperscript{113} Happel declared the restoration project a success. (Figure 96) He reported “now we have something that not only is as historically authentic as possible but also a sturdy and carefully wrought structure.”\textsuperscript{114}

\textsuperscript{111} Memorandum, Northington to Director, 11 December 1963, 4, File A2615 Monthly Narrative Reports Historian’s Copy 1961-65, Cabinet 10, Drawer 1, FRSP Basement Files.
\textsuperscript{112} Carroll, HSR Part II, Jackson Shrine, 4. Orville W. Carroll, Historic Structures Report Part III Architectural Data Section on Restoration of the Jackson Shrine, April 1964, 1-4, FRSP\_326\_D11\_001pg.pdf, Denver TIC.
\textsuperscript{114} Happel, as quoted by Goolrick in “Jackson Shrine Is Carefully Restored,” Free Lance-Star, 21 October 1964.
Landscaping and walkways were completed from a new parking lot to the building. The building itself, when re-opened in 1964, was largely unfurnished except for the bed where Jackson had died and the clock on the mantel piece that had timed his hour of death. The NPS Branch of Museums repaired the clock. Happel wrote a furnishings plan, which was largely implemented by summer 1966. (Figure 97) Caretaker Walter Snellings and his family lived at the Shrine and escorted visitors. A Sidney King painting displaying Jackson’s arrival to Guinea and an accompanying audio station appeared in February 1967. This painting proved a favorite among park visitors.115

**LAND ACQUISITION AND CLOSING OUT MISSION 66**

Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania National Military Park had matured and grown under Mission 66. The basic park, with roads originally established by the War Department, remained essentially the same, with a few land acquisitions (described below). Interpretive opportunities, however, had grown exponentially. The original museum and headquarters building became a visitor center with updated exhibits, including an electric map show. The Chancellorsville Visitor Center allowed the park to give necessary attention to the other three battlefields using an automatic slide show and almost 30 exhibits. Plus, the new modern building provided storage space for the curatorial collection and offices for rangers and interpreters. Exhibit shelters at Wilderness and Spotsylvania Court House, though visited less than the park staff would have liked, still gave key information about these battle grounds. Jackson Shrine saw new life with its masterful restoration and furnishings to memorialize where Stonewall Jackson took his last breath.

A few land acquisitions characterized this period. The congregation of Salem Baptist Church started the process in 1952 to build a new church building. (Figure 98) Northington informally talked with the deacons to impress upon them the historic significance of the original structure and the hope that this building would be saved. Once the congregation moved into its new church, the trustees voted at the end of 1961 to give the historic building and a little more than an acre of land to the National Park Service. (Figure 99) Northington accepted the deed in June 1962 in a special ceremony. Happel wrote the Historic Structures Report, which served as a basis for its restoration in the early 1970s (described in chapter six).116 Other land acquisitions included the Widow Tapp Farm, a 1963 donation from Dr. A.
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116 Northington, Monthly Narrative Report February 1952, 10 March 1952, 1, File A2823 Jun 1952-Dec 1953 FRSP, Box 188, Entry P-11, RG 79, NARA-Archives II. Memorandum, Northington to Director, 12
M. Giddings of Battle Creek, Michigan. Giddings was an enthusiastic supporter of the park, having also donated more than 500 volumes to the park library.\textsuperscript{117}

Parklands largely still hugged the earthworks and roads designed to take visitors through the four battlefields. Spotsylvania Court House, as a promising counterpoint, resembled a self-contained park, with lands encompassing battle areas, not just trenches. Northington wanted more lands, though, in each battlefield, to combat growing commercial and residential activity at park boundaries. Numerous monthly reports from 1950 until his retirement at the end of 1966 warned of new access roads connecting private lands with park roads, lumbering, housing developments, and other potential threats to the park. He noted that metal detecting had become a nuisance, and he even grumbled about the granting of permits to haul milk.\textsuperscript{118} His exasperation is palatable in these reports, such as when he called access roads in 1954 the “outstanding perpetual problem here” and warned that unless land and access rights were purchased, park roads “bid fair to become suburban streets.”\textsuperscript{119}

Development pressures outside park boundaries impressed upon Northington the need to act forthrightly. He argued at the beginning of Mission 66 that instead of building expensive facilities, the Park Service should use the money to buy more land. “Extensive development [within the park] without acquiring certain strategic parcels,” he wrote in October 1957, “would compound the obvious error in past planning.” He wanted assurances that an exchange could be made, reducing building projects to increase land acquisition funds. “We need the land,” he concluded, “more than we need certain other features of the program.”\textsuperscript{120} Unfortunately, the money pots could not be exchanged, and each project category had to be justified on its own. Northington and his staff opted to take the development money, immediately available, and continue to make their case for land acquisition funds, which did not appear in large sums.\textsuperscript{121} The stunning loss in 1962 of a key tract in the Fredericksburg battlefield made clear the park’s inadequate position.

\textsuperscript{117} Memorandum, Northington to Director, 14 May 1963, 2, File A2615 Monthly Narrative Reports Historian’s Copy 1961-65, Cabinet 10, Drawer 1, FRSP Basement Files.

\textsuperscript{118} Examples include Northington, Monthly Narrative Report March 1950, 13 April 1950, 2, File A2823 Jul 1949- Dec 1951 FRSP; Memorandum, Northington to Director, 10 November 1954, 1, File A2823 Jan 54-Jul 57 FRSP; Memorandum, Northington to Director, 13 January 1959, 1; Memorandum, Northington to Director, 12 October 1959, File A2823 Jul 57- Dec 59 FRSP; all in Box 188, Entry P-11, RG 79, NARA-Archives II. Memorandum, Northington to Director, 13 April 1966, 4, File A2615 FRSP Jan 66-Dec 67, Box 89, Entry P-11, RG 79, NARA-Archives II. One story handed down attributes Northington with knocking down milk buckets placed on park roads and letting the milk spill onto the ground. See Robert Howard, transcription of oral history interview with the author, 29 September 2010, 30, FRSP Archives.

\textsuperscript{119} Memorandum, Northington to Director, 12 April 1954, 2, File A2823 Jan 1954- Jul 1957 FRSP, Box 188, Entry P-11, RG 79, NARA-Archives II.

\textsuperscript{120} Memorandum, Northington to Regional Director, Region One, 24 October 1957, File A 98-CP Mission 66, Cabinet 15, Drawer 2, FRSP Basement Files.

\textsuperscript{121} Memorandum, Elbert Cox to Northington, 5 November 1957, File A 98-CP Mission 66, Cabinet 15, Drawer 2, FRSP Basement Files.
Northington had obtained a 12-month option to acquire this land at what he considered a bargain price of $800 an acre (it later sold for more a $1,000 per acre). The Park Service failed to exercise the option, and the owner sold to a developer, who planned to construct a 76-acre housing development along 3,800 feet of park boundary. The new subdivision would have access rights to Lee Drive at an important interpretive site, compounding an already difficult situation. Northington cringed, writing that “we face a frustrating and expensive situation.” Another tract, moved up to number one priority with the loss of the Fredericksburg tract, also had an option, but he sounded defeatist in the prospects of gaining this land.  

Northington understood that this battlefield park actually encompassed four parks. The difficulties arose because “population growth and construction activity have increased at a startling rate,” but the park management team had four times the amount of boundaries to protect and four times the amount of interpretive programming to plan with only the staff of one park, emphasizing the fact that the park sat at the crossroads of preservation and development. Northington and his staff proposed even changing the name of the park to reflect this multiplicity. They considered “Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania County National Battlefield Parks,” to emphasize that “there is more than one park, a matter which it seems to all of us here has been overlooked.” They also suggested the name “Fredericksburg-Chancellorsville-Wilderness-Spotsylvania National Battlefields” to indicate the different areas protected in the park. This exercise in naming reveals the frustration in the existing situation and the desire to declare the park a multiple of itself to aid its development and protection. 

Instead of recognizing Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania as a multiple park requiring more staff, the Park Service handed more administrative duties to the already taxed staff. George Washington Birthplace had first managed Fredericksburg when the latter was established in 1927. That relationship switched in the post-World War II period with Fredericksburg serving as an overall manager of George Washington Birthplace. The agency expanded this responsibility in 1969 by forming a cluster of the Birthplace and Manassas operating under Fredericksburg. Around this same time period, following the recommendation of the region, Fredericksburg itself combined its ranger and interpretive divisions into one new division, the new Division of Interpretation and Resources Management. The region and park hoped that this new administrative configuration would

122 Memorandum, Northington to Director, 9 August 1962, 2, File A2615 Monthly Narrative Reports Historian’s Copy 1961-65, Cabinet 10, Drawer 1, FRSP Basement Files.
123 Mission 66 for FRSP, attached to memorandum, Northington to Regional Director, Region One, 5 June 1957, 4, File A 98-CP Mission 66, Cabinet 15, Drawer 2, FRSP Basement Files.
124 Underlining in the original. Memorandum, Northington to Regional Director, Region One, 2 October 1958, File L1417 Part 2 FRSP, Box 1630, Entry P-11, RG 79, NARA-Archives II.
remove duplication and enhance visitor protection and services. Employees received cross-
training to aid in the transition.\textsuperscript{125}

**NORTHINGTON AND HAPPEL FAREWELLS**

The end of Mission 66 marked the end of two distinguished careers at the park. Oscar Northington, Jr. retired after 20 years of service as park superintendent in December 1966, sent off with a farewell party from the park and also a special citation from the City of Fredericksburg. Northington left a record of commitment to the park, always worrying about its future and wanting to find the means to ensure its protection and survival in the face of development. Opal Ritchie, a former private secretary, stated that Northington “loved the park” and that “the park was his life.” Ritchie also recalled that he sometimes was not very diplomatic when he saw people doing something wrong in the park, but his intentions were true, wanting only the best for the park.\textsuperscript{126}

Ralph Happel also neared the completion of his time at Fredericksburg, retiring in 1972 after more than 35 years in the Park Service (with all but a few of those years at Fredericksburg). Happel was equally devoted to the park, turning down promotions to stay in his hometown. He is remembered as being the park’s chief historian, but he never officially served in that position. He instead embraced the research and writing, along with the contacts with the public, as opposed to the administrative duties and management functions associated with the chief historian’s position. (Figure 100) He learned the historian’s trade largely while working at the national park; his undergraduate degree from the University of Virginia was in English, though he took a few courses in history. Later park superintendent Dixon Freeland called Happel an “old-school historian, classically trained in both literature and history.”\textsuperscript{127} Happel also had a streak of fun in him, and he wrote for the campus humor magazine. Some remember that he never wrote or spoke an ungrammatical sentence, and he liked to go to the main office of the local newspaper and report what errors he had seen in the latest edition. His writing demonstrated his command of the English language; he won a special award for his history of Chatham.

Happel’s historical work at Fredericksburg left a long and valuable legacy. He interviewed the next-generation of Civil War veterans and their families, recording precious accounts of life where the park eventually stood and details about the battles. His predilection for documentation expanded to include photography. He remembered in an

\textsuperscript{125} Memorandum, Happel to Superintendent, 29 January 1970, 2, File K2621 Annual Report Interpretation and Information 1953-, Cabinet 9, Drawer 3, FRSP Basement Files. Memorandum, Northington to Director, 14 June 1965, 3, File A2615 Monthly Narrative Reports Historian’s Copy 1961-65, Cabinet 10, Drawer 1, FRSP Basement Files. Memorandum, Thomas Harrison to Director, 14 June 1966, 1; and Memorandum, Dwight Stinson, Jr., to Director, 13 March 1967, 1, both in File A2615 FRSP Jan 66- Dec 67, Box 89, Entry P-11, RG 79, NARA-Archives II.

\textsuperscript{126} Opal Ritchie, personal conversation with the author, 26 October 2010.

\textsuperscript{127} Dixon Freeland, transcription of oral history interview with the author, 9 March 2010, 5, FRSP Archives.
oral history late in life that NPS Chief Historian Charles Porter corralled him one day to take HABS photos of Fredericksburg’s old houses. Porter produced a large-view camera for the task, and Happel was off and running. With that camera and simple 35 mm ones, he chronicled the development projects under the CCC and Mission 66 with a steady stream of photographs. Historical architect Orville Carroll, when he worked on restoring Jackson Shrine, had Happel take those photographs, too. Carroll later referred to Happel as “truly a gift from heaven,” because of his devotion to the history of the park. Happel had firm opinions that he never hesitated to voice, but he was also a “complete Southern gentleman,” as newspaper writer Larry Evans recalled, and Happel’s extensive knowledge shined each time he gave a presentation.

Happel, however, freely admitted later in his career that he was a conservative at interpretation who did not plan on adopting new approaches in the field. He gave skilled talks when “motivated by the group to whom he is talking,” according to a 1971 NPS Operations Evaluation Team assessment, but his great skill lie in research and writing. Happel was not necessarily against new approaches in living history and audiovisual programs, but he did urge that interpreters and planners “consider the possibility of the danger of mere popularization and its vitiating effect on integrity.” He wanted the park to “avoid merely entertaining demonstrations” and instead be sure to instruct and maintain safety. The evaluation team, after speaking with him and his co-workers and superiors, characterized Happel as having “no intention of changing,” and their report may have signaled that now may be a good time for a change at Fredericksburg.

ANALYSIS

Happel and Northington largely shaped and contributed to the Mission 66 and Civil War Centennial efforts completed at Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania. Their long tenures at

---


129 Carroll, personal communication to the author, 22 January 2010, 2. Carroll maintained a relationship with Happel and his wife Louise after the Shrine project. Carroll designed an addition to the Happel cottage in King George County, which eventually became their permanent home.

130 Larry Evans, personal communication with the author, 25 October 2010, FRSP Admin History Files.


the park and their Virginia roots provided important context and unequaled knowledge about the park, its administrative history, and the Civil War history it interpreted. They pursued new scholarly information about the four battles commemorated at the park and focused interpretation and events upon those battles, the military tactics used, and the stories of the soldiers and civilians who lived and fought in the area. Happel and Northington, both born and raised in Virginia, also accepted southern traditions and used the Lost Cause tradition and the emphasis upon reconciliation and reunion as frameworks for park interpretation. They failed to make the modernistic Mission 66 approach apparent beyond the architectural statement of the Chancellorsville Visitor Center. The visitor center and shelter exhibits, plus speeches given at historic occasions, emphasized Lee and Jackson over any discussion of the Federal military leaders and their actions. This focus upon the Confederacy (and separately to reconciliation) served as the overriding interpretive theme throughout the park. Attention to the plight of the average soldier and of civilians remained from the CCC days, but the park’s interpretive program did so more to engage the public with the human story than to expand the interpretive focus beyond the Lee-Jackson storyline. Lee remained ascendant in the park’s interpretation, and if Jackson had not died at Chancellorsville, the course of the war would likely have changed for the better for the South, at least according to the park’s underlying message. The National Park Service regional and Washington offices, which carefully reviewed and approved all exhibit materials, hardly questioned this approach. NPS historians had the Chancellorsville exhibits expanded to include something about Grant and the actual fighting at the Wilderness, but these same reviewers failed to edit what Happel and the interpretive division had proposed for the Lee Hill Shelter, for example, to say anything about Federal fighting. This shelter focused entirely upon Lee.

The Kirkland memorial stands as another potent reminder of the pro-Confederate interpretive approach used at the park. The Park Service did not formally initiate or design this monument, but Happel served as a liaison between the park and memorial committee and provided important historical research. Northington reported on the status of the memorial in his monthly reports, and the park itself offered land for the memorial, indicating its overall approval for the project. The dedication speeches almost all focused upon the bravery of Kirkland to defy the sharpshooters and reach across enemy lines to help the Federal wounded. This act of mercy deserves acknowledgment and praise, but the park failed to consider (then and years later) the larger interpretive message this monument imposes upon the historic scene. Civil War historian and former park interpreter Peter Carmichael argued recently that “there was a slaughter pen . . . of 10,000 dead, wounded Union soldiers” along the Sunken Road after the December 1862 battle, and the “Confederates were gleeful in the kind of punishment that they inflicted on the Army of the Potomac,” but visitors will take away the image of the statue, of “redemption in war” and
reconciliation instead of understanding the horrors and pain inflicted.\textsuperscript{134} A Southern soldier redeems the Confederacy through his simple act of giving water to the wounded, erasing uncomfortable thoughts about the preceding fighting.

Civil War scholarship by the early 1960s had begun to shift away from the Lost Cause tradition, and historical scholarship on blacks had also taken a critical eye towards how the plight of blacks and slavery in particular had started the war. Kenneth Stampp in 1950 had written about the United States in the 1850s that there could be no sectional harmony so long as slavery existed and the North continued to assert its political power over the South’s interests. Allan Nevins, also in 1950, had argued that slavery and the issue of race, particularly the role of blacks in American society, had been the prime causes of the Civil War. Russell B. Nye had written in 1949 that even though Northern whites may have not cared about the plight of blacks in slavery, the South’s zealous defense of the institution provoked people to oppose slavery as a way to defend their own civil liberties.\textsuperscript{135} Black historians, including W. E. B. DuBois, Carter G. Woodson, and later John Hope Franklin, asserted the history of blacks as an integral part of United States history and made clear slavery as a cause of the Civil War. The National Park Service, though, remained deferential in its presentation of the battles, avoiding any discussion or reference to the causes of the war. This empty approach became most apparent at the closing of the Civil War Centennial commemorations at Appomattox Court House. The Park Service, joined by the Virginia State Civil War Commission, dedicated the newly reconstructed courthouse without any mention of what had happened at that site in 1865. No one talked about Lee surrendering to Grant or the end of the Confederacy. Back at Fredericksburg, Happel, Northington, and others acknowledged that important historians, like Nevins, had visited the park, and this acknowledgment would likely include recognition of their important historical work. But, the arguments made and the themes developed in these books would not see application in any National Park Service exhibit or brochure for years to come.\textsuperscript{136}

The relationship of blacks to the park is harder to define during the Mission 66 period as opposed to the CCC days. The original museum and administration building had only facilities for whites to use the restrooms, with blacks having to use facilities in the garage. The Chancellorsville Visitor Center, built in the years following legal desegregation as embodied in the 1964 Civil Rights Act, provided restrooms for all. Work on the Fredericksburg Visitor Center did not delineate if the black restrooms had been removed, but certainly legal requirements opened the white restrooms to all by the mid-1960s.

\textsuperscript{134} Peter Carmichael, transcription of oral history interview with the author, 1 September 2010, 14-15, FRSP Archives.


Visitation statistics do not delineate how many, if any, blacks toured the battlefields. There is one potentially telling reference to blacks, though, in a May 1960 monthly superintendent’s report. Northington noted that a recent county law requiring dance halls to close before midnight may help or hurt the park. An increase in visitors, “particularly of teen-agers, colored persons, and public dance hall addicts” who would look for other places to congregate (like the national park) if the dance halls closed early, complicated what had already been “a bad situation.”\footnote{Northington, Memorandum, 7 June 1960, 5, File A2823 Jan 1960-Dec 1961 FRSP, Box 188, Entry P-11, NARA-Archives II.} The fact that Northington set aside blacks from the rest of the groups who had potentially increased visitation of the park, but not in a positive way, suggests that he saw black visitors as largely problem visitors. No further references to blacks are found in these monthly reports, and any sustaining analysis is left open for further research, but clearly this one mention provides a potentially tantalizing clue into the relationship of park managers to one segment of park visitors. The park’s interpretive program, with its continued pro-Confederate and Lost Cause slant, certainly would not have appeared inviting to black visitors.
Figure 55. Oscar Northington started at Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania NMP during the CCC days and then went on to become park superintendent between 1946 and 1966. Photo courtesy of National Park Service <verify NPS photo>, Park Personnel Box, File Park Personnel, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 56. Mission 66 planners considered in 1957 placing the Chancellorsville Visitor Center, and three employee residences, south of Route 3 off Stuart Drive at Fairview. Map courtesy of National Park Service, Denver Technical Information Center, FRSP_326_3011A.pdf.
Figure 57. Northington and the park’s historians raised concerns about a south-of-Route-3 location for the Chancellorsville Visitor Center and further reflection prompted Mission 66 planners to agree to the location near the Jackson wounding site, north of Route 3. Map courtesy of National Park Service, Denver Technical Information Center, FRSP_326_3011C.pdf.
Figure 58. Mission 66 planners initially recommended building a full-service visitor center at the Bloody Angle at Spotsylvania Court House battlefield. Map courtesy of National Park Service, Denver Technical Information Center, FRSP_326_3007.pdf.
Figure 59. Mission 66 planners agreed with Northington to keep the Bloody Angle area free of development, choosing instead to build an exhibit shelter near the Sedgwick Memorial. Map courtesy of National Park Service, Denver Technical Information Center, FRSP_326_3007B.pdf.
Figure 60. The Wilderness visitor center/shelter initially would have stood on Hill-Ewell Drive near the intersection with Route 20. Map courtesy of National Park Service, Denver Technical Information Center, FRSP_326_3008A.pdf.
Figure 61. Mission 66 planners agreed with Northington's recommendation to have the Wilderness exhibit shelter stand on Route 20 just east of Hill-Ewell Drive. Map courtesy of National Park Service, Denver Technical Information Center, FRSP_326_3008C.pdf.
Figure 62. Fredericksburg battlefield auto tour route from the mid-1950s. Map courtesy of National Park Service, FRSP Auto Tour booklet.
Figure 63. Chancellorsville battlefield auto tour route from the mid-1950s. Map courtesy of National Park Service, FRSP Auto Tour booklet.
Figure 64. Wilderness battlefield auto tour route from the mid-1950s. Map courtesy of National Park Service, FRSP Auto Tour booklet.
Figure 65. Spotsylvania Court House battlefield auto tour route from the mid-1950s. Map courtesy of National Park Service, FRSP Auto Tour booklet.
Figure 66. Orientation disks flush with the ground had been placed during the CCC days. During Mission 66, the park placed new orientation disks on raised brick and concrete platforms, as shown in this example. Photo courtesy of the author.
Figure 67. These aluminum narrative markers used distinctive medallions for each battlefield, plus the frames were painted to correspond to a different battlefield. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Spotsylvania Box 4, File Spotsylvania Exhibit Signs, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 68. Renovations to the Fredericksburg Visitor Center in 1961-62 included installing an automated system for the electric map, moved into the lecture hall. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Fredericksburg Box 6, File FVC Exhibits, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 69. The 1961 Shot and Shell exhibit in the Fredericksburg Visitor Center used professional design, models of gun carriages, and artifacts from the battlefields to help visitors understand the battle. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Contemporary Photos Box 3, File FVC Displays, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 70. This 1961 exhibit in the Fredericksburg Visitor Center described how armies moved men and supplies prior to the battle. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Contemporary Photos Box 3, File FVC Displays, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 71. The Lee’s men exhibit for the Fredericksburg Visitor Center presented personal artifacts and descriptions to help visitors understand the common Confederate soldier’s life. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Contemporary Photos Box 3, File FVC Displays, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 72. The Impact of War exhibit for the Fredericksburg Visitor Center described how civilians coped with the war at their doorsteps. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Contemporary Photos Box 3, File FVC Displays, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 73. The Chancellorsville Visitor Center, completed in 1963, made a bold modern architectural statement with its cantilevered roof and simple design. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Chancellorsville Box 2, File CVC, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 74. The 1963 Chancellorsville Visitor Center contained a large auditorium/exhibit area and service/office area, connected to a spacious lobby with floor-to-ceiling windows. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Chancellorsville Box 2, File CVC, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 75. The 1963 Chancellorsville Visitor Center invited visitors into its light-filled lobby. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Chancellorsville Box 2, File CVC, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 76. The 1963 diorama of the Bloody Angle included an audio station for understanding this desperate part of the Spotsylvania Court House battle. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Chancellorsville Box 2, File CVC, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 77. This 1963 exhibit for the Chancellorsville Visitor Center described how in the various battles memorialized at the park sharpshooters felled generals from both sides of the conflict. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Chancellorsville Box 2, File CVC, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 78. This drawing indicates the location of the Chancellorsville Visitor Center in relationship to Route 3 (far left) and the three employee residences (right upper side). Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Denver Technical Information Center, FRSP_326_30208.pdf.
Figure 79. This close-up of one of the NPS drawings indicates that the Park Service knew it would be covering the trace remains of the old Colonial Mountain Road when it sited the Chancellorsville Visitor Center. Photo courtesy of National Park Service.
Figure 80. The 1962 Lee Hill Shelter used an angled roof and asymmetrically stacked concrete disks as modernist architectural details for this three-sided brick structure. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Fredericksburg Box 1, File Lee Hill Shelter, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 81. These exhibit panels in the 1962 Lee Hill shelter described the guns Lee used to assert his position during the December 1862 battle. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Fredericksburg Box 1, File Lee Hill, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 82. The 1962 Lee Hill shelter also provided information about the Second Battle of Fredericksburg in May 1863. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Fredericksburg Box 1, File Lee Hill, FRSP Photo Archives.
**Figure 83.** The drawing for the Lee Hill shelter indicates the location of and view from the shelter. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Denver Technical Information Center, FRSP_326_3017.pdf.
Figure 84. The Park Service placed a 30-pound Parrott cannon next to the Lee Hill shelter and completed some landscape clearing to help open the view. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Fredericksburg Box 1, File Lee Hill, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 85. The Wilderness shelter used a roof overhang and skylights to help control light inside the exhibit area. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Wilderness Box 1, File Wilderness Exhibit Shelter, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 86. The Spotsylvania Court House shelter sat near the Sedgwick Memorial at the start of the battlefield tour. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Spotsylvania Box 1, File Spotsylvania Exhibit Shelter, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 87. The 1950s Sidney King painting and short audioprogram made this exhibit on Marye’s Heights one of the most popular in the park. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Fredericksburg Box 2, File Fredericksburg National Cemetery, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 88. The New Jersey state legislature erected this 23rd New Jersey Monument to honor both the New Jersey and Alabama soldiers who had fought in 1863 at Salem Church. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Monuments Box 2, File 23rd New Jersey Monument, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 89. Special commemorative exercises in 1864 rededicated the four New Jersey monuments, including this one to the 15th New Jersey, at the Bloody Angle. Photo courtesy of the author.
Figure 90. The 1965 Kirkland Memorial honored Sgt. Richard Kirkland of the Second South Carolina Volunteers for aiding wounding Federal soldiers after the 1862 Fredericksburg battle. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Donald C. Pfanz, History through Eyes of Stone, 2006.
Figure 91. This 1880 photo helped historical architect Orville W. Carroll restore the Jackson Shrine to its Civil War-era appearance. Photo courtesy of Library of Congress, as reproduced in Carroll, Historic Structures Report I on Jackson Shrine, 1962.
Figure 92. This 1962 photo of Jackson Shrine shows its appearance before historical architect Orville W. Carroll began restoration work. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Carroll, Historic Structures Report I on Jackson Shrine, 1962.
Figure 93. The Jackson Shrine restoration project took the building down to its interior frame. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Carroll, Historic Structures Report I on Jackson Shrine, 1962.
**Figure 94.** Historical architect Orville W. Carroll had workers remove the fireproofing insulation installed by the Richmond, Fredericksburg, and Potomac Railroad during its 1927-28 restoration. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Carroll, Historic Structures Report I on Jackson Shrine, 1962.
Figure 95. The Park Service removed modern brick from the foundation and chimneys and replaced it with handmade brick laid in the same pattern as the original. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Carroll, Historic Structures Report I on Jackson Shrine, 1962.
Figure 96. The completed Jackson Shrine, which was re-opened to the public in 1964, greeted visitors with new signage. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Jackson Shrine Box 2, File Jackson Shrine Exterior, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 97. In the room where Gen. Stonewall Jackson died, the bed and clock are authentic, the mantel is a reconstruction based on historic photographs. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Carroll, Historic Structures Report I on Jackson Shrine, 1962.
**Figure 98.** The Salem Baptist Church congregation built this new building in 1961 and donated the adjacent historic church to the National Park Service. Photo courtesy of the author.
Figure 99. The historic Salem Church sits next to the modern church building along Route 3 near the Interstate 95 interchange. Photo courtesy of the author.
Figure 100. Ralph Happel, shown here in 1958 giving a talk for a Civil War Round Table group, turned down promotions to stay in his hometown of Fredericksburg and research and write about its Civil War battles. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Park Personnel Box, File Park Personnel, FRSP Photo Archives.
CHAPTER FOUR

BEGINNINGS OF THE SEA OF PRIVATE DEVELOPMENT

Dr. Benjamin Franklin Cooling III did not like what he saw when he visited the Wilderness battlefield in spring 1970. He had “trampled these woods over the past decade” and more, but this time he saw “vulnerable portions” of historic land being subdivided and bulldozed alarmingly close to the Civil War monuments and roads. Second-growth forest had already been “raped” in a “sizable slash” by developers building a new subdivision known as Lake Wilderness. Cooling asked in a letter to Interior Secretary Walter Hickel that the federal government not allow the current events in Southeast Asia “obscure depredations to environment and historic sites” here in the States. He demanded to know what steps the National Park Service, state of Virginia, and individuals had done and could do to halt such destruction. He closed with the admonition that “Wilderness [battlefield] enjoys a special place due to its historical continuity being tied to the environmental setting.” He knew that to understand the Civil War battle, future generations needed to see the forest, and developers threatened that essential landscape.

Cooling’s letter did not represent simply an angry rant and frustrated call for action by a one-time visitor to Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania National Military Park. He had from an early age explored Spotsylvania County to learn about and connect with the Civil War battles that would fascinate him throughout his life. Longtime park historian Ralph Happel recorded in his September 1949 monthly report that “Master Franklin Cooling (aged 10½)” and his parents from Washington, DC, had visited the park (this was not their first time) expressly to help Franklin with his writing (in longhand) of a short history of the Civil War, illustrated by himself. The budding Civil War scholar had especially wanted to see then-park historian Francis Wilshin. Wilshin was off, but he expressly came back the next day to meet with the Cooling family. Wilshin and Happel each gave Franklin advice on books and sources, plus Happel gave the boy a bullet from his personal collection. Happel noted at the end of his entry about this visit that the Cooling parents were doing all that they could to “further their boy’s interest.” The son eventually became a noted scholar of Civil War history, publishing books on Washington’s Civil War defenses and on Jubal Early’s raid

---


3 Happel, September 1949 Report, 4 October 1949, 1, File 21, Box Unarranged Records 2, Collection Happel 14117, FRSP CVC.
of DC, among others. His 1970 words of warning and concern resonated throughout the park, National Park Service, and Civil War history community.\(^4\)

Superintendent Dixon Freeland had been at Fredericksburg about a year when he took on the task of answering Cooling’s letter. He thoroughly understood the problems Cooling had delineated. Freeland admitted that “real estate development was almost inevitable,” given that the park’s enabling legislation had allowed for such “inherent trouble” by virtue of the initial land acquisition strategy. This approach reserved trench remains and vital sites but allowed the land inbetween, in effect the land at the crossroads of park and outside development, where much of the fighting took place, to stay in private ownership. The “ground around was believed to be safe,” Freeland wrote, and nobody in the early 20\(^{th}\) century foresaw the “population explosion and the accelerated mobility” of the latter half of the century. Expressing his basic optimism and generosity of spirit, Freeland cautioned that “one does not blame the past, however; one does one’s best with the present.” Doing best in the present meant to Freeland using funds from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, established in 1964 to use proceeds from sales of surplus Federal real property, motorboat fuel taxes, and fees for recreation use of Federal lands to provide a funding source for both federal acquisition of park and recreation lands and matching grants to state and local governments for recreation planning, acquisition and development. Congress amended the law in 1968 to tap Outer Continental Shelf mineral leasing receipts to bolster the fund. Freeland saw this 1968 change in the law as an opportunity to acquire additional land at Wilderness and other threatened battlefield areas. Doing best also meant cooperating, “in any way possible” with state and county governments to establish zoning regulations (Spotsylvania County did not have a zoning ordinance in 1970) or other controls on use of the land. But, Freeland noted, the National Park Service did not have “the authority to police private development” and owners had the “right to peaceful and quiet possession and use” of their lands. He invited Cooling to return and “discuss some new opportunities for preservation,” closing with hope for the future.\(^5\)

Three superintendents, William Hollomon, Freeland, and James Zinck, would tackle this accelerated development around all corners of the park’s boundaries between the end of Mission 66 and the approval of the park’s General Management Plan in 1986. Each man brought his personality and passion to bear on the far-reaching situation. Hollomon filled the superintendent’s residence with furniture made by him and his family, antiques refinished by them, plus pieces collected on travels abroad. Described as a genial man,

\(^4\) Cooling’s books include *Mr. Lincoln’s Forts: A Guide to the Civil War Defenses of Washington*, by Cooling and Walton H. Owen II, new ed., (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2010); *Jubal Early’s Raid on Washington* (Fire Ant Books, 2008); and *Forts Henry and Donelson: The Keys to the Confederate Heartland* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1987). Cooling had also been an NPS historian, college professor, and historian in various federal agencies. The author met him when he was chief historian of the Department of Energy.

originally from Tennessee, he had served four and half years in the Navy in the European Theatre during World War II, with the last two years in the Naval Attache office in London. He had worked as a seasonal at Lassen Volcanic National Park (CA) before his wartime service, and when he returned, he gained permanent status as a park ranger at the same park before moving on to Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Parks, also in California. His first superintendency was at Andrew Johnson National Historic Site (TN), then Richmond National Battlefield Park (VA), before he took the Fredericksburg position. He served at Fredericksburg from January 1967 to June 1969, then moved on to become a park planner in the National Park Service’s Southeast Regional Office in Richmond. He eventually went to work for the Virginia Highway Department. Hollomon started out at Fredericksburg wanting to “see more use made of national parks everywhere” while still preserving their features. At Fredericksburg, he had particular interest in having school children visit.

Freeland would stay for eleven years, from June 1969 to May 1980, mixing his administrative abilities and people-friendly attitude to tie the park and larger community together. Freeland came from a National Park Service family, had completed high school at age 16 just outside Shenandoah National Park (VA), where his father had worked, and had gone into the Navy for two years at the end of World War II as a pharmacist’s mate. After his service, he went to Colorado State University and completed an arts and sciences general degree, following the advice of a former NPS director that NPS employees be broadly educated. He worked as a seasonal ranger at Yosemite National Park (CA) and Bryce Canyon National Park (UT) during summers, but when he graduated, he tried private industry for three years before finally following in his father’s footsteps. His first permanent position within the agency took him to Carlsbad Caverns National Park (NM), then Great Smoky Mountains (NC), Colonial National Historical Park (VA), and Blue Ridge Parkway (NC). He served his first superintendency at Saratoga National Historical Park (NY), then worked two years in the Park Service’s office of legislation before accepting the position at Fredericksburg. His long NPS career, and ability to make influential friends, including Director George Hartzog, proved fruitful for Fredericksburg in effectively making the case for land acquisition money. Freeland oversaw between 1969 and 1979 the acquisition of approximately 3,062 acres, more than doubling the size of the park. This accomplishment would be his key legacy.

James Zinck brought an attention to detail and an absolute commitment to the preservation of the park’s resources while he served as Fredericksburg’s superintendent.

---


8 Freeland, transcript of interview, 1, 23-24. Moser, “Fredericksburg—Returning Home,” Free Lance-Star, 8 July 1969. The park contained 2,557 acres as of the 1969 Master Plan (p. 34) and as of 3 December 1979, it contained 5,619 federal acreage (plus 779 non-federal acreage and 61 acres of easements), according to Park Area Identification by State, File A2621 Park Area Identification by Geographic Location, Cabinet 14, Drawer 1, FRSP Basement Files.
from January 1981 to June 1989. He had a Bachelor of Science degree in geography and science from Western Illinois University, and the department head for his major, along with one of his fraternity brothers, both encouraged him to consider work in the National Park Service. He followed their advice and worked as a seasonal for four summers, interrupted by two years in the military, at Crater Lake National Park (OR), then took a permanent position in interpretation at Carlsbad Caverns. He quickly moved to Montezuma Castle National Monument (AZ) as a park ranger, then chief ranger at Chaco Canyon National Monument (NM). He became a sub-district ranger at Lake Mead National Recreation Area (NV, AZ) before moving into a training assistant position at Mather Training Center at the Grand Canyon. He went on to the Washington, DC, office to enter a two-year training program before taking his first superintendency at Western Pennsylvania Group, which at that time included Allegheny Portage, Johnstown Flood, and Fort Necessity. He stayed there nine years and then accepted the position at Fredericksburg. His first weeks at Fredericksburg included attending an unruly Spotsylvania County Board of Supervisors meeting which left a bad taste in everyone’s mouth. He eventually lost support, even within his own park, because, as a he later remembered, he stuck to the minutiae of his preservation mission and resources management focus when development barreled down the main roads crisscrossing the park. But Zinck also oversaw the establishment of a new land acquisition strategy (in the 1986 General Management Plan) that, after his time, would again double the park’s size.9

One more person, never the park’s superintendent but with a longtime presence and influence, also shaped the park during this period and beyond: Robert K. Krick. Krick began his thirty-year career at Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania National Military Park in 1972 as an interpretive specialist but in reality as the park’s chief historian. He had worked most recently as superintendent of Fort Necessity National Battlefield Park (PA) and previous to that as a supervisory historian at Fort McHenry National Monument (MD). His master’s degree in American history from San Jose State College, with a specialty in military history, prepared him to delve into the history of the French and Indian War and the War of 1812 at these previous posts. But, Krick had a long established love of the history of the American Civil War, and despite his birth in Trenton, New Jersey, and his raising in California, he took a decidedly Southern view in his historical tendencies with the war. This Confederate sympathy can be found in the fact that he and his Virginia-born wifename their two sons after Southern military officers, Robert E. Lee and Williams Barksdale.10 Former seasonal historian and now Gettysburg College history professor Peter Carmichael characterized Krick as a brilliant intellect who constantly wanted to update and revise the on-the-ground history of the park’s battlefields but largely kept a Southern-leaning perspective, in line with

---


the Lost Cause tradition, as an overall interpretation of the Civil War. Krick acknowledged when he first arrived at Fredericksburg that his interests have “always been Confederate.” The local newspaper *Free-Lance Star* noted in its introduction of Krick to the area that “He now has what he wants” being stationed at a southern Civil War national military park. Krick would shape the park’s interpretive programming (detailed in chapter six) and land acquisition strategies (detailed in this chapter and chapter five) for the next three decades.12

**WIDENING ROUTE 3**

Krick had a rude introduction to the realities of development around the battlefield park when he first arrived in 1972. The Virginia Highway Department had begun widening Route 3 in Chancellorsville, turning the two-lane country road into a four-lane highway that ran across about 12 acres of National Park Service land at the battlefield. Krick later declared, as longtime park historian Donald Pfanz remembered, that he would have blocked the widening if he had started at the park a year earlier. In reality, the state had been planning the widening for more than fifteen years, and former superintendent Oscar Northington, along with NPS regional officers, had had repeated discussions and meetings with the state about the proposed roadwork. Krick’s proposed blocking of the project would have come too late to have made a difference in the outcome of the project.13

Road widening in Spotsylvania County represented a larger effort in the post-World War II period by states to modernize transportation systems, improve safety and dependability, and foster economic development. The state of Virginia adopted in the late 1940s a 20-year plan to upgrade its roads and replace most of the state’s ferries with bridges and tunnels. One example of this push was the Route 3 widening begun in the mid-1950s. The federal government, in addition, used the 1956 Federal-Aid Highway Act to add a new type of roadway to the mix, the interstate system of limited access highways that would eventually crisscross Virginia and the entire country. Interstate 95, which paralleled the heavily traveled and built-up U.S. Route 1, opened its interchange at Route 3 in December 1964. The interstate system, however, could not handle all the traffic needs of the increasingly urbanized and mobilized society. Roads designed even 10 years earlier needed improvements to carry safely the heavy vehicles traveling at fast speeds. Virginia General Assembly members responded to this situation and passed in 1964 legislation to develop further an arterial network for the areas not directly served by the interstates, and further road widenings around Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania resulted.14

---

11 Peter Carmichael, transcription of oral history interview with the author, 1 September 2010, 10-11.
13 Draft, Robert Krick, Superintendent’s annual report, 1972, 12, File A26 Superintendent’s Annual Report CY 1972, Cabinet 8, Drawer 1, FRSP Basement Files. Donald Pfanz, personal communication with the author, 29 October 2010, FRSP Admin History Files.
State planning for Route 3 went back at least as far as 1955, with the overall tenor of discussions suggesting accommodation on the part of the Park Service. Two specific geographic areas required Park Service involvement, road widening at Chancellorsville and at Salem Church. The state debated, as described in chapter three, whether the additional two lanes at Chancellorsville would parallel to the north or south of the existing two-lane road. The Park Service adjusted its planning for the Chancellorsville Visitor Center based on this back-and-forth decision, ultimately choosing to locate the visitor center near the Jackson Monument when the state favored a southern Route 3 addition.¹⁵

Salem Church, and specifically the 15th New Jersey monument located across from the church, would also see four-laning of Route 3 that would require moving the monument. Discussions about this relocation illuminate the willingness of park and regional officials to meet state highway demands. Historian Albert Dillahunty urged in 1959 that the Park Service reject state plans to move the monument and leave it with little land to allow for “suitable[ly] landscap[ing]” or “preclude future development of an objectionable nature.” He recognized that the monument would end up looking like a “flagpole sitter instead of a dignified monument.”¹⁶ Ralph Happel agreed, adding that the park “should get something for giving up its property.” He noted that “we would be losing a lot and getting nothing,” just as was happening at Chancellorsville. He reminded Northington in his February 1959 memorandum that “we are already ceding a long strip for the road at Chancellorsville and asking nothing.” Happel believed that the Park Service had a responsibility to maintain the perpetual memorial for the 15th New Jersey Regiment, including having adequate land for its setting. Giving up land at Salem Church and Chancellorsville for a highway did not, in Happel’s mind, meet that preservation mission.¹⁷ Dillahunty also noted that the adjacent property owner would be willing to sell a 40-foot wide strip to enhance the setting. But the state highway department argued that it did not have the authority to condemn land for other than the highway. Plus, its officials were anxious to move forward with the planning and obtain the required right-of-ways.¹⁸

Park documentation uncovered so far is silent regarding further discussions between the regional office and the state highway agency on relocation of the New Jersey monument. Northington stated that the regional director would make the final determination.¹⁹ April 1961 saw the beginning of the move, with the “indomitable old granite Yankee,” in Happel’s words, watching “uneasily” in his halfway position between his former and new homes,
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¹⁵ See also J. E. Harwood to Northington, 6 November 1958, 1, File Deed #39, FRSP Lands Files.
¹⁶ Memorandum, Albert Dillahunty to Northington, 26 February 1959, 1, File Deed #39, FRSP Lands Files.
¹⁷ Memorandum, Happel to Northington, 26 February 1959, File Deed #39, FRSP Lands Files.
¹⁸ Memorandum, Dillahunty to Northington, 26 February 1959, 2. Memorandum, Elbert Cox to Northington, 20 February 1959; Memorandum, Clifford Harrison to Northington, 1 April 1959, both in File Deed #39, FRSP Lands Files.
¹⁹ Memorandum, Northington to Director, 11 March 1959, 1, File A2823 Jan 54-July 57 FRSP, Box 188, Entry P-11. RG 79, NARA-Archives II.
waiting for the pouring of cement. (Figure 101) Happel also remarked that the “new lane of Virginia Highway 3 is progressing nicely across the ground” where the monument had once stood.\(^{20}\) Dillahunty had predicted correctly that a lack of land around the monument for a proper memorial setting would leave it open to too-close development, as detailed further in this chapter.

Documentation in the park’s files is also scarce in understanding what negotiations the park and regional office undertook with the state to obtain concessions or land for that being given for the Chancellorsville widening. Northington certainly encouraged and enjoyed a friendly relationship with the highway department that may suggest his having an accommodating stance. When the state celebrated the 50\(^{th}\) anniversary of this department in June 1956, Northington attended the all-day picnicking and speaking event for Northern Virginia state highway employees. He admitted it was “a pleasure to get together with friends of some years standing,” and he noted that “our relationship with this State organization has always been most pleasant and cooperative.”\(^{21}\) His monthly reports do not reveal any tensions or nagging issues when referring to the Route 3 widening.

The talks reached a climax in summer 1966. Chief historian Thomas Harrison, who replaced Dillahunty, urged Northington to request that the regional office reject the state highway’s request for a special use permit to allow for the building of the two new lanes through Chancellorsville. Instead, Harrison argued that the park should request 12 acres of land in exchange for the land that would be lost. His memo describes this land to be lost based on the current status of the discussions: loss of three gun emplacements at Fairview, loss of the original site of the Van Wert House (a battlefield landmark), loss of 1.4 acres at the Jackson formation area, and loss of tour stop 18 (1 acre) where visitors could learn about Jackson’s flank attack. The park would also be giving up 9.4 acres of battlefield land, and the highway project would change the historic character of Route 3, a road from the Civil War era that would become a high-speed highway. None of these losses could be remedied, Harrison stated, except replacement of the lost tour stop at Jackson’s flank attack. Harrison wanted the state to buy, through the Virginia Highway Beautification Act of 1965, six acres on either side of Route 3 to allow for interpretation of the flank attack area and the Federal line at Howard’s XI Corps. He also argued that the state should keep trees as much as possible, provide for deceleration lanes or pull-offs for the new proposed Jackson flank attack area and the Chancellorsville Visitor Center, and have utility lines be undergrounded.\(^{22}\)

Happel recalled in June 1968 that Northington had “worked out an agreement” in 1966 for the widening project. According to Happel, the highway department would take

\(^{20}\) Memorandum, Northington to Director, 13 June 1961, with a section written by Happel, 2, File A2823 Jan 54-July 57 FRSP, Box 188, Entry P-11, RG 79, NARA-Archives II.

\(^{21}\) Memorandum, Northington to Director, 10 July 1956, 2, File A2823 Jan 54-July 57 FRSP, Box 188, Entry P-11, RG 79, NARA-Archives II.

\(^{22}\) Memorandum, Thomas Harrison to Northington, 7 July 1966, File Historian’s Reading Files 7/1/66-12/31/66, Cabinet 3, Drawer 1, FRSP Basement Files.
ground opposite and west of former tour stop 18 and then lease it to the park. The park would not receive any land for the losses at Fairview. When Happel asked that the highway department check on this agreement, the representatives “were vague about this.” The files note that Northington stated in a late summer 1966 memorandum that a decision would be made once all parties met with the Regional Director in September. A decision was made, as recorded in early 1967 by acting superintendent Dwight Stinson, with him detailing that “several cannon emplacements” were included in the “historic ground to be sacrificed” for the Route 3 widening. Northington, just before his retirement, continued to engage the highway department in negotiations in November 1966. He stated that “it required some little perseverance to convince” the highway folks that “grassed plots, instead of yellow concrete islands, were suitable” at the proposed road intersections on Route 3. The highway representative “succeeded finally” after meeting with Northington.

A new superintendent, William Hollomon, and new attention on state highway plans to widen Route 20 through Wilderness battlefield meant that any possible agreements Northington may have worked on for Route 3 through Chancellorsville quietly died. There is no record of a lease for land from the state highway department, just the special use permit for the highway. When the bulldozers and construction vehicles finally descended on Chancellorsville in 1972, another superintendent, Dixon Freeland, would be blamed by Krick and others for the desecration of the 12 acres. Freeland, however, had absolutely no authority or role in the Route 3 widening, as made clear in park documentation, including monthly and annual reports. The regional office had long ago made the decision. Freeland did work with the highway department and regional office to narrow the footprint of the highway slightly, but the region, according to Freeland, made the final decisions even with respect to the road’s footprint. Freeland also worked with the regional office, according to the 1974 Annual Report, to develop a policy statement declaring the park’s position regarding the use of preserved park land for highway uses. Freeland reported in his 1974 annual report about the “much improved cooperative attitude now evident” with the local and Richmond offices of the state highway department.
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23 Memorandum, Happel to Hollomon, 1 July 1968, 2, File Division I&RM Reading File 7/1/68-8/31/68, Cabinet 3, Drawer 1, FRSP Basement Files.
24 Memorandum, Northington to Director, 13 September 1966, 2, File A2615 FRSP Jan 66-Dec 67, Box 89, Entry P-11, RG 79, NARA-Archives II.
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The Route 20 widening near Wilderness also resulted in 1968 in some loss of land, including tour stop 24 (the federal encampment area where Routes 3 and 20 intersect). Possibly because the park was smarter with these discussions than it had been with the Route 3 debacle, or possibly because the park dealt with a different highway district than for Route 3, but it did gain a few concessions. The highway department agreed to build a new tarred turnout just west of the lost tour stop. Plus, the highway agency put in “good approaches” to Hill-Ewell Drive and the Wilderness Exhibit Shelter. The highway department also relocated the United Daughters of the Confederacy stone and bronze marker which had originally stood at the beginning of Hill-Ewell Drive. At the completion of the widening project, the marker was reinstalled flanking exhibits at tour stop 26, at the beginning of Hill-Ewell Drive. Either road widening may have had a different result if national environmental and historic preservation laws, described late in the chapter, had been in effect at the time of road planning.

THE PRESS OF DEVELOPMENT

These road projects, along with work at the local level to extend utilities and services along these improved roads, welcomed development of residential and commercial properties, putting the park at the crossroads. Ralph Metts, a Stafford Board of Supervisors member and businessman, presciently noted that the opening of I-95 would “make it desirable for people working in the Washington area to live here.” He was right. Spotsylvania and Fredericksburg City both saw a population boost in the years to come. Fredericksburg would grow from just over 10,000 people in 1940 to almost 20,000 in 1990, doubling in population in a 50-year span. Spotsylvania would show even more impressive gains, making it the fastest growing county in the country during the 1990s. It grew from almost 10,000 residents in 1940 to more than 57,000 in 1990. In the next decade alone, Spotsylvania County leaped up another 64 percent, reporting 90,395 residents in the 2000 US Census. A combination of opening the interstate, increased residential development of once rural areas, availability of commuter rail service beginning in 1992, and an overall openness to development proposals joined together to feed this population growth. Spotsylvania County, in particular, lacked a zoning ordinance until 1973, giving developers the green light to build with few restraints on where and how extensively. With three-quarters of the national park in this county, the lack of zoning tried many superintendents and their staffs in their efforts to protect the park’s boundaries and preserve historically significant land not yet acquired.  

29 Memorandum, Happel to Holomon, 1 July 1968, 3-4. Quote on p. 3. Memorandum, Happel to Holomon, 15 October 1968, 1, File Division I&RM Reading File 7/1/68-8/31/68, Cabinet 3, Drawer 1, FRSP Basement Files.


31 United States Census figures from www.census.gov/population/cencounts/va190090.txt. With respect to the lack of support for zoning throughout Virginia, see Georgie Boge and Margie Holder Boge, Paving
All of these people did not show up at once, and development happened in fits and spurts, based on the larger regional and national economic conditions. But one person in the county, Hugh Cosner, proved a formidable force in mapping out where development would eventually go and what that development would look like. Cosner had seen his father’s Ford dealership in Louisa, Virginia, burn to the ground when he was only five years old, leaving his family destitute and living as sharecroppers on their former farm, which they had to sell to relatives. When old enough to pursue his own destiny, he moved in 1959 to Spotsylvania and opened a general store. He studied his clientele, met their needs, and quickly established himself, with annual sales topping $700,000. He received an appointment to the county Planning Commission in 1963 and thus began his career in public service. Five years later, Cosner was elected to represent the Lee Hill district on the county Board of Supervisors. He served an impressive six terms, resigning in January 1990. Jean Jones, a fellow supervisor representing the Battlefield district stated upon his retirement that “What Spotsylvania is today is the result of his planning. Whether you see that as good or bad depends on your own individual perspective.”

Cosner achieved personal economic independence through his partnership in owning a series of Pizza Hut restaurants and successfully pursuing various real estate investments. He helped Spotsylvania County achieve commercial independence from Fredericksburg city by aggressively placing county utility services along major corridors, including Route 3, to spur growth. Sewers and water lines determined where developers would choose to build their residential or commercial centers, and having the county own those services, as opposed to the city, meant that the county could assert its priority if ever the city came knocking to annex land. The resulting growth would diversify the county’s tax base and allow the county to funnel money into its school system, which Cosner actively supported throughout his tenure in public office. He lobbied heavily for a mall in Spotsylvania County, though other nearby jurisdictions, Fredericksburg and Stafford, had also vied since 1971 for the prestige and tax money. That mall opened on Route 3 in early 1980, and when Fredericksburg tried to engulf this commercial center in its 1984 annexation bid, Cosner successfully led the charge to keep the mall within the county.

Growth near the national park’s boundaries varied based on a number of factors, including location and time period. The area along Lee Drive saw residential subdivisions begin to sprout soon after World War II. The Lee Hill Industrial Park, begun in the early 1970s, expanded in the early 1980s with a People’s Drug distribution center. Spotsylvania County promoted this industrial center, and added another by the mid-1980s, all in an effort to add new sources of income to the tax base. Heavy industry also started establishing itself


32 Jones as quoted by Daryl Lease, “Fighting to Make a Name,” Free Lance-Star, 1 September 1989.
in the early 1980s south of Hamilton’s Crossing at the Fredericksburg battlefield. The entire stretch of Route 3 offered more opportunities for growth, though the shape of this development varied. In the western reaches by Chancellorsville and Wilderness, recreational amenities first took hold. These are the developments that Cooling spotted and prompted his letter of concern. Lake of the Woods, a 2,600-acre tract of recreational homes began in 1966 at Routes 3 and 20. Developers initially intended these as secondary homes or getaways but economic recession during the 1970s and the relatively affordable home prices in comparison to counties closer to Washington, DC, meant that these homes eventually became primary residences. Lake Wilderness, with 1,200 lots in a 1,000-acre community, opened in 1969. This development, with recreational facilities and a restaurant, sandwiched the thin Federal line of earthworks owned by the park in the Wilderness battlefield. The Wilderness Camping Resorts, starting in the early 1970s, sat adjacent to Chancellorsville and offered owners yearlong respite from everyday life with its campsites, 100-acre lake, marina, heated swimming pool, and hiking trails. A timeshare community known as Presidential Resorts at Chancellorsville opened in the 1980s [verify date], continuing the outdoors theme.  

Balancing these huge developments came a myriad of smaller housing subdivisions that cut up farmland and demanded improved roads and county services. As many as 22 residential subdivisions, according to Freeland’s counting in 1975, sat on the park’s far-flung boundary. Historian Ralph Happel characterized that boundary as a “winding coast line, touch[ing] at so many points the sea of private development.” People like Cosner and others on the planning commission and Board of Supervisors made sure sewer and water kept up with, and even ahead of, development demands. The Free Lance-Star reported in 1972 about an engineering study, ordered by the supervisors to determine the feasibility of extending sewer lines into the Wilderness area. The reporter characterized this action as signaling the likelihood of more development. Fawn Lake, a luxury housing development built in the 1990s, actually had its start by an earlier developer in the early 1970s, who successfully lobbied for a sewer line to be brought out to this then-lonely outpost on the southern side of the Wilderness battlefield. That sewer line proved essential for the eventual Fawn Lake to take shape.


35 Ralph Happel, Draft Park Management Objectives, 6 August 1971, 3.

36 Memorandum, Freeland to Associate Regional Director, Park System Management, Mid-Atlantic Region, 26 March 1975, 3, File K2615 Reports Monthly Public Contact 1/1/65 FVC, Cabinet 9, Drawer 3, FRSP Basement Files. L. Kimball Payne, transcription of oral history interview with the author, 16 March 2010, 8, 15, FRSP Archives. Nancy Moore, “Sewer Study May Pave Way for Wilderness Area Boom,” 2
Along the eastern end of Route 3, close to the Interstate 95 interchange, commercial developments swiftly took hold. Where in the early 1970s no traffic lights had slowed motorists on their trek across the county, in 1981 five stop lights signaled the emergence of strip shopping centers. More would come with the mall as a magnet. Giant grocery stores opened a new outlet across from the mall, and an office complex came in next to the mall entrance. Carl D. Silver, who would probably develop more real estate around this stretch of Route 3 than any single developer, laid claim in 1980 to a new strip mall just west of Salem Church. This addition to the landscape would offer a Nichols department store, a host of smaller stores, and an office park where Silver would relocate his offices. The possibilities along Route 3 seemed endless, with plans in the early- to mid-1980s for an old Virginia store, a High’s convenience store, a health club, a buildings material store, and restaurants, banks, and other commercial establishments. A further indication of change came when White & Weeks, a long-established furniture store on Caroline Street in historic Fredericksburg moved to a new larger storefront on Route 3. The four department stores in downtown Fredericksburg had already moved to the Spotsylvania Mall to serve as anchors in attracting more business. Spotsylvania County was not just growing, but it was taking away Fredericksburg’s historic commercial presence. The city’s annexation effort in 1984 in part tried to offset these losses.  

Aerial photos around Salem Church chronicle the devastation to the rolling countryside. (Figures 102 and 103) A colonial-styled gas station (designed to lessen the impact of the modern structure to the historic church) sat at the corner. Developers removed thousands of cubic yards of earth to allow access from both roads to the gas station, “obliterat[ing] a large portion of the ridge” where Salem Church had stood for more than 100 years.  Large masses of asphalt parking lots served the strip centers with anchor big-box stores accompanied by smaller satellite shops. (Figure 104) A constant stream of traffic slowly made its way through the seemingly unremitting line of stop lights. The park’s 1969 master plan and the 1972 Civil War Boundary Study (discussed below) failed to identify any tracts for land acquisition around Salem Church, though Superintendent Dixon Freeland remembered trying to get a little bit of land around the church as a buffer. He competed, though, with developer Carl Silver. The land acquisition officers at the time, according to
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Freeland, could not justify the price. Later, superintendent James Zinck remembered trying again. He dealt with Silver’s son, Larry, who said “Make me an offer that I can’t refuse.” Park Service regulations would not allow an offer above the appraised value, and in that hot real estate market, the appraised value fell far short of what developers were willing to pay for the future potential growth of the property. 39 Salem Church and the two New Jersey monuments fell victim to the land development frenzy, but the park continued to advocate for some controls. Historian Bob Krick appeared in 1987 before the Board of Supervisors to register the park’s concerns about changing a residential tract into a commercial one near the 15th New Jersey monument. Krick conceded that Route 3 was already heavily developed, but that the park was “eager to save what fragments remain.” 40

Growing pains for the county set in during the mid-1980s, to the point that even Cosner admitted at the time that “I can see serious problems, major problems, ahead.” 41 Traffic congestion had increased, the county needed $20 million in new school buildings to accommodate increased enrollments from all the new residents, and the county’s three sewage treatment plants were in danger of meeting capacity before already approved housing developments had been completed. The new assistant county administrator, L. Kimball Payne (he would become the county administrator in 1987), delivered a 67-page report detailing the level of growth and how the county had no plan to address it. The county did not have a planning department until after Payne helped set one up. 42

In the case of Route 3, county officials adopted an overall plan to concentrate regional commercial development from the I-95 interchange to the Spotsylvania Mall, then have community commercial development extend from the mall to Five Mile Fork (at Routes 610 and 3), to meet the needs of the nearby residential communities. From there, the county expected commercial development to largely peter out. 43 Critics, including other county planners, warned that talking about varied intensity centers was “meaningless if all the centers run into each other.” 44 Plus, zoning along Route 3 was set at medium density commercial, the same zoning as the mall site. Nothing regulated the types of businesses that might locate along that highway, and in theory multiple malls could find a home there. The Board of Supervisors took baby steps in harnessing the growth spiral and ordered in 1986 that housing lots on water and sewer lines now had to average 15,000 square feet as opposed
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44 Former Stafford planner George Smerigan, as quoted by Wishner, in Ibid.
to the former 10,000 square feet. This action worked to decrease the density of suburban areas as a way to control at least some of the growth.\textsuperscript{45}

**MASTER PLANNING AND BOUNDARY AUTHORIZATION**

No rallying cry, except from the park’s staff, rose above the din of bulldozers and cement mixers as the Lake Wilderness housing development sliced through Wilderness battlefield and strip shopping centers crowded out Salem Church. This reaction differed significantly from what Manassas National Battlefield Park (which was administered at various times by the superintendent at Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania) experienced. Manassas superintendent (and former Fredericksburg historian) Francis Wilshin deployed an effective public relations strategy when faced with significant threats to his park, and park neighbor Annie Snyder enrolled as his feisty and committed comrade in fighting off threats to that park. Wilshin went to the DC Civil War Round Table in 1957 when the state highway department revealed its plans to build Interstate 66 along Lee Highway through the heart of the battlefield park. He ignited this group, which resolved to act, and this Round Table urged others to join in sending letters to the state and the US Congress in protest. Wilshin appeared before other civic and patriotic organizations, winning their support. He also gained the ear of newspapers and even television and radio stations, publicizing his argument far and wide. Snyder enlisted anyone who would listen in a letter-writing campaign, inundating the state with cries of outrage from people across the nation. The state bowed to the unrelenting pressure and chose a southern route for the interstate around the park, the bump clearly visible when viewed from a map. The Route 3 widening through Chancellorsville did not take away as much land as an interstate would have, but no one at the Fredericksburg battlefield park waged the kind of fight Wilshin led when he thought Manassas was threatened.\textsuperscript{46}

Wilshin and Snyder relied upon the same tactics in subsequent preservation battles. They enlisted Civil War enthusiasts, Prince William County residents and officials, historic preservationists, park supporters, environmentalists, and many others who recognized the value of maintaining the integrity of the battlefield landscape. They talked before groups, encouraged people to write letters to Congress, and gained enough attention to appear in newspaper articles and on radio and television programs. They successfully fought a 1969 proposal to build a national cemetery at Manassas, although Wilshin was reassigned to a position in Washington for publicly taking a position contrary to the National Park Service, which had initially supported the cemetery idea. Wilshin remained a stalwart Manassas park supporter while living in Fredericksburg, including fighting a 1973 proposal to build a Marriott Great America theme park on land associated with Second Manassas. Snyder and


\textsuperscript{46} Zenzen, *Battling for Manassas*, 57-60.
others became the chief preservation activists, but they used the tactics Wilshin had established.47

Why did Manassas garner such regional and even national attention while Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania’s preservation threats remained quietly local affairs? Prince William County, where Manassas was located, experienced explosive growth like Spotsylvania County, only earlier, with its population growing from 50,000 in 1960 to 111,000 in 1973. Prince William’s relatively close proximity to Washington, DC, helped boost this growth. That proximity also meant that any preservation threat had the potential to make its way to Congress and get visibility and see action, since local news was readily available. Plus, some members of Congress chose to live in the Manassas area or at least visit on occasion, allowing them to hear firsthand about any preservation concerns. Wilshin, while superintendent, would personally escort any congressional members or other political officials, using the valuable time to point out concerns and seek support. Manassas also had a stalwart group of activists, led by Annie Snyder, who astutely employed Wilshin’s public relations tactics to inundate government agencies with objections and cries for action. These efforts worked again and again, most notably during the Manassas Mall controversy of 1988 and the Disney’s America theme park proposal of 1993. Fredericksburg had longtime supporters in Ralph Happel and Oscar Northington, but neither of them had the charisma and drive that Wilshin clearly displayed. The Fredericksburg park also lacked passionate supporters, like Snyder, from the neighboring area itself. Fredericksburg’s enabling legislation, which focused upon narrow lanes of land encompassing fortifications, may have also hindered advocacy, despite years of trying to consolidate land holdings into parcels that could act as protection from development. Targeted land acquisition instead became the key piece in their arsenal that Fredericksburg park managers deployed through the mid-1980s and beyond.48

The park’s 1969 master plan justified land acquisition as necessary for “effective presentation of the four battlefields.” It argued that so long as “important military sites remain outside the park, their adverse use will threaten basic values within the park.”49 Spotsylvania Court House needed the purchase of some inholdings to complete preservation of the scene of initial fighting, Upton’s attack, and parts of the Bloody Angle. (Figure 105) Chancellorsville required land acquisition to fill in the loop road on either side of Route 3, where the 3 May fighting occurred around the house site, plus around Catharine Furnace. Additional proposed land acquisition at Chancellorsville included the area around the Lee-Jackson Bivouac site, Hazel Grove (along Stuart Drive), and a small parcel along Route 3 for interpreting Jackson’s flank attack (the park’s original tour site had been lost with the Route 3 widening). (Figure 106) Both Fredericksburg and Wilderness needed land acquisition on

47 Ibid., 77-81, 88-98.
48 Ibid., 61, 87, 171.
49 FRSP Master Plan, 1969, 35.
select private properties to “maintain the atmosphere of the period.”

The master plan identified for the Fredericksburg battlefield the Sunken Road, Lee Drive itself (as a control for increased traffic), Prospect Hill, and Chatham as key resources for acquisition. (Figure 107) The Wilderness battlefield required acquisition of the Orange Turnpike area to provide a woodland buffer, the Grant-Meade battle station, the Widow Tapp farm, and the Orange Plank Road area to preserve the scene of 5-6 May fighting. (Figure 108) (Figure 109)

Identification of these lands came from a joint effort between the Washington Service Center’s Office of Resource Planning and the park, utilizing a landscape architect, engineer, park planner, and members of the Fredericksburg staff. Initial meetings involved field reviews of the battlefields and development of objectives and programs for visitor services and resource management. Land acquisition personnel, along with contract appraisers and park personnel, later toured the proposed areas for acquisition. There is no evidence that the park gathered public comments during the planning process, but Superintendent Hollomon did meet with the Spotsylvania Board of Supervisors to discuss the master plan just as it obtained final approvals.

A land acquisition officer set up at the park, and work began. Funds came from the newly established Land and Water Conservation Fund. One of the first significant acquisitions totaled only about an acre in size, but its location next to the Sunken Road represented an important step forward for the park. This 1969 purchase of three tracts (Rowe, Carter, Redd, and 1st and Merchants National Bank of Richmond, Trustees) included the historic Innis House (the park used the Ennis spelling at the time of purchase), which had been present during the 1862 battle and revealed the bullet holes from the fighting. The park removed the other non-historic structures, stabilized the historic house, and offered a set of walking tours in June 1970 to mark this important acquisition.

Other land acquisition efforts between 1969 and 1972 filled in important gaps. Eastern National, the park’s cooperating association or concessionaire, donated more than 50 acres at the Widow Tapp farm, and the park purchased almost 30 acres at Longstreet’s wounding site, all at Wilderness. In 1972, the park also obtained the old Chewning farm at
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50 Ibid., 36.
51 Ibid., 35-36. Quote on p. 36.
52 The park switched regional offices during the time period of developing the master plan, starting with the Southeast office and moving to the National Capital one. Master planning was done for FRSP and GEWA simultaneously. The FRSP master plan was approved in July 1968 and printed with a date of 1969. Memorandum, Charles Brooks to Regional Director, 11 August 1966, File D18 Master Plan Field Study FRSP-GEWA September 19-26, 1966, Cabinet 8 Drawer 4, FRSP Basement Files.
54 Memorandum, Happel to Freeland, 29 January 1971, 2, File K2621 Annual Report-Interpretation and Information 1953-, Cabinet 9, Drawer 3, FRSP Basement Files. More information about the Innis House restoration is available in chapter six.
Wilderness. The park filled in the area at Spotsylvania Court House south of Grant Drive West (according to the park roads at the time) and on the western side of Brock Road, totaling 166 acres. These tracts represented the Laurel Hill engagement site and the area between the opposing lines on the west side of the Mule Shoe salient. Another 38 acres came in near Heth’s salient. To this latter landowner, the park sold about 14 acres of alienated land located south of Courthouse Road, far from the core area of the battlefield park.  

The park in 1972 placed options on several other tracts, but the congressional committees approving such purchases rejected the options. Spotsylvania did not have any zoning ordinances at the time, and Congress required that lands purchased be in jurisdictions with zoning laws. The Spotsylvania County Board of Supervisors had debated and rejected a zoning ordinance in 1964 and 1968. The failed 1964 attempt had included 500-foot buffer strips on either side of the parks’ roads, while the 1968 version did not include any provisions for such historic zoning. The Board finally adopted its first-ever zoning ordinance in April 1973.  

This historic action resulted in part because large numbers of residents, like Peter Snyder who lived in Motts Run Estates between Salem Church and Chancellorsville, argued that they liked the “uncharted, rural character of the area” and wanted to protect “their farms and homes and rolling streams and fields” from the “onslaught of concrete and townhouses” that had already descended upon the county. County residents in February 1973 had overwhelmingly voted in favor of a Massaponax sewer bond issue, which would help the county to take control of sewer issues from the City of Fredericksburg, giving the county more flexibility with respect to development. Some Board of Supervisors members, including Hugh Cosner, had linked passage of the sewage referendum with passage of zoning, and many residents had indicated that they wanted assurances if the sewer bond issue passed that then the county would get serious about controlling development. The resulting zoning law brought that assurance.  

A different legislative action, this time from the United States Congress, defined and restricted the park’s boundaries for the first time. A two-year Civil War boundary study, initiated by the Senate Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies and looking at all Civil War battlefield parks, resulted in freezing Fredericksburg’s boundaries, subject to change through master planning leading to legislative action.  

The author has not found

---


59 Mike Johnson refers to this Civil War boundary study as being done under the Bible Commission—Senate Alan Bible (D-NV). See also Zenzen, Battling for Manassas, 101-02. FRSP, Land Protection Plan, 1986, 15, 37, FRSP Library. FRSP Annual Report, 1974, 4. Memorandum, Richard Schwartz to Freeland,
many crucial details about this study, though its basic results are known. A September 1972 map defined the park’s boundaries, as reported in a letter, dated 7 June 1974, by the Chairman of the Senate Subcommittee. This letter, as quoted in the 1981 FRSP Statement for Management, stated that “the depicted boundaries will not be subject to change in the future except for substantial and compelling reasons that are not now apparent. Thus, any subsequent alteration or deviation must be subjected to the full legislative process.” According to the park’s 1986 Land Protection Plan, the park had participated in the boundary study under two handicaps: the park did not know that the resulting study would become a permanent code rigidly defining its boundaries, and the study itself was completed “in a tremendous rush.” These two handicaps led the committee completing the boundary study to incorporate some lands more for reasons of opportunity (they were for sale at the time) than for thoughtful consideration of whether those lands were the most historically significant. Committee members also drew boundary lines that did not take into account natural features or existing tract boundary lines, leaving uneconomic remnants to sort. This situation led the park in its 1980s general management and land protection planning effort to redraw functionally appropriate boundaries.

Park annual reports and correspondence in the 1974 time period refer to Freeland’s concerns about the boundary study. He states in 1973, without further explanation, that this “extremely important document [the boundary study] still does not represent all of the eventual park needs.” A 1976 planning requirements document provides more tantalizing clues about the atmosphere surrounding the boundary study. Freeland states that “tremendous conservatism” surrounded the boundary study, and he mentions the “threat of possible alienation of some lands already in park ownership.” He admits that the park did not understand at the time that its recommendations, many of which the park considered preliminary in nature, would “come to have virtually the strength of legislation.” The resulting boundary thus excluded some “vital segments, not large but significant,” which also were threatened with imminent destruction. Other tracts included in the boundary study, according to Freeland, were possible legitimate candidates for alienation. Land associated

10 November 1972, and attached FRSP Civil War Boundary Study, 1972, No File, Cabinet 8, Drawer 1, FRSP Basement Archives. This version of the boundary study is the only one the author has found in the park’s files.


61 FRSP, LPP, 1986, 37.

62 The author does not have information about who served on this committee, although the park’s 1986 General Management Plan states that the team was composed of historians, managers, and lands specialists. See FRSP, GMP, 1986, 70, FRSP Library.


with Jackson’s flank attack did animate the park historians, according to Freeland in 1973. He wrote that during the 1972 process of identifying lands for the boundary study, the historians “pleaded at great length and with considerable desperation” to include that land, “but somehow this did not get into the works” and the boundary study went forward. The boundary study probably did not include the flank attack land due to “rigorous instructions to delete acreage if possible,” as related in the park’s 1986 General Management Plan, “and under no circumstances to propose major acquisitions.”

How did the lands identified for acquisition in the 1969 master plan compare to those listed in the 1974 Civil War Boundary Study? The author has found a boundary study dated 1972, with a map, and this may be the final version referred to in the June 1974 subcommittee letter. The author has not found any further revisions to this 1972 study. Using this 1972 version, some comparisons can be made with the master plan. At Fredericksburg battlefield, the 1972 version of the study identified land behind the Lee Hill exhibit shelter for acquisition to allow for a road to shelter and remove incongruous views from the shelter. Two tracts along Lee Drive on either side of Lansdowne Valley Road would also be acquired according to the boundary study. These tracts, located north of Lee Drive, would substantially protect the park road from development threats at this busy intersection. Two more tracts, identified for acquisition in the boundary study but not the master plan, located at the end of South Lee Drive on Mine Road, would also buffer the park’s holdings along this well-traveled road. Montford Academy and Brompton on Marye’s Heights also received attention for acquisition in the boundary study as opposed to the master plan. The boundary study committee largely agreed with the recommendations of the master plan for land acquisition at Chancellorsville battlefield. A few additions in the 1970s included parcels on either side of Furnace Road at Sickles Drive and Jackson Trail East. Another area for land acquisition sat north of Bullock Road on the west side of Elys Ford Road. The boundary study also labeled two tracts, on the easterly side of Elys Ford Road, for alienation due to their poor interpretive potential. The boundary study recommended adding about 185 acres of land at Wilderness between south Route 20 and Hill-Ewell Drive to serve as an important shield against the Lake Wilderness development. The boundary study map (but not the text) also identified a large swath of land along the southern reach of Hill-Ewell Drive

66 Robert Krick actually drafted this letter, as the language and his initials on the last page attest. Memorandum, Freeland to Director, Northeast Region, 20 June 1973, Deed #257, FRSP Lands Files.
67 Ibid., 1.
68 FRSP, GMP, 1986, 70. The Civil War Boundary Study referred to a number of East Coast battlefield parks.
69 FRSP Boundary Study, 1972, 6-9. The 1969 master plan recommended that the National Park Service obtain a cooperative agreement with Montford Academy and Mary Washington College. See FRSP Master Plan, 1969, 60.
70 The boundary study map identified these parcels at Chancellorsville for acquisition but the written text does not mention these lands.
71 FRSP Boundary Study, 1972, 13-15. One tract (03-145) along Route 3 received special attention for acquisition due its owner’s proposal to develop a shopping center there.
for acquisition. Both the master plan and the boundary study recommended for alienation small tracts, one north of Route 3 past the Route 20 intersection and another along Longstreet Drive south of Plank Road. The 1972 version of the boundary study also significantly took the position that the park should alienate the long narrow tract of land following the Warren-Wadsworth earthworks. Subdivisions had sandwiched this line, causing it to lose “all value for interpretation,” the boundary study committee reported. The 1972 boundary map, but not the accompanying text, identified about 87 acres north of Grant Drive East at Spotsylvania Court House that would fill in the park beyond the north side of that park road. Neither the boundary study nor the master plan laid out any acquisition plans around Salem Church. The boundary study did add a little more than an acre to the land acquisition plan at Jackson Shrine. Plus, the 1972 boundary study recommended pursuing scenic easements on three sides of the Shrine, all north of Route 606.

Chatham proved the first area requiring legislation for land acquisition. Chapter six details the story of Chatham’s donation to the Park Service, but 20 acres of land identified for this new park unit exceeded the boundaries drawn in the 1974 boundary study. The National Park Foundation aided the park by purchasing the desired land, and the Park Service obtained legislative authorization to acquire that land from the Foundation under the law that established Channel Islands National Park and for other purposes (Public Law 96-199, dated 5 March 1980). This land buffered Chatham from development threats (a proposed shopping center, described later in this chapter) and may have also been considered as a possible access route for visitors to the property.

**LAND ACQUISITION**

Land acquisition continued apace even as the Civil War boundary study defined where those efforts should go. Freeland noted in 1973 that his entire staff understood that work on land acquisition was “the first priority in historic preservation (his emphasis).” Visitors were “hard-pressed to envision the scope of a battle” when shopping centers, houses, and businesses occupied the open fields across which troopers had charged and men had died. This preservation in the face of development theme continued to drive the park’s land acquisition efforts. As one example, more than a decade of negotiations concluded in 1973 with the protection of one of the most important remaining sites at Chancellorsville, the
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72 FRSP Boundary Study, 1972, 24-25.
73 Ibid., 25.
74 Ibid., 18, 29-30.
76 Memorandum, Freeland to Chet Brooks, 13 August 1973, and attached report England Exchange, Chancellorsville Battlefield, 2, Deed # 145, 146, 147, FRSP Lands Files.
77 FRSP Summary Sheet, no date [1979], Part 2, 1, File L30, Cabinet 1, Drawer 3, FRSP Break Room Files.
Chancellor House site ruins. This story, like others, illuminate the developer-crazy atmosphere swirling throughout this time period and what the park had to face in meeting its obligations of protection and interpretation of the Civil War battles. Superintendent Oscar Northington recognized the plodding but important work he undertook to help gain the Chancellor House land, stating in 1960 “And so it goes: struggling to obtain tracts of land in order to protect what we have.” He admitted it was “slow progress,” but his work helped the park reach its goal of acquiring important historical areas.78

Northington acted quickly in 1959 when, for the first time in 50 years, the Chancellor House site went up for sale, as a result of the passing of its owners. The daughter of the heir (the heir was an invalid in a nursing home) asked $50,000 for the almost 100 acres, and Northington pleaded with the regional office to find the funds to acquire the land.79 He worried that if sold on the open market, the property would become a housing development and “will be lost forever.”80 An appraisal completed a month later came up far short, at just under $20,000, well below the asking price. Plus, the Park Service had already programmed its limited land acquisition funding for the immediate future. The regional office considered asking the owners to wait up to 15 months until new funds became available. The difference between the asking price and appraisal, though, proved problematical.81 Northington stepped in as negotiator, and he obtained a reduced price of $43,000, but he acknowledged this amount to be “simply too much money” for the property.82 He asked if anyone knew of “an angel,” whether a person or organization, who might step in to buy the land and then donate it to the park.83 The park had just received 15 acres at Chancellorsville battlefield from Continental Can, thanks to Northington approaching “friends who in turn have friends” connected to the company. He hoped for the same result with the Chancellor House site.84

Park Chief Historian Thomas Harrison pursued a different angle in 1964 in trying to overcome the price difference. The owners now wanted $67,000 for 97 acres of land, and they appeared open to having the house site section sold off separately from the rest of the acreage. Harrison wondered if the park could offer the heirs $4,000 for simply the two acres where the house site ruins lay. This offering price may still be low, but he hoped that the

78 Northington to Jay Jones, 12 January 1960, Deed #145, 146, 147, FRSP Lands Files.
79 Northington to Jay Johns, 2 November 1959, Deed #145, 146, 147, FRSP Lands Files.
80 Quote from Memorandum, Northington to Regional Director, Region One, 25 August 1959, Deed #145, 146, 147, FRSP Lands Files. See also Northington to Mrs. William Shouman, 12 August 1959, Deed #145, 146, 147, FRSP Lands Files.
81 James Pates, Appraisal for Spotsylvania NMP of the Rowley Estate, 14 October 1959, no page numbering; Memorandum, E. M. Lisle to Director, 1 September 1959, both in Deed #145, 146, 147, FRSP Lands Files.
82 Quote from Northington to Jay Johns, 12 January 1960, 1, Deed #145, 146, 147, FRSP Lands Files. See also Northington to Johns, 2 November 1959, 1, Deed #145, 146, 147, FRSP Lands Files.
83 Quote from Northington to Vergil Carrington Jones, 28 August 1959, Deed #145, 146, 147, FRSP Lands Files. See also Northington to R. E. Warren, 6 November 1959, Deed #145, 146, 147, FRSP Lands Files.
84 Northington to J. W. Johns, 6 May 1960, 1, Deed #145, 146, 147, FRSP Lands Files.
“right approach” would convince them. Harrison emphasized the importance of at least acquiring the house site, a “minimum recommendation” for land acquisition “in which we should have maximum efforts to preserve battlefield integrity.” The danger was real and imposing. Oklahoma interests had bought 500 acres in the vicinity for $75,000 as an investment. One 15-acre parcel of this investment was already up for sale for $25,000, indicating how quickly land prices were rising. Separately, a four-acre parcel on Bullock Road had sold recently for $225 per acre and in 1964 was back on the market for $375 per acre. Harrison could only urge action on whatever fronts available to the park before developers bought the house site.85

Lack of agreement on price with the Park Service ultimately led the heirs to sell the 100-acre tract to Ralph England, and the agency approached this local businessman (he lived off Lee Drive near Landsdowne Valley Road) to negotiate acquisition of the house site. These negotiations straddled another four years, with the Park Service obtaining options and then running into snags with identifying funding or addressing the congressional committee’s requirements that jurisdictions have zoning if purchasing land for a national park. Park Service realty specialists, working with Freeland, finally had authorization from Congress in February 1973 to proceed despite the lack of zoning (Spotsylvania County approved its zoning ordinance in April 1973) and offered England $200,000 for the almost 100 acres. England refused the money and instead indicated his interest in a land exchange, both at Fredericksburg and at Shenandoah National Park, where he owned 300 acres. Shenandoah had recently exchanged a large tract of land with Green Land and Lumber Company, and England wondered if another exchange was possible. Shenandoah reluctantly agreed to exchange further lands.86 Park superintendent Robert Jacobsen stated that “while we sympathize” with other national parks “in their lands problems, we would hope” that “our excess lands would not be considered as being available” except in case of emergency or until Shenandoah’s own boundary problems were resolved.87

England visited the properties proposed for exchange and signed the agreement in July 1973. He exchanged his 99-acre parcel at Chancellorsville for a little more than 327 acres of land (11 tracts) located in Page, Madison, Warren, Spotsylvania, and Orange Counties in Virginia, and he received an additional sum of $125,326 to settle the difference. The land in Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania included about 20 acres along Miles Drive off Route 3 and another 20 acres on Elys Ford Road north of Route 3, both at Chancellorsville.
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85 Memorandum, Harrison to Northington, 1 February 1964, Deed #145, 146, 147, FRSP Lands Files. Quotes on pp. 1, 2.
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England also received about 10 acres north of Route 3 at Wilderness and the western portion of Hancock Road at Spotsylvania Court House. The deed file does not describe the exact properties exchanged in Shenandoah.\textsuperscript{88}

Freeland had to reassure those residents living near the newly alienated tracts, outside park boundaries. He recognized that “feelings hereabouts are strong about [park] lands.” Some of these park neighbors did not want park land given up. Others had homes built specifically to be near park land. Some based their speculative investments in lands being off park land. Others worried they might lose longstanding rights of continued access to roads now under private ownership. He knew that if the neighbors felt poorly treated during the exchange of ownership, the resulting public relations problem would adversely affect future negotiations.\textsuperscript{89} He wrote a letter to each neighbor explaining the changed status in land ownership and had his rangers personally deliver them to the affected property owners. He also wrote a press release and invited a reporter from the local Free Lance-Star to talk with him. That reporter asked for specifics about the amount of land and money agreed upon in the exchange, and Freeland told him, sparking a little controversy within the agency that quickly subsided. The agency did not want to embarrass England by making public financial details, but Freeland noted that the local paper always published land sales, which were public record, and sales to the national park often ended up on the front page. Freeland admitted that every neighbor “knows intimately what is happening in the market.” News about land sales, according to Freeland, “travels faster than any other news hereabouts.”\textsuperscript{90}

Freeland and his staff could give a big sigh of relief upon the success of the land acquisition negotiations and began the process of evaluating how to incorporate the house site and surrounding land into the park’s interpretive program. The Spotsylvania Board of Supervisors promoted the idea of reconstructing the Chancellor House, and Freeland kindly acknowledged that an exterior reconstruction with a visitor center-type service inside might serve the park and county well. But, the Park Service as a policy did not encourage reconstructions, and the idea dropped.\textsuperscript{91} The park stabilized the house ruins with the laying of bricks and installing through-the-wall flashing to prevent further deterioration.\textsuperscript{92} (Figure 110)

\textsuperscript{88} Warranty Deed, 19 July 1973; Freeland to Park Neighbor, 20 July 1973, both in Deed #145, 146, 147, FRSP Lands Files.


\textsuperscript{90} Ibid., 1-2. Quote on p. 1. See also Memorandum, Freeland to Director, Virginia State Office, 24 July 1973, and attached Press Release, Key Chancellorsville Site Added to National Park; Helaine Patterson, “Park Addition Is Key Battlefield Tract,” Free Lance-Star, 21 July 1973; and Freeland to Park Neighbor, 20 July 1973; all in Deed #145, 146, 147, FRSP Lands Files.

\textsuperscript{91} Helaine Patterson, “County Seeking Rebuilt ‘Chancellor,’” Free Lance-Star, 27 July 1973. Freeland to Andrew Seay, 9 August 1973, Deed #145, 146, 147, FRSP Lands Files.

\textsuperscript{92} FRSP, Annual Report, 1987, 11, File A2621 Superintendent’s Annual Report 1987, Cabinet 14, Drawer 1, FRSP Basement Files.
A distinguishing feature of land acquisition throughout the park’s existence has been the minimal amount of controversy. Careful attention to park neighbors, as Freeland did, aided this cause. Freeland remembered later that one of his tasks when he started at Fredericksburg was “to do the public relations necessary to lay the foundation for land acquisition without, hopefully, too much opposition to it.”93 He maintained regular contact with the county’s elected officials, including Board of Supervisors members and congressional representatives.94 His naturally gregarious personality served the park well in making friends even as the park bought more and more land. He served on the board for Historic Fredericksburg Foundation in addition to other historic and public service organizations, such as Rotary and the Rappahannock Basin Advisory Commission.95 Freeland sought cooperative relations to aid land acquisition efforts and to protect the park’s boundaries from incompatible adjacent uses.96

The park and its realty officers also largely followed an opportunity-basis approach to land acquisition. Park officials informed private property owners that their lands in part or whole sat within the authorized park boundaries. These officials noted the park’s interest in acquiring these private lands and folding them into the actual park boundaries, but those conversations largely avoided any intimidating approaches or threats of condemnation. When Freeland reported in his 1979 annual report that there was a “slowdown in activity,” he meant that all remaining private land within the park’s authorized boundary was held by people who did not want to sell. The park would not urge them otherwise, it would instead simply wait for the right opportunity.97

Park neighbors reinforce this aspect of the park’s interactions with the public. Debbie Hawkins Aylor, who grew up along Route 3 near Wilderness Church at Chancellorsville, remembered park superintendents stopping by on a casual basis to talk with her parents. The family farm sits inside the park’s authorized boundary, but her family has never consented to sell their land to the Park Service. Aylor remembers that park

93 Freeland, transcript of interview, 9 March 2010, 4.
95 FRSP Annual Report, 1974, 1-2; Freeland, transcript of interview, 9 March 2010, 9-10. A Wilson Greene, who had served as an interpreter historian while Freeland was at the park, remembered that Krick did not think highly of Freeland’s active involvement in the community. Greene remembered that Krick and others saw such activity as “pandering to the local history museums and maybe the tourism people” although now Greene readily admits the value and necessity of such actions. See A Wilson Greene, transcription of oral history interview with the author, 24 February 2010, 9, FRSP Archives. Krick would in fact become quite effective in pursuing park goals exactly through the connections he developed in the local community, on Capitol Hill, and within the Park Service.
96 FRSP, Annual Report, 1976, 4; Memorandum, Freeland to Regional Director, Mid-Atlantic Region, 30 August 1974, and attached draft Statement for Management and Planning, 13.
97 FRSP Annual Report, 1979, 2.
interactions never went beyond friendly.98 Danny Pemberton, president of the Spotsylvania County Land Owner’s Association, has worked with this organization for the past 15 years to ensure that the concerns of property owners are heard by the county and the National Park Service. Pemberton has often criticized the Park Service for hindering development and growth in the county. But, when asked specifically if land owners had been treated unfairly by the agency during land acquisition attempts, Pemberton said no. “I can’t think of any land,” Pemberton said, “that they forced anybody to sell.”99

Condemnations on unfriendly terms have been rare throughout the park’s history, with most condemnations done simply to clear title. This happy situation is not always the case with other national parks. Land acquisition at Minute Man NHP during the 1960s involved threats of condemnation and left a bitter taste in park neighbors’s mouths for decades afterwards. Shenandoah and the Blue Ridge Parkway, as other examples, also experienced difficult relations with local residents due to the aggressive land acquisition strategies practiced in the early years of those parks.100 Fredericksburg largely escaped such acrimony. But, a property owner within the park’s boundaries at Chancellorsville in the early 1970s started causing irreparable harm to the land to the extent that the park had to act to save the resource. Freeland’s careful attention to process ensured that the resulting condemnation and declaration of taking did not harm the park’s otherwise good neighbor reputation.

A. N. Johnston purchased in 1967 about 30 acres of land south of Route 3 near Berry-Paxton Road and within sight distance of the Chancellor House ruins. Johnston, an excavation contractor, ran a construction company and portable rock crusher at the site, zoned light industrial. Johnston rebuffed National Park Service attempts, either from the park’s staff or from the NPS real estate office, over the years to discuss possible acquisition of his property. Freeland and his staff, however, noted with increasing alarm by the early 1970s that Johnston had “bulldozed and scarified” much of his land and had left old run-down buildings and semi-trucks out in highly visible spots where park visitors could not help but be jarred by the 20th-century intrusions.101 Johnston added to the alarm in early 1975 when he submitted an application asking that Spotsylvania County rezone his land as heavy industrial so that he could operate a ready-mix concrete plant. He then proceeded to have the large pieces of such a plant delivered to his property, in anticipation of obtaining the needed zoning and permits. The Planning Commission voted against the application, but the Board

98 Debbie Aylor, transcription of oral history interview with the author, 8 December 2009, 16-18, FRSP Archives.
99 Danny Pemberton, transcription of oral history interview with the author, 7 December 2009, 15, FRSP Archives.
100 Zenzen, Bridging the Past, 80-87; Lambert, Undying Past, chapters 16-17; Anne Mitchell Whisnant, Super-Scenic Motorway: A Blue Ridge Parkway History (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006), chapter 3.
101 Memorandum, Freeland to Regional Chief of Land Acquisition, Mid-Atlantic Region, 16 January 1975, Deed #226, FRSP Lands Files.
of Supervisors overrode this action and voted in favor of the application. Historian Robert Krick attended each of the hearings and spoke against the proposal, emphasizing how the cement plant would “do a great deal of harm to a historic treasure” belonging to the American people.

The Park Service’s realtors, in the meantime, met behind-the-scenes with Johnston in March and April 1975 to try to reach a settlement for acquisition of the land. Johnston profanely rejected an offer of $150,000, more than 50 percent above the $118,000 appraised price, and argued that he wanted $262,000 for his property and the relocation costs. Continued attempts at negotiation, over many long hours, failed to extract an agreement. Freeland assessed the situation, and even before the board of supervisors granted the zoning change, he requested from the regional office permission for implementation of condemnation proceedings. He argued that the cement plant would do “major and irreversible damage to the terrain,” threatening a piece of land of “quintessential importance” to the preservation and interpretation of the park. NPS realty specialists currently and in the past had made “valiant but vain efforts” to reach a settlement with Johnston. “Time is of the essence,” Freeland wrote, even as he admitted his dislike of using legal force. “Condemnations are productive of enough evil,” he wrote, “to be ardently avoided.” He would continue to look for alternatives to legal action, but he also knew condemnation proceedings took time to gain approval, and he did not have a lot of time to ensure protection of the resource.

Freeland obtained the requested declaration of taking on 14 August 1975, but the park did not gain control of the land until January 1977. Johnston, according to accounts documented by park personnel, had tried to run-up the value of his land by assembling and running the concrete plant so that he would gain a large settlement and relocation payment during the condemnation proceedings. He continued to use and incur “considerable harm” to the property, including selling topsoil to “extract everything of value before his
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expulsion." He asked for and received a considerable amount of time to relocate his business, while he also rented out the house on the property to one of his employees. That renter finally vacated the premises on 21 January 1977, and the Park Service gained control. Johnston and the renter left a mess, with “tremendous quantities of raw garbage” and land as “badly torn up and covered with trash as any piece of property I [Freeland] have ever seen in the Park Service.”

The park did have a huge clean-up effort ahead of it but fortunately that clean-up did not extend to local community relations. Freeland followed regional office recommendations and refrained from attending additional public hearings over the permitting process to “avoid exacerbation of community feeling on the sensitive subject of condemnation.” Krick did appear at an unrelated hearing in support of a different business development along Jackson Trail, to remove “some of the stigma of eternal opponents of everything” and gain some points with the planning commission. Freeland personally contacted the local congressman and asked his help in moving the condemnation proceedings along, which the congressman did without any resistance, indicating no public fervor over the situation. Johnston even decided to run against Andrew Seay, the one supervisor who had voted against his permit application for the concrete plant. Seay won re-election and the chairmanship of the Board, again indicating that the local community did not have reservations about how the Park Service had treated Johnston. A Richmond Times-Dispatch reporter, writing an article about the cement plant proposal, quoted Freeland as saying that it was very important to the Park Service that “as we acquire land the citizens are happy with what we’re doing.” He just asked that people give the park a “first crack” at buying land once someone was ready to sell within the park’s boundaries. This philosophy has long characterized Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania’s approach to land acquisition.

Park Service realty officials, guided by the park’s historians and superintendent, continued to fill in the park’s boundaries as opportunities presented themselves. Freeland
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113 Memorandum, Krick to the Files, 9 July 1975, Deed #226, FRSP Lands Files.

114 Freeland, Memorandum of Telephone Call, 14 July 1975, Deed #226, FRSP Lands Files.

115 “Two Candidates in Chancellor,” 31 May 1975; “Andrew Seay to Lead Board of Supervisors,” 13 January 1977, both in Free Lance-Star.

116 Freeland, as quoted by Robin Gallaher, “Contractor’s Plan Touches Off New Battle of Chancellorsville,” Richmond Times-Dispatch, 7 December 1975. The article does not include any references to public outcry over Johnston’s plight. The reporter quoted Johnston, Freeland, and the Assistant US Attorney.
joked that “there was something cooking all the time,” requiring park staff to urge action by the region to address development threats and acquire land. Deed files document the effort to acquire lands before developers could subdivide and build housing. Land acquisitions slowly filled in sections of battlefields, such as along South Lee Drive at Fredericksburg. The park also acquired all four corners, and much land around the corners, at the Chancellor House site, plus land around Bullock Road at Chancellorville. National Park Service Chief Historian Harry Pfanz encouraged such robustness. “This has been a necessity,” Pfanz wrote in 1978, “we cannot afford to lose more at this park.” More than 3,000 acres would result from this land acquisition push during Freeland’s tenure. This notable accomplishment meant that the park needed to evaluate its next steps and develop a general management plan, the management document that the Park Service used to replace the former park master plan.

**MANAGEMENT PLANNING AND LAND PROTECTION**

The park underwent a change in superintendents before the staff began intensive management planning. Freeland in May 1980 accepted the superintendency at Roosevelt-Vanderbilt National Historic Sites in Hyde Park, NY, and James Zinck stepped in as Fredericksburg’s next superintendent in January 1981. Zinck came on board running, wanting to learn about the park’s history and management challenges so that he could articulate its needs to whoever would listen. He stated later, “As superintendent, I was obviously the foremost advocate, the buck stops here, kind of advocate.” He drove and walked the park and got to know well its resources, both historic and natural. He invited others to familiarize themselves with the park’s landscape, starting annual VIP bus tours that continued throughout his tenure. He invited representatives from local governments and
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120 Freeland recounted later that before he left, an unhappy employee filed grievances which sparked an inspector general investigation. According to Freeland, the inspector general had some recommendations to improve park operations, but otherwise found no wrongdoing. Freeland saw his appointment to Hyde Park as a promotion and vindication for his handling of his job at Fredericksburg. Freeland, transcript of interview, 9 March 2010, 25. FRSP Operations Evaluation, November 1976, 24, File A54 Operations Evaluation, Audits, Cabinet 8, Drawer 2, FRSP Basement Files. Freeland remembered a maintenance employee fining the grievance; the operations report states it was the Administrative Officer.

121 James Zinck, transcription of oral history interview with the author, 22 March 2010, 18. See also p. 5.

122 The 1984 tour, for example, focused on resources and park problems and management issues. See FRSP, Annual Report, 1984, 17, File A2621 Superintendent’s Annual Report 1984, Cabinet 8, Drawer 1, FRSP Basement Files. In 1986 and 1987, in addition to the VIP tour, the park held four battlefield walking
organizations, plus interested citizens, for these tours, with the intention of developing working relationships with them. Zinck wanted these tour takers to appreciate the “responsibilities and problems” facing the battlefield park and hopefully help them understand the importance of “mak[ing] certain that the parks were protected so that that reverence, then, could continue to be fostered.” His staff also started a regular “Park Views” column in the Free Lance-Star to explain park policies and positions in what they hoped was a neutral manner. This feature, which appeared on Fridays, lasted for a little more than a year. Zinck and Krick appeared in 1982 on a local radio station, and the local cable television station began airing park event schedules and a few videos of interpretive programs. Radio and cable TV programs with the park’s historians picked up again in 1987 and 1988. Nineteenth-century battlefield parks throughout Virginia benefitted in 1983 with the establishment of the Friends of Virginia Civil War Parks group, to support development of the parks. These efforts and more aided the park in building relationships with the local communities during the different stages of management planning.

Superintendents before Zinck fostered relationships with the park’s local community, but beginning in the late 1960s, the federal government mandated such interactions in specific ways. Federal laws, such as the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, made public participation an integral part of federal government review and action. In order for a federal agency to move forward on an action or project, the agency had to evaluate the relevant environmental effects, gathering public comments and input in the process. The federal agencies invited the public to help with the scoping process to identify issues, and the public had the right to provide feedback on the plans drafted by the federal agency. The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, and its subsequent 1976 amendment, required federal agencies to review all federally funded projects and permitted projects that might impact historic sites, archeological sites, and buildings that are on or might be eligible for the National Register. This Section 106 review under NHPA also has a public comment component. The National Park Service has thus incorporated public involvement in the new master planning effort, the general management plan. Zinck’s efforts...
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to reach out to the local community through tours and media would aid the park’s GMP development.  

Why did Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania need a new master planning document, a general management plan? The 1969 master plan did not take into account the rapidly changing commercial and residential development, and accompanying population explosion, surrounding the park’s battlefields and historic sites. The park’s managers needed new tools and approaches, worked out with the valuable input of local jurisdictions and citizens, for addressing these changes within the preservation and interpretation mission of the park. Other factors also required attention. The land acquisition program during the 1970s had brought in about 600 acres of land outside the park’s defined authorized boundaries that needed resolution, either through alienation or new boundary legislation. The increasing number of subdivisions on the park’s boundaries meant that use of accesses for private roads to connect with park roads had increased and threatened park resources. The park needed to evaluate these accesses, which numbered almost 200, and determine best steps for meeting the legal requirements while addressing park values. Resource management required evaluation and project planning to incorporate newly acquired lands into the fabric of the visitor experience. Public participation, whether with individuals, local governmental agencies, or local organizations, would bind all of these planning needs together and result in a defensible and feasible GMP.

The early 1980s political climate shaped the general management plan’s development. Ronald Reagan and his Interior Secretary James Watt (1981-1983) held views that favored use over preservation of natural resources. Reagan was often quoted as saying “You know, a tree is a tree, how many more do we need to look at?” This reference from his 1966 California gubernatorial campaign soon became, “If you’ve seen one tree, you’ve seen them all,” and referred to his taking the lumber companies and loggers position against establishing a Redwoods National Park. Watt promoted commercial use of federal lands, by loosening mining regulations, for example. He put a virtual block on any new land acquisition within the National Park Service and even resisted any land donations. He proposed opening all 80 million acres of designated wilderness areas to drilling and mining.

When Zinck first appeared before the Spotsylvania Board of Supervisors, he came straight up against this political climate. He had expected a basic meet and greet but in reality
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127 For information on NHPA, see http://www.preservationnation.org/resources/legal-resources/understanding-preservation-law/federal-law/nhpa.html, http://www.achp.gov/about.html. For information on NEPA, see http://www.epa.gov/compliance/nepa/index.html, all accessed January 2011. The previous road widening of Route 3 and loss of historic park land may have gone differently if these federal laws had already been in place at the time of planning.


the situation became what he later remembered as a “get the Park Service” meeting. Zinck tried in the Supervisors meeting to sound reassuring, saying that the Park Service “will seek to be reasonable,” but he ruffled feathers. He remembered Supervisor Hugh Cosner triumphantly stating that the Reagan administration did not like spending, did not like land acquisition, and that Cosner and the board would keep the park from trying to pursue those ideas. Cosner warned, according to Zinck’s later recollections, that he had “a hotline right to the Reagan White House.”

Zinck and the National Park Service were well aware of the limitations they worked under during the Reagan administration, and they found alternatives, such as scenic easements instead of fee acquisition, to reshape the park’s boundaries in a defensibly preservationist way. Because the park’s management issues swirled around land issues, the park decided, and the regional office agreed, to have a Land Protection Plan done simultaneously with the General Management Plan. The GMP laid out the management, use, and development of the park for the next 10-15 years. The LPP, an action element of the GMP, laid out “the minimum interests necessary to implement plans for resource management and visitor use.” The GMP/LPP process involved convening a group of NPS experts in areas important to the park’s development, such as community planning, natural resources management, and regional planning from both the Denver Service Center and the regional office. Key managers from Fredericksburg, including superintendent Zinck, chief historian Krick, and chief ranger Johnson, served on the planning team as well. Information gathered from the park, public meetings, and overall NPS mission informed the draft and final versions of the reports. The regional office approved the resulting two documents.

The GMP and LPP focused upon the park’s authorized boundary and how best to adjust it to meet the park’s mission. As of 1986, the park had an authorized boundary of 5,909 acres, of which 5,336 acres were in federal ownership and 573 acres were in private ownership. An additional 623 acres were in federal ownership outside park boundaries. This additional 600-some acres resulted in part from some previously purchased tracts that partially lay inside the boundaries. The LPP recommended setting the park’s boundary to 6,638.70 acres, having 652.13 acres in scenic easement (not fee). (Figure 111) This boundary would not include 471.18 acres of NPS lands and 128.40 acres of inholdings, recommended for deletion. In total, the net change projected by the LPP would have been 590 more acres in scenic easement than the existing boundary and 80 more acres of fee lands than the
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existing boundary plan. Scenic easements are legally enforceable interests created by the
transfer of certain property rights. They are meant to control how a property looks to
maintain a level of compatibility with the surrounding historic scene. The park also
included cooperative agreements as another non-acquisition approach to define
relationships between local governments or private individuals working toward a shared
vision on management of a property. Such an arrangement, which does not have a monetary
component, reflects the park’s increasing interest in building relationships among different
groups to establish “land use protection strategies that will be mutually advantageous.”

Recommendations for Fredericksburg battlefield included fee acquisition of the land
behind the Lee Hill exhibit shelter to restore the historic scene and façade easement on the
historic Braehead house at Howison Hill on North Lee Drive. The park changed the status
of some tracts along Lee Drive, keeping in the park those lands directly associated with the
fleetingly hopeful Federal attack but removing those previously used as a buffer or alternate
access road without historic significance. Around Chatham, park planners required revision
of the boundary to include certain parcels to aid in improving visitor access and safety,
including room for a parking lot. The park opted to pursue cooperative agreements around
Salem Church, whose boundary was enlarged to the west, to encourage compatible
development and work with the Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation to
realign Route 639 next to the church. The park could not practically afford the cost of fee or
even scenic easements in this area due to the level of commercial development. Brompton
and Montfort on Marye’s Heights remained within the park boundary, with emphasis upon
cooperative agreements and right of first refusal if the properties ever went up sale.
Properties along Willis Street, Lafayette Boulevard, and the gas station at the corner nearest
the Fredericksburg Visitor Center were identified for fee acquisition. Previously, the
boundary line had included only the back yards of the Willis Street houses; the revised
boundary included each of these entire tracts.

Chancellorsville battlefield lacked any significant amount of land associated with
Jackson’s flank attack. The little bit of land the park did have was sacrificed to the widening
of Route 3 in the early 1970s. Visitors had to stand in the median strip of busy Route 3 to
view two signs explaining the attack. Park planners sought to remedy this situation by adding
12 acres for fee acquisition at the place where the attack began (for a visitor access road and
viewing platform) and obtaining scenic easements on 323 acres (all in agricultural use in
1986) west of the historic core of the battlefield. The LPP noted strenuously that “nowhere
else in the park is the deficiency of the Antietam plan . . . apparent than in this location.”
The park recommended keeping inside the boundary small tracts with residences in the heart

137 FRSP, LPP, 1986, 30.
138 Ibid., 29. See also pp. 32-33.
139 Ibid., 41-44.
140 Ibid., 45.
of the battlefield. One tract by Catharine Furnace owned by the government but outside the park boundary was recommended for inclusion in the boundary. Tracts currently within the park’s boundary where Jackson marched his men the wrong way to fool any potential spies were listed for fee acquisition to ensure no incompatible uses.\textsuperscript{141}

Park planners sought ways to protect the Wilderness battlefield historic scene from the incursions of nearby developments. The LPP recommended fee acquisition and a boundary revision to include tracts north and south of Route 20 near the knoll where Grant and Meade established their headquarters during the battle. Agricultural land around Ellwood, totaling about 200 acres, would be included in the revised boundary using scenic easements. Two other small tracts visible from Hill-Ewell Drive were also recommended for scenic easement and inclusion in the revised boundary. The LPP recommended another tract north of Hill-Ewell Drive for fee acquisition and inclusion in the boundary to subvert plans for a subdivision. Acquisition of tracts along Orange Plank Road, with necessary boundary revisions, would preserve this area of intense fighting. Some of these tracts were part of the Lake Wilderness subdivision. The LPP does not identify the narrow Federal trench line cutting across most of the Wilderness battlefield or the trenchline along Longstreet Drive for alienation, as the 1974 Boundary Study had done. These NPS lands would remain in the park boundaries.\textsuperscript{142}

At Spotsylvania Court House, the park recommended acquisition of the inholdings, which were small single-family residences, at the entrance at the Sedgwick Monument. Some boundary revision and fee acquisition was needed at the tip of the Bloody Angle and west of the Mule Shoe for two remaining tracts. Park planners designated scenic easements on either side of the exit road (Burnside Drive, the former Grant Drive East), on land then under agricultural use.\textsuperscript{143} Instead of scenic easements, as identified under the 1974 Boundary Study, park planners recommended at Jackson Shrine fee acquisition of the tracts within the existing boundary to ensure preservation of the historic scene.\textsuperscript{144}

Chief ranger Mike Johnson made a major contribution to the Land Protection Plan by focusing attention on the accesses private individuals and developments had in the park and categorizing them to guide efforts in working toward extinguishing those accesses. Johnson, as he recounted later, remembered that A. Nelson Waller, a retired judge, had done an initial historic study of the park’s accesses. Waller’s family had first settled in Spotsylvania before the American Revolution, and he served as president of the Spotsylvania Historical Association, Inc.\textsuperscript{145} Johnson took that study and assigned his rangers to go to the county deed offices and pull each deed to determine how many access rights the deeds reserved.

\textsuperscript{141} Ibid., 45-46.
\textsuperscript{142} Ibid., 46-48.
\textsuperscript{143} Ibid., 49.
\textsuperscript{144} Ibid., 58.
These accesses largely resulted because of the peculiar nature of the park, which acquired narrow strips of land, often along roads. The accesses allowed the landowners to continue to use those roads, otherwise they would have been landlocked on their properties. This review of the deeds then led Johnson to work with the NPS regional solicitor, Tony Conte, to examine the legal rights of the property owners who had sold the narrow strips of land, how many accesses and where they could be placed, for example. Johnson found the Waller study also important for determining how much width the federal government had granted for these accesses. Waller found that the accesses had been set at 18 feet, which was basically how much room a farm implement from the 1930s needed to get down a road. This determination, according to Johnson, “really, really was important in controlling the development around the boundaries.” A subdivision under modern regulations needed 60 feet to get to a state maintained road, so this research helped limit accesses for these purposes.\(^{146}\)

The LPP laid out for each battlefield which tracts had how many accesses. The plan then categorized those accesses in terms of the priority with which the Park Service should pursue acquiring those accesses due to development threats. Steps recommended for action included purchase or donation of the tract plus its access rights, consolidation of multiple accesses, or condemnation as a last resort in case of irreparable harm to the resource. First priority in Fredericksburg battlefield was the Sunken Road which served as a short-cut route between two major east-west arteries through the city. The plan recommended closing Sunken Road, at least on weekends, to ensure the safety of visitors as they toured the historic landscape. Sunken Road had been one way for the last decade, but the number of vehicles using it, often at 30 miles per hour, made it a prime access needing attention. Another access led from the Braehead subdivision to Lee Drive at a major tour stop (Howison Hill). The park hoped to close this access and leave the subdivision with one other non-park access. The closed access could be opened with moveable barriers in case of an emergency.\(^{147}\)

High priority accesses at Chancellorsville included two areas, one on the north end of the battlefield and the other off Jackson Trail East, both of which had plans for building large subdivisions. The park did not recommend acquiring these properties but instead sought ways to limit the access on park roads. Another access easement, on Hooker Drive, would prevent the park from converting this road to a hiking trail, as recommended in the GMP.\(^{148}\)

At Wilderness battlefield, park planners recommended acquisition of tracts along Route 20 to remove those accesses and retain the historic scene. Along Route 613, acquisition of two inholdings would require specific identification of purchase of access easements due to their location on road frontage along a 1,000-acre holding proposed for a resort community. This particular access situation would play an important role in subsequent boundary legislation.

\(^{146}\) Mike Johnson, transcription of oral history interview with the author, 11 December 2009, 8-9. Quote on p. 9. Some landowners did have accesses with defined widths that would allow subdivision development.


with respect to Fawn Lake. Two more accesses, one off Hill-Ewell Drive and the other off Jackson Trail West, had not been fully developed at the time of the GMP/LPP, but they had the potential to “destroy the ambience” and cause damage to historic earthworks.\footnote{FRSP, LPP, 1986, 64-65. Quote on p. 65.} Spotsylvania had some potential accesses in the heart of the park, which was “a carefully controlled, historically correct setting that [would be] destroyed if access construction were to take place.” More accesses, with residential developments, at the exhibit shelter were identified for fee acquisition. Another access at the end of Burnside Drive required that the park keep that road two-way, creating what the LLL identified as safety issues and leaving visitors confused about the park roadways. A new subdivision off Hancock Road (at the other end of the battlefield) introduced non-park traffic on the park road and opened a vista to the subdivision, creating a visual disturbance. The park did not have any conflicting access concerns at Jackson Shrine.\footnote{Ibid., 69-70.}

The GMP and LPP provided tools and an overall vision for park managers to defend the park against possible future threats. The combination of the recommended boundary adjustment, identification of lands for fee acquisition versus scenic easements, and the categorization of access easements made a significant difference. Chief ranger Johnson stated in retrospect that “development rights on our boundaries, around our boundaries, through our boundaries became the focal point of the rangers.” They could use the planning documents “to maintain their boundaries, to mark their boundaries, to know exactly where our boundaries were, to deal with the encroachments of the boundaries.” Johnson admitted that “we did an awful lot of resource protection work that way.”\footnote{Johnson, transcript of interview, 11 December 2009, 9.}

Park planners also laid out priorities for resource management for the next 10-15 years in the GMP. Earthwork preservation involved clearing and stabilizing identified trenches, usually those with high visibility and interpretive value (22 miles of the total 38 miles of earthworks in the park). Trees would be removed, in winter months to reduce damage to the trenches, and suitable cover placed that would have low maintenance but provide high levels of protection from visitors and the elements. Scenic restoration also gained attention in the GMP. The plan identified 357 acres to be cleared and another 123 acres reforested with native plant species to allow visitors an appreciation of where the most severe fighting took place and how the rest of the battlefields looked at the time of the Civil War. The park placed priority for scene restoration on those areas most important for interpretation and public understanding. At Fredericksburg, scene restoration would involve opening two fields, near Prospect Hill and Harrison’s Crossing, while reforesting 11 acres on the battlefield and keeping 123 acres forested though they had been open at the time of the battle. Park planners recommended clearing a total of 89 acres at Chancellorville battlefield, including areas along Elys Ford Road and at Catharine Furnace. Four fields totaling 99 acres would remain forested though they had been cleared at the time of the
battle, and two fields of nine acres would be reforested. Planners recommended that four fields (including Widow Tapp and Higgerson Farm) of 47 acres be cleared and two fields of 75 acres be reforested. Six tracts totaling 79 acres would remain wooded though they were open in 1864. Spotsylvania Court House required the most scene restoration. Seven sites at the McCoul field, at the Federal attack point of May 10, and at long the nose of the Bloody Angle needed reopening (195 acres) while 28 acres on four other fields required reforesting. Six fields of 149 acres would remain forested, though they had been open in 1864, due to screening needs and low visitation. No scene restoration would take place at Chatham, Salem Church, or Jackson Shrine.\textsuperscript{152}

The GMP also had suggestions for interpretation. Park planners wanted each battlefield tour to focus upon key sites, emphasizing the unique aspects of each unit. The two visitor centers would provide general information for the park as a whole and help visitors choose the route that best fit their interest and travel destinations. Ellwood would eventually become a battlefield contact station, once restored and the exterior scene recreated. A year-round visitor contact station would replace the exhibit shelter at Spotsylvania Court House. Planners hoped to close Sunken Road eventually, acquire and remove the Willis Street residences, acquire and remove the gas station next to the Fredericksburg Visitor Center, and remove the back parking lot, garage, and storage buildings to build a 2,000 square foot addition to that visitor center. Interpretation at Chatham would continue to stress the Civil War use of the site, and visitor services would be upgraded to include a parking lot, increased capacity restrooms, and modification of the stable building to house a sales outlet and audiovisual program.\textsuperscript{153}

Possible visitor contact locations garnered much debate and consideration among the GMP team members and park staff. The Fredericksburg Visitor Center continued to be too small for the numbers of people touring that site, the Chancellorsville Visitor Center sat too far away from the hub of tourist traffic in downtown Fredericksburg to attract attention as an overall visitor station, and Chatham had an isolated location and difficult approach. GMP team members considered a contact station at Marye’s Heights, but acquisition of the required land seemed unlikely. A visitor center close to Interstate 95 also seemed attractive as a way to gain attention, except for the non-historic surroundings and high cost for acquiring land. Slight consideration also went to a joint visitor center between Fredericksburg city and the Park Service, but such collaboration would potentially confuse the colonial and Civil War themes for inattentive visitors. Park planners even considered a spot just west of Salem Church, but land acquisition costs and the lack of historical integrity squashed that idea. Multiple visitor contact stations became the accepted recommendation.\textsuperscript{154}

\textsuperscript{152} FRSP, GMP, 1986, 55, 65-66.
\textsuperscript{153} Ibid., 72-74.
\textsuperscript{154} Memorandum, Bonnie Campbell to Assistant Manager, Mid-Atlantic/North Atlantic Team, DSC, 6 May 1983; Memorandum, Dan Huff, et al. to Assistant Manager, Mid-Atlantic/North Atlantic Team, DSC, 14
Park roads received attention in the GMP to reduce visitor confusion and relieve park maintenance and patrolling duties on roads no longer necessary for the visitor experience. (Figure 112) Two miles of roads (out of the 30 miles of park roads) were designated as unnecessary and eligible for removal. These closings included South Lee Drive at Prospect Hill at Fredericksburg battlefield, with the intention of converting the road between Prospect Hill and Hamilton’s Crossing into a hiking trail. Slocum Drive and Hooker Drive (between the maintenance area and Route 618) at Chancellorsville battlefield would also be converted to hiking trails to allow access to less-visited trench lines. The GMP recommended eliminating the southern portion of Anderson Drive at Spotsylvania Court House, past the interpretive point at Lee’s Last Line, and return that area to its historic setting of forest. Park planners called for other road improvements, including a Lee Drive overpass at Landsdowne Road to increase visitor safety in a heavily trafficked area. Bullock Road would become one-way northbound after leaving the Chancellorsville Visitor Center to reduce speeding and traffic from non-park users. The park also hoped at some point in the far future to restore the historic segment of Orange Plank Road (Route 621), with the assistance of the Virginia highway department, to have a surface similar to that of 1864 at the Hill-Ewell Drive intersection.\textsuperscript{155}

Drafts of the GMP combined the GMP and LPP (they would be placed in separate reports for the final versions) into one document and provided three possible alternatives for review. Alternative A continued existing management, with No Action. Alternative B, the most fleshed out of the possibilities and the one chosen for the final GMP, enhanced the historic setting and expanded interpretive services. Alternative C expanded opportunities for nonhistoric uses, such as environmental education and natural resources interpretation.\textsuperscript{156}

**RESPONSE TO THE GMP**

Fredericksburg’s entire GMP process defined itself by the lack of disagreement between the Park Service and the local communities. This end result came as a surprise, given the opening impressions and meetings. Hugh Cosner and others, as recounted earlier, challenged Zinck at his first Spotsylvania Board of Supervisor’s meeting. Plus, the GMP team recognized early on that the park was “not held in high esteem” in Spotsylvania or Stafford
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\textsuperscript{155} FRSP, GMP, 1986, 74-79. Maintenance areas also received a little attention in the GMP, with the Lee Drive area slated for rehabilitation and upgrading to double its indoor shop space and vehicle storage. The Spotsylvania and Wilderness CCC buildings would be removed and the existing structure at Ellwood would be rehabilitated. A new garage would be built at Spotsylvania. See FRSP, GMP, 1986, 81.
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counties, requiring that “much needs to be done to create a cooperative climate.” When the time came to reviewing the GMP alternatives and discussing the boundary changes and scene restoration recommendations, however, discussion remained cordial and productive. The *Free Lance-Star* admitted about one pre-planning public hearing that “attendance was slim, suggestions were few” from attendees. The local newspaper even registered sympathy for Zinck and his GMP team, recognizing that Interior Secretary James Watt sat in Washington “as overlord of the Park Service,” a man who the newspaper said many regard as “the arch enemy of the nation’s parks.”

The park reached out to a wide range of people and groups to help ensure a successful GMP process. Staff mailed out regular newsletters and asked for input from more than 80 individuals and organizations about pre-planning documents and drafts of the GMP. Zinck and GMP team members participated in at least 10 meetings preparatory to drafting the GMP to gain insights into the local communities and their ideas for the park. Another 29 meetings allowed individuals and local governments to comment upon the draft GMP.

Public comments and concerns ranged across many issues, but always the tone remained cordial and productive, even in Spotsylvania, which had signaled early on through Hugh Cosner its distaste for land acquisition. The Spotsylvania County administrator, Steve Foster, and Planning Commission member Mrs. Hilldup emphasized in a 1983 pre-planning meeting the tremendous economic growth of the county, especially Route 3 West, and that the Park Service needed to “give proper attention to the realities of economics.” An NPS citizen advisory group may help, according to Foster, to provide local input and viewpoints. Foster, however, also made clear that lawsuits over zoning changes had resulted largely in the state courts “uphold[ing] the right of landowners.” He did offer to hear recommendations from the Park Service about how zoning could help protect the park.

Spotsylvania County residents, in a separate pre-planning meeting, echoed the sentiments of their administrators. They declared that the “rights of private citizens should remain protected,” and that the Park Service should consider commercial and economic
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needs before weighing in on highway development. These residents wanted zoning and management of unprotected historic areas done on a case-by-case basis, and condemnation be done only in extreme situations. Residents, however, had lots of suggestions with regard to interpretation and resource management, indicating that they had an interest in and attachment to the battlefield park. They wanted the Chancellorsville Visitor Center enlarged and made a primary stopping place, they wanted reenactments of the battles, and they wanted the park to rebuild and rehabilitate the earthworks.\textsuperscript{162}

Other jurisdictions shared their pre-GMP ideas, too. The pre-planning meeting with Stafford County focused upon the proposed east-west connector bypass. One possible route went through Chatham, and Zinck had worked hard to steer routing away from national park land. Ultimately Stafford County chose an alternative that did not infringe upon Chatham. The Stafford authorities did ask the Park Service to consider bike paths along the waterfront where the park held small land holdings where the December 1862 pontoon bridge crossing had been.\textsuperscript{163} A separate Stafford County resolution indicated the possibility of special buffering of commercial and residential developments next to Chatham to protect its historical integrity. The resolution also promised careful consideration of the bypass location.\textsuperscript{164} This olive branch to the park may have resulted from the shopping center approved east of Chatham just off the park’s boundary. Zinck had worked with the developer to obtain vegetative screening, but relations with Stafford County supervisors and planners had been difficult when combined with negotiations about the connector route.\textsuperscript{165} Caroline County representatives, including the county administrator and historical society director, recommended that the Park Service pursue some zoning changes to ensure the historic integrity of Jackson Shrine. The City of Fredericksburg city manager and director of planning gave hope to the Park Service that Sunken Road might get closed, with the city manager saying it “possibly could be worked out.” The city planner also indicated his willingness to having open-space zoning or historical zoning next to Park Service properties along Lee Drive, to keep housing or industrial developments from appearing directly adjacent to park lands.\textsuperscript{166}

The Orange County representatives, including the administrator, planning commission members, and historical society president, might have surprised the Park Service most of all in these pre-planning meetings. Discussion centered upon ways to promote and

\textsuperscript{162} Ibid., 10-11. Quote on p. 10.
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expand park interpretive efforts, such as making the Wilderness shelter larger and making Ellwood more visible to the public through promotions. One unidentified questioner wondered if the Park Service would buy more land in the county. “This appeared,” according to the notes, “to be a statement of encouragement to do so.”\textsuperscript{167} Alexander (“Sandy”) Rives, the park’s management assistant at the time (he eventually became the park’s superintendent) remembered later that it was the Orange County Board of Supervisors who wanted in 1986 more county land in the park.\textsuperscript{168}

These generally positive comments early in the GMP process continued as the GMP and LPP neared completion. Many factors contributed to this positive atmosphere. The planning documents revised the park’s authorized boundaries and added about 80 acres of land, but this planned fee acquisition came balanced with several concessions. The Park Service acknowledged that scenic easements would be a central feature of the LPP, allowing property owners to continue living on and using their land as they had been but restricting future development. Scenic easements kept land on the local tax rolls and allowed for protection of property rights, a key concern in Spotsylvania in particular.\textsuperscript{169} The LPP also called for the Park Service to engage the public in a “vigilant outreach program” to attain “the best possible working relationship” with local governments and private citizens. The conflict between the counties having a “strong economic growth philosophy” and the park pursuing preservation of the rural environment, as it had been in the 1860s, could only be resolved, according to the LPP, “by an intensive educational and public relations effort” aimed at “influencing, rather than attempting to prevent growth.”\textsuperscript{170} The local newspaper made a point of highlighting this language in its reporting about the planning documents.\textsuperscript{171}

The Park Service also responded in the GMP/LPP to concerns and questions raised by local governments, further helping to reduce tensions about the planning documents. The final LPP contained a listing of compatible and incompatible uses on lands within the proposed park boundaries that remained privately held. This listing came as a result of requests from Spotsylvania County and other jurisdictions, wanting more information about park boundaries and inholdings. A summary of comments of the draft GMP/LPP indicated no negative reactions to this listing, an important step forward in reducing anger and confusion about potential condemnation actions or in helping the local areas develop zoning and regulations to address future development.\textsuperscript{172} Orange County’s desire to have Ellwood

\textsuperscript{167} Ibid., 11-12. Quote on p. 12.
\textsuperscript{168} Alexander Rives, transcription of oral history interview with the author, 19 February 2010, 12-13, FRSP Archives.
\textsuperscript{169} FRSP, LPP, 1986, iii.
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\textsuperscript{171} Robert Freis, “Park Plan Draws New Battle Line,” \textit{Free Lance-Star}, 13 May 1986. Although the article has a title that suggests confrontation, the article itself does not suggest any battle lines being drawn by residents or governments.
\textsuperscript{172} FRSP, LPP, 1986, 22-24. Memorandum, Zinck to Regional Director, Mid-Atlantic Region, 15 July 1986, and attached summary of comments, no page numbering, File D18 Public Review GMP 1986-87,
featured more prominently in the park’s interpretive programs saw fruition in the GMP, with an eventually restored Ellwood serving as a contact station. News reporting acknowledged this feature of the plan and indicated no negative repercussions. Individual concerns sometimes raised concerns about specific aspects of the plan, usually directly relating to their own properties, but these concerns never became a rallying cry for opposing the plan in total or the Park Service.

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

One area of GMP concern, the Chatham gardens, did generate considerable debate within the park and the Park Service but not the outside community. Zinck convinced the regional office in fall 1983 to provide major funding for repair and restoration of the 1920s neo-colonial formal gardens at Chatham. These floral beds and corners for statuary had once been a showcase, and local gardening groups had advocated for their return. Zinck pursued such funding in part because the gardens ate up so much maintenance time and money without being safe and inviting to visitors. He also wanted to engage visitors with the long history of Chatham, beyond its use as a Civil War signaling station and field hospital. Initial work in 1983-84 involved repairing the garden walls and removing all trees and growth that would adversely affect the repaired walls. New poured concrete foundations and a plastic perforated drain line to a nearby storm drain would help ensure the continued strength of the garden wall foundations. Regional landscape architect Reed Engle oversaw the extensive project, with the work completed in-house. Engle used the original drawings and specifications in designing his plans. Staff removed 626 feet of boxwood hedge, excavated and prepared almost 3,500 feet of perennial flower beds, and re-laid slate sidewalks. They planted 384 shrubs and 2,200 flower bulbs and rebuilt 24 climbing rose arbors. Zinck worked out a cooperative agreement with the local chapter of the American Iris Society to have the society’s members donate 1920s-era irises to the newly refurbished planting beds and help maintain the plantings. New boxwood hedges bordered the rectangular beds, and dogwoods lined some of the walkways.

Garden restoration occurred outside the parameters of the GMP. An early draft of the GMP noted the project, but the NPS Director’s office recommended its deletion unless tied directly to the park’s primary interpretive theme of the Civil War. The planning team

Cabinet 15, Drawer 2, FRSP Basement Files. Spotsylvania County may have been receptive to the GMP/LPP in part because the NPS regional office had granted an easement to the county for the Deep Run Sewer Interceptor through part of Fredericksburg battlefield. See FRSP, news release, 20 September 1985, File Reading Copies September 1985, cabinet 2, Drawer 4, FRSP Basement Files.
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revised the reference to emphasize what work had already been done to meet safety and maintenance cost concerns. Park staff, however, has remembered the garden restoration project as a contentious issue within GMP planning. Sandy Rives recalled the gardens as a significant part of the GMP and that Zinck, as Rives stated later, “just pushed it through. He would not relent” despite many others saying the Park Service could not maintain formal gardens in the long run. Rives called the project “enormously expensive. It was enormously controversial.” Former park historian ranger A. Wilson Greene recalled that most people on Fredericksburg’s interpretive staff felt “that resources, money, and time spent” on the Chatham gardens, at a park whose story focused on the Civil War, “seemed superfluous, and a waste of money and a waste of time, and a direction of resources away from” this primary theme. This attitude came in part as a reaction, according to Greene, to the expansion of the National Park System into National Recreation Areas that did not, in the minds of people like Greene, have nationally significant resources like Fredericksburg did. The garden restoration project seemed to diminish the Civil War story and take away from the national importance of the park.

Superintendent Zinck focused his administrative attention on the park’s resources, in all their variety. Former park chief ranger Mike Johnson noted that Zinck “was going to die for every square inch of the battlefields.” He loved the Park Service and its mission. Former park ranger and maintenance foreman Robert Howard agreed, remembering that Zinck “would fight just about every encroachment or intrusion [for] the park’s well being.” But, Johnson pointed out that Zinck also had a difficult time communicating his commitment to resource protection to his staff. Zinck had definite ideas of how to protect the park’s resources, and he did not easily entertain other’s ideas, nor did he communicate effectively his own ideas. Johnson believed that Zinck “had more of an ‘It’s my way or the highway’” attitude. Rives agreed, stating that when Zinck “wanted to get something done, there was no stopping him.” This approach alienated the staff, as seen with the Chatham gardens project. He drove the staff crazy, according to Johnson, Rives, Howard, and Greene. Zinck would drive the park every week, with a notepad by his side, and write down everything he saw that didn’t fit his expectations of how the park should appear. If there was litter on the ground, Rives would joke later that Zinck, “even if he caused a car accident, he would hit the

176 Memorandum, Director to Regional Director, Mid-Atlantic Region, 28 January 1986, 1; WASO Comments and Planning Team Revisions for Draft FRSP GMP and LPP, 14 February 1986, 1-2, both in File D18 GMP 1986-88, Cabinet 13, Drawer 4, FRSP Basement Files. FRSP, GMP, 1986, 27-28.
177 Rives, transcript of interview, 19 February 2010, 5.
178 Greene, transcript of interview, 24 February 2010, 12.
180 Robert Howard, transcription of oral history interview with the author, 29 September 2010, 10, FRSP Archives.
brakes and jump out of the car and pick up the trash himself." Greene remembered the joke that Zinck “would go out and move a sign six inches because it wasn’t exactly in the right spot.” Yet, this careful attentiveness to the look of the park, Greene admitted, was “good medicine” because “there is a lot of stuff that just gets allowed to occur in a public history site” that needs fixing. Zinck just did not communicate the over-arching vision he had for the park to his staff; instead he stayed tied to the minutiae.

This inability to engage his staff ultimately led to Zinck’s re-assignment to Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area (PA, NJ). As he retold the situation, one year he had laudatory reviews from the region, and then two years later the park was the worst in the region. He “was told that I had lost the support of the staff. And so I left, obviously.” Maria Burks would step in as the next superintendent.

How did Fredericksburg fare in terms of staffing and budget between 1969 and 1986? Structurally, the park abandoned in the early 1970s the combined Interpretation and Resource Management Division and separated them into two divisions. Further refining happened in 1976 when the park reorganized the ranger division into two separate (eastern and western) districts. This arrangement would lessen the mileage of rangers coming into the headquarters office, reducing fuel costs. Chief ranger Mike Johnson made further changes in 1981 by replacing the eastern-western divisions with a park ranger in charge of protection and another in charge of resources management. Each battlefield had one ranger assigned to live there and pay attention to its resources and neighbors. Maintenance organization changed the same year, with the replacement of one general foreman over all employees to a foreman for buildings and utilities and another foreman for roads, trails, and grounds. This restructuring may have helped the maintenance division address its inability in the mid-1970s to handle all of the park’s needs over its wide geographic area. Regional office restructuring in 1983 resulted in the park’s gaining a new position, a management assistant, filled by Sandy Rives. Rives focused upon addressing central Virginia’s Green
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Springs National Historic Landmark District, which had been placed under Fredericksburg’s management, plus the GMP.\textsuperscript{189}

Staffing and budget numbers are harder to pin down from the annual reports. The opening of Chatham to the public in 1977 included the addition of five new permanent positions.\textsuperscript{190} This same time period also saw the highpoint of seasonal contributions to the interpretation program, with 13 seasonal employees working during the busy summer months. This number slowly eroded through the mid-1980s with seasonals numbering between five and nine and permanent interpretive staff remaining at nine or ten.\textsuperscript{191} Full-time equivalents for the entire park increased in the early 1980s from 32.7 FTE to 55 FTE.\textsuperscript{192} Budget numbers seemed to steadily increase from $345,000 in 1972 to $844,200 in 1979, $977,400 in 1981, and $1,282,900 in 1984. Mandatory reductions in 1985 due to base reductions and 1986 due to implementation of Gramm-Rudman assessments left the park with $1,298,500 in 1986. Taking into account inflation and converting these operating budget numbers to 2011 numbers, though, the park’s buying power clearly decreased. Its 1972 buying power, adjusted for inflation, was $1.86 million dollars. That buying power, as adjusted, peaked in 1977 at just over $3 million. By 1981, again adjusted for inflation, the park’s operating funds had in reality decreased to $2.4 million and they would not rise above $2.7 million by 1986, adjusted for inflation. When considering that the park doubled in size between 1972 and 1986, plus gained an important new historic site at Chatham, the challenges become apparent.\textsuperscript{193}

In one area, maintenance facilities, the park did gain crucial ground as a result of the GMP. The park’s facilities buildings, based at an old complex along Lee Drive, could not meet current park needs for storing vehicles and housing space to complete needed electrical, plumbing, and carpentry work. Zinck convinced the General Services Agency (GSA) to lease 2.2 acres of land in the Spotsylvania Industrial Park and pay for a new building complex with 18,000 square feet of useable space. The park moved into the new maintenance complex in June 1987.\textsuperscript{194}

\section*{Analysis}

There is an underlying sense in the 1969 master plan, 1974 boundary study, and 1986 GMP that some lands were simply off limits for fee acquisition due to strong negative reactions from local jurisdictions, especially Spotsylvania. The author does not have
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comprehensive plans to chart where the county may have planned for expansion of residential and commercial development, thereby giving an inkling of hot spots with regard to park land. The area of Jackson’s Flank Attack appears to be one such hot spot, but documentation is only suggestive and spotty. The area that became Fawn Lake also may have been a hot spot, but the author does not have documentation.

The park used a land acquisition strategy, negotiating with potential buyers to trade alienated lands for lands desired, that has become heatedly opposed by many both inside and outside the Park Service today. Part of the reason for this strategy may have been that the Park Service inherited the battlefield park from the War Department, and some lands acquired by the War Department may have not fit the vision the Park Service had for the park. But, some lands had been acquired by the Park Service and then later alienated. This removal of park lands sets the agency up for criticism about what exactly is historically significant land and whether that changes over time. Plus, the Park Service may run into poor public relations, as Freeland actively tried to avoid with the England land switch, if its managers are not careful during the alienation process. How often did parks alienate park lands and what have been the repercussions? What is the current accepted policy within the agency?

Zinck’s dogged attempt to interpret Chatham and its gardens using a continuum approach, as opposed to sticking to the Civil War story, strikes the author as requiring more attention and consideration. Minute Man NHP went through a similar conversation at about the same time and struggled for many more years in addressing the idea of a continuum approach to restoring and interpreting landscapes and historical features. Zinck may have not envisioned doing a continuum approach anywhere but Chatham (and he may very well have decided to do it at Chatham simply to clean the mess up in the gardens), but what were/are the possibilities at Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania, throughout the park? How could a continuum approach help the park to tell stories about slaves in the colonial period, freed blacks trying to survive after the Civil War, and the rise of maybe a defined black middle class in the late 20th century, thanks to the expansive growth? Plus, how might other stories of change over time be told, about women or the rise of bedroom communities with maybe a multicultural presence? Could telling these stories be layered with telling how the interpretation and management of Fredericksburg changed over time, from the focus upon reconciliation and commemoration and the Lost Cause to an understanding of the role of slavery in causing the Civil War? Would land acquisition priorities mirror what has been done in the past, with this continuum approach, or would the park have approached land acquisition differently?

The overriding theme of this chapter has been the effort to make up for the deficiencies of the Antietam Plan in acquiring land to allow the park to tell the Civil War story. But there is an underlying message, a change in focus by the national park and the visiting public. People, it seems, now want to have the battlefield park do more than provide a nice day’s diversion while driving the countryside, seeing marked and visible fortifications. By the late 20th century, people wanted more. They wanted to walk the fields. They wanted
to experience the quiet and solitude of the battlefields to help them gain a sense of the power of the past events. They wanted to understand why these battles were important, not just for the outcome of the Civil War, but for the growth of the nation. These people are not the military strategists, though they still use the battlefields. They are enthusiasts and preservationists and tourists and the progeny of those who had fought on those lands. They don’t simply want to drive by the fortifications, they want to be part of the entire battlefields. This idea needs to be made clear in understanding the shift in land acquisition approach in the park and the eventual shift in interpretation. And, other parks were doing the same thing, because the audience was changing and expectations were expanding.

Finally, the shift in land acquisition and what to buy can also be assigned to Bob Krick, with his continued fascination with Chancellorsville but also due to his deeply held conviction that Civil War battlefield land deserved preservation. Krick had a big influence, as noted in chapter five.
Figure 101. The Virginia highway department moved the 15th New Jersey monument in 1961 during the four-laning of Route 3 near Salem Church. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Monuments Box 2, File 15th NJ Moving Monument, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 102. Salem Church sits in the middle in front of the widened Route 3. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Aerial Photos Box, File Salem Church, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 103. Historic Salem Church sits in the middle of the photograph with the four lanes of Route 3 in the foreground. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Aerial Photos Box, File Salem Church, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 104. Historic Salem Church sits obscured by trees in the middle of the photo showing extensive parking lots and commercial developments. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Aerial Photos Box, File Salem Church, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 105. The 1969 master plan land acquisition plan for Spotsylvania Court House battlefield. Map courtesy of National Park Service, Denver Technical Information Center, FRSP-326_7005A.pdf.
Figure 106. The 1969 master plan land acquisition plan for Chancellorsville battlefield. Map courtesy of National Park Service, Denver Technical Information Center, FRSP-326_7003A.pdf.
Figure 107. The 1969 master plan land acquisition plan for Fredericksburg battlefield. Map courtesy of National Park Service, Denver Technical Information Center, FRSP-326_7006A.pdf.
Figure 108. The 1969 master plan land acquisition plan for Wilderness battlefield. Map courtesy of National Park Service, Denver Technical Information Center, FRSP-326_7002A.pdf.
Figure 109. The 1969 master plan land acquisition plan for Chancellorsville and Wilderness battlefields. Map courtesy of National Park Service, Denver Technical Information Center, FRSP-326_7003.pdf.
Figure 110. The Park stabilized the ruins and marked the outline of the former Chancellor house. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Chancellorsville Box 1, File Hazel Grove, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 111. The 1986 General Management Plan’s overall land acquisition plans. Map courtesy of National Park Service, Denver Technical Information Center, FRSP_326_20035A.pdf.
Figure 112. The 1986 General Management Plan's proposed road changes. Map courtesy of National Park Service, Denver Technical Information Center, FRSP_326_200311.pdf.
CHAPTER FIVE

BECOMING AN EFFECTIVE AND VALUED PLAYER

“The shape the park assumes in the next three to four years,” former Fredericksburg historian A. Wilson Greene warned in December 1990, “will determine its shape forever.” Greene had embarked on an experiment to serve as executive director of the fledgling Association for the Preservation of Civil War Sites (APCWS), an organization founded in his living room in summer 1987. Park historian Donald Pfanz and Civil War historian and reenactor Brian Pohanka had invited interested individuals to join them in starting this organization. APCWS was meant to combat the loss of historically significant battlefield land, like Chantilly in Fairfax County, Virginia, threatened by development. Noted Civil War historian Gary Gallagher served as the first president, Bob Krick was the vice president, and Greene served initially on the Board and as the newsletter person. Greene had seen how urban sprawl had encroached upon battlefield land in northern Virginia and other jurisdictions, and he saw that the Fredericksburg area was following along a similar trajectory. Battlefield land would be lost for good if the Park Service did not act now.

That action would take place in a new environment from what previous superintendents Northington, Freeland, and Zinck had encountered. The first wave of development had already swept over the landscape, and people could see exactly its effects. They didn’t like all that they saw. One area in particular, around Salem Church, stood out for many people as a regrettable blunder. Piecemeal development, including a strip shopping center next to it and big box retail across the street, hemmed in the historic church and the two New Jersey monuments. People inching along congested Route 3 could easily forget that more people had fought and either died or been wounded at this site in May 1863 than had at the First Battle of Manassas. The Spotsylvania County Board of Supervisors, in what one newspaper reporter had called a “cockeyed compromise,” had even allowed a gas station directly on the Salem Church corner, so long as it displayed such “colonial” architectural features as brick columns and cedar shake shingles. That station would eventually be bulldozed to widen Salem Church Road.
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Remarkably, by the 1990s, people in Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania began to recognize the absurdity of Salem Church. Hugh Cosner, who did more to shape Spotsylvania County than anyone as a successful business owner and longtime member of the Board of Supervisors, proudly told anyone and everyone in retrospect in 1987 that he had been the “lone soul” to vote against the gas station proposal. He thought the county “should be ashamed” of that decision. He argued that the time had come to look backward, think twice about future development, and take steps to protect the remaining historical and natural features. The Board of Supervisors meeting minutes, however, record on 12 May 1981 that the board voted unanimously for the conditional use permit for the gas station. Cosner was at the meeting and commented upon the stipulations to the permit, saying that the Board should look at the number of signs commercial establishments had erected throughout the county with an eye toward finding ways to reduce the number. He had voted for the gas station.

Strategic political thinking probably colored Cosner’s proclamations about Salem Church. Spotsylvania residents had erupted in protest that year to a proposal for a 200-lot subdivision around the courthouse and the Confederate Cemetery. Supervisors reacted in October 1987 to this furor by adopting for the first time zoning for historic areas. This plan added another layer of zoning and gave an appointed Historic Preservation Commission authority to review development proposals for the effects they might have on the character of a historic district. This new historic preservation law could not help Salem Church, but the law’s existence signaled a new willingness among elected officials to talk and consider.

A new progression of superintendents started at Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania National Military Park just as this openness to cooperation began appearing within the local governments. Maria Burks, serving from 1989 to 1993, led the charge by building solid bridges of communication that were built on mutual respect and interests. She admitted about Salem Church that maybe it was important “to have that as an example of what you don’t want to happen.” By not preserving history, she argued, “we’ll be sorry for what’s lost.” Burks would help shepherd two key pieces of boundary legislation in 1989 and 1992. Martha (Martii) Leicester, serving as superintendent from 1994 to 1997, continued Burks’s work in maintaining relationships with the local community. Sandy Rives, who returned to Fredericksburg after a stint at Shenandoah National Park, served as superintendent between 1998 and 2002. Rives used the connections he had developed with Congress and its staff to win key land acquisition appropriations and 1999 boundary legislation to obtain property in
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Wilderness battlefield. Russ Smith, who started as superintendent in 2003, has worked to continue positive community relations while the park embarks on a general management plan revision.

Four superintendents in a dozen or so years contrasted sharply with the park’s history. Some of these superintendents, Burks and Rives, often got pulled for agency duties, leaving them to rely upon their staff for maintaining the priorities they had set. That staff had the longevity and commitment to keep the park moving forward. Chief Ranger Mike Johnson, who had started at Fredericksburg in 1981 under Zinck, became the park’s land acquisitions representative. He built relationships with property owners inside the park’s boundaries and laid the foundation for acquiring land on a willing seller-willing buyer basis once Congress appropriated money. Mike Greenfield, who started at the park in late 1986 as supervisory ranger, addressed the growing threat of relic hunting to the park’s archeological remains. He aggressively used federal law to ensure the safety and protection of the park’s resources. Assistant superintendent John Hennessy, although he only started in 1995, quickly became a chief preservation advocate in addressing road and development threats. He would serve as acting superintendent between Rives and Smith and became park chief historian in 2001 when Robert Krick retired. Krick and many members of his interpretive staff also had long careers at Fredericksburg upon which superintendents could draw. These interpreter historians, all still at the park, included Donald Pfanz, Greg Mertz, Noel Harrison, Frank O’Reilly, and eventually Eric Mink. Janice Frye, another park interpreter (and curator and educational specialist), only recently retired after having started during the Zinck years.

URBAN SPRAWL

APCWS executive director Greene’s statement that Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania military park sat at a crossroads for action that would ultimately determine its future recognized the impact of urban sprawl upon the surrounding landscape. Sprawl can be defined based on some common characteristics: low-density and scattered development, lack of regional land-use planning, and dependence upon private transportation. As experienced in Spotsylvania County, sprawl included development of housing subdivisions, using cul-de-sacs connecting to main arterial roads. These residential subdivisions varied in size from a few acres to a thousand acres and often leapfrogged each other. Development remained focused along main roads in the northern part of the county or along the shores of Lake Anna in the southern part of the county. Strip retail, commercial developments, and industrial parks appeared along main regional roads. The lack of multiple road connections between housing and commercial establishments meant, according to the draft 1994 Spotsylvania comprehensive plan, that traffic congestion had increased, public services had
been inefficient or inadequate, residents felt a lost sense of community, and agricultural and forest lands had decreased.\textsuperscript{10}

Driving along Route 3 past Interstate 95, the Spotsylvania Mall, and toward Chancellorsville gave the impression in the early 1990s that Spotsylvania County was an urbanized area. The Route 3 and I-95 intersection had sprouted a cornucopia of retail and commercial complexes. The Silver Companies added Central Park in the mid-1990s, a 300-acre complex on land annexed by the City of Fredericksburg in 1984. Big-box retailers, like Target, moved in starting in 1996, joined by restaurants and entertainment venues. In reality, three-fourths of land in the county, as of 1994, remained wooded, undeveloped, or agricultural, with almost 200,000 acres devoted to this use. Developed land represented one-quarter of the land use, at almost 70,000 acres. Of this developed land, almost 60,000 acres went to residential use.\textsuperscript{11}

One number stands out as indicative of the problems Spotsylvania faced. Sixty percent of its workforce left the county to go to work. This fact made roads and commuter services a growing concern.\textsuperscript{12} L. Kimball Payne, who served as the county administrator between 1987 and 2001, recalled the “enormous amount of commuting to D.C.” Spotsylvania, in his mind, became a “transient community... with less opportunity for community involvement” due to the time, often more than an hour each way, taken away to commute. People tended to family matters and the basics, like weekly shopping, during their time at home. Residents, however, liked the lower house prices and the good schools, compared to close-in DC suburbs, plus Payne admitted Spotsylvania was a beautiful county once you drove past the commercial centers.\textsuperscript{13} Longtime residents, Payne later said, saw growth as an opportunity to improve the county. Devastated by the Civil War and the exodus of former slaves, the county population took a hundred years to recover its numbers Spotsylvania also felt like the poor cousin to the City of Fredericksburg. Agricultural activity by the mid-20\textsuperscript{th} century failed to provide the pay-off needed to meet expectations for county services. County leaders instead turned to other options. Aggressive extensions of water and sewer lines made Spotsylvania ripe for development, what many saw optimistically, with the


\textsuperscript{12} Draft, Spotsylvania County Comprehensive Plan, 1994, 71.

\textsuperscript{13} L. Kimball Payne, transcription of oral history interview with the author, 26 April 2010, 3-4, FRSP Archives. Quotes on p. 3. Jerry Marcus, a longtime resident of Spotsylvania County and former Supervisor echoes Payne’s characterization of county residents. See Marcus, transcription of oral history interview with the author, 27 May 2010, 3-6, FRSP Archives.
promise of improving the school system, offering more community services, and generally enriching the county.\textsuperscript{14}

Urban sprawl, and many of its negative characteristics, resulted from that development. Spotsylvania lacked any zoning ordinances until 1973, allowing the first development wave to spread out along Route 3 in a largely haphazard fashion. Major roads like Route 3 slowly acquired stop lights to allow safe access, and traffic steadily increased and slowed down as more and more residents moving into the subdivisions relied upon a small number of roads to carry them to shopping, services, and other destinations. That increased traffic and services to accommodate those vehicles had adverse effects. Exhaust fumes and road salt killed off tall trees, like Norwegian Spruce, that once lined the country roads. Builders often replaced them with Bradford pear trees, which promised white flowers in spring, striking color in fall, and a relatively low height that did not block views of new commercial establishments.\textsuperscript{15} Additionally, three-fourths of county land may have remained as agricultural or open space, but residents saw the press of development and worried aloud about preserving the scenic atmosphere. Kerry Lane, a former Marine, then a farmer, and president of the Spotsylvania County Farm Bureau, repeatedly wrote letters to the editor of the local newspaper and spoke at county hearings to promote preservation of farms. He argued that “open space, fresh air, clean water, and a natural habitat for wildlife” all represented worthy qualities for the county.\textsuperscript{16}

Lane backed up these qualitative features with quantitative figures. He argued in 1987 that each farmer received only about 5 cents in county services for every dollar paid in taxes. He agreed that businesses and industries also generally received less in services than they paid in taxes, but these companies relied upon a younger work force which had children in schools and consumed a large number of services. Those residents in the subdivisions actually used more county services than their tax money paid. Lane estimated\textsuperscript{17} that the average new Spotsylvania household would have 3.16 people and would bring in about $2,764 per year, from taxes, state education funds, and payments from an uncertain federal revenue-sharing program. Each household would cost the county $3,162 per year in general government, community development, social services, security, recreational, and educational expenses. Long-range capital expenditures for education, government, recreation, and landfills would likely require an additional $8,999 per household.\textsuperscript{18} Lane did not provide a source for these figures, but other studies generally support his findings. Local governments
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have recognized over time that residential properties cost more in services than they contribute in taxes. To offset these costs, local communities have sought commercial and industrial companies, thereby diversifying their tax base and providing jobs for their residents.19

Scholarly literature on urban sprawl has largely focused upon its negative effects while also advocating for new approaches to development. Negative environmental consequences of sprawl have included air pollution from increased driving in private automobiles, as opposed to using public transportation or having homes, workplaces, and retail establishments close together to reduce mileage for each trip. Water pollution has resulted from run-off from the increased numbers of roadways that carry increased numbers of vehicles spilling oil and other harmful pollutants. More negative effects have come from erosion, with the loss of trees and other vegetation to keep soil in place, and increased chance of flooding, with asphalt-covered ground unable to absorb the excess water. Placement of subdivisions has also exacerbated land stability if developers did not take into adequate consideration hillsides or floodplains, for example. Increased energy consumption has resulted from automobiles needing to use more gas and oil to cover the distances required in the sprawled landscape. The new homes usually offered air conditioning (and sometimes electric heat), but these modern conveniences added tremendously to the demands on power companies, requiring them to up their coal consumption or other power generating forces. Health risks from lung cancer and asthma, for example, have increased from the pollutants resulting from sprawl. Farmers, working the fewer pieces of open land in a sprawling community, often cannot expand their operations (to increase profitability) due to high land prices. They have faced the lack of nearby suppliers and service operators to support their farming efforts, adding to costs. Scholars have also associated sprawl with economic and racial inequality, when comparing the poverty-stricken inner cities and the wealthier outer suburbs. Industry and jobs have moved out to these suburban locations, in part following its educated workforce and in part taking advantage of tax breaks and other conveniences offered by local jurisdictions anxious to broaden their tax base and create jobs for their residents.20


What to do about sprawl has generated an equal amount of scholarly debate and interest. Robert Bruegmann in his compact history of sprawl argued that sprawl was historically as old as cities and resulted from the dynamics of population movement irrespective of transportation, planning, regulations, or other influences. This perspective thus offers little hope for any actions taken by local communities to avoid or control urban sprawl. Alternatively, many other scholars have pointed to planning as an important remedy. Andres Duany, Elizabeth Plater-Zyberk, and Jeff Speck in Suburban Nation advocated for the new urbanism (which they had experimented with in their own development projects at Seaside, FL, for example). New urbanism embraced the traditional town design with its interconnected streets, pedestrian-friendly areas, and mixed-use development that put homes, retail, and jobs close to each other. These designers then added diversity of housing categories and prices to encourage a diverse population. They also promoted green transportation and sustainable energy sources and uses. States such as Maryland have adopted smart growth policies, backed by tax incentives, to encourage development near transportation hubs, for example, and discourage new construction in outer areas. Minneapolis/St. Paul has experimented with metropolitan and regional governance to share resources between downtown and suburban areas, plus Portland, OR, adopted a growth boundary to control sprawl. Some developers have also designed their own large planned communities, such as in Irvine, CA, and Columbia, MD, as a way to combat sprawl while also unleashing their creativity and powerful economic and political connections to succeed.21

**THE PARK AND URBAN SPRAWL**

Preservation of the battlefield park sits at the crossroads with the urban sprawl in Spotsylvania with residents expressing varying and strong opinions. Danny Pemberton, president of the Spotsylvania County Land Owner’s Association and lifetime county resident, argued that “the war was fought 150 years ago; it’s time to forget about it.” He agreed that “We need to have a few small areas marked as park property, and remember the ones that were lost at that time,” but he did not think that the Park Service should “gobble up more land.” Pemberton asserted that property owners had rights over their land. “Property is an asset to people who own land,” he stated, “and if you own land, it’s the only way to survive, is to develop and sell it sometimes.” His organization has worked to ensure that property owners retained their rights.22

One of the major developers in the area, Silver Companies, acknowledged the value of the battlefield park. B. Judson Honaker, president of the Silver Companies commercial division, noted that “we are sympathetic and sensitive to preserving the history.” He would


22 Danny Pemberton, transcription of oral history interview with the author, 7 December 2009, 4, 8, FRSP Archives. Quotes in reverse order of page numbers.
not allow his company to develop a piece of property directly adjacent to an important part of the battlefield park.\textsuperscript{23} Plus, Silver Companies had donated land and money to help preserve historically significant land. When development did seem possible but still near battlefield land, he argued that his company had added vegetative buffers or worked with the Park Service to maintain the basic contours of the historic landscape, such as with a golf course. Honaker admitted that his company supported the battlefield park “because it is obviously very important in the country’s history. It’s also good for tourism, which is good for our economy.” He did acknowledge, though, that, aside from a few rare pieces that may still be outside the park, “they’ve got plenty of land. They’ve got more land than they can maintain.” He also prickled at the idea of keeping any development away from any park land. “One of the jokes that people say,” Honaker mused, “is they [the Park Service] want a buffer to the buffer to the buffer to the buffer to the park.” The question became, where was the boundary between the 19th century and modern times?\textsuperscript{24}

In some ways, that boundary didn’t exist. Debbie Hawkins Aylor grew up on land where Stonewall Jackson’s men surprised the Federals during the Chancellorsville flank attack. She and her brother as kids would pretend they were the Rebels, “running out of the woods screaming” until they came to a crest of a hill. “Once you get up to that crest,” she remembered, “you can see for about a mile. And to think that that’s what these guys are seeing, and they’re pumped up and they’re scared, and they’ve got the sun to their back and just what was going through their minds.” The Hawkins farm is inside the park boundary, but Aylor isn’t sure if her family will sell the land to the park. They continue to farm it. Her father, when he was alive, worried “because once they [the Park Service] get a piece of land, they let it grow, they let it grow up.” According to Aylor, he didn’t feel that the Park Service would “take as good of care of it as should be taken care of.” But, she valued the battlefield park, saying it was “important to preserve the land because it’s a part of who we are as a nation, as a people.” She did not like the alternative, the sprawl. She argued that “If we plow it up and put houses and buildings all over it, . . . it’s gone it’s gone forever, . . . you can’t recover it, it’s just gone.”\textsuperscript{25}

One family, the Atkins, did sell their Chancellorsville land to the park. As Enos Richardson remembered, they wanted to save the property. Richardson, a local lawyer who helped close the deal, characterized the Atkins family as realizing the land’s historical significance. If they had waited a little while, Richardson said, “they probably could have gotten more for it” than the price they had agreed to, “but they were willing to sell it at what we considered a reasonable price because they were really aware that it was worth saving.”

\textsuperscript{23} B. Judson Honaker, transcription of oral history interview with the author, 4 February 2010, 3, FRSP Archives. Honaker may be referring to more recent times. Larry Silver was one of the commercial partners in 1981 who successfully advocated for building a gas station on the corner where historic Salem Church stands. Wishner, “Spotsylvania Approves ‘Colonial’ Gas Station.”

\textsuperscript{24} Honaker, transcript of interview, 4 February 2010, 2-4, 8-9. Quotes on pp. 3, 8.

\textsuperscript{25} Debbie Hawkins Aylor, transcription of oral history interview with the author, 8 December 2009, 12, 15, 20-21, FRSP Archives. Quotes in order on pp. 15, 12, 20-21.
The alternative, development, did not sit well with many people. Richardson characterized how developers tackled their projects in the last decades of the 20th century, saying it was “a death knell situation down here with the destruction of these properties.” With the huge earth-moving machines, the land became “like the mountaintop mining in West Virginia. They just obliterate everything.” And when the land is gone, Richardson warned, “there’s no way that you could even ever get it back.”

Former Board of Supervisor member Jerry Marcus recognized the historical importance of the land. He worked hard with potential developers to obtain proffers, or concessions, to reduce the impact of residential subdivisions on land near the battlefield park. But, Marcus also considered the property owners and their rights. He would say to the Park Service, “if a piece of property is so important to history,” but another person owns it and has the legal right to develop it, “then what you [the Park Service] need to do is buy the property from them.” Marcus did not think it quite right for the Park Service to “tell them what they can or cannot do.” Instead, Marcus argued the Park Service should “just buy it from them and then that resolves it, and you put it into trust, and that’s it.” Of course, that would take a lot of money, but Marcus believed that the conflicts would stop if the Park Service simply paid for the land.

1989 BOUNDARY LEGISLATION

The Park Service set out to acquire that historically significant land through boundary legislation. The park’s 1986 general management plan had laid out which lands the park still needed, either in fee acquisition or scenic easements, to tell the story of the four Civil War battlefields. Park staff could not fully implement the land acquisition part of that plan, though, until Congress had agreed to a boundary adjustment through formal legislation. During this same time period, public furor had erupted over development plans adjacent to Manassas National Battlefield Park. One of the large northern Virginia developers, John T. “Til” Hazel with his partner Milt Peterson, had proposed to build a 550-acre mixed-used development, with residential, retail, and office complexes, on land associated with the Second Battle of Manassas. Rolland Swain, the superintendent of Manassas at the time, had worked with the developer to gain important proffers. These controlled the height of buildings, added vegetative buffers, and addressed traffic concerns by directing traffic away from park roads. Swain would have preferred not having any development next to the battlefield park, but he knew that Prince William County would favorably embrace the expected large increase in tax dollars the project would provide county coffers. He also knew that the county could not legally have negotiated for the

---

26 Enos Richardson, transcription of oral history interview with the author, 9 December 2009, 12, 9-10, FRSP Archives.

27 Marcus, transcript of interview, 27 May 2010, 12.
proffers, only accept them. Swain spoke in favor of the project at the county public hearing.  

In late January 1988, the entire landscape of the William Center project changed when Hazel/Peterson Companies announced its intention to place a 1.2-million-square-foot shopping mall on top of Stuart’s Hill, the most historically significant part of the property. Historical and environmental preservationists, Civil War enthusiasts, professional historians, some local residents, and many others around the country cried foul at the idea of having the epitome of American materialism desecrate what many considered hallowed ground. The Department of the Interior, and thus the National Park Service, tried to forge a compromise with Hazel/Peterson, focused again on roads, plus moving the mall to a lower elevation. But preservationists, rallied by local resident Annie Snyder, turned the mall into a national debate about saving the land. Congress stepped in and with a rarely used legislative taking, stopped the development, paid what many considered an exorbitant price of $134 million, and brought the contested land into the battlefield park.  

Every national park, but especially Civil War battlefield parks, felt the tremors from this Third Battle of Manassas. Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania started the process of engaging the public and Congress in its proposed boundary expansion, and all sides wanted to avoid another Manassas. The local newspaper in July 1988 urged Rep. D. French Slaughter, Jr. (R), to “prod” the National Park Service into finishing its review of the 1986 Land Protection Plan and “carry the banner forward” to acquire the needed land. The Free Lance-Star argued that protection boosted not just the history “but also the economy of this area.” Tourist dollars flowed to places with quality attractions, and it was “that quality that’s at the heart of the land protection plan.” The paper editorialized again once Congress had stopped the Manassas mall project, saying “it’s time to rally the congressional troops behind proposals to expand” the Fredericksburg battlefields. Otherwise, the paper warned, “there will be a need for more last-second, come-from-behind rescues,” with the same costly results. That fear of paying outrageous sums to protect historical land gave even Republicans, the traditionally fiscally conservative party, pause. Rep. Stanford Parris (R-VA), who was running for the Republican nomination in the Virginia governor’s race, questioned why the Park Service wanted to alienate more than 300 acres currently held by the Fredericksburg battlefield park. He referred to the Manassas mall example and urged “If we’re going to err, let’s err on the side of being extra-protective.”  

---

29 Ibid., chapter 10. John Hennessy supplied documentation of the historical significance of Stuart’s Hill, based upon his research for his book on Second Manassas. Hennessy went on to work at Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania NMP as assistant superintendent and then park chief historian.
fiscal prudence, went on the record saying that he did not favor a prohibition that the proposed boundary legislation would be the last one, an idea the Park Service had supported. 33

Park chief historian Robert Krick worked with various people through the late 1980s and the 1990s to build support for boundary expansion and land acquisition. Krick declined offers for an oral history interview, but others have shared their impressions of his important role. Rep. Robert Mrazek (D-NY) had worked with Rep. Mike Andrews (D-TX) to convince Congress to act on the William Center tract at Manassas. Krick worked with Mrazek and his staff to identify other lands needing preservation. Krick “brought the history alive for me,” Mrazek would later say when describing tours of battlefields with Krick as the guide. Krick knew what lands, not just at Fredericksburg but also Antietam and other parks, needed saving and, as Mrazek noted, he “was so persuasive.” Mrazek stated that Krick never got the recognition he deserved for his behind-the-scenes work, using “various tools, including me” to save battlefield lands. 34 Robert Howard, the park's roads and grounds foreman during this time period, recalled that Krick “was an unending spokesman to try to get . . . lands preserved,” and he “did all he could to marshal the forces” to support preservation. 35 Krick helped find both the APCWS and the later Central Virginia Battlefields Trust, key preservation organizations that have helped save hundreds of acres of land. His connections with people in elected office, the Civil War community, and others strengthened the ability of these organizations. 36

The park’s boundary legislation evolved over the course of 1989. The National Park Service draft bill, presented to Rep. Slaughter in January 1989, had many of the key provisions that would appear in the final approved legislation. These included how the Secretary of the Interior could convey federal lands no longer included in the boundaries, having a time limit of five years for such conveyance before the lands could be sold. To address access easements, the draft bill and final legislation allowed the government to acquire alternative access rights on non-parkland and convey these to owners of access rights within the park in order to obtain those access easements within the park. Owners who sold land to the park, according to the early draft and final bill, could retain a right of use and occupancy for up to 25 years or until the death of the owner or owner’s spouse. 37

The draft bill also had some differences from the final legislation. The draft referred to the 1927 act for determining acquisition and interests in lands. Further review by the Department of Justice determined that the 1927 act contained inconsistencies with existing

33 Ibid.
34 Robert Mrazek, notes of conversation with the author, 14 June 2011, FRSP Admin History Files.
35 Robert Howard, transcription of oral history interview with the author, 29 September 2010, 15, FRSP Archives.
36 John Hennessy, personal communication with the author, 26 October 2010, FRSP Admin History Files.
federal law, especially with respect to the work of a battlefield commission and condemnation procedures. The final bill simply stated that the Secretary could acquire lands through donation, purchase, or exchange. The National Park Service’s draft version of the boundary bill also recommended a new name for the park, Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania National Battlefields. This attempt probably tried to address several problems long associated with the park. The original name was long and difficult to remember exactly. The park hardly used the official name in its everyday work. Another factor for the name change may have been an effort to emphasize the plurality of battlefields as opposed to the singularity of a park. Past superintendents and park staff had long endured the relative lack of funds for preservation and interpretation of the far-flung park, and they had argued the park really was four parks. The proposed name would help make that distinction.  

Another goal, of curbing recreational use by emphasizing the battlefields name, may have also motivated the Park Service. However, the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, in its July 1989 report, rejected this assertion. The committee supported “appropriate recreational usage” which did not “adversely affect Park resources.”

The draft bill shared with the final legislation a provision about conservation easements. Committee staffer Heather Huyck particularly remembered that aspect of the bill. Huyck was a National Park Service employee who had accepted a congressional fellowship through the American Historical Association and then remained as a staffer for a total of eight and half years. She worked between 1985 to 1994 for Rep. Bruce Vento (D-MN) on the House Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands. She thought of the idea of conservation easements, allowing the Secretary to accept donations of easements outside the park boundary. Such ability might prove essential if property was “imminently endangered,” Huyck argued. The Secretary would not be constrained by park boundaries to act in the name of preservation.

Local jurisdictions wanted reassurances that the proposed legislation would occur under a willing seller basis. The final act (and not included in the Park Service draft bill) included such a provision. The act ensured that improved land bounded by Route 3, McLaw’s Drive, and Route 610 at Chancellorsville be acquired under consent of the owner. If the Secretary deemed the land threatened or having an adverse impact upon the park, then the Secretary could acquire the land. Zinck, who assisted with development of the boundary

38 Legislative Counsel to James C. Miller III, 11 January 1989, and attached draft bill to revise the boundaries, File FRSP Correspondence 1986-1992, NRHE Files. FRSP, Public Law 101-214, 101st Cong, 1st sess. Carol Crawford to Bruce Vento, no date, Microfiche HR 875 FRSP, NPS Legislative Affairs Office.


40 Heather Huyck, transcription of oral history interview with the author, 11 June 2010, 3, 6, 14-15, FRSP Archives. Quote on p. 15.
legislation, also emphasized that the 1986 general management plan and land protection plan had requirements for willing seller-willing buyer negotiations.\footnote{Zinck to D. French Slaughter, Jr., 1 June 1989, 1, Microfiche HR 875 FRSP, NPS Legislative Affairs Office.}

This boundary legislation also made a first-ever bold and important statement about park interpretation. In a section not originally found in the Park Service draft bill, the Secretary was called upon to interpret the battles commemorated at Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania “in the larger context of the Civil War and American history, including the causes and consequences of the Civil War and including the effects of the war on all the American people, especially on the American South.”\footnote{Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania County Battlefields Memorial, Public Law 101-214, Section 5.} Huyck remembered that Rep. Vento particularly wanted such inclusive language in the bill. “He wanted to tell the whole story,” Huyck said, and make sure “that the story itself featured everybody and not just some groups.” That approach was also important to Huyck.\footnote{Huyck, transcript of interview, 11 June 2010, 17.} She had read every book in her elementary school library on American history, except the books on the Civil War. She had understood even as a child the terrible implications of the Civil War. “I have always been profoundly saddened and upset by [the Civil War],” Huyck later said, “that we needed to fight a war to free people.”\footnote{Ibid., 14.} She took that perspective with her as she pursued her Ph.D. in American history, focusing upon another traditionally oppressed group, women. Rep. John Lewis (D-GA) may also have encouraged Vento to include this section on interpretation.\footnote{Ibid.} Lewis, who served his first term in Congress in 1987, had been actively involved as a student in the 1960s Freedom Rides and other non-violent Civil Rights protests. He had been the youngest speaker at the 1963 March on Washington, representing the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee. Lewis has used his position in Congress to raise awareness about African-American history and issues.\footnote{The author in chapter six places the 1989 boundary legislation’s section on interpretation within the larger context of NPS and FRSP park interpretation.}

Congress took the park’s 1986 GMP and set out the proposed boundaries for the legislation. Vento, as the chair of the relevant subcommittee, assigned his NPS/historian staffer Huyck to do the legwork. Huyck in turn asked Ed Bearss, then NPS chief historian and an admired and revered Civil War historian, to join her in walking the battlefields and determining the most logical and historically defensible places for the revised boundary. They met at the crushing hour of 4:45 AM one weekday, driving first to Richmond so that Bearss could advocate for lands at that Civil War park, then arriving at Fredericksburg. Huyck (and Vento) wanted to remove as much politics as they could from where the Park Service had drawn the lines at Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania. Huyck carried a camera, brought all kinds of maps, and took notes. She recalled that “we would go to a place. Ed
would explain what had happened there. He would explain where he believed the boundary should go.” Then they would “drive like hellions to the next spot and repeat the process.” Bearss gave the authoritative reasons for why a tract needed preservation for its historical significance. They came back from the trip with the revised maps that served as the basis for the legislation.47

The 1989 boundary legislation added more than 1,900 acres, making the authorized boundary include a total of 7,764 acres for the park. Key aspects at Chancellorsville included fee acquisition of the land associated with Jackson’s flank attack, north of Route 3 and near Wilderness Church. (Figure 113) Land south of Route 3 remained in private hands. The 1989 legislation also brought in the entire area west of McLaws Drive and land on the western side of Sickles Drive and Jackson Trail East. These lands had not been part of the 1986 GMP. According to the November 1989 Senate Report on the legislation, of the 784 acres of private land to be added at Chancellorsville, 417 acres would be fee acquisition and 367 acres in scenic easements. Another 77 acres of land already in fee acquisition would be officially added to the park. At the Fredericksburg battlefield, the 1989 boundary included the Bernard’s cabins site, not originally in the 1986 GMP. (Figure 114) In total at Fredericksburg, according to the Senate report, about 70 acres of private land once identified for addition to the park would be deleted while 60 acres of private land and 185 acres of already federal land would be added. Part of this additional land would protect the historic scene along Lee Drive and at Lee Hill while other land would provide safe access and parking at Chatham. Along the Sunken Road, about three acres would be added to obtain the houses along Willis Street. (Figure 115) The area where junior officer John Pelham used a single artillery piece to temporarily halt a Federal advance did not get placed within the adjusted park boundary, due to its distance from other park land. Congress did ask that the park work with local landowners, the county, and the Virginia highway department to protect and interpret the site. About 1.5 acres of two private undeveloped rights-of-way at Jackson Shrine would be added to the park. (Figure 116) The 1989 boundary added a total of 62 acres of already federal-owned land and another 16 acres of private land at Spotsylvania Court House to maintain the historic scene.48 (Figure 117)

Several changes occurred with respect to the Wilderness battlefield boundary under the 1989 legislation. In total, according to the November 1989 Senate report, 475 acres of private land and 287 acres of already federally owned land came into the park, with half the private land as scenic easements. (Figure 118) The boundary allowed purchase of scenic easements of the viewshed opposite of Ellwood. Several historic roadways received attention for preservation. Fee acquisitions included about 300 acres on the north shoulder of Orange Turnpike, a doubling of the amount of land already inside the park along the north

shoulder of Orange Turnpike (Lake Wilderness house lots), and a nice buffer at the northeast quadrant of the Brock-Plank Roads intersection.\textsuperscript{49} (Figure 119)

Another important opportunity presented itself at Wilderness during consideration of the 1989 boundary legislation. When Huyck and Bearss had gone out to review the different land tracts for possible inclusion in the park, Bearss had pointed out to Huyck at Wilderness the “Gibbs tract.” Huyck readily acknowledged that after meeting with Bearss at 4:45 AM and then traveling through Richmond’s and Fredericksburg’s Civil War battlefields, her mind had gotten a bit foggy and overwhelmed. Her initial reaction was, “Oh my God, here’s yet another Confederate Colonel that I should know, and I don’t.” She humbly asked which Gibbs he meant. Bearss just laughed and said, “You know, Joe Gibbs from the Washington Redskins.”\textsuperscript{50} The former head coach of the area football team had become the head promoter of Fawn Lake, a residential subdivision of about 1,500 lots on almost 3,000 acres of land south of Wilderness. He had had a summer home at Lake of the Woods in nearby Orange County since the early 1980s, and he had a 7,000 square-foot home built at Fawn Lake, where he retired in 1993.\textsuperscript{51}

Developers had identified the land at Fawn Lake since the early 1970s for construction of residences, but not until the late 1980s and early 1990s did the eventual owner, NTS Corporation of Louisville, KY, succeed. Park officials acknowledged that the land had been part of fighting during the 1864 battle, but the Park Service could not compete moneyside with the developer in obtaining the land. The park’s authorized boundary, however, included 90 acres of land along the Orange Plank Road (Route 621) that effectively controlled access to the Fawn Lake site. The Park Service did not yet own this 90 acres, but it did own the thin strip of land along Longstreet Drive (built by the War Department in the early 1930s) and the remaining earthworks the road followed.\textsuperscript{52} Chief ranger Mike Johnson recalled later that NTS sought a way to have a grand gated entrance to its Fawn Lake development. They were building what would be priced in the early 21\textsuperscript{st} century as multi-million dollar homes, and they wanted to use the cache of having residents enter their exclusive community through a national park. Other access opportunities existed, including on Brock Road. A predominantly black community lived there, and as Johnson remembered, NTS didn’t think the area was “a very attractive way to bring their people in, not a lot of houses out there, but they didn’t like it, and they made no bones about it.” The park, however, had Longstreet Drive, and NTS went to the Park Service to discuss possibilities.\textsuperscript{53}

Zinck, still superintendent when negotiations started, admitted that existing zoning ordinances “allowed, encouraged, and [made] inevitable” the development that NTS


\textsuperscript{50} Huyck, transcript of interview, 11 June 2010, 13.


\textsuperscript{52} Burks to Cooling, 13 February 1990, 1-2. Memorandum, Zinck to Regional Director, Mid-Atlantic Region, 25 April 1988, Deed #293, FRSP Lands Files.

\textsuperscript{53} Mike Johnson, transcription of oral history interview with the author, 11 December 2009, 19-20, FRSP Archives. Quote on p. 20.
proposed. Instead, the Park Service should “minimize losses, consolidate holdings, and prepare itself for the future” by coming to an agreement with NTS. That agreement had long-range benefits for the park. The Park Service agreed to swap its 22-acre attenuated line of land along Longstreet Drive for the 90 acres along Route 621. Superintendent Burks later stated that the War Department, in constructing Longstreet Drive, had caused “a very wide swath of ground disturbance” that archeologically left few cultural remains. The 90 acres of land along the south shoulder of Orange Plank Road, however, had seen significant fighting during the Wilderness battle, and this land remained largely undisturbed. NTS could have built access routes along any portion of that 90 acres, potentially harming areas directly across from Widow Tapp, for example. The NTS-Park Service agreement made the land swap, and NTS had the responsibility of protecting the earthworks along Longstreet Drive and to allow the Park Service access to conduct archeological investigations. But the agreement promised more. The Park Service now owned both shoulders of the Orange Plank Road, and as traffic predictably increased with Fawn Lake fully developed, the Park Service could effectively thwart any attempts to widen the road. Instead, working with the Virginia highway department, which the Park Service had already approached, the road could get moved to the southern boundary of the 90 acres. The Park Service could then restore a sample stretch of the historic trace and “rejoice in a battlefield setting far better than we could have hoped for” under other scenarios.

One feature of the agreement, though, soured public opinion of the Park Service. The agency allowed NTS to build an entrance sign for its community on either side of Longstreet Drive on land now owned by the park. This sign would eventually get moved farther south once the highway department built the new road. (Figure 120) No one expected the size of the sign when it finally went up. The brick entrance wall was “mammoth,” as Mike Johnson recalled, and “the size and the scope of the wall after they built it that kind of -- even the Park Service, we all went, ‘Whoa, we didn’t quite expect that.’ But it was part of the deal” and eventually, they hoped, the sign would come down. (Figure 121) But the public decried the sign’s blatant reference to materialism, especially in light of
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54 Memorandum, Zinck to Regional Director, Mid-Atlantic Region, 25 April 1988, 1.
55 Burks to Cooling, 13 February 1990, 2.
56 NTS Senior Vice President to Zinck, 8 March 1989, 2, Deed #293, FRSP Lands Files. NTS and the Park Service reached a settlement in 2001 following the 1999 destruction of a section of the earthworks along Longstreet Drive. NTS paid a sum that went toward two restoration projects, the stone wall along the Sunken Road and an archeological investigation of Willis Hill and structures along the Sunken Road, as equivalent restoration work for the loss at Longstreet Drive. See Mark Barash to Robert White and Bruce Nesslage, 11 July 2001, and attached 19 March 2001 settlement agreement; and Park System Resource Protection Project Completion Report Fact Sheet, 2003, NTS Fawn Lake Earthworks I, both in Deed #293, FRSP Lands Files.
57 Burks to Cooling, 13 February 1990, 3.
the Manassas mall debacle, and people declared that the “‘Park Service is in bed with
developers; they gave everything away,’” according to Johnson.\footnote{Johnson, transcript of interview, 11 December 2009, 21. See also Daryl Lease, “Area Battlefield groups Hoping to Gain Ground,” \textit{Free Lance-Star}, 24 March 1990; and FRSP Fiscal Year 1990 Budget Briefing Statement: Fawn Lake, 15 March 1990, 1, File Reading Copies March 1990, Cabinet 2, Drawer 3, FRSP Basement Files. Preservationists also decried the impending destruction of one part of the NTS development, where Longstreet’s flank attack occurred, and the mammoth sign helped crystallize that concern. Further discussion on the Longstreet flank attack area later in this chapter.}

Public opinion, in contrast, favored the overall 1989 boundary legislation. The
typical supporters, including Carter Hudgins from the Center for Historic Preservation for
Mary Washington College, sent in letters to Congress or spoke at the House hearing in July
1989. Perhaps more revealing was the statement by Charles McDaniel, president of Hilldrup
Moving and Storage located in an industrial park adjacent to the battlefield park. McDaniel
wrote the House committee chairman in May 1989 that “from my perspective in the business
community in Fredericksburg,” as past president of the local Chamber of Commerce and a
longtime resident and businessman in the area, “the expansion of the battlefields ... in our
area makes good sense.” He referred to the “sea of traffic lights and commercial intrusions”
that kept people from “mentally recreat[ing] the environment where our nation’s destiny was
determined.” There had to be “a balance between development and preservation” because,
he admitted, “almost everything we do is dependent upon the battlefields themselves.”
Fredericksburg and the surrounding counties “need[ed] a viable National Military Park as
the centerpiece of our tourist economy” and to maintain the important historical character.
He characterized the relationship between business interests and the National Park Service
as “cooperation, not confrontation” and stated that there was “substantial and wide-spread
support for this modest boundary expansion” among the business leaders of the area.
McDaniel called the expansion legislation “reasonable” and necessary for saving land, such
as that associated with Jackson’s flank attack from the “short-sighted, selfish, and ultimately
bad business” of housing developments or strip shopping centers. He closed by warning that
“we do not want to see the Manassas situation repeated in Fredericksburg.”\footnote{Charles McDaniel to Chairman, Support for HR 875, 2 May 1989, Microfiche HR 875 FRSP, NPS Legislative Affairs Office. Quotes from all three pp.}

Given that McDaniel and his representatives had recently worked out an agreement to screen a
development expansion next to the Fredericksburg battlefield, this resounding support is all
the more remarkable.\footnote{Zinck to Charles McDaniel, 31 May 1985; and McDaniel to Zinck, 3 June 1985, both in File L30 Hilldrup, Cabinet 1, Drawer 2, FRSP Break Room.}

**RELATED LANDS**

Maria Burks started as superintendent just as P. L. 101-214 boundary legislation
passed Congress and was signed on 11 December 1989 by President George H. W. Bush (see
appendix). She was at the time only one of 30 women superintendents out of more than 300
male superintendents, and she was the first woman ever to lead a Civil War battlefield park.\textsuperscript{61} Fredericksburg was her first superintendency, after having served at Independence National Historical Park [PA] and Golden Gate National Recreation Area [CA], focusing upon visitor services and cultural resources oversight.\textsuperscript{62} Raised a Quaker with liberal and idealistic sensibilities, she had always felt that what she was doing had to be “for the broader benefit of mankind.” She had marched against the Vietnam War in 1970, facing off against Park Service rangers on the National Mall. Even after being hired by that agency, she did not shy from asserting her rights. She led a protest against the uniforms women Park Service rangers had to wear, winning a class action suit by demonstrating that these uniforms, not warm enough to wear in evenings or colder weather, had kept women from getting overtime pay. She also did not shy away from criticizing Presidents Reagan and Bush for financially ignoring the national parks.\textsuperscript{63}

Burks remembered her first days at the park, with the regional director coming down to introduce her to the staff and key stakeholders in the area, then after a mere three hours heading back to his work. “I had no--there was nothing like critical results or a to-do list or anything,” Burks later laughed. “I was sitting there, gazing at the desk, wondering what the heck I was supposed to do.” She figured it out very quickly. She “was just struck with how rural it [the area] was” and how “intertwined it [the park] was with its local communities and how affected by them it [the park] was.” She knew “very quickly” that one of her most important responsibilities was “the challenge of managing the integrity of park values in that spread-out context of that park.” And that responsibility gave her a moment’s pause. “Lordy be,” she later exclaimed, “those battlefields were under tremendous pressure.” She knew from driving between the four battlefields that “the sense of place, the sense of reverence and of significance was really threatened” by urban sprawl, “and I had to hustle and get out there and see if there was any way to get out in front of the bulldozers.”\textsuperscript{64}

She also had to contend with a skeptical audience, the local communities. Park neighbors, local businesses, and area governments had generally supported the boundary expansion, but they had had a difficult time with former superintendent Jim Zinck. Burks characterized Zinck as being fairly “old-style” with carrying a big stick and not necessarily working with the communities. Burks approached her job as “everybody’s interest is legitimate and of equal value.” She didn’t want to come in and “exercise eminent domain over everywhere” but instead she worked collaboratively “to make it work, and the best way to make it work for us is if what works for us, also works for our partner.”\textsuperscript{65} She argued early on that the park’s interpretation should “excite you, anger you, make you question” and
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realize the “Ah! Factor.” She believed that her job, and that of her park staff, was “to get people to understand what they’re about to lose and get them to care” about it enough that they “want to fight for it—for their own reasons.” “If we can’t convince people that it matters,” she admitted, “then maybe it doesn’t.” That convincing had to take place in an environment that didn’t simply rely upon saying no to all development. Burks knew that that was “not a reasonable position to take.”

Burks’ approach to leading the national military park reflected an essential change happening with the National Park Service. The advent of the agency’s 75th anniversary in 1991 led to an intensive review of its responsibilities and possibilities for the future, culminating in a conference with nearly 700 participants, from the Park Service and related organizations, in Vail, CO, in October 1991. Four working groups met beginning in spring 1991 to draft documents that served as the basis for discussion within the larger congress in October. Burks served on one of those working groups, Organizational Renewal. The other working groups focused upon Park Use and Enjoyment, Environmental Leadership, and Resource Stewardship. The resulting Vail Agenda had many important recommendations and strategies for the protection and enjoyment of national parks, but one recommendation wove throughout the report: partnerships. Park managers could not sit within their boundaries and take care of their resources with hardly a glance outside their parks. They had to step into the larger community and share their expertise, ask for expertise, build relationships to aid their parks with protection and interpretation, and work collaboratively to obtain what was best for the park and for the larger community. Burks sat in a front-row-and-center seat during this conversation, and she actively sought ways to apply the Vail Agenda to her work at Fredericksburg.

Burks and her staff readily admitted that urban sprawl, in all its manifestations, and its impact on parkland provided the “biggest stumbling block to effective park management.” She continued to face varied development proposals, but her staff did not have the expertise to determine specifics about what impacts such developments would have on the park. A convenience store here or a subdivision wall there might have an impact on park resources, but park staff did not have the baseline data and monitoring expertise to articulate the exact nature of those impacts. Instead, she admitted, she tried to “bluff from a position of ‘moral right.’” She needed maps showing the relationship of different lands to park values. Then, she argued, the Park Service could work with local governments, developers, and the public before proposals came up for review. “Nothing is less effective,” she authoritatively stated, “than coming in at the eleventh hour, after a developer has spent tens of thousands of dollars,” and voicing complaints. Each park superintendent needed to build constituencies within his or her communities, she wrote, becoming “an effective and valued player” within local planning and government actions.

The Fredericksburg staff met this challenge by developing the concept of related lands. Related lands are areas outside of the park’s authorized boundaries which are important to the conservation of the physical resources and the interpretation and commemoration of the nationally significant Civil War battlefields. The idea of related lands sprang in part from the historical interests of one of the park’s longtime historian interpreters, Noel Harrison. Harrison had a strong interest in 19th-century civilian and industrial history, especially with respect to the Civil War. When he transitioned from working as a full-fledged park interpreter to the park’s first cultural resources manager, he followed the encouragement of chief historian Krick and then-historian interpreter Greene to examine sites associated with the Civil War, using diaries, letters, troop after-action reports, maps, and other primary sources. Many of these sites fell outside the national park’s boundaries. Harrison also benefitted from previous surveys done by the Works Progress Administration during the 1930s, four battlefield documentation volumes completed between 1948 and 1955 by previous park historians Ralph Happel and Francis Wilshin, and a two-volume study of the economic impact of the Civil War upon the local area by Cynthia Musselman written in 1984. Harrison identified which buildings had stood where, giving details about who had lived in or used the buildings and what the buildings had looked like. This research resulted in the publication of a two-volume *Gazetteer of Historic Sites Related to Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania National Military Park*, published in 1986 and 1989 and sponsored by Eastern National and Monument Association. Harrison examined about 150 sites of historical importance to the Civil War battles and located them (since many buildings had long since disappeared) on contemporary maps.69

Harrison’s *Gazetteer* focused on surveying resources around Fredericksburg. Other attempts looked at historically significant sites beyond the area. Greene had the APCWS conduct its own national survey to determine the location of the historic cores of battlefields. The organization assessed the integrity of each battlefield and the level of threat from development. This critical information then allowed the group to prioritize which lands to buy. APCWS purchased tracts, with funds raised from private sources, and held onto them until the federal government could accept them.70

Interior Secretary Manuel Lujan, Jr., in response to the Manassas mall debacle, also stepped in. He called upon Congress in summer 1990 to assist battlefield preservation efforts by establishing the American Battlefield Protection Program. This program would work to build partnerships with an array of private interests to preserve battlefields. Preservation might include outright purchase, but other means, including easements and cooperative agreements, offered alternative possibilities. Sen. Dale Bumpers (D-AR), responding to
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Lujan’s call, added a provision for establishing a Civil War Sites Advisory Commission to a bill to survey battlefields in the Shenandoah Valley. Civil War historians, preservationists, land-use specialists, members of Congress, and the National Park Service director served on the commission of 13 (later increased to 15). The commission’s 1993 report identified 384 battles representing all of the primary military campaigns and operations during the Civil War. The commission report assessed each site based on its existing condition and the potential threat of development. This survey and analysis served the American Battlefield Protection Program of the National Park Service in its efforts to protect these battlefields, encourage Americans to assist in the preservation and interpretation of these sites, and raise awareness of the need to continue preservation efforts.\(^{71}\)

Building upon this momentum of activity to save threatened Civil War sites, Burks established in 1990 an internal Related Lands Task Force, chaired by her assistant superintendent George Church, and he assembled an extensive resource library of books and reports on zoning and planning. This information gave Burks and Church the language and concepts they needed to address effectively various commercial rezoning proposals. Burks introduced the terms “key park values” and “compatible development” to qualify the park’s concerns about these development proposals. She admitted in her annual report for that year that park neighbors and others “did not understand why we were no longer simply saying ‘no development,’” prompting some press coverage.\(^{72}\)

These new terms helped Burks articulate the complex effects of development on the park as it stood at the crossroads with preservation. She admitted that the park in the past had made a blanket call for a 200-foot buffer around the entire park, but she now saw such a buffer as “no longer useful.”\(^{73}\) In some cases, such a buffer might be overly restrictive, in other cases, it might not protect enough. Using the concept of key park values allowed her staff to address development proposals specific to the site and propose meaningful mitigations. Key park values might include earthworks, road traces, sites of important actions, monuments, or views. This specificity then gave the park a wider understanding of how different development proposals might negatively affect the park beyond visual intrusions. Erosion, sedimentation, noise, inappropriate park use leading to damage, and
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disruption of watercourse channels all could have an adverse affect on the park. The Park Service needed to address these possible impacts and negotiate for alternative outcomes.\footnote{Burks to Wayne Taylor, 15 October 1990.}

She built bridges to the larger community by bringing some money to the table and hosting a dinner lecture, with Historic Fredericksburg Foundation and the Rappahannock Area Development Corporation. Local officials heard a noted planner speak about cluster developments as a positive alternative strategy. This effort led to more interactions, especially with the City of Fredericksburg, to help plan a citywide trail system, with Civil War sites as a component. Burks continued the VIP tours initiated by Zinck, but she added an emphasis upon how certain development proposals would negatively affect the battlefields. Burks reached out further in 1991 by hosting with Historic Fredericksburg Foundation a training program and evening lecture for the five county planning directors in the area. This event marked the first time the five planning representatives had sat down together.\footnote{Ibid., 2; Burks, transcript of interview, 4 May 2010, 4. Memorandum, Burks to Regional Director, Mid-Atlantic Region, 25 April 1990; Burks to Friend, 20 September 1990; Burks to Catharine Gilliam, 10 January 1991, both in Cabinet 2, Drawer 3, FRSP Basement Files. Melissa Jacobs, “Better Plans for a Better Community,” \textit{Free Lance-Star}, 1 November 1990. FRSP, Annual Report, 1991, 3, File A2621 Superintendent’s Annual Report 1991, Cabinet 14, Drawer 1, FRSP Basement Files.}

One important interaction, with Spotsylvania County administrator L. Kimball Payne, heightened the possibilities of the related lands concept. Payne in 1990 was beginning the arduous process of guiding the county through a comprehensive plan review and revision. Burks sent him a list of the top 10 threatened historic tracts in the county. Payne thanked her for the list, but he needed something more. He wanted a listing of historically significant sites that weren’t under immediate threat. Such a list could help the county’s “longer range planning activities so that we can try to avoid” cases when threatened parcels needed short reaction times. Payne didn’t refer to the Manassas mall crisis, but he clearly had that example in mind. He hoped the county could take “a longer view toward the protection of these resources.”\footnote{L. Kimball Payne to Burks, 2 October 1990, File L30 Related Lands 90, 91, 92, Cabinet 11, Drawer 3, FRSP Basement Files.} During this same time period, the military park responded to a request from the Spotsylvania County planning commission for a set of maps indicating sensitive viewshed areas. Burks hoped that the Park Service could create similar maps of other key park values.\footnote{Burks to Taylor, 15 October 1990, 2.}

These initial interactions with Spotsylvania County led to a multi-year set of agreements, beginning in 1991, in which Spotsylvania County requested that the Park Service provide the county critical related lands information. The county tasked the National Park Service, in the first set of agreements, to develop a related lands data base, using technical assistance from the ABPP and planning help from the NPS regional office. Harrison led this effort, identifying about 70 sites associated with the four battles located on private lands within the county. He used his \textit{Gazetteer} as the starting point for this research. The related
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lands data base actually consisted of four paper volumes. Each site had information about its historic significance, historic map and current map locations, historic resources, the values associated with the related events, a delineation of the park’s preferred direction for development, and relevant information of environmental features associated with the site. The data base included a listing of principle sources used to identify the site. The county referred to this four-volume resource to respond to land use and development proposals.  

Spotsylvania County engaged the National Park Service in further work to continue related lands studies. The American Battlefield Protection Program gave the county a $50,000 grant toward revision of the county’s comprehensive plan. The county agreed to assess, over the course of a year, the extent to which its existing zoning and subdivision regulations protected battlefield lands. The related lands study provided the necessary data about battlefield locations, and the county added growth trends and files documenting past development proposals to make informed decisions when revising its zoning. A cooperative agreement furthered this work by making the National Park Service an active participant in commenting upon development projects at the earliest stages in the review process. This 1993 arrangement, in which the Park Service sat on the county’s Preliminary Plat Review Committee, reduced the chances of the park having to come in at the eleventh hour to raise concerns.

Technological improvements also enhanced the related lands data base. The National Park Service began using GIS (Geographic Information System) to integrate different types of maps to help identify relationships. Additional funding from ABPP allowed the NPS Washington Office Cultural Resources facility to develop a comprehensive GIS database. This database layered various types of maps charting troop movements, modern tax parcels, environmental features, and the historic maps relating to the four battles and the larger county. The Park Service expected to transfer this GIS data to the county once it had its own GIS system in place. Global Positioning Systems (GPS) allowed the Washington
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office cultural resources staff to map the park’s earthworks, military road traces, house sites, and other features.  

The park’s revised Land Protection Plan (1991) demonstrated the degree to which related lands changed the communication and outreach efforts of park staff. An entire related lands section laid out that “future land use in critical areas outside” the park boundary “could be detrimental to the visitor experience” and historic resources both inside and outside the park. The LPP charted a course of cooperation in addressing this situation, stating that a “cooperative effort is needed to assess, identify, document, protect, and preserve” the remaining resources relating to park purposes. Park staff expected to work with federal, state, and local agencies and neighboring jurisdictions “to establish limits of acceptable change” and explore together innovative approaches for managing preservation and development. The Park Service readily admitted that it did not have the “desire, the financial ability, or the legal basis” to own or control all properties bordering the park. The agency was, however, “vitally interested in current land uses or potential land uses” next to or visible from the park. For this reason, park staff expected to work with local governments and property owners to develop “protective strategies that will be mutually advantageous to all concerned.” Planning commissions and land zoning controls offered the best alternatives for preservation of the area’s heritage, but the park recognized that other options may also prove fruitful.

Such cooperative negotiations required “an assertive course of community education,” and the park embarked on such a program. The Park Service, ABPP, and the Natural Lands Trust, in association with Spotsylvania County, combined their interests and talents to produce two outreach documents specific to the Fredericksburg-Spotsylvania area. One provided administrative guidelines for assisting landowners and local jurisdictions in evaluating Civil War sites. This 1995 study delineated the technical details about laws and regulations guiding determinations of development proposals. A community guide, dating from a year later, reached out to a general audience and presented different options for protecting battlefield sites while also recognizing landowners and their rights.
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Marti Leicester, who served as the park’s superintendent from November 1994 to November 1997, continued Burks’ work with related lands. Leicester, originally from California, had joined the National Park Service early in her career because she saw it as an opportunity to use education and a broad range of communication strategies to reach people and help them make decisions. She was intrigued by the relationship between education and civic life. She had started out at the NPS San Francisco and Philadelphia regional offices learning everything she could behind-the-scenes in interpretation and park management before going to Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area (CA) to help establish this new urban park. She moved on to Golden Gate National Recreation Area (CA), where she eventually left the Park Service for two years to serve as chief of program development for the Presidio. She then sought a superintendency, preferably in the Washington, DC, area near the heart of government, and she obtained the Fredericksburg job.\textsuperscript{84}

Leicester met Spotsylvania County administrator Payne early in her assignment, and that meeting helped her to understand the importance of related lands from the start. Leicester remembered Payne saying to her that “You know I can’t do anything unless the citizens want it.” He continued, according to Leicester, saying that “if you want us to protect the battlefields, you’re going to have to find a way to get the citizen input to let that happen.”\textsuperscript{85} Continued partnerships and sharing of information would help the park meet its preservation goals. Leicester also appreciated the park staff and their intimate knowledge and understanding of the park resources. She later said that the staff was “imbued with Civil War history and loved the site,” and they “knew what the related lands program meant, because they had been walking and living in that -- that was part of their blood and their heritage.”\textsuperscript{86} Leicester recognized that the park staff didn’t simply recite the events of the past; they ingested that past and tried to do everything they could to preserve that history for future generations. Related lands was a tool for that larger vision.

Park staff, led by Burks and the successor superintendents, broke new ground with the related lands approach to park preservation efforts. The Vail Agenda had encouraged the use of partnerships, as a way to take into account a charged political environment that focused attention on property rights and sought ways to reduce the federal government presence. Congress had encouraged partnerships between the National Park Service and local communities going back as far as 1961 with the establishment of Cape Cod National Seashore (MA). This enabling legislation represents the first attempt within the national park system to preserve fragile lands and local cultural and social life through a cooperative approach, in this instance between NPS and the Cape’s six towns. Other park partnerships followed at Fire Island National Seashore and Springfield Armory, as examples. President
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Reagan in 1984 signed into law the first National Heritage Area, establishing another avenue for preservation that relies upon partnerships and no federal land holdings. National Heritage Areas number 49 across the nation with the Park Service acting as a partner and technical assistant. These areas foster community stewardship by conserving natural and historical resources and boosting local economies.87

Congress further developed the idea of partnerships and the national parks in the 1990s. New Bedford Whaling National Historical Park (MA), established in 1996, allowed for little federal ownership of land and/or buildings. Instead, the National Park Service collaborated with the City of New Bedford and the related historical, cultural, and preservation organizations to manage the site. These cooperative arrangements went beyond Massachusetts to the North Slope Borough Cultural Center in Barrow, AK. Native Alaskan peoples contributed their own stories about commercial whaling and had them integrated into the historical park’s interpretive programming.88 Partnerships for pursuing related lands preservation at Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania marked a slightly different approach. At the county’s request, the park did establish formal partnerships with Spotsylvania County to address concerns about long range planning and development. But related lands went further than the partnerships themselves. Related lands encompassed a new approach for evaluating park resources within the context of the larger landscape (environmental, historical, cultural, governmental, political, and financial) surrounding the park’s units. Park staff used its vast historical and geographical knowledge to argue specifically how a development proposal had an impact upon key park values. This focus upon key values gave the park the language it needed to identify potential threats and also find satisfactory actions, agreed upon by all parties, to mitigate those threats. This approach has now become the accepted and expected one for parks to pursue. Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania NMP initiated it in the late 1980s and early 1990s.89

RELATED LANDS RESULTS

The related lands approach has worked successfully. Park staff in 1991 talked to a builder who planned to construct a coal-fired electric power generating plant in Stafford County within a critical viewshed of the Fredericksburg battlefield. Tours of the affected battlefield helped to convince the builder to move the project to another county, where the project received a favorable reception. A 1993 proposal for a large retail warehouse next to the 15th New Jersey Monument near Salem Church benefited from park input. Spotsylvania County approved the application but required that the developer move the parking lot back 75 feet to reduce intrusion on the monument. The county also approved an
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office/manufacturing/warehouse facility near a park walking trail and picnic grounds. Park staff input convinced the developer to move a utility corridor away from Civil War earthworks located on a nearby private property and to paint the facility a color that would reduce its visual intrusion on park visitors.  

Spotsylvania County administrator Payne later said that the related lands database helped to “inform the process, to give people a head’s up and to help resolve” potential development issues. He noted that the database made people aware that “there’s the real boundary and then there’s the authorized boundary and then there is the other stuff of significance that’s not even in the authorized boundary, but could raise some concerns.”

Another important partnership, this time with the United States Army Corps of Engineers, measurably raised the visibility and applicability of the related lands approach. One of the Corps’ responsibilities is ensuring the navigability of the nation’s rivers and streams, plus regulating waterways, including wetlands, to keep them from being filled. This authority comes from the 1899 Rivers and Harbors Act (Section 10) and from the 1972 Clean Water Act (Section 404). The Corps’ review of applications must consider all factors in the public interest, including economic development and environmental protection. Some applications get denied, but more often the Corps will grant a permit with stipulations and mitigations that balance preservation of the environment with economic progress. The Corps also must consider, according to the 1966 National Historic Preservation Act (Section 106), the effects of a development proposal on historic properties, either listed in the National Register of Historic Places or eligible for the register. If a development project will affect historic properties, then the Corps must consult with the State Historic Preservation Officer to assess these effects and possibly mitigate them to grant a permit. The key consideration involved reconciling interests of the involved parties over denying development. The involved parties needed to develop strategies to address the development proposal.

Harold (Hal) Wiggins started at the US Army Corps of Engineers Fredericksburg Field Office in March 1991, just as Burks and her staff recognized the possibilities of the related lands concept. Wiggins realized quickly that his ability to properly review applications and administer his permitting authority relied upon having accurate and complete data, including historical information. The Fredericksburg area, Wiggins later said, has “more blood-soaked ground” in the continental United States “where men fought and died.” The confluence of “rapid development, the suburbanization of the region,” plus the
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strain on wetlands from development projects, meant, Wiggins said, that “practically every project that’s built in this region is going to require some review by my agency.” He recalled later that Noel Harrison visited him one day, pointing out development projects needing permits that were likely on historic sites. Wiggins requested to use Harrison and the rest of the park historical staff as “interested persons” in project reviews involving Civil War-era resources. The park had the historical documentation to inform Wiggins about the history associated with those sites as an aid in addressing the permits. The related lands database served as an important resource. This relationship eventually evolved 1996 into a formal Memorandum of Understanding among the Corps of Engineers, the Park Service, the State Historic Preservation Office, and Spotsylvania County.

Harrison made clear the night-and-day difference the related lands approach gave to addressing development proposals reviewed by the Corps of Engineers. Historical review of a 1992 proposal for a shopping center and parking lot demonstrated that the land had been the site of Civil War combat that had not used fortifications. Park staff documented the event and urged for preservation of the entire site, not yet having the tools to offer appropriate mitigation. They could not point at earthworks as something to save on the site. The applicant argued successfully that total preservation was “both unfair and impractical.” This loss pushed the park staff to formulate appropriate steps that would balance development and preservation, as required under the applicable federal laws. Harrison reported on two mitigation concepts, non-development corridors and historical mitigation-banking. The former concept preserved an appropriate corridor of all landscape features, including hills, stream valleys, road traces, and fortifications. The width of the corridor generally was determined by what a typical modern visitor needed walking along a center line to experience the landscape and extrapolate its contours to the rest of the historic site. The park successfully argued for this mitigation approach in 1993 and 1995 at the Chancellorsville battlefield, resulting in both corridors being open to the public. The latter concept, historical mitigation-banking, allows a developer to use one combat area while preserving an adjacent or nearby combat site. The saved site is of equal or greater historical value than the developed site. A 1994 proposal by the City of Fredericksburg to build a storm-water retention pond in a portion of a city-owned ravine near Chancellorsville prompted application of historical mitigation-banking. The city agreed to establish a four-acre historical reserve on a nearby slope of the same ravine in exchange for building the storm-water pond.

Wiggins admitted in 1995 the value of the related lands database and involvement of the Park Service to his review authority. He wrote that the data base was “an excellent tool”
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to allow for early determination in the review process whether a proposal would have an effect on a historic resource.\textsuperscript{97} He later added that the Park Service has served as a “partner by my side, and I appreciate their help and their responsiveness and showing up to give us the best available information” on properties with development proposals.\textsuperscript{98} Harrison recalled that Wiggins “embraced its [the data base] information enthusiastically, and applied it diligently, in consultation” with park staff.\textsuperscript{99} The related lands data base expanded the number of known sites of historic significance, thereby expanding the number of times Wiggins had to invoke Section 106 review when assessing a development application.\textsuperscript{100} This fact meant that Wiggins had to find ways to balance preservation and development. He found that through his Park Service collaboration, along with the state historic preservation office, the Corps obtained over the past ten or so years mitigation steps that resulted in preservation of 824 acres of land.\textsuperscript{101}

This significant accomplishment resulted from his fair and effective application of federal regulatory law in a cooperative and collaborative environment. Wiggins emphasized that when developers come and sit at his table, “they know I’m consistent. I’ve tried not to bring any personal agenda to my review.” He knew, and developers knew, that the Section 106 review “is a process of consultation primarily; it’s not a show stopper.” Mitigation steps moved the permitting process forward, and, as Wiggins stated, “most developers are willing to proffer land to protect our Civil War resources.”\textsuperscript{102}

One local developer, the Silver Companies, has had positive interactions in recent years with the Army Corps of Engineers and the National Park Service. Chris Hornung, the chief planner and engineer for the commercial division, first met Wiggins in 1999. Hornung’s boss had told him to get all the needed permits done, as quickly as possible, for the Silver Companies’ huge entertainment and resort complex, Celebrate Virginia. Hornung sat down with Wiggins and repeated this charge. Wiggins looked right back at Hornung and said, as Hornung later remembered, “no one is going to push this project through my department. I just want to make sure to make that clear before I get started.” Hornung took away from that exchange that “the folks we were dealing with in the environmental and historic communities weren’t in any rush,” and everyone wanted to ensure that the review process “was done right versus doing it quickly.”\textsuperscript{103}

That review process resulted in several mitigation steps for the Celebrate Virginia complex. Silver Companies completed its identification of all cultural resources before
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initiating design of the 2,100-acre property. Archeological and historical research identified earthworks associated with Federal Gen. Burnside’s attempt in January 1863 to cross the Rappahannock River, a failed effort that later became known as the Mud March. The company agreed to set aside with preservation easements about 400 acres where those earthworks remained, leaving them untouched as the project proceeded. Another mitigation step included acceptance of height restrictions so that people paddling along the river would not see modern buildings. The company literally put people in boats in the middle of the river and tested the heights of balloons on the ground to determine the maximum allowable height. Silver Companies commercial division president Honaker recalled that the Park Service did not oppose the golf course also placed in the area of the Mud March, knowing that the terrain remained largely unchanged. The company added an educational component to address concerns raised by the Virginia historic resources department, putting the information from its many archeological studies onto a website to showcase Stafford County history. Each of these steps helped mitigate the effects from the development of the 2,100-acre parcel.104

Sometimes, the Silver Companies representatives found the Park Service unable to accept mitigation steps due to what the company officials called the inflexibility of the federal bureaucracy. That inflexibility, as viewed by Honaker, reflected policy and procedures for maintaining the high standards of preservation required of the agency. Honaker remembered, in one case, that when he served on the Fredericksburg Industrial Development Authority, he wanted to have the members of the authority pitch in to pay for a vegetative buffer between an industrial site and Lee Drive. The Park Service wouldn’t allow the buffer unless the authority used trees indigenous to the area, a hallmark of responsible natural resources management. Honaker, however, was incredulous, wondering if a visitor from Tennessee would really know the difference.105 Hornung referred separately to a property along Route 3 owned by the company. They would like to fix the intersection to make it work better for the proposed development, but that would involve getting a right-of-way from the Park Service. In exchange, the company would develop only a small part of the property and give the rest to the government at no cost. But Hornung admitted that the Park Service is focused on preservation. “I don’t think there’s anybody on any level of the Park Service,” he later said, “who’s able to make that kind of a deal.” The Park Service, they “own it, they control it, their mission is to protect it and never let it be developed,” Hornung explained, “so no one is ever going to do that.” Yet, here was an opportunity in Hornung’s mind, “where the net benefit is enormous” down the road. Hornung shrugged and said, maybe the Park Service has that ability to trade, “maybe we just haven’t approached the right


105 Honaker, transcript of interview, 4 February 2010, 8.
folks” to achieve that end. The Park Service had to implement its preservation mission to the highest level even if that meant not always meeting the developers halfway.106

MORE BOUNDARY LEGISLATION

The presidential ink had hardly dried on the 1989 park boundary expansion when Burks faced the next preservation challenge, back at Fawn Lake. NTS Corporation’s construction of the huge brick entrance wall announcing its new residential resort provoked an immediate negative response from historic preservationists and Civil War enthusiasts. Annie Snyder, who had helped stop the Manassas mall with her Save the Battlefield Coalition, joined hands with Will Greene from the Association for Preservation of Civil War Sites, Bruce Craig at the National Parks and Conservation Association, and other groups. As Greene later remembered, the brick wall was a “hideous and unnecessary intrusion” on the historic scene, dwarfing everything else. Greene said later that he saw the situation as an “opportunity to build relationships and partnerships with other sister organizations.”107 The preservationists opposed development of a 435-acre tract associated with Longstreet’s Flank Attack during the Battle of the Wilderness. NTS planned to build more than a hundred homes on this tract, east of Longstreet Drive. Congressional staffer Huyck and NPS chief historian Ed Bearss had discussed this tract when assessing which lands to include in the boundary expansion.108 Congress ultimately declined to include this acreage. Burks later characterized this decision as one made “by a stern sense of caution” that did not want the bill’s scope to exceed what the current “political environment” could bear.109 Former superintendent Jim Zinck told reporters in 1989 that Congress included what was “deemed politically feasible as well as practical” for passage.110 Denis Galvin, NPS Associate Director of Planning and Development, reported in July 1992 to the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources that the land under dispute had already been part of a platted subdivision and slated for immediate development, and Congress had thus decided in 1989 not to

106 Hornung, transcript of interview, 4 February 2010, 18.
107 A. Wilson Greene, conversation with the author, 4 February 2011.
109 Memorandum, Burks to Regional Director, Mid-Atlantic Region, 13 March 1991, 1, File Reading Copies March 1991, Cabinet 2, Drawer 3, FRSP Basement Files.
include the parcel. No one questioned the historic value of the tract, with Burks stating that its historical significance was a matter of “indisputable record.”

The preservation groups asked for the National Park Service to re-open the conversation about the tract. Burks agreed to explain the situation to NTS and put the company in touch with the non-profits, but she also explained that the Park Service’s public position was embodied in the 1989 boundary expansion law. She did note in March of that year that she hoped NTS would appreciate the “substantial discomfort that determined preservationists will cause” the company because of their historical concerns. The Manassas mall example continued to sit in people’s minds. Discussions between NTS and the preservationists resulted by summer 1990 with NTS agreeing to sell the disputed tract. Spotsylvania County officials signaled privately that they would agree to the arrangement, pending their approval of the revised plat for Fawn Lake. Newly appointed Interior Secretary Manuel Lujan responded to these negotiations by adding Wilderness battlefield to his top 25 endangered battlefields. Lujan supported the coalition of non-profits, developers, and local and federal government officials working to save the tract, an idea he highlighted with his American Battlefield Protection Program. He visited the battlefield and the disputed site in August 1990, stating during his tour that the federal government could not buy the tract, for lack of authority, “so, we try to be a catalyst to people putting up their portion.” Craig from NPCA stated that the non-profits needed to know how far the federal government would go, and in what role, so that they could act accordingly. They did not want to raise the necessary millions of dollars to acquire the site and then face a situation in which the Park Service could not accept the land because Congress had not amended the boundary.

Rep. D. French Slaughter (R-VA) and Sen. John Warner (R-VA) each introduced bills in their respective houses for expanding the park’s authorized boundary. These bills allowed for a total of 560 acres added to the Wilderness battlefield. (Figure 122) Other tracts, in addition to the Longstreet flank attack site, generated increased interest for inclusion. Congress had omitted them in 1989 due to the political environment, even though “their historic value merited inclusion” within the park. Two of these tracts (a total of about 60 acres) sat along Brock Road and contained Federal fortifications used as defense against Longstreet’s flank attack. Another 55-acre tract bordered Grant’s headquarters on the

112 Memorandum, Burks to Regional Director, Mid-Atlantic Region, 13 March 1991, 1.
115 Scott Rafshoon, “Interior Secretary Visits Wilderness,” Free Lance-Star, 2 August 1990. See also Memorandum, George Church to Regional Director, Mid-Atlantic Region, 2 August 1990, File Reading Copies August 1990, Cabinet 2, Drawer 3, FRSP Basement Files. Rafshoon reported that NPS chief historian Bearss called the Longstreet flank attack site six times more important than the William Center tract at Manassas.
historic Orange Turnpike, where the Federals held a final line against Confederate Gen. John B. Gordon’s attack and where the Sixth Corps field hospital had stood. The bills stipulated that the Park Service could only accept the land by donation, relying upon the preservation groups or another benefactor to make the purchases. Acceptance of these donations required the necessary legislated boundary modifications.

Lingering concerns by at least one of the congressional committees delayed acceptance of the boundary expansion, but finally on 27 October 1992, President Bush signed the act into law. The congressional committee had feared that the federal government would end up using funds to purchase the Longstreet flank attack site although other higher priority tracts may have needed the money. The donation requirement in P. L. 102-541 (see appendix) helped address these concerns. Burks noted that a “sharp change in the political environment” had made the legislation possible. Both Orange and Spotsylvania County had expressed support for the boundary adjustment. Spotsylvania County administrator Payne wrote to the Department of the Interior that Spotsylvania “encourage[d] passage” of the bill “to preserve this historic ground.” The local newspaper also supported the legislation. The Free Lance-Star’s editor wrote as early as August 1990 that preservation needed a “concerted effort” with corporations and private individuals joining with local and federal governments “to protect historically valuable places.”

The next seven years resulted in no donation of the critical Longstreet flank attack site owned by NTS. The New York-based Trust for Public Land offered NTS in 1992 $2.7 million for the 450 acres, but NTS rejected the offer. The other preservation organizations failed to raise additional sums to bolster this offer. The 55-acre tract at Grant’s headquarters did end up being donated to the Park Service, but the NTS parcel and the other two (totaling about 60 acres) along Brock Road remained privately owned. Congress did attempt to address the stalemated situation in 1998 by allowing for the federal government to purchase the lands, but the bill failed to make it into the federal budget bill passed by the Senate. NTS that year had submitted a rezoning application to the Spotsylvania Board of Supervisors, wanting to add more lots to the Fawn Lake development. This action complicated matters because NTS did not include in its rezoning request any mention of preservation attempts of the disputed land. Fredericksburg superintendent Sandy Rives acknowledged that Congress

---
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probably recognized the controversial nature of the situation and decided it was running out of time and couldn’t deal with the local situation while trying to get the budget bill passed.\textsuperscript{122}

Rives worked with the Spotsylvania Board of Supervisors and NTS to resolve the situation. NTS’s rezoning request essentially asked for cluster developing by increasing the density of residential units in one area to make up for the expected loss of another area to preservation. Rives pointed out to the Board of Supervisors, though, that NTS never guaranteed open space preservation if it obtained the cluster zoning. The county’s comprehensive plan required such land preservation for permission to use a cluster development model. Rives sought to make clear that he did not want the National Park Service seen as an opponent to the rezoning application. He argued instead that the park saw this situation as a “magnificent opportunity to fulfill the vision of the comprehensive plan.” He urged the Board to “seize this opportunity by stipulating” that NTS give a written assurance for the “perpetual protection” of the Longstreet flank attack site.\textsuperscript{123}

NTS agreed to a set of proffers in exchange for obtaining the rezoning request. Key concessions included giving the National Park Service three years to obtain the necessary legislation and appropriation to purchase the site. After three years, NTS had the right to begin development of the tract, done in phases that would start closest to the rest of the Fawn Lake development. NTS won the right to add 149 more housing units and add an upscale restaurant and some shops to the golf and lake resort community. Fawn Lake so far had completed 200 homes and sold about 300 lots over the past decade. A sluggish economy, especially during the first half of the decade, contributed to this slow pace, and NTS hoped that the rezoning would spur more sales.\textsuperscript{124} Assistant superintendent John Hennessy said, in response to the news of the proffer agreement that “We will work our collective tails off over the next three years” to get the tract added to the park.\textsuperscript{125}

Rep. Bateman and Sen. Warner introduced bills in May 1999 to their respective houses to allow acquisition of the tracts by purchase. Bateman urged immediate action, stating “we are running out of time” due to the three-year window of opportunity. The House added specific language to require purchase from a willing seller and then voted in October 1999 to approve the bill. The Senate followed suit a month later, and President Bill
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Clinton signed the bill into law on 9 December 1999. P. L. 105-150 (see appendix) gave the Park Service the ability to begin the process of appraisal and negotiations.\(^{126}\) Hennessy enthusiastically stated that “we’re deliriously happy” to have the legislation in place, at the end of the second year of the three-year window for action.\(^{127}\)

NTS proved itself an assertive negotiator. The company maintained that it had “supported the acquisition interest” of the Park Service and preservation organizations. Its corporate officials, however, also emphasized that they had a fiduciary commitment to its investors to obtain the “maximum financial result while managing the asset to its highest and best use.”\(^{128}\) Differences over appraisal techniques and thus the worth of the land extended talks into 2002. The two sides came to an agreement in April 2002, with the federal government paying $6.1 million for the 456-acre tract. The Park Service had obtained the $6 million in the Department of the Interior’s fiscal 2001 appropriation bill. NPS realty officer Boyd Sponaugle said with pride that the Park Service will be acquiring a “piece of land that’s been virtually unchanged since the Civil War.”\(^{129}\) Sponaugle, according to superintendent Leicester, loved Civil War sites, and he put “his heart and soul” into land acquisition efforts, convincing the regional office to put high priorities on them.\(^{130}\) To its credit, NTS never tried to artificially inflate the land’s value (as other developers in the region had done) by initiating construction on the historic land.

**LAND ACQUISITION AND FRIENDS**

The park acquired more than 1,500 acres of land between 1990 and 2002, an impressive achievement given the realities of urban sprawl in the crossroads area of Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania. The 1989 law with the section allowing for acceptance of donated conservation easements also protected lands outside the authorized boundary. The Conservation Fund in 1991 purchased undeveloped land along Jackson Trail East at Chancellorsville. This land, about 142 acres, sat outside the park boundary but had an access which the park needed to extinguish. The Fund donated the land to Spotsylvania County, which then donated a conservation easement to the national military park to restrict
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\(^{128}\) Memorandum, Michael Hannon to Rebel Powell, 6 February 2000, 1, File W38 Legislation WBF Boundary Adjustment, Cabinet 1, Drawer 2, FRSP Break Room.
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development to nature trails and the like. In this first-time partnership, the county gained new green space and protection of a valuable watershed near a reservoir, the Fund protected wooded areas, and the park achieved important screening along the Jackson Trail. The Conservation Fund repeated its efforts in 1993, purchasing more than 250 acres threatened for residential subdivision. Spotsylvania County accepted the donated land and the military park accepted the conservation easement, plus the extinguishment of two additional accesses.\textsuperscript{131}

Friends groups aided the park during this time period, providing critical funds in speedy fashion to obtain threatened parcels. They then donated or sold the lands to the federal government, once the government could accept them. The Conservation Fund, as a further example, purchased in 1994 an 80-acre tract at Chancellorsville facing development. The park then bought the tract from the Fund once it obtained funding the year later.\textsuperscript{132} The Fund, based in northern Virginia, reaches out across the country to mesh economic goals with environmental protection. Other national organizations have also stepped in to save lands before developers could bulldoze them. The Association for the Preservation of Civil War Sites, started in 1987 in Fredericksburg but with a national focus, obtained through donation a small parcel (0.14 acres) running along the edge of Hazel Run behind the National Cemetery. APCWS intended to donate the tract to the park.\textsuperscript{133} After this organization in 1999 combined with the Civil War Trust to become the Civil War Preservation Trust, this new organization (now recently renamed the Civil War Trust) also partnered with the park to preserve lands. The most important preservation success with CWPT came in 2006 when the organization acquired the Slaughter Pen Farm, 208 acres on the Fredericksburg battlefield. The main Federal line had crossed this land in December 1862 to attack Stonewall Jackson’s Corps. This land remains outside the park boundary and is owned by the Trust.\textsuperscript{134}

Local friends groups also made substantial contributions to the park’s land acquisition and resource management efforts. Superintendent Leicester built on initial forays by her predecessor. The park won in 1995 a competitive grant from the American Battlefield Protection Program to hire a consultant from Partners in Parks to foster establishment of a friends group. Park Chief of Maintenance Brian Dendis also explored partnerships, building an elder hostel program that provided maintenance and helped the national cemetery. Robert and Lee Ann Williams, residents of Lake Wilderness, responded


\textsuperscript{133} Memorandum, Burks to Regional Director, Mid-Atlantic Region, 12 July 1990, 1, File Reading Copies July 1990, Cabinet 2, Drawer 3, FRSP Basement Files. A Wilson Greene, conversation with the author, 4 February 2011. The author needs confirmation that this donation took place.

enthusiastically to the call for partnerships. Friends of the Wilderness Battlefield began in 1995 as an ad hoc committee of the Lake Wilderness Property Owners Association. Its members did not try to raise funds with other non-profits to try and obtain from NTS the Longstreet flank attack site. FOWB instead focused upon interpretation and resources. Members took on regular trash pickups and trail improvement projects. They also offered walking tours of Saunder’s Field and Widow Tapp farm. They eventually focused upon Ellwood (described in chapter six) and raised significant amounts of money to help with the historic house restoration and develop tours of the building and grounds. This friends group made it possible to open Ellwood to the public for the first time in 1998, and the continued restoration and interpretation of this building relies upon this generous group. Leicester enthusiastically responded to the founding of FOWB, saying that the park had wanted to build community support, and “here comes Robert Williams, and he’s already gotten a start on it.” She went on to acknowledge that “I was delighted to see this kind of civic involvement.”  

The Friends of Fredericksburg Battlefield started in 1996, following the leadership example of Friends of the Wilderness Battlefield.  

A new local land trust came into existence in 1996, dramatically enriching the preservation opportunities in the Fredericksburg area. Local people committed to the Civil War heritage of the area launched the Central Virginia Battlefields Trust to help the Park Service obtain a newly advertised property, Montfort on Willis Hill. Enos Richardson, a lawyer who focused on trusts and estates, served as the first president. Other founders included John Mitchell, who owned the Made in Virginia store in downtown Fredericksburg; Erik Nelson, who served as a city planner; James Pates, the city attorney; and Anne Rowe, wife of the publisher of the local newspaper. They decided from the beginning to outright purchase, not pursue easements of, Civil War battlefield land in the area to add to the national park. Fee ownership gave the protection from a law enforcement point of view. The founders took an expansive approach to finding funding sources, taking their campaign across the country, probably in recognition of the national significance of the parklands and the fact that every state of the Union and Confederacy had sent soldiers to fight in these battles. Richardson later joked that their fundraising technique may be summarized as the “simple answer is we pray for it, and the flip answer is we walk down the street and hope something is going to fall out of a tree,” but, he acknowledged, “it’s extremely difficult.”

---
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Leicester remembered that the trust drew upon the park’s knowledgeable staff, including chief historian Bob Krick, chief ranger Mike Johnson, and assistant superintendent John Hennessy, who first came to the park in 1995. She also arranged some training, by bringing in the head of the Pennsylvania Land Trust to share ideas and strategies.\(^{140}\)

CVBT quickly left its preservation mark on the surrounding landscape. The fledgling organization joined forces with the Civil War Trust to purchase the 8.5-acre Willis Hill tract next to the national cemetery. This property had served for three decades as a parochial school run by a New-York based nun’s order. Chief park historian Krick reported the impending sale to the prime prospective buyer, Mary Washington College, in a “really truly important memo” to Leicester, noting the “daunting, petrifying threat to Montfort.” Krick relayed what he had heard, that the college was “in the driver’s seat to buy” the Montfort land and that college officials intended to build athletic fields on the site (they later said they would build an alumni center and offices). He argued that this scenario would be a “disaster far beyond mitigation,” by destroying forever the only remaining stretch of the Confederate main line atop Marye’s Heights and replacing those fortifications with playing fields that would disrupt the park visitor experience and “thoroughly vitiate efforts to do anything of quality nearby.” He also believed that the loss would tarnish the Park Service’s record, leaving the agency “hard pressed to stand up for the sanctity of the boundary” in other areas, especially in less friendly Spotsylvania County.\(^{141}\)

Negotiations quickly ensued. The Park Service could not make an offer above the appraised value, so the Civil War Trust and the CVBT stepped in to meet the offer by the college. Behind-the-scenes talks with the nuns, part of the Daughters of Wisdom, emphasized the value of selling to the National Park Service, which had a public educational and stewardship mission different from that of the college.\(^{142}\) The waiting in late 1996 left everyone on pins and needles. Hennessy admitted that “it’s all in the hands of the Daughters of Wisdom.” This organization wanted to expand its presence in the Fredericksburg area and open a larger school nearby, prompting their sale of the property.\(^{143}\) The nuns chose the Park Service in January 1997. Officially, the Civil War Trust (with help from CVBT) purchased the property for $1.65 million from the nun’s order. The Park Service then closed with the Trust for $1.52 million.\(^{144}\) The park hosted a special celebration in June of that year, with noted Civil War historian James McPherson speaking. Richardson told the audience of
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about 150 people that “we believe these places are the soul of our country,” giving the CVBT reason enough to help save them.\textsuperscript{145}

The CVBT built on this stunning success, which measurably raised its visibility beyond a local non-profit to one with a national membership. The Ashley family at Chancellorsville decided it was ready in 1997 to sell its 99-acre parcel adjacent to McLaws Drive and inside the park boundary. The Park Service could not go above the appraised value and meet the firm asking price of $450,000. Richardson noted later that the price seemed high at the time, but with so much interest in development out there, the prices kept rising.\textsuperscript{146} The CVBT raised $100,000 to put down on a loan for the rest. The organization had to pay off the loan by spring 1998, a dicey situation. Richardson told the local newspaper, though, that “if you don’t take the risk, you lose the gem.”\textsuperscript{147} The Park Service paid the CVBT $420,000 in May 1998, and the non-profit raised the additional money through continued fundraising. The non-profit hosted a large reenactment on the property in early May 1998. About 500 reenactors set up a living-history encampment and reenacted the Jackson flank attack. Former NPS chief historian Ed Bearss spoke.\textsuperscript{148} Fellow CVBT founder John Mitchell, a local businessman, recognized that parcels along Route 3 were “ripe for sprawling development.” The CVBT needed to act immediately or risk losing this particular property. Mitchell admitted that “I got emotional when I saw this place and knew that what we dreamed was accomplished.” He felt a “numb feeling of pride” for being part of its preservation.\textsuperscript{149}

The park also found congressional friends to funnel urgent money to land acquisition funds. Sandy Rives, who came back to Fredericksburg in 1998 as superintendent, used connections he had cultivated while serving in the Washington office and later while at Shenandoah National Park that aided Fredericksburg. Rives, originally from Keswick, VA, had started out with the United States Coast Guard, had moved to the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, and then transferred into the short-lived Heritage Conservation Recreation Service under the Carter administration. The Reagan administration abolished this agency, and Rives was swept into the National Park Service, staying in the Washington office until Congress decided to reduce the federal bureaucracy. Rives became the management
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Rives brought in millions of dollars for land acquisition. He and the park staff made clear that Congress “need[ed] to purchase these lands quickly or they’ll be developed.”\footnote{Rives, as quoted by Elizabeth Pezzullo, “Green Light for Battlefield,” \textit{Free Lance-Star}, 2 November 2000.} Rives knew after the boundary expansions that “the only way we were going to protect the boundary was to get money and to buy the lands.” He put together a list of tracts that seemed most likely they would go up for sale soon, he assigned a dollar value, and then he went to Congress to “say these are our needs.” He used the relationships he had developed previously with staff members for Senators John Warner and Chuck Robb (D-VA), plus Rep. Herb Bateman (R-VA).\footnote{Rives, transcript of interview, 19 February 2010, 8.} Chief ranger Mike Johnson later said that Rives knew “everybody in the state. Everybody knows him. So he was wonderful because he had connections,” that helped the park. Johnson also had watched Rives in action and admitted that “Sandy could stand up in front of a board and make them -- he could sell them the Brooklyn Bridge from here. He was just smooth.”\footnote{Johnson, transcript of interview, 11 December 2009, 28.} Rives was more modest. He admitted later that it “would be naïve if [people] didn’t understand the fact that the [congressional] staff asked questions saying, if you had the ability to buy these particular parcels, what would it cost?” He provided the needed information, and “if the money shows up in the budget, it shows up in the budget.”\footnote{Rives, transcript of interview, 19 February 2010, 8-9. Quote on p. 9.} He was very good at getting that money, obtaining $5.5 million in 1998 alone.\footnote{FRSP, \textit{Annual Report}, 1998, 1, File A2621 Annual Reports, Cabinet 14, Drawer 1, FRSP Basement Files. The author needs confirmation of the total land acquisition money Rives obtained.}

Outside events eventually helped the park’s cause. The Virginia Department of Transportation in 1995 formally initiated a study of a proposed Outer Connector, extending west of I-95 from southern Stafford County, crossing the Rappahannock River, and entering northern Spotsylvania County. VDOT had considered since the late 1970s the idea for an additional roadway between Stafford and Spotsylvania, and the two counties plus the City of Fredericksburg had supported in 1981 its further study. No funds became available, but in 1993 Stafford County obtained permission for an additional interchange on the interstate, and this development revived interest in an Outer Connector. State and federal transportation authorities submitted in 1997 a draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and in 2001 a supplemental DEIS. The DEIS evaluated five alternative roadways, with four of them requiring an additional crossing of the Rappahannock River (the other route would have used the existing I-95 crossing). Each alternative would travel south of Route 627 in
Stafford County, cross Route 17, and terminate on Route 3 in Spotsylvania County, either at the May 1 Chancellorsville battlefield or at Zoan Church. The studies cited increased traffic and transportation needs in the area as reasons for the new roadway. Ultimately, highway planners envisioned the Outer Connector as part of a beltway around Fredericksburg.\footnote{The author thanks City of Fredericksburg Senior Planner Erik Nelson for describing the major issues related to the Outer Connector proposal and providing associated documents. The following documents are from the City of Fredericksburg’s Planning Department, with copies of relevant pages kept in FRSP Admin History Files. US Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and VDOT, Outer Connector Study Draft Environmental Impact Statement and Section 4(F) Evaluation, 1997, 1-7, 1-8, Exhibit 2-9; FWHA and VDOT, Outer Connector Study Northwest Quadrant Supplemental Draft EIS and Section 4(F) Evaluation, 2001.}

Many different governmental and non-profit organizations cited concerns throughout the study process. The National Park Service focused its response on the impacts of the proposal, not the proposal itself. Traffic concerns through the park, potential damage to park resources, and damage to nearby historic resources, including the May 1 Chancellorsville battlefield outside the park’s authorized boundary, all informed the park response. John Hennessy, appointed in 1995 as the park’s Assistant Superintendent for Planning and Related Lands, served as the main point person. Superintendent Marti Leicester in her 1997 response to VDOT’s study argued that “it is almost certain that a virtual city” will appear at the terminus of the proposed roadway on Route 3, due to ancillary development.\footnote{Martha K. Leicester to Ken Wilkinson, 26 March 1997, 1-2, Erik Nelson documents, FRSP Admin History Files. Quote on p. 2. Wilkinson served as VDOT’s Environmental Program Planner.}

A 1997 proposal to build a golf course and residential-retail-office complex on about 60 acres of the May 1 battlefield verified the park’s concerns and added increased urgency to the situation. The United States Army Corps of Engineers emphasized its alarm that the DEIS did not adequately consider the potential negative effects of the Outer Connector upon historic and cultural resources nor upon the unique corridor of riparian lands owned by the City of Fredericksburg along the Rappahannock River. The Corps argued that “this region of Virginia has one of the greatest concentrations of historic resources per square mile” in the United States and in Virginia, requiring careful evaluation. Plus, the publically available riparian lands provided a unique-to-the-East Coast unbroken visual experience of riverine forests extending 23 miles west of the City of Fredericksburg along a state designated Scenic River.\footnote{Robert H. Reardon, Jr. to Roberto Fonseca-Martinez, FWHA Division Administrator, 30 November 1997, 2, Erik Nelson documents, FRSP Admin History Files.} The Friends of the Rappahannock argued that the proposed roadway would not meet current and future traffic needs and instead would cause “major threats to the region’s quality of life and heritage.”\footnote{R. Thomas Van Arsdall and Rita G. Van Arsdall to Earl T. Robb, VDOT Environmental Administrator, 28 December 1997, 5, Erik Nelson documents, FRSP Admin History Files.}

The National Trust for Historic Preservation brought a national audience to the seemingly dire situation by naming the Chancellorsville battlefield to its list of the 11 most endangered historic sites in 1998. This attention spurred giving by Congress and individuals.
The Trust wrote to the federal highway administration in 2001, arguing that all five alternative roadways would “slice through the historic districts, irreparably altering their character and the integrity of their battlefields.” Once a highway came through, the Trust argued, “these lands will never again possess the historic character” of today.\footnote{Elizabeth S. Merritt, National Trust’s Deputy General Counsel to Roberto Fonseca-Martinez and Earl T. Robb, 1 August 2001, 3, Erik Nelson documents, FRSP Admin History Files.}

The City of Fredericksburg laid out as early 1994 its multiple concerns regarding the proposed roadway.\footnote{The city had supported in 1981 study of a beltway, but subsequent experience had convinced the city to change its perspective on the idea.} The city argued that as a result of its official federal standing as a central city following the 1990 census, any proposed transportation changes, as delineated under the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA), had to take into account the social and economic effects on the central city. The Outer Connector, the city argued, would pull economic activity west along Route 3, away from the city. The city had already experienced severe negative consequences from the placement of US Route 1 and I-95 away from Fredericksburg’s downtown, and the city only recovered economically by annexing the new major intersection created by those roadways. The city would not have that option available to it with most of the proposed Outer Connector alternatives. The city also noted that the proposed roadway would cross watersheds where the potential remained high of threatening water supplies. Plus, the city owned approximately 5,000 acres of riparian lands within the city limits and extending into Spotsylvania, Stafford, Orange, Culpeper, and Fauquier Counties. These lands provided unparalleled natural and recreational experiences for boating and fishing that the proposed connector would impact with regard to water, air, visual, and noise pollution.\footnote{Marvin S. Bollinger, Fredericksburg City Manager, to L. Kimball Payne, III, Spotsylvania County Administrator and C. M. Williams, Jr., Stafford County Administrator, 25 April 1994; Erik F. Nelson to Ken Wilkinson, 25 August 1997; Bollinger to Wilkinson, 15 January 2002, all in Erik Nelson documents, FRSP Admin History Files.}

The city’s role as a central city and owner of the riparian lands proved the major factor in determining the outcome of the Outer Connector proposal. The city council in late June 2001 passed two key resolutions. The first one recommended the No Build alternative for the Outer Connector study due to environmental and economic impacts. The second resolution formally designated the city’s riparian lands as “a publicly owned recreation area, a wildlife and waterfowl refuge, and historic area of national, state and local significance” and directed city staff to update the Rappahannock River Watershed Plan to administer the lands accordingly. This second resolution used language necessary to meet the requirements of Section 4(f) of the 1966 Department of Transportation Act, which prohibited DOT agencies from using any public park land, as defined by the act, unless there is no feasible alternative and the action includes all planning to minimize this use of the land. The federal highway authority in December 2001 determined that the city’s designation of the riparian lands qualified the lands for protection under Section 4(f). Any river crossing by a proposed Outer
Connector would face heightened scrutiny and innumerable obstacles, which effectively killed the proposal.\footnote{Quote from City of Fredericksburg, Resolution 01-43; City of Fredericksburg, Resolution 01-42, both dated 26 June 2001; Ken Wilkinson to Marvin S. Bolinger, 4 December 2001, 1, all in Erik Nelson documents, FRSP Admin History Files.}

One local developer held out hope. A 2002 proposal by Dogwood Development would build a “Chancellorsville Town” on the site of the proposed golf course. The town idea would have included 2,350 homes and 2-3 million square feet of office and retail space on the 770-acre tract, owned by funeral-home business owner John Mullins. Dogwood developer Ray Smith predicted the town would generate 70,000 vehicle trips per day, and the Park Service worried that the Virginia highway department would require making Route 3 an eight-lane road through Chancellorsville battlefield, further gobbling up precious park land. Voters in Spotsylvania County had already voted out the supervisors who had supported the Outer Connector and had elected new members to the Board of Supervisors sympathetic to the values of an intact riparian corridor and to the Civil War park’s plight. The supervisors also recognized that the Outer Connector proposal had effectively been squashed with the Section 4(f) designation of the riparian lands. The County rejected the Chancellors Town proposal, and in 2004 the regional transportation plan had also removed the Outer Connector options that included a river crossing. The Civil War Preservation Trust and Central Virginia Battlefields Trust stepped in and brokered a deal with Tricord developers and Mullins, purchasing 140 acres of the most historic land, to be set aside. The deal allowed a subdivision of 300 homes, set back from Route 3 behind a swell of land. The Outer Connector proposal and subdivision development in the late 1990s and early 2000s generated national attention and brought money into the park to acquire what land it could.\footnote{“Road May Carve Hallowed Ground,” National Parks, May-June 1998, 18-19. Elizabeth Pezzullo, “National Exposure Aids Effort to Save Battlefield,” 15 February 1999; Elizabeth Pezzullo, “Site Gets Top Status,” 15 June 1998, both in Free Lance-Star. Deborah Fitts, “Huge Development Proposed at Chancellorsville,” Civil War News, August 2002. John Hennessy, personal communication with the author, 26 March 2010, FRSP Admin History Files. Marcus, transcript of interview, 27 May 2010, 8-11. Christopher Shea, “Fighting Back,” Preservation, May/June 2010, 30. Rachel F. Seidman, “Chancellorsville Battlefield,” accessed June 2011 at http://www.thehistorychannelclub.com/articles/article-type/article-view/article-id/97/chancellorsville-battlefield. Erik Nelson, personal communication with the author, 27 June 2011, FRSP Admin History Files.}

Rives understood that with this money, he had to make sure he spent it. He later said that “I took upon as my major responsibility to buy the land.” He worked with the regional office lands staff, which he found “was very supportive,” and they did the appraisals and made the offers. These purchases included ones already discussed, such as the Longstreet flank attack site for $6.1 million, and the Ashley tract for more than $400,000. Rives also oversaw the purchase of land at the Jackson flank attack site at Chancellorsville.\footnote{Rives, transcript of interview, 19 February 2010, 9. See also FRSP, Annual Report, 1998, 2; FRSP, Annual Report, 1999, 2; and FRSP, Annual Report, 2000, 2, all in File A2621 Annual Reports, Cabinet 14, Drawer 1, FRSP Basement Files.}
Chief ranger Mike Johnson aided in the acquisition of less high-profile sites. Johnson adopted a course of action that he called “slow and steady.” He sat down and talked with residents with lands inside the park boundary. He built connections and sought to convince property owners “very quietly and subtly that selling to the National Park Service was the big thing.” One woman had a disabled brother who lived with her and needed care. Johnson would stop by and go talk with the brother in his shed behind the house. The brother would putter around fixing small engines, and Johnson would just talk and build up trust. Eventually that trust led the woman to agree to sell her property, using the relocation funds to set her brother up elsewhere. This land was the park’s first purchase in the Jackson flank attack site, an integral site. “But it was a long, slow process,” Johnson admitted. He stayed patient with the lands program because he figured the land wasn’t going anywhere. Unless the owners planned to build a McDonald’s on their property, Johnson figured he could “go easy about this.”

Johnson’s approach meant that the park fostered relationships and built a kind of partnership between the park and residents. Johnson recalled that “I knew every one of those people. I was welcomed into their homes. I could knock on their doors. My rangers could knock on their doors” without fear of a gun going off. This trusting environment, according to Johnson, “spoke in volumes of the success of this park and its lands program because we had a very steady pace of purchasing lands.” Congress kept giving the park money, and residents agreed to sell to the park. Land acquisition happened at “a nice steady pace,” and it was “uncontroversial here. The people that sold land to us were our biggest advocates.” They were willing sellers. Johnson did know of some property owners, though, who hated the Park Service for its lands program. He gave the example of Bobby Landram, whose father had sold land to the War Department at Spotsylvania battlefield. Landram argued, according to Johnson, that the federal government had stole that land because it had paid so little in the 1930s in comparison to what the land was worth in the 1990s. Johnson argued that Landram’s father had willingly sold his land, but “Bobby never got over that.” He continued to see the park as stealing his family’s land.

**PROTECTION AND MANAGEMENT**

Land acquisition brought more historic sites into the park, requiring protection by the park’s rangers. Urban sprawl and the resulting rise in subdivisions eating up farmland meant that the park’s boundaries often jutted up against residences. Ranger Mike Greenfield, who started at Fredericksburg in late 1986 and retired in 2004, noted that these quarter-acre house lots brought many more people into contact with the park boundary and often resulted in infringements. Bulldozers constructing the houses unintentionally backed into earthworks along the border due to lack of maneuvering space. Children living in the houses sought play areas and found an inviting park with earthworks that made great forts.

---

167 Ibid., 11-12.
The entire federal line of earthworks running through Wilderness battlefield presented an “almost hopeless” situation. Greenfield shook his head saying, “the bulldozers on one side building houses would almost meet the bulldozers on the other side like that, and the trench work was in between and was eliminated.” Permanent protection staff remained set at seven commissioned rangers, the same number since 1986, but a 1994 assessment had concluded the park needed almost 12 rangers. Increased reporting functions and training requirements by 2000 had effectively reduced the seven rangers’ duty time. Scheduling in these requirements plus annual leave often resulted in only one person on duty at a time, a serious safety violation. Visitors would see the green and gray uniform if they went to the two park visitor centers, but if they drove the battlefields, they rarely saw a ranger patrolling. This situation left the park’s resources vulnerable.

Protection of archeological resources gained increased attention beginning in the late 1980s. Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania military park preserved four battlefields, but these lands had also hosted winter encampments between 1862 and 1864, exponentially increasing the possibility of artifacts being left for later generations to uncover. Relic hunting became an increasing resource threat as the prices for artifacts rose significantly, reflecting increased numbers of people collecting authentic items. Collectors could choose from “dug” items or heirloom pieces that had been passed down in families. Dug items usually came from legal collecting on private land, but battlefield parks also provided an attractive alternative for relic hunters willing to break the law. Fredericksburg’s extensive land holdings and the historic longtime Civil War occupation made the park ripe for illegal digging. The problem dated back decades. Former superintendent Oscar Northington reported in the 1950s that extensive mine detecting had taken place in the park, especially at Chancellorsville and Spotsylvania Court House. Ranger Greenfield had a special interest in archeological resources, and he pursued protection of the park’s archeological resources.

The park during Greenfield’s tenure largely used the Archeological Resources Protection Act of 1979 as a means of prosecuting individuals caught relic hunting in the park. ARPA provided the legal means for protecting the archeological sites and resources on federal and tribal lands. Fredericksburg distinguished itself with its targeted and effective use of ARPA over the years. The park successfully prosecuted 13 individuals under ARPA and an additional 32 individuals for archeological theft or damage under 36 CFR (Code of Federal Regulations, series 36 for the national parks) between 1986 and 2000. This success, probably the most cases by any NPS unit, led the park to receive special ARPA funding for further resource protection. ARPA enforcement is labor intensive requiring scheduling of rangers to

169 Ibid., 4-5. FRSP, Law Enforcement Needs Assessment, March 2000, 11-12, FRSP Admin History Files. The author thanks Mike Greenfield for providing this document.
increase coverage at special times known for relic hunting. Looters in the 1980s often left their holes alone once they dug out the artifacts, but with time, these relic hunters became more careful to fill-in their holes and cover them with leaves, making it more difficult for rangers to find evidence of their theft. Numbers of prosecution cases have dropped recently, but that situation might reflect both the decreased numbers of ranger hours to enforce ARPA and the increasing effort by looters to cover their tracks. Plus, newspapers started publishing articles educating readers about the law and how the park had effectively caught individuals. Convicted relic hunters, as part of their punishment, had to place looter prevention ads in the newspapers.\textsuperscript{171}

Fredericksburg also cooperated with other agencies across the country to protect archeological resources. This commitment resulted in the park being involved with the first case successfully prosecuted under NAGPRA, the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act. This 1994 case involved a buyer near Fredericksburg who had accepted and sold illegally dug artifacts and human remains dug at Custer battlefield in Montana. A sting operation resulted with the buyer being caught offering to sell the artifacts and human bones, and his helping to set up a Maryland buyer who had previously bought similar items from him. Both set ups produced taped conversations of the transactions, and both men were successfully prosecuted. Greenfield served as a point person who fielded phone calls asking about the case and handling some of the outcry afterwards in response to what many believed were light sentences for the convicted persons. A Native American group also decided to stage a protest at the sentencing, generating additional press. Return of the artifacts and human remains to Montana ended the case with a well-received ceremony.\textsuperscript{172}

The park suffered a major loss in 1990 of one of its prized artifacts displayed in a visitor center. The Cornwall note had served as the centerpiece of the Friendly Enemies exhibit in the basement of the Fredericksburg Visitor Center. (Figure 123) The enemies on either side of the Rappahannock River, during the slow winter encampment months, often sent small handmade wooden boats across the river to exchange supplies. A Rebel soldier sent tobacco on his boat and asked in this note for coffee in return. Private Fred Cornwall of the 27th Connecticut Infantry Regiment picked up the boat. He saved the note as a souvenir, had it framed, and brought it to Fredericksburg when he moved there after the war. His relatives eventually gave the note to the Park Service. A Time magazine photographer and park historian Ralph Happel reconstructed a wooden boat and in July 1953 reenacted sailing it across the Rappahannock, further publicizing the Cornwall note. (Figure 124) Ranger Greenfield had signaled to park management about the vulnerability of the note to theft


\textsuperscript{172} Personal communication, Greenfield to the author, 18 January 2010, 1. FRSP, Annual Report, CY 1994 and FY 1995, 11.
when in the late 1980s he had completed a security review of park facilities. The note remained mounted on an exhibit display without a locked case. Park officials discovered the theft in summer 1990. Park rangers publicized the loss and informed dealers, but the artifact has never been located.  

Greenfield refers to this theft as an example, in his mind, of the low priority protection received in the park over the years. He wrote later that “protection/law enforcement issues were just not a concern at Chatham [park headquarters].” Chief ranger Johnson pointed out that the protection staff “didn’t get the glamorous job. We got the dirty work. The rangers always got the dirty work.” He laughed that “while I was here [working at the park], somebody didn’t want to do anything, they gave it to the ranger because we would do it. We did what we had to do.” By taking on these unpopular tasks, though, Johnson felt that “at times I think that we were looked upon in an unfavorable light because we were doing the dirty work.” Unfortunately, personnel numbers in annual reports do not consistently provide an indication of how the protection division fared versus interpretation and maintenance. The 2000 needs analysis for the protection division does give an indication that based on work requirements, the ranger force did need augmentation. More lands in the park certainly signaled that more ranger time was needed to patrol and ensure safety of visitors and resources.

Staffing for the entire park between 1986 and 1998 did rise. Zinck reported in his 1986 annual report that the park had 37.2 Full-time Equivalents (FTE). The number steadily rose until Rives reported in 1998 that the park had 55 FTE. Burks lamented in her 1990 annual report that interpretation had half the number of seasonal employees that summer than had been the case 15 years earlier. Programming, though, included some innovations in the 1990s, including long walks through Wilderness battlefield and weekend walks at Prospect Hill, the Bloody Angle, and Saunter’s Field. The protection division thinned its staffing ability by clustering Fredericksburg and Richmond ranger duties. Chief ranger Johnson and supervisory ranger Greenfield provided service to both parks as a way to help
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173 FRSP, Annual Report, 1990, 5. Personal communication, Greenfield to the author, 10 January 2010, FRSP Admin History Files. Amy Satterthwaite, “Artifact from Civil War Stolen from Battlefield Center,” *Free Lance-Star*, 4 September 1990. Theft Case #900297, 31 August 1990, FRSP Admin History Files. The note came to the park in 1949, according to OF Northington, Monthly Narrative Report, December 1949, 3, File A2823 Jul 49-Dec 51 FRSP, Box 188, Entry P-11, RG 79, NARA Archives II. The Cornwall note theft certainly has not been the only loss over the years. Superintendent Northington noted in 1952 the theft of a dragoon type pistol from the Fredericksburg museum building. This was the third theft from the museum since its existence, and all thefts had been of historic firearms. See OF Northington, Monthly Narrative Report, February 1952, 2, File A2823 Jun 52-Dec 53 FRSP, Box 188, Entry P-11, RG 79, NARA Archives II. Information about reenacting sailing the wooden boats from 1953 photograph, File Reenact sending small boats, Fred Box 10, FRSP Photo Archives.

174 Personal communication, Greenfield to the author, 10 January 2010.

175 Johnson, transcript of interview, 10 December 2009, 33.


during a tight budget situation. Fredericksburg hoped to gain a new position in its protection division from this arrangement, but that position failed to materialize. Greenfield noted later that he lost some opportunities to keep in close contact with rangers at either park because he was traveling between them. The 2000 needs assessment found that overall Fredericksburg lost time and gained an increased workload.\textsuperscript{178}

A remarkable growth in the number of volunteers provided the park with flexibility to address many of its needs. Volunteers logged 8,100 hours in 1992 and just under 17,000 hours in 1998. Some programs only happened because of volunteers, such as opening Salem Church for summer weekend tours. Volunteers took over running the visitor center information desks during the weekdays. Other volunteers conducted natural resource inventories of bird populations and water quality assessments in the park. The Knights of Columbus beginning in 1991 rebuilt and repainted cannon carriages. Inmates from the local jail aided the maintenance division. They painted various buildings, cleared earthworks, and provided grounds maintenance around the Fredericksburg visitor center. Establishment of friends groups, such as Friends of the Wilderness Battlefield and Friends of Fredericksburg Battlefield, powered these volunteer hours. The park also gained aid and visibility with a luminaria program, begun in 1997 for the annual Memorial Day ceremony at the National Cemetery. (Figure 125) Boy and Girl Scout councils led the effort to light a candle for each of the 15,300 Federal soldiers buried in the cemetery. Publicity for the ceremony helped jump visitation from more than 2,800 visitors in 1998 to more than 6,700 visitors the next year.\textsuperscript{179}

These volunteer numbers helped offset a stagnant budget situation. Straight numbers suggest small steady increases throughout the period 1986 to 2000, from $2.6 million to $4.2 million. Conversion to 2010 numbers by taking into account inflation indicates that between 1986 and 1993, the park’s budget stayed close to $2.6 million. After this point, the park saw small clustered increases. Between 1994 and 1996, the budget stayed close to $3.2 million, in 2010 numbers. Between 1997 and 1998, the budget stayed around $3.5 million, in 2010 numbers, and for 1999 and 2000, the budget jumped to $4.1 million, in 2010 numbers.\textsuperscript{180}

\textbf{ANALYSIS}

The related lands approach to development proposals stands out as a remarkable gift the park staff has given to the agency as a whole. Instead of simply opposing projects, related lands provided an essential vocabulary for articulating key park values and specifying how a development proposal would impact those values. Related lands also allowed the Park Service to partner with local jurisdictions, other federal agencies (such as the US Army Corps


\textsuperscript{180} FRSP, Annual Reports, 1986, 2; 1993, 2; 1996, 16; 1998, 7; 1999, 5; 2000, 4.
of Engineers), and developers to find solutions to adverse effects. A proposal didn’t just get approved or just get denied. Mitigation steps appropriate to the historic resources being threatened balanced the economic needs of private individuals and local communities. Historic resources were lost, but communication using related lands made possible some preservation. Developers having regular interaction with the Park Service (and Corps of Engineers) now accept that some proffers to save historic resources will be part of the conversation for their proposals, if they trigger application of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Some caution is necessary, though. One person works in the Corps of Engineers permitting office for the Fredericksburg area, and he is thoroughly versed with the related lands database and its utility for his reviewing process. Time will tell if his eventual replacement embraces the same approach. Spotsylvania County initially requested the development of the related lands database, but it is unclear how much the county staff today uses the related lands approach when undergoing planning and permitting. The database itself, which really is paper volumes, needs updating using recent historical research. Plus, the database only addresses Spotsylvania County. Other jurisdictions would benefit from a similar research tool. The language of related lands remains valid and has seeped into the review process of development proposals. But the identification of sites and the integration of those sites into a planning strategy are tenuous.

The related lands approach calls up the question for local communities if the park will continue to expand its boundaries. In arguing about the impending destruction of the May 1 Chancellorsville battlefield, the park clearly had concerns about its authorized holdings and how traffic and ancillary development would harm the park’s resources. But an underlying argument focused upon the historic importance of the May 1 battlefield itself. If CVBT had somehow raised the money to buy the entire 800-acre tract from John Mullins, would the expectation be that the park would expand to accept it? Does the Civil War Trust want the park to accept the 140 acres it has of the May 1 battlefield? What about Slaughter Pen Farm at Fredericksburg battlefield? Related lands could be interpreted by people outside NPS as a wholesale everything needs to come inside the park, leaving no land free for development and use by the local communities. This may be an extreme position, but how does the park decide it has enough land?

This question refers back to Heather Huyck’s oral history interview. She said that when she toured the battlefield with Ed Bearss to determine which lands should be included in the new legislation (1989), her approach was “what lands are needed to tell the story?”

The park has authorized boundaries, with Congress saying these lands are needed to tell the story of the four battles, but do the park’s historians agree? Do the outside preservationists agree? Is more land needed to tell the story? Or is preservation of historic land, simply that, what drives the park in advocating for saving May 1 at Chancellorsville and other tracts?
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181 This quoted statement is a paraphrase of Huyck. See Huyck, transcript of interview, 11 June 2010, 13-14.
What does preservation mean in relationship to the park? Related lands focuses upon preservation through mitigation corridors and land banking, as examples. Is that approach enough for places like the May 1 battlefield or Slaughter Pen Farm? At what point will the park lose credibility if it keeps advocating for preservation of lands outside its authorized boundaries? Can the park survive continued urban sprawl by keeping quiet about preservation of related lands not within the park boundaries?
Figure 113. 1989 boundary legislation map for Chancellorsville. Map courtesy of National Park Service, Denver Technical Information Center, FRSP_326_40074E_Z1.pdf.
Figure 114. 1989 boundary legislation map for Fredericksburg. Map courtesy of National Park Service, Denver Technical Information Center, FRSP_326_40075D_Z1.pdf.
Figure 115. 1989 boundary legislation map for the Sunken Road. Map courtesy of National Park Service, Denver Technical Information Center, FRSP_326_40070D_Z1.pdf.
Figure 116. 1989 boundary legislation map for Jackson Shrine. Map courtesy of National Park Service, Denver Technical Information Center, FRSP_326_40073D_Z1.pdf.
Figure 117. 1989 boundary legislation map for Spotsylvania Court House. Map courtesy of National Park Service, Denver Technical Information Center, FRSP_326_40071C_Z1.pdf.
Figure 118. 1989 boundary legislation map for Wilderness Battlefield. Map courtesy of National Park Service, Denver Technical Information Center, FRSP_326_40072E_Z1.pdf.
Figure 119. 1989 boundary legislation map for Wilderness. Map courtesy of National Park Service, Denver Technical Information Center, FRSP_326_40069_C_Z1.pdf.
Figure 120. This photo shows the proximity of the park’s waysides to the where the new Fawn Lake sign would stand. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, File Wilderness new entrance to Fawn Lake, Wilderness Box 5, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 121. The Fawn Lake entrance sign along Orange Plank Road in Wilderness battlefield stunned many people with its size. Photo courtesy of the author.
Figure 122. 1992 boundary expansion map for Wilderness. Map courtesy of National Park Service, Denver Technical Information Center, FRSP_326_40072E_Z2.pdf.
Figure 123. The Friendly Enemies exhibit at Fredericksburg Visitor Center displayed the Cornwall note, written by a Rebel soldier and retrieved from a wooden boat by a Federal soldier with the last name of Cornwall. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, File FVC Displays, Contemporary Photos Box 3, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 124. A Time photographer set sail a reproduction of the wooden boats that soldiers from the North and South used to exchange goods when not fighting each other. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, File Reenact sending small boats, Fredericksburg Box 10, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 125. Scouts light a candle for each Federal soldier buried in the cemetery at the Memorial Day Luminaria at the Fredericksburg National Cemetery. Photo courtesy of National Park Service.
CHAPTER SIX

TO BUILD A FOUNDATION OF EMPATHY

The House Committee on Military Affairs made the trip seem all too easy. “In one drive of 38 miles, without alighting from a car, one may pass practically all points of importance on five battle fields,” read the 1924 report on a bill to inspect the battlefields around Fredericksburg. People could drive the “celebrated ‘plank road’” and see where seven successive assaults of Federal soldiers tried to storm Marye’s Heights. Tourists could view the spot where Stonewall Jackson had been wounded and drive past the regimental monuments at Salem Church. Thousands of travelers, who used the main highway between Florida and Massachusetts, could easily take a side trip and view these historic lands, the House Committee predicted.  

Fast forward 15 years, and the National Park Service, with Civilian Conservation Corps enrollees, laid out roads and contact stations that allowed visitors to drive unfettered, as the Committee had envisioned, and explore the Civil War landscape in the Fredericksburg-Spotsylvania area. Another 20 years later, well into the Mission 66 period of park development, visitors still could start their visit at the Fredericksburg Visitor Center and then jump in their cars and drive out Route 3 to the Chancellorsville Visitor Center. They could largely enjoy a scenic rural drive, once past the budding commercialism where Fredericksburg City and Spotsylvania County met. Park visitors, wanting to immerse themselves in the history, could take the new auto tour and stop at each of the four battlefields, plus the Jackson Shrine, comfortably within a day. As the previous two chapters attest, however, travel between Fredericksburg and Chancellorsville after 1970 became increasingly clogged with commuters and residents of constantly sprouting residential and commercial developments. A twenty-minute ride in 1955 between the two visitor centers often became more than an hour by the 2000s.

Automobiles and good roads made the park of four battlefields and historic sites possible. If the battlefields had been located a little farther apart or if automotive travel had not been as promising at the time of park establishment, supporters might have adopted an alternative strategy for preserving these historic landscapes. They might have had Fredericksburg be its own national park site, for example, and then packaged Chancellorsville and Wilderness-Spotsylvania Court House as another national park site. Or they might have channeled off Wilderness-Spotsylvania Court House as a third national park unit, if travel distances and roads justified such a division. These possibilities never entered
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1 FRSP, Interpretive Prospectus, 1973, 2, FRSP Library.
2 House Committee on Military Affairs, Inspection of the Battle Fields in and around Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania Courthouse, Va., 68th Cong., 1st sess., 2 May 1924, H. Rep. 634, 2.
the level of recorded discussion or action. Park managers and historians instead stayed true to the original vision of a cohesive park and designed the interpretive program and visitor services to accommodate and encourage a holistic understanding of and approach to visiting the park’s resources. Park folders numbered tour stops sequentially across the battlefields, reinforcing this one park-one tour philosophy. The 1973 Interpretive Prospectus reduced the number of tour stops, but the idea of a continuum tour across all four battlefields continued. Not until the turn of the 21st century did the park raise the white surrender flag and deliberately devise a park tour system with each battlefield having its own inclusive route. The roads (and the traffic they contained) had finally engulfed the 1924 congressional vision.³

This gloomy assessment of the state of travel around the park from 1970 on does not accurately capture the positive energy and fearless commitment to the park’s mission that park staff rendered repeatedly during this same time period. Part of this story, with respect to aggressive land acquisition and legislation, has been described in the previous two chapters. This chapter examines how the park presented itself to the public, through its interpretive program and resource management, between 1970 and 2000. Robert Krick, the park’s chief historian beginning in 1972, led a cadre of trained historian interpreters in designing an interpretive program that in some ways clung to the park’s early storylines and in other ways sought new approaches and themes. Krick continued the emphasis upon battle tactics storytelling, but he added a significant new component—empathy—to build preservation support for the park and help visitors to connect in meaningful ways to the Civil War story.

This chapter describes Krick’s interpretive approach in the first section and then examines how Krick and his team, along with the park’s protection and resource management teams, implemented this larger vision by having the reader take an imaginary tour of the park (thinking in terms of that long ago visitor who drove the entire park in a day), beginning in Fredericksburg and ending at the Stonewall Jackson Shrine. This tour format allows the reader to imagine how the sites and battlefields changed over time and how the Park Service varied its programming and management of the park to meet new circumstances and opportunities for welcoming the public. The idea of crossroads, with preservation and development shaping park interpretation, underlies the story. The park map in the appendix will help trace the route taken by the chapter narrative, and photos from this and previous chapters help to identify important landmarks.

EMPATHY AND PRESERVATION

Robert Krick set the stage for his tenure at Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania by authoring in 1973 a new Interpretive Prospectus to guide his division’s efforts. He worked
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³ The author emphasizes that no documents from the park’s establishment period suggested splitting up the battlefields into separate park units. On separate tour routes for each battlefield, see FRSP, Long Range Interpretive Plan, 2001, 19, FRSP Library. See also A. Wilson Greene, transcription of oral history interview with the author, 24 February 2010, 5, FRSP Archives.
on the prospectus with the National Park Service’s Virginia office, Harpers Ferry Center, and fellow historians at the park. This document, along with correspondence and oral histories with people who worked with him, provides a crucial window into how Krick saw the park and wanted to present it to visitors. (Krick declined invitations to be interviewed for the preparation of this history.)

Krick wanted visitors to connect in meaningful ways with the stories and places preserved at Fredericksburg. The prospectus lists five interpretive objectives, with four of them directly linked to this vision and the fifth one supporting it. These objectives were “to build a foundation of empathy between modern Americans and their mid-19th century forebears,” to create a set of communal roots shared by all Americans, to make the men of the Civil War fully dimensional, to convey the facts of the battles, and to use these resources to provide in-depth responses in the many different people visiting the park. Krick lays out what essentially are the underlying tenets of interpretation as taught by Freeman Tilden. Tilden, a journalist, novelist, and playwright, professionalized the field of interpretation with the 1957 publication of *Interpreting Our Heritage*. This book is in its third edition and remains a key resource for every National Park Service interpreter. Tilden emphasized that interpretation revealed a larger truth beyond facts and that interpretation should enrich the human mind and spirit. Tilden encouraged interpreters to relate information that could connect to the audience and provoke it to act in some beneficial way.4

Krick used the term “empathy” to convey the idea of connection between visitors and the men of the Civil War battles. According to the online Free Dictionary, empathy means the power of entering into another’s personality and imaginatively experiencing his/her feelings. Krick wanted the interpretive programming, whether it was exhibit panels or ranger talks, to evoke feelings for the past and to have visitors act on those feelings in positive ways, such as learning more about the history or working in some way to continue preservation efforts. Empathy was a tool for park interpretation and a vehicle for eliciting positive action to help the park and its preservation mission. Tilden may not have used the term, but he advanced the same idea.

Krick gathered together an extraordinary group of motivated historians and fostered a research environment to instill empathy and connection between the visitors and the battlefield’s resources. He continued the work of Superintendent Branch Spalding and Historian Ralph Happeland made research a fundamental component of the division’s work. Krick called the interpreters “historians” and encouraged them to conduct research, write scholarly pieces, and present that research to the public. The research library Spalding started grew steadily under Krick to support this work. Will Greene, who served as a
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4 Quote and listing of objectives from FRSP, Interpretive Prospectus, 1973, 2, FRSP Library. Freeman Tilden, *Interpreting Our Heritage*, 3rd ed. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1977), 8-9. Evidence of the continued importance of Tilden’s book to NPS interpretation can be found in the fact that the author participated in a 2007 National Council on Public History working group about NPS interpretation and history, and the key book the working group read and discussed was *Interpreting Our Heritage*. The group was organized by an NPS interpretive ranger.
historian during two terms at the park, stated that he couldn’t “imagine a better place for someone with my interest to have worked.” Another historian interpreter under Krick, Peter Carmichael, noted that all of the historians competed in trying “to see how many visitors we could bag and get that kind of material [historical documentation from the Civil War period]” to add to the research library. Krick told his summer seasonals, according to former seasonal and now park cultural resources manager Eric Mink, that one of the best ways to make an impact at the park was to bring in new source material. That material would then feed into new interpretive programs.

New research supported the interpretation and provided engaging details and revealing clues for the historians to use in their walks, talks, and exhibits. This research provided new insights into battles or gave a human face to the fighting through diaries or photographs. Krick especially inserted the new historical findings into his talks for special groups, making him a favorite speaker at Civil War Round Tables and the like. The augmented research helped all of the interpreters reach out to audiences and connect visitors to the stories played out on the battlefields. Stepping into a restored building and walking a trail along earthworks were tangible ways that all national parks could connect visitors to the resources. Krick and his team worked to enhance those experiences and cement the connections.

Dozens of historians gained their training within this research-driven environment, all trained by Krick and encouraged to publish outside normal NPS channels. Krick established specialized positions with clear delineation of responsibilities for his historians, resulting in an efficient and professional staff. Fredericksburg became, in the eyes of many, “an incubator for [NPS] staffs across the cannonball circuit.” Park historian Frank O’Reilly praised the nurturing environment Krick created for his historians to explore research topics, present them publicly in a wide array of venues, and succeed. “His staff was considered the envy of the entire National Park Service’s Civil War parks,” according to O’Reilly, and the Krick period came to be known in lore as “the Golden Age of NPS Civil War Historians.”

Emphasis upon personal service also distinguished the park’s interpretive program under Krick. Former park seasonal and former cultural resources manager and now park historian Noel Harrison remembered that Krick viewed a visitor’s arrival as “that person’s

5 Greene, transcript of interview, 24 February 2010, 2.
6 Peter Carmichael, transcription of oral history interview with the author, 1 September 2010, 12, FRSP Archives.
7 Eric Mink, personal communication with the author, 28 October 2010, 2, FRSP Admin History Files.
8 Greene, transcript of interview, 24 February 2010, 7. Frank O’Reilly, personal communication with the author, November 2010, 1, FRSP Admin History Files. John Hennessy, personal communication with the author, 26 October 2010, 2, FRSP Admin History Files.
9 Mink, personal communication with the author, 28 October 2010, 1.
10 John Hennessy, park comments to draft chapter six, 1, FRSP Admin History Files.
11 O’Reilly, personal communication with the author, November 2010, 2-3.
only chance in years to visit the park—or perhaps even their only opportunity in a lifetime”
and that person may have been “planning and imagining” the trip for as many years. The
greeting ranger historian needed to recognize what was a “unique experience” for the visitor
and “offer enthusiasm and graciousness” even if that visitor was only one of a hundred the
ranger would interact with on a typical summer day. Cultural resources manager Mink
remembered that Krick told his historians that personal service was of the “utmost
importance” and that Fredericksburg often offered many more walking tours and other
visitor services than any other Civil War park. Personal contacts may have increased under
Krick’s tenure, but other interpretive media, such as exhibits and films, remained static and
largely unchanged. Park historian Donald Pfanz characterized Krick’s view of non-personal
media as “If it works, don’t fix it.” Krick continued the emphasis, common within Civil
War battlefield parks, upon telling the details of the battles and thus he did not see the
necessity of changing the Mission 66 exhibits that followed this approach. He kept the same
driving tour signs dating from the Ralph Happel days and rarely explored updating the
exhibits at the two visitor centers even though many other Civil War parks obtained new
exhibits and movies during the period of his tenure at Fredericksburg.

Personalized service helped Krick’s interpretive program instill empathy in visitors.
Krick, according to historians who worked with him, wanted people to feel a connection to
the battlefields so that he could enlist their support to continue preservation efforts. He
succeeded, as described in chapters four and five, by working behind-the-scenes with
members of Congress and others, and won tangible land acquisitions with important new
park legislation. Some interpretive methods adopted at the park, though, didn’t sit well with
Krick. He despised living history, but he allowed some costumed interpreters, as described
below, to interact with visitors on the battlefields and at some of the historic sites. He was
the acknowledged expert on Lee’s Army of the Northern Virginia, and he had little interest
in the civilian story. When Chatham came under National Park Service ownership in late
1975, Krick focused its interpretation upon the Civil War period, and the exhibits presented
little information about the site’s other long history. Park historian Noel Harrison had an
interest in the civilian and industrial history of the Fredericksburg area, and Krick steered
research notes to him and even encouraged Harrison’s publication of his results, which
proved influential with establishing the Related Lands database (chapter five). Krick
recognized talented and motivated historians and assisted them with their research interests,
even if those research areas did not mesh with his own.
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12 Noel Harrison, personal communication with the author, 26 October 2010, 1, FRSP Admin History Files.
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This emphasis upon research and personal services, though, had an unsettling
counterexample. Krick maintained and supported the emphasis upon military maneuvers,
developed at the park during the 1930s and repeated in the Mission 66 exhibits and
programming. He also refused to allow disturbing topics, such as slavery and its role in
causing the war, in the park’s interpretive programming. He sympathized strongly with the
Southern experience during the war, especially with relation to Lee and the Army of
Northern Virginia, which had fought long and hard with reduced supplies and manpower.
Krick effectively continued the Lost Cause tradition and the reconciliationist perspective
about the Civil War. He wrote in the 1973 Interpretive Prospectus that the Chancellorsville
Visitor Center exhibits and audioprogram “combine to produce a very effective package.”
He noted some slight errors that needed correction, but he also wanted the Lee to the Rear
diorama, which had been cut in the early 1960s due to funding constraints, constructed and
installed in the originally designed space.\(^{17}\) The Chancellorsville story continued to focus
almost entirely upon Lee and Jackson, and the Jackson Shrine was meant, in Krick’s words,
to convey “the towering image of the living Jackson” even as the site itself focused upon his
death.\(^{18}\) Krick allowed that the theme at the Lacy House (Ellwood) at Wilderness should be
Grant, but his description then lapsed into discussions of southern attitudes toward Grant,
including regurgitating the stories about his drinking. The Lacy family cemetery where
Jackson’s arm was buried received its own paragraph in the prospectus even as Krick
minimized the Grant storyline with southern perspectives. The other tour stops at
Wilderness, as outlined in the 1973 prospectus, all focused upon Lee and his army. Historian
interpreter Carmichael, now the Fluhrer Professor of Civil War Studies and Director of the
Civil War Institute at Gettysburg College, viewed Krick’s allegiance to the Lost Cause
tradition as a “tragedy [because] … here’s a man who has an incredible intellect, here is a
man who could have raised, I think, a more nuanced, more critical interpretation of Douglas
Southall Freeman’s important works on Lee” and “at the very end of the day, R. K. Krick
basically subscribed to all of that.”\(^{19}\) Krick would not let his staff engage the public in
anything controversial, and slavery was the first topic he rigorously, according to
Carmichael, opposed including in any interpretive programming.\(^{20}\)

National Park Service historians and interpretive specialists at the regional and
national level, though, approved Krick’s decision to continue the Southern perspective and
the military focus. Another park historian interpreter, A. Wilson Greene, argued that the
interpretation at Fredericksburg matched the emphasis on military tactics and battles found
at that time in the 1970s and 1980s at all Civil War sites within the system. Krick did not find
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much opposition to his approach, at least not until well into his time at the park. The battlefield parks relied upon the military emphasis, which fit within the National Park Service tradition of directly connecting the land to the educational experience presented to visitors (see chapter two). Battle tactics and details about maneuvers allowed interpreters to describe what was unique and important about the battlefield park lands. Plus, many visitors wanted that information. But, this emphasis upon military maneuvers also helped park staff avoid the very controversy that Krick warned his historian interpreters not to engage in with visitors. Exhibits, waysides, and ranger talks could in theory sidestep sticky topics like slavery by staying close to what strategies officers pursued and where fighting took place. Battlefield parks needed to talk about specific battle actions on their landscapes to meet their mission and fulfill expectations from visitors. However, how broad was visitation at battlefield parks? Visitation figures, for example, don’t provide details of how many non-whites visited Civil War sites during this period, but the exhibit media’s lack of coverage on slavery and its role in shaping the war, for example, suggests that blacks, and other people with a broad interest in the larger forces shaping the war, were not considered a strong component of the visiting public. Historian interpreter Carmichael remembered from his seven years working at Fredericksburg that even northern visitors subscribed to and expected the park to adopt the Lost Cause perspective and its sympathetic approach to the South in its programming. They expected veneration of Lee and Jackson.

One agency appraisal does help capture the state of the Civil War parks and interpretation at the turn of the 21st century. The National Park Service surveyed its 28 Civil War-related sites in late 1999-early 2000 to tally how many sites had interpretive programming (exhibits, waysides, film/media/websites, publications, and personal services) that included discussions of the broader themes of the Civil War and specifically slavery as a cause. All sites responded, and the survey showed that for interpretive media that required large outlays of money and time to update (exhibits, waysides, and films, for example), less than 10 of the parks presented anything about these broader themes. Cumberland Gap NHP (TN), as a typical example, had exhibits dating from 1959 with an ethnocentric focus and reliance upon military maneuvers. Fort Scott NHS (KS) had a wayside that discussed the slavery issue as it related to Kansas before the war, but the wayside did not mention slavery in relation to the war. Interpretive media with a shorter shelf life or low expense to change did provide parks with opportunities to update. Between 10 and 15 parks addressed the broader causes of the Civil War, and/or slavery as a cause, in their publications and personal services. Still, around 15 other parks failed to show significant improvements in this area, suggesting a continuing reluctance on the part of some park historians to move beyond military tactics as a theme for interpretation. Vicksburg NMP (MS) admitted in the survey that its staff, trained to respond to questions, largely fielded queries from visitors about their ancestors who had fought at the site. Fredericksburg’s answers to this 1999-2000 survey indicated that this park

21 Greene, transcript of interview, 24 February 2010, 4-5.
22 Carmichael, transcript of interview, 1 September 2010, 14, 16.
mainly had done little to no updating of its interpretation to include the broader causes of the Civil War and/or slavery.\textsuperscript{23}

Change was coming to these parks, though. Historical scholarship from the 1950s forward accumulated a vast reservoir of facts and perspectives that inconvertibly demonstrated the fallacy of the Lost Cause tradition and its southern-leaning perspective. This “new social history” scholarship, prompted in part by the 1960s social movements for black civil rights and women’s rights, resurrected forgotten or ignored documentation that clearly identified slavery as a reason for southern states to secede. These new studies laid out the interweaving political, economic, technological, and cultural forces that shaped the United States prior to, during, and after the Civil War, allowing historians to paint this era accurately as complex and divisive. The weight of this scholarship eventually, slowly, filtered into mainstream presentations, whether Alex Haley’s \textit{Roots} 1977 TV miniseries (which spurred people to conduct their own genealogical research but also depicted the brutal realities of slavery) or Ken Burns’s \textit{Civil War} 1990 documentary series (which used esteemed historians and readings from primary source documents to lay out the war and people affected by it).

Congress then entered in the 1990s to legislate an expanded vision for national park sites, both in terms of what to preserve and how to interpret those sites. Custer Battlefield National Monument in 1991 became Little Big Horn Battlefield NM (MT), and the park’s veneration of Gen. George Custer and his white soldiers shifted to a balanced presentation of both the attacking soldiers and the defending Indians. New national park sites appeared that legitimized preserving places of painful history, such as Sand Creek Massacre National Historic Site (CO, 1992), \textit{Brown v. Board of Education} National Historic Site (KS, 1992), Manzanar NHS (CA, 1992), and Little Rock Central High School NHS (AR, 1998). Congress also started to take notice of the Civil War battlefields, and, as described in chapter five, inserted language into Fredericksburg’s 1989 boundary legislation requiring that its interpretation take into account the causes and consequences of the Civil War, including the effects of the war on all Americans, especially on the American South. Gettysburg and Vicksburg also had their interpretive lenses expanded through separate pieces of legislation in 1990.\textsuperscript{24}

It is hard to say if these legislative actions forced changes upon the Civil War sites or if the sites had already started taking strides to expand their programming. The 1999-2000 sites survey suggests some movement for change, but only in a handful of parks and in the most ephemeral of interpretive media (publications and personal services). Certainly many new park historians whose academic training benefited from at least some exposure to the expanded historical scholarship would have sought ways to apply that learning to their parks.

\begin{flushleft}
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\end{flushleft}
But, there were also plenty of oldtimers like Krick, and even historians trained by people like Krick, who saw value in staying with the so-called tried and true approaches. Civil War battlefield superintendents recognized, however, by 1998 that their sites had to change to meet the demands of an increasingly savvy and intrigued visiting public. These park managers, across the Civil War park landscape, met in a special conference in Nashville, TN, and adopted a set of principles and action steps to address not only park interpretation but also roads, adjacent land use, and resource management. They concluded that park interpretation should establish a continuum understanding of the war; illuminate the causes of the war as expressed in social, economic, and cultural factors; display the full breadth of the human experience during the war; and make clear the relevance of the war to people today. Congress incorporated this viewpoint in the 1999 Interior Department’s appropriations legislation, requiring the secretary to encourage all Civil War sites to include the role of slavery as a cause of the war and its role, as relevant, in each site.²⁵

This widening of the interpretive lens largely saw fruit at Fredericksburg after Krick retired in 2002 and his successor John Hennessy set about to update and expand interpretive themes throughout the park (described briefly in the epilogue). For this chapter, the reader now takes an armchair tour throughout the park as it looked between 1970 and 2000.

**FREDERICKSBURG**

Possibilities opened and closed for telling the battle of Fredericksburg to park visitors between the 1970s and the 2000s. The Fredericksburg Museum and Administration Building (renamed during the Mission 66 period as the Fredericksburg Visitor Center) sat prominently next to the National Cemetery and the Sunken Road. This building served as a staging ground for welcoming visitors as they entered the park. During seasonal high visitation times, especially the summer and early fall, park historians offered regular walking tours starting near the back entrance of the visitor center. Museum exhibits inside the building dated to the Mission 66 period, and by the early 1970s, park managers had begun investigating ways to improve them and the layout of the center. Steadily increasing numbers of visitors crowded the building. People could not move through the reception area, exhibits, and sales area efficiently and effectively. The interpretive staff also wanted to offer a new audiovisual program separate from the electric map. Initial steps in the 1970s to improve building circulation and exhibits ran aground of funding limitations, despite the shared feeling within the park that the Fredericksburg Visitor Center was deficient in its interpretive programming. Superintendent Dixon Freeland called the visitor center “high in the running for the head of the list at the negative end of the spectrum” of interpretive
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programs within the Park Service, teasingly giving the visitor center high praise for its negative accomplishment.\textsuperscript{26}

A slide program, however, debuted in late 1978. This show, run by six projectors carefully synchronized to an audio script, used words written by soldiers and civilians as a basis for chronicling the events of the Battle of Fredericksburg. The audience saw on three screens an image of the person from the past whose words were spoken along with visuals of the places, actions, or people being referred to in the script. The program eschewed using a narrator and instead had a modern family touring the park as a way to set the scene. Images flashed frequently, dissolving into each other to suggest action. Krick wanted the audiovisual program to serve as a “provocative orientation device” for visitors, to concentrate on the human experience as opposed to tactical or strategic aspects of the battle or the war in general. He recognized that to achieve this aim, the slide program should describe the experiences of soldiers who fought and civilians who lived through the fighting. This emphasis would, in Krick’s mind, pave the way for park visitors to feel empathy toward their nineteenth-century forebears.\textsuperscript{27}

A small infusion of funding brought additional changes to the visitor center. Four glass and metal cases, holding topical exhibits, in late 1980 went downstairs to open up space on the main floor for the sales area. Space and circulation issues continued to challenge the visitor center, resulting in further work in 1984. The park removed two walls and a historian’s office on the main floor. This reconfigured space housed an enlarged lobby and sales area. Three new exhibits graced the walls, including one called Soldier Art. Unpublished paintings, drawings, and sketches revealed what Civil War soldiers saw in and around the Fredericksburg area. These works, as an example, provided the only known contemporary depiction of the fighting on Spindle Farm during the Battle of Spotsylvania Court House and the only surviving view of the Tapp cabin at the Wilderness Battlefield. Eastern National Park and Monument, the sales arm of the park, funded between 1992 and 1993 a complete rehabilitation of the former garage behind the Fredericksburg Visitor Center to turn this space into a new booksale facility. Sales increased, and the visitor center gained added space for interpretive efforts.\textsuperscript{28}

\textsuperscript{26} Quote from Memorandum, Dixon Freeland to Chief, Branch of Equipment Services, Harpers Ferry Center, 15 January 1975, File D6215 CVC Slide Program, Cabinet 15, Drawer 4, FRSP Basement Files. See also Memorandum, Charles Marshall to Director, Denver Service Center, 20 December 1972; Memorandum, William Smith to Director, Northeast Region, 19 January 1973, 1; and Memorandum, Vincent Mauro to Superintendent FRSP, 26 November 1974, all in File D2615 Renovation of FVC Exhibits 1973-1974, Cabinet 15, Drawer 4, FRSP Basement Files.

\textsuperscript{27} Quote from Robert Krick, Draft Task Directive, AV Script, Fredericksburg NMP, 5 May 1976, 1, File D6215 Slide Program, FVC, Cabinet 15, Drawer 4, FRSP Basement Files. See also Joanne Young, A Medley of Voices: Treatment Proposed for Sound/Slide Program for FVC, no date; and Memorandum, James Zinck to Manager, Harpers Ferry Center, 23 March 1981, both in File D6215 FVC audiovisual program 1974-81, Cabinet 15, Drawer 4, FRSP Basement Files.

\textsuperscript{28} Memorandum, Richard Smith to Acting Superintendent FRSP, 12 September 1980 and attached Fredericksburg Visitor Center Project, 12 September 1980; and Memorandum, Robert Krick to Regional Director, Mid-Atlantic, 3 October 1980, both in File D6215 FVC Renovation Jan-Feb 1981, Cabinet 15,
The visitor center slide projectors, showing the 1978 audiovisual program, after regular use each day, failed to keep up with the sound program and eventually died. The stalwart electric map also showed mechanical difficulties, and the park in 1983 had its wiring replaced and a new script audiotaped. The map provided an overview of the Civil War as fought in Virginia, Maryland, and Pennsylvania, with particular emphasis on Fredericksburg in 1862. Park staff in 1985 reconfigured the seating in the auditorium to accommodate 20 additional seats (from 45 to 65) and introduced a new sound and slide audiovisual program, using only two projectors and a standard narrator approach. This script focused on the 1862 Fredericksburg battle, providing a few quotes from soldiers and descriptions of the destruction of the town. Visitors also learned in a broad brush fashion about the course of the war at Chancellorsville, Wilderness, and Spotsylvania Court House. The slide program ended with a recognition that 20th century development sprawled across much of the battlefield landscape. Originally, the script had said “much of the terrain has been saved,” but “much” was crossed out with “some” put in its place, in recognition of the significant changes wrought from shopping centers and housing developments. The script closed by referring to the “seemingly inert places” of the Civil War that could “reach across time” and be understood as events that “shaped our national destiny.”

Krick wanted audience members to have a sense of the “personal, human drama” and to go out into the park to see the sites associated with the stories told in the program. By connecting to the personal human drama of the Civil War, visitors might feel empathy for the combatants and the civilians, a goal the park wanted to achieve.

What visitors saw and did just outside the Fredericksburg Visitor Center auditorium may have inspired but also frustrated them. In defiance of the battlefield park, a gas station
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29 Quotes from Memorandum, James Zinck to Manager, Harpers Ferry Center, 18 April 1984, attached script, 13, File D6215 Planning for New AV Program for FVC, Fall 1983, Cabinet 15, Drawer 4, FRSP Basement Files. See also Memorandum, Zinck to Manager, Harpers Ferry Center, 22 December 1982; Memorandum, Zinck to Fred Jessen, 9 February 1983; and Memorandum, Zinck to Manager, Harpers Ferry Center, 29 September 1983, all in File D6215 Electric Map Program, FVC, Cabinet 15, Drawer 4, FRSP Basement Files. Memorandum, Zinck to Manager, Harpers Ferry Center, 23 March 1981. Memorandum, Frederick Jessen to Zinck, 8 October 1981, 1, File D6215 FVC Audiovisual Program 1974-81, Cabinet 15, Drawer 4; Memorandum, Zinck to Regional Director, Mid-Atlantic Region, 4 November 1985, File Reading Copies November 1985, Cabinet 2, Drawer 4, all in FRSP Basement Files.
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sat at the corner of Lafayette Boulevard and Willis Street, directly next to the visitor center. (Figure 126) When the park acquired this land in 1991, it immediately removed the building and used the land for additional parking.\textsuperscript{31} The park also did not own much of the geographical high ground of the 1862 battle. Except for what the National Cemetery encompassed, Marye’s Heights remained in part within the hands of the Montfort Academy, a private Catholic school, and the rest within the grounds of the Mary Washington College, later renamed University of Mary Washington. Visitors could not hike up the steep slope and look down upon the doomed scene where Federal soldiers launched their attacks. The heart of Lee’s defenses, with artillery on the heights and infantry behind the stone wall, mowed down Federal soldiers who dared to cross the Sunken Road. Nor did the park own the land skirting Willis Street where those Federal soldiers reached the limit of their forward advance against the Confederates at the Sunken Road and Marye’s Heights.

This situation slowly changed. Park representatives, dating back to 1929 and the War Department era, identified the Sunken Road as significant and worked for its inclusion within the park. (Figure 127) This effort resulted in 1931 with the City of Fredericksburg deeding its portion of the road to the federal government, and in 1936, the County of Spotsylvania also deeding its holdings of the road. However, at least one abutting property owner refused to relinquish rights to the road, and the city and county deeds reserved the right of use of the road to the general public. The park could not assert control of the Sunken Road. By the time of the early 1970s, park superintendent Dixon B. Freeland knew that he had a potential problem with visitors and traffic along this road. People enjoying the historic sites often did not pay close attention to the increasing amount of two-way traffic buzzing past, and he worried about potential accidents. He also had the park’s 1969 master plan as a guide, which identified the Sunken Road for eventual closure. In a letter to the Mayor and Council, Freeland asked the city to consider either closing the road or making the road one-way heading south to reduce traffic flow. On 24 August 1972, the city agreed to make the Sunken Road a southbound-only road.\textsuperscript{32}

Continued park efforts eventually resulted in some concessions to making the Sunken Road safer. The 1986 General Management Plan, repeating the 1969 master plan in


\textsuperscript{32} Tenney Ross to the Mayor and Council of the City of Fredericksburg, 9 August 1929; City of Fredericksburg, Deed to Battlefield Park Commission, 13 August 1931; Copy, Resolution, Board of Supervisors, County of Spotsylvania, 9 June 1936; Memorandum, Branch Spalding to Director, 2 December 1941; Memorandum, Mike Sweeney to Superintendent, 25 August 1976, 1, all in Deed #38, FRSP Lands Files. The City of Fredericksburg annexed all of the Sunken Road in the early 1940s. See Memorandum, Spalding to the Director, 18 April 1941, Deed #38, FRSP Lands Files. FRSP Master Plan, 1969, 57, FRSP Library. “Sunken Road to be Changed to One-Way,” 19 May 1972; and Larry Evans, “Sunken Road Still Two-Way to Some,” 2 October 1972, both in Free Lance-Star. Concerns over keeping Montfort Academy students safe resulted in the early 1960s with the city building a narrow sidewalk on the east side of the Sunken Road. See “Sunken Road Walkway Plan Gets Go-Ahead,” 12 April 1963, Free Lance-Star.
wanting the road closed, also offered an interim step of having the road open to vehicles only on weekdays. Park superintendent James Zinke approached the city in March 1987 with the idea of closing the road from Memorial Day to Labor Day as a trial. Zinke cited as reasons the historic significance of the road and concerns over visitor safety. Each week, about 11,000 cars used the Sunken Road, and many truck drivers ignored the truck prohibition. Some drivers even went the wrong way on the one-way road. Although the local newspaper and many residents supported the trial idea, many more voiced objections, stating that other neighborhood streets would experience increased traffic and parking problems. The idea stalled. Council members listened sympathetically two years later and closed the Sunken Road for a trial period in summer 1989. Acting park superintendent Sandy Rives declared the trial a success, with visitation up 20 percent at the Fredericksburg Visitor Center and no serious traffic troubles reported elsewhere. But, many city residents remained opposed to a permanent closing, and the council declined a request in 1990 to repeat the summer road closing. Instead, the city allowed the Park Service to narrow the one-way road from 18 to 10 feet, install an oak rail fence to separate pedestrians from vehicles, and construct cobblestone crosswalks.33 (Figure 128)

Two key events turned the tide toward closing the Sunken Road. On 20 November 1995, the Blue and Gray Parkway opened its last leg of the bypass around downtown Fredericksburg. Traffic counts on the Sunken Road dropped a whopping 80 percent, from 1,300 vehicles to under 300 daily. Second, the National Park Service acquired in 1998 the Montfort Academy property (discussed in greater detail in chapter five), giving the park and its visitors substantial access to Marye's Heights. The park had also started acquiring the homes along Willis Street, further helping to restore the historic landscape. On the Sunken Road, access rights remained only to Brompton, home of the President of Mary Washington College. In response to these changed circumstances, the Mayor and Council voted on 22 May 2001 to close the Sunken Road to vehicular traffic. Conditions placed on this closing included that the city would continue to have access for utility work. Park historians completed a survey of historic photographs of the road and stone wall to ensure an accurate rehabilitation. Temporary closings began in May 2002 when the Park Service initiated archeological investigations. Rehabilitation and restoration work proceeded, following the

August 2004 official road closing, with removal of the asphalt pavement. The park covered the road bed with gravel and clay and built a handicapped parking lot and place for a trolley stop. Stone masons used 1,000 tons of sandstone from a Pennsylvania quarry to rebuild the stone wall. A special dedication ceremony in May 2005 celebrated the rehabilitated Sunken Road with a range of programming, including a rifle demonstration. Costumed interpreters, dressed in blue and gray, interacted with the public.34

Other historic attractions peppered the Sunken Road area, available for visitors to explore prior to the closing of the road. The Kirkland Memorial (described in chapter three), erected by the State of South Carolina and the Commonwealth of Virginia in 1965, memorialized the humanitarian deed of Confederate Sgt. Richard Kirkland, who gave water to wounded Federal soldiers on the Fredericksburg battlefield in December 1862. The park did not own the memorial, but as early as 1975, the president of Mary Washington College began discussions with the Park Service about possibly selling the land and statue. These discussions eventually turned in the 1980s to exchanging the Kirkland tract for land owned by the National Park Service but outside the existing boundary. Discussions stalled as the college considered the impact of the park’s desire to close the Sunken Road, as articulated in development of the 1986 General Management Plan. The effort renewed successfully, and in July 1987, the Kirkland Memorial passed to the United States, in exchange for 24.5 acres of land on Mine Road near Prospect Hill. The average visitor might not have realized this change, except that the Park Service could then control maintenance and access.35

Two original structures remain from the time of the 1862 battle along the Sunken Road, Brompton (now home of the president of the University of Mary Washington) and the Innis House. The Innis House, built between 1840 and 1850, had been occupied by a woman named Martha Stephens nee Innis nee Farrow (various common law marriages had accorded her several different last names.) Legend holds that she had refused to leave her house during the December 1862 and May 1863 Fredericksburg battles. Both this house and the nearby Stephens house also on the property (which subsequently burned down) were “literally loaded with battle scars and history.” Bullet holes filled exterior and interior walls of the Innis House, and some studs and doors showed where bullets entered. Contemporary


35 Memorandum, Dixon Freeland to Chief, Division of Land Acquisition, Mid-Atlantic Region, 26 September 1975; Memorandum, John Cook to Regional Director, Mid-Atlantic Region, 5 November 1975; Prince Woodard to Freeland, 20 February 1980; Memorandum, James Zinck to Regional Director, Mid-Atlantic Region, 27 October 1981; William Anderson to Zinck, 2 February 1984; Zinck to R. L. Miller, 19 June 1984; Herbert Rothenberg to Thomas Williams, 21 May 1987, 1; and Rothenberg to Zinck, 14 October 1987, all in File Deed #282, FRSP Lands Files. Michael Zitz, “College and Park Service Make a Land Deal,” 5 December 1987, Free Lance-Star. The university later sold the 24 acres, and the land now holds a subdivision.
accounts allege that Martha tore up all the cloth in her house to bandage wounded soldiers. Her actions gained the notice of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, who in 1917 placed a marker to her at the side of the house. The park acquired this simple pine and oak Gothic carpenter’s house in 1967, but work on its restoration stretched into the 1980s. Partial exterior restoration work in 1976 included removing two east wings that had been added after the historic period. Funds dried up before the park could complete interior work. Archeological and structural work in 1986 resulted in completion of the restoration. The park opened the Innis House to visitors for the first time in summer 1987. (Figure 129) People could see the almost one hundred bullet holes that marked the walls and the Victorian Gothic mantel in the parlor. (Figure 130) The park opted to keep the interior unfurnished since it did not have any evidence of furnishings and its small size limited available space.  

Outdoor signage along the Sunken Road area provided visitors with key information. These tall signs, made of metal with distinctive designs and colors for each battlefield, dated from the days when Ralph Happel served as the chief park historian (discussed in chapter three). Large-format paintings done by Sidney King helped to add a human dimension to the signs and enrich the words with historically appropriate images. One King painting at the National Cemetery stood in a contemplative area, along with a comfortable bench and trees for shade, to allow visitors a chance to catch their breath from the short uphill hike and gain a sense of the magnitude of the fighting that had occurred during the December 1862 battle. By the end of the 1990s, the park’s interpretive staff had begun to remove the King paintings as a preservation measure. Plus, new waysides, standing so that visitors could look down to read the text and see the images and then look up to catch the view itself, began to grace tour stops.  

Visitors wanting to see the opening action for the 1862 battle travel about a mile west from the Sunken Road to the area of Lee Hill. In 1862, General Lee could stand at his headquarters on Lee Hill (it was called Telegraph Hill initially) and look out over the landscape to direct his troops and watch the battle unfold. A Mission 66 shelter with exhibits sits at this commanding post looking toward the Rappahannock River. Commercial and industrial development, including large warehouses, and an explosion of residential housing


37 FRSP, Outline for Wayside Exhibits, August 1998, 3-5, FRSP Library.
along the park’s boundaries, marred the view from the shelter, and visitors sometimes had a hard time making out the key points of the battle amidst the 20th-century incursions. (Figure 131) For this reason, the 1973 park Interpretive Prospectus had recommended either removing the shelter or reorienting it toward the battle lines preserved along Lee Drive. Lee Drive itself follows along the miles-long earthworks complex built and successfully defended by Confederate troops. This stretch of Confederate defenses and Federal attack lines culminated at Prospect Hill. Here, Maj. Gen. George Meade’s Pennsylvanians fought, momentarily gained the advantage, and ultimately retreated against Lt. Gen. Thomas J. Jackson’s corps. The “Meade Pyramid,” placed in 1898 for railroad passengers to see as they passed the site, marks this crucial point in the battle. A Sidney King painting at the Prospect Hill tour stop illustrated Meade’s attack with brilliant reds and smoky whites to convey the energy and hope of the attack.38

Lee Drive, built by the Park Service in the 1930s, hugged the earthworks, but it relied upon city and county roads, Lafayette Boulevard and Mine Road, to carry visitors to and out of the park land. These two roads carried increasing numbers of commuters and truck traffic as various industrial parks and residential communities appeared. Lansdowne Road crossed Lee Drive at about its halfway point, and its traffic counts also increased as development progressed. Between Lafayette Boulevard and Mine Road, the park until the early 1970s only owned the narrow strip of land along the earthworks and Lee Drive. Wanting to provide a buffer for the scenic drive and to protect an open view around Prospect Hill, the park defensively began purchasing land. Key tracts included 322 acres at the southern leg of Lee Drive. Another 65 acres adjoining the Meade Pyramid came into the park in 1978. Scene restoration and the use of agricultural lease permits of these and other smaller land purchases helped visitors gain an appreciation of the landscape as it appeared during the battle.39

Traffic problems intensified along Lee Drive as usage surged upward. Nearly 150 of the almost 190 traffic citations ticketed by park rangers during 1985 went to motorists along Lee Drive. Concerns over visitor safety and their enjoyment of the historical resources prompted the park in its General Management Plan development efforts to recommend closing South Lee Drive at Prospect Hill. The park recognized that the connection between Lee Drive and Mine Road made that route an important through-road for area users. Removing the connection would remove all but visitor traffic, at least along the southern half of the park road. Funding came available in 1988, and the park completed the closing in


February 1989. Previous park superintendents, going back to the days of Oscar Northington, had wanted to close Lee Drive, but local opposition had thwarted such a step. Current park chief historian John Hennessy has called the South Lee Drive closing a “courageous, decisive act” that enhanced the visitor experience better than almost anything other than acquisition and protection of the land.

Physical and visual intrusion problems also plagued this area. Park staff in 1981 removed the Prospect Hill picnic area to reduce vandalism. Staff also restored the historic scene, including removal of trees from the earthworks. The park constructed in 1989 a chipped hiking and biking trail to allow non-motorized vehicle access to the area between Prospect Hill and Hamilton’s Crossing. (Figure 133) This trail helped to meet the park’s continued commitment to the cycling community, which had used Lee Drive as part of the National Bicycle Route.1

Out-of-town visitors driving along Lee Drive between 1970 and 2000 would likely have experienced varying degrees of seclusion. Big nondescript warehouses and colonial-styled homes sat along the borders of the first half of Lee Drive, emphasizing the narrow property lines between the park and private users. Trees helped to cloak these modern intrusions. Signage along the route encouraged visitors to drive and take short stops at key tour points. The Happel signs continued to provide the key interpretive story. Their height and size allowed drivers to read the contents from their cars. A picnic ground at Pickett’s Circle invited visitors into the historic scene. Along South Lee Drive, the park eventually came to own larger plots of land, some of which remained in agricultural use via special leasing arrangements. These farm plots gave visitors a taste of the area’s former rural character. Crossing Lansdowne Road, however, might have proved the most jarring part of the drive, since Lee Drive users had to wait at a stop sign and watch carefully as drivers on Lansdowne barreled down at oftentimes highway speeds. Commuting traffic taking Lee Drive as a cut-through might also come up unexpectedly behind visitors taking a more leisurely approach to their travels. This latter situation lessened considerably once the park closed South Lee Drive.

Chatham

The landscape of the battlefield of Fredericksburg changed dramatically in May 1976 when the National Park Service obtained control of Chatham following the December 1975
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41 John Hennessy, line-by-line comments to draft chapter six, May 2010, 9, FRSP Admin History Files.
death of its owner John Lee Pratt. (Figure 134) Pratt had set aside Chatham and about 30 acres of surrounding grounds for the federal government in a March 1964 deed of gift, stipulating that this gift receive “no publicity of any kind.”44 This wording long characterized Pratt’s approach to philanthropy. One of six children born of a Civil War soldier who had surrendered at Appomattox, John Lee Pratt had been born in King George County, Virginia, in October 1879. He graduated from the University of Virginia with an engineering degree and immediately began working in 1905 for E. I. DuPont de Nemours & Company. His early success with engineering projects led to his placement in New York City with top DuPont officials and his traveling the country to find suitable sites for new DuPont plants. Through a relationship between DuPont and the then-fledgling General Motors Corporation, Pratt took on a few special assignments with the car manufacturer and eventually joined GMC in 1919 fulltime. Highly regarded for his hard work, good sense, and organizational capabilities, Pratt contributed to the growth of General Motors, becoming a vice president in 1922 and a member of the executive committee from 1924 until its dissolution in 1935. He officially retired in 1937 with a personal fortune later estimated to range between $100 and $200 million dollars. During World War II, he served in important capacities on the War Resources Board, Office of Production Management, the Lend-Lease Administration, and the Foreign Economic Administration.45

He and his wife Lillian Thomas, who later died in 1947, created the John Lee and Lillian Thomas Pratt Foundation to promote their interest in scholarly, research, and philanthropic causes. They did not have any children of their own. Beneficiaries of the foundation over the years included Virginia institutions, such as the University of Virginia, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, and the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts, but also research activities at Johns Hopkins University, including the establishment of the McCollum-Pratt Institute to study vitamins and micronutrients.46 Their giving reflected John Lee Pratt’s life-long efforts to eliminate disease, make agriculture productive, and provide reasonable assistance for people to educate themselves.47 The Pratts generally requested anonymity with their donations, wanting as little publicity as possible. Former Virginia Governor Colgate Darden, Jr. remarked upon John Lee Pratt’s death that “You never saw an individual more determined to avoid the limelight.”48 One of the executors of his will and a Fredericksburg attorney, Ralph M. Whittcar III, noted that Pratt “wanted to do what he did, and he didn’t want to receive any public credit for it, and that was that.”49

44 Memorandum, JC Harrington to Director, 24 March 1964, File Deed #200, FRSP Lands Files.
46 Ibid., 240.
48 Colgate Darden, Jr., as quoted by Friddell, “Millionaire’s Business: People.”
49 Ibid.
A gingko tree and a patient superintendent might have led to the extraordinary gift of Chatham to the federal government. Longtime superintendent Oscar Northington recalled about ten years after the event that around 1963 John Lee Pratt had invited Northington to Chatham to talk about the large gingko tree in the Fredericksburg National Cemetery. Pratt had his own large gingko tree in his yard, and he had funded a considerable amount of research on the trees at the University of Virginia. Northington recalled asking Pratt what was to become of Chatham, and Pratt had at first remarked that he would like a person from a prominent Virginia family and of distant connection to the estate to have it. Northington remembered suggesting that a historical organization inherit the property, but Pratt did not want to have to subsidize such an endeavor. On a subsequent trip again to talk about the gingko tree, Northington asked if Pratt would consider giving a portion of Chatham to the government as an addition to the national park. Pratt thought favorably of this idea and asked for more information. Negotiations began in earnest, and Northington recalled that the deal was set just prior to the dedication ceremony for the Chancellorsville Visitor Center in May 1963. A draft letter in the lands files suggests that Pratt wanted at first to deed the estate to the Park Service with a life estate, but he also did not want Stafford County to lose any taxes from this arrangement. Instead, in March 1964, Pratt placed the deed of gift in escrow to deliver to the United States upon his death.\footnote{Memorandum, Dixon Freeland to Regional Director, Mid-Atlantic Region, 24 December 1975; draft letter from John Lee Pratt to Conrad Wirth, c. 1963; A. F. Rollins to John Lee Pratt, 5 December 1963; and Memorandum, J. C. Harrington to Director, 24 March 1964, all in File Deed #200, FRSP Lands Files. Preliminary Historic Resource Study, Chatham, October 1982, 241, FRSP Library.}

Pratt did not wait to give the Park Service a different parcel of land. Also in March 1964, he donated a half-mile strip of land, totaling 23 acres, along the Rappahannock River where Federal troops had built a pontoon bridge for the December 1862 battle. Dr. and Mrs. Thomas Payne and Miss Mary Garnett completed the bridgehead grant by donating to the federal government four lots in the 1300 block of Sophia Street in Fredericksburg. At the time of these donations, then-superintendent Northington stated that the park had long recognized that the park had not any vantage point from which to tell the story of the battle from the perspective of the attacking Federal army. These donations would “go a long way toward correcting this deficiency.”\footnote{Oscar Northington, as quoted by Paul Muse, “Civil War Bridge Sites Given to Park Service,” \textit{Free Lance-Star}, 14 March 1964. See also Preliminary Historic Resource Study, Chatham, October 1982, 242, FRSP Library.}

Chatham sits 80 feet above the Rappahannock River on steep banks. (Figure 135) The plantation house, attached wings, and the detached kitchen and laundry all comprise the original historic structure, built between 1768 and 1771. (Figure 136) The main house (with 12 rooms on the upper two floors) is a well built and finely detailed architectural example of mid-eighteenth century Georgian plantation styling. All walls above the water table are Flemish bond with glazed headers and grapevine joints. Walls below the water table are the same bond with plain headers. Rubbed brick is used below the cornice at the juncture of the
house, wings, and passages, and at the corners of the house and wings and in the four-course belt marking the second story. Post-Civil War structures include a barn, stables and garages, a dairy and milkhouse, greenhouses, and numerous other garden and farm structures. The main house underwent outward cosmetic changes over time to reflect architectural progression from Victorian styling, as evidenced in two-story porches added to the front and back of the house (Figure 137), to Colonial restraint with the removal of the porches and the addition of limestone doorways modeled after Palladio designs. (Figure 138) Interior changes included removal of one set of stairs, modification of the remaining set of stairs, and installation of bathrooms.52 (Figure 139)

The plantation house and support buildings received steady attention between the time of Pratt’s death to the October 1977 official opening to the public. Overall, the estate was in remarkably good condition, evidence that its past owners had paid attention to its upkeep and no major disasters had befallen it.53 The Park Service first had to assess the existing status of the buildings and grounds, from the point of view of public safety and comfort, and determine priorities of action for opening the estate to the public in a reasonable amount of time from the date of acquisition. Superintendent Dixon Freeland worked with local community leaders to set the 1977 opening. He knew that the Park Service would still be only in the beginning stages of its rehabilitation work, but he also wanted to ensure public access, in keeping with Pratt’s wishes. Youth Conservation Corps volunteers along with the park’s maintenance staff removed ivy and overgrown trees and bushes from near the historic buildings and prepared the ground for installation of drainage tile. Plants had grown into the walls, loosened the mortar, and allowed moisture into the walls. The park repointed and replaced bricks. The roof and chimneys were repaired. Park Service employees, brought in from other areas, assisted the small park staff in painting inside and out, repairing the heating system, and replacing some disintegrating floor joists. Eventually, some summer beams needed reinforcement.54

Chatham expanded the possibilities for interpretation at the park. The estate provided a place to tell the Federal story and more. Here, Edwin V. Sumner, commander of the Federal army’s Right Grand Division, set up in December 1862 his command post,


53 The Federal occupation of the estate during the Civil War did leave the grounds trampled and some of the original wood paneling and doors taken down for firewood, but the buildings themselves did not sustain any shell damage. See Preliminary Historic Resource Study, Chatham, October 1982, 179, FRSP Library.

54 Memorandum, Dixon Freeland to Key Staff, FRSP, 7 July 1976, 1, File Chatham Rehab, Cabinet 9, Drawer 2, FRSP Basement Files. Memorandum, Freeland to Associate Regional Director, Operations, Mid-Atlantic Region, 3 August 1976, 1; Memorandum, Nathan Golub to Regional Director, Mid-Atlantic Region, 26 March 1976, 1; Memorandum, Freeland to Regional Director, Mid-Atlantic Region, 2 April 1976, 1, all in File Chatham Development Planning 1974-77, both in Cabinet 9, Drawer 2, FRSP Basement Files. Paul Sullivan, “Chatham Is Prepared for Opening Next Fall;” and 11 December 1976. Larry Evans, “Company’s Coming,” 7 October 1977, both in Free Lance-Star.
overlooking the Rappahannock River and the town of Fredericksburg. Here, Clara Barton and Walt Whitman nursed fallen soldiers in a makeshift field hospital after the December 1862 and May 1863 battles. Here, President Lincoln in May 1862 met with Federal brigade commanders while Federal forces occupied Fredericksburg. Here, in colonial and early Republic days, George Washington visited and corresponded with his friend William Fitzhugh, the original owner of Chatham. Here, more than a hundred slaves worked the fields, served in the main house, and practiced skilled crafts such as carpentry and blacksmithing, although the Park Service has not located the remains of slave quarters.\footnote{Preliminary Historic Resource Study, Chatham, October 1982, 34, 37, 49, 129, 134, 144, 155, FRSP Library. See also \url{www.nps.gov/frsp/chatham.htm}. About possible locations for Chatham’s slave quarters, see \url{http://npsfrsp.wordpress.com/2010/04/01/j-horace-lacy%E2%80%99s-chatham-quarters-part-1/}, \url{http://npsfrsp.wordpress.com/2010/04/02/j-horace-lacy%E2%80%99s-chatham-quarters-part-2/}, accessed July 2011.}

Visitors to Chatham in October 1977 found three rooms with exhibits that explored many of these themes. The central Great Room provided a “feeling” of the mansion, allowing its architectural grace to welcome people. An interpreter answered questions and directed people to either the Civil War Room to the right or the Chatham Room to the left. The Civil War Room’s exhibit panels focused upon Chatham as the Federal headquarters and as a field hospital where Barton and Whitman assisted the wounded. A communications display, surgeon’s kit, a photo of one of the onsite wartime graves, and a portrait of Lincoln added details to this story. Two panels also described the Lacy family, who owned Chatham during the war, and how the estate looked after Appomattox. The Chatham Room gave brief information about the other Chatham owners, going back to William Fitzhugh, who had the estate built, and moving forward into the twentieth century. This room gave a sense of major changes introduced to the buildings and grounds. The other first-floor rooms and the entire second floor served as administrative space for the now-park headquarters.\footnote{Memorandum, Stuart Maule to Regional Director, Mid-Atlantic Region, 2 November 1976, and attached drawings; Memorandum, Dixon Freeland to Regional Director, Mid-Atlantic Region, 20 January 1976, and attached draft Preliminary Plan for the Operation of Chatham Manor, 16 January 1976, both in File Chatham Development Planning 1974-77, Cabinet 9, Drawer 2, FRSP Basement Files.}

Visitors would not have seen any significant historic furnishings\footnote{Four portraits of previous Chatham owners and three pieces of furniture associated with the house were put on display in 1996 following donations. Another painting which had once hung at Chatham also was donated to the park. See NPS Press Release, Historic Furnishings Put on Display at Chatham, 18 April 1996, File D6215 Museum and Exhibit Activities 1994-, Cabinet 15, Drawer 4, FRSP Basement Files.} when touring these three rooms. The Park Service did not inherit any furnishings from the John Lee Pratt estate. These were sold off in a two-day auction in May 1976 with the proceeds distributed according to his will. Interpretive planners, both at the park and within the region, argued that the primary story at Chatham should be the Civil War. Chief park historian Krick in particular wanted to avoid a “white columns” approach which threatened to undermine the wartime story, and he had suggested leaving the rooms unfurnished to emphasize this point. Others agreed, and the Chatham interpretive approach became one relying upon reading panels, seeing a few historic objects of related significance, and walking the grounds. Outside
signage gave visitors needed information about the role of Chatham as a Federal headquarters, and one painting showing an overhead view of Chatham during the winter helped place the building within the historic landscape. Visitors could also look from Chatham’s front lawn toward the city. The Park Service had topped trees along the steep ravine facing the Rappahannock River, providing visitors with the same stunning view of Fredericksburg that Federal commanders would have had in 1862.\textsuperscript{58}

The interpretive emphasis upon the wartime uses of Chatham meant that Krick and his historians could conveniently sidestep any mention of the many slaves who had worked inside the house and outside in the plantation the many years before the Civil War. Plus, Krick’s interpretive team could largely ignore life at Chatham after the war, whether the devastated lives and livelihoods of the Reconstruction period or the eventual rebirth of the home once wealthy individuals in the early 20\textsuperscript{th} century bought and used it as a showplace or retreat. The narrow presentation of Chatham’s wartime uses fit within the Fredericksburg battlefield story, providing an important and needed Federal perspective largely lacking in previous interpretation of that battlefield. The larger continuum story, though, would have opened visitors’ eyes to a rich and complicated past for the entire area.

The Park Service’s decision not to fill Chatham with reproduction furnishings to suggest a certain time period represents a small movement within the historic preservation community to acknowledge the limits of documentation or the possibilities of architecture to inspire visitors. Perhaps the most famous example of a historic structure with no furnishings is Drayton Hall, outside Charleston, SC. When the National Trust for Historic Preservation obtained this property in 1974, it recognized that it held a gem. John Drayton had had built the two-story brick plantation house and seven generations of Draytons had lived in and owned the property, but they had never updated it with electricity, plumbing, heating, or air conditioning. Some furnishings had remained, but the Palladio-inspired architectural features, from hand carved moldings to the elaborate overmantle in the great hall could shine without competition. Other Park Service historic houses have also been left empty or used for other purposes. Many of the historic houses along the Battle Road Trail at Minute Man National Revolutionary Park (MA) stand empty as silent witnesses to the American Revolutionary War events. The Captain William Smith House, when restored in the 1980s, had a small meeting area and kitchenette incorporated for interpreters to use, and the Job Brooks House interior now functions as a curatorial storage area through adaptive reuse. Space requirements, lack of authentic furnishings or details about how the spaces had been

decorated, and funding constraints all played into the decisions to keep these buildings free of furnishings.\(^59\)

New interpretive opportunities at Chatham came in the 1980s. Two more rooms on the first floor, with exhibit panels, opened in spring 1981 for visitor use. On the front lawn, the park hosted a series of summer concerts, widely attended by local residents. Superintendent Jim Zinck thought that the concerts gave local residents and other visitors an added opportunity to enjoy the wonderful view of Fredericksburg from Chatham's heights. The park also rehabilitated the gardens along the east front of the house to their 1920s period of establishment (discussed previously in XXXchapter four/five). (Figure 140) Krick and others had adamantly opposed giving any attention to the gardens because they saw limited funding going to interpretation not related to the wartime period. Zinck was equally adamant the work should be done, if only to address safety and maintenance issues. He found a way to get the funding for the garden restoration, begun in 1983 and completed three years later. The work addressed deterioration of walls, walks, and other features while also removing large quantities of dead and overgrown plant material. The park used the original garden design plans developed by noted landscape architect Ellen Shipman. The gardens had long been a source of pride within the larger Virginia gardening community, and the park worked with various groups during the restoration. The park also developed a relationship with Rappahannock Adult Activities to use Chatham's greenhouses as a way to help train disabled adults.\(^60\)

A continuing source of concern and potential controversy at Chatham involved the route visitors took to enter the park unit. Pratt had traditionally used the River Road entrance, a winding and hilly gravel road that forced drivers to cross oncoming traffic just east of the Chatham bridge into Fredericksburg, a congested area. Deed restrictions on private Chatham Lane allowed Chatham owners, and other owners along the lane, access to this narrow roadway. A third potential option involved using nearby Jefferson Street, another narrow but public roadway. Pratt's will deeded six lots surrounding Jefferson in

---


anticipation of the Park Service eventually widening this road and using it as the primary park entrance. This option had the difficulty of having houses within a few hundred feet of the proposed widened road. Houses sat further back in comparison along Chatham Lane. The Virginia State Highway Department offered a fourth option with the possibility of having an entrance built off a proposed widened Route 218 and Routes 3-17 (east-west) connector. This latter possibility remained largely in the planning stages and never resulted in changes for Chatham. The park from the start chose to have visitors take Chatham Lane to enter and use the River Road route for exit. Buses, mobile homes, and other large vehicles had to use Chatham Lane both ways. One particular family along Chatham Lane, Dr. and Mrs. Louis Massad, grew more and more irritated by the public use of this private road, eventually hiring lawyers to assert their rights and at one point in 1989 building a fence that infringed upon the right-of-way. The Park Service argued and demonstrated that as the owner of Chatham, it retained use of the private road and maintained it for visitors.61

SALEM CHURCH

Visitors to Salem Church between 1970 and 2000 could appreciate the silent determined presence of this simple brick building with gable roof amidst the encroaching commercial and residential growth of its immediate surroundings.62 Salem Church literally sat at a crossroads between historic preservation and urban sprawl. Strip shopping centers, expansive asphalt parking lots, and the constant crawl of traffic along Route 3 steadily ate up the land around the historic church and overwhelmed the structure. Visitors largely saw Salem Church on their own, as the park rarely stationed interpreters at the site and the building remained locked. (Figure 141)

Some important restoration work did enhance this limited visitor experience. Park maintenance staff restored the building's exterior in 1972-1973, replacing the metal roof with a shingle one, repairing structural cracks, repointing the bricks, and installing drainage tiles around the building. They left the numerous bullet holes in the walls as reminders of the church's place in the 1863 Chancellorsville Campaign. Star-shaped iron anchor plates, installed pre-Civil War to stabilize the building, also remained. Park staff members in the mid-1970s turned their attention to the interior of the church. They laid a new pine floor fastened with cut nails similar to the original ones. They replastered the walls where cracks

61 Memorandum, Charles Wyatt to Files, 26 April 1976, 1; Memorandum, Dixon Freeland to Regional Director, Mid-Atlantic Region, 18 June 1976; Memorandum, Freeland to Dave Kimball, 17 September 1976, 1; Memorandum, Barron Bohnet to Regional Director, Mid-Atlantic Region, 17 September 1976; Memorandum, Jack Galloway to Assistant Manager, Mid-Atlantic Region/North Atlantic Team, DSC, 14 July 1980, 1, 3, all in File D18 DCP Chatham, Cabinet 15, Drawer 2, FRSP Basement Files. FRSP Environmental Assessment Chatham Manor Unit, 1982, 33, File H30 Chatham Environmental Assessment, Cabinet 13, Drawer 4, FRSP Basement Files. Memorandum, James Zinck to Regional Solicitor, 12 August 1983; Memorandum, James Zinck to Dr. and Mrs. Louis Massad, 6 September 1983; Memorandum, Anthony Conte to James Zinck, 7 September 1983; David Wright to Russell Roberts, 4 October 1984; and James Zinck to D. French Slaughter, 24 June 1986, 1, all in File D30 Chatham Lane Access Question, Cabinet 13, Drawer 4, FRSP Basement Files.

62 The growth of developments surrounding Salem Church is discussed in chapter four.
had formed and painted the finished walls. They placed wooden pews similar to the original ones, reinstalled the pulpit, and restored the galleries to their original design.63 (Figure 142)

Salem Baptist Church, which had donated the original church building in 1961 following completion of a new larger church building, joined the Park Service in May 1977 in dedicating the restored historic structure. Cold War concerns meshed with remembrances of the past in this ceremony. Rep. J. Kenneth Robinson (R-VA) gave the dedicatory address, emphasizing in his remarks the need for the United States in the late 1970s to strengthen its military to oppose effectively the “Soviet drive for dominance.” He loosely connected this idea to the Battle of Chancellorsville, in which he stated President Lincoln had worried that Britain and France would recognize the Confederate States following this victory, but that the victory was “illusionary because it could not be sustained.” Robinson did not want modern Americans to be disillusioned that United States military buildup was sufficient when in his mind the Soviets continued to pose a real threat.64

Chief park historian Robert Krick also spoke at the dedication, providing a brief historical account of the battle associated with Salem Church. His closing statement gives some clues as to his vision for interpretation at Salem Church and within the park as a whole. He referred to the fact that many audience members had had kin who had been associated with the battle in some way. He stated that, in honor of this association, “it is the goal of the National Park Service to extend this feeling of kinship” to the church and its historic associations to the thousands of park visitors who will visit this site and others.65 Krick also alluded to this desire of kinship with the past in a 1974 anniversary address at Salem Church, in which he admitted that amidst all of the traffic and development bearing down on the historic site, “it is somewhat difficult to evoke the Presence of the Past.” But, he confidently asserted that despite all this modernization, “the past will always be with us” because “you and I, each of us, will have a great deal to say about that [what happens at Salem Church].”66

Krick and his interpretive team worked with limited resources to achieve this connection between past and present at Salem Church. The building’s 1977 interpretive plan ended with the rousing words that the “quiet dignity” of the simple church building still

---


65 Robert Krick, Salem Church speech, 29 May 1977, 5, File A8215 Salem Church Dedication, Cabinet 8, Drawer 3, FRSP Basement Files.

66 Robert Krick, Salem Church Anniversary Address, 29 September 1974, 6, File A82 Anniversary Celebration, Salem Church, 1974, Cabinet 8, Drawer 3, FRSP Basement Files.
bearing the “visible scars” of the battle “is awe-inspiring in itself.”67 The park interpretive staff wanted visitors to feel and react to the events of the past in a visceral way, as developed in the park’s 1973 Interpretive Prospectus and its emphasis upon empathy.68 Krick encapsulated this interpretive vision in both of his remarks at the historic church.

Three Sidney King paintings served as a key interpretive tool to achieve empathy at Salem Church. The first painting on the short walking tour around the church documented the Fredericksburg refugees who fled their homes just before the December 1862 battle commenced. (Figure 143) The second painting provided a snapshot of the May 1863 battle around the church. The third painting, set inside one of the building’s windows for visitors to peer at from the outside, recreated the church as a field hospital. Visitors also had two metal battle maps, located at the first tour stop, to orient themselves as to battle lines and movements of troops. The King paintings, notably three for such a small site, served as a counterpoint to the maps, illustrating a huddled refugee family around firelight, for example, or wounded men on stretchers waiting for care.69

The more practical aspects of the visitor experience at Salem Church changed as modern development and traffic, with increasing noise, mushroomed around the historic site. Visitors in the 1960s through the 1980s had to park their cars in a Park Service lot across Route 639 from the church. They then had to cross this increasingly busy road to access the church grounds. The park’s 1986 General Management Plan notes that discussions had started with the Virginia highway department to reroute 639. This work, tied to the widening of the road to four lanes to accommodate its increased use, resulted in 1993 with the relocation of Route 639 to the west. The Park Service no longer had to contend with a busy road directly next to the church’s historic front entrance. With the added space from the road relocation, the park could have visitor parking on the same side of Route 639 as the church, easing concerns about visitor safety.70

The few interpretive additions to Salem Church did not hide the fact that this one-acre site lacked essential resources. The National Park Service, as described in chapter four, had never made land acquisition around the church a priority. Developers quickly took away any opportunities that may have existed prior to the 1960s Route 3 widening and bought adjacent lands, driving prices higher than the park could hope to meet. Auto tour routes may have mentioned Salem Church as a side trip, but the park focused its interpretive story for 1863 on the events at Chancellorsville, especially Jackson’s flank attack and his eventual
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67 Salem Church Interpretation and Use, January 1977, no pagination [last page for quote], File A8215 Salem Church Dedication 1977, Cabinet 8, Drawer 3, FRSP Basement Files.
68 FRSP, Interpretive Prospectus, 1973, 2, FRSP Library.
69 Herbert Collins, as quoted by Betty Hayden Snider in “Caroline Painter Leaves behind Legacy,” Free Lance-Star, 26 April 2002.
wounding and death from friendly fire. Krick and his predecessors had a clear preference for the Lee and Jackson story. A volunteer group, organized through the new Salem Baptist Church, kept the historic building open during the summers of 1984 and 1985, but even that effort floundered.\footnote{FRSP, Annual Report, 1984, 18, File A2621 Superintendent’s Annual Report 1984; FRSP Annual Report, 1985, 19, File A2621 Superintendent’s Annual Report 1985, both in Cabinet 8, Drawer 1, FRSP Basement Files.} Salem Church, along with the Second Battle of Fredericksburg (and almost any discussion of the Federal fighting at Chancellorsville except its defeat), received minimal attention in comparison.

**CHANCELLORSVILLE**

The Chancellorsville Visitor Center in the 1970s had new attractions inside and out to engage visitors. Inside, the park displayed a 12-foot by 20-foot mural by award-winning artist Ethel Magafan. Outside, the park invited visitors to an engrossing living history camp. Both of these elements helped to further the park’s commitment, as expressed in the 1973 Interpretive Prospectus, to building connections of empathy in the people visiting those sites with the historical events and people remembered at the battlefield park.

The mural, installed in 1979, depicted Grant’s resolute ride on horseback south after the Battle of the Wilderness. (Figures 144 and 145) A tired column of men started cheering and throwing their caps in the air, recognizing that Grant’s decision to pursue Lee, not retreat, represented the beginning of the end of the Civil War. Magafan embodied the sense of tension and excitement in the scene by positioning the guns in soldiers’ arms and mirroring that effect with the tree branches. These short diagonals and smoke rising in extended horizontals from the fires gave the mural drama and movement. Little painted stories are encapsulated around the main focus on Grant, adding realistic and historically accurate portrayals. Two soldiers carry off a fallen comrade, their heads bowed with the solemnity of their task. A triad of men in the center of the mural calls out with raised arms, exemplifying the relief and exhilaration felt. A fallen horse near the lower center and a dead soldier in the lower left-hand corner remind viewers of the costs of the war.\footnote{Sylvia Day, “Magafan’s Epic Mural—‘Battle of the Wilderness’—Superb Work of Art,” *Ulster County Gazette*, 30 November 1978.}

Grant as the subject for mural came later in the process of developing the mural idea. Originally, chief park historian Krick had talked about a mural, probably envisioning a subject related to Jackson and Lee, with his historical artist friend William A. Smith. Superintendent Dixon Freeland enthusiastically encouraged Krick in pursuing a mural if funds could be found. Smith recommended approaching the National Academy of Design for such funding. The National Academy expressed interest, but it held to its requirements that a competition among members of the academy had to determine the artist chosen for the mural project. Smith encountered some health problems, and the academy chose Magafan. Magafan had largely a landscape painting background, but she had also completed murals for the U.S. Senate Chamber, Social Security Administration Building, and the Recorder of
Deeds Building. During the Depression, she had completed murals for United States Post Offices in Nebraska, Colorado, Oklahoma, and Arkansas. Just before winning the commission at Fredericksburg, in 1971 she had toured the western states and drawn sites for the Department of the Interior. The National Gallery of Art in Washington, DC, and the Smithsonian Institution, in a traveling exhibit, displayed the results of this travel.\(^{73}\)

The mural idea continued to excite Freeland and others, but Magafan as the artist did provoke some concerns. Krick called her a “clown” and hoped that the Academy would initially throw her out of consideration.\(^{74}\) Once the Academy chose Magafan, Freeland asked for a meeting with the artist to help address concerns that she had not previously produced “the sort of historical mural we have had in mind.”\(^{75}\) This meeting resulted in the park agreeing to have Magafan as the artist of the mural.\(^{76}\) Freeland and other Park Service officials articulated excitement and promise for the mural to reach out and touch visitors, building empathy for the portrayed historical figures. Freeland wanted the mural to “distill the essence” of a great moment in American history and “transmit it with force and feeling” to viewers. The proposed location in the visitor center for the mural and the proposed subject matter all suggested heroism, in his mind.\(^{77}\) Mid-Atlantic regional director Chester Brooks wrote that he anticipated that the mural “will move our visitors” both by its artistic merit and historical verity.\(^{78}\) Associate Regional Director Nathan Golub urged the park to give some leeway to the artist so that she could embody a subject of general interest but imbue it with “an emotion that has meaning for all.”\(^{79}\) Freeland encouraged Magafan to depict a scene from the Battle of the Wilderness, and specifically about Grant, since his role in winning the war had been crucial.\(^{80}\) Magafan read Federal and Confederate accounts,
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\(^{74}\) Memorandum, Krick to the Files, 23 October 1975, File D62 Historical Mural CVC, Cabinet 15, Drawer 3, FRSP Basement Files.

\(^{75}\) Memorandum, Freeland to Chet Harris, MARO, 2 March 1976, File D62 Historical Mural CVC, Cabinet 15, Drawer 3, FRSP Basement Files.

\(^{76}\) Nathan Golub to Alfred Easton Poor, 21 June 1976, File D62 Historical Mural CVC, Cabinet 15, Drawer 3, FRSP Basement Files.

\(^{77}\) Memorandum, Dixon Freeland to Regional Director, Mid-Atlantic Region, 20 June 1974, 2, File D62 Historical Mural, CVC, Cabinet 15, Drawer 3, FRSP Basement Files.

\(^{78}\) Chester Brooks to Alfred Poor, 27 November 1974, 1, File D62 Historical Mural, CVC, Cabinet 15, Drawer 3, FRSP Basement Files.

\(^{79}\) Memorandum, Nathan Golub to Dixon Freeland, 4 November 1976, 1, File D62 Historical Mural, CVC, Cabinet 15, Drawer 3, FRSP Basement Files.

\(^{80}\) When first considering ideas for a mural in 1974, Freeland had favored Grant in the Wilderness, Krick had favored the Jackson flank attack, and the park staff as a whole was “somewhat attracted to” the Jackson wounding idea. Krick may have stepped aside in pursuing the flank attack subject once Magafan was chosen since her previous work did not mesh with what he had envisioned. See Memorandum, Freeland to
explored the Wilderness landscape when touring the park, and read secondary sources explaining the battle. She chose the exact subject matter for the mural based on a passage in Bruce Catton’s *A Stillness at Appomattox*, when Grant rode into the lead following this battle. Her completed mural received high marks from local newspapers around where she had her home and studio in Woodstock, NY, and Freeland remarked in one letter of the “tremendous public acceptance.”

Another crowd pleaser and innovative approach to interpretation came from a living history camp at Chancellorsville. The park hosted a living history camp for twelve weeks during the summers of 1973 and 1974, outfitting a set of seasonal employees and an additional group of weekend costumed interpreters with carefully researched and reproduced equipment for living and working 24 hours a day, seven days a week as Confederate soldiers. (Figure 146) The story line for the first year had the living history costumed interpreters serve as an ordnance team, gleaning the Chancellorsville battlefield after the May 1863 battle for weapons, cleaning them, and sending them to Richmond for further repair and reissue. The summer 1974 team acted as a detachment camp, guarding the area against re-entry of Federal soldiers after the battle. Visitors could walk a short distance from the Chancellorsville Visitor Center and observe the camp in action, interact with the costumed interpreters, ask questions, even participate in various activities. The costumed interpreters slept, ate, and worked at the camp, having regular days off but otherwise immersed in the everyday life of a Confederate soldier or camp follower. Camp followers were women, often the wives of noncommissioned officers. (Figure 147) They served on the army roles and were subject to military discipline. They completed typical domestic tasks such as cooking and sewing. (Figure 148) The soldiers and officers chopped wood, worked with weapons, and marched. (Figure 149) The weekend costumed interpreters provided extra interpretive help on busy summer weekends and also broke some of the inevitable boredom felt by the seasonals, who didn’t have anything but the camp and each other for company.”

---

81 Dixon Freeland quoted in Freeland to John Dobkin, 23 October 1979, File D6215 CVC Mural, Cabinet 15, Drawer 4, FRSP Basement Files. See also Dennis Dogseth, “When Does a Painting Take Two Years and Nine Months to Complete?” *Woodstock Times*, 30 November 1978. Sylvia Day, “Magafan’s Epic Mural—‘Battle of the Wilderness’—Superb Work of Art,” *Ulster County Gazette*, 30 November 1978. Freeland may have found merit in the mural, but most park staff never warmed to the mural’s subject or depiction. The park covered the mural with muslin in 2010 to install other temporary exhibits.

82 The costumed interpreters were not part of a larger outside reenactment group but instead received specific training from NPS staff and worked directly for FRSP.

Visitors reacted to the living history camp in a range of ways. Some simply observed from afar or took photos. (Figure 150) Others immersed themselves in the experience.\(^\text{84}\) One family with two young daughters wrote more than a month after they had visited that the camp experience was a highlight of their month-long vacation. The girls were “nose to nose” helping a camp follower clean up the pots and pans after lunch while their father joined in a chase for the camp hen as a rain storm threatened.\(^\text{85}\) A Midwestern couple in 1973 ended up staying the night in the tents and sharing grits and fatback the next morning with the camp soldiers. An Australian man stumbled upon the camp in 1974 and stayed three nights, dumbfounded by the idea. The costumed interpreters especially found satisfaction when visitors could relax and view the entire setting as real. They disliked questions about who they really were and where they really lived. They answered queries about the reproduction artifacts or tasks being done, providing the perspective of the Civil War character they portrayed.\(^\text{86}\) The camp soldiers and followers recognized early on that life went at a much slower pace than in the 20\(^{\text{th}}\) century, forcing them to realize that the Confederate soldier had a “different sense of values,” being “robust people, true utilitarians. . .”\(^\text{87}\) They wanted to communicate that sense of slowness and simplicity through their actions and conversations with visitors. (Figure 151)

Living history, as practiced at the Chancellorsville camp and in other parks, offered details about the past, such as what people ate, how they spent their freetime, and what gear they used in soldiering, that made the era come alive. These details, in some ways, mimicked the heavy emphasis upon military maneuvers used in exhibits and waysides. But, Krick also knew that these details intrigued visitors, as the examples above indicate, and helped build powerful connections of empathy. Finally, living history emphasized largely the toils of daily life, putting the spotlight on everyday people, much as the new social history was doing within academia.\(^\text{88}\)

Living history within the Park Service had undergone changes before its implementation at Fredericksburg. Indian camps in Yosemite National Park (CA), traditional Navajo dances performed at Mesa Verde National Park (CO), and Indian handicrafts sold at Pipe Spring National Monument (AZ) all served as 1930s forerunners. The Civil War Centennial (1961-1965) and particularly the reenactment of the First Battle of Manassas in July 1961 demonstrated how far reenacting could go. The Manassas reenactment, as described in chapter three, overwhelmed the historic resource and park staff, prompting NPS Director Conrad Wirth to establish a policy for no more reenactments


\(^{85}\) Gerald and Mary Rankin to Charlotte and Soldiers, 17 July 1973, File CVC 1973 Living History Camp, CVC Archives.


\(^{88}\) John Hennessy, comments to draft chapter six, May 2010, 5, FRSP Admin History Files.
on national park lands. Fort Davis National Historic Site (TX) addressed this policy in 1965 by being one of the first park sites to dress interpreters in period uniforms. Director George Hartzog, who succeeded Wirth in 1964, embraced the idea of living history when he stated in unprepared testimony before a House subcommittee that he would not have another “dead and embalmed historical area” in the agency. He pursued the idea of national park sites having living historical farm programs, with farm animals, crops, and demonstrations of farm life. This effort flowered into several programs at parks as divergent as Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial (IN) and Oxon Hill Children’s Farm (MD). Battlefield parks quickly adopted their own living history programs. Saratoga National Historical Park (NY) presented military drilling and firing in addition to 18th-century cooking, baking, sewing, and candle making.99

Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania joined other Park Service sites and dabbled with living history in the late 1960s and early 1970s. The park hosted in 1968 rifle and mortar demonstrations.90 Seasonal interpreters, dressed as Federal soldiers, expanded the repertoire in summer 1969 by having mule demonstrations, packing and unpacking Kate the mule. The interpreters also hosted separate mortar firings, all done at the Chancellorsville Visitor Center. Park staff thought that such programming would be “dramatic and effective,” but the historians also had to make allowances for modern-day requirements. Mortar firings actually happened at Spotsylvania Court House, not Chancellorsville, but safety and space considerations made Chancellorsville a better choice. Plus, the staff could schedule such demonstrations three times a day and know that they would have “constant audiences,” not a probability at Spotsylvania. The interpreters would begin each mortar firing explaining that they actually happened elsewhere historically.91 A separate living history program at Lee Drive had seasonal interpreters, dressed in Confederate uniforms, demonstrate trench digging. This activity, offered daily when visitors stopped to see, took place at Pickett’s Circle in front of the Confederate trench remains. Living history at the park in 1970 repeated these same activities at Chancellorsville and Lee Drive. The end of that season, though, saw the unfortunate loss of Kate, who escaped her quarters and was hit and killed on Route 3, not far from the Jackson wounding site.92

The enthusiasm for the promise of living history across the agency soon brought criticism and adaptations. Historian George Davidson at Vicksburg National Military Park
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90 Memorandum, William Hollomon to Regional Director, Southeast Region, 25 September 1968, File Historian’s Reading Files 9/68-12/31/68, Cabinet 3, Drawer 1, FRSP Basement Files.


Frank Barnes, as quoted by Barry Mackintosh in *Interpretation in the National Park Service: A Historical Perspective*, chapter three, section Living History at [http://nps.gov/history/history/online_books/mackintosh2/directions_living_history.htm](http://nps.gov/history/history/online_books/mackintosh2/directions_living_history.htm). See also Memorandum, Charles Shedd to Superintendents, 30 November 1972, File K1817 Interp Planning 1971-80, Cabinet 9, Drawer 3, FRSP Basement Files.


Bill Meuse, a historian who had arrived in 1972 at Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania after serving for six years as chief historian at Saratoga National Historical Park (NY), played a key role in infusing new ideas and energy into the park’s living history program. He drew nationwide attention to Saratoga with its Revolutionary War training camp. Soldier reenactors dressed, marched, and used weapons just as their 18th-century counterparts had done. Meuse had conducted years of research to make the Saratoga program a historically
accurate portrayal. Fredericksburg’s 1973 Interpretive Prospectus noted that the park planned to try out a living history camp that year, and the plan left open the possibility of living history for the future. Planners cautioned that such interpretive programming needed lots of planning and a good setting to meet its ultimate aim of creating a “fully dimensional” recreation of the past. Meuse addressed this concern with the 24/7 living history camp.\footnote{Quote from FRSP, Interpretive Prospectus, 1973, 35, FRSP Library. See also James Moser, “Former Saratoga Aide Gets Park Service Role Here,” \textit{Free Lance-Star}, 20 July 1972. Les Jensen, email message to author, 2 April 2010, FRSP Admin History Files. Bill Meuse later went to Springfield Armory National Historic Site (MA) as curator and became known as a gun enthusiast and collector.}

Superintendent Dixon Freeland noted that he wanted the camp to be more than entertaining and instead convey a deep understanding of the nation’s tragic past. He wasn’t sure if the living history camp achieved that aim, but he was willing to keep experimenting and work toward that ultimate goal.\footnote{Dixon Freeland to Mr. and Mrs. Gerald Rankin, 3 August 1973, 1, File CVC 1973 Living History Camp, CVC Archives.}

Those experiments morphed by 1978 into Confederate and Federal costumed interpreters stationed at each of the battlefields to interact with visitors. They used first-person interpretation, becoming a character they had each developed from historical research, to describe soldier life and the battles. Locations and times varied slightly, but interpretive plans placed a Federal soldier reenactor on the Chatham lawn and by restored trenches in either Spotsylvania Court House or the Wilderness battlefields. Confederate soldier costumed interpreters stood at the Bullock Road camp in Chancellorsville and the C.S. Line in Fredericksburg. They all presented three 10-15 minute talks a day and then used the rest of their time to answer questions and describe the battle site from their 19th-century perspective.\footnote{Memorandum. Chris Calkins to Prospective Participants in the Living History Program, 17 November 1977, File K1815 Living History, Cabinet 16, Drawer 3, FRSP Basement Files. Robert Krick to Parke Rouse, 29 December 1978, 2-3, File Interp Reading Files 1978, Cabinet 3, Drawer 2, FRSP Basement Files.}

Krick noted in 1985 that the program gave information about military events but also the “attitudes and lifestyles” of the men who had fought.\footnote{Robert Krick to Stephen Hynes, 8 August 1985, 1, File Reading Copies August 1985, Cabinet 2, Drawer 4, FRSP Basement Files.} Budget cuts and fee collection programs reduced the number of living history locations to Chatham and Chancellorsville by the mid-1980s, and the program effectively ended by the mid-1990s.\footnote{The 1990 annual report states that summer staffing was one half what it had been 15 years earlier. FRSP, Annual Report, 1990, 4, File Reading Copies April 1991, Cabinet 2, Drawer 3, FRSP Basement Files.}

The reduced program, when in operation, had a Chatham reenactor who represented a member of the 14th Indiana Infantry, and he talked about that day’s date in 1864, plus the 1862 battle. The Chancellorsville reenactor talked about that day’s date in 1863. They had been assigned to stay behind and gather equipment or maybe recover from a wound, but he was now getting ready to join the rest of his unit. The park favored living history specific to the locale and only about once a year had outside groups hold an encampment. Park
historian Greg Mertz, who was heavily involved with the different encapsulations of the park’s living history program, noted that this approach helped ensure quality control over the accuracy of the program. Mertz believed that living history had to do more than present firing demonstrations. It had to relate to the park’s interpretive goals and themes.100

The 125th anniversary of the Battle of Chancellorsville provided another opportunity to incorporate living history. The five superintendents from the Virginia Civil War parks began meeting in 1984 to discuss ways to coordinate their commemorations and use the support of the newly established Friends of Virginia Civil War Parks group. They decided to mark the different battle anniversaries in a similar fashion with walking tours, living history encampments, speeches by dignitaries, and in-depth seminars on the battle events. The Friends group would help with the planning and assist in the development of appropriate commemorative items. Fredericksburg, which decided to focus its 125th anniversary activities on Chancellorsville, further coordinated its programming with local organizations. Mary Washington College opened the more than two-week long series of events on 15 April 1988 with a concert of Civil War-era music. Between 23 and 28 April, the park hosted evening lectures about the Chancellorsville campaign at that visitor center. A scholarly afternoon seminar followed on 29 April. That night, the park held a candlelight tour and evening address by Krick at Jackson Shrine. Saturday and Sunday were loaded with opportunities to learn about the battle. The park hosted a 5.8-mile walking tour of Jackson’s flank attack and bus tours of the battlefield and other associated sites. Park historians manned key battle sites to talk with visitors. Dignitaries, including former Virginia governor Charles Robb, spoke at a special commemorative ceremony. Visitors could see a living history encampment at Hazel Grove and Fairview, with tactical exercises by Federal and Confederate costumed interpreters including firing of artillery pieces. Park Service policy forbade having a full-fledged reenactment of the battle, but on that Sunday, nearby Fort A. P. Hill hosted the Living Historians for Virginia in a full reenactment.101 Alexander (“Sandy”) Rives, who served as the park’s management assistant during this period (he would come back later as superintendent), helped plan the 125th anniversary events, but he felt that the programming “just never caught hold.” Dignitaries and historians talking about the events, in his opinion, could not attract the public the way reenactments and pageantry events would. Park Service policy restricted such reenactments, though, forcing all the Civil War parks to find alternative events that would catch the public’s attention and entice them to learn more about the history.102

100 James Zinck to Martha Steger, 12 November 1985, File Reading Copies November 1985, Cabinet 2, Drawer 4, FRSP Basement Files. See Summer ’94 Interpretation Schedule and Summer ’96 Interpretation Schedule, Staff Historian’s Files, FRSP. Greg Mertz, email message to author, 1 February 2010, FRSP Admin History Files.
Visitors driving along the Chancellorsville auto tour between 1970 and 2000 would find additional land preserved in a restored state and roads aligned for ease of direction. The Virginia Highway Department in the early 1970s widened Route 3 through Chancellorsville, as described previously in chapter four. This step led the Park Service in 1986 to screen the Chancellorsville Visitor Center and Jackson wounding memorials from the busy and increasingly noisy road. Previously, they had stood clearly visible to travelers along the then-narrow road. Scene restoration efforts between Hazel Grove and Fairview in 1972 and 1980 opened this vista. The park cleared the vista for Maury Birthplace site in 1991. Park acquisition of the Chancellor House site in 1973 (discussed in chapter four) made it possible for clearing this vista, conducting archeological surveys, and marking the house site with waysides. The main stack of Catharine Furnace underwent a major rehabilitation in 1984 to firm up the crumbling stone and cap the stack with metal to reduce moisture intrusion. (Figure 152) The 1986 General Management Plan identified a few road changes to ease travel through the battlefield. These included making Bullock Road one-way northbound from the visitor center, helping to reduce non-park traffic on the road and improve visitor safety. Visitors could follow the route of Stonewall Jackson’s famous flank attack against Hooker’s right flank by following Jackson Trail East, Jackson Trail West, Brock Road, and Route 3. The trail roads, built by the park in the 1930s (described in chapter two), remained gravel although increasing numbers of residential buildings, and even a few subdivisions, appeared along them. Not until 1998 (described in chapter five) did the park acquire the land where the attack occurred. The park removed non-historic structures, opened this vista, and placed waysides in 1999. Before this time, visitors had to stand in the median of busy Route 3 and read two signs about the attack.103

**WILDERNESS**

Visitors driving out Route 3 past Chancellorsville and into the Wilderness area between 1970 and 2000 maneuvered over gently rolling wooded plateaus punctuated by the increasing presence of suburban residential and commercial development. Travelers crossed Wilderness Run, the main drainage source that flows north to the Rapidan River. They saw some open agricultural fields, many of which would give way to modern uses, and hickory-oak forests that gave Wilderness its essential character. Preserved land for the battlefield spreads as an open circle along Route 20, the park-built Hill-Ewell Drive, Route 621’s Orange
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Plank Road, and ending with narrow federal ownership along Route 613’s Brock Road. Land acquisition over the years and accompanying scene restoration helped establish some sense of protected parkland. Visitors driving Hill-Ewell Drive, for example, could look out toward the west and south and feel embraced by the historic scene. A view in the other direction, though, showed homes, garages, play sets, cars, lawn furniture, pools, and other reminders of the subdivisions that had settled just outside the park boundary and behind stands of trees (more on these subdivisions in chapters four and five). Ellwood, the former home of the Lacy family who had also owned Chatham during the Civil War, and about 100 acres came under park ownership in 1971, further protecting a vast swath of rolling farmland and wooded areas.104

The Mission 66 exhibit shelter welcomed visitors to the Wilderness. They could read about the battle on the exhibit panels, see a large-format painting by Sidney King of the historic scene, and possibly even ask questions of a park interpreter, stationed there during peak visitation times beginning in 1979. A short trail led from the Wilderness exhibit shelter through Saunders Field, where Federal and Confederate forces first clashed on 5 May 1864. Important scene restoration beginning in 1983 cleared Sauber’s Field, with a local logger cutting down and removing the trees. The park went in afterwards and removed stumps and seeded the newly cleared fields. The park had to leave trees screening the back portion of the field to hide the Lake Wilderness housing development just beyond the park boundary. At the nearby picnic area along Hill-Ewell Drive, visitors could take the Federal Line Trail, which linked with the former Warren-Wadsworth Trail originally built in the 1930s by CCC enrollees. This 5.2-mile trail re-opened in 1988 after Boy Scouts for an Eagle Scout project cleared brush and trees, built bridges across two streams, and marked the trail with blazes. This narrow line of earthworks had become essentially lost to visitors due to the construction of the Lake Wilderness subdivision that surrounded it and effectively isolated it from the bulk of the Wilderness battlefield. Contractors and Youth Conservation Corps volunteers in 1982 had done initial work along this line, clearing up to four miles of trenches. Trees had populated these earthworks. The Higgerson Farm (developed as a tour stop following implementation of the 1986 General Management Plan) and Chewning Farm tour stops gave visitors an opportunity to see the mixture of cleared fields and wooded acreage common for this area at the time of Civil War.105

Another farm field, owned by James Horace Lacy of Ellwood but farmed by the Widow Catharine Tapp, stood until 1988 in trees. The Park Service cleared this 22-acre field that year in an important act to restore this scene and developed a trail to take visitors to the


house site. Waysides told of the battle, including the Lee-to-the-rear incident, and reproduced a soldier’s drawing of the Tapp cabin, the only known representation of this structure. Visitors could also see various monuments placed over time in the field. These ranged from simple stone markers remembering fallen Confederate Col. James Nance (just across the Plank Road from Tapp Field) or the Lee story, both placed at the beginning of the 20th century, to a tall granite monument placed by the state of Texas during the Civil War Centennial. Continuing on the tour route, visitors could see the Wadsworth Monument, placed in 1936 by Federal Gen. James Wadsworth’s grandson, marking near the location where Wadsworth was mortally wounded. Legislation in 1992 and later 1999 allowed the park to acquire from the developers of the Fawn Lake subdivision directly adjacent to the park Longstreet’s Flank Attack site (this acquisition story is described in chapter five). The Brock Road-Plank Road intersection tour stop, with monuments placed in remembrance of Federal forces, emphasized the intense combat that took place there and the decision by Grant to continue the fighting south at Spotsylvania Court House, as opposed to retreating as his successors had done in the face of Lee’s Army.  

Ellwood did not open to the public until 1998. (Figure 153) Dr. Gordon Jones and his wife Winifred Jones in 1971 sold the house and about 100 acres. They then donated another three acres and donated a scenic easement for about 65 acres. However, they retained a 10-year reservation on the house and about an acre of land for Dr. Jones’s parents to continue living on the property. The Joneses extinguished this remaining reservation in 1975, giving the park control of the site. The family enthusiastically shared its knowledge of the house and surrounding lands. Dr. Jones’s mother, Blanch Willis Jones, and her family had owned the property since 1907. She authored a history of the house, relating folk stories from the time of the American Revolution forward. Dr. Jones and his father Leo Jones shared their knowledge about what maintenance and other changes the family had done to the house over the years. Dr. Jones also donated in 1975 his substantial library, containing many books of historical merit, to the park.

Ellwood stands two stories high with an attic. This T-shaped building, originally clapboard but later covered in cedar shingles, has a pedimented front porch with classically

106 FRSP, Annual Report, 1988, 7, File A2621 Superintendent’s Annual Report 1988, Cabinet 14, Drawer 1, FRSP Basement Files. XXX Form, Historic Widow Tapp Field clearance, 9 October 1987, File Widow Tapp Scene Restoration, Cabinet 16, Drawer 2, FRSP Basement Files.

107 The Ellwood Historic Structure Report and newspaper reports incorrectly reported that the Joneses obtained a life estate for Dr. Jones’s parents. See Schedule A; Warranty Deed, 26 April 1971; Memorandum, Dixon Freeland to Files, 29 October 1972; and Memorandum, Richard Schwartz to Chief, Branch of Coordination and Control, WASO, 25 November 1975, and attached 21 October 1975 deed terminating the reservation, all in File Deed #136, FRSP Lands Files. The park gained control of Ellwood in 1975, not 1977 as previously believed.

108 Memorandum, Richard Stanton to Chief, Division of Land Acquisition, 30 April 1971, 1; Memorandum of Visit with Dr. Gordon Jones and Father at the Lacy House “Ellwood,” 21 June 1974; Dixon Freeland to Gordon Jones, 26 August 1975, and attached Jones to Freeland, 19 August 1975, all in File Deed # 136, FRSP Lands Files. Henry Magaziner, Field Trip Report, 2-3 August 1976, 11, File Regional Trip Reports, Cabinet 8, Drawer 1, FRSP Basement Files.
designed columns and an elaborate bracketed cornice. Windows on the first floor are nine over nine, and second-floor windows are six over six lights. The brick foundation holds up the frame structure. The house, situated on a knoll overlooking Wilderness Run, was built around 1790 on a 5,000-acre estate that included stables, barns, a detached kitchen, and slave cabins to house the few dozen slaves who worked the surrounding fields. William Jones or his descendants owned Ellwood for its first century. Famous guests of Ellwood during this period may have included “Light Horse Harry” Lee, father of Robert E. Lee; Revolutionary War hero Marquis de Lafayette; James Madison; and James Monroe. Following the death of his first wife, Jones married his first wife’s 16-year old granddaughter, Lucinda Gordon, and they produced a daughter, whom William named after his first wife, Betty Churchill. William Jones died in 1845, and Ellwood passed to his second wife Lucinda. She remarried two years later, and ownership passed to her daughter Betty, following the conditions of William Jones’s will. Betty married in 1848 J. Horace Lacy, and they used Ellwood largely as a summer home, preferring to live at Chatham, their primary residence.\footnote{Henry Magaziner, Field Trip Report, 2-3 August 1976, 11-12, File Regional Trip Reports, Cabinet 8, Drawer 1, FRSP Basement Files. See also \url{www.nps.gov/frsp/ellwood.htm}, accessed 14 April 2010.}

Ellwood received historical distinction and merit as an important addition to the battlefield park through its role in the Civil War battles of Chancellorsville and the Wilderness. Confederates unsuccessfully staved off Federal advances to Chancellorsville in April 1863. Days later, J. Horace Lacy’s brother, Beverly Tucker Lacy and chaplain to Stonewall Jackson, brought Jackson’s amputated arm to Ellwood and buried it in the family cemetery. The house served as a field hospital for months after the Battle of Chancellorsville. Federal troops ransacked the Lacy library in the fall of 1863 while passing through to Mine Run. Ellwood achieved prominence during three days in May 1864 when it served as headquarters for Gens. Gouverneur Warren and Ambrose Burnside, two of the Federal army’s four corps commanders during the Battle of the Wilderness. Grant, recently appointed commander of all Federal armies across the country, had his headquarters about a few hundred yards north of Ellwood. By the time they moved on to Spotsylvania Court House, Ellwood would be left desolate and inhabited by caretakers or squatters. The Lacy family returned to Ellwood in 1872 and remained in ownership until they sold to law professor Hugh Evander Willis in 1907. This family eventually sold Ellwood in 1971 to the Park Service.\footnote{See \url{www.nps.gov/frsp/ellwood.htm}, accessed 14 April 2010.}

Restoration efforts stretched over two decades. The park, when it first gained control of the house in 1975, cleaned up, cleared, and fenced the cemetery on the property, including where Stonewall Jackson’s arm had been buried. A Volunteer In the Parks (VIP) stayed in Ellwood the following year while the park began making assessments about the structure. Those assessments pointed to some serious problems needing immediate attention. A number of wood girders, or summer beams, in the framing system transferred their loads from one to another as opposed to going directly from one foundation wall to the
opposite wall. This situation was compounded by the fact that the summer beam spanning from the southwest rear wing to the main house was under-designed and made of second-hand lumber already pocked with mortise joints. This beam had bowed badly, and the entire main block of the building running NW to SE had moved precariously. The entire SW wall of the main wing of the house dropped as a result. The front wall rotated slightly upward in response to the backward downward pull. The NPS architect conducting the survey worried that the building may still be moving and requested the “best engineering talent . . . . Quickly!” Signs of severe insect infestation also were apparent.  

Further investigation led the Park Service in 1978-79 to insert a steel grid beneath the superstructure to provide necessary support for the “violently-shifting and unstable structure.” The ends of this steel support system fitted into a new concrete foundation, made of cement block and reused original brick facing the block. Interior plaster was removed to expose the rotted and insect-damaged studs and beams. The park replaced the damaged wood and applied new plaster. Ellwood received a new wood shingle roof in 1982, and contractors in 1983 stabilized and replaced deteriorated beams and rafters in the attic. Contractors also removed modern wood-shingled siding and replaced any damaged original wood clapboard underneath with new milled treated material, identical to the historic fabric. The park also removed the non-historic modern kitchen addition in 1984 and found three original windows, restoring them. Ellwood was made weather tight with new insulation and was painted a medium-mauve color, matching the original color found from paint analysis. Funding for restoration work stopped until 1989 when the park replaced the doors and completed other tasks to keep the building secure and safe from fires and intruders. The interior remained unfinished.  

Volunteers through The Friends of Wilderness Battlefield, formed in 1996, made it possible for the Park Service to open Ellwood to the public for the first time on 9 May 1998. This group provided crucial manpower to complete renovation of the entrance road, clear brush along fence rows, and clean the building’s interior. Members also began a docent program so that they could open the house weekend afternoons all summer in 1998 and 1999. The national park’s interpretive staff assisted with the intensive training. More than four thousand people visited Ellwood those two summers. Those visitors saw new interior


112 Benjamin Zerbey to Robert Garvey, 7 July 1978, 1, File H30 Lacy House, Cabinet 16, Drawer 2, FRSP Basement Files.  

exhibit panels and five exterior waysides, the latter funded from a grant from the American Battlefield Protection Program. The panels gave information about the Lacy family, civilian life, and the use of Ellwood as a Federal headquarters during the Wilderness battle. An all-volunteer maintenance team has worked to keep the grounds in good shape. The friends group has set its next goal to working with historical architects to plan for restoration of Ellwood’s interior, using donations the group has actively collected.114

Opening Ellwood represents two significant shifts within the National Park Service. First, the agency has made a commitment to make more of its holdings accessible to the public, often using cooperative agreements as a catalyst. The Vail Agenda (discussed in chapter five) of 1991, initiated for the agency’s 75th anniversary, emphasized that park units should provide educational and recreational opportunities for the public as a means to learn about and appreciate the lessons of each park, while also maintaining unimpaired those unique features. Having Ellwood stand empty and unavailable to the public did not help the park staff to tell the story about its important family, the building, and the Civil War. Funding constraints meant that the park could not accomplish its interpretive goals on its own. The partnership with the friends group made the difference. The Vail Agenda promoted partnerships and cooperative agreements to achieve similar goals across the national park system. Second, the park’s 1989 boundary legislation required that interpretation expand to include the civilian story, plus the causes of the Civil War and slavery’s role as a cause. The Holding the High Ground conferences of 1998 and 2001 added further weight to this push. Opening Ellwood as a home and battle command post serves as an immediate example of this evolution in interpretation.115

**SPOTSYLVANIA COURT HOUSE**

Visitors driving the tour route for the Battle of Spotsylvania in 1970 and again in 2000 would have recognized significant changes. The basic story would have remained the same, focusing on the bloody clash between Lee’s and Grant’s armies across formidable earthworks over a two-week period in May 1864 before moving farther south. The same key sites would also have educated visitors about the battle. But the landscape transformed from a veritable overgrown forest to the open farm fields present at the time of the Civil War. Spotsylvania Court House became the one quintessential park experience within the entire Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania collection of battlefields. An active and growing farm program, used throughout the national park, from the 1980s on helped to keep the landscape open and agriculturally active. The park’s road system also shifted, with two major road
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closings, to help ensure the safety of visitors and maintain the historic landscape. These changes have made Spotsylvania the only park unit at Fredericksburg with a truly insular quality. Former supervisory park ranger J. Michael Greenfield described this feeling when he said recently that “if you want to go someplace and turn around 360 degrees and not see McDonald’s arches or telephone poles,” you as visitors should go to Spotsylvania.  

A Mission 66 exhibit shelter started visitors on their exploration of this last battlefield in the park. Its site is loaded with markers and interpretive information, and also some incompatible uses. A cluster of inholdings of relatively small size surround the park entranceway, cloaked by trees. Interpretive markers, ranging from the compass directional to the Happel metal signs to a Sidney King painting depicting an overhead view of the fighting, all compete for the visitor’s attention. A monument to Federal General John Sedgwick remembers this highest ranking Federal officer to die in the Civil War. Visitors then drove past the point where Federal Col. Emory Upton successfully advanced upon Confederate defenses but had to retreat without support. The park in 1987 cleared more than four acres of trees and seeded it. Visitors then drove into the Muleshoe Salient. This bulge in the center of the Confederate line of earthworks served as the location for continued attacks and heavy hand-to-hand fighting, first at the west side of the salient, known as the Bloody Angle, and later on the east face. 

The road system in 1970 essentially brought three roads, Grant Drive West, Anderson Drive, and Bloody Angle Drive, together at this crucial historic site. This configuration intruded upon the scene and possibly confused visitors. The 1973 Interpretive Prospectus suggested that the park adopt a loop road system, using Grant Drive East and Anderson Drive. Gordon Drive, which looped back to Anderson Drive from the point where Bloody Angle Drive met Grant Drive East, would be obliterated, according to the 1973 plan. Further consideration led the park in 1982 to obliterate about 855 feet of Bloody Angle Drive where it joined Grant Drive West. This action opened up the historic scene, fulfilling what Superintendent Oscar Northington and Historian Ralph Happel had envisioned back in the early days of planning Mission 66 in the park. Current park chief historian John Hennessy characterizes removal of this section of road near the Bloody Angle as “one of the most important improvements to a specific historic site within the park, ever.”

Scene restoration efforts in the 1980s further shaped the road system. A contractor in 1985 cleared trees from 40 acres around the Harrison House site, Lee’s headquarters during the battle. More scene restoration opened up the area around Laurel Hill and Dole’s Salient. The Park Service restricted access to Anderson Drive for the logging trucks, keeping visitors and any other traffic off the road with barricades. General Management Plan development during
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118 John Hennessy, line-by-line comments on draft chapter six, 28, FRSP Admin History Files.
this period had already identified Anderson Drive for possible closure, and chief park ranger Mike Johnson noted that no one had complained about the closures for the logging operation. The park decided to keep the road closed, as approved in the 1986 GMP.\(^\text{119}\) Without Bloody Angle Drive connecting Grant West and Grant East, the park decided to rename Grant East as Burnside Drive, to honor this commander from both the 1862 Fredericksburg battle and the Wilderness-Spotsylvania campaigns.\(^\text{120}\)

Features at the Bloody Angle and other tour stops helped to immerse visitors in the history. The park in the 1970s reconstructed at the Bloody Angle a set of the earthworks that CCC enrollees had rebuilt of the original trenchline. This reconstruction gave visitors an understanding of the size and complexity of the originals. The park’s Long Range Interpretive Plan noted that these reconstructed earthworks had deteriorated like the originals.\(^\text{121}\) A War Department marker identified the location of the 22-inch oak tree that small arms fire had felled. Tall upright Happel metal signs described the action and provided troop movement maps. Monuments placed over the years remembered the 15\(^{th}\) New Jersey, the 49\(^{th}\) New York, and the 126\(^{th}\) Ohio. The Harrison and McCoull house sites reminded visitors of the rural slave-holding families who had lived where the fighting had taken place. Happel signs and low-profile waysides from the park’s most recent period gave information about the families and the key events of the battle. Visitors could see a fairly well preserved system of original earthworks at the east face of the Mule Shoe salient. The park in 1987 cleared 14 acres of trees from this section of the battlefield. Installed in 1997, a monument remembers the 17\(^{th}\) Michigan Regiment at Heth’s Salient, where Burnside led a new attack upon another bulge in the Confederate line. Visitors could then drive to Lee’s Last Line, behind the Mule Shoe and representing some of the most extensive and best preserved earthworks from the entire war. These earthworks, recreated in 2000, layered logs to a height above a soldier’s head and separated the top two logs to give room to shoot through and still protect the soldier’s head. A trench ran behind the logworks for soldiers to stand in and remain protected and earth sloped in front of the earthworks.\(^\text{122}\)

Spotsylvania Court House might represent the one “true” park experience in the battlefield park, but it and the Wilderness stand as “second sisters,” as current park chief


\(^{120}\) Will Greene remembered in his oral history interview that he had suggested naming the road after Burnside. See Greene, transcript of interview, 24 February 2010, 16.

\(^{121}\) The park produced a Long Range Interpretive Plan in March 1998, and then a more detailed LRIP in 2001. Discussion of the Spotsylvania Court House reconstructed earthworks are found in FRSP, Long Range Interpretive Plan, 1998, 16-17; FRSP, LRIP, 2001, 31, both in FRSP Library.

historian John Hennessy has noted, to Chancellorsville and Fredericksburg. This situation had long characterized the visitation and interpretation reality at the park. Both Fredericksburg and Chancellorsville captured the imaginations of the largely Virginia-born and bred historian staff, from the CCC days forward (Krick was not a Virginia native, but he embraced the Confederate story). They presented an interpretive program that focused almost exclusively upon Lee and Jackson, with little attention paid to Federal commanders or Federal tactics and achievements. Fredericksburg also had the advantage of location, with the dramatic fighting at Marye’s Heights located in the city boundaries and near the commercial downtown and tourism areas. Chancellorsville required more time and energy to get there, but in the days when Route 3 was still a country road, the trip seemed attractive for visitors wanting a taste of the country. A visitor center (after 1963) with personal services enhanced the experience. Wilderness and Spotsylvania Court House required more effort (with a map) to navigate to their locations, and they did not have any reliable personal services. The pay-off in terms of interpretation probably did not justify, in some people’s minds, the trip. The exhibit shelters and waysides helped, but Spotsylvania Court House, and the Bloody Angle in particular, benefits from ranger tours to help visitors understand the intense clashes and movement of troops over days of fighting.

STONEMAWL JACKSON SHRINE

Geographic reasons often convinced visitors to drive to Guinea Station after touring Spotsylvania Court House battlefield rather than heading south from Chancellorsville, the battle associated with Stonewall Jackson. The Shrine, where Jackson died after wounds suffered during the Chancellorsville Battle, welcomed visitors on a fairly regular schedule after its restoration in 1963 (described in chapter three). Low visitation numbers and the relatively small size of the rooms in the shrine allowed interpreters to assist visitors in small groups and individually. The park contracted out in 1984 the building of a restroom facility, with water treatment facility and new septic system. That same year, park interpreters experimented with a living history program at the Shrine. Peter Carmichael, one of those costumed interpreters who also happened to be completing his graduate work in history at Penn State University, dared to broaden the interpretive story at the Shrine. He remembered that visitors often treated their time at the Shrine as a “ritual of admiration,” paying their debt to Jackson. The party line story reinforced at the Shrine was that this spot symbolized the end of the Confederacy, and people essentially paid their respects to Jackson and the Confederacy by visiting. Carmichael challenged people to think that this spot did not represent the end of the Southern bid for independence. Krick tolerated such an approach,
according to Carmichael, because he knew Carmichael was a strong historian who was bringing in new manuscript material and helping the park’s research library grow.\footnote{Carmichael, transcript of interview, 1 September 2010, 12.}

**ANALYSIS**

Krick continued the Lost Cause tradition and the emphasis upon military maneuvers, especially those that highlighted Lee and Jackson’s tactics, that historians from the CCC days and Mission 66 period had established. This approach fit his sympathies and his recognition of the difficult circumstances and dramatic disadvantages that Lee’s Army faced. The battle tactics emphasis also fit within the National Park Service’s belief that park lands served as the classroom for visitors to learn about the nation’s history and natural beauty. Interpreters described military maneuvers as a way to meet visitor’s curiosity about what happened on that land. The military emphasis also fed into the commemorative role of the battlefield parks, as a way of remembering the soldiers and officers who fought and died on those landscapes. The opening lines of the park’s enabling legislation made clear that Congress set aside the Fredericksburg-Spotsylvania battlefields to commemorate the Civil War battles fought there and that the key land initially identified for acquisition would be areas where visible fortifications stood, again emphasizing the military components of the battles. The Lost Cause approach and emphasis upon battle details also fell in line with the National Park Service’s aversion, up until the 1990s, to taking on controversial topics, with slavery as a top contender. Commemoration, however, does not have to, nor should it, stop with the men on the battlefield. The park has in the past and in recent interpretive efforts included aspects of the common soldier life and that of civilians. More could be done. Families, men and women, black and white, slave and free, who lived on the fields and in Fredericksburg itself, had to protect their lives even as their physical surroundings and livelihoods, in many cases, were torn apart. Once the Civil War ended, these same families had to reconstruct their relationships with each other and find economic means for sustaining their existence. Spotsylvania County did not rebound in population, due largely to a black exodus, until a hundred years after the year, an indicator of the extent of the devastated and depressed area. These civilians caught in the midst of battle deserve increased attention and commemoration just as the soldiers engaged in the fighting do.

Further research attention might illuminate the situation of blacks who might have fought during the 1862-1864 battles and blacks who lived in pockets around the Civil War battlefields before and after the war. More research and discussion about the role of the United States Colored Troops at Wilderness is needed. Separately, former Chief Ranger Mike Johnson noted in his oral history interview, when talking about Fawn Lake, that the developer wanted access on the Orange Plank Road, instead of the Brock Road, because the latter was near a black community. Johnson suggested that people living in million-dollar houses in Fawn Lake would not want to drive past a black community, of supposedly lower
socio-economic status. Was this black community historically significant to understanding the post-Civil War settlement patterns? If such a settlement of maybe free blacks existed during the war, how did their experiences differ or match those of whites in the area?

Shying away from controversy with relation to slavery may have worked for the National Park Service until the 1990s. But, the visiting public now has had 24/7 access to the Internet and increased exposure to historical scholarship (often presented in popular media forms) that has defeated the Lost Cause tradition. At the same time, proponents of the Lost Cause perspective have hardened their stance in perpetuating their interpretation of the Civil War, and they are quick to make public their ire when the Park Service veers away from this tradition. Many more perspectives, not just relating to the slavery issue and interpretation, have appeared over the years to challenge the Park Service’s management of Civil War battlefield parks. Civil War enthusiasts, whether they pursue their interest by reading books, watching movies, or reenacting, want to experience the battlefields as they would have appeared in the 1860s, preserved and restored. Neighbors and inholders may appreciate having a national park near their homes and businesses until they see park managers trying to obtain restrictions on development outside park boundaries. Preservationists may act in partnership with the agency to publicize threats and even gather voices and money to acquire more land. These actions, however, may continue to distance residents and officials in the local communities, exacerbating relationships. Preservation also sparks confrontations when park managers want to restore battle scenes by cutting down swaths of trees. Neighbors may prefer the shade and privacy of such trees, plus their environmental benefits, despite their historical incongruity. Other preservationists may decry “freeze-framing” the landscape to one time period without acknowledging a continuum in history across the area. People from different racial, ethnic, geographic, and socio-economic backgrounds ascribe a vast array of competing and oftentimes antagonistic feelings to these battlefields. These lands are known as hallowed ground, but any ceremony or commemorative act, or interpretive or management decision, thanks to the competing and conflicting voices, makes these actions open to criticism and devaluation.

The National Park Service has thus entered a new phase in its management of Civil War battlefields, focused on the diversity of its visitors. Each of these voices wants to be heard and wants to control the presentation of the battlefields to the public. The agency cannot side with one or even a few without raising the ire of those feeling ignored. The threat of retaliation (in the form of funding decreases or legislation) from Congress, responding to constituents angered by the Park Service’s actions, always looms. What can an
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127 Mike Johnson, transcription of oral history interview with the author, 11 December 2009, 20, FRSP Archives.
128 Pitcaithley, “‘A Cosmic Threat,’” 172-86.
agency do? Its best hope may be to embrace all perspectives in a postmodernist (there is no one truth but rather relative truths for each person or group) sense. Such an approach might involve declaring in different waysides and exhibits how these different groups would look at the same landscape or understand different battles. Ranger talks would incorporate discussions of the varied preservation actions and interpretive perspectives over time when also describing battles. Preservation (and building a sense of connection and empathy in tangible ways) would achieve a heightened focus, with the possibility of building new partnerships and new approaches to protecting the battlefields well into the future.
Figure 126. This gas station sat next to the Fredericksburg Visitor Center until 1991 when the park acquired the land and demolished the structure. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Fredericksburg Box 4, File Fredericksburg Visitor Center, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 127. This undated view shows the Sunken Road and original Stone Wall. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Fredericksburg Box 2, File Sunken Road, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 128. The National Park Service slightly narrowed the roadway and constructed an oak rail fence along the Sunken Road, as shown in the c. 2000 photo, to help keep pedestrians safe from vehicles. The Innis House is on the right. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Fredericksburg Box 2, File Sunken Road, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 129. Visitors toured the Innis House in December 1987, soon after the park completed its restoration. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Fredericksburg Box 10, File Visitor Use, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 130. Visitors on a December 1987 candlelight tour of the newly restored Innis House saw the main room and mantel decorated for the holiday. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Fredericksburg Box 10, File Visitor Use, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 131. A visitor standing just below Pickett’s Circle on Lee Drive can clearly see housing just across from the park boundary in this 2010 photo. Photo courtesy of the author.
Figure 132. The park in 1989 closed South Lee Drive at Prospect Hill and restored the historic scene. Photo courtesy of the author.
Figure 133. The park provided a chipped trail and entrance for hikers and bikers to continue past the closed South Lee Drive to Hamilton’s Crossing. Photo courtesy of the author.
Figure 134. Chatham, originally constructed in 1786, served as a Federal headquarters and then a hospital in 1862. Photo courtesy of the National Park Service, Chatham Photos Box, File Chatham Photos, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 135. This view looking west from Chatham lets visitors see Fredericksburg from the position of the Federals during the Civil War. Photo courtesy of Library of Congress.
Figure 136. The west view, or front entrance, to Chatham looked out onto the Rappahannock River. Photo courtesy of Library of Congress.
Figure 137. This 19th-century photograph shows the two-story porches added to Chatham, which were later removed. Photo courtesy of Library of Congress.
Figure 138. Early 20th-century owners added limestone doorways inspired by Palladio. Photo courtesy of Library of Congress.
Figure 139. This interior photograph of a Chatham mantel and fireplace illustrates the fine architectural detailing throughout the public rooms. Photo courtesy of Library of Congress.
Figure 140. This view shows a section of the Chatham gardens while still under private ownership. Photo courtesy of Library of Congress.
Figure 141. Salem Church is shown in this 1977 photo with an interpretive painting by Sidney King and a United Daughters of the Confederacy 1927 plaque. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Salem Church Box, File Salem Church Modern, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 142. The Park Service in the mid-1970s restored the interior of Salem Church. Photo courtesy of National Park Service.
Figure 143. This reproduction of a Sidney King painting at Salem Church documents refugees who fled their homes just before the December 1862 battle. Photo courtesy of the author.
Figure 144. Ethel Magafan used battle histories and visits to the battlefield to inform her depiction of Lt. Gen. Ulysses Grant’s decision to continue from the Wilderness to Spotsylvania Court House. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 145. Detail of the Magafan mural at Chancellorsville Visitor Center. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 146. Visitors could witness a fulltime living history camp at Chancellorsville during the summers of 1973 and 1974. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Living History Box, File Confederate Camp Continued, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 147. Men and women as costumed interpreters set up as a fulltime living history camp at Chancellorsville during the summers of 1973 and 1974. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Living History Box, File Confederate Camp Continued, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 148. Women as costumed interpreters completed such tasks as sewing and cooking in the Chancellorsville living history camp. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Living History Box, File Confederate Camp Continued, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 149. Men as costumed interpreters cut wood and marched at the living history camp at Chancellorsville. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Living History Box, File Confederate Camp Continued, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 150. Visitors asked questions and took photos of the costumed interpreters at the Chancellorsville living history camp. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Living History Box, File Confederate Camp Continued, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 151. Costumed interpreters shared with visitors about life in a Confederate living history camp at Chancellorsville. Photo courtesy of National Park Service, Living History Box, File Confederate Camp Continued, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 152. The National Park Service in 1984 rehabilitated Catharine Furnace at Chancellorsville. Photo courtesy National Park Service, Chancellorsville Box 1, File Catharine Furnace, FRSP Photo Archives.
Figure 153. Ellwood on the Wilderness battlefield opened to the public in 1998, thanks in part to the volunteer work of the Friends of the Wilderness Battlefield. Photo courtesy of the author.
EPILOGUE

TOUCH THE FUTURE

Superintendent Russ Smith invited local residents and interested individuals to join the park staff in public meetings during the summer and early fall of 2009 to share ideas about the future of the national military park, as it prepared a new general management plan. He wrote in the community newsletter that “the GMP is an exciting opportunity to touch the future” and work together to “envision the park that will be left to future generations.” That future already meant updating interpretive programming with new media to reach out to new audiences. Plus, park staff needed to remain vigilant in protecting park resources against continued development threats.

Interpretation has had a huge boost from a combination of factors. The 1989 boundary legislation specified that the park should expand its interpretive focus to the causes of the Civil War and its effects upon civilians, especially the diverse population of the South. The Lost Cause mentality and emphasis upon battle tactics would give way to a nuanced and textured look at the complex history of the era. Superintendents Rives and Smith have encouraged programming to reflect this new approach. Rives saw the new film (written by chief historian John Hennessy) and its telling of the December 1862 battle within the context of slavery and the civilian story in addition to the battle itself debut at the Fredericksburg Visitor Center. Smith, who has a strong interest in storytelling, has encouraged Hennessy to explore the many ways stories can be told at the park. Hennessy has built upon the expertise of the park’s longtime historian interpretive staff to explore new possibilities.

New media has served as a cornerstone for the park’s interpretive programming in the first decade of the 21st century. The park’s website contains important features that let visitors electronically delve into the landscape and its history. Virtual tours for each battlefield contain photographs of tour stops, a short statement of the historical significance of that location, and links to maps and historical summaries to bring the battle events into full perspective. Multimedia presentations or YouTube-type videos let viewers take a guided tour of the Stonewall Jackson Shrine or meet poet Walt Whitman while he served as a nurse at Chatham after the Fredericksburg battle. Photo galleries showcase the many historical and contemporary images in the park’s holdings. Six mobile tours for iPods and MP3 players, available on the “Fredericksburg Timeless” website, let visitors connect to history with their everyday technology. Hennessy and his historian interpreters routinely post on “Mysteries and Conundrums” and “Fredericksburg Remembered” blogs. These postings, which share
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recent research finds, often delve into the miseries of slavery as experienced in the area or the hardships of soldiers between battles. Hennessy also wrote additional scripts and worked carefully throughout the production on three more movies for the park, including one specifically about civilian life.4

Traditional media for interpretation have seen improvements. The park tour brochure has been enlarged 50 percent to make it easier to follow along the 70-mile trek through the park. The park has installed 100 new waysides, with another 50 coming soon, to aid visitors out in the battlefields. These waysides largely depart from the Happel signs used since the 1950s. The new waysides encourage people to read the information, then look up and view the restored landscape. The Happel signs stood in front of viewers and largely blocked their sightlines. New directional signs remind travelers that they are entering park boundaries and help with navigating the far-flung park. “History at Sunset” tours, offered on summer Friday evenings, allow the park’s historians to share stories about people and places in an intimate and detailed fashion. Two new exhibits at the Chancellorsville Visitor Center focus upon families and Civil War ancestors. A new cannon, a smoothbore Napoleon, allows park staff to demonstrate artillery firings for the first time in years.5

Educational programming for school groups has sat in limbo since Janice Frye’s 2009 retirement. Frye, a longtime park historian interpreter, had initiated in the mid-1990s a limited outreach program to teachers and their classes. Frye had additional duties as park curator and lead manager of the Chancellorsville Visitor Center, restricting her availability. She obtained funding from such sources as the National Park Foundation, Teaching Using Historic Places, and Teaching American History to put together traveling haversacks and a traveling uniform trunk for outreach. A second trunk and traveling maps later joined this offering to the schools. She coordinated teacher workshops to demonstrate ways in which the park’s Civil War history could be used in the classroom and encourage field trips. Frye tried with mixed results (due to lack of regular funding and changing standards) to develop educational programs specifically linked to Virginia’s Standards of Learning curriculum guidelines. Teachers who attended workshops and bus tours (the park offered the first bus tour for teachers in 2002) responded enthusiastically, asking for additional opportunities for such interactions and indicating how they would share their new experiences with their students. By the end of her time at the park, though, school budget limitations and further changes in educational priorities resulting from the federal No Child Left Behind legislation (which resulted in increased classroom time and testing) limited field trip opportunities for schools.6

6 A complete run of annual reports on the Educational program can be found in Janice Frye’s Files, CVC, FRSP. See specifically October 93-September 94, 1, 5; 95-96 Education Program, 2; FY97 Education Program, 3; FY 1998 Education Recap, 1-3; FY 2000 Education Recap, “Teaching with Historic Places” at FRSP section; FY 2001 Education Recap, 2; FY 2003 Education Recap, 2, Archeology Inservice workshop
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Protection continues to garner attention and vigilance by park staff. Walmart officials had begun talks with Orange County representatives in 2007, resulting in an application for a special-use permit to build a 240,000-square foot Super Walmart at the juncture of Routes 3 and 20, at the entrance to the Wilderness battlefield. The 51-acre site was located next to small strip shopping center with a Sheetz gas station and McDonald’s. But the Walmart promised traffic and ancillary development, all the makings of extending the sprawl along Route 3 and through the battlefield park. Objections grew from local residents and the park to Virginia’s highest elected officials, including Senators Mark Warner (D) and Jim Webb (D), then-Governor Tim Kaine (D), and the speaker of the Virginia House of Delegates, William J. Howell (R). Historians, led by noted Civil War scholars James McPherson and David McCullough, sent Walmart in December 2008 a plea to consider another location further west, away from the one and only Wilderness battlefield. The Orange County Board of Supervisors listened to the preservationist arguments and then voted in August 2009 to approve Walmart’s plans. Plaintiffs, composed of a coalition of local residents, historians, and non-profit organizations, filed a legal complaint in September 2009, arguing that the Board had acted so unreasonably to have abdicated its responsibility. The case moved forward, and the trial opened on 25 January 2011. Walmart surprised all on the following day, announcing its intention to buy the land and offer it to a conservation group to keep it as open space. The retailer would seek another location in Orange County for its superstore.7

Touching the future resonates with a double meaning. Interpretation brings the history forward to educate and entertain people of all ages wanting to understand and touch the past. Development proposals such as the Walmart superstore have the potential to bring the demands and intrusions of the future up against the past, making them touch in potentially conflicting ways. Park managers and interpreters have the responsibility to tell the stories and protect the resources so that future generations can also touch the past.
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APPENDIX B

An Act To provide for the inspection of the battle fields in and around Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania Court House, Virginia, approved June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 646)

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That a commission is hereby created, to be composed of the following members, who shall be appointed by the Secretary of War:

(1) A commissioned officer of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army;
(2) A veteran of the Civil War who served honorably in the military forces of the United States; and
(3) A veteran of the Civil War who served honorably in the military forces of the Confederate States of America.

SEC. 2. In appointing the members of the commission created by section 1 of this Act the Secretary of War shall, as far as practicable, select persons familiar with the terrain of the battle fields in and around Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania Court House, Virginia, and the historical events associated therewith.

SEC. 3. It shall be the duty of the commission, acting under the direction of the Secretary of War, to inspect the battle fields in and around Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania Court House, Virginia, in order to ascertain the feasibility of preserving and marking for historical and professional military study such fields. The commission shall submit a report of its findings to the Secretary of War not later than December 1, 1924.

SEC. 4. There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $3,000 in order to carry out the provisions of this Act. (See 16 U.S.C. § 425 note.)
APPENDIX C

An Act To establish a national military park at and near Fredericksburg, Virginia, and to mark and preserve historical points connected with the battles of Fredericksburg, Spotsylvania Court House, Wilderness, and Chancellorsville, including Salem Church, Virginia, approved February 14, 1927 (44 Stat. 1091)

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to commemorate the Civil War battles of Fredericksburg, Spotsylvania Court House, Wilderness, and Chancellorsville, including Salem Church, all located at or near Fredericksburg, Virginia, and to mark and preserve for historical purposes the breastworks, earthworks, gun emplacements, walls, or other defenses or shelters used by the armies in said battles, so far as the marking and preservation of the same are practicable, the land herein authorized to be acquired, or so much thereof as may be taken, and the highways and approaches herein authorized to be constructed, are hereby declared to be a national military park to be known as the Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania County Battle Fields Memorial whenever the title to the same shall have been acquired by the United States, the said land so to be acquired being the land necessary for a park of the plan indicated on the index map sheet files with the report of the Battle Field Commission appointed pursuant to an Act entitled “An Act to provide for the inspection of the battle fields in and around Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania Court House, Virginia,” approved on the 7th day of June, 1924, said index map sheet being referred to in said report, and particularly in the “Combined Plan–Antietam system,” described in said report, the first of the plans mentioned in said report under the heading “Combined Plan–Antietam system” being the plan which is hereby adopted, the said land herein authorized to be acquired being such land as the Secretary of War may deem necessary to establish a park on the combined plan, Antietam system, above referred to, the particular boundaries of such land to be fixed by surveys made previous to the attempt to acquire the same, and authority is hereby given to the Secretary of War to acquire for the purposes of this Act the land above mentioned, or so much thereof as he may deem necessary, together with all such existing breastworks, earthworks, gun emplacements, walls, defenses, shelters, or other historical points as the Secretary of War may deem necessary, whether shown on said index map sheet or not, and together also with such additional land as the Secretary of War may deem necessary for monuments, markers, tablets, roads, highways, paths, approaches, and to carry out the general purposes of this Act. As title is acquired to parts of the land herein authorized to be acquired, the Secretary of War may proceed with the establishment of the park upon such portions so acquired, and the remaining portions of the lands desired shall be respectively brought within said park as titles to said portions are severally acquired. (16 U.S.C. § 425.)
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SEC. 2. The Secretary of War is hereby authorized to cause condemnation proceedings to be instituted in the name of the United States under the provisions of the Act of August 1, 1988, entitled “An Act to authorize condemnation of lands for sites for public buildings, and for other purposes” (Twenty-fifth Statutes at Large, page 357), to acquire title to the lands, interests therein, or rights pertaining thereto within the said Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania County Battle Fields Memorial, herein above authorized to be acquired, and the United States shall be entitled to immediate possession upon the filing of the petition in condemnation in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia: Provided, That when the owner of such lands, interests therein, or rights pertaining thereto shall fix a price for the same, which in the opinion of the commission, hereinafter referred to, and the Secretary of War, shall be reasonable, the Secretary may purchase the same without further delay: Provided further, That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to accept on behalf of the United States, donations of lands, interests therein or rights pertaining thereto required for the said Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania County Battle Fields Memorial: And provided further, That no public money shall be expended for title to any lands until a written opinion of the Attorney General shall be had in favor of the validity of title thereto. (16 U.S.C. § 425a.)

SEC. 3. The Secretary of War is hereby authorized to enter into leases with the owners of such of the lands, works, defenses, and buildings thereon within the said Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania County Battle Fields Memorial, as in his discretion it is unnecessary to forthwith acquire title to, and such leases shall be on such terms and conditions as the Secretary of War may prescribe, and may contain options to purchase, subject to later acceptance if in the judgment of the Secretary of War it is as economical to purchase as condemn title to the property: Provided, That the Secretary of War may enter into agreements upon such nominal terms as he may prescribe, permitting the present owners or their tenants to occupy or cultivate their present holdings, upon condition that they will preserve the present breastworks, earthworks, walls, defenses, shelters, buildings, and roads, and the present outlines of the battle fields, and that they will only cut trees or underbrush or disturb or remove the soil under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe, and that they will assist in caring for and protecting all tablets, monuments, or such other artificial works as may from time to time be erected by proper authority: Provided further, That if such agreements to lease cover any lands the title to which shall have been acquired by the United States, the proceeds from such agreements shall be applied by the Secretary of War toward the maintenance of the park. (16 U.S.C. § 425b.)

SEC. 4. The affairs of the said Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania County Battle Fields Memorial shall, subject to the supervision and direction of the Secretary of War, be in charge of three commissioners, consisting of Army officers, civilians, or both, to be appointed by the Secretary of War, one of whom shall be designated as chairman and another as secretary of the commission. (16 U.S.C. § 425c.)
SEC. 5. It shall be the duty of the commissioners, under the direction of the Secretary of War, to survey, locate, and preserve the lines of the opposing armies in said battles, to open, construct, and repair such roads, highways, paths, and other approaches as may be necessary to make the historical points accessible to the public and to students of said battles and for the purposes of the park, to ascertain and mark with historical monuments, markers, tablets, or otherwise, as the Secretary of War may determine, all the breastworks, earthworks, gun emplacements, walls, or other defenses or shelters, lines of battle, location of troops, buildings, and other historical points of interest within the park or in its vicinity, and to establish and construct such observation towers as the Secretary of War may deem necessary for said park, and the said commission in establishing the park shall have authority, under the direction of the Secretary of War, to employ such labor and services at rates to be fixed by the Secretary of War, and to obtain such supplies and materials as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act. (16 U.S.C. § 425d.)

SEC. 6. The commission, acting through the Secretary of War, is authorized to receive gifts and contributions from States, Territories, societies, organizations, and individuals for the said Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania County Battle Fields Memorial: Provided, That all contributions of money received shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States and credited to a fund to be designated “Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania County Battle Fields Memorial fund,” which fund shall be applied to and expended under the direction of the Secretary of War for carrying out the provisions of this Act. (16 U.S.C. § 425e.)

SEC. 7. It shall be lawful for the authorities of any State having had troops engaged in said battles of Fredericksburg, Spotsylvania Court House, Wilderness, and Chancellorsville, including Salem Church, or in any of said battles, to enter upon the lands and approaches of the Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania County Battle Fields Memorial for the purposes of ascertaining and marking the lines of battle of troops engaged therein: Provided, That before any such lines are permanently designated, the position of the lines and the proposed methods of marking them by monuments, tablets, or otherwise, including the design and inscription for the same, shall be submitted to the Secretary of War, and shall first receive written approval of the Secretary, which approval shall be based upon formal written reports to be made to him in each case by the commissioners of the park; Provided, That no discrimination shall be made against any State as to the manner of designing lines, but any grant made to any State by the Secretary of War may be used by any other State. (16 U.S.C. § 425f.)

SEC. 8. If any person shall, except by permission of the Secretary of War, destroy, mutilate, deface, injure, or remove any monument, column, statue, memorial structure, or work of art that shall be erected or placed upon the grounds of the park by lawful authority, or shall destroy or remove any fence, railing, inclosure, or other work for the protection or
ornament of said park, or any portion thereof, or shall destroy, cut, hack, bark, break down, or otherwise injure any tree, bush, or shrubbery that may be growing upon said park, or shall cut down or fell or remove any timber, battle relic, tree or trees growing or being upon said park, or hunt within the limits of the park, or shall remove or destroy any breastworks, earthworks, walls, or other defenses or shelter or any part thereof constructed by the armies formerly engaged in the battles on the lands or approaches to the park, any person so offending and found guilty thereof before any justice of the peace of the county in which the offense may be committed, or any court of competent jurisdiction, shall for each and every such offense forfeit and pay a fine, in the discretion of the justice, according to the aggravation of the offense, of not less than $5 nor more than $50, one-half for the use of the park and the other half to the informer, to be enforced and recovered before such justice in like manner as debts of like nature are now by law recoverable in the several counties where the offense may be committed. (16 U.S.C. § 425g.)

Sec. 9. The Secretary of War, subject to the approval of the President, shall have the power to make and shall make all needful rules and regulations for the care of the park, and for the establishment and marking of lines of battle and other historical features of the park. (16 U.S.C. § 425h.)

Sec. 10. Upon completion of the acquisition of the land and the work of the commission, the Secretary of War shall render a report thereon to Congress, and thereafter the park shall be placed in charge of a superintendent at a salary to be fixed by the Secretary of War and paid out of the appropriation available for the maintenance of the park. (16 U.S.C. § 425i.)

Sec. 11. To enable the Secretary of War to begin to carry out the provisions of this Act, including the condemnation, purchase, or lease of the necessary lands, surveys, maps, marking the boundaries of the park, opening, constructing, or repairing necessary roads, pay and expenses of commissioners, salaries for labor and services, traveling expenses, supplies and materials, the sum of $50,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to remain available until expended, and such additional sums are hereby authorized to be appropriated from time to time as may be necessary for the completion of the project and for the proper maintenance of said park. All disbursements under this Act shall be annually reported by the Secretary of War to Congress. (16 U.S.C. § 425j.)
APPENDIX D

An Act To establish the Channel Islands National Park, and for other purposes, approved March 5, 1980 (94 Stat. 67)

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I

*    *    *    *    *    *    *    *

SEC. 105. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to revise the boundaries of the following units of the National Park System:

*    *    *    *    *    *    *    *

(3) Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania County Battlefields Memorial National Military Park, Virginia: to add approximately twenty acres.

(b) Sections 302, 303, and 304 of the National Parks and Recreation Act of 1978 (92 Stat. 3467) shall be applicable to the boundary revisions authorized in subsection (a) of this section, except that for the purposes of this section, the date of enactment referred to in section 302 of such Act shall be deemed to be the date of enactment of this section.

(c) For the purposes of acquiring the lands and interests in lands added to the units referred to in subsection (a), there are authorized to be appropriated from the Land and Water Conservation Fund such sums as may be necessary, but not to exceed $304,000 for Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park and not to exceed $234,000 for Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania County Battlefields Memorial National Military Park.

*    *    *    *    *    *    *    *
APPENDIX E

An Act To expand the boundaries of the Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania County Battlefields Memorial National Military Park near Fredericksburg, Virginia, approved December 11, 1989 (103 Stat. 1851)

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania County Battlefields Memorial National Military Park Expansion Act of 1989”.

SEC. 2. REVISION OF PARK BOUNDARIES.

(a) BOUNDARY REVISION.—In furtherance of the purposes of the Act entitled “An Act to establish a national military park at and near Fredericksburg, Virginia, and to mark and preserve historical points connected with the battles of Fredericksburg, Spotsylvania Court House, Wilderness, and Chancellorsville, including Salem Church, Virginia”, approved February 14, 1927 (44 Stat. 1091), the Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania County Battlefields Memorial National Military Park (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the “park”) shall hereafter comprise the lands and interests in lands within the boundary generally depicted as “Proposed Park Boundary” on the maps entitled “Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania National Military Park”, numbered 326-40075D/89, 326-40074E/89, 326-40069B/89, 326-40070D/89, 326-40071C/89, 326-40072E/89, 326-40076A/89, and 326-40073D/89, and dated June 1989. The maps shall be on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

(b) EXCLUDED LANDS.—Lands and interests in lands within the boundary depicted on the maps referred to in subsection (a) as “Existing Park Boundary” but outside of the boundary depicted as “Proposed Park Boundary” are hereby excluded from the park, in accordance with the provisions of subsection 3(b). The Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the “Secretary”) may relinquish to the Commonwealth of Virginia exclusive or concurrent legislative jurisdiction over lands excluded from the park by this section by filing with the Governor a notice of relinquishment. Such relinquishment shall take effect upon acceptance thereof, or as the laws of the Commonwealth may otherwise provide.
SEC. 3. ACQUISITIONS AND CONVEYANCES.

(a) ACQUISITION.—The Secretary is authorized to acquire lands and interests in lands within the park, by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds or by exchange.

(b) CONVEYANCE OF LANDS EXCLUDED FROM PARK.—(1) The Secretary is authorized, in accordance with applicable existing law, to exchange Federal lands and interests excluded from the park pursuant to subsection 2(b) for the purpose of acquiring lands within the park boundary.

(2) If any such Federal lands or interests are not exchanged within five years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary may sell any or all such lands or interests to the highest bidder, in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, but any such conveyance shall be at not less than the fair market value of the land or interest, as determined by the Secretary.

(3) All Federal lands and interests sold or exchanged pursuant to this subsection shall be subject to such terms and conditions as will assure the use of the property in a manner which, in the judgment of the Secretary, will protect the battlefield setting. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the net proceeds from any such sale or exchange shall be used, subject to appropriations, to acquire lands and interests within the park.

(c) ALTERNATIVE ACCESS.—In order to facilitate the acquisition by the United States of existing easements or rights of access across Federal lands within the park and to provide the owners of such easements or rights of access with alternative rights of access across nonpark lands, the Secretary may acquire, by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, or exchange, interests in land of similar estate across lands which are not within the park. With or without the acceptance of payment of cash to equalize the values of the properties, the Secretary may convey such nonpark lands or interests in lands to the holders of such existing easements or rights of access across Federal lands within the park in exchange for their conveyance to the United States of such easements or rights. Nothing in this Act shall prohibit the Secretary from acquiring any outstanding easements or rights of access across Federal Lands by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds or by exchange.

(d) CONSERVATION EASEMENTS.—The Secretary is authorized to accept donations of conservation easements on lands adjacent to the park. Such conservation easements shall have the effect of protecting the scenic and historic resources on park lands and the adjacent lands or preserving the undeveloped or historic appearance of the park when viewed from within or without the park.

(e) OTHER PROVISIONS.—Within the area bounded by the Orange Turnpike, the Orange Plank Road, and McLaws Drive no improved property (as defined in section 4) may be acquired without the consent of the owner thereof unless the Secretary determines that, in his judgment, the property is subject to, or threatened with, uses which are having, or would have, an adverse impact on the park.
SEC. 4. RETAINED RIGHTS.

(a) RETENTION OF USE AND OCCUPANCY.—With the exception of property which the Secretary determines is necessary for development or public use, the owner or owners of improved property acquired pursuant to this Act may retain a right of use and occupancy of such improved property for noncommercial residential purposes for a definite term of not more than twenty-five years, or for a term ending at the death of the owner or the owner’s spouse. The owner shall elect the term to be reserved, except that if the owner is a corporation, trust, partnership, or any entity other than an individual, the term shall not exceed twenty-five years. Ownership shall be determined as of June 1, 1989. Unless the property is wholly or partially donated, the Secretary shall pay to the owner the fair market value of the property on the date of such acquisition, less the fair market value of the right retained by the owner.

(b) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—Any rights retained pursuant to this section shall be subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe and may be terminated by the Secretary upon his determination and after reasonable notice to the owner thereof that such property is being used for any purpose which is incompatible with the administration, protection, or public use of the park. Such right shall terminate by operation of law upon notification of the owner by the Secretary and tendering to the owner an amount equal to the fair market value of that portion of the right which remains unexpired.

(c) DEFINITION.—As used in this section, the term “improved property” means a year-round noncommercial single-family dwelling together with such land, in the same ownership as the dwelling, as the Secretary determines is reasonably necessary for the enjoyment of the dwelling for single-family residential use.

SEC. 5. INTERPRETATION.

In administering the park, the Secretary shall take such action as is necessary and appropriate to interpret, for the benefit of visitors to the park and the general public, the battles of Fredericksburg, Chancellorsville, Spotsylvania Courthouse, and the Wilderness in the larger context of the Civil War and American history, including the causes and consequences of the Civil War and including the effects of the war on all the American people, especially on the American South.

SEC. 6. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.
APPENDIX F

An Act To expand the boundaries of the Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania County Battlefields Memorial National Military Park, Virginia, approved October 27, 1992 (106 Stat. 3565)

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. FINDING.

Congress finds that the land area near Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania County Battlefields Memorial National Military Park, Virginia, located south and west of the intersection of the Orange Plank Road and Brock Road in Spotsylvania County was strategically significant ground associated with the battle of the Civil War known as the Battle of the Wilderness, and that the tract of land adjacent to such area known as “Longstreet’s Flank Attack” was also strategically significant to that battle.

SEC. 2. ADDITION TO WILDERNESS BATTLEFIELD.

(a) Section (2) of Public Law 101–214 (16 U.S.C. 425k(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking “326-40072E/89,”; and

(2) by striking “1989.” and inserting in lieu thereof “1989, and the map entitled ‘Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania National Military Park,’ numbered 326-40072E/89/A and dated September 1990.”; Provided, That this subsection shall not be effective until the lands included within the proposed new boundaries of the Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania County Battlefields Memorial National Military Park pursuant to this Act have been donated to the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) Lands included within the boundaries of the Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania County Battlefields Memorial National Military Park pursuant to this section may be acquired only by donation.
APPENDIX G

An Act To allow the National Park Service to acquire certain land for addition to the Wilderness Battlefield in Virginia, as previously authorized by law, by purchase or exchange as well as by donation, approved December 9, 1999 (113 Stat. 1730)

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. ADDITION TO WILDERNESS BATTLEFIELD, VIRGINIA.

(a) Removal of Condition on Battlefield Addition.—Section 2(a)(2) of Public Law 102-541 (16 U.S.C. 425k note; 106 Stat. 3565) is amended by striking ": Provided," and all that follows through "Interior".

(b) Authorized Methods of Acquisition.—
(1) Limitations on acquisition methods.—Section 3(a) of Public Law 101-214 (16 U.S.C. 425l(a)) is amended—
(A) by striking "The Secretary" and inserting "(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Secretary"; and
(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(2) The lands designated 'P04-04' on the map referred to in section 2(a) numbered 326-40072E/89/A and dated September 1990 may be acquired only by donation, and the lands designated 'P04-01', 'P04-02', and 'P04-03' on such map may be acquired only by donation, purchase from willing sellers, or exchange.".

(2) Removal of restriction on acquisition of addition.—Section 2 of Public Law 102-541 (16 U.S.C. 425k note; 106 Stat. 3565) is amended by striking subsection (b).

(c) Technical Correction.—Section 2(a) of Public Law 101-214 (16 U.S.C. 425k(a)) is amended by striking "Spotsylvania" and inserting "Spotsylvania".
APPENDIX H

SUPERINTENDENTS AND DATES OF SERVICE

War Department Period
Capt. George F. Hobson 1928-1929
Col. Tenney Ross 1929-1930
Maj. Arthur E. Willbourn 1930-1933

National Park Service Period
Philip R. Hough 1933-1934
Branch Spalding 1934-1942
Edward A. Hummel 1942-1944
Tyler B. Kiener 1943-1946
Edward A. Hummel 1946
O. (Oscar) F. Northington, Jr. 1946-1966
William R. Hollomon 1967-1969
James R. Zinck 1980-1989
Maria Burks 1989-1993
Martha (Marti) Leicester 1994-1997
Russ Smith 2003-present
APPENDIX I

ANNUAL VISITATION NUMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Recreational Visitors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>64,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>50,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>92,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>98,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>102,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>93,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>162,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>79,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>27,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>37,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>43,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>87,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>101,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>117,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>144,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>173,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>188,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>215,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>224,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>213,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>233,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>240,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>247,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>213,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>269,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>413,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>458,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>522,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>465,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>603,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>734,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>719,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>775,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Recreational Visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>1,025,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>971,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>1,121,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>1,041,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>1,087,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>1,018,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>1,224,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>1,150,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>1,335,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>1,163,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>1,108,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1,010,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>995,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>1,000,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>961,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>244,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>232,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>240,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>252,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>381,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>404,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>448,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>449,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>471,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>472,623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>472,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>493,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>465,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>477,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>464,773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>449,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>480,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>489,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>465,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>464,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>443,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>443,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>534,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>499,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Recreational Visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>469,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>473,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>906,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36,551,001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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