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Introduction

Management Summary

This Cultural Landscape Report (CLR) is for The Oaks, a component of Tuskegee Institute National Historic Site (TUIN) in Tuskegee, Alabama. Booker T. Washington, the first president of the Institute, and his wife Margaret Murray Washington arranged for the construction of a residence on the campus in 1899. Students, overseen by Tuskegee faculty, made the bricks, constructed the residence, and provided labor for the installation of the surrounding landscape. After Dr. Washington’s death in 1915, his wife Margaret Murray Washington occupied the residence until her death in 1925. Tuskegee Institute immediately acquired the property with the purpose of maintaining the structure to honor its first president.

Tuskegee Institute was designated a National Historic Landmark (NHL) in 1965. The US Congress authorized the National Historic Site in 1974 to include the 50-acre original campus, campus buildings, The Oaks, George Washington Carver’s laboratory (now the Carver Museum,) and Grey Columns, an antebellum house near the campus. The US Department of the Interior and the Trustees of Tuskegee Institute signed a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) in August of 1976, and the National Park Service (NPS) officially established the national historic site in 1977.1

In the MOA, the Department of the Interior agrees to preserve the original campus of Tuskegee Institute at the national historic site. A 2005-2008 Strategic Plan for Tuskegee Institute National Historic Site states, “[t]he purpose of Tuskegee Institute National Historic Site is to protect and preserve the cultural resources of ‘The Oaks,’ the family home of Booker T. Washington, the George W. Carver Museum, and any other lands or interests acquired pursuant to Public Law 93-486.”2

The NPS currently manages the national historic site in conjunction with two other NPS sites in the region: Tuskegee Airmen National Historic Site (approximately 4.2 miles away) and Selma to Montgomery National Historic Trail (approximately 30 miles away). Figure 1 and Figure 2 illustrate the location of the site and the Tuskegee University Campus. The property is significant under Criterion A (Association with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history), Criterion B (Association with the lives of persons significant in our past) and Criterion C (Embodies distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, represent the work of a master, or possess high artistic values). Contributing resources to the period of significance at the site are The Oaks residence and the cultural landscape features at the site including driveways, concrete gutters, concrete walkways, and cultural vegetation.

The site history included in this report gives an overview of The Oaks. Research for the site history included consultation of both primary and secondary sources of information, including documents gathered from TUIN records, NPS Southeast Region Office files, Library of Congress, and Tuskegee University Archives. The existing conditions section provides a comprehensive description of cultural landscape features at The Oaks, including natural and cultural resources. The inventory includes information gathered during site visits by project team members in October 2016 and January 2017. The analysis of integrity section uses criteria developed by the National Register of Historic Places and the Secretary of Interior Standards for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes to evaluate the historic integrity of existing landscape resources. The section on treatment recommendations provides guidance for future management decisions related to the site’s historic landscape resources.

1. In 1984, the NPS and Tuskegee University renewed the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) allowing the Tuskegee University president to use Grey Columns as a residence.

Historical Overview

The Oaks is the historic residence of Dr. Booker T. Washington, the first president of Tuskegee Institute and his wife Margaret Murray Washington, a prominent leader in the Progressive Era women’s club movement. Constructed in 1899, Dr. Washington resided at The Oaks until his death in 1915. By merit of his outstanding success as a public orator and pioneer of education for African Americans, Tuskegee Institute not only advanced the lives of its students but also attained international renown. The construction of The Oaks and the historic campus embodies the educational philosophy of Dr. Washington. The building consists of locally sourced materials manufactured by students as part of their vocational training. During the time the Washingtons lived at the property, The Oaks received many influential visitors and patrons of the school, including numerous prominent businessmen, politicians, and two US Presidents.

The site of the Washingtons’ residence functioned as a self-sufficient homestead, often attributed to Dr. Washington’s capacity to create abundance from dedication and hard work. During the period of significance, the site included several secondary structures and functional landscape features. The Washingtons commissioned David A. Williston to design the landscape including a carriage drive, planting beds, and a rustic summer house at the rear of the property. Williston was the first African American graduate of Cornell University’s College of Agriculture and the first African American to own and operate a landscape architecture firm in the US. He served as an instructor and as Superintendent of Buildings and Grounds at the Tuskegee Institute. In addition to the Williston design, secondary structures on the site included a large carriage house and barn. George Washington Carver also assisted the Washington family in selecting appropriate plants for the landscape. Constructed landscape features at The Oaks included a wood picket fence around the front and side yards, a fence at the rear of the property for...
Washington’s garden, chickens, and horses, a cold frame for his personal garden, and a covered well. Historic plantings included shade and fruit trees, formal shrub beds, vines, and vegetable beds.

Following the death of Dr. Washington in 1915, the residence remained in the family. Margaret Murray Washington remained at the house until her death in 1925. Prior to 1925, changes to the cultural landscape at The Oaks included the removal of the carriage house and barn and construction of a brick garage. After 1920, David Williston’s design for the roads on campus informed a new layout for the driveway at the Oaks. This revised drive design featured Williston’s typical campus roadway details including concrete valley gutters with drop inlets.

In 1925, Tuskegee Institute purchased the residence from the Washington’s three children. Changes to both the structure and the landscape altered its appearance during this period of ownership. The changes to the structure included improvements such as installation of a new metal roof, repainting of the exterior of the main structure, re-installation of wood floors, and updates to modern electricity and fire-suppression systems. It is likely during this period that Tuskegee Institute changed the wood floor and steps of the exterior porches to concrete. Most notably, Tuskegee Institute paved the historic gravel and chert driveway with asphalt. Tuskegee Institute also completed a concrete sidewalk around the main structure and constructed a brick retaining wall along the front boundary of the property. During this period, site managers demolished other historic secondary resources and abandoned the formerly abundant vegetable garden and flowerbeds.

Following the authorization of Tuskegee Institute National Historic Site as a national park unit, the NPS became the manager for The Oaks, the Carver Museum, and Grey Columns. The historic site includes the adjacent 50-acre Historic Campus District with many of the original campus buildings. The NPS restored the historic character of The Oaks by repainting the exterior surfaces of the building the original dark brown with red detailing, restoring the shingle roof, and restoring the surface of the driveway to gravel. Only the foundation remains of the brick garage at the
rear of the property, and the current interpretive program does not describe the historic secondary structures that existed during the period of significance. NPS facilities staff maintains the new plant species introduced during the Tuskegee Institute and National Park Service Periods. The residence and grounds at The Oaks are open to public visitation, with daily tours administered by the NPS. The interior interpretation focuses on the Booker T. Washington Period (1899-1915). The NPS added several improvements to the property to aid the visitor experience of the site. The NPS constructed the picnic area to the southwest of the residence, installed waysides in the front and rear of the property, installed a wheelchair lift at the residence, and added trash receptacles to the site. Two NPS constructed parking lots accommodate visitors arriving by vehicle.

The site history section of this report organizes the site into periods of development. These periods reflect changes in ownership and management of the site and physically express the site’s landscape layers.

These periods are:

- Booker T. Washington Period (1899-1915)
- Margaret Murray Washington Period (1915-1925)
- Tuskegee Institute Period (1925-1977)
- National Park Service Period (1977-present)

**Scope of Work and Methodology**

According to the Project Statement, the CLR will (1) describe the historical development of The Oaks; (2) document the existing site conditions; (3) provide analysis of the landscape’s National Register significance; (4) identify the site’s character-defining features; (5) determine an appropriate treatment strategy; and (6) develop treatment recommendations that facilitate preservation of these resources, address park management concerns, and inform future development and preservation.

A 1987 general management plan for the national historic site called for improved visitor parking and services around The Oaks. This document and a 2001 strategic plan for the national historic site currently provide guidance for maintenance of the cultural landscape at The Oaks. This CLR will help inform the decision process as the NPS works to improve interpretation of the site, address circulation concerns, and provide for the health, safety, and welfare of park employees and visitors.

This CLR uses primary and secondary sources to establish the historic significance of the landscape, identify a period of significance, and complete the historic analysis. Primary and secondary sources inform a history of Dr. Washington’s life and the development of Tuskegee Institute in the site history section, which informs the historic significance of the site. These sources include Robert J. Norrell’s 2009 biography of Booker T. Washington, several publications from Tuskegee University, and *Freedom to the Free*, the United States Commission on Civil Rights 1963 report to the President on the century of emancipation. Resources authored by Douglas A. Williams and Dreck Wilson provided information on the life and work of landscape architect David A. Williston. Scholarly works from Sheena Harris and Jacqueline Anne Rouse provided information on Margaret Murray Washington.

Information from the previous studies of the site also informs and shapes the narrative of the site history section. Information pertaining to the development history, determination of the periods of development, and historical analysis of the resources draws heavily from these studies. A historic structure report for The Oaks, prepared in 1980 by the NPS and another historic structure report for Tuskegee University completed in 1988 by Hickerson Fowlkes Architects were particularly helpful in writing this report. Another park resource that provided information for the report was a historic landscape report for The Oaks composed by Williams-Russell and Associates in 1979, which provided three period plans representing the landscape in 1911, 1925, and 1978. Additional resources included plans from Tuskegee University Facilities Services, Physical Plant files and campus information from the *Tuskegee University Campus Heritage Plan*.

Using information gathered during site visits, this CLR identifies landscape characteristics and associated features that contribute to the historic significance of the site. This CLR compares the
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historic condition of a particular resource with its current condition to evaluate its historic integrity.

**Description of Study Boundaries**

The study boundaries include the 2.5 acres the NPS acquired during the establishment of the national historic site. It includes The Oaks, ruins of an outbuilding, walkways, historic plantings, lawn areas, and a visitor parking lot area. The site is located on West Montgomery Road (Alabama State Highway 126). (Tuskegee University maps refer to this route as “Old Montgomery Road.”) There is a shared NPS and Tuskegee University parking to the east of The Oaks. This parking lot is outside the 2.5-acre project boundary, but the report addresses the perimeter of the lot and the streetscape along West Montgomery Road in the context of visitor access to the site and contribution to site integrity. Illustration 1.1 depicts the location and context of The Oaks.

**Summary of Findings**

Tuskegee Institute acquired The Oaks from the Washington heirs in an effort to preserve and commemorate Booker T. Washington’s contribution to African American lives and the school. The commemorative mission continues today under management by the NPS.

An assessment was made of character-defining landscape features to inform future management decisions that may impact significant cultural landscape features. Treatment recommendations were created to guide future management decisions related to The Oaks’ landscape resources. The treatment and use section articulates a treatment philosophy that preserves and rehabilitates the landscape character as it developed through the end of the tenure of David A. Williston at Tuskegee Institute in 1929.

This report recommends rehabilitation as the most appropriate choice for the site’s overall treatment. Rehabilitation was selected to preserve historic features, improve features that are in decline, and permit compatible changes at The Oaks, allowing the site to operate as a historic site and a site where the life of Booker T. Washington and his family may continue to be interpreted and honored. With rehabilitation selected as the treatment, the recommended treatment section addresses specific recommendations for landscape features, organized by landscape characteristics. The intent of this approach is to preserve and enhance the historic character of the site. The plan calls for removal or screening of some non-historic site features and the replacement of missing historic landscape features to enhance the ability of the NPS to interpret the Washington family’s tenure at The Oaks.
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Introduction

Tuskegee is located in east Alabama, 51 miles west of Columbus, Georgia and 40 miles east of Montgomery. Tuskegee is the county seat of Macon County, established in 1822. The land once belonged to the Creek nation and was among the areas of the state settled by European Americans. Old Cahawba, the original capital of Alabama between 1820 and 1826, is located about 100 miles west of Tuskegee. Macon County is within the Alabama Black Belt, named for the naturally rich agricultural soils. The term colloquially refers to the majority African American populations in much of the region. The focus of this study is The Oaks, set within the historic district of Tuskegee Institute National Historic Site in Tuskegee, Alabama. The Oaks was the historic residence of Dr. Booker T. Washington, the first president of Tuskegee Institute and his wife Margaret Murray Washington, a leader during the Progressive Era.

Between 1881 and 1915, under the leadership of its founding principal, Dr. Booker T. Washington, Tuskegee Institute attained national prominence among institutions of higher learning. Dr. Washington was a highly skilled organizer, eloquent speaker, and effective proponent for African American education. He became a seminal leader of the movement for racial equality in the United States at the turn of the twentieth century. His advocacy for African American rights attracted many well-known historic figures to the Institute, including Andrew Carnegie, President William McKinley, and President Theodore Roosevelt. Dr. Washington constructed The Oaks to provide a private residence for his family and to provide a suitable location for hosting such dignitaries. Dr. Washington resided at The Oaks until his death in 1915. Margaret Murray Washington continued to live and receive distinguished visitors at The Oaks until her death in 1925.

The formation of Tuskegee Institute began in 1880 when the Alabama State Legislature appropriated a yearly sum of $2,000 to establish a school for African Americans in Macon County. Two men prominently campaigned for this legislation—Lewis Adams, a former slave, and George W. Campbell, a former slave owner. The school originated as “Tuskegee Normal School for Colored Teachers” in a small one-room school building erected near the Tuskegee African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church. The purpose of this school was to educate and train teachers. The school grew in subsequent years to include three buildings for 30 students and three teachers (Figure 3). Under the leadership of their new principal, Booker T. Washington, and with a loan of $500, the school purchased 100 acres in 1881. This land constitutes the historic core of Tuskegee University campus today. Tuskegee Normal became Tuskegee Normal and Industrial Institute in 1893, and its students included 40 men and women from Macon County and the surrounding area.

The US Congress passed legislation to expand land-grant institutions with the First and Second Morrill Acts in 1862 and 1890, and Tuskegee Institute qualified to receive federal funding. By the time Booker T. Washington died in 1915, the Institute had expanded into a 1,900-acre campus. The University today has 112 buildings. Twenty of these structures are historic brick buildings constructed with student labor during the tenure

Figure 3. The first buildings constructed at the Tuskegee Institute. Library of Congress, LC-USZ62-62997.

4. Ibid., 8.
of Dr. Washington. The name of the school changed to Tuskegee Institute in 1937 and Tuskegee University in 1985, when it attained university status by offering a range of graduate degrees. In 1974, the US Congress established the national historic site including The Oaks, the Carver Museum, and Grey Columns. The NPS now administers the national historic site.

Tuskegee Institute

Reconstruction and the New South Era (1865-1900)

In the midst of the Civil War, President Abraham Lincoln signed the final draft of the Emancipation Proclamation on New Year’s Day in 1863. The Proclamation declared that all enslaved persons in the states of the Union were “thenceforward and forever free.” In early 1865, President Lincoln signed the constitutional amendment for the abolition of slavery—the Thirteenth Amendment. Following the assassination of President Abraham Lincoln on April 15, 1865, five days after the end of the Civil War, Vice President Andrew Johnson assumed the presidency.

President Johnson pursued a number of federal policies that ushered in the Reconstruction Era. Under Johnson, the federal government offered full amnesty to all former Confederates who would swear allegiance to the Union and who agreed to “abide by and faithfully support all laws and proclamations which have been made during the existing rebellion with reference to the emancipation of slaves.” The federal government appointed provisional governors for the former Confederate states until new civil governments could form. As new state governments organized, former Confederate military leaders frequently took positions of political power. Under the lenient Reconstruction policies of President Johnson, political leaders in the Southern states enacted a series of restrictive laws known as “Black Codes.” The intent of the Black Codes was to force freed blacks into unfavorable working arrangements, to limit their personal freedom, and restrict their access to the political process.

Prior to emancipation, the slave population in Alabama totaled 435,080 people (45 percent of the total population), and free blacks numbered 2,690 people. The 1860 US Census lists approximately 18,000 slaves in Macon County, Alabama. The 1870 US Census lists the total (white and black) population of Macon County as 17,727 people showing a major decrease in population after the Civil War.

Throughout the South in 1865 and 1866, former slaves and freedmen organized conventions and demonstrations to protect their basic rights and to claim their right to vote. In Tuskegee, Alabama, the commencement of Reconstruction meant “the return of the US army to govern much of the South,” and

... a coalition of local Unionists, Yankees, and blacks took control of the state government. This new challenge provoked more white terrorism: the Ku Klux Klan rode at night to scare blacks and their few white allies into submission, killing them when necessary....schools in dozens of Alabama counties were burned and the first teachers of blacks in Tuskegee run out of the town.

President Johnson did little to oppose the Black Codes that restricted African Americans’ economic self-determination and civil rights.

Violence against blacks reached a high point in Tuskegee in 1871 after several incidents involving black elected officials and church leaders. A US congressional inquiry heard testimony about the incidents, but white leaders diminished the severity of the attacks and claimed that race relations in the Macon County vicinity were peaceful.
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Alabama state government, “elected through intimidation in 1870,” voted in 1871 to grant amnesty to white males who had fought for the Confederate army. Amnesty allowed these men to vote and “revived the Democratic electorate.”

The Democratic-elected legislature passed laws to disenfranchise many of the state’s African Americans. New laws provided grandfather clauses allowing white males automatic voter registration eligibility, while

… would-be black voters had to pay poll taxes in cash and also had to be able to read any section of Alabama’s Constitution, explain what that segment meant, and describe the implications of the recited statutes.

The depressed economy in Macon County, Alabama added to racial tension. Many poor white farmers moved west in hope of an improved economic situation. This immigration was not limited to whites. “In 1876 scores of blacks were leaving Tuskegee daily…[and] hundreds of farms were being sold for nonpayment of taxes, and thousands of acres of farmland lay idle.”

Advocacy for education of blacks in trades began to gain momentum. White support for improved education “grew out of the desire for economic recovery, based on an ample supply of black labor.”

Reflecting the Republican Party’s ascendancy to power, the US Congress passed several laws and Amendments to the Constitution in the decade after the Civil War, designed to promote and protect racial equality. One federal agency dedicated to assisting the formerly enslaved African American population was the Bureau of Refugees, Freedmen, and Abandoned Lands, also known as the Freedmen’s Bureau.

Established under President Lincoln in March 1865, the Freedmen’s Bureau worked throughout the former Confederacy securing and supervising fair labor contracts for African Americans and providing access to education. The Freedmen’s Bureau opened over 1,000 schools in the South before the US Congress terminated its program in 1872.

In April 1866, the US Congress enacted, over President Johnson’s veto, the Civil Rights Act of 1866, which affirmed that the law protected all citizens. In July 1868, the US Congress adopted the Fourteenth Amendment, which further codified civil rights and equal protection for African Americans. In 1870, the US Congress ratified the Fifteenth Amendment, which guaranteed federal protection against racial discrimination in voting.

Again, in direct response to the Black Codes and southern states’ restrictions on African American civil rights, the US Congress enacted the Civil Rights Act of 1875. This law proclaimed federal recognition of “the equality of all men before the law…” and recognized the responsibility of government to “mete out equal and exact justice to all, of whatever nativity, race, color, or persuasion, religious or political.”

Southern states’ persistent attempts to undermine the civil rights of African Americans provided for in these federal acts—particularly, the right to vote, the right to equal protection under the law, and the right to education—resulted in increased racial tensions into the 1900s. However, there were legal and political victories for African Americans near Tuskegee, Alabama during this period. One example came in 1881, when Lewis Adams, a former slave in the town of Tuskegee, and George W. Campbell, a former slave owner, successfully initiated the passage of an act by the Alabama legislature to establish a school for black youth.

Lewis Adams was a prominent citizen of Macon County. The local African American community held him in high regard as a businessman and because of his efforts in support of black education. Leaders of the local Democratic Party sought Lewis Adams’ support in advance of the 1880 election, hoping he could influence the votes of other African Americans in his community. Adams offered his support in exchange for their pledge to submit a bill to create and fund a school in Tuskegee for African Americans. The bill became law on February 12, 1881. It provided the
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The new school in Tuskegee needed a principal to run and organize the facility, and its founders sent a request for a recommended person to General Samuel Armstrong of the Hampton Institute in Virginia. According to Armstrong, Booker T. Washington, a graduate of the Hampton Institute, was the best person for the job, and he came with Armstrong’s strongest recommendation (Figure 4). On July 4, 1881, Booker T. Washington became the principal of the school. In his first year, Washington purchased 100 acres to become the school’s new campus, rehabilitated three buildings to serve as classrooms, and began construction of additional buildings for students. Washington also expanded the purpose of the school beyond educating teachers to include practical training in a variety of trades. He renamed the school Tuskegee Normal and Technical Institute in 1893 to reflect this approach to education.

Tuskegee Normal and Technical Institute became the physical embodiment of Washington’s educational philosophy and his commitment to self-improvement. Faculty taught students the skills to improve access to economic security. Among the trades offered at Tuskegee, students learned farming, brick-making, blacksmithing, sewing, and furniture making. The school demonstrated the practical benefits of industrial education and student labor. Students constructed the school’s buildings, grew the food served in the cafeteria, and designed and constructed the roads on campus. Beyond education of the individual students, the greater mission of the school was to serve and empower disadvantaged African American populations of the entire Southeast.

The setting of Tuskegee in the Alabama Black Belt and Dr. Washington’s soon-to-be national prominence ensured that civil rights and racial equality would be important components of the institution’s purpose. Tuskegee Institute inspired African Americans, illustrating that they could attain education and economic independence. Dr. Washington came to embody his belief that any African American would excel in the world if given the same opportunities and basic rights afforded to white Americans.

There were competing philosophies in America concerning African American education and the path towards racial equality. Other black leaders, including W. E. B. Du Bois, believed Washington and Tuskegee focused too narrowly on industrial training and economic opportunity. Regardless, it was clear by the end of the 1800s that neither the amendments to the Constitution nor federal legislation and executive orders would result in true equality for African Americans in the South.

Across the South, local and state legislatures used election laws to disenfranchise African Americans with poll taxes, literacy tests, and other forms of intimidation. Tennessee passed a law in 1881, directing railroad companies to separate cars or portions of cars for first-class African American passengers, instead of relegating them to second-

class accommodations as had been the custom. These kinds of laws, which codified the separation of races, served as precedent for the “Jim Crow” laws that enforced segregation between the black and white races for many decades.

By 1894, the five states of Alabama, Louisiana, Arkansas, Georgia, and Kentucky, had joined Tennessee by enacting similar laws despite substantial opposition by African Americans and some sympathetic whites. In 1898, South Carolina passed a law enforcing complete segregation on railroads and in 1899 and 1900, North Carolina and Virginia passed similar legislation. By 1907, segregation became mandatory throughout the South in an expanding list of public places including boarding houses, county jails, hospitals, theaters, waiting rooms, streetcars, and institutions for the blind and deaf. By 1910, disfranchisement of African Americans was the rule in the states of the former confederacy, either by law in constitutional amendments or “by means of the Democratic white primary.”

The Legacy of Dr. Booker T.
Washington (1856 -1918)

Booker T. Washington was born into slavery in 1856. Booker, his mother Jane, older brother John, little sister Amanda, and uncle Monroe, were five of ten slaves owned by James Burroughs on his farm in the Blue Ridge Mountains of Virginia. When Washington was nine years old, a Union soldier arrived at the Burroughs farm and read the declaration of their emancipation from slavery. The family moved to Malden, West Virginia, to join Jane’s husband, and Amanda’s father, Washington Ferguson. The young Booker may not have known his true father’s identity, but his physical appearance, with reddish hair and gray eyes, were evidence of his bi-racial heritage.

In the small industrial village of Malden, Ferguson put Booker and his brother to work in the coal mine that supplied fuel to the town’s saltworks. Booker educated himself despite the hazardous, long hours working in the coal mine. He taught himself the alphabet and arranged nighttime tutoring sessions with a local schoolteacher. He sometimes hired another student to teach him the day’s lessons at night. Eventually, his mother persuaded Ferguson to permit Booker to attend the local school full-time on the condition that he worked from four to nine in the morning and again after school. It was at the beginning of his formal education that Booker realized the need for a surname, and he adopted the name Washington. When he later discovered his mother considered his surname to be Taliaferro, Booker adopted it as his middle name.

With the support of this mother, Booker left his job working in the mine to become a domestic servant to Viola Ruffner, the wife of the owner of the saltworks. Though the meticulous demands of his employer wore on Booker, the position proved to be one of providence. Mrs. Ruffner, formerly the head of a school English department, promoted Booker’s education by allowing him time off for school, and she became his private tutor. Booker attributed his later eloquence and effectiveness as a public speaker to the time he spent working for and learning from Mrs. Ruffner.

Ruffner instilled in Booker the essence of what the German sociologist Max Weber later called the Protestant ethic, which taught that the values of industry, sobriety, thrift, self-reliance, and piety, accounted for success in modern capitalist societies.

These values would drive his education philosophy later in life.

In 1872, at the age of 16, Washington entered politics by serving as the secretary of the Malden
Republican Party organization. During this time, Washington balanced his desire to avoid racial conflict and the desire to engage in the political process. This approach to political life would characterize much of Washington’s later career. The ambitious young man soon set his sights on a formal education at the Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute, a college established in 1868 by the American Missionary Association for Freedmen. In September 1872, Washington left Malden with little money and a satchel of clothes to make the 500 mile journey to Hampton, Virginia. After impressing upon the head teacher his worthiness as a student, Hampton Institute admitted Washington with a job as a janitor, and a Massachusetts merchant covered his tuition with a $70 scholarship.

When Washington graduated from the Hampton Institute, he returned to teach in Malden. Washington taught about ninety children in the daytime and adults in the evening. He also took care to advance the education of his younger siblings Amanda and James (his adopted brother). He served as a schoolteacher until 1881 when General Armstrong, founder of the Hampton Institute, recommended him to the position of principal of the new teacher’s school in Tuskegee, Alabama.

Booker T. Washington became one of the leading voices of his generation as African Americans faced continued racist extremism, lynching, and the numerous injustices of the Reconstruction and Jim Crow eras (Figure 5). Washington’s speech at the Cotton States and International Exposition in Atlanta in 1895 propelled him to national prominence as an African American leader. One of the most famous excerpts from his exposition speech was a statement arguing for economic and social advancement over integration. Washington proposed, “[i]n all things that are purely social we can be as separate as the fingers, yet one as the hand in all things essential to mutual progress.”

To some fellow activists, like W.E.B. Du Bois, Washington’s “separate but equal” philosophy undermined his expressed support for racial equality. Washington proposed a policy of mutual progress and cooperation through economic advancement of the African American community. He also promoted consensus across divisive societal lines by empathizing with the opposition. Washington’s influence in American society was so widely recognized that he received an honorary master’s degree from Harvard University in 1896 and an honorary doctorate of laws degree from Dartmouth University in 1901.

Dr. Washington’s engagement with politics, particularly as counsel to President Theodore Roosevelt as an advocate for black farmers and businesses, earned him both public respect and rebuke. On August 23, 1900, he founded the National Negro Business League (NNBL), which started with over 400 delegates from 34 states. One of the most controversial of his political involvements was when he was a guest of President Roosevelt at private dinner hosted at the White House during a visit to Washington, D.C. The incident led to the widespread expression of disapproval of President Roosevelt by the media in both the north and south. Some of the white media portrayed the dinner as “an acceptance of a Negro into the bosom of the Roosevelt family.”

Dr. Washington “knew well the hysteria that overtook white southerners at such displays of
‘social equality’.”45 While many black Americans saw the White House dinner as an honor for Dr. Washington and a step toward equality, many white southerners expressed concern that “giving Washington such status would cause other blacks to demand the same privileges.” According to these segregationists, the perceived dangers of this type of acceptance included integration and miscegenation.46 Due to the amount of press coverage lent to the event, Booker T. Washington’s dinner at the White House “was instantly loaded with political meaning in the [s]outh.” The publicity “fueled the campaign to ratify Alabama’s new constitution” and gave momentum to passing additional laws to disfranchise black Alabamans.47 President Roosevelt continued to spark public controversy, particularly in the south, by appointing William H. Lewis, an African American, as Assistant US Attorney for Boston. Lewis became a firm ally to Dr. Washington’s political cause. Even after his term as president ended, Roosevelt continued supporting the efforts for economic progress and equal rights made by the NNBL, and he even spoke at its 1910 convention in New York (Figure 6). Following the White House dinner controversy and amid growing criticism of his apparent political connections, Dr. Washington attempted to avoid negative publicity, which prevented him from openly supporting several important issues among the African American community. He never publicly condemned forced segregation, Jim Crow laws, or lynching, while he secretly contributed funds to the legal fight against them. For years, he quietly supported court cases challenging state laws and state constitutions that disfranchised African Americans.48

Dr. Washington’s literary success brought increased acclaim to Tuskegee Institute. His autobiographical work Up from Slavery was an enormous success. It sold 30,000 copies in its first year of publication in 1901 and received international recognition. Washington’s principles of self-help and emphasis on dignity even under oppression resonated powerfully across the globe. For example, a teacher in southern India wrote that all 700 students at a local high school were reading Dr. Washington’s book in a Malayalam translation.49 Because of Washington’s work, international students from Latin America, Japan, China, and the West Indies enrolled at Tuskegee Institute in the early 1900s. Washington’s acclaim also brought more public interest to the Institute.
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from leaders in education and from wealthy benefactors who eventually provided financial support to the school. During the 25th anniversary celebration of the founding of Tuskegee Institute, Dr. Washington hosted Secretary of War William Howard Taft, Harvard President Charles W. Eliot, and industrial philanthropist Andrew Carnegie (Figure 7). Carnegie funded the construction of a new library in 1902, one of the most significant donations to the Institute. In 1907, President Theodore Roosevelt visited Washington at his residence adjacent to campus, The Oaks.51

A strong sense of community developed from the construction of Tuskegee Institute—an early ambition of Dr. Washington that is outlined clearly in his autobiography, *The Story of My Life and Work*.52 Students built the roads and the buildings of the campus.53 “Every day that he labored for Tuskegee Institute, every year that Tuskegee survived, everything that he and his students achieved—all nurtured a sense of honor among blacks and demonstrated to a skeptical and hostile world that they could rise by their own efforts.”54 Student labor completed nearly all construction of the first buildings, in exchange for paying tuition and expenses as early as 1889. By 1899, Tuskegee became one of the first brick manufacturers in the region; the students created a million bricks a year (Figure 8, Figure 9, and Figure 10). Tuskegee Institute provided vocational training that would enable African Americans to earn a living. Courses included carpentry, brick-making, sewing, millinery, animal husbandry and gardening. Tuskegee Institute also required its students to complete specified coursework to meet requirements for general diplomas including mathematics, English, and history.

Dr. Washington recruited the best and brightest within the African American community to teach at the school. The most notable professor was George Washington Carver, the renowned

---
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Carver’s experimentation with a variety of plants exemplified Tuskegee’s focus on research and development. Another notable member of the Institute was David A. Williston, a landscape architect and graduate of Cornell University under renowned horticulturist, Liberty Hyde Bailey. Williston was the “first professionally trained black landscape architect in the United States and the first to establish his own professional office.” Williston taught at Tuskegee from 1902-1906 and served as Superintendent of Buildings and Grounds at Tuskegee Institute from 1910 until 1929. The impressive faculty also included architect Robert Robinson Taylor, Director of Mechanical Industries (1868-1942). Taylor designed and oversaw the construction of many of the University’s buildings including the University Chapel (1896), which was renowned for its “singing windows” depicting eleven Negro spirituals. Carver, Williston, and Taylor would all contribute not only to the design of the campus, but also to the design of The Oaks, Washington’s personal residence.

Dr. Washington served as President of Tuskegee University, until his death on November 14, 1915. During the 34 years of his leadership, the Institute constructed 48 major buildings and over 80 total structures on the campus. Of these buildings, approximately 32 remain on the campus today as testimony to the quality of their design and construction. The school prospered under his administration, and it has remained a representation of his policies and philosophies on education throughout the tenure of his successors.

Dr. Washington purchased two adjacent parcels of land. He obtained the first parcel from H.C. Ferguson on December 31, 1889. He bought the second parcel from H. C. Ferguson on June 7, 1893. The two lots combined constituted 160 feet of frontage along West Montgomery Road and each lot was 492 feet deep. The front property line along West Montgomery Road changed when...
Figure 11. Circa 1900 view of the north and west elevations of The Oaks taken from the northwest corner of the site shortly after construction. Note that none of the landscaping has been installed. The historic circulation pattern of the front walkway appears to be in place, though it is more formalized in later views (Figure 19.) Schomburg Center for Research in Black Culture, Jean Blackwell Hutson Research and Reference Division, New York Public Library Digital Collections. http://digitalcollections.nypl.org/items/510d47df-7576-a3d9-e040-e00a18064a99.

Figure 12. Circa 1900 view of Tuskegee Campus with The Oaks depicted left center. Tuskegee University Special Collections.
Tuskegee Institute purchased the property from Washington’s heirs.69

Robert R. Taylor most likely drafted the architectural plans for The Oaks.70 Taylor was one of the first African American graduates to receive a degree in architecture from Massachusetts Institute of Technology. His absence from the record of Institutional Staff for the year 1899-1900 suggests he may have been on leave during the year of construction of The Oaks. Taylor was responsible for the design of most of the Institute’s significant buildings and later became Vice President of the Institute. Taylor billed Washington for the design of The Oaks directly.71 The construction of The Oaks exemplifies the principles of Dr. Washington’s educational philosophy: students of the Institute constructed the residence as part of their vocational training and manufactured or locally-sourced the materials.72 The Oaks construction project also served as a training ground for project managers. The assistant foreman for the project, Jailous Perdue, later became the head foreman for other campus building projects including Carnegie Library, Rockefeller Hall, and Hunt Memorial Academic Building. By 1916, he was teaching carpentry at the school.73

The Oaks is a two-and-one-half story brick house built in the Queen Anne style with 15 rooms. The basement and two upper stories are brick masonry construction with tinted pink mortar. The large wrap-around veranda originally had wood floors and steps. Dr. Washington and his family moved into The Oaks during the summer of 1900 (Figure 11). (It is possible that the Washington family moved in earlier during the spring, but records indicate that they did not install a furnace.

---
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or window shades until that summer.\textsuperscript{74} The Washingtons’ residence served as the reception center for the Institute to host the numerous influential visitors and patrons of the school. The Oaks appears in a 1900s Bird’s Eye View of the Tuskegee Campus (Figure 12). Once completed, The Oaks became a reception place for students, faculty, and visiting dignitaries (Figure 13).

The first alteration to the house was an addition to the east of the dining room, which occurred sometime before 1908. The Washingtons commissioned much of the furniture and the stair railing to be custom-made to accommodate the 4’-11” stature of Margaret Murray Washington (Figure 14). The Washington family installed a radiant heating system before 1905, but it damaged some of the wood architectural details while in use. In 1908, the family hired artist E. W. Borman to paint a series of frieze murals. Borman painted the murals above the picture moldings of the three major first-floor rooms. The murals depicted scenes from Europe, which Dr. and Mrs. Washington favored from their memories of travel abroad\textsuperscript{75} (Figure 15). The murals remain in excellent condition today because of low levels of light exposure inside the residence.

Another major alteration to the house was the addition of a second story above the kitchen, constructed between 1910 and 1915. This construction included the removal of the roof of the one-story kitchen wing and new construction of a porch west of the addition—each made necessary by the second floor addition. The porch served as a personal study for Dr. Washington (Figure 16 and Figure 17). Another permanent modification to compensate the ell-shaped roof
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\footnotesize\textsuperscript{75} David Arbogast and David Ates, Architectural Data Section: Tuskegee Institute National Historic Site: Carver Museum/Grey Columns/The Oaks (Denver: National Park Service, 1978), np.
and second-story addition included the removal of the south dormer of the main roof to facilitate connecting the new roof with the existing roof. Additionally, builders used brick to fill the removal of the south window of the rear stair hallway to match the surrounding walls

**The Landscape at The Oaks**

David Augustus Williston designed many of the formal landscape features at The Oaks including circulation layout, the front planting beds, and a rustic summer house. Williston was born in 1868 in North Carolina. Williston’s family members were “middle class, educated, and respected pillars of the community.” Williston’s siblings all attended post-secondary school, and his brother, a physician, paid his tuition at Howard Normal School. He graduated in 1895. In 1895, Williston entered Cornell University College of Agriculture, and began a course of study under Liberty Hyde Bailey. Bailey was the Director of the College of Agriculture and he created the Department of Landscape Art at Cornell (later the Department of Landscape Architecture.)

Williston became the first African American to graduate from the College of Agriculture in 1898. Williston completed municipal engineering courses after his graduation from Cornell and became an instructor at State College of North Carolina in 1898. He became a professor of horticulture at Lincoln Institute until Booker T. Washington recruited him to Tuskegee Institute in 1902. Williston was “horticulture curator” and taught at the Institute intermittently between 1902 and 1927, eventually becoming Superintendent of Buildings and Grounds. Williston also taught at Fisk University and Tennessee State Agricultural and Industrial. He later established the first African American-owned landscape architecture firm in the United States, located in Washington, D.C. He practiced there until his death in 1962.

Williston contributed to the design and layout of several Historically Black Colleges and Universities and his designs “demonstrated his multi-faceted proficiency for creating spaces that were topographically engineered, embraced conservation principals, and utilized durable construction materials.”

Williston’s campus designs “favored the English Landscape School.” This school of thought “advocated the picturesque, irregular, romantic and undulating gestures in plant massing and landforms.” At Tuskegee, Williston worked with architect Robert R. Taylor to lay out the campus and grounds and with George Washington Carver to select plant materials.

---
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In 1905, Washington requested estimates from Williston for work to complete the landscaping at The Oaks. Williston replied:

I have your letter relative to the charges for my services on the improvement of your home grounds. In reply permit me to state that my charges will be named to you $40.00 per acre for the design which will include the following:

1. [an] arrangement plan
2. a detailed planting plan
3. a plan for grading

There are near three acres in your residence site. As to the execution of the named plans, my charges are $5.00 per day. To complete the work, I estimated it would take near sixty days. All over the named time necessary for the completion of the work, I shall make to change. I cannot finish the job before spring as there are many things which cannot be done until the named season.

I submit you a plan of the summer house which can be built of cedar in this locality for $90-$100.00

I trust this is satisfactory.

According to Williston scholar Doug Williams, “[t]his letter indicates one of Williston’s earliest residential designs, and possibly his design introduction not only at Tuskegee but also his career.” The project may also have been one of the first collaborations between Williston and George Washington Carver. Records indicate that both Carver and Williston selected plants for The Oaks, and the men collaborated on other Tuskegee Institute projects later in Williston’s career. Wilson emphasizes the importance of this relationship stating, “as pioneers in their respective trades, the men formed a ‘black brain

The initial planting layout at The Oaks reflects the influence of his former instructor, Liberty Hyde Bailey. According to Wilson, “Williston’s landscape schemes and choice of plant materials clearly reflect the English Landscape School. His formal training in horticulture and sensitivity to the value of native plants may be traced to his teacher, Liberty Hyde Bailey.” At The Oaks, Williston’s design included informal clusters of evergreen shrubs with hardwood trees, typical to his planting arrangements on campuses as shown in a photo from around 1906 (Figure 21).

Williston’s proposed cedar summer house was a gazebo type structure, rustic in design. Williston produced a sketch of the structure for Washington (Figure 22). Williston’s plans for the front of The Oaks also included the addition of a picket fence on the north, east and west property lines, tree plantings along West Montgomery Road and the eastern property boundary, and construction of numerous planting beds. His plantings in the rear of the house were less formal and included pecan, fruit trees, and native trees likely transplanted from wooded areas surrounding the property. Williston’s plant palette was similar to the palette he used in planting plans for the campus, where he frequently used native plants in landscape projects. Trees shown on his campus plans included elm, oak, maple, cedar, magnolia, catalpa, fringetree, redbud, dogwood, sweetgum, cherry laurel, and American holly. Williston also made use of yucca, yaupon holly, cross vine, jessamine, sweet shrub, and French mulberry. When available, Williston planted non-native materials including wax-leaf privet, Japanese quince, winter honeysuckle and varieties of spiraea.

Scholars who have studied Williston’s plans state, “Williston’s planting designs were not only cost effective but practical, considering the hot climate where many of his projects were located.” Appendix A includes a list of plants Williston used in his designs at Tuskegee.

The Washingtons also enlisted the help of George Washington Carver in landscaping The Oaks. Washington requested that Carver select trees and shrubbery suitable for the climate and region for The Oaks including some for the chicken yard. Washington wrote to Carver in 1908,

I wish you would have a talk with Mrs. Washington and decide upon a list of flowers, including rose bushes, etc., which she desires to have purchased for the yard, and send off for what she desires… I want you to go through my yard and in the garden together about two dozen trees or pieces of shrubbery. I want you to make a careful study of the whole situation and put out such trees and shrubbery as will be suitable for that climate. You can get a good many ideas from the various magazines and outdoor life as well as from the catalogues. I want some trees and shrubbery[ly] also put in my chicken yard.

91. Ibid., 83.
92. Ibid., 84.
94. Ibid., 32.
96. Ibid.
97. Wilson, African American Architects, 455.
98. Ibid., 14.
Washington’s study on the second floor overlooked his backyard farm, which included chickens, pigs, vegetable beds, and flower gardens. Washington was the subject of photographs in his garden surrounded by his vegetable beds and livestock. Scholars note the importance of these published images; they “showed that he had not risen above those he served, or in another reading, that his pleasure in such part-time productivity bound him to the gentleman farmer class he was courting.”

According to contemporary accounts,

The ground in the rear of the house was designed for the exclusive use of Dr. Washington. It was his ‘garden of love.’ Here he raised magnificent Plymouth Rocks, Braham, and other fowl, ducks, and pigeons, and full-blooded swine, all kept in fine pens and runways; and cultivated flowers, fresh greens and vegetables, largely as a matter of personal enjoyment and recreation.

Dr. Washington stated that he liked to rise early to visit his chickens in the back yard and collect fresh eggs. He wrote about the pleasure the garden behind The Oaks gave him,

My garden, also, what little time I can be at Tuskegee, is another source of rest and enjoyment. Somehow I like, as often as possible to touch nature, not something that is artificial or an imitation but the real thing. When I can leave my office in time so that I can spend thirty or forty minutes in spading the ground, in planting seeds, in digging about the plants, I feel that I am coming into contact with something that is giving me strength for the many duties and hard places that await me out in the big world. I pity the man or woman who has never learned to enjoy nature and to get strength and inspiration out of it.
Aside from the large number of fowls and animals kept by the school, I keep individually a number of pigs and fowls of the best grades, and in raising these I take a great deal of pleasure. I think the pig is my favourite [sic] animal.103

Former neighbors of the Washington family recalled that Mrs. Washington kept a peacock in the rear yard.104 A site plan based on research and interviews conducted during the 1979 Historic Landscape Report depicts the approximate location of a picket fence, vegetable garden, flowerbed, and cold frame at the rear of the residence.105 Photographs from the period support this plan including high and low board picket fences (Figure 23).

Historic photographs show vines covering a trellis on the west side of the house around 1910 (Figure 19). Carver planned for a vine-covered drive at the rear yard of The Oaks, noting that he was ready to set the vines out just as soon as construction of a wire screen over the driveway was completed. The location of this screen was “around the garden fence beginning south of the poultry yard gate and letting it extend entirely around the fence to where the wire joins Mr. Logan’s fence.”106 Another photo shows vines on the front of The Oaks in approximately 1910 (Figure 24). These may have been Dutchman’s pipe vine (Aristolochia sipho), but Williston specified additional large leaved vines on campus as well including cross vine (Bignonia capreolata).107

Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps from Washington’s occupancy depict the layout of buildings at The Oaks in 1903 and 1909 (Figure 25 and Figure 26). The 1909 map depicts the full construction of The Oaks. Recorded secondary structures include a well, a summer house, a carriage house and barn, and a cold frame. Between 1903 and 1909, a well existed in two different locations at the rear of the property; but it does not appear on Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps of the property after 1909.

---

105. Ibid.
106. Ibid., 14-15.
107. Ibid., 4.
indicating its removal.\textsuperscript{108} Although the date of construction is uncertain, Sanborn Maps show that the Washingtons commissioned the construction of a carriage house and barn south of the house, near the western property border by 1909.

Circulation on the site included a carriage drive and a walkway, both depicted on a 1911 map of the site (Figure 27). A sidewalk paralleled West Montgomery Road, connecting the site to the adjacent campus. A semi-circular walk connects this sidewalk to The Oaks. Dr. Washington had the drives and walks at the residence paved with chert, a typical drive surfacing at the time due to its ability to compact and drainage qualities (Figure 28). Chert was readily available near campus. Williston often used this material in construction. Williston’s student, Edward R. Pryce noted, “he paved the roads and paths with white chert dug from pits on campus and edged them with valley gutters made from concrete and local iron stone.”\textsuperscript{109} Another map dated January 24, 1913 shows the location of the carriage house and barn and the sewer lines.\textsuperscript{110}


\textsuperscript{109} Pryce, Historic Landscape Report, 3.

\textsuperscript{110} Ibid., 13.

\textsuperscript{109} Pryce, Historic Landscape Report, 3.

\textsuperscript{110} Ibid., 13.

The original location of rustic, octagonal summer house designed by Williston was to the rear of the residence.\textsuperscript{111} The carriage house and horse barn located at the rear west perimeter of the property served an active use until their demolition between 1920 and 1926. Figure 29 is an annotated view of the rear yard with outbuildings including the carriage house, barn, summer house, and well house. There is little evidence to reveal the type of fencing located at the rear of the house beyond the historic photograph showing Dr. Washington with his chickens, but interviews with former neighbors indicate that there was fencing surrounding the chicken yard.\textsuperscript{112} The fence between the front and rear yards featured white-painted pickets with cross bracing. This type of fencing also appears near the planting areas in the rear yard (Figure 19 and Figure 23). Correspondence from Carver regarding The Oaks and between Washington and Taylor indicates that the enclosures in the rear yard evolved over several years. Carver writes to a Mr. Stewart in 1908,

\textsuperscript{111} Ibid., 49.

\textsuperscript{112} Goetcheus, “Booker T. Washington,” 32.

\textsuperscript{113} George Washington Carver to Mr. Stewart, June 5, 1908, February 6, 1908, Local Correspondence, folder Agricultural Dept. Experiment Station, 1908, Carver, con. 583, Booker T. Washington Papers, Library of Congress, quoted in Jenkins and Platt “HSR/History Data,” 14-15.
Washington instructed Robert Taylor in 1910,

There is some work pertaining to the fences between my house and Mr. Callaway’s store which I have been trying to get done ever since I came home. Mr. J.H. Washington and Mr. Williston can tell you about this. I wish you would see that this work is begun without further delay.114

The Oaks and its surroundings served as the center of social activities at Tuskegee Institute during the tenure of Dr. and Mrs. Washington. Contemporary references to The Oaks “emphasize the influence of [the] flood of visitors” to the residence, which allowed the Washingtons to entertain guests, faculty, and students in a fashionable manner.115

The Oaks served as the backdrop for the marriage of Dr. Washington’s daughter Portia to William Sidney Pittman in 1907. On October 31 of that year, “The Electrical Division of the school transformed the entire grounds of ‘The Oaks’ into a blaze of light by utilizing colored lights in the trees, among the rose bushes, hedges, and in the various nooks and corners.”116

Illustration 2.1 depicts the arrangement of landscape features at The Oaks circa 1910.

**Margaret Murray Washington Period (1915-1925)**

Following the death of Dr. Washington in 1915, The Oaks remained in the ownership of his wife, Mrs. Margaret Murray Washington, until her death in 1925 (Figure 30). Mrs. Washington continued to advocate for both Tuskegee Institute and the black race in the years following his death. According to scholar Sheena Harris, “[w]hatever thoughts consumed her mind at Washington’s last breath, she knew that she had a great responsibility ahead

114. Booker T. Washington, November 15, 1910, Local Correspondence, folder Dept. of Mechanical Industries, 1910, Taylor, con. 602, Ibid.
115. Jenkins and Platt, HRS/History Data, 17.
Margaret Murray Washington was born Margaret James Murray in 1861, the child of an African American washerwoman and an Irish railroad worker. Margaret’s mother was very poor, and sent her to live with a family of Quakers, the Saunders, during her childhood. According to Harris, Quaker families “adopted black children and taught them their doctrines and concepts of ‘holiness’.” The Saunders sent Margaret to Nashville, Tennessee in 1875 “to further her schooling.” Margaret enrolled in Fisk University six years later. Harris states,

> It is important to understand the political and social environment that Margaret Murray lived through in order to fully grasp the ‘stern’ educator she became. She lived under a system of segregation and inequality, and saw many of the hopes and dreams of blacks shattered because of the ‘lack of knowledge’ and the resistance of whites to change.

Margaret’s upbringing, the influence of the Quakers, and her time at Fisk University would shape her future agenda as an advocate for and leader of black women. Fisk University exposed Margaret to many educational ideas, including an interest in African and African American history. According to Harris, Margaret’s education at Fisk also “facilitated her entrance into a class [of black elites] that prided itself on higher education during the Industrial era and at the height of the Progressive Era.”

Margaret applied to teach at Tuskegee University toward the end her education at Fisk University. She accepted a position teaching in Texas prior to graduation, however, and at her commencement ceremony, Margaret was seated near Booker T. Washington, who was delivering the commencement address at the school. She used this opportunity to ask Dr. Washington personally for a position at Tuskegee. Margaret impressed Booker T. Washington, and he offered to hire her and an English teacher at Tuskegee Institute for the upcoming academic year. She moved to Tuskegee and began to teach, and in September 1890, Margaret became Lady Principal and Director of the Department of Domestic Service. The students and faculty of the Institute held her in high regard. Margaret held this position until her death in 1925.

When Margaret Murray arrived at Tuskegee Institute, Booker T. Washington was twice a widow. His previous wife, Olivia, was both the mother of his sons and a teacher and administrator at Tuskegee.
the school. Margaret filled Olivia’s shoes as a faculty member, but she eventually developed romantic feelings toward Dr. Washington and began to care for his two young sons. Booker T. Washington and Margaret Murray married in October 1892. According to Norrell, their marriage was “a conventional Victorian marriage, with clear boundaries about their separate spheres but a strong commitment to their common purposes.” As Lady Principal at the Institute, Margaret Murray Washington soon became a surrogate for her husband when he traveled for speaking engagements in his promotion of the school.

During this period, Margaret began to work as a community advocate. Her initial efforts emphasized improving sanitary conditions in the homes of formerly enslaved blacks in nearby rural areas. Mrs. Washington wrote, “[w]here the homes of colored people are comfortable and clean, there is less disease, less sickness, less death and less danger to others.” Harris writes, “Margaret Washington had to uphold the belief that there was one thing that transcended work, school, and church, and was always of paramount importance: the home.”

Mrs. Washington’s outreach efforts led her to form the Tuskegee Women’s Club, an organization that hosted mother’s meetings and promoted housekeeping skills to the black women who resided in the communities around Tuskegee. The group’s “Bath, Broom, and Bible” program aimed to make black homes the “centers to produce the next generation of young men and women who would carry on those traditions and values necessary for racial improvement and uplift.” Harris writes, “[t]he Tuskegee Women’s Club was a direct response to the efforts by educated southern black women to join forces, as northern black women had done, and create outlets through which they could mingle on personal, professional, and social levels.” Tuskegee Women’s Club was part of a national movement of middle-class women during the Progressive Era. Across the nation, middle- and upper-class women formed organizations to improve community needs, “invoking their own maternal duties to protect children and care for the poor.” Issues common to these clubs included the improvement of working conditions, sanitation, creating of improved civic assets such as schools, parks, and playgrounds, and maternal and child welfare.

In 1895, a group of black female leaders met in Boston and founded the National Federation of Afro-American Women’s Clubs (NFAAWC). The group elected Mrs. Washington president.

127. Booker T. Washington had three children. His daughter Portia was from his first marriage to Fannie Smith, who died in 1884. His sons, Booker T. Washington, Jr. and Ernest Davidson Washington, were the sons of his wife Olivia Davidson, who died in 1889.
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131. Quoted in Harris, “A Female Reformer,” 58.
132. Harris, “A Female Reformer,” 58.
133. Under Mrs. Washington’s leadership, Tuskegee Women’s Club efforts were diverse and included many issues “outside the home” including improving prison conditions, the convict lease program, temperance issues, lynching, and education. NACW efforts also addressed many of these issues.
135. Harris, “A Female Reformer,” 69.
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The NFAAA WC promoted an anti-lynching platform and advocated against the defamation of the character of black Americans, particularly women. Harris states “[t]his election positioned her as the premier leader of African American women.” Members of the NFAAA WC merged with the Colored Women’s League to become the National Association of Colored Women (NACW) in 1896. The constituents elected Margaret Murray Washington Chairwoman of the Executive Board. “The NACW set out to make a difference in the black community through social reforms and ideas of uplift.”

The Washington family’s own residence at The Oaks embodied the idea of the possibility of uplift through hard work. The structure indicated the social status to which Dr. Washington and his wife had risen due to their importance at Tuskegee, in the black community, and within white philanthropic circles. Noteworthy visitors continued to frequent The Oaks even after Booker T. Washington’s death, as Mary Murray Washington had become an eminent black leader in her own right (Figure 31). The NACW held its eleventh biennial conference at Tuskegee in the summer of 1920. Invited guests included two white members of the Southern Methodist Women’s Committee. The women were invited guests at a gathering at The Oaks. This interracial meeting at a black woman’s residence was unusual, Margaret Murray Washington scholar Jacqueline Anne Rouse states that,

After overcoming the lack of special treatment and accommodations usually extended to southern white women in such settings, the women agreed to meet with some of the NACW’s leaders. In a private meeting around Booker T. Washington’s table, Haskins and Johnson met Eugenia Burns Hope, Nannie Helen Burroughs, Lucy Laney, Charlotte Hawkins Brown, Janie Porter Barrett, Mary McLeod Bethune, and Margaret Murray Washington. NACW presented their guests with a statement.

138. Rouse, “Out of the Shadow,” 35; Rouse notes that during the 1890s, media portrayals of African American women included language describing them as immoral and driving black men to attack virginal white women; Harris, “A Female Reformer”, 132-133.
139. Harris, “A Female Reformer,” 136.
140. Ibid., 142.
denouncing lynching and supporting the enfranchisement of black women, as adopted at the NACW annual meeting. After a prolonged discussion of the issues, both groups agreed to meet again.\footnote{142}

The NACW eventually merged with the traditionally all-white National Council of Women. Mrs. Washington had other passions including universal suffrage and African and African American history. She advocated for the inclusion of African American history in educational curricula. Her interest in Africa and concern for the conditions of the “plight of women and children of color around the world” led her to found the International Council of Women of the Darker Races in 1922.\footnote{143} The group addressed not only female oppression but also sent “a petition to the US Congress denouncing the horrible treatment of the people in the Congo [and] the US Occupation of Haiti.”\footnote{144}

Changes to The Oaks

After Booker T. Washington’s death, the landscape at The Oaks changed under the direction of Mrs. Washington. The previously mentioned correspondence between Dr. Washington and George Washington Carver indicates that she had influence over plant selections for the garden and public areas during its initial installation. After Dr. Washington’s death, mapping records the gradual removal of the outbuildings in the rear yard of the house. The proliferation of automobile travel likely prompted one change to the south side of the lot. A 1920 Sanborn Insurance Map shows only the house and the “Shed” (carriage house) (Figure 32). Between 1920 and 1925, Mrs. Washington commissioned the construction of the brick garage at the former location of the carriage house and barn, evidenced by a 1926 Macon County Sanborn map (Figure 33).\footnote{145} The garage is also included in later site plans drawn during NPS ownership, in 1978 and 1980, but only the foundation remains at the site. According to interviews conducted in the 1970s, Williston’s summer house and the well were demolished by 1915.\footnote{146}

Landscape architect Edward R. Pryce, who was familiar with the site from his tenure at Tuskegee Institute, stated that Williston planted Macartney roses (Rosa bracteata) on the western boundary of the site in the early 1920s.\footnote{147} It is not known if Margaret Murray Washington had any influence over this planting addition. Illustration 2.2 depicts the landscape at The Oaks circa 1925, at the time of Margaret Murray Washington’s death.

Margaret Murray Washington died at the Oaks in June 1925. She is buried next to her husband on the campus of Tuskegee University. Harris states, “[Margaret] Washington’s life reveals the extent to which Southern black female reformers were pioneers in the betterment of the community and the race, and represents the efforts of one of the most influential clubwomen of the Progressive Era.”\footnote{148}

Tuskegee Institute Period (1925-1977)

The Board of Trustees of Tuskegee Institute purchased The Oaks from the Washington children and acquired some of the furniture at an auction in 1925.\footnote{149} The majority of alterations to the original structure occurred at different points in time during this period of historical development. The Women’s Club of Tuskegee Institute maintained The Oaks for the first 10 years, and this group occupied many of the rooms of the residence with the exception of some bedrooms and Washington’s den. The Women’s Club may have had a hand in initial preservation efforts at The Oaks. Other groups associated with the NACW led efforts to
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Cultural Landscape Report: The Oaks, Tuskegee Institute National Historical Site

Figure 34. Detailed view of Map of the Tuskegee Campus with Proposed Changes, Taylor and Persley Architects, April 1930. Building shown to the east of The Oaks was never constructed, Tuskegee University Physical Plant Flat Files.

preserve the residences of prominent black leaders. For example, NACW president Mary Tolbert led an effort to preserve Frederick Douglass’ residence, Cedar Hill, in the Anacostia neighborhood of Washington, D.C.150 The Oaks served the Institute in several capacities over the subsequent decades including housing alumni and administrative offices.151

Changes to The Oaks

The circulation at The Oaks changed during this period. Between 1925 and 1929, the Institute replaced the front semi-circular walkway with a straight concrete walk leading from the front door to West Montgomery Road. The changes to circulation at the site may have coincided with renovations to the upper floor of the residence in 1929. The new front walkway is shown on a 1930 campus map (Figure 34). Since Williston was at Tuskegee until 1929, he likely oversaw this change to the circulation in front of the residence. The date of construction of the other walkways around The Oaks is unknown. However, they likely date to the improvements made under the Institute to facilitate use of the residence for the Women’s Club and administrative offices.

At some point, workers lowered the elevation of West Montgomery Road, perhaps to install curb and gutter. This elevation change required the construction of a low brick retaining wall along the sidewalk and property line (Figure 35). The construction of this wall likely corresponds with the removal of the front picket fence, which is no longer visible in a 1934 view of the property. Williston’s shrub beds, the trellises with vines on the porches, and yucca plants near the drive are no longer at the site.

The Institute and Women’s Club drastically reduced the number of plants around the residence between 1925 and 1934. Figure 35 shows that the landscape in the front is simplified, with lawn panels and overstory trees. Williston’s shrub beds, the trellises with vines on the porches, and yucca plants near the drive are no longer at the site. A later postcard shows the Institute added some foundation shrubs along the north side of the house and east of the porte-cochère (Figure 36).

By the 1930s, campus maps depict the circulation layout on the site in the context of the campus. A walkway leads from the front steps of the house to the sidewalk paralleling West Montgomery Road. The circular drive on the northeast corner of the site goes under the porte-cochère, behind the residence and south to the garage. Another drive runs from the circular carriage trail southwest to the southern border of the property, but the map does not show the terminus of this driveway (Figure 37). Campus workers likely installed valley

Figure 35. The Oaks, circa.1934. Tuskegee University Archives.

gutters and drop inlets along the edges of the driveway at this time. In 1935.

In 1957, the Institute made another round of renovations to the residence that altered the interior. The most significant changes included stripping and re-varnishing the floors, re-installing the electric system, enclosing the lower rear porches for storage space, and installing a telephone system. Tuskegee Institute also installed a new doorway in the den adjacent to the east-side porch. The Institute enclosed the porch off the den with casement windows instead of historic screening, most likely because it protected visitors from the weather when exiting from the new den doorway. Additionally, in the late 1950s, the Institute installed a new aluminum roof to replace the historic painted, pressed metal shingle roof and standing seam metal roof. The Institute also installed a very thorough fire suppression system in all interior and exterior spaces of the house. The installation of this fire suppression system likely included the addition of the existing post indicator valve, located in the yard north of the residence. Finally, the exterior trim was painted white, instead of the historic brown, to match the other buildings on the historic campus.

The Institute applied asphalt paving to the circular loop of the carriage trail in 1958. Edward Pryce notes in his Historic Landscape Report, “the vegetable garden and the rest of the property to the

---
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south [of the residence] was allowed to grow up in weeds and trees.”

National Park Service Period (1977–present)
The NPS established Tuskegee Institute National Historic Site in 1977. This site includes The Oaks as well as the 50-acre Historic Campus District. A Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the NPS and the University defines “the respective roles of the Park Service and the University in preserving and interpreting the historic site.”

Under this agreement, the NPS began recordation and preservation efforts at The Oaks. Illustration 2.4 and Illustration 2.5 depict the landscape at The Oaks prior to landscape improvements by the NPS. Improvements to the residence included repainting of all of the trim work, cornice, square columns on the porches, and vents in the foundations. Sometime before 1996, maintenance crews added a wheelchair lift to the northeast corner of the house at the porte-cochère.

The NPS interpretation of the residence focuses on the domestic life of Dr. Booker T. Washington during the period in which he occupied The Oaks, between 1899 and 1915. The interpretive emphasis on this period is evident in the tour offered by The Oaks. Illustration 2.4 and Illustration 2.5 depict the landscape at The Oaks prior to landscape improvements by the NPS. Improvements to the residence included repainting of all of the trim work, cornice, square columns on the porches, and vents in the foundations. Sometime before 1996, maintenance crews added a wheelchair lift to the northeast corner of the house at the porte-cochère.

The NPS added a picnic area to the southwest of the residence in 2005. The NPS also constructed a visitor kiosk on the eastern property line, installed two interpretive panels to the front and rear of the property, and added trash receptacles. Between 2007 and 2014, crews replaced the portion of the circular entrance drive from the drive apron to the porte-cochère with pre-cast concrete pavers set in an ashlar stone pattern. Crews paved the remainder of the drive with washed river stone and pea gravel. Due to a lack

158. NPS, *General Management Plan*, i.
of available administrative records, the installation date of these items is undocumented.

Correspondence from NPS staff following a 1996 site visit recommends removing the visitor kiosk to maintain historic views, and the NPS removed the small structure sometime after the visit and before 2016. Improvements to the south parking lot in 2014 included replacement of some portions of the brick retaining wall on the north side of the parking lot to improve wall stability. NPS maintenance crews added a gate at the driveway entrance at West Montgomery Road in 2015. In 2015, Tuskegee University crews removed the front walkway paralleling West Montgomery Road.

At the beginning of NPS acquisition, the vegetative cover and formal plantings were varied. The NPS installed foundation plantings that they continue to maintain. Some of the historic tree specimens remain from the period of significance, but the majority of the original trees have died. According to Southeast Regional Office (SERO) personnel field notes from a 1996 visit, a 1991 hurricane resulted in the loss of three large pecan trees dating from the period of significance and damaged others. Maintenance crews have removed much of the vegetation that existing along the western property line recorded in 1996 photographs and field notes. During this visit, SERO personnel noted “a Macartney Rose hedge (planted by David Williston)” on the western border of the site (Figure 39). The NPS removed this rose prior to field observation in 2016.
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Approximate Dates of Construction

The Oaks & Porte Cochere (1899)
Dining Room Extension (1902)
Conservatory (pre-1908, removal date unknown)
Carriage House and Barn (c. 1903-1909)
Well House (c. 1903-1909)
Summerhouse (c. 1906)
Hose Cart House (date of construction unknown)

Plant Key

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Tree Name</th>
<th>Latin Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Red cedar</td>
<td>Juniperus virginiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>Deodar cedar</td>
<td>Cedrus deodara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MG</td>
<td>Southern magnolia</td>
<td>Magnolia grandiflora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>American elm</td>
<td>Ulmus americana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QN</td>
<td>Water oak</td>
<td>Quercus nigra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YA</td>
<td>Yucca</td>
<td>Yucca aloifolia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES

* Unidentified hardwood tree species in referenced 1911 historic plan by Edward Pryce or historic photographs.
** Approximate location of planting beds with shrubs according to historic photographs.

The location and dimensions of the non-existing house additions and outbuildings are approximated using historic photographs, campus maps, and descriptions.

SOURCES

5. Historic photographs.
Approximate Dates of Construction

Garage (c. 1920-1925)
Gutters and Drop Inlets (c. 1920-1929)
Hose Cart House (date of construction unknown)

Plant Key

- J Red cedar
- CI Pecan
- CD Deodar cedar
- MG Southern magnolia
- UA American elm
- QN Water oak
- YC Yucca

NOTES

* Unidentified hardwood tree species in referenced 1925 historic plan by Edward Pryce or historic photographs.
** Approximate location of planting beds with shrubs according to historic photographs.

The location and dimensions of the non-existing house additions and outbuildings are approximated using historic photographs, campus maps, and descriptions.

SOURCES

4. Historic photographs.

Margaret Murray Washington Period Plan (1925)
The Oaks • Cultural Landscape Report
March 2018 • Illustration 2.2
Approximate Dates of Construction

Front Walkway and Concrete Walks Around Site (c. 1929)
Brick Wall at West Montgomery Street (c. 1930s)

Plant Key

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Plant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Red cedar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>Pecan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>Deodar cedar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS</td>
<td>Chinese parasol tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Amure river privet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MG</td>
<td>Southern magnolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJ</td>
<td>Pfizer juniper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB</td>
<td>McCartney rose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>Baby's breath spiraea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>American elm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QN</td>
<td>Water oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YA</td>
<td>Yucca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Red cedar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pecan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deodar cedar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chinese parasol tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amure river privet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southern magnolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pfizer juniper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>McCartney rose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baby's breath spiraea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American elm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Water oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yucca</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES

* Unidentified hardwood tree species in referenced 1925 historic plan by Edward Pryce or historic photographs.
** Approximate location of planting beds with shrubs according to historic photographs.

The location and dimensions of the non-existing house additions and outbuildings are approximated using historic photographs, campus maps, and descriptions.
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Legend

- Concrete Surface
- Chert or Gravel Surface
- Asphalt Surface

The Oaks • Cultural Landscape Report
March 2018 • Illustration 2.3
Approximate Dates of Construction

Flagpole (unknown)
Marker with Bench (unknown)
Retaining Walls at Lower Parking Lot (unknown)

Plant Key

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Plant Name</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AG</td>
<td>Abelia</td>
<td>Abelia x grandiflora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>Cattail</td>
<td>Cattail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>Deodar cedar</td>
<td>Cedrus deodara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP</td>
<td>Elaeagnus</td>
<td>Elaeagnus pungens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER</td>
<td>Pearl bush</td>
<td>Exochorda racemosa*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS</td>
<td>Chinese parasol tree</td>
<td>Firmiana simplex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Yaupon holly</td>
<td>Ilex vomitoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Red cedar</td>
<td>Juniperus virginiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li</td>
<td>Crape myrtle</td>
<td>Lagerstroemia indica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lj</td>
<td>Wax leaf privet</td>
<td>Ligustrum japonicum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV</td>
<td>Common privet</td>
<td>Ligustrum vulgare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Crabapple</td>
<td>Malus angustifolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MG</td>
<td>Southern magnolia</td>
<td>Magnolia grandiflora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>Red mulberry</td>
<td>Morus rubra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Nandina</td>
<td>Nandina domestica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Cherry laurel</td>
<td>Prunus caroliniana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF</td>
<td>Photinia</td>
<td>Photinia x fraseri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pj</td>
<td>Pfitzer juniper</td>
<td>Juniperus chinensis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Py</td>
<td>Firethorn</td>
<td>Pyracantha yunnanensis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB</td>
<td>Macartney rose</td>
<td>Rosa x bracteata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Elm</td>
<td>Ulmus sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QN</td>
<td>Water oak</td>
<td>Quercus nigra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS</td>
<td>Wisteria</td>
<td>Wisteria sinensis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

L* are indicated on 1978 Plan by Williams-Russell and Associates as “privet” the variety is not specified.

L** these shrubs are noted as “Japanese privet” on 1978 Plan by Williams-Russell and Associates. Pryce typically refers to Ligustrum japonicum as “wax leaf privet” in his documentation. It is unclear which privet variety he is referring to on this plan.

Sources

Note
* Edward Pryce notes that Williston used Exochorda racemosa in his site redecoration at The Oaks in 1978. However, Pryce recorded Exochorda grandifolia in his list of plants Williston planted on the Tuskegee Campus. These are both assumed to be the plant with the common name pearl bush.
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Existing Conditions

Introduction

The focus of this study is The Oaks, set within the historic campus district of Tuskegee National Historic Site in Tuskegee, Alabama. The Oaks was the residence of Dr. Booker T. Washington, during much of his tenure as the first president of Tuskegee Institute (now Tuskegee University) and his wife, Margaret Murray Washington. The study area is 2.5 acres located on the south side of West Montgomery Road directly across from the campus of Tuskegee University. University property surrounds The Oaks. To the east of the property is a large parking lot; to the west is a vacant lot; and to the south is a woodland hillside and sports facilities. The historic resources of the site include the historic Queen Anne style residence, the remaining foundation of a rear garage, a historic drive alignment lined with concrete gutters, several small-scale features, and historic plant materials including specimen trees.

This section inventories the existing conditions of the property using a combination of photographs and observations from site surveys, plan-view graphics and period plans, and a cultural resource overview (reconnaissance study) of the landscape characteristics. This section documents the natural systems and cultural landscape features. Illustrations 3.1 and 3.2 are plan view graphics depicting the entire NPS property at The Oaks and the landscape immediately surrounding the historic residence.

The CLR identifies each cultural landscape feature according to the characteristics defined by the NPS in the Cultural Landscape Inventory Professional Procedures Guide as well as A Guide to Cultural Landscape Reports: Contents, Process, and Techniques. This inventory of landscape characteristics provides a condition assessment of each feature—whether the condition is in good, fair, poor, or unknown. List of Classified Structures (LCS) numbers are noted when available.

Natural Systems and Features

Topography

Macon County, Alabama is located in the East Gulf Coastal Plain and is part of the greater Alabama River drainage basin. The boundary for this study encompasses the entire 2.5 acres of The Oaks. It begins approximately at the 430-foot contour line and extends to the 468-foot contour line, on the “USGS Map of Tuskegee” depicting the Tuskegee National Historic Site. Figure 40 depicts topographic conditions at the site.

Tuskegee University campus occupies a series of ridges separated by steep drainage valleys. The primary ridge within the campus lies between West Montgomery Road and University Avenue. According to a USGS map, the topographic high point on campus, near Carnegie Hall, is approximately 460 feet above sea level.

Soils

The USDA Soil Conservation Service identifies the soil types underlying The Oaks site as Cowarts loamy sand and Marvyn loamy sand. Cowarts loamy sand soils are located on the south/southwest side of the site. This soil has moderately high permeability and low organic matter content. The depth to bedrock is typically more than 60 inches. The Marvyn loamy sand soils are located on the north portion of the site and make up the majority of soils on-site, at 65.4 percent of the total acreage. The soil has high permeability and classified as prime farmland. Figure 41 maps existing soil conditions at The Oaks.

Directly opposite the site is a steep valley where Tuskegee students excavated clay for the historic brickmaking on campus. Students constructed 20 of the historic brick buildings on the Tuskegee campus. In fact, by 1899, Tuskegee became one of the first brick manufacturers in the region and the students created a million bricks a year.

164. Ibid.
Figure 40. Existing topographic conditions at The Oaks.
Figure 41. Existing soils at The Oaks.
Vegetation

Typically, the native forests in Alabama are a diverse mix of both hardwoods and softwoods. The predominate tree species that are the most frequently occurring in the natural hardwood forests of Alabama are red oak (Quercus rubra), sweetgum (Liquidambar styraciflua), yellow poplar (Liriodendron tulipifera), white oak (Quercus alba), hickory species (Carya spp.), shortleaf pine (Pinus echinata), and loblolly pine (Pinus taeda). The naturally occurring flora at the southwest corner of the site consists of a mix of oaks, hickories, and an understory of exotics and invasive species. Due to the proliferation of invasive exotic undergrowth, this area is in fair condition.

Cultural Features

Land Use

Within The Oaks study boundary, land uses include:

Commemoration.
Similar to the entire Tuskegee Institute National Historic Site, The Oaks commemorates the founding of Tuskegee Institute (Tuskegee University), an important historically black college, and the Institute’s first president, Booker T. Washington. The Oaks provides opportunities for education and reflection on events associated with the tenure of Dr. Washington at Tuskegee Institute. Through the preservation of the site’s historic resources and the park’s interpretive program, visitors gain a greater understanding of the life of the Washington family at their former residence, as well as an understanding of the on-the-job training students at Tuskegee experienced during their education at the Institute. The house remains in a campus setting surrounded by educational buildings and support facilities. The Oaks is an Alabama Historic Landmark, and the Keeper of the National Register listed The Oaks in the National Register of Historic Places in 1965.

Interpretation and Tourism.
The interpretive signs are located where the historic circular drive meets West Montgomery Road as well as at the base of the stairs of the lower level (south) parking lot. The NPS offers a tour through The Oaks nearly every hour on weekdays. The interpretive program at The Oaks follows the period between 1899 and 1915, the time of Dr. Washington’s residency. Overall, the interpretation of the interior is true to this time of occupancy. For example, the arrangement of the furniture and the low lighting reflect the historic use. A few modern alterations, such as the installation of carpet throughout the first story, diverge from historic conditions.
Utilities

The Oaks was the first residence in Macon County to have running water and electricity. Macon County water and sewer service currently operates at The Oaks. Water and sewer services are subgrade. There are modern manholes and valve covers located throughout the site. There is a Taylor Power Systems generator on the west property line (Figure 42). Overhead power services the site. There are eight large yard lights located throughout the lawn facing the residence (Figure 43 and Figure 44). These illuminate the facade of The Oaks at night. There is one overhead light located in the center of the lower parking lot.

Circulation

Pedestrian.

West Montgomery Road Sidewalk. The sidewalk system on West Montgomery Road provides access to the historic campus and connects The Oaks to Tuskegee University. The sidewalks are in good condition from the eastern property line to the drive entry (Figure 45). The remainder of sidewalk on the property line, directly in front of The Oaks, is in poor condition. This section is missing, and a dirt path takes its place (Figure 46).

Concrete Entry Walkway (LCS 092175). A concrete entry walk connects The Oaks to the main pedestrian route of the University along West Montgomery Road. It leads to the front porch. This 6½-foot-wide sidewalk is 41 feet long and includes two steps near West Montgomery Road. During heavy rain events, this sidewalk becomes flooded and holds water at the top of the steps. Overall, the walkway is in good condition (Figure 47 and Figure 48).

Figure 45. West Montgomery Road sidewalk, east of The Oaks.

Figure 46. Missing portion of West Montgomery Road sidewalk north of The Oaks, facing west.

Figure 47. Entry walkway of The Oaks facing north. Note ponding and drainage issues near planting beds.

Figure 48. Entry sidewalk at The Oaks.

Concrete Walkways around The Oaks (LCS 092175). A series of concrete walks parallel the facades of the residence to provide visitor access around the main building. The four-foot-wide sidewalk that leads from the driveway to the rear of the residence is 192 feet long. The remaining portion of four-foot-wide walkway that circles from the rear of the house to the front entry path is 39 feet long. Overall, the concrete walks that surround The Oaks are in good condition (Figure 49, Figure 50, and Figure 51).

Vehicular.

Drives (Carriage Trail) (LCS 092173). The entry drive features a concrete paved apron at West Montgomery Road. The portion of the drive from the drive apron to the porte-cochère is concrete pavers with an ashlar stone pattern (Figure 52). The remainder of the drive is paved with washed river stone and pea gravel with concrete valley gutters. The concrete valley gutters line the drive from the circular portion of the drive in the northeast corner of the site to the garage foundation southwest of the house. The circular entry drive at The Oaks is a historic landscape feature that dates from circa 1925 (Figure 53). The driveway is in good condition. The two drop-inlets are original to the design of the gravel driveway. These iron-grate drop-inlets are installed directly into the concrete gutter (Figure 54). The concrete gutters are one and a half feet wide.
Upper Parking Lot. To the east of the site, there is an asphalt lot that provides parking for visitors and NPS superintendent. This lot is located off NPS property but serves the site. The lot also contains universal access parking spaces. These spaces are indicated with signs. The parking lot is a shared use lot with the University. The surface is in good condition (Figure 55).

Lower Asphalt Lot. A lower lot, accessed via a set of concrete steps south of the historic core of the site, provides additional parking for the University, visitors, and buses. The asphalt surface is in fair condition and needs resurfacing (Figure 56, Figure 57, and Figure 58).
Figure 59. Oblique view of northwest corner of The Oaks, 2016.

Figure 60. Brickwork on windows.

Figure 61. Porch detail, west elevation.

Figure 62. Porch detail, south elevation.

Figure 63. Stairs and entry to porch, south elevation.

Figure 64. Door and awning at south wing elevation.
Buildings and Structures

The Oaks (LCS 091220)

The Oaks is a two-and-a-half story brick structure located on the south side of West Montgomery Road within the historic campus of Tuskegee University (Figure 59). The house is Queen Anne style and contains 15 rooms, five halls, five bathrooms and two stairs.168 The structure is brick construction with tinted pink mortar on the first two stories. The exterior material of the gables, second-story porches, and roof are painted red shingles and the paint color of all of the exterior trim is brown. The floor plan is irregular and asymmetrical with a multi-gabled roofline.

The Greek Revival detailing of the wood cornice features a full entablature with slight eave overhang and brackets on the second story. The windows of the house, except the elliptical windows, are double-hung in configurations of one-over-one, two-over-two, four-over-four, and six-over-six. The second-story window on the north elevation features a bracketed top with a molded cornice. Each of the windows has a single or one-and-a-half row brick lintel and a sill (Figure 60). A five-row brick belt course sits atop the brick foundation, which features ventilation openings in a diamond-shape masonry pattern on the northwest elevation, wood screening on the south elevation, and windows on the east elevation (Figure 61). The front veranda has brick piers and a concrete floor inlaid with red tile. Concrete steps lead to the house at multiple points of entry. The veranda has a hipped roof on the north elevation and on the west elevation. Wood columns with slanted-side piers support the roof of the veranda, which is enclosed by a wood balustrade installed between each column. The house features three of the original five chimneys with ornate brick masonry detailing169 (Figure 62).

The south and west elevations include two-story wood construction porches. Wood paneling with wainscoting encloses the rear porch. The northwest portion of the house includes a second-story porch of brick and wood construction.170 Each of the porches features a hipped shingle roof with the same Greek Revival cornice and slight eave overhang as the main house. A bracketed shed roof with shingles and unbroken semi-circular pediment is above each side-entry door. The entrance stairway at the east elevation from the den has a metal railing; all other railings are wood (Figure 63, Figure 64, and Figure 65). The residence at The Oaks is in good condition.

169. Ibid.
170. Ibid., 84-85.
Figure 68. View of southwest corner of The Oaks, garage foundation, and hose cart house location.

Figure 69. Wood post at corner of garage foundation.

Figure 70. Concrete and brick retaining walls at lower level parking lot.

Figure 71. Brick retaining wall at lower level parking lot, facing northeast.

Figure 72. Stepped brick retaining wall at lower level parking lot, facing east.

Porte-Cochère
The porte-cochère is at the southwest corner of the house adjacent to the dining room. The porte-cochère includes wood posts set on brick piers with a hipped roof. It is in good condition (see Figure 66).

Carriage House and Barn (missing)
The owners removed the carriage house and barn structures between 1911 and 1925. They were set in the west portion of the yard with a surrounding barnyard (Figure 67). There is no above ground evidence of this structure.

Summer House (missing)
The owners removed the summer house from the rear yard by 1925. The original location of this structure was south of the residence in the yard, adjacent to the barnyard. There is no above ground evidence of this structure.

Hose Cart House (missing)
This building had been the only service structure to have survived on the grounds. It was far beyond repair, as reported in the 1980 Historic Structure Report, and the NPS did not retain this structure. There is a wood post indicating a corner of this structure on the site (Figure 69).

171. Ibid., 287.
Existing Conditions

Walls

Retaining Walls at Lower Parking Lot
Two four-foot high retaining walls, one made of brick and the other made of concrete blocks, reinforce the steep slope on the south side of the property adjacent to the lower level parking lot. The concrete block retaining wall is 12 feet tall. The brick retaining wall is 4.5 feet tall (Figure 70, Figure 71, and Figure 72). A site plan from 1978 depicts these walls. The NPS repaired portions of the walls in 2014. These walls are in good condition.

Front Retaining Wall
An 18-inch-high brick wall (LCS 092191) lines the north property boundary along West Montgomery Road. The wall includes square brick piers at the wall ends. The cap of these piers includes decorative brickwork. The wall is in fair condition, and repairs are necessary where some brick is missing (Figure 73 and Figure 74).

Cultural Vegetation
The site reconnaissance surveys in October 2016 and January 2017 and reference to historic documentation of the landscape at The Oaks show that the majority of existing plantings along the foundation and within the surrounding yards consist of new plant species that replaced the original plantings. (See Site Plans, Illustrations 3.1 and 3.2)

The foundation plantings are significantly more varied and dense than the landscape had been in earlier periods of development. As of NPS acquisition, the northwest-northeast foundation plantings were majority wax-leaf privet (*Ligustrum japonicum*) and nandina (*Nandina domestica*), and these plantings remain. The nandina (*Nandina domestica*), photinia (*Photinia x fraseri*), and wax-leaf privet (*Ligustrum japonicum*) were recommended in the 1978 design and remain today, though they are in different locations than on the plans. Since nandina can naturalize, the conclusion is that those present on the site are naturalized from the 1978 planting. The 2016 site survey identified new northwest-northeast foundation plantings of Burford holly (*Ilex cornuta*), gardenia (*Gardenia jasminoides*), and camellia (*Camellia*...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Native Sp.</th>
<th>Approximate Location</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>Deodar cedar</td>
<td>Cedrus deodara</td>
<td></td>
<td>SE, SW yard</td>
<td>Existing plant, originally shown on 1911 site plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>Pecan</td>
<td>Carya illinoiensis</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>W, SW, S yard</td>
<td>Existing plant, originally shown on 1911 site plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS</td>
<td>Chinese parasol</td>
<td>Firmiana simplex</td>
<td></td>
<td>W, SW yard</td>
<td>Existing plant; two near western property line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Red cedar</td>
<td>Juniperus virginiana</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>E and SW yard</td>
<td>Existing plant, originally shown on 1925 site plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LI</td>
<td>Crape myrtle</td>
<td>Lagerstroemia indica</td>
<td></td>
<td>SW and N yard</td>
<td>Existing plant, shown on 1978 site plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MG</td>
<td>Southern magnolia</td>
<td>Magnolia grandiflora</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>N, NE, S yard</td>
<td>Existing plant, shown on 1911 site plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Cherry laurel</td>
<td>Prunus caroliniana</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>S-SE yards; SE yard, border</td>
<td>Field Survey 2016 shows cherry laurel in S-SE yards and in SE yard at the border of the NPS parking lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF</td>
<td>Photinia</td>
<td>Photinia x fraseri</td>
<td></td>
<td>W yard</td>
<td>Existing plant, shown on 1978 site plan, W foundations; Field Survey 2016 shows eleagnus in the original location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>Loblolly pine</td>
<td>Pinus taeda</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>SE perimeter</td>
<td>Field Survey 2016 shows loblolly pine along N border of lower-level parking lot, SE of residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PY C</td>
<td>Bradford pear</td>
<td>Pyrus calleryana</td>
<td></td>
<td>S perimeter, border</td>
<td>Field Survey 2016 shows Bradford pear along S border of lower-level parking lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QA</td>
<td>White oak</td>
<td>Quercus alba</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>SE perimeter</td>
<td>Field Survey 2016 shows Bradford pear along S border of lower-level parking lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QN</td>
<td>Water oak</td>
<td>Quercus nigra</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Street trees on Old Montgomery Road</td>
<td>Existing plant; originally shown on 1911 site plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QP</td>
<td>Willow oak</td>
<td>Quercus phellos</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>S yard, SE foundations</td>
<td>Field Survey October 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shrubs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>Indica azalea</td>
<td>Rhododendron indicum</td>
<td></td>
<td>SE foundations</td>
<td>Field Survey October 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RK</td>
<td>Kurume azalea</td>
<td>Rhododendron kiusianum</td>
<td></td>
<td>SE foundations</td>
<td>Field Survey October 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>Sasanqua camellia</td>
<td>Camellia sasanqua</td>
<td></td>
<td>NE foundations, N yard</td>
<td>Field Survey October 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP</td>
<td>Elaeagnus</td>
<td>Elaeagnus pungens</td>
<td></td>
<td>S and W foundations</td>
<td>Existing plant, shown on 1978 site plan; Field Survey shows nandina as replacement in the original S (and W?) foundations location</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1. Existing Vegetation*
### Existing Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Native Sp.</th>
<th>Approximate Location</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GJ</td>
<td>Gardenia</td>
<td>Gardenia jasminoides</td>
<td>N foundations</td>
<td>Field Survey October 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR</td>
<td>Dwarf gardenia</td>
<td>Gardenia radicans</td>
<td>N foundations</td>
<td>Field Survey October 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL BU</td>
<td>Burford holly</td>
<td>Ilex cornuta 'Burfordii'</td>
<td>NE foundations</td>
<td>Field Survey October 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL HY</td>
<td>Yaupon hybrid</td>
<td>Ilex vomitoria x hybrid</td>
<td>SW-SE foundations</td>
<td>Field Survey October 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL VO</td>
<td>Yaupon holly</td>
<td>Ilex vomitoria</td>
<td>* S-SW foundations; SE-E yard, border</td>
<td>Originally shown on 1978 site plan, SW border; Field Survey October 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LJ</td>
<td>Wax-leaf privet</td>
<td>Ligustrum japonicum</td>
<td>NE-SW foundations</td>
<td>Existing plant, shown on 1978 site plan, SW foundations; Field Survey 2016 shows gardenia as replacement in NE foundations location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV</td>
<td>Common privet</td>
<td>Ligustrum vulgare</td>
<td>NE yard, border</td>
<td>Existing plant, same as original location shown on 1911 site plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJ</td>
<td>Pfitzer juniper</td>
<td>Juniperus chinensis 'Pfitzeriana'</td>
<td>NE yard, framing entry walk</td>
<td>Existing plant, originally shown on 1925 site plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Cherry laurel</td>
<td>Prunus caroliniana</td>
<td>* S yard; SE yard, border</td>
<td>Field Survey 2016 shows cherry laurel in S yard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YF</td>
<td>Yucca</td>
<td>Yucca aloifolia</td>
<td>SE yard, border</td>
<td>Shown in historic photographs near driveway entrance and behind porte-cochère; existing yucca at the in two beds near the NE corner of the site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Perennials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Native Sp.</th>
<th>Approximate Location</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Canna lily</td>
<td>Canna × generalis</td>
<td>NW yard, border</td>
<td>Field Survey October 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Lily turf</td>
<td>Liriope muscari</td>
<td>N-W foundations, edge</td>
<td>Field Survey October 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Goldenrod</td>
<td>Solidago spp.</td>
<td>* NW yard, border</td>
<td>Field Survey October 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Invasive Plants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Native Sp.</th>
<th>Approximate Location</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Chinaberry</td>
<td>Melia azedarach</td>
<td>W yard, border</td>
<td>Field Survey October 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Nandina</td>
<td>Nandina domestica</td>
<td>N and SE foundations</td>
<td>Existing plant, shown on 1978 site plan, N and SE foundations; Field Survey 2016 shows Burford holly and wax-leaf privet intermixed in the original locations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>Wisteria</td>
<td>Wisteria sinensis</td>
<td>NW yard, border</td>
<td>Field Survey October 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1 cont’d. Existing Vegetation*
These additional plants date from the beginning of NPS ownership. The new southeast-southwest foundation plantings included azalea (*Azalea indica*), yaupon holly (*Ilex vomitoria*), elaeagnus (*Elaeagnus pungens*), and kurume azalea (*Rhododendron kiusianum*). Additionally, a new groundcover planting exists today where lily turf (*Liriope muscari*) forms a border of the foundation plantings at the southwest and northwest foundations.

The lawn at The Oaks surrounds the entire residence. These lawn areas are in fair condition. The lawn is spotty in shaded areas and areas with high foot traffic. The plantings between The Oaks and the parking lot to the east includes yucca, (*Yucca aloifolia*), privet (*Ligustrum vulgare*), and elaeagnus (*Elaeagnus pungens*). Tree plantings around the north and south border of the lower level parking lot include white oak (*Qercus alba*), loblolly pine (*Pinus taeda*), cherry laurel (*Prunus caroliniana*), and Bradford pear (*Pyrus calleryana*).

Several trees remain from the period of significance. These include two pecan (*Carya illinoinsensis*), an eastern red cedar (*Juniperus virginiana*), and four water oak (*Quercus nigra*). A 38-inch-caliper southern magnolia (*Magnolia grandiflora*) survives from the period of significance, located northeast of the residence in the front yard, and a 22-inch-caliper Deodar cedar (*Cedrus deodara*) remains in the southwest yard. Of note is the largest tree on the site, a specimen 43-inch-caliper red cedar (*Juniperus virginiana*), located in the northeast yard. The contributing pecan trees in the rear yard include one 30-inch tree located south of the residence and north of the gravel-paved drive and one 36-inch tree located upslope from the northwest corner of the lower parking lot.

There are several perennial species on the western property border including canna lily (*Canna x generalis*) and goldenrod (*Solidago spp.*). The current landscape also includes several invasive species. Chinaberry (*Melia azedarach*) and wisteria (*Wisteria sinensis*) are invasive species in the state of Alabama according to the US Department of Agriculture.\(^{172}\) Similarly, the following species are recorded landscape plants at The Oaks since the beginning of NPS ownership, but they are considered invasive in the states of Alabama and Georgia: nandina (*Nandina domestica*), wax-leaf privet (*Ligustrum japonicum*), common privet (*Ligustrum vulgare*), wisteria (*Wisteria sinensis*), and Macartney rose (*Rosa bracteata*).

Table 1 describes existing plants recorded in the October 2016/January 2017 reconnaissance surveys.

**Small-Scale Features**

**Picnic Tables.**

A picnic area exists adjacent to the lower level parking at the southwestern corner of the site, adjacent to natural woodlands. Nine contemporary wood picnic tables with built-in benches are included and two trash receptacles are located on the lawn. The arrangement of these features is somewhat haphazard; the impression is that the picnic area appears underused or is neglected by management staff on-site (Figure 75). The tables themselves are in good condition.

**Trash Receptacles.**

Four contemporary trash receptacles exist at the park. Two are located in the picnic area, one at each corner. Two trash receptacles flank the entry steps near the north facade of The Oaks. All of the trash receptacles are constructed of composite lumber and include a sign on the top to encourage the recycling of plastics and aluminum cans (Figure 76). The trash receptacles are in good condition.

**Flagpole.**

There is a flagpole at the northeast corner of the site. It is adjacent to the entry at the circular drive (Figure 77). The flagpole is in good condition.

**Fence.**

A continuous four-foot-high cast-iron fence with arrow-topped balusters lines the southern boundary of the site. It is a contemporary feature in good condition (Figure 78).

**Post Indicator Valve.**

The post indicator valve is part of the building fire suppression system and is located at the north front yard of the residence (Figure 79). The post indicator valve is in good condition.

---

Figure 75. Picnic area adjacent to The Oaks.

Figure 76. Trash receptacle at The Oaks.

Figure 77. Flagpole and entry sign at northeast corner of The Oaks.

Figure 78. Cast iron fence at NPS parking lot.

Figure 79. Post indicator valve, north corner of front yard.

Figure 80. Wheelchair lift at the porte-cochère.
Wheel-chair lift.
The wheel-chair lift provides universal access to the residence and is located under the porte-cochère (Figure 80). The wheel-chair lift is in good condition.

Signs.
Waysides. Two interpretive panels exist at the site. One is located at the base of the stairway in the lower parking lot. The other is located at the northeast corner of the property at the historic driveway entrance. Constructed of metal posts supporting a vandal-proof graphic board, each panel describes the period of significance at The Oaks and Dr. Booker T. Washington’s domestic life and legacy at Tuskegee Institute (Figure 81, Figure 82, and Figure 83). The panels are in good condition.

Entrance Sign. Two reflective metal signs are located at the property corners along West Montgomery Road. The signs have a light brown background and large white lettering. The signs include the NPS arrowhead logo (Figure 84). The entrance signs are in good condition.

Regulatory and Road Signs. Two reflective metal signs are located along West Montgomery Road to direct visitors to The Oaks and visitor parking. The signs have a light brown background and large white lettering. The NPS installed these signs following acquisition of the site. The sign at the upper lot has earth piled up at the bottom, which obstructs a portion of the sign (Figure 85). A third sign is located in the lower parking lot that designates the bus parking area (Figure 86). The signs are in good condition.
**Existing Conditions**

**Gates.**
A metal gate is located at the entry to the circular drive. The gate restricts vehicular access to the site to unauthorized vehicles. The gate is metal, painted green, and supported by two wooden posts with copper caps. Another metal gate is located at the rear southwest corner of the property (Figure 87 and Figure 88). The gates are in good condition.

**Views/Vistas**
The views from the Oaks are limited, largely because of the relatively flat topography and numerous surrounding campus buildings. The view from the north elevation of the house is towards the historic Tuskegee University Campus. The view from the west elevation is towards a vacant lot and the view from the east elevation is towards the NPS parking lot and other campus buildings. To the south, the view is towards the lower parking lot and adjacent woodlands. The view to the east is of the adjacent parking area and of a library building.

**Spatial Organization**
The relationship between campus buildings and large spaces of undeveloped green space defines the spatial character of the Tuskegee University campus. The layout of buildings in the historic core of the campus groups them around an open green space with many of the facades of the buildings oriented toward a road. The Oaks, which is set within the Tuskegee University campus, is a continuation of this pattern of spatial organization. The house is oriented towards the main campus, facing the West Montgomery Road, across from Carnegie Hall. Similar to most of the campus, the majority of the property is open space, defined by the naturalistic design of its extensive lawns. Also, the circulation in and around the site continues from the surrounding sidewalk paths and roads of the campus, giving it connectivity to its surroundings.
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Plant Key

Trees

- Deodar cedar
  - Botanical Name: Cedrus deodara
  - ID: CD
- Carya illinoinensis
  - Botanical Name: Pecan tree
  - ID: CI
- Juniperus virginiana
  - Botanical Name: Red cedar
  - ID: J
- Chinese parasol tree
  - Botanical Name: Firmiana simplex
  - ID: FS
- Prunus caroliniana
  - Botanical Name: Cherry laurel
  - ID: PC
- Lagerstroemia indica
  - Botanical Name: Crape myrtle
  - ID: LI
- Photinia x fraseri
  - Botanical Name: Photinia
  - ID: PF
- Melia azedarach
  - Botanical Name: Chinaberry
  - ID: MA
- Magnolia grandiflora
  - Botanical Name: Southern magnolia
  - ID: MG
- Quercus nigra
  - Botanical Name: Water oak
  - ID: QN
- Q. phellos
  - Botanical Name: Willow oak
  - ID: QP
- Photinia x fraseri
  - Botanical Name: Photinia
  - ID: PF
- Crape myrtle
  - Botanical Name: Lagerstroemia indica
  - ID: LI
- Photinia
  - Botanical Name: Photinia x fraseri
  - ID: PF
- Chinaberry
  - Botanical Name: Melia azedarach
  - ID: MA
- Magnolia grandiflora
  - Botanical Name: Southern magnolia
  - ID: MG
- Water oak
  - Botanical Name: Quercus nigra
  - ID: QN
- Willows
  - Botanical Name: Salix spp.
  - ID: SW

Shrubs

- Camellia sasanqua
  - Botanical Name: Sasanqua camellia
  - ID: CS
- Elaeagnus pungens
  - Botanical Name: Elaeagnus
  - ID: EP
- Gardenia jasminoides
  - Botanical Name: Gardenia
  - ID: GJ
- Gardenia radicans
  - Botanical Name: Gardenia radicans
  - ID: GR
- Ilex cornuta 'Bufordii'
  - Botanical Name: Burford holly
  - ID: IL BU
- Ilex vomitoria
  - Botanical Name: Yaupon holly
  - ID: IL VO
- Sasanqua camellia
  - Botanical Name: Camellia sasanqua
  - ID: CS
- Elaeagnus pungens
  - Botanical Name: Elaeagnus
  - ID: EP
- Gardenia jasminoides
  - Botanical Name: Gardenia
  - ID: GJ
- Gardenia radicans
  - Botanical Name: Gardenia radicans
  - ID: GR
- Ilex cornuta 'Bufordii'
  - Botanical Name: Burford holly
  - ID: IL BU
- Ilex vomitoria
  - Botanical Name: Yaupon holly
  - ID: IL VO
- Photinia
  - Botanical Name: Photinia x fraseri
  - ID: PF
- Photinia
  - Botanical Name: Photinia x fraseri
  - ID: PF
- Photinia
  - Botanical Name: Photinia x fraseri
  - ID: PF
- Photinia
  - Botanical Name: Photinia x fraseri
  - ID: PF
- Photinia
  - Botanical Name: Photinia x fraseri
  - ID: PF
- Photinia
  - Botanical Name: Photinia x fraseri
  - ID: PF
- Photinia
  - Botanical Name: Photinia x fraseri
  - ID: PF
- Photinia
  - Botanical Name: Photinia x fraseri
  - ID: PF

Groundcover/Perennials

- Canna lily
  - Botanical Name: Canna x generalis
  - ID: C
- Liriope muscari
  - Botanical Name: Lily turf
  - ID: L
- Solidago spp.
  - Botanical Name: Goldenrod
  - ID: S
- Wisteria sinensis
  - Botanical Name: Wisteria
  - ID: W

*Cherry laurel appears in both the tree and shrub form at the site.
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Analysis and Evaluation

Introduction

For cultural landscapes such as The Oaks, documenting existing conditions and analyzing and evaluating natural and human-made historic resources is critical in the development of a strategy for their management and treatment. Cultural landscape analysis involves two primary activities: evaluating the historic significance and assessing historic integrity. Both use criteria determined by the National Register of Historic Places, which has developed nationally recognized methods for evaluating the significance and integrity of historic buildings and landscapes. The evaluation of historic significance identifies important historical associations of the property, as well as its architectural, archeological, and social value. The property’s significance is tied to a discreet period of time (period of significance) in which its important contributions were made and the broader historic contexts within which the activities that occurred on the property may be placed.

This chapter compares the existing conditions of landscape features to the site’s understood historic condition. The objective of this analysis is to identify the specific features associated with the historic periods and assess to what degree they continue to convey their historic significance.

Landscape features are categorized based on their contribution to the understanding of the historic character of the landscape during the period or periods of significance. These categories are: Contributing, Noncontributing, Missing, and Noncontributing but Managed as a Cultural Resource.

Contributing landscape features survive from the periods of significance and continue to reflect their historic appearance and function. Noncontributing landscape features include those added to the site since the periods of significance or that no longer retain enough physical integrity to convey their historic appearance or function. Missing features existed during the period of significance but have been removed, destroyed, or cannot be recognized in their current condition. Undetermined features include site assets whose age cannot be determined or whose contribution to the historic landscape is unknown.

National Register Status

The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, established the National Register of Historic Places, which comprises the official list of the historic places and landscapes designated worthy of preservation. The National Register of Historic Places coordinates and supports public and private efforts to identify, evaluate, and protect America’s historic and archaeological resources. To achieve National Register status, a property must meet the National Register criteria for evaluation. The evaluation criteria examine a property’s age, integrity, and significance. For qualification as a historic property designation to the National Register, the date of original construction of a property must be at least fifty years past. To possess integrity, a historic property cannot be altered to the point that the original historic appearance is lost. The property must also be significant according to National Register criteria defined below:

A. Association with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or
B. Association with the lives of significant historical figures; or
C. Embodiment of the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
D. Yielding or the potential to yield significant archaeological resources that are significant to history or prehistory.

The process to identify landscape elements follows a National Park Service methodology that categorizes all landscape elements as one of thirteen landscape characteristics:
Archeological Sites
Buildings and Structures
Circulation
Arrangement of Buildings
Constructed Water Features
Cultural Traditions
Land Use
Natural Systems and Features
Other
Small-Scale Features
Spatial Organization
Topography
Vegetation
Views and Vistas

Statement of Significance

The Oaks is the former residence of Booker T. and Margaret Murray Washington. The Washington family commissioned the construction of the residence at The Oaks in 1898, and it was completed in 1899. Robert Taylor designed the building, and David A. Williston designed the landscape. George Washington Carver helped the Washington family in their design and implementation of landscape improvements at The Oaks. The Washington family maintained a small farm behind the house that included vegetables, flowers, and farm animals. Booker T. Washington wrote about his love for his work in the garden and with his animals. The Oaks was the site for many visiting dignitaries to Tuskegee Institute between 1899 and 1929, including two US presidents. Booker T. Washington died in 1915 and Margaret Murray Washington continued to live in the house and receive important visitors until her death in 1925. Tuskegee Institute then purchased the property from the Washington children. David A. Williston continued to influence the design of the landscape of The Oaks until his departure from his position at Tuskegee Institute in 1929.

The cultural landscape at The Oaks is eligible under three of the four criteria of significance defined by the National Register standards for evaluating historic properties: Criteria A, B and C. Under Criterion A, the property is associated with events significant to broad patterns of American history. The Oaks is associated with the establishment of Tuskegee Institute and African American industrial and vocational education. The Oaks is significant under Criterion B for its association with the lives of important historic figures, including African American leaders Booker T. and Margaret Murray Washington and David A. Williston, America’s first black landscape architect. The Oaks is significant at the local level under Criterion C for architecture and the use of local materials.

National Register Criterion A: Social History and Education
The Oaks is significant at the national level in the areas of social history and education. The Oaks is associated with the establishment of Tuskegee Institute and African American industrial and vocational education in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

National Register Criterion B: Social History and Landscape Architecture
The Oaks is significant under Criterion B at the national level for its association with African American leaders Booker T. and Margaret Murray Washington. The Oaks is also significant at the national level for its association with landscape architect David A. Williston.

Association with Booker T. Washington
The Oaks was the personal residence of Dr. Booker T. Washington, the first President of Tuskegee Institute and a renowned speaker and activist of his time. A former slave, his accomplishments as educator, author, and public orator not only enabled oppressed peoples to pursue advanced education and professions, but also served as direct and powerful inspiration to many. The NPS preserves and interprets The Oaks to a period 1899 and 1915, when Washington resided there.

Association with Margaret Murray Washington
The Oaks was the personal residence of Margaret Murray Washington, who lived there from 1899 until 1925. Margaret Murray Washington was an influential African American social reformer associated with the Progressive Era and the Women’s Club movement. She was the founder of the Tuskegee Women’s Club and the National Association of Colored Women.

Association with David A. Williston
The Oaks is also associated with David A. Williston, the first professionally trained African American landscape architect, who designed the landscape at The Oaks including the circulation and plantings. Williston’s tenure at Tuskegee Institute ended
in 1929, when he moved to Washington D. C. to open the nation’s first African American-owned landscape architecture firm.

**National Register Criterion C: Architecture**

The Oaks is significant at the local level under Criterion C as a surviving example of turn of the century architecture in Alabama. The residence at The Oaks is significant under Criterion C as an excellent example of a Queen Anne style brick house in Alabama. The residence possesses irregular massing, roof pitch, shingle siding, and the asymmetrical facade typical to this style. The structure is also locally significant for its construction methodology using locally sourced materials and student labor. While no longer used as a home, the building retains all of its character-defining features from the period of significance.

**Existing Documentation**

The current documentation in the National Register of Historic Places includes a two-page National Survey of Historic Sites and Buildings form dated March 1, 1965. This document does not include information included in later nomination forms pertaining to statement of significance or period of significance. The document mentions The Oaks, but it does not include any information about the cultural landscape at The Oaks.

This report considers The Oaks to be a component cultural landscape of Tuskegee Institute National Historic Site. As mentioned above, The Keeper of the National Register of Historic Places designated The Oaks as a historic site worthy of preservation in 1965. The Oaks was one of the first African American heritage properties listed in the National Register.

**Period of Significance**

The interpretation at The Oaks currently focuses on the period when Dr. Washington occupied the house, between 1899 and 1915. Because of the nationally important contributions of Margaret Murray Washington and the association with the first African American landscape architect, David A. Williston, who worked at the site both before and after Dr. Washington’s death, the period of significance should be expanded to 1899 to 1929. Tuskegee Institute owned and operated the property from 1925-1977, and the NPS acquired The Oaks in 1977 as part of Tuskegee Institute National Historic Site.

**Natural Systems and Features**

**Natural Vegetation**

**Historic Condition**

The historic condition of the southernmost portion of The Oaks is unknown. The earliest photo of The Oaks (1899) shows little evidence of the area south of the house, and other historic views focus on the structures and formal front landscaping. Landscape architect Edward Pryce concludes that the area south of the Carriage House and Barn was likely pasture for Washington’s horses and other farm animals.

**Existing Condition**

The existing small wooded area between the lower parking lot and the property line includes several large diameter trees and invasive understory growth. While some trees may date from the period of significance based on their caliper size, the remainder of this growth does not contribute to the integrity of the property.

**Cultural Features**

This CLR uses historic photographs, postcards and maps to identify cultural features from the period of significance. The landscape features are summarized in Table 3: Cultural Resources Summary.

**Land Use**

**Historic Condition**

The historic land use of The Oaks influenced the character of the landscape by determining its organization, form, and spatial organization over time. The Washington family used the site as their primary residence from 1899-1925. Tuskegee Institute used the structure for office space during its period of ownership (1925 -1974), but this use did not adversely impact the resource’s historic integrity.

**Existing Condition**

While the structure has not been occupied as a residence since 1925, the NPS currently maintains and interprets The Oaks as a residence within the national historic site. The existing land use is a contributing feature as the site commemorates and interprets Booker T. Washington’s use of The Oaks as a residential property.
Buildings and Structures

Historic Condition

The residence at The Oaks is the premier historic resource at this site and the most notable building. Designed by Robert Taylor, the home’s construction embodies the educational philosophy of Dr. Washington. Constructed between 1899 and 1899, the building consists of locally sourced materials manufactured by students as part of their vocational training at Tuskegee Institute. Washington and his family altered the house with the construction of various additions between 1905 and 1915. The first alteration included an addition east of the dining room. Before 1908, the Washingtons also added a conservatory east of the dining room. Between 1910 and 1915, alterations included the addition of a second story above the one-story kitchen wing and a new porch west of the addition.173

The site of the Washingtons’ residence functioned as a self-sufficient homestead. During the period of significance, the site included several secondary structures and functional landscape features, including a well house, carriage house and barn, summer house, and hose cart house. By 1909, the Washingtons had removed the well house. Tuskegee Institute provided water service to the site, which likely coincided with the well’s removal. Prior to 1925, changes to the cultural landscape at The Oaks included the removal of the carriage house and barn and construction of a brick garage.174 Historic records do not indicate when the owners removed the summer house from the site.

Tuskegee Institute rehabilitated the structure in 1929 and 1957. These renovations included modifications to the interior, updates to electrical and heating systems, and the installation of a


fire-suppression system. Tuskegee Institute also installed a new doorway in the den adjacent to the east-side porch in all of the rear porches for use as storage space. Additional alterations included a new roof, new paint (white to match the rest of the campus buildings), and the addition of concrete steps on the exterior ground floor porches.

After completing the Historic Structure Report for The Oaks, the NPS rehabilitated the structure in the 1980s. In addition to many interior restoration efforts, the NPS painted the exterior trim, cornice, square columns, and vents brown to comply with the historic paint palette. The NPS repointed exterior brick areas and repaired chimneys. More recent alterations include the addition of a wheel chair ramp to the porte-cochère area. The NPS removed the hose cart house sometime between 1980 and 1996. According to a Consensus Determination of Eligibility document, site managers constructed the wall in 1971. Research associated with this report did not reveal the actual construction date of the existing feature; however, a wall has existed in this location since 1934, and “it does not detract from the historic setting of The Oaks and the park maintains the wall as a cultural resource.”

Existing Condition
The existing buildings at the site are The Oaks residence, the porte-cochère, and the ruins of the brick garage at the rear of the property. A Consensus Determination of Eligibility Document states that the brick garage foundation is a contributing feature. The remaining secondary buildings and structures have been removed. The carriage house and barn were removed between
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Figure 91. Circa 1907 view of The Oaks and yucca planting. *Historic Structure Report*, 56.

Figure 92. 2016 view of The Oaks from the northeast corner of the site.
Figure 93. Rear yard of The Oaks, facing north, c. 1910 with outbuildings and landscape features annotated. Originally annotated by Edward Pryce, *Historic Landscape Report*, 47.

Figure 94. 2016 view of south elevation of The Oaks.
1920 and 1926. These were located in the west portion of the rear yard with a surrounding barnyard. The summer house was located adjacent to the barnyard, south of the residence. The NPS did not retain the hose cart house. A wood post indicates the former location of the hose cart house on the site. Existing structures include a retaining wall near the lower parking area and a the front retaining wall at the northern property boundary.

Landscape Features

The Oaks (LCS 091220)
- Contribution Status: Contributing
- Condition: Good
Porte-Cochère
- Contribution Status: Contributing
- Condition: Good
Garage Foundation (LCS 092176)
- Contribution Status: Contributing
- Condition: Good
Front Retaining Wall (LCS 092191)
- Contribution Status: Managed as a cultural resource
- Condition: Fair
Retaining Walls at Lower Parking Lot
- Contribution Status: Noncontributing
- Condition: Good
Carriage House and Barn
- Contribution Status: Missing
- Condition: N/A
Summer House
- Contribution Status: Missing
- Condition: N/A
Well House
- Contribution Status: Missing
- Condition: N/A
Hose Cart House
- Contribution Status: Missing
- Condition: N/A

Cultural Vegetation

Historic Condition
During the period of significance, the landscape between the residence and West Montgomery Road included lawn panels dotted with shrub beds and mixed tree species. Annual and perennial vines grew on a trellis on the north and west sides of the house (Figure 89). Williston installed young saplings throughout the front lawn area and planted beds with evergreen and woody shrub species including yucca (Yucca aloifolia) (Figure 91). Washington had an extensive garden in the rear yard (Figure 93). Since 1929, much of the vegetation has been lost due to damage or has been removed from the site. Mrs. Washington and Tuskegee Institute did not maintain the vegetable garden at the rear of the house, and the area became overgrown during subsequent decades.

Existing Condition
A 1978 existing condition plan shows more vegetation including specimen trees than is the current condition at The Oaks. Several pecan trees, southern magnolias, and red cedars no longer exist. None of the Walter southern catalpas (Catalpa bignonioides) shown on the 1978 plan remain on site. Foundation plantings implemented during the NPS ownership period are traditional American landscape plants including photinia (Photinia × fraseri), elaeagnus (Elaeagnus angustifolia), Burford holly (Ilex cornuta ‘Burfordii’), wax-leaf privet (Ligustrum japonicum), and camellia (Camellia sasanqua).

There are no longer vines or trellises on the residence, and the existing plantings are sparse and limited to several trees and foundation plantings (Figure 90). The Williston-designed planting beds no longer exist in their original locations in the front yard or drive circle (Figure 92). The NPS has installed several shrub areas that include yucca (Yucca aloifolia), but these are not in the historic locations. Most of the foundation plantings have changed over time, and site managers have replaced historic shrubs with a variety of evergreen species. Tuskegee Institute cleared vegetation from the rear yard area upon acquiring the property (Figure 94).

Several trees at The Oaks remain from the period of significance and are contributing resources. These include a southern magnolia (Magnolia grandiflora) located at the front of the house, a red cedar (Juniperus virginiana) near the circular drive in front of the porte-cochère, two pecan (Carya illinoinensis) in the rear yard, and a Deodar cedar (Cedrus deodora) at the rear of the house. One of the pfitzer junipers that flank the central front walkway (Juniperus chinensis ‘Pfitzeriana’) is historic, and the other is a replacement plant dating
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Table 2. Plants removed from the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Approximate Location</th>
<th>Notes/Recordation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pecan</td>
<td><em>Carya illinoinensis</em></td>
<td>Multiple locations</td>
<td>1911, 1925, 1978 site map (Pryce); 1996 field visit (SERO staff); Historic photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deodar cedar</td>
<td><em>Cedrus deodara</em></td>
<td>Multiple locations</td>
<td>1911, 1925, 1978 site map (Pryce); Historic photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese parasol tree</td>
<td><em>Firmiana simplex</em></td>
<td>W border</td>
<td>1925, 1978 site map (Pryce)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red cedar</td>
<td><em>Juniperus virginiana</em></td>
<td>Multiple locations, located in shrub beds</td>
<td>1911, 1925, 1978 site map (Pryce); Historic photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crabapple</td>
<td><em>Malus angustifolia</em></td>
<td>NW yard, corner</td>
<td>1925, 1978 site map (Pryce)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water oak</td>
<td><em>Quercus nigra</em></td>
<td>E yard, West Montgomery Road, south yard</td>
<td>1911, 1925, 1978 site map (Pryce); Historic photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elm</td>
<td><em>Ulmus americana</em></td>
<td>SE perimeter</td>
<td>1978 site map (Pryce); Historic photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrubs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amur river privet</td>
<td><em>Ligustrum amurense</em></td>
<td>W yard, border</td>
<td>1925 site map (Pryce)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese Privet</td>
<td><em>Ligustrum japonicum</em></td>
<td>NW corner</td>
<td>1925, 1978 site map (Pryce)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macartney Rose</td>
<td><em>Rosa bracteata</em></td>
<td>W yard, border</td>
<td>1925 site map (Pryce); 1996 field visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirea</td>
<td><em>Spirea thunbergii</em></td>
<td>N property border, along wall</td>
<td>1911, 1925 site map (Pryce); Historic photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yucca</td>
<td><em>Yucca aloifolia</em></td>
<td>Multiple locations</td>
<td>1911 site map (Pryce); Historic photos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Plants removed from the site.

To the 1970s. The four water oaks (*Quercus nigra*) lining West Montgomery Road may not date to the period of significance. These are likely replacement trees for the original elms in this location. However, due to their location, these trees contribute to the feeling and setting of the site. The lawn between the residence and West Montgomery road remains in its historic configuration. The remaining historic vegetation is in good condition and is a contributing feature.

Table 2 describes the trees and shrubs that owners removed from the site after the period of significance.

**Landscape Features**

- Water oak (4), street trees on West Montgomery Road
  - Contribution Status: Contributing
  - Condition: Good and Fair
- Southern magnolia in front yard
  - Contribution Status: Contributing
  - Condition: Good
- Red cedar in circular drive
  - Contribution Status: Contributing
  - Condition: Good

**Small-Scale Features**

**Historic Condition**

One of the most noticeable historic small-scale features of the site was a picket fence, which surrounded The Oaks home site. This feature was constructed by 1906. The fence added to the residential character of the landscape. Another fence separated the rear yard from the front lawn area. The rear yard included at least one high-board fence and likely others to contain livestock. These fences and other small-scale features have

---

been removed from the site. Additional small-scale features during the period of significance included planters and a bench.

**Existing Condition**
The existing small-scale features were introduced to the site after the period of significance and are noncontributing features. Most of the small-scale features found on the site today were installed to accommodate the needs of visitors and to interpret the site and are noncontributing. These features include a picnic area, trash receptacles, a flagpole, a fence, a post indicator valve, a wheelchair lift, signs, and gates.

**Landscape Features**
- Picket fence
  - Contribution Status: Missing
  - Condition: NA
- Garden fence
  - Contribution Status: Missing
  - Condition: NA
- Picnic tables
  - Contribution Status: Noncontributing
  - Condition: Good
- Trash receptacles
  - Contribution Status: Noncontributing
  - Condition: Good
- Wheelchair lift
  - Contribution Status: Noncontributing
  - Condition: Good
- Post indicator valve
  - Contribution Status: Noncontributing
  - Condition: Good
- Flagpole
  - Contribution Status: Noncontributing
  - Condition: Good
- Signs
  - Contribution Status: Noncontributing
  - Condition: Good
- Cast iron fence
  - Contribution Status: Noncontributing
  - Condition: Good
- Gates
  - Contribution Status: Noncontributing
  - Condition: Good

**Spatial Organization**

**Historic Condition**
Historically, The Oaks was located across the road from the heart of the Tuskegee Institute campus. The lot west of the site had a residence of similar size located on it, which Tuskegee University demolished in the 2000s. A small picket fence surrounded the front yard and defined the residential space. A second fence separated the front formal yard from the rear yard, which included gardens and livestock areas. There were various outbuildings in the rear yard including a summer house, carriage house, barn, and hose cart house.

**Existing Condition**
The orientation of the historic residence to West Montgomery Road remains unchanged from its initial construction. The site continues to occupy a prominent spot overlooking campus. The spatial organization of the front yard retains integrity to the period of significance. The spatial organization of the rear yard lacks integrity since none of the outbuildings remain at the site. The fences that once organized the property as a single residential lot no longer exist.

**Circulation**

**Historic Condition**
The original circulation in the front yard of The Oaks included a circular carriage trail on the eastern side of the property and a semi-circular walkway in the front lawn of the property. A walkway connected the front yard to the rear of the property on the west side of the residence. The circular drive passed below the residence’s porte-cochère. This carriage trail extended south of the house and west to the carriage house and barn. Historic photographs show a carriage trail entrance from West Montgomery Road. Photographs also show a sidewalk along West Montgomery Road paralleling the northern property border.

Landscape architect David A. Williston designed many of Tuskegee Institute’s roads, paved with chert and lined with concrete valley gutters. Williston applied this treatment along the perimeter of the carriage trail south of the porte-cochère when he reconfigured this drive for vehicular travel in the mid- to late-1920s. The primary access point for vehicular circulation remained at the northeast corner of the property. Additionally, a linear concrete sidewalk from the north facade of the residence to West Montgomery Road replaced the semi-circular chert walkway in the front lawn. Tuskegee Institute commissioned the installation of concrete walks to facilitate
pedestrian access around the residence after 1925. Walkways extending from the front walk wrapped around the north, west, and south facades of the residence. It is not clear if Williston designed the layout of these walks, but construction of the front walkway may have coincided with renovations to the upper floor of the residence in 1929, when Williston was still overseeing landscape development at the campus. In 2015, Tuskegee University removed a section of the sidewalk paralleling West Montgomery Road just outside the property boundary.

Existing Condition
Much of the circulation that existed at the end of the period of significance is still legible in the landscape. The pedestrian circulation extending from West Montgomery Road to the front of the house is still present, with extensions around the residence. The Consensus Determination of Eligibility Document states that these walkways are contributing features.181 This walk intersects the carriage trail at the northeast corner of the house. Concrete valley gutters exist along the drive south of the porte-cochère. The circular driveway leading to The Oaks from West Montgomery Road is not the historic chert surface. The updated vehicular circulation is now split into two sections. The drive extending from West Montgomery Road to the porte-cochère is a concrete paver surface. The remainder of the drive is topped with large pea gravel. The lower parking area south of the residence is within the property boundary. The lot is asphalt surface and is in fair condition. The upper lot east of the residence is outside the property boundary, but it services the site. Walkways link these parking areas to The Oaks landscape.

Landscape Feature
Semi-circular Walkway (Front)
• Contribution Status: Missing
• Condition: NA
West Montgomery Road Sidewalk
• Contribution Status: Missing
• Condition: NA
Concrete Walkways around The Oaks (LCS 092175)
• Contribution Status: Contributing
• Condition: Good

Utilities
Historic Condition
The Oaks was the first residence in Macon County to have running water and electricity. The sewer line first appears as an existing condition a January 24, 1913 map.182 Tuskegee Institute updated the utilities at The Oaks in the 1950s.

Existing Condition
Existing above-ground utilities at the site include overhead power lines, large ground lights, and an overhead light in the lower parking lot. Historic photos show power poles and overhead power lines at the site, but they are in a different location from the existing condition. None of the above-ground utilities are contributing resources.

Landscape Features
Overhead Power
• Contribution Status: Noncontributing
• Condition: Good
Yard Lights
• Contribution Status: Noncontributing
• Condition: Good
Overhead Light in parking Lot
• Contribution Status: Noncontributing
• Condition: Good
Power Generator
• Contribution Status: Noncontributing
• Condition: Good

Views/Vistas
Historic Condition
The Washington family could look across West Montgomery Road from The Oaks and view the Tuskegee Institute campus that some people called the “Booker T. Washington City.” Dr. Washington could look out of his personal study and see a garden, his livestock, and several outbuildings. Tuskegee University demolished the residence located west of The Oaks in the early 2000s.

181. Ibid.
**Existing Condition**
The view from The Oaks north to campus is consistent with conditions during the period of significance. This aspect of the cultural landscape is a contributing feature. Views to the east and west of the residence are altered from the period of significance. There is a large power generator along the western property line. The features that were located south of the residence related to Washington’s garden and animal husbandry activities no longer exist. The view from Dr. Washington’s study today is to a sloped lawn area behind the house and the lower parking lot. The view east of the house includes a library and parking lot, both constructed after the period of significance.

**Landscape Features**
- **View from Front Porch to Campus**
  - Contribution Status: Contributing
  - Condition: Good
- **View from Washington’s Study**
  - Contribution Status: Contributing
  - Condition: Poor

**Evaluation of Landscape Integrity**
The National Register of Historic Places identifies seven aspects that define the integrity of a historic property. These include location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. The analysis of landscape integrity in this CLR compares the historic character of landscape features with the present ability of these features to convey historic significance. To be listed in the National Register, the historic identity of a cultural landscape will be evident because of the survival of sufficient characteristics from the period of significance. While it is not necessary for all seven qualities to be present for a landscape to retain overall integrity, a property should retain enough physical fabric to evoke its historic appearance. Cultural landscapes, such as that at The Oaks, reflect a continuum of history. As such, the accumulation of historic features includes those that date to the period of significance as well as those features added subsequently but that have retained historic significance in their own right.

- **Location** is the place where the historic property was constructed or the place where the historic event occurred;
- **Setting** is the physical environment within and surrounding a property;
- **Design** is the combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property;
- **Materials** are the physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time and in a particular pattern or configuration to form a historic property;
- **Workmanship** is the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period in history or prehistory;
- **Feeling** is a property’s expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time; and
- **Association** is the direct link between an important historic event or person and a historic property.

In order to retain historic integrity, a property must possess at least several of these seven aspects of integrity. Evaluating historic integrity involves first determining the historic significance of a property and then identifying the existing features that contribute to our ability to recognize and understand this significance. Character-defining features are the physical qualities that make a property unique. They are the individual parts that make the entire place worthy of recognition as a historic site.

**Location**
The National Register of Historic Places defines location as the place where the historic property was constructed or where the historic event occurred. The Oaks residence is situated on West Montgomery Road, in Tuskegee, Macon County, Alabama where the Washington family commissioned its construction near the turn of the twentieth century. The residence, porte-cochère, some circulation routes, large specimen trees, and the garage foundation remain in their same location from the period of significance. The historic Tuskegee Institute campus is located across West Montgomery Road, north of the site. Residences to the west of The Oaks no longer exist, and additions to adjacent properties include parking lots and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature Name</th>
<th>Date of Origin</th>
<th>Contributing</th>
<th>Noncontributing</th>
<th>NC/Managed as CR*</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural Vegetation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wooded area southern corner of site</td>
<td>c. 1920s</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commemoration</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation/Tourism</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Missing Land Uses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generator (Taylor Power)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead power lines and poles</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yard lights</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer and water manholes</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buildings and Structures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Oaks (House) (LCS 091220)</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porte-cochere</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front retaining wall (LCS 092191)</td>
<td>c. 1930s</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage (Foundation) (LCS 092176)</td>
<td>1920-1925</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaining walls at lower parking lot</td>
<td>pre-1978</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Missing Buildings and Structures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carriage House and Barn</td>
<td>1903-1909</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer House</td>
<td>c. 1906</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hose Carl House</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well House</td>
<td>1903-1909</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spatial Organization</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation to W Montgomery Rd and Campus</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open front lawn</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oragnization of rear yard</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vegetation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water oak (4)**, street trees on W Montgomery</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Good/Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern magnolia (front yard)</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red cedar in circular drive</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pfitzer juniper</td>
<td>1920s</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pecan trees in rear yard (2)</td>
<td>c. 1900s</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deodar cedar in rear yard</td>
<td>c. 1900s</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation plantings</td>
<td>1970s-2017</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Good/Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrub plantings at wayside</td>
<td>c. 2000s</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional existing vegetation (See Table 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Missing Vegetation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrub masses in front yard</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vines on trellis</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetable garden (rear yard)</td>
<td>1900-1915</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flower beds (rear yard)</td>
<td>1900-1915</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional missing vegetation (See Table 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Circulation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drives/Carriage trail (LCS 092173)</td>
<td>1899-1920s</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete gutters (LCS 092174)</td>
<td>1920-1929</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete walkways (LCS 092175)</td>
<td>c. 1929</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower parking lot</td>
<td>pre-1916</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Missing Circulation Features</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-circular walkway (front yard)</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Montgomery Road sidewalk</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Views and Vistas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View from The Oaks to Tuskegee campus</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View from Washington’s study</td>
<td>1910-1915</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Small Scale Features</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic tables</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash receptacles</td>
<td>c. 2000s</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flagpole</td>
<td>pre-1978</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cast iron fence</td>
<td>c. 2000s</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheel-chair lift</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post indicator valve</td>
<td>c. 1957</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signs</td>
<td>Post-1978</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood post</td>
<td>1978-1996</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gates</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Missing Small Scale Features</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picket fence (front and side yards)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden fences (rear yard)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* NC Managed as CR = Noncontributing but Managed as a Cultural Resources as stated in Determination of Eligibility
** Originally believed to be elm, replaced with water oak

Table 3. Cultural Resources Summary.
Despite the changes to the surrounding landscape, the property retains integrity of location.

**Design**

Design is the combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property. The Oaks residence retains its form, floor plan, and significant interior and exterior features from its original construction and the period of significance. Outside of the residence, porte-cochère, garage foundation, and some elements of landscape architect David A. Williston's design for the property remain at the site. Features original to the Williston design include the drive/carriage trail layout with concrete gutters and several specimen tree plantings. The Oaks' spatial relationship to West Montgomery Road and the Tuskegee Institute campus remains consistent with the period of significance.

The legibility of the original design has been diminished by the loss of the outbuildings, fence lines, and the alteration of materials. Some Williston-designed landscape elements have been changed since the period of significance. Materials of the carriage trail driving surface have been altered, and the original shrub masses and many of the original canopy trees have been removed from the site. The decline and disappearance of historic vegetation diminishes the design at The Oaks. Overall, the design of the site does not retain integrity to the period of significance.

**Setting**

Setting is the physical environment of a property and the general character of the place. The surroundings of The Oaks, including land use patterns, characterize the cultural landscape's setting. West Montgomery Road retains its historic configuration, and The Oaks visually remains a part of the Tuskegee Institute campus with its tree-lined roads and brick buildings.

The loss of outbuildings and Washington's garden south of the residence and the removal of a neighboring residence on the adjacent lot to the west of the site have diminished the setting at The Oaks. However, the historic relationship between The Oaks and the Tuskegee Institute remains consistent with the setting during the period of significance. Overall, the property retains integrity of setting.

**Materials**

Materials are the physical elements that were combined or deposited during the period of significance in a particular pattern or configuration to give form to a property. Due to careful rehabilitation of The Oaks residence, much of the original material remains intact, and most repairs included original and historically compatible materials where possible.

Few original plantings exist at the site. Several specimen trees remain, dating to the period of significance. The materials for the circulation system vary from the original design. Concrete valley gutters and walkways are consistent with the historic condition, but the gravel surface and concrete pavers in the drive/carriage trail are not consistent with the original chert surface designed by Williston. Under the ownership of the Tuskegee Institute, site managers removed the fences and many of the formal plantings from the front lawn of the property. Because so much of the material from the historic period no longer exists at the site, the materials at the property do not retain integrity to the period of significance.

**Workmanship**

Workmanship is the physical evidence of the craft and methods of construction used during the specified historic period of significance. The existing workmanship of the architectural detailing of The Oaks residence reflects the period of significance. The steeply pitched roofs, brackets, eave overhangs, elliptical windows, and application of shingle siding are characteristic of a Queen Anne residence and required a high-degree of craftsmanship to construct. The exterior brick of The Oaks residence is in good condition, and the preservation of the tinted red mortar reflects the work of skilled masons. The vegetation at the site, the carriage trail alignment, and the concrete gutters along the carriage trail are the only remaining landscape features from Williston's design for the site. The front retaining wall at West Montgomery Road is a modern addition to the site, and it is in need of repair. The workmanship of the landscape features at The Oaks does not retain integrity to the period of significance.
Feeling
Feeling is an expression of the aesthetic or historical sense of a particular time resulting from the presence of physical features that, taken together, convey a property’s historic character. The existing house, remaining specimen trees, and the adjacent historic campus influence the feeling of the site. The residence has been rehabilitated to the period of significance and is open to the public. There is an experience of the spatial order of the site at the front of the house, as the house sits close to West Montgomery Road and the Tuskegee Institute campus. The loss of the historic picket fencing that once framed the residential lot’s front yard and the visual intrusion of the generator on the property’s western border diminish the feeling associated with the period of significance. During the period of significance, Booker T. Washington’s view from his study was out to this small farm complete with crops, livestock, and a barn and carriage house. The rear yard is devoid of these features. Despite these changes, the fact that the Tuskegee campus surrounds the property and its location on tree-lined West Montgomery Road helps the site retain integrity of feeling.

Association
Association is the direct link between the property and an important historic event or person. The site exists today because of its association with Booker T. Washington and Margaret Murray Washington, who were both leading African American activists and educators. Architect Robert Robinson Taylor designed the dwelling, and David A. Williston designed many of the landscape features at The Oaks. George Washington Carver contributed to the selection of plant materials at the site during the period of significance. These men were members of the Tuskegee faculty and were distinguished professionals in their respective trades. The association with Booker T. Washington and Tuskegee Institute are central in the NPS interpretation of the site. The property retains its association as the home of Booker T. and Margaret Murray Washington and with landscape architect David A. Williston.

Integrity of the Site as a Whole
The cultural landscape at The Oaks at Tuskegee Institute National Historic Site retains integrity of location, setting, feeling, and association for its period of significance (1899-1929). The loss of character-defining secondary structures and many landscape features from the period of significance impacts the integrity of workmanship, design and materials. Overall, the condition of the landscape at The Oaks is fair given the examination of the site under the seven aspects of integrity of cultural landscapes.
Page intentionally left blank
**Contributing Resources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The Oaks Residence</td>
<td>1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Porte-Cochère</td>
<td>1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Concrete Sidewalk</td>
<td>circa 1925-1929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Concrete Entry Sidewalk</td>
<td>circa 1925-1929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Carriage Trail</td>
<td>circa 1925-1929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Garage Foundation</td>
<td>circa 1920-1926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Water oak along West Montgomery Rd.</td>
<td>circa 1920-1926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Southern magnolia in front yard</td>
<td>1905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Red cedar in driveway circle</td>
<td>1905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Pfitzer juniper south of front walk</td>
<td>circa 1925-1929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Historic pecans in rear yard</td>
<td>circa 1905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Deodar cedar in rear yard</td>
<td>circa 1905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Brick wall at Old Montgomery Road (managed as a cultural resource)</td>
<td>circa 1934</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources**


**Analysis and Evaluation**
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March 2018 • Illustration 4.1
Treatment and Use

Introduction

The treatment recommendations for this Cultural Landscape Report (CLR) propose a preservation strategy for long-term management of the cultural landscape based on research, inventory, and analysis. The appropriate preservation approach considers the evolution of the landscape alongside significance, existing conditions, and current use. The CLR combines the site history and analysis with input from the current site managers to formulate an appropriate treatment and management philosophy.

Recommendations follow National Park Service policy, including the Director’s Orders No. 28: Cultural Resource Management Guidelines and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes. These documents identify four types of treatment: preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, and reconstruction. Each treatment ranges by level of physical intervention and includes specific guidelines and standards.183

Preservation is the act or process of applying measures necessary to sustain the existing form, integrity, and materials of a cultural landscape. Work, including preliminary measures to protect and stabilize the cultural landscape, generally focuses upon the on-going maintenance and repair of historic materials and features rather than extensive replacement and new construction. New exterior additions are not within the scope of this treatment; however, the limited and sensitive upgrading of mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems and other code-required work to make properties functional is appropriate within a preservation project.

Rehabilitation is the act or process of making possible a compatible use of a cultural landscape through repair, alterations, and additions while preserving those portions or features that convey its historical, cultural, or architectural values.

Restoration is the act or process of accurately depicting the form, features, and character of a cultural landscape as it appeared at a particular period of time by means of the removal of features from other historic periods in its history and reconstruction of missing features from the restoration period. The limited and sensitive upgrading of mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems and other code-required work to make the cultural landscape functional is appropriate within a restoration project.

Reconstruction is the act or process of depicting, by means of new construction, the form, features, and details of a non-surviving site, landscape, building, or objects for the purpose of replicating its appearance at a specific period of time in its historic location.184

Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Treatment

Standards for Preservation

A cultural landscape is used as it was historically, or is given a new or adaptive use that maximizes the retention of historic materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships. Where a treatment and use have not been identified, a landscape is protected and, if necessary, stabilized until additional work may be undertaken.

The historic character of a cultural landscape is retained and preserved. The replacement or removal of intact or repairable historic materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a landscape is avoided.

Each cultural landscape is recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Work needed to stabilize, consolidate, and conserve historic materials and features is physically and visually compatible, identifiable upon close inspection, and properly documented for future research.

Changes to a cultural landscape that have acquired historical significance in their own right are retained and preserved.

Historic materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a cultural landscape are preserved.

The existing condition of historic features is evaluated to determine the appropriate level of intervention needed. Where the severity of deterioration requires repair or limited replacement of a historic feature, the new work matches the old in design, color, texture, and where possible, materials. Repair or replacement of features is substantiated by archeological, documentary, or physical evidence.

Chemical or physical treatments that cause damage to historic materials are not used.

Archeological and structural resources are protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures are undertaken including recovery, curation, and documentation.

Stabilization detracts as little as possible from a cultural landscape’s appearance and significance. Reinforcement is concealed wherever possible so as not to intrude upon or detract from the aesthetic, historical, or archeological quality of the landscape, except where concealment would result in the alteration or destruction of historically or archeologically significant features, materials, or physical or visual relationships. Accurate documentation of stabilization procedures is kept and made available for future needs.

Maintenance is executed by qualified technicians in accordance with approved work procedures. Where such procedures are nonexistent or incomplete, a historical landscape architect or appropriate cultural resource specialist provides technical guidance.

All features of the cultural landscape are inspected on a scheduled basis and information about their condition is entered into NPS Facility Management Software System (FMSS).

**Standards for Rehabilitation**

A cultural landscape is used as it was historically or is given a new or adaptive use that maximizes the retention of historic materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.

The historic character of a cultural landscape is retained and preserved. The replacement or removal of intact or repairable historic materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a landscape is avoided.

Each cultural landscape is recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features from other landscapes, are not undertaken. Work needed to stabilize, consolidate, and conserve historic materials and features is physically and visually compatible, identifiable upon close inspection, and properly documented for future research.

Changes to a cultural landscape that have acquired historical significance in their own right are retained and preserved.

Historic materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a cultural landscape are preserved.

Deteriorated historic features are repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires repair or replacement of a historic feature, the new feature matches the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Repair or replacement of missing features is substantiated by archeological, documentary, or physical evidence.

Chemical or physical treatments that cause damage to historic materials are not used.

Archeological and structural resources are protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures are
undertaken including recovery, curation, and documentation.

Additions, alterations, or related new construction do not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the cultural landscape. New work is differentiated from the old and is compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing of the landscape.

Additions and adjacent or related new construction are undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the cultural landscape would be unimpaired.

Reinforcements required for stability of existing support systems and protective or code-required features (electrical, security, fire protection, handicapped accessibility, etc.) are concealed whenever possible so as not to intrude upon or detract from a cultural landscape’s aesthetic and historical qualities, except where concealment would result in the alteration or destruction of historically significant features, materials, or physical or visual relationships.

**Standards for Restoration**

A cultural landscape is used as it was historically or given a new or adaptive use that interprets the landscape and its restoration period.

Materials and features from the restoration period are retained and preserved. The removal of materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize the period is not undertaken.

Each cultural landscape is recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features from other landscapes, are not undertaken. Work needed to stabilize, consolidate, and conserve materials and features from the restoration period is physically and visually compatible, identifiable upon close inspection, and properly documented for future research.

Materials, features, finishes, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize other historic periods are documented prior to their alteration or removal.

Historic materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize the restoration period are preserved.

Deteriorated features from the restoration period are repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a historic feature, the new feature matches the old in design, color, texture and, where possible, materials.

Replacement of missing features from the restoration period is substantiated by archeological, documentary, or physical evidence. A false sense of history is not created by adding conjectural features or features from other landscapes, or by combining features that never existed together historically.

Chemical or physical treatments that cause damage to historic materials are not used.

Archeological and structural resources are protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures are undertaken including recovery, curation, and documentation.

Designs that were never executed historically are not constructed.

Archeological, documentary, or physical evidence is sufficient to permit accurate restoration with minimal conjecture.

Restoration is essential to public understanding of the cultural associations of a landscape.

Reinforcements required for stability of existing support systems and protective or code-required features (electrical, security, fire protection, handicapped accessibility, etc.) are concealed whenever possible so as not to intrude upon or detract from a cultural landscape’s aesthetic and historical qualities, except where concealment would result in the alteration or destruction of historically significant features, materials, or physical or visual relationships.
Standards for Reconstruction

Archeological, documentary, or physical evidence is available to permit accurate reconstruction with minimal conjecture, and such reconstruction is essential to public understanding of the cultural associations of an NPS unit established for that purpose.

Reconstruction of a cultural landscape in its historic location is preceded by a thorough archeological investigation to identify and evaluate those features and artifacts which are essential to an accurate reconstruction. Mitigation measures are undertaken including recovery, curation, and documentation.

Reconstruction includes measures to preserve any remaining historic material, features, and spatial relationships.

Reconstruction is based on the accurate duplication of historic features substantiated by archeological, documentary, or physical evidence, rather than on conjectural designs or the availability of different features from other landscapes. A reconstructed cultural landscape re-creates the appearance of the non-surviving landscape in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials.

A reconstruction is clearly identified as a contemporary re-creation.

Designs that were never executed historically are not constructed.

The reconstructed cultural landscape is full-scale and on the original site.

The reconstruction does not simulate a damaged or ruined cultural landscape or constitute a general representation of a “typical” landscape, e.g., kitchen garden, period garden, orchard, that never existed historically.

Management Philosophy

In 1965, the historic campus area at Tuskegee was designated a National Historic Landmark (NHL). The Oaks was included in the NHL boundary. Congress authorized Tuskegee Institute National Historic Site (Public Law 93-486) in 1974. This site includes the historic campus area, The Oaks, the Carver Museum (George Washington Carver’s laboratory), and Grey Columns (an antebellum mansion adjacent to campus.) The NPS prepared a general management plan (GMP) for the site in 1978 and 1987 to guide the development and interpretation of these resources. The NPS oversees maintenance and administration of The Oaks and The Carver Museum. The NPS and Tuskegee University jointly oversee the campus portion of national historic site.

The 1987 GMP designates both The Oaks and the Carver Museum as resources that the NPS should manage within the Historic Zone of the campus. The recommendations in the GMP aim to improve visitor experience with the donation of an easement by Tuskegee University to the National Park Service for the purpose of constructing a walkway between The Oaks and Carver Museum and maintaining the view between the two structures. The GMP calls for management of the area immediately surrounding The Oaks as a historic zone and the parking lot areas as a development zone. The report calls for increasing parking spaces from 53 cars/3 buses to 68 cars/3 buses in the lot south of The Oaks. The NPS did not implement the expanded parking plan outlined in the GMP, which would have required acquisition of additional land southwest of The Oaks. The GMP also calls for a cooperative agreement with Tuskegee University to provide accessible parking in the lot east of the Oaks. The University continues to provide this accommodation at the time of this report. The GMP also addresses signage and visitor orientation.

NPS maintenance staff performs landscape maintenance and site management at The Oaks. Duties include regular lawn mowing, trimming of hedges, fall cleanup, maintenance of site lighting, and removal of refuse and trash. The irrigation system at The Oaks is currently inoperable.

Changes to the cultural landscape over time reflect the different periods of ownership. During the Booker T. Washington Period, the landscape in the front of The Oaks functioned as a reception area for Dr. Washington and Tuskegee Institute. The landscape behind the residence served as

a mini-farm for Dr. Washington. Circulation was functional but formalized by a network of walkways and drives. After Dr. Washington’s death, Mrs. Washington maintained the front yard as a residential landscape, but circulation changed with the advent of the car. When Dr. Washington was no longer alive to care for his garden and livestock, these functions disappeared from the site. After the site transitioned to ownership by Tuskegee Institute, the landscape became, for all practical purposes, part of the larger campus. Tuskegee Institute maintenance crews maintained larger trees and plantings on the site, but over time, they replaced historic foundation plantings with more institutional-quality plant material. NPS ownership of the site meant the introduction of visitor amenities including additional parking, signs, lighting, and gates.

The goal of the recommendations in this report is to provide a framework for NPS managers to use when making decision about how best to protect historic resources at the site, how to provide a range of visitor experience opportunities, how to manage visitor use, and what kinds of additional facilities to develop at the site.

**Treatment Period/Date**

The period of significance recognizes the site’s association with the life of Dr. and Mrs. Washington and David A. Williston and their association with Tuskegee Institute. Since the NPS acquired the property, it has focused its management on commemorating Dr. Washington’s occupancy of the site 1899-1915. This report recommends that this period expand to 1929 to include the dates of residency by Margaret Murray Washington and to include additional features designed by Williston.

**Treatment Recommendations**

**Primary Treatment**

This CLR recommends rehabilitation as the primary treatment of The Oaks. Rehabilitation protects the significant historic features that contribute to the integrity of the cultural landscape while allowing for necessary improvements. Like preservation, rehabilitation involves identifying, retaining, and preserving character-defining features. Additionally, when the historic character is diminished because an important landscape feature is missing, rehabilitation allows for its replacement if adequate historical, pictorial, and physical documentation exists so that the feature may be accurately reproduced, and if it is desirable to re-establish the feature as part of the landscape’s historical appearance. Rehabilitation provides for the continued use of the cultural landscape through alterations and additions that do not damage the character-defining features. Additions are sometimes necessary to facilitate a new use of a historic landscape, but the rehabilitation guidelines emphasize that new additions should only occur when there is no viable alternative. Illustration 4.1 illustrates the treatment for individual resources.

**Overall Goals**

The ultimate goal of treatment is to improve the interpretation of Booker T. and Margaret Murray Washington, their lives, and family by preserving and/or rehabilitating the character-defining elements of The Oaks when it served as the Washingtons’ residence and small farm. Recommendations also facilitate the interpretation of the contribution of David Williston to the site. The treatment recommendations aim to improve visitor orientation, access, and circulation. Rehabilitating The Oaks landscape involves preserving the existing features that contribute to the historic significance of the site. Rehabilitation also involves the addition of documented features that might facilitate interpretation of the site.

Currently no interpretation of the use of the rear yard exists at the site. Documentation of this area includes narrative sources, a few historic photographs, and information from interviews. An archeological study may provide information on the location of features in the rear yard such as ancillary structures, planting bed limits, paths, walkways and fence lines. There was preliminary archeological subsurface shovel testing performed at the site in 1979. Although no evidence of buildings in the rear yard were identified in this study, the report recommends further archeological testing prior to any development.186
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Should a new archeological study reveal the location of any landscape features, the NPS might be able to more fully interpret and/or restore these features.

Characteristics of the cultural landscape that existed during Booker T. and Margaret Murray Washington’s occupancy of the site include:

- A domestic landscape designed to serve the family and entertain visiting dignitaries.
- A series of outbuildings designed to serve the family.
- A vegetable/flower garden and livestock area.

The treatment goals should:

- Maintain the overall aesthetic of a residential landscape set in the context of a historic campus by rehabilitation of the historic components of the landscape, restoring selective features if their locations can be interpreted through archeology. The primary features contributing to the residential character of the site include the lawn, specimen canopy trees, and various ornamental planting beds.
- Use waysides to improve the visitor’s understanding of the cultural landscape.
- Remove or screen features that compromise the historic character of the site.
- Preserve the residence and garage foundation.
- Replace materials in kind whenever possible or use historically appropriate materials. Historic materials should be replaced in kind and comply with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Properties.

Buildings and Structures

The main building at The Oaks served as a personal residence during the period of significance. Several secondary structures existed historically that supported the operation of the residence and Washington’s interest in horticulture and animal husbandry. During the period of significance, the Washingtons had a summer house, designed by David Williston, constructed in the rear yard. A well house existed on the site, but Washington removed this structure during his lifetime. Following Washington’s death, Margaret Murray Washington and Tuskegee Institute removed several other ancillary structures from the site, including the summer house, the carriage house, and the barn. The following treatment tasks address methods for improving the site’s ability to convey the landscape setting during the period of significance.

The Oaks

- Preserve The Oaks residential structure and the attached porte-cochère, which is the only surviving historic building on the site.
- Refer to the 1980 Historic Structure Report to determine appropriate treatments for preservation of The Oaks residence.\(^{187}\)

Outbuildings

- Consult with the Southeast Regional Archeological Center to conduct additional archeological testing to determine the location of outbuildings and interpret these locations if found. If archeology cannot locate the foundations, the NPS may use historic photographs and Sanborn maps to approximate their locations if the NPS erects waysides in the future.
- Preserve the garage foundation walls. The NPS should interpret this location with an interpretive wayside.
- Restore summer house using Williston’s drawings and historic photographs if archeology can determine its location. Otherwise, interpret using a wayside.
- Interpret location of well house with a building footprint if archeology can determine its location. Otherwise, interpret using a wayside.

Retaining Wall for South Parking Lot

- Maintain the retaining wall for the lower parking lot. As improvements/repairs are required, repair with consistent materials (choose either brick or concrete block.)

Vegetation

During the historic period, trees, ornamental shrubs, and vines grew around the Washington residence. The front landscape featured trees in

\(^{187}\) At the time of this report, SERO was completing an updated HSR for The Oaks. Once approved, this document should guide treatment of the building.
open lawn with ornamental shrub beds. Vines grew on trellises on the porches and on the side of the house. Today, changes to the vegetation around the house have resulted in a loss of historic character. Site managers removed the vines from the porches by the 1930s. More recently, NPS maintenance staff has replanted the northwest foundation area with non-historic ornamental shrubs. Several plantings near the perimeter of the site do include historically appropriate plant materials.

- In general, all historic trees on site are character-defining features that the NPS should preserve with ongoing maintenance. Maintain the open-lawn character of the historic landscape between the house and West Montgomery Road.

- The trees along West Montgomery Road are in various states of decline. Historic photographs indicate that the trees may have been American elm. Tuskegee Institute likely installed the existing water oaks as part of the road construction project in the 1930s. Research conducted in 1996 by NPS landscape architects recommended a disease resistant elm variety that would be similar to those originally specified by Williston for the campus drives. As the existing water oaks reach the end of their life cycle, replace the water oaks along West Montgomery Road with disease resistant elm variety or another native oak species.188 The NPS should use current best management practices (i.e. use structural soil under adjacent pavements) for planting trees in urban environments for the installation of these street trees.

- In the northeast area of the front yard, restore specimen trees in locations corresponding to the period of significance. Where it is not possible to identify specific tree species from photographs or plans, use native species from Williston’s planting list (Appendix A). This planting includes the addition of one hardwood inside the circular drive, three hardwood trees and one small flowering tree on the west side of the driveway entrance and on the south side of the brick wall (see Illustration 4.1 for specific locations.)

- Photographs from the period of significance indicate that the Washingtons installed Williston-designed shrub beds adjacent to the front driveway and behind the porte-cochère. Although not all of the plant species are identifiable in the photographs, several of the plants correspond to Williston’s plant list and information in Ed Pryce’s report on the site. Yucca and small evergreen trees are visible in historic photographs. Replant ornamental beds in the front driveway area and behind the porte-cochère with appropriate shrub species from the Williston list (Appendix A). Williston’s list includes invasive species, but non-invasive and native species are preferred. Consult Alabama Exotic Plant Council list for guidance.

- Rehabilitate the ornamental foundation plantings on all sides of the house. There are no planting plans for the site from the historic period. Historic photographs do not indicate which species existed at the foundation of the house. Some of the existing plantings contain species compatible with the period of significance. As plants decline and are replaced, the NPS should rehabilitate planting beds using shrub species from Williston’s list (Appendix A.) Williston’s list includes invasive species, but non-invasive and native species are preferred. Consult Alabama Exotic Plant Council list for guidance.

- Restore the planting beds on the western property border. Historic photographs show a large shrub bed on the western property border near the location of the existing generator. Historic photographs do not indicate the quantity and specific species in this shrub bed, but this bed appears to include small evergreen trees, at least one hardwood tree, and yucca. Re-establish a planting bed in this location

using shrub species from Williston’s list (Appendix A.) Williston’s list includes invasive species, but non-invasive and native species are preferred. Consult Alabama Exotic Plant Council list for guidance. Recommended species for this area include yucca and eastern red cedar.

- Replant trees in known historic locations in the western portion of the yard. This includes one eastern red cedar in the northwest quadrant of the yard and Deodar cedar near the back driveway. Documentation from the 1970s shows a historic pecan in the location of the existing magnolia in the west lawn. Replace the southern magnolia in the west lawn with a pecan once this tree declines.

- Replant trees in known historic locations in the east area of the yard. This includes one eastern red cedar and a Deodar cedar near the circular drive entrance and two hardwood trees near the visitor parking lot. The hardwood trees should match the species selected for the planting along West Montgomery Road.

- Plant an additional five fruit and/or pecan trees in rear yard to screen views toward the visitor parking lot. Use native trees from Williston’s list (Appendix A.)

- NPS maintenance staff should continue to regularly mow the lawn surrounding The Oaks to provide a uniform ground plane consistent with the historic period. NPS staff should maintain the lawns following the recommendations for best management practices of turf by the Tuskegee University or Auburn University Cooperative Extension Agencies. At a minimum, the NPS should perform soil tests to identify nutrient deficiencies and take corrective measures through a fertilizer regimen. NPS maintenance staff should aerate the lawns annually in the spring.

- Eradicate invasive exotic vegetation including wisteria and privet in the wooded area on the south side of the site. Maintain the wooded buffer south of the lower parking lot area.

- The vines on the porch and sides of the residence were a character-defining feature of the landscape towards the end of the Booker T. Washington Period. However, vines growing directly on the structure and vines that become overgrown can damage the building. Should future maintenance budgets allow, the NPS could replant vines using a method that protects the structure. The NPS can install trellis system detached from the building and plant Dutchman’s pipe vine. NPS maintenance staff will need to prune the vine to prevent it from growing onto the residence. The trellis system should follow NPS methodology outlined for reestablishing vines on historic buildings.

- During Dr. Washington’s tenure at The Oaks, a large flower and vegetable garden was located south of the residence. The exact limits of the garden are undocumented, but historic photographs can suggest the approximate locations if the beds and the cold frame. Edward Pryce’s analysis of the site concluded that there was a flower bed off the southeast corner of the house to the east of the carriage house/barn. Archeological investigations might be able to locate the original extents the garden, garden paths, and fence lines. To help interpret The Oaks as a family home with a working garden, the NPS should rehabilitate a portion of the vegetable or flower garden in the southeast corner of the yard if sufficient information exists.

- Repair the existing irrigation system during landscape installation. The recommended plants do well in a hot, humid climate, but irrigation supports growth and survival rates immediately following installation. Retrofit system to accommodate drip irrigation. The increasing threat of drought and projected temperature rise will stress...
any new plant material installed at the site, and drip irrigation is the most sustainable way to get water to plants.

Circulation
The initial design of The Oaks included pedestrian circulation in front of the house (the semi-circular walkway with two entrances at West Montgomery Road) and vehicular circulation on the east side of the house (the circular carriage trail under the porte-cochère.) The carriage trail connected to the back of the house. Later additions included the perimeter walkway around the house, vehicular access to the garage, and a walkway from West Montgomery Road to the front entrance of the house. The drive configuration changed during the historic period with the introduction of vehicular use to the site and the addition of concrete gutters along the drives. Eventually the walkways were reconfigured to eliminate the front semi-circular walk, and it was replaced with a concrete walkway to the front door. Restoration of the semi-circular front walk would affect the brick wall along West Montgomery Road. During the historic period, the vehicular circulation consisted of chert drives, later lined with concrete gutters with drop inlets. Tuskegee Institute and the NPS installed various surfaces on the drives including asphalt, large pea gravel, and stamped concrete.

- Rehabilitate the drives and walks to reflect more accurately their condition during the period of significance. Maintain existing configuration, but work with Tuskegee University to restore sidewalk along West Montgomery Road.

- Williston designed several site elements in association with the drive that led to the brick garage. The NPS should preserve these contributing features including: gutters and drop inlets along the driveway, driveway alignment, and perimeter walkway around the residence. Replace with in-kind materials as necessary.

- Work with Tuskegee University to establish a visitor link along the eastern property border between the steps from the lower parking lot and West Montgomery Road. This concrete walkway should be immediately adjacent to the upper parking area and connect to the walkway on West Montgomery Road.

- Universal accessibility: The Oaks offers visitors accessible parking, some accessible circulation routes, and first floor access to the residence. The General Management Plan does not specifically address access issues, but NPS Management Policies direct that, to the greatest general degree possible, the national historic site will make a reasonable effort to have accessible facilities, programs, and services. As one of the national historic site’s primary resources, providing universal access to the cultural landscape at The Oaks should be a priority. Rehabilitation of drives with an accessible material will provide visitors universal access to the rear yard.

- Remove the non-historic concrete pavers that cover a portion of the drive from West Montgomery Road to the porte-cochère, replace with stabilized gravel paving to ensure universal accessibility. Remove large pea gravel from the driveway and replace with stabilized or compactable gravel paving to match the look of the original chert surface. If chert cannot be found at a local quarry, the NPS should use a light grey aggregate with an ecologically friendly stabilizer to bind the material.

- Resurface asphalt parking lot as needed.

Small Scale Features
During the period of significance, small-scale features included fences, a bench, and other features associated with the Washingtons’ personal use of the property. The lack of fencing in the front yard is one of the most noticeable changes between the period of significance and the current condition at the site. Site managers have added non-historic features to facilitate visitor use of the property. The following recommendations address removing or relocating non-historic features to enhance the historic character of the landscape. They also address the restoration of some fence lines that help define the front lawn area.

Fences and Small Walls
- A picket fence existed around the front lawn area during the period of significance. The fence defined the space in the front lawn of The Oaks and visually separated

192. An example of this material is Stabilizer Solutions, Stabilizer® for Stabilized Aggregate Pathway.
the residence from campus. The fencing on the southern property boundary near the lower parking lot is non-historic and is a non-contributing feature. Conduct archeology to determine the location of the picket fence on the east and west property lines and in the lawn area south of the residence (Figure 95). If locations can be determined, restoring the fence would give the site a sense of enclosure that has been lost over time. Given the location of the existing brick retaining wall, it will not be possible to restore the fence on the north property line.

- Repair and maintain front retaining wall at West Montgomery Road.

Figure 95. Detail of picket fence along property line, c. 1906.

- The site identification sign should be in keeping with the materials and aesthetic of the site. Use current NPS standards when replacing signs (Figure 96). The wayside at West Montgomery Road shows signs of wear and age. Replace with new wayside.
- New waysides should include information on Margaret Murray Washington and David A. Williston. The NPS should provide information on the cultural landscape at the site.
- Relocate non-historic flagpole and trash receptacles to pedestrian access area at the southwest corner of the upper visitor parking lot. Add orientation sign or wayside in this area to create a visitor amenity zone. Screen zone with appropriate vegetation from David Williston Plant List (Appendix A.)

Picnic Area
- The picnic area is non-contributing to the period of significance; however, it serves an important function to support tourism at the site. Organize existing picnic tables into a more usable, pleasant visitor area. Consider using hardscape or restore lawn area under tables for visitor comfort. Plant additional canopy trees near the picnic area to provide shade for the seating area. Use native trees from the Williston list (Appendix A.) Retain trash receptacles in this area.

- Preserve the view from The Oaks to the Tuskegee University campus. Retain

Views and Vistas
Views toward campus are largely unchanged from the period of significance. The northern edge of the visitor parking lot east of the residence has a negative impact on the view from the front of The Oaks. The view toward the south side of the site is substantially different from the period of significance due to the removal of secondary structures and the construction of the lower visitor lot. Rehabilitation of historically significant views are addressed in the following treatment recommendations. Related treatment recommendations are included in the vegetation section and in the buildings and structures section.
**Spatial Organization**

- Preserve the spatial relationship of the house with West Montgomery Road and the Tuskegee University campus. The spatial relationships between the house, West Montgomery Road, and campus are a character-defining feature of the historic landscape.
- Preserve the historic setting and viewshed of the house overlooking the Tuskegee University campus. Improve the view to the west where Tuskegee University has demolished the house immediately west of The Oaks. (See vegetation section for screening recommendations.)
- Conduct archeology to determine the location of the original outbuildings south of the house. At present, the site lacks integrity of spatial organization at the rear of the residence.

**Further Study**

Additional issues that may require further study or action beyond the specific treatment recommendations are as follows:

**Archeological Study**

A preliminary archeology study at TUIN sites conducted in 1979 did not reveal any “cultural resources of National Register caliber.” The report continues, “this should not, however, be interpreted as meaning that they do not exist, for almost certainly they do. For this reason future development should be preceded by historical and archeological research.”

Conduct an archeological study at the site to locate features in the rear yard including ancillary structures, planting bed limits, paths, walkways and fence lines. Should the study reveal specific locations of features, interpret or consider restoration of these features.

**National Register Nomination**

Amend the National Register Nomination for Tuskegee to provide a revised Statement of Significance and Period of Significance for The Oaks that recognizes the period after Booker T. Washington’s death. Augment the narrative of the nomination to support a period of significance from 1899-1929 to include the period when Mrs. Washington still lived at the site and David A. Williston continued to influence the design of the landscape. Conduct further research into the involvement of the Women’s Club of Tuskegee in the initial preservation efforts at The Oaks in 1925 and add this information to the amended listing.

**Cultural Landscape Inventory**

Revise the Cultural Landscape Inventory to reflect the Cultural Landscape Report and the amended National Register Nomination.

**Preservation Maintenance Plan**

Develop preservation maintenance plan for entire site.

---

Climate Change

Cultural resources including historic buildings and small-scale features “are fixed in place or derive much of their significance from the place within which they were created. Many are non-living, and all are unique. As a result, the capacity of cultural resources to adapt to changing environments is limited.” Climate change can impact cultural vegetation with even the slightest variation in temperature and moisture. As stated in the Director’s Policy Memorandum 14-02, “NPS cultural resource management must keep in mind that (1) cultural resources are primary sources of data regarding human interactions with climate change; and (2) changing climates affect the preservation and maintenance of cultural resources.”

There has not been a study on the effects of climate change on cultural resources completed by the NPS for TUIN, but there is a brief for Horseshoe Bend National Military Park, which is approximately 45 miles away. This report states that climate patterns suggest that the region will experience “hotter conditions during the driest time of year and wetter conditions during the already wettest month of the year.” Such climate events can have negative effects on park resources.

According to NPS documents, negative impacts to cultural landscapes related to extreme temperature and higher relative humidity include: “decline/disappearance of some vegetation species,” “heat stress on culturally significant vegetation,” and “increased stress (e.g. desiccation, warping cracking, etc.) on constructed landscape features.”

Heavier precipitation could cause “decline/disappearance of some vegetation species” and “decreased soil fertility from erosion, waterlogging, leaching.” Changes related to extreme temperatures and moisture levels may also impact buildings and structures. Potential impacts include: deterioration, conflagration, and desiccation.

A loss of resource integrity may occur over time from conditions related to climate change and its impacts. Typically, documentation is one of the first mitigation techniques undertaken in response to deterioration. This document, which includes narrative, photographs, drawings, and recommendations, fulfills this first step in the mitigation process. As the climate changes, park managers may consider alternate plant materials that tolerate the heat and additional moisture forecasted by climate projections. The use of native species will increase the chances of adaptability to climate changes.

196. The NPS has conducted a study on the effect of climate change on visitation at TUIN. See Park Visitation and Climate Change: Park-Specific Brief, “Tuskegee Institute National Historic Site: How might future warming alter visitation?” June 23, 2015.
199. Ibid., 22.
200. Ibid., 22.
1. Replant ornamental beds plantings near circular drive and behind porte-cochère with shrub species from Williston list (Appendix A).
2. Restore summer house using Williston’s drawings and historic photographs if archeology can determine its location.
3. Interpret location of well house with building footprint if archeology can determine its location.
4. Rehabilitate drive/carriage trail with universally accessible material.
5. Rehabilitate foundation plantings.*
6. Interpret rear yard through additional wayside.
7. Restore picket fence along east and west property lines if archeology can determine its location.
8. Add shrub bed to screen visitor amenity area.
9. Relocate flagpole, trash receptacles, and add additional interpretive sign.
10. Replace entrance sign and add appropriate plantings along border with upper parking lot.
11. Construct pedestrian link between parking and West Montgomery Road.
12. Update wayside.
13. Repair wall.
15. Re-establish tree and shrub bed to screen view of generator.*
16. Replace all lighting with compatible features.
17. Plant fruit and pecan trees to help screen view of parking.
18. Re-establish flower garden if archeology can determine its location.
19. Replace the southern magnolia in the west lawn with a pecan once this tree declines.
20. As trees along West Montgomery Road decline, replace with appropriate species (see +UA note below).
21. Plant small flowering tree in front yard. Use native tree from David A. Williston plant list (see Appendix A).

* Rehabilitation of shrub beds and foundation plantings should include removal of plants that do not meet historic criteria or are declining. Replace with plants David A. Williston used on the Tuskegee Institute campus (see Appendix A.) Site managers should avoid invasive species.

UA - Historic photographs indicate that the initial planting of these trees may be American elm, which may have been removed due to disease or during road construction. However, the existing trees on the site are large water oaks. Both species are appropriate for the site (see text page 93).

H - Historic photographs indicate hardwood trees in these locations. Where it is not possible to identify specific tree species from photographs or plans, use native species from Williston’s planting list (Appendix A.)

Preserve existing contributing vegetation (see Analysis and Evaluation Map, Illustration 4.1).
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Appendix A

D. A. Williston Plant List

Native Trees planted on campus by Williston from 1902 to 1948

• *Ulmus alata* Winged Elm
• *Ulmus americana* American Elm
• *Quercus falcata* Southern Red Oak
• *Acer rubrum* Red Maple
• *Quercus nigra* Water Oak
• *Quercus phellos* Willow Oak
• *Magnolia grandiflora* Southern Magnolia
• *Catalpa bignonioides* Catalpa
• *Chionanthus virginiana* White Fringetree
• *Cercis canadensis* Red Bud
• *Ilex opaca* American Holly
• *Juniperus virginiana* Red Cedar
• *Platanus occidentalis* Sycamore
• *Prunus caroliniana* Cherry Laurel
• *Cornus florida* Dogwood
• *Liquidambar styraciflua* Sweet Gum

Other native plants used on campus by Williston

• *Yucca aloifolia* Spanish Bayonet
• *Yucca filamentosa* Adams Needle
• *Ilex vomitoria* Yaupon Holly
• *Eruthrina herbacaea* Coral Berry
• *Bignonia capreolata* Cross Vine
• *Calycanthus floridus* Sweet Shrub
• *Callicarpa americana* American Beautyberry
• *Gelsemium sempervirens* Yellow Jessamine
• *Kalmia latifolia* Mountain Laurel

Common shrubs used by Williston

• *Cydonia japonica* Japanese Quince
• *Exochorda grandiflora* Pearl Bush
• *Forsythia intermedia* Border Forsythia
• *Lonicera fragrantissima* Winter Honeysuckle
• *Spiraea thunbergii* Thunberg Spiraea
• *Spiraea vonhouttei* Bridal Wreath Spiraea
• *Hibiscus syriacus* Shrub Althea
• *Jasminum nudiflorum* Winter Jasmine
• *Ligustrum amurense* AmurPrivet
• *Ligustrum japonicum* Wax Leaf Privet
• *Ligustrum sinense* Chinese Privet
• *Nandina domestica* Nandina
Non-native coniferous evergreen trees and shrubs used by Williston

- *Cedrus deodara* Deodar cedar
- *Juniperus chinensis* ‘Pfitzeriana’ Pfitzer Juniper
- *Thuja occidentalis* Eastern Arborvitae
- *Thuja orientalis* Oriental Arborvitae

The above information is an excerpt from Edward Pryce’s 1979 *Historic Landscape Report for The Oaks.*

---

As the nation’s principal conservation agency, the Department of the Interior has responsibility for most of our nationally owned public lands and natural resources. This includes fostering sound use of our land and water resources; protecting our fish, wildlife, and biological diversity; preserving the environmental and cultural values of our national parks and historical places; and providing for the enjoyment of life through outdoor recreation. The department assesses our energy and mineral resources and works to ensure that their development is in the best interests of all our people by encouraging stewardship and citizen participation in their care. The department also has a major responsibility for American Indian reservation communities and for people who live in island territories under U.S. administration.
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