

**“On A Great Battlefield”:
The Making, Management, and Memory of Gettysburg National Military Park, 1933-2009**

by

Jennifer Marie Murray

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
Auburn University
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Auburn, Alabama
August 9, 2010

Keywords: Gettysburg Battlefield, National Park Service

Copyright 2010 by Jennifer Marie Murray

Approved by

Kenneth Noe, Chair, Professor of History
David Carter, Professor of History
Aaron Shapiro, Professor of History

Abstract

Since July 1863 historians have written a great deal on the three-day Battle of Gettysburg, but have devoted little attention to the history of the battlefield itself. In the decades since the sound of artillery and muskets silenced and the soldiers retreated from the field, the Gettysburg battlefield has become a place of commemoration, veneration, celebration, and controversy. It is a site unlike any other on American soil. This dissertation provides an innovative perspective on the Civil War and Gettysburg historiography by examining how the National Park Service (NPS) has administered the battlefield from its acquisition of the site in August 1933 through 2009. Underlying the National Park Service's expansive history are variables of management philosophies, land acquisition, planning initiatives, competing notions of privatization and commercialism, and evolving interpretive efforts. Between August 1933 and October 2009 ten superintendents have administered the Gettysburg National Military Park. This inevitable change in management has resulted in an ever-evolving battlefield. Superintendent's backgrounds, whether as landscape architects, government bureaucrats, or historians, consistently shape their vision for the battlefield. Additionally, several landmark eras became evident, all dramatically changing the management, interpretation, and memory of the battlefield. Those four eras are the Great Depression period, 1933-1940; World War II, 1941-1945; the MISSION 66 and Civil War Centennial years, 1955 to 1955; and the fifteen years of John Latschar's administration, 1994 to 2009. Notwithstanding the degree of change at the battlefield, however, many variables remained constant. Management decisions made by the

National Park Service receive America's close securitization because of Gettysburg's prominent place within American History and the sensationalism of the site. Controversy and heated debates underscore each administration. Additionally, throughout the twentieth century the battlefield has been used as a landscape of patriotic expression, which was seen most evidently during World War II. This dissertation examines the successes and failures of the National Park Service at Gettysburg. In its simplest form the Gettysburg battlefield is a memorial landscape to war. Yet to many Americans Gettysburg is more than a battlefield; it is a place of patriotic expression, of public display, and a place of veneration.

Acknowledgments

Writing the history of the Gettysburg Battlefield has been a herculean topic and I have received the assistance of many while working on this dissertation. At Auburn I am appreciative of the guidance from my advisor, Dr. Kenneth Noe, and other committee members, Dr. Aaron Shapiro and Dr. David Carter.

Since 2002 I have worked as a seasonal interpretive park ranger at Gettysburg National Military Park, and over the course of my eight seasons at Gettysburg I have had the pleasure of working with some of the finest of the green and gray. I owe an enormous amount of gratitude to several individuals at Gettysburg for their assistance while working on this dissertation. First and foremost, I want to thank former Gettysburg superintendent Dr. John A. Latschar. John has read every chapter of this dissertation, offering contextual comments and factual corrections that have made this a significantly better project. He has graciously directed me toward appropriate sources and openly talked with me about the events of his administration. Thousands of visitors to Gettysburg now enjoy an enormously better interpretive experience because of John's vision, knowledge, leadership, and character.

I also am indebted to other employees at Gettysburg. I want to thank Greg Goodell, the park archivist, for giving me open access to the park's records, pulling hundreds of files, and for allowing me to establish residency in the archives. During this process I benefited enormously from numerous conversations with Gettysburg's Senior Historian, Kathy Harrison. Her knowledge on the Battle of Gettysburg and the history of battlefield remain unmatched and I can

only aspire to develop a similar base of knowledge. Kathy read much of my dissertation and ensured that I had the opportunity to view vital documents and files. I also owe a special thanks to Katie Lawhon, Gettysburg's public relation officer, who helped me navigate through much of the park's contemporary files. John Heiser, the park librarian and historian, has patiently answered many emails and questions helping me sort out factual questions from afar. I also want to extend my appreciation to Winnona Peterson, Jo Sanders, Norma Lohman, Scott Hartwig, Eric Campbell, and Barbara Finrock all of whom have helped me with sources and questions throughout this project.

Last, but certainly not least, I want to thank my friends and family. David Dillard, my advisor at James Madison, has patiently guided me through this PhD odyssey. He has provided invaluable advice on countless occasions and I aspire to be as good of a mentor as he has been to me. The PhD journey could never have been complete without the rock solid support of my parents, Michael and Jacqueline, and my sister Brittany. They have consistently encouraged me in my academic endeavors and have made countless trips to "The Plains" to share in this experience. My parents have been beacons of support and encouragement throughout my life and I owe much of my success to them. I am forever grateful for the support of Clyde Bell. He has read every chapter of this dissertation and has accompanied me on dozens of research trips. More importantly, he has spent hours listening to me talk about this dissertation and has been a constant source of encouragement, consultation, and support.

Finally, I dedicate this dissertation to Shiloh Armistead Murray, the very best dog in the world. He has been with me every day and every step of the way. Shiloh is my true companion. He has patiently slept by my side, on the floor, or on the couch, while I worked on the dissertation for countless hours each day. I never would have made it without him.

“Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in Liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal. Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation, or any nation, so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battle-field of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field, as a final resting place for those who here gave their lives that that nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this. But, in a larger sense, we can not dedicate, we can not consecrate, we can not hallow this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it, far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note, nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government: of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.”

- Abraham Lincoln, Gettysburg Address,
November 19, 1863

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	ii
Acknowledgments	iv
The Gettysburg Address	vi
Introduction.....	1
Chapter 1 “We Are Met On A Great Battlefield”: The Gettysburg Battlefield, 1863-1933	32
Chapter 2 “We Cannot Hallow This Ground”: The National Park Service’s Beginnings at Gettysburg, 1933-1940	57
Chapter 3 “From These Honored Dead We Take Increased Devotion”: World War II Comes To A Civil War Battlefield, 1941-1945.....	99
Chapter 4 “The World Will Little Note Nor Long Remember”: Postwar Tourism, Patriotism, and Commercialization, 1946-1955.....	142
Chapter 5 “The Great Task Remaining Before Us”: MISSION 66 and Cold War Patriotism at Gettysburg, 1956-1960	180
Chapter 6 “Dedicated to the Proposition That All Men Are Created Equal”: The Civil War Centennial at Gettysburg, 1961-1965	218
Chapter 7 “Our Fathers Brought Forth On This Continent A New Nation”: A New Direction at Gettysburg, 1966-1976	258
Chapter 8 “So Conceived And So Dedicated”: A Decade of Planning Without Implementation, 1977-1988	303

Chapter 9 “Now We Are Engaged In A Great Civil War”: Confusion, Controversy, and Criticism, 1989-1994	335
Chapter 10 “A New Birth of Freedom”: Finding A New Direction at Gettysburg, 1995-1997	378
Chapter 11 “They Who Fought Here”: Controversy Over A New Direction at Gettysburg 1998-2000	407
Chapter 12 “Shall Not Perish From The Earth”: A New Beginning at Gettysburg, 2001-2009	453
Conclusion	499
Bibliography	508

Introduction

Since 1863 millions of Americans “have met on a great battlefield” of the American Civil War. They have met at Gettysburg, now a site of 6,000 acres in south-central Pennsylvania where for three days in July 1863, two powerful armies clashed over the meaning of freedom, sovereignty, and nationhood. To the more than 160,000 soldiers in General Robert E. Lee’s Army of Northern Virginia and the Army of the Potomac, commanded by General George G. Meade, Gettysburg was a bloody field of battle; a place of soon-to-be legendary peach orchards, wheat fields, round tops, devil’s dens, and slaughter pens. Four months later, on November 19, 272 words transformed the bloodstained fields of battle and shocking carnage into something more. The Gettysburg Address provided the deadliest battle of the war with meaning; it gave America a “new birth of freedom.” Gettysburg became the battle that in the popular mind defined the Civil War, while the Gettysburg Address offered a vision for a stronger, united nation. In the years since the sound of artillery and muskets silenced and the soldiers retreated from the field, the Gettysburg battlefield has become a place of commemoration, veneration, celebration, and controversy. It is a site unlike any other on American soil.

No other battlefield grips the nation’s consciousness as Gettysburg. Nearly two million visitors travel to the Pennsylvania battlefield each year to visit the fields where Pickett and his men charged across on that fateful day of July 3, to walk on Little Round Top where Colonel Joshua Chamberlain’s 20th Maine held the Union left flank on the battle’s second day, or to somberly walk through the Soldiers’ National Cemetery and contemplate the meaning of this country’s most famous speech. Gettysburg remains indisputably this country’s most studied military engagement in any war. Thousands of books and articles are devoted to the battle. Year

after year, historians and Civil War enthusiasts add to the litany of Gettysburg scholarship, examining, or often reexamining, various aspects of the battle that changed American history.

Arguably the turning point in the Civil War and the Union's greatest victory, it is not surprising that efforts to preserve and protect these "hallowed grounds" began only months after the fighting. Since the time of the battle three organizations shouldered the task of preserving and protecting the historic fields administered the Gettysburg battlefield: the Gettysburg Battlefield Memorial Association (GBMA, 1864-1895), the United States War Department (1895-1933), and the current administrator, the National Park Service (NPS).

Yet for all the battle's dissection, scholars have devoted only minimal attention to the battlefield itself and the process of preserving, interpreting, and remembering the bloodiest battle of the Civil War. This dissertation will provide a fresh and innovative perspective to the Gettysburg historiography by examining not the battle, but the battlefield park, and specifically how the National Park Service has administered Gettysburg since its acquisition in August 1933. The story of the Battle of Gettysburg has been told; the story of the Gettysburg Battlefield has not.

This is not surprising. Only recently have scholars begun to examine the process of preserving and interpreting America's battlefields. Only a few sources specifically relate to the preservation Gettysburg. Many of these works are written by people affiliated with Gettysburg National Military Park and only offer cursory analysis of the battle. The most comprehensive history of the battlefield is the park's *Administrative History*, written by Harlan D. Unrau. He examines the "conception, establishment, development, and operation of the park and cemetery" from 1864 to 1991.¹ Unrau's study, however, was not intended for widespread distribution. It is

¹ Harlan D. Unrau, *Administrative History: Gettysburg National Military Park and Gettysburg National Cemetery* (United States Department of Interior: National Park Service, 1991), iii.

only an in-house publication written primarily to “present and future park administrators with a more informed background about the successes, failures, and ongoing or recurring issues of the past and greater awareness for management decision-making.”² While valuable in giving management a basic understanding of the park’s history, it suffers from several serious flaws. While Unrau makes use of the park archives and library, he often only quotes reports in their entirety while offering little discussion or analysis. Furthermore, Unrau’s work suffers from a narrow vision, for he fails to place any of Gettysburg’s management decisions into a larger context, which quite often influenced how the battlefield was administered. He offers no discussion of park-community relations or concurrent events at other Civil War battlefields. Moreover, in the eighteen years since the release of Unrau’s study, a myriad of significant changes occurred on the Gettysburg battlefield, changes that not only redirected the future of the battlefield, but also set precedence for the National Park system.

In addition to Unrau, three park affiliates offered their own narrative of the history of the battlefield. Park volunteer Barbara L. Platt’s *“This is holy ground” : A History of Gettysburg Battlefield*, offers a general analysis of the park’s history.³ Barely over 150 pages, including illustrations, Platt’s study is a product of non-scholarly research that offers only the briefest understanding of the park’s history. Like Unrau, Platt also fails to situate events at the battlefield into a larger story of American history. Moreover, most of Platt’s source material derives from local newspapers, principally the *Gettysburg Times* and Hanover’s *Evening Sun*. She fails to take advantage of the abundance of primary source material in the park’s archives. Released in 2001 and again in 2009, it at least provides an up-to-date story of the most recent events at

² Unrau, *Administrative History*, iii.

³ Barbara L. Platt, *“This is Holy Ground” : A History of the Gettysburg Battlefield* (Harrisburg: Huggins Printing, 2001).

Gettysburg. Park Ranger Karlton Smith, during the 1995 seminar at Gettysburg National Military Park, presented “The Changing Faces of Gettysburg: The National Park Service at Gettysburg.” This short essay focuses broadly on the Park Service’s sixty-year administration of the battlefield and offers a cursory discussion on the important administrative changes. And finally, Barbara J. Finfrock’s *Twenty Years on Six Thousand Acres: The History of the Friends of the National Parks at Gettysburg, 1989-2009* provides a concise but narrow narrative of the Park Service’s partner association.⁴

It has only been in the last two decades that professional scholars have begun to shift away from strategy and tactics to address larger questions of commemoration and memory. Amy J. Kinsel’s pioneering work examines how the battlefield evolved into a cultural memorial from the days immediately after the battle to the 1938 anniversary. Her 1992 dissertation, “‘From These Honored Dead’: Gettysburg in American Culture, 1863-1938” studies the park as a “phenomenon in American culture” and explores its meaning during this seventy-five year period. In addition, her essay “From Turning Point to Peace Memorial: A Cultural Legacy” in *The Gettysburg Nobody Knows*, edited by Gabor S. Boritt, examines the changing interpretations of the battle, how the battlefield evolved into memorial to the soldiers, and how Americans have come to understand the battle. Unfortunately, Kinsel’s essay concludes with the battle’s 50th anniversary in 1913 and provides no discussion on how the battlefield was transformed into a “peace memorial” or “cultural legacy” afterward, much less the National Park Service’s administration. John Patterson’s “A Patriotic Landscape: Gettysburg, 1863-1913” closely parallels arguments later made by Kinsel. Patterson concludes that the establishment of the

⁴ Karlton Smith, “The Changing Faces of Gettysburg: The National Park Service at Gettysburg,” presented at Gettysburg National Military Park’s 5th Annual Seminar, 1995. A copy of this essay can be found in the Gettysburg National Military Park Library; Barbara J. Finfrock, *Twenty Years on Six Thousand Acres: The History of the Friends of the National Parks at Gettysburg, 1989-2009*, (Harrisburg: Huggins Printing Company, 2009).

Soldiers' National Cemetery with its subsequent ceremonies influenced and assisted Gettysburg's development as a sacred site. By the 1913 Memorial Day commemoration fit perfectly into the larger trends of national reconciliation, especially when former Confederates, southern politicians and civilians began to partake in the ceremonies of the North's greatest victory.⁵

While Gettysburg is a commemorative landscape, it is also, and undeniably, a major tourist attraction. Two historians, Jim Weeks and John Patterson, have examined the process by which the hallowed battlefield became a tourist destination with a strong emphasis on commercialization. In "From Battle Ground to Pleasure Ground: Gettysburg as a Historic Site" (1989), Patterson categorizes the history of the Gettysburg battlefield in its transformation from battlefield to tourist site into three phases. Phase one occurred between the late 1870s until 1895 and was characterized by Union reunions and monument dedications. Phase two took place between 1895 and 1938 and became a period of administrative transition from the War Department to the National Park Service and the last great veterans' reunion in 1938. The final phase in the transformation started after the Second World War and after the passing of the Civil War generation when the battlefield "vanished from living memory" and the site experienced unparalleled commercialization.⁶

Weeks stands as the leading historian on the battlefield's commercial development. In his first work, "Gettysburg: Display Window for Popular Memory," (1998) he offers themes

⁵ Amy Kinsel, "From Turning Point to Peace Memorial: A Cultural Legacy" in *The Gettysburg Nobody Knows*, edited by Gabor S. Boritt (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997); Amy Kinsel, "From These Honored Dead": Gettysburg in American Culture, 1863-1938," (Ph.D. diss., Cornell University, 1992); John Patterson, "A Patriotic Landscape: Gettysburg, 1863-1913," *Prospects* 7 (1982): 315-333.

⁶ John Patterson, "From Battle Ground to Pleasure Ground: Gettysburg as a Historic Site," in *History Museums in the United States: A critical Assessment*, ed. Warren Leon and Roy Rosenzweig (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1989), 128-157.

similar to Patterson's earlier work. Both historians, for example, emphasize the role of the Gettysburg & Harrisburg Railroad, which opened in 1884, in promoting battlefield tourism. The railroad made touring the battlefield accessible and affordable, leading Weeks to conclude "The shrine at Gettysburg grew along with America's commercial culture, as much a product of that world as the great exhibitions, railroads, department stores, and public amusements." Weeks and Patterson differ, however, on when the commercialization started. Patterson asserts that early efforts to promote tourism at the battlefield were often unsuccessful, concluding that the "multifaceted campaign to promote preservation and to make the field an attractive place to visit, Gettysburg's development was uneven during the fifteen years after the battle." In contrast, Weeks pinpoints the commercialism of the battle just days after the armies departed when the first tourists flocked to gawk at the already famous fields. By the time of the National Cemetery's dedication in November, entrepreneurs had already produced battle memorabilia, and in 1864 David McConaughy, a local attorney who spearheaded the first preservation efforts, sent canes from battlefield trees to be sold as souvenirs at Philadelphia's Great Fair.⁷

Expanding on themes presented in the 1998 article, Weeks offers a more thorough discussion of the commercialization of the site in *Gettysburg: Memory, Market, and an American Shrine* (2003). His goal is to understand how "such a horrific field of slaughter" was transformed into a "site of commercial leisure" over a time period of 140 years. He explores the consumption and marketability of Gettysburg and how social changes, including the increased commercial leisure and the rise of the automobile, drove this process. Defining Gettysburg as a

⁷ Jim Weeks, "Gettysburg: Display Window for Popular Memory," *The Journal of American Culture* (Winter 1998), vol. 21, Issue 4: 41-56; John Patterson, "From Battle Ground to Pleasure Ground: Gettysburg as a Historic Site," 133. David McConaughy was a local attorney who spearheaded the early preservation efforts and the GBMA.

“shrine,” he offers the “history of its development...tell us more about the American people than about the battle Gettysburg memorializes.”⁸

As Gettysburg evolved from a venerated battlefield to a commercialized tourist destination, the battlefield’s place became instilled not only in popular culture, but also in popular memory. To date, Carol Reardon’s *Pickett’s Charge in History and Memory* (1997) remains one of the best works on Civil War memory and the Battle of Gettysburg. Reardon explores the history, memory, and myth of Pickett’s Charge, and intermingling of these forces to form a palatable version of the attack accepted by Americans. She describes how the “Charge” was viewed in its immediate aftermath and how the press glorified its participants, in both the North and South. Reardon states that southern newspapers, especially those in Richmond, provided the “foundation of facts and fancy for legend building and myth making,” and heralded the role of Pickett and his Virginians at the expense of Pettigrew and Trimble’s North Carolinians, Tennesseans, Mississippians, and Floridians. Moreover, veterans’ accounts quickly became influenced by the “fog of war”; the desire to embellish their contribution often resulted in factual errors. “Myth and history intertwine freely on these fields, and some of their tendrils always will defy untangling.”⁹

Similar to Reardon’s work, is *These Honored Dead: How the Story of Gettysburg Shaped American Memory* (2003), by Thomas Desjardin. He discusses “the multitude of meanings that Americans have attached to the story of Gettysburg in the first 140 years since the battle ended,” and examines how the battle became *the* defining moment not only Civil War history, but

⁸ Jim Weeks, *Gettysburg: Memory, Market, and an American Shrine* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003), 1-10.

⁹ Carol Reardon, *Pickett’s Charge in History and Memory* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997), 10;49.

American history. Using a series of examples, Desjardin illustrates how Americans consciously manipulated the events of the battle in order to devise a story of what they thought happened, or more often what they wanted to have happened. For example, Desjardin recounts how General Daniel Sickles, wounded on July 2 and sent to Washington D.C. to recover, readily influenced popular memory when he impressed upon and indeed justified to President Abraham Lincoln his version of the fighting. In another example, John Bachelder, the battle's first historian, influenced the interpretation and memory of Gettysburg when he created the popular ideal of the "High Water Mark." This phrase refers to the popularly held notion that the Army of Northern Virginia reached its zenith, or its "High Water Mark," at the Battle of Gettysburg, and specifically on July 3rd when the Army of the Potomac successfully repulsed Pickett's Charge. Bachelder even named the grouping of trees along Cemetery Ridge the "copse of trees," an archaic British phrase used to identify a grove or thicket of reverential importance.¹⁰

Examining Gettysburg, however, has not been the exclusive domain of historians. Geographers have also studied the battlefield with a close eye, not toward its history, but toward the landscape. Benjamin Dixon's dissertation, "Gettysburg, A Living Battlefield," provides a cultural geographer's assessment. He offers a snapshot interpretation of the battlefield by dividing the park's history into five phases: 1883 "Division"; 1904 "Memorialization"; 1940 "Reconciliation"; 1970 "Promotion"; and 2000 "Restoration." Dixon considers how changes in the park's geography have offered differing interpretations of the battle in the five selected phases. Focusing primarily on park tour brochures, Dixon offers a discussion on how popular battlefield sites influenced interpretation and memory. Another geographer, Brian Black, has also delved into studying the nature and ecology of the battlefield. His "Addressing the Nature

¹⁰ Thomas Desjardin, *These Honored Dead: How The Story of Gettysburg Shaped American Memory* (Cambridge: Da Capo Press, 2003), xxii; 95-98.

of Gettysburg: Addition and Detraction in Preserving an American Shrine,” discusses the battlefield’s ecology. He argues that the battlefield must be seen for more than its historic value, and suggests that the site’s natural environment is as important as its cultural and historic significance.¹¹

While scholars usually focus on the Gettysburg battlefield, a few other historians have examined the preservation of other Civil War battlefields. Timothy B. Smith is the leading scholar on the preservation of the Shiloh National Military Park, one of the most secluded and isolated battlefields of the war. A former park ranger at Shiloh, he explores the history of the battlefield in *This Great Battlefield of Shiloh: History, Memory, and the Establishment of a Civil War National Military Park* (2006) from the early preservation efforts through the National Park Service era. Smith’s work also addresses larger themes of patriotism, nationalism, reconciliation, and memory as related to the preservation and interpretation of Shiloh. His second book, *The Untold Story of Shiloh: The Battle and the Battlefield* (2006), is essentially a collection of essays that illuminates lesser known aspects of the April 1862 battle, including the role and influence of the Union navy, the Corinth Campaign, the placement and dedication of battlefield monuments, the Shiloh National Cemetery, and the career of David Reed, “the Father of Shiloh National Military Park.”¹²

In a wonderful contextual analysis, Smith explores the influence of the Great Depression on the management of Shiloh National Military Park in two additional essays. He offers an

¹¹ Benjamin Y. Dixon, “Gettysburg, A Living Battlefield,” (Ph.D. diss., Oklahoma State University, 2000). Black’s forthcoming book *Contesting Gettysburg* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011) will examine the use and management of the ecology at Gettysburg, paying particular focus on the current restoration projects.

¹² Timothy B. Smith, *This Great Battlefield: History, Memory, and the Establishment of a Civil War National Military Park* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2006); Timothy B. Smith, *The Untold Story of Shiloh: The Battle and the Battlefield*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2006).

overview of the New Deal's influence on the management of Shiloh in "A Case Study in Change: The New Deal's Effect on Shiloh National Military Park." In a more focused essay, Smith documents the Civilian Conservation Corps at Shiloh in "Black Soldiers and the CCC at Shiloh National Military Park" (2006). He explores the establishment of the camps, projects undertaken, and the World War I black veterans' struggle with unequal accommodations and segregation. Linking the racial injustice in the camps with the Union effort to emancipate the slaves, Smith asserts "Sadly, African American veterans were denied full equality in the CCC camps, even on a hallowed battlefield where their very freedom and citizenship had been partially gained."¹³

Smith's most recent work, *The Golden Age of Battlefield Preservation: The Decade of the 1890s and the Establishment of America's First Five Military Parks* (2008), examines the formation of Chickamauga/Chattanooga, Antietam, Shiloh, Gettysburg, and Vicksburg, arguing that "never before had American battlefields been preserved so extensively."¹⁴ Several factors collided to create a "golden age of preservation," including lessening of animosities over Reconstruction, increasing desires for reconciliation, and veterans' influence in politics. The comparative nature of Smith's account allows a better understanding on how each of the five parks developed, and how each battlefield is comparable or distinct from the others.

The preservation of the first five battlefield parks occurred in two distinct and separate ways. One method, practiced at Chickamauga by park commissioner Henry Boyton, attempted to preserve the entire battlefield with massive land acquisitions, and the extensive marking of

¹³ Timothy B. Smith, "A Case Study in Change: The New Deal's Effect on Shiloh National Military Park." *Tennessee Historical Quarterly* 66, no.2 (Summer 2007): 126-143; Timothy B. Smith, "Black Soldiers and the CCC at Shiloh National Military Park," *CRM: The Journal of Heritage Stewardship*, 3, no. 2 (Summer 2006): 73-84.

¹⁴ Timothy B. Smith, *The Golden Age of Battlefield Preservation: The Decade of the 1890s and the Establishment of America's First Five Military Parks* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2008), 28.

battle lines and monumentation. On the other hand, Antietam remained limited to piecemeal acquisition and varied administration practices. Whereas a park commission consisting of three members-- two Union veterans and one Confederate veteran, selected by the Secretary of War-- managed the other sites, two “agents” appointed by the secretary administered Antietam. The first members of the Antietam Board were Colonel John Stearns (USA) and Major General Henry Heth (CSA), neither of whom actually fought in the September 1862 battle. The board, as a result, struggled to establish Antietam, while the other four battlefields thrived.¹⁵

Smith acknowledges that basic preservation and commemoration patterns began at Gettysburg with the establishment of the Gettysburg Battlefield Memorial Association. He contends that, “the work at Gettysburg indeed pointed the direction battlefield preservation would take.” He finds overarching preservation and commemoration precedent not only at Gettysburg, but at Chickamauga/Chattanooga as well. Actually Gettysburg became the fourth park to be preserved by the federal government in 1895, leading Smith to assert that “such a late start does not diminish Gettysburg’s historical position, but it does show Gettysburg was not the foundation upon which all federal battlefield preservation was built.”¹⁶

Other battlefields of equal significance were not as fortunate. In “Civil War Battlefield Preservation in Tennessee: A Nashville National Military Park Case Study,” Smith examines the unsuccessful efforts to adequately preserve the Nashville battlefield. In 1909 local residents created the Nashville Battlefield Preservation Association, but were unsuccessful in lobbying

¹⁵ Efforts to mark the battle lines and troop placements underscore the problems at Antietam. Having not served at Antietam, Stearns and Heth requested the assistance of battle veterans in locating troop positions. The earliest markings of troops positions included wooden markers and wooden signs nailed to trees, both of which were commonly removed or destroyed by tourists and local farmers.

¹⁶ Smith, *The Golden Age of Battlefield Preservation*, 26; 145.

Congress to provide federal protection. Today the Battle of Nashville Preservation Society struggles to protect the site against urban development and sprawl.¹⁷

As illustrated by the efforts at Nashville, a battlefield's location plays a pivotal role in the site's post Civil War history. Such was the case at Manassas. Joan Zenzen's *Battling for Manassas: The Fifty Year Preservation Struggle at Manassas National Battlefield Park* (1998) examines the trials and tribulations of preserving those historic grounds of the war's first major battle. Like Nashville, Manassas is unfortunately situated today in a hub of commercialization and suburban sprawl. As a result, its location influenced the development and preservation of the July 1861 battlefield. Manassas struggled to gain status as a national military park. The Sons of Confederate Veterans embarked on the first significant preservation efforts when they purchased land on the battlefield and created Confederate Park in 1921. In 1935, President Roosevelt designated over 1,000 acres for the Manassas Battlefield and Confederate Park, which became known as the Bull Run Recreational Area. Six years later, on May 10, 1940, the federal government designated Manassas National Battlefield Park, and placed under the administration of the National Park Service.¹⁸ Yet, despite its designation as a national park, full protection of the historic grounds did not follow. Proximity to Washington D.C. and northern Virginia made the Manassas battlefield prone to reoccurring developmental threats. Park officials and Civil War preservationists thwarted efforts by the Virginia State Highway to build a multi-lane highway through the heart of the battlefield. In 1973 Marriott proposed the construction of the Great America Theme Park and in the 1980s Hazel/Paterson Company announced proposed plans to build a mall on top of Stuart's Hill, ground critical to the Second Battle of Manassas,

¹⁷ Smith, "Civil War Battlefield Preservation in Tennessee: A Nashville National Military Park Case Study," in the *Tennessee Historical Quarterly* vol. 63, Issue 4, 236-247.

¹⁸ Joan Zenzen, *Battling for Manassas: The Fifty Year Preservation Struggle at Manassas National Battlefield Park* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1998), 13; 24.

August 1862. Most recently, in 1993 Walt Disney unveiled plans to build a historical theme park three miles from the battlefield. Fortunately, for the historical integrity of the battlefield, none of these efforts came to fruition, but with its geographic location and increasing urban sprawl, future struggles to preserve this battlefield are inevitable.

Susan Trail's dissertation, "Remembering Antietam: Commemoration and Preservation of a Civil War Battlefield" (2005) offers a discussion on that battlefield's preservation from 1862 through 1967. She argues that preservation, commemoration, and management at Antietam differed from trends practiced at Gettysburg. Antietam's uniqueness developed, in part, due to the battlefield's location in a former slave-holding state, as well as local indifference to preserving ground of the war's single bloodiest day. When transferred to the National Park Service in 1933, Antietam at first came under the management of Gettysburg National Military Park. While under the same superintendent, Antietam developed in an individual fashion. Trail concludes that Civil War remembrance did not follow the pattern established at Gettysburg, nor did the commemoration practices at Antietam parallel David Blight's definition on the culture of reunion. She concludes that memory on Civil War battlefields is not monolithic, but varies depending on their location, leaving each battlefield with its own distinctive history of commemoration and memory.¹⁹

A few additional historians have offered a broader understanding of National Park Service policies by focusing not on one specific park, but by comparing several historical sites. Mary Munsell Abroe's dissertation, "All the Profound Scenes: Federal Preservation of Civil War Battlefields, 1861-1990" offers a chronological approach to understanding the evolution of the

¹⁹ Susan B. Trail, "Remembering Antietam: Commemoration and Preservation of a Civil War Battlefield," (Ph.D. diss., University of Maryland, 2005); David Blight, *Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001). While Trail offers an admirable and thorough discussion of the history of Antietam, Trail does not explain why her narrative ends in the 1960s.

National Park Service system, as related to Civil War battlefields from 1861 to the present. John Christian Spielvogel's dissertation "Interpreting 'Sacred Ground': The Rhetoric of National Park Service Historical Battlefields and Parks," examines the creation of memory at Harper's Ferry National Park and Gettysburg National Military Park by analyzing waysides, exhibits, brochures, and media to ascertain the meaning on the historical event portrayed by the Park Service. Spielvogel concludes that at Harper's Ferry and Gettysburg, the Park Service "tacitly utilize the commemorative traditions of emancipation and national reconciliation to craft historical narratives about the Civil War."²⁰ At Gettysburg, he specifically focuses on the presentation of the Gettysburg Address. Spielvogel maintains that the NPS selectively uses portions of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address to honor and commemorate the sacrifices of the men who died, while downplaying Lincoln's vision of a racially equitable society.

One of the most important programs implemented by the NPS was MISSION 66, a ten-year initiative (1956-1966) to fund and improve America's national parks. This federally funded program radically changed Americans' experience at national parks by providing millions in funding that allowed these parks to build new visitor centers, interpretive exhibits, improve roads and trails, and other needed maintenance projects. Yet scholars have relatively ignored this monumental project. One exception, Sara Allaback explores MISSION 66 architecture in "Mission 66 Visitor Centers: The History of a Building Type" (2000). She offers a discussion of the origins of the program and explores MISSION 66 projects at five national parks, including Gettysburg. Ethan Carr's *MISSION 66: Modernism and the National Park Dilemma* (2008) offers a more thorough discussion on MISSION 66. Complete with an array of historic

²⁰ Mary Munsell Abroe, "All the Profound Scenes: Federal Preservation of Civil War Battlefields, 1861-1990," (Ph.D. diss., Loyola, 1996); John Christain Spielvogel, "Interpreting "Sacred Ground": The Rhetoric of National Park Service Historical Battlefields and Parks," (Ph.D. diss., Pennsylvania State University, 2003), 216.

photographs, Carr explores the planning stages of the project, but like Allabeck focuses most of his attention on the MISSION 66 architecture and construction projects.²¹

The Civil War Centennial was another watershed event in American history that surprisingly has received minimal attention from historians. In fact, Robert J. Cook stands as the undisputed Civil War Centennial scholar. Tapping into an unexplored and controversial topic over fifty-years after the centennial, Cook authored *Troubled Commemoration: The American Civil War Centennial, 1961-1965* (2007). This book stands as the best, albeit the only, complete source on the centennial activities. Cooke places the centennial celebrations into the larger, more turbulent events of the 1960s: heightened Cold War tensions, the election and assassination of President John F. Kennedy, the Cuban Missile Crisis, and the nation's volatile race relations. In this context, Cook provides a detailed examination of the origins of the commemoration, racial unrest, and the divisiveness of the memory of the Civil War. Prior to the publication of *Troubled Commemoration*, Cook published two essays that first outlined themes addressed later in his book. In "Unfinished Business: African Americans and the Civil War Centennial" (2003), he explores issues of civil rights within the celebrations of the Civil War. In an essay "(Un) Furl That Banner: The Response of White Southerners to the Civil War Centennial of 1961-1965" Cook explores the importance of race and racism in the planning and celebration of the centennial.²²

²¹ Sara Allaback, "Mission 66 Visitor Centers: The History of a Building Type," 2000. www.nps.gov/history/history/online_books/allaback. Since this is an on-line publication, there are no page numbers, only chapter divisions; Ethan Carr, *Mission 66: Modernism and the National Park Dilemma* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2007).

²² Robert Cook, *Troubled Commemoration: The American Civil War Centennial, 1961-1965* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2007); Robert Cook, "Unfinished Business: African Americans and the Civil War Centennial," in *Legacy of Disunion: The Enduring Significance of the American Civil War*, edited by Susan-Mary Grant and Peter J. Parish (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2003); Robert Cook "(Un)Furl That Banner: The Response of White Southerners to the Civil War Centennial of 1961-1965," *The Journal of Southern History*, vol. 68, no. 4 (Nov. 2002), 879-912. More contemporary to the centennial, Robert Penn Warren's *The*

While the historiography of the Gettysburg battlefield and the National Park Service are relatively scant, a broader, deeper scholarship exists on historical memory, particularly as related to Civil War sites. Paul A. Shackel's *Memory and Black in White: Race, Commemoration, and the Post-Bellum Landscape* (2003) offers several case studies of the subtle, or sometimes explicit, effects of historical memory. Shackel, for instance, examines the varying meanings and interpretations of 54th Massachusetts monument. Edward Tabor Linenthal also addresses issues of memory and culture at several historic sites. In his seminal *Sacred Ground: Americans and Their Battlefields* (1991), he outlines the process of "veneration, defilement, and redefinition" at five of America's famous battles: Lexington/Concord, Pearl Harbor, Little Big Horn, Gettysburg, and the Alamo.²³ Linenthal provides a thumbnail sketch of Gettysburg's history, including preservation, commemoration, and reunion.

Civil War memory is a rapidly growing subfield within Civil War historiography. Two of the best works on the Lost Cause ideology are Gaines Foster's *Ghosts of the Confederacy: Defeat, the Lost Cause, and the Emergence of the New South, 1865-1913* (1988) and Charles Reagan Wilson's *Baptized in Blood: The Religion of the Lost Cause, 1865-1920* (1983). They offer differing conclusions on the creation of the Lost Cause ideology and the influence and role of the defeated Confederate nation in the New South. Another early work to take on the issue of Civil War memory is Nina Silber's *The Romance of Reunion: Northerners and the South, 1865 – 1900* (1993). Silber offers a cultural history of the reconciliation era, and examines how Northerners cultivated images of reunion, often grounded in perceived notions of gender and

Legacy of the Civil War is a short, reflective essay, Robert Penn Warren, *The Legacy of the Civil War* (New York: Random House, 1961).

²³ Edward Tabor Linenthal, *Sacred Ground: Americans and Their Battlefields* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1991), 1.

honor. Kirk Savage's *Standing Soldiers, Kneeling Slaves: Race, War, and Monument in Nineteenth Century America* (1997) is a phenomenal study of efforts to depict slavery and emancipation in monuments and sculptures in the years following the Confederate defeat. Savage concludes Reconstruction failed politically, economically, and socially, as well as the country's inability to effectively commemorate the struggle of African Americans.²⁴

The foremost work on Civil War memory, however is David Blight's *Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory* (2001). Blight outlines the process in which Americans remember the country's most divisive and tragic era. Defining three themes of memory-- reconciliationist, white supremacist, and emancipationist-- Blight probes the relations between race and reunion between 1865 and 1915. He concludes that the prevailing memory of the Civil War was, and remains, the reconciliationist view, where white southerners and white northerners reconciled, often at the expense of African Americans and their role in the Civil War. Published two years after Blight's work, *Legacy of Disunion: The Enduring Significance of the American Civil War*, a volume edited by Susan-Mary Grant and Peter J. Parish, offers a compilation of essays that explore the myth, memory, and legacy of the Civil War.²⁵

The Civil War in film has also received attention among scholars. Melvyn Stokes explores the portrayal of the war by Hollywood in "The Civil War in Movies." Focusing on the most popular films such as *Gone with the Wind*, *Red Badge of Courage*, and *Birth of a Nation*,

²⁴ Gaines Foster, *Ghosts of the Confederacy: Defeat, the Lost Cause, and the Emergence of the New South, 1865-1913* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988); Charles Reagan Wilson, *Baptized in Blood: The Religion of the Lost Cause, 1865-1920* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1983); Nina Silber, *The Romance of Reunion: Northerners and the South, 1865 - 1900* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993); Kirk Savage, *Standing Soldiers, Kneeling Slaves: Race, War, and Monument in Nineteenth Century America* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997).

²⁵ David Blight, *Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001); Susan-Mary Grant and Peter J. Parish, ed., *Legacy of Disunion: The Enduring Significance of the American Civil War* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2003).

Stokes examines some of the common myths perpetrated in film. In the fall of 1990, Ken Burns's *The Civil War*, produced by PBS, quickly became one of the most popular and influential films on the war. Some historians, however, criticized Burns' portrayal of the war, noting historical inaccuracies and interpretive issues. This is the subject of Robert Brent Toplin's edited volume *Ken Burns's The Civil War: Historians Respond*. In a more recent work, Gary Gallagher also offers a discussion of the Civil War in film in *Causes Lost Won and Forgotten: How Hollywood and Popular Art Shape What We Know About The Civil War*.²⁶

Expanding beyond Civil War battlefields, post-war commemoration, and the development and perpetuation of Civil War memory, there's a vibrant genre on the creation of American memory. One of the pioneering works is John Bodnar's *Remaking America: Public Memory, Commemoration, and Patriotism in the Twentieth Century* (1992), which examines the construction of public memory. Bodnar devotes an entire chapter to the role of the National Park Service in shaping public memory and how the agency "fostered a triumph of a public memory that served the cause of a powerful nation state." Michael Kammen's *Mystic Chords of Memory: The Transformation of Tradition in American Culture* (1993) offers a broader understanding on Americans' effort in shaping a collective memory for the nation.²⁷

The issue of slavery is one of the more controversial topics that public historians, including Gettysburg's staff, are faced with presenting to the public. *Slavery and Public History: the Tough Stuff of American Memory*, edited by James Oliver Horton and Lois E. Horton offers a

²⁶ Melvyn Stokes, "The Civil War in the Movies," in Susan-Mary Grant and Peter J. Parish, ed., *Legacy of Disunion: The Enduring Significance of the American Civil War* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2003); Robert Brent Toplin, ed. *Ken Burns's The Civil War: Historians Respond* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996); Gary Gallagher, *Causes Lost Won and Forgotten: How Hollywood and Popular Art Shape What We Know About The Civil War* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 2008).

²⁷ John Bodnar, *Remaking America: Public Memory, Commemoration, and Patriotism in the Twentieth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), 205; Michael Kammen, *Mystic Chords of Memory: The Transformation of Tradition in American Culture* (New York: Knopf Press, 1991).

compilation of essays by noted historians that explores the discussion of slavery in the public realm. Dwight T. Pitcaithley, former NPS Chief Historian, contributes “‘A Cosmic Threat’: The National Park Service Addresses the Causes of the American Civil War.” He discusses how the issue of slavery and secession are presented at Civil War sites, and explores the recent Congressional mandate that the NPS include a discussion of slavery in their interpretation. In the wake of the 2000 NPS Appropriations that mandated a broader interpretation of the Civil War, the NPS sponsored the “Rally on the High Ground” conference in May 2000. The proceedings of this conference were published in 2001 by Eastern National and include the key speaker’s presentations as well as the question and answer period.²⁸

Several historians also have examined the commemoration of war. Joseph Mayo’s *War Memorials as Political Landscape* (1988) explores the use of war memorials, battlefields, statues, or monuments, as political and commemorative symbols. He argues that their meaning and symbolism is not static, but instead changes over time as social and political circumstances dictate. G. Kurt Piehler’s *Remembering War the American Way* examines how Americans commemorate war and argues that “memory of war remains central to the creation of the national identity.” Providing adequate attention to all American wars starting from the Revolution and ending at Vietnam, Piehler defines Civil War commemoration era as a key moment how Americans remembered military conflicts, particularly as the federal government

²⁸ James Oliver Horton and Lois E. Horton, ed., *Slavery and Public History: The Tough Stuff of American Memory* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006). In addition to Pitcaithley other contributors include: Ira Berlin, David Blight, James Oliver Horton, John Michael Vlach, Gary Nash, Joanne Melish, Lois Horton, Marie Tyler-McGraw, Bruce Levine, and Edward Linenthal; Robert K. Sutton, ed., *Rally on the High Ground: The National Park Service Symposium on the Civil War* (Eastern National, 2001). Guest speakers to this conference include Congressman Jesse Jackson, Jr, Ira Berlin, David Blight, Edward Linenthal, James McPherson, James Oliver Norton, Drew Gilpin Faust, and Eric Foner. In a similar vein, Edward Linenthal and Tom Engelhardt’s *Enola Gay and Other Battles for the American Past* (New York : Metropolitan Books, 1996) explores similarly controversial issues, including the controversy surrounding the Smithsonian’s desire to display the fuselage of the World War II plane the *Enola Gay* that dropped the atomic bomb on Hiroshima in August 1945.

began to play an active role in marking the graves of Union soldiers, and eventually preserving key battlefields. While Piehler discusses broad trends in remembering America's wars, Sarah J. Purcell focuses on the memory of the American Revolution in *Sealed with Blood: War, Sacrifice, and Memory in Revolutionary America* (2002). Like Piehler, Purcell places military conflict, and specifically the American Revolution, at the center of American nationalism. Specifically, she examines how the War for Independence was portrayed in public culture between 1775 and 1825, including local community commemorations, memorials, sermons, and theatrical plays. This collective remembrance helped to create a public memory of the American Revolution and engendered a national identity. Purcell argues that the romanticism of the post Civil-War reconciliation era found its roots in the creation of the memory of the American Revolution.²⁹

Besides examining the process of commemoration and creation of memory at Civil War sites and monuments, historians have addressed similar issues at other historical sites. For example, Richard Handler and Eric Gable's *The New History in an Old Museum: Creating the Past at Colonial Williamsburg* (1997), examines the establishment and administration of Colonial Williamsburg. Taking an ethnographic approach, Handler and Gable offer a critical analysis of Colonial Williamsburg, concluding that the site fails to effectively and realistically interpret the colonial era, but instead serves as a theme park that offers escape and entertainment.

²⁹ Joseph Mayo, *War Memorials as Political Landscape: The American Experience and Beyond* (New York: Praeger, 1988); G. Kurt Piehler, *Remembering War the American Way* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1995), 8; Sarah J. Purcell, *Sealed With Blood: War, Sacrifice, and Memory in Revolutionary America* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002). In addition to the study of the commemoration of war in American history, an equally deep scholarship exists on the commemoration of European wars, especially on the memory of World War I. Jay Winter stands as the dominant historian on the memory of World War I. These works include: Paul Fussell, *The Great War and Modern Memory* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1975); Jay Winter, *The Great War and the British People* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1986); Jay Winter, *Sites of Memory, Sites of Mourning: the Great War in European Cultural History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998); Jay Winter, *The Experience of World War I* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989); Jay Winter and Emmanuel Sivan, ed., *War and Remembrance in the Twentieth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999); Jay Winter, and Antoine Prost, *The Great War in History: Debates and Controversies, 1914 to the Present* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005); Jay Winter, *Remembering War: The Great War Between Memory and History in the Twentieth Century* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006).

The authors argue that Colonial Williamsburg provides a sanitized version of American history, avoiding controversial issues such as slavery, and label the Virginia site a “Republican Disneyland.” In two different works, Edward Linenthal examines the process of remembering, commemorating, and interpreting tragedy in American history. *The Unfinished Bombing: Oklahoma City in American Memory* (2001) is a study of the shock, differing memories, and commemoration of the 1995 bombing of Oklahoma City and subsequent trial and execution of Timothy McVeigh. In *Preserving Memory: The Struggle to Create America’s Holocaust Museum* (2001) Linenthal outlines the creation, and subsequent controversies, of the Holocaust Museum in Washington, D.C.³⁰

A more narrow scholarship exists on the history of the National Park Service as a federal agency and protector of America’s cultural and historic sites. Former NPS Director Conrad Wirth has written a valuable history of the Park Service in *Parks, Politics, and the People* (1980). He discusses the establishment of the National Park Service, the influence of the New Deal and the Civilian Conservation Corps upon the agency, and MISSION 66. Another work on the agency’s history is Ronald A. Foresta’s *America’s National Parks and Their Keepers*, which presents a comprehensive introduction to the agency, its mission, and fundamental changes, including the New Deal and MISSION 66.³¹

Freeman Tilden, while not a NPS employee, became one of the agency’s most influential figures on his studies in interpretation and public education. His work, *The National Parks*, is essentially an encyclopedia of the National Parks that includes short descriptions of each park.

³⁰ Richard Handler and Eric Gable, *The New History in an Old Museum: Creating the Past at Colonial Williamsburg* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1997); Edward Linenthal, *The Unfinished Bombing: Oklahoma City in American Memory* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001); Edward Linenthal, *Preserving Memory: The Struggle to Create America’s Holocaust Museum* (New York: Viking Press, 1995).

³¹ Conrad L. Wirth, *Parks, Politics, and the People* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1980); Ronald A. Foresta, *America’s National Parks and Their Keepers* (Washington, D.C., : Resources for the Future, 1984).

His seminal work is *Interpreting Our Heritage*, which offers a collection of essays on the craft and art of interpretation. Since its publication in 1957, his work has stood as a monumental work for NPS Interpretive Rangers. In *National Parks: The American Experience*, Alfred Runte, a former director of the Institute of Environmental Studies at Baylor University, writes on the establishment of the National Park Service, with an emphasis on its role as a conservation agency. In doing so, Runte turns his attention primarily towards Western parks and cultural sites and pays minimal attention to Civil War and historical parks.³²

Other works focus on the problems within the National Park Service. Among these is *National Parks for a New Generation: Visions, Realities, Prospects*, an official report issued from the Conservation Foundation, sponsored by the Richard King Mellon Foundation. The Conservation Foundation commissioned this study to explore critical issues facing the National Park system, including land use, maintenance of resources, excessive visitor use, and fiscal constraints. Four parks were studied in detail, including the Civil War battlefield of Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania National Military Park. Finally, an edited volume by Eugenia Horstman Connally, *National Parks in Crisis*, is a collection of essays that calls attention to the problems and threats within the agency. In this collection, Robert Meinhard offers a brief discussion of problems faced by Civil War battlefields in “Battlefields Under Fire.”³³

Harlan Unrau and G. Frank Williss’ “To Preserve the Nation’s Past: The Growth of Historic Preservation in the National Park Service during the 1930s” generically traces the

³² Freeman Tilden, *The National Parks* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1976); Freeman Tilden, *Interpreting Our Heritage* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1957). UNC Press has recently reprinted *Interpreting Our Heritage* for a 2008 publication; Alfred Runte, *National Parks: The American Experience* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1979).

³³ Richard King Mellon, *National Parks for a New Generation: Visions, Realities, Prospects*, (Washington, D.C.,: The Conservation Fund, 1985); Eugenia Horstman Connally, ed., *National Parks in Crisis* (Washington, D.C.,: National Parks & Conservation Association, 1982).

expansion of the agency acquiring historic sites. The authors emphasize the influence of Horace A. Albright, director of the NPS from 1929 to 1933, for setting the agency “on a new course in historic preservation destined to influence greatly the future growth and direction of the National Park system.” Included during this unprecedented expansion was the acquisition of Civil War battlefields from the War Department. Once these sites were acquired, the agency had to develop a method of historical interpretation, which is the subject of Barry Mackintosh’s “The National Park Service Moves into Historical Interpretation.” Mackintosh emphasizes the significance of the New Deal programs in channeling funds to parks to construct visitor centers and to hire historical technicians. He acknowledges that the Park Service was successful at the newly acquired Civil War sites to interpret the battle’s tactical information, but struggled to meet visitor’s expectations and contextual interpretation. Former chief historian of the Park Service Edwin C. Bearss’s “The National Park Service and Its History Program: 1864-1986: An Overview” offers a simple recitation of the development and evolution of the agency’s interpretation.³⁴

An understanding of American tourism is also pertinent to a discussion of the National Park Service and Gettysburg National Military Park. A few scholars have explored the “tourists” and their place in society and leisure vacation. For example, John A. Jakle discusses one of the first understandings of park visitors in *The Tourist: Travel in the Twentieth-Century* (1985). Studying the first sixty years of the twentieth century, he finds that tourism was not an indicator of social change, but instead became a “precipitator of changing social values.” Most evident

³⁴ Harlan D. Unrau and G. Frank Williss, “To Preserve the Nation’s Past: The Growth of Historic Preservation in the National Park Service during the 1930s,” *The Public Historian* 9, no. 2 (Spring 1987): 19-49, 20; Barry Mackintosh, “The National Park Service Moves into Historical Interpretation,” *The Public Historian* 9, no. 2 (Spring 1987): 51-63; Edwin C. Bearss, “The National Park Service and Its History Program: 1864-1986: An Overview,” *The Public Historian* 9, no. 2 (Spring 1987): 10-18.

example of changing social values was the increase of the family automobile, and the subsequent proliferation of the interstate highway system, which gave Americans' geographic mobility to travel and made tourism a genuine industry.³⁵

Several historians have offered discussions of tourism. Dean MacCannell's *The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class* (1999) offers a key theoretical and anthropological perspective of the tourist. His purpose is to understand the role of the tourist in modern society. Offering a slightly different interpretation, and in a more recent work, Susan Sessions Rugh explores the cultural history of the white, middle-class American family during the post World War II era, the "golden age" of family vacations. Her narrative concludes in the 1970s when she sees a decline of family road trips. Other works on tourism focus on particular regions. For example, Blake Harrison's *The View from Vermont: Tourism and the Making of an American Rural Landscape* (2006) offers a case-study in tourism in the Green Mountain State. Hal Rothman's *Devil's Bargains: Tourism in the Twentieth-Century American West* (1998) examines the economic, social, and cultural implications of tourism in the American west by focusing on popular sites including the Grand Canyon, Santa Fe, and Las Vegas, as well as ski areas and dude ranches.³⁶

In the context of this historiography, this dissertation will briefly examine the early administrators of the battlefield, the Gettysburg Battlefield Memorial Association and the War

³⁵ John A. Jakle, *The Tourist: Travel in the Twentieth-Century* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1985); Warren James Belasco, *Americans on the Road: From Autocamp to Motel, 1910-1945* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1979). Belasco offers a discussion of American automobile tourism from the introduction of the automobile in 1910 through the immediate end of World War II. He offers a discussion of facilities that support the automobile tourist, namely autocamps and the development of hotels.

³⁶ Dean MacCannell, *The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999); Susan Sessions Rugh, *Are We There Yet: The Golden Age of American Family Vacations* (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 2008), 2; Blake Harrison, *The View From Vermont: Tourism and the Making of an American Rural Landscape* (Burlington: University of Vermont Press, 2006); Hal Rothman, *Devil's Bargains: Tourism in the Twentieth-Century American West* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas), 1998.

Department, but primarily will focus on the acquisition, administration, and alterations by the National Park Service from 1933 through 2009. Underlying themes include the National Park Service's physical management of the park, particularly how the battlefield resources were treated and why; and second, the Park Service's intellectual management of the park, namely how interpretive themes have changed and why.

The history of the Gettysburg National Military Park between 1933 through 2009 is a story that must be told. Gettysburg holds the distinction of being the most visited battlefield in the United States and perhaps the world. The popularity of the site alone makes a study of Gettysburg a valuable contribution to the Civil War scholarship. Each year nearly two million visitors come to Gettysburg, more than Antietam, Chancellorsville, Fredericksburg, Wilson's Creek, Appomattox, Perryville, or Kennesaw Mountain. The National Park Service at Gettysburg is thus encumbered with an enormous responsibility to educate the public not only on the battle, but also the Civil War. For many individuals Gettysburg is *the* Civil War, and their visit to the Pennsylvania battlefield may be their only experience at a Civil War battlefield. Moreover, it is a fitting and proper time to examine the management philosophy at Gettysburg because controversial policies recently implemented at Gettysburg frequently have set the standard for administrative practices at other Civil War sites. The most recent management dilemma sought to provide improved preservation for the site's artifacts and expanded interpretative opportunities in the face of increasingly constrained federal allocations. To solve these management issues the National Park Service partnered with the Gettysburg Foundation for the creation of a multi-million dollar visitor center and museum.

The first chapter will briefly outline the early preservation efforts by the GBMA and subsequent management by the United States War Department. Commonly referred to as the

“veteran’s era,” this time period has already received some attention from Timothy Smith and Amy Kinsel. This chapter will set the foundation of how the park was first preserved and interpreted, in order to appreciate the administration by the National Park Service from 1933 through 2009. A key point in philosophy is to recognize and appreciate that the early administrators and preservationists of the battlefield were veterans, not government officials. War veterans, led by Emor B. Cope painstakingly marked unit positions, oversaw the placement of various regimental monuments, and in doing, so set forth precedent how the battlefield would be interpreted and how the battle would be remembered.

The second chapter will focus on the Park Service’s acquisition of Gettysburg National Military Park from the War Department in 1933 and its early management of the park until 1941. This chapter finds that during the Park Service’s first eight years of administering Gettysburg, park officials implemented an unprecedented amount of changes that drastically and permanently altered the battlefield’s landscape and integrity. Some of the changes, principally advancements in education and improvements to the park infrastructure, benefited the battlefield’s preservation and interpretation objectives. Other changes, for instance to the Soldiers’ National Cemetery and the agricultural landscape, adversely impacted the historical integrity of the famous fields made sacred by the blood and devotion of the soldiers. During the Park Service’s first ten years preservation efforts fell considerably short and committed what preservationists would later consider egregious errors.

The third chapter will examine the Gettysburg Battlefield during the Second World War. Although the battlefield remained geographically removed from the shores of Iwo Jima or the beaches of Normandy, America’s involvement in World War II had an indelible influence on how the battlefield was operated, managed, and even remembered. Military necessity brought

significant changes to the battlefield, namely the establishment of a German prisoner of war camp located on the fields of Pickett's Charge and the collection of Civil War ordnance for scrap drives. Meanwhile, Americans found solace in the sacrifices of the Union and Confederate soldiers and equal comfort in the words and inspiration of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address. Between 1941 and 1945 the Civil War battlefield became a platform of patriotic expression, as orators and guest speakers commonly invoked the sacrifices of these men to bolster American's support for the current war.

In the aftermath of World War II the domestic economy surged. Americans, in their newly purchased automobiles, took to the highways and began to explore and vacation. National Park Service sites received a dramatic increase in visitation and officials quickly realized that many parks were ill-equipped to meet the demands of the large number of visitors. The fourth chapter, 1946 to 1955, examines this period of post-war visitation and Gettysburg's struggles to provide quality visitor services and interpretation in the wake of fiscal constraint.

National Park Service officials readily recognized that significant changes were necessary in the nation's parks. Chapter 5 explores MISSION 66 and how its initiatives were implemented at Gettysburg. Most significantly, federal money from MISSION 66 provided the necessary funds to construct a new visitor center, to improve park roads, trails, wayside exhibits, and to build an outdoor amphitheater. Following tourism trends established in the post-war era, Gettysburg experienced a dramatic surge in commercialization. Hotels, restaurants, souvenir stands, and private commercialized museums now dotted the battlefield landscape and the surrounding area. Within the larger context of the Cold War, visiting Gettysburg also became a way to reaffirm American patriotism during the anti-Communist era.

In the context of the surge of Cold War patriotism and MISSION 66 America celebrated the centennial anniversary of the Civil War between 1961 and 1965 at various national battlefields. Chapter 6 explores these celebrations and the influence of the \$1 million MISSION 66 funding. While several battlefield sites offered centennial activities, including Manassas, Antietam, Vicksburg, and Chickamauga, none captivated the nation more than those held at Gettysburg in July 1963. The celebrations at Gettysburg were certainly the “High Water Mark” of the centennial. Yet while the centennial emphasized a theme of “A Nation United,” the reality remained much different. During the centennial, orators used the battlefield, once again, to advance a particular agenda on the issue of Civil Rights and full emancipation of the African Americans. For millions of Americans the “new birth of freedom” had not yet been delivered.

During Gettysburg’s centennial year in 1963, and for the first time in the history of Gettysburg National Military Park, over two million people visited the battlefield. Impressed with the surge in visitation, park officials expected visitation to reach five million within the ensuing years. Chapter 7 explores the decade after the centennial, 1966-1976, in which park officials undertook a long-range planning initiative to better protect the park’s resources and provide enhanced interpretation. They explored revised tour routes, interpretive objectives, landscape management, and just years after the opening of the Gettysburg Visitor-Cyclorama Center, proposed the construction of a new information facility. Meanwhile, commercialization continued to pervade the battlefield, which manifested itself in the grand opening of the Gettysburg National Tower in 1974. Two years later, in July 1976, thousands of Americans once again gathered at Gettysburg to celebrate the birth of the nation, as well as America’s new birth of freedom at Gettysburg.

Chapter 8, covering the period 1977-1988, continues the story of Gettysburg's planning initiative. In 1982, the National Park Service produced a *General Management Plan (GMP)* that articulated a management philosophy for Gettysburg National Military Park, leading the park into the final years of the 20th century. Probably the most controversial aspect of these plans was the "Devil's Den bypass," which recommended the closure of this area to automobile traffic. Superintendent John Earnst was determined to push the bypass plan through, and by 1988 his support with the local community had plummeted. Meanwhile, the battle's 125th anniversary, whose theme "Let Us Have Peace" only seemed to underscore the divisiveness within the Gettysburg community. After fourteen years as superintendent at Gettysburg National Military Park, Earnst announced that he would leave. His successor, Daniel Kuehn, immediately reversed the bypass concept, and in doing so quickly improved relations with the Gettysburg community.

The four-year period between 1989 and 1994, the focus of Chapter 9, became another highly contentious period in the history of the Gettysburg battlefield. The Park Service proposed an ill-conceived Memorial Landscape Philosophy and considered a land proposal that revised the boundary of Gettysburg National Military Park. In light of this proposal, the National Park Service executed a land exchange with Gettysburg College that resulted in the destruction of the Seminary Ridge railroad cut, which outraged many in the country. By 1994 park officials seemed to have lost all credibility with the American public.

In the midst of this controversy, John Latschar arrived as the new superintendent in August 1994. Chapter 10 explores the period of 1995 through 1997, a short, but critical era in the history of the battlefield. Public relations continued to deteriorate when the NPS announced its decision to implement a white-tailed deer program that called for the "removal" of hundreds of deer living within the battlefield. More significantly to the long-term vision of the battlefield,

however, was the proposal offered by a local businessman, Robert Monahan, to build the park a new visitor center through the creation of a non-profit partner. Public anger over the non-competitive selection of a partner, however, forced the Park Service to reexamine its planning goals. Once again, Gettysburg embarked a monumental planning initiative, which resulted in the release of the *Draft Development Concept Plan, Environmental Assessment: Collections Storage, Visitor and Museum Facilities (Draft, DCP)*, in April 1996. Determined to pursue a new museum to better preserve the park's artifacts and to better interpret the battle, the Park Service released a *Request for Proposals* in December 1997 that solicited designs for a new museum. On November 6, 1997, NPS Director Robert Stanton approved the Robert Kinsley of Kinsley Equities proposal.

Thereafter, the “great task” remaining before Gettysburg was the implementation and completion of a new museum and visitor center. Chapter 11 explores the three-year period of 1998 through 2000 when the Park Service undertook a herculean effort to plan the long-term future of Gettysburg National Military Park. These efforts culminated in the two-volume *General Management Plan*, released in June 1999. This *GMP* consisted of two fundamental philosophies: the construction of a new museum by creating a partnership with the Gettysburg Foundation, and a landscape rehabilitation program to restore the battlefield to its 1863 appearance. The controversy and divisiveness of these policies further underscored the significance of the Battle of Gettysburg and the battlefield to the American people.

Beginning in 2001 and through 2009, the Park Service and the Foundation sought to implement the vision articulated in the *GMP*. The final chapter explores the multitudes of efforts that culminated in the grand opening of the \$103 million Gettysburg Visitor Center and Museum and the \$12 million restoration of the Gettysburg Cyclorama on September 26-28, 2008. At the

same time, Gettysburg worked toward achieving its second goal as outlined in the *GMP*, the rehabilitation of the battlefield. By 2009, Gettysburg continued a rehabilitation project unparalleled not only in the history of the battlefield, but also within the National Park Service. The project included the removal of 576 acres of non-historic woodlots, completed “health cuts” in 381.70 acres of historic woodlots, the replanting of 110 acres of historic orchards at 35 different sites, and the reestablishment of 12.07 miles of historic fence patterns. By 2009, thanks to the leadership of Superintendent John Latschar and his staff, visitors to the battlefield saw a landscape relatively consistent with what the Union and Confederate soldiers saw in 1863.

Standing on Little Round Top, the pivotal Union left flank, at the dedication of the 20th Maine Regimental Marker in 1889, Colonel Joshua Lawrence Chamberlain noted, “In great deeds something abides. On great fields something stays.” The National Park Service has had the enormous task of preserving and administrating the “great field” at Gettysburg and the monumental task of interpreting and commemorating the “great deeds” of 170,000 Union and Confederate soldiers. A closer look at the history of the Gettysburg battlefield is not only “fitting and proper,” but also a much needed addition to the Civil War scholarship.

Chapter 1

“We Are Met On A Great Battlefield”:

The Gettysburg Battlefield, 1863-1933

“No doubt the news of the great three days battle of Gettysburg has resounded throughout the land and fill many a heart with mourning,” wrote William Calder of the 2nd North Carolina to his mother on July 18, 1863. A Union veteran offered a similar sentiment, “How many widows and orphans were made by that battle God only knows. It was without the doubt the bloodiest and most terrific battle of the war,” declared Lieutenant Frank Haskell, a Union staff officer in the 2nd Corps in a letter to his brother. Haskell concluded, “The battle of Gettysburg is distinguished in this war...as by far the greatest and severest conflict that has occurred.”¹

The words of Private Calder and Lieutenant Haskell typified the sentiments of other Union and Confederate soldiers who fought in the battle of Gettysburg on July 1-3, 1863. The Civil War was now entering its third summer by the time Robert E. Lee’s Army of Northern Virginia met General George G. Meade’s Army of the Potomac at a small crossroads in south-central Pennsylvania, and never had the country witnessed a battle as large, bloody, or deadly as the three-day engagement at Gettysburg. The number of casualties at the end of the battle totaled 51,000, including 10,000 killed, over 30,000 wounded, and nearly 11,000 missing or prisoners of war. For the 2,400 residents living in the small town of Gettysburg and the surrounding countryside, life would never be the same.

¹ William Calder, to mother, July 8, 1863, William Calder Papers, Southern Historical Collections, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill; Frank Aretas Haskell, *The Battle of Gettysburg* (Commandery of the State of Massachusetts, Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States, Boston, 1908), 80.

As Lee's defeated Army of Northern Virginia retreated back across the Potomac River, local residents struggled to regain some semblance of living. The aftermath of battle left field crops consumed or else ruined, fences destroyed, and wells contaminated from decayed human and animal corpses. Wounded soldiers recovered in homes and public buildings, while dead soldiers lay haphazardly buried in shallow graves on the fields where they fell. Surrounded by unimaginable tragedy and death, local residents initiated efforts to establish a cemetery for the fallen Union soldiers. David Wills, a local attorney, purchased twelve acres on behalf of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and seventeen other northern states who had lost soldiers in the battle for the creation of a proper burial of their fallen sons. Wills selected the high ground of Cemetery Hill, which had figured prominently into the Union army's battle line, but was also adjacent to the Evergreen Cemetery, the town's civilian cemetery. Upon selecting and purchasing the ground, Wills arranged to have noted Scottish horticulturist William Saunders design the burial ground. Within weeks, a reburial crew led by Samuel Weaver, disinterred the Union bodies from their primitive battlefield graves and reinterred them in the new cemetery.

Underscoring the North's collective understanding of the magnitude of the events on the Pennsylvania farm fields, approximately 20,000 spectators braved the cold fall day to witness the dedication of the Soldiers' National Cemetery. On November 19, 1863, Boston orator Edward Everett offered the key-note dedication speech that lasted nearly two hours. Thereafter, President Abraham Lincoln delivered a "few appropriate remarks." In a mere two minutes, Lincoln's Gettysburg Address captured the enormity and horror of the Civil War, while offering a "final resting place" for the 3,512 soldiers who "gave their lives that that nation might live."²

² The best work on the aftermath of the Battle of Gettysburg is Gregory A. Coco's *A Strange and Blighted Land: Gettysburg, the Aftermath of the Battle* (Gettysburg: Thomas Publications, 1998). For additional reading on President Lincoln's Gettysburg Address see, Garry Wills, *Lincoln at Gettysburg: The Words That Remade America* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1992).

In the wake of the establishment of the Soldiers' National Cemetery, local residents, led by another local attorney, David McConaughy, spearheaded efforts to preserve key terrain from the fields of battle. On August 9, 1863, McConaughy noted that "there could be no more fitting and expressive memorial of the heroic valor and signal triumphs of our Army... than the Battlefield itself." State officials agreed and on April 30, 1864, less than one year after the battle, the Pennsylvania legislature chartered the Gettysburg Battlefield Memorial Association (GBMA), the battlefield's first preservation organization. The charter established the GBMA to "hold and preserve, the battle-grounds of Gettysburg, on which were fought the actions of the first, second, and third days of July...with the natural and artificial defenses, as they were at the time of said battle."³ This charter represented the articulation of a first preservation philosophy at the Gettysburg battlefield that future administrators attempted to implement.

The GBMA commission, which consisted mainly of local residents, guided the formation of the battlefield in its early years. Essentially this organization focused its efforts on three issues. First, because the battle was fought on dozens of farmsteads and nearly twenty five square miles, the commissioners sought to purchase lands associated with the battle. Within one year of its establishment, the GBMA had acquired seventy-five acres. Two years later, in 1866, the association purchased an additional twenty-nine acres at the Round Tops and four acres where Major General John Reynolds fell on the morning of July 1. The GBMA proudly reported that the grounds would remain as they were at the time of the battle, and urged further acquisition of other properties, while appealing to "patriotic citizens" to donate money for such

³ David McConaughy, to Hon. Jos. R. Ingersoll, August 19, 1863. Vertical Files, 11-29 B, Gettysburg National Military Park Library [hereinafter cited as VF, GNMP Library]; Harlan D. Unrau, *Administrative History: Gettysburg National Military Park and Gettysburg National Cemetery* (Denver: Branch of Publications and Graphic Design, Denver Service Center, 1991), 41.

purchases. Second, the commissioners supervised the placement of the earliest monument and markers. In 1879 veterans of the 2nd Massachusetts dedicated the Army of the Potomac's first regimental monument near Spangler's Spring. Third, the commissioners also developed the battlefield's first tour routes, having constructed twenty miles of rudimentary avenues along the Union battle line and named them to honor selected Union generals.⁴

The GBMA's preservation efforts were commendable. Yet hindered by a lack of money and a strict enabling legislation, the association was only able to purchase land on the Army of the Potomac's battle line, while the Confederate battle line remained in private hands. Facing financial restraints, the association eagerly sought Federal intervention in the 1890s. In what Timothy Smith terms the "golden age of battlefield preservation," Congress authorized the establishment of five Civil War battlefields to be administered by the War Department: Chickamauga and Chattanooga (1890), Antietam (1890), Shiloh (1894), Vicksburg (1899), and Gettysburg in 1895.⁵

The War Department's purpose in acquiring Civil War battlefields was threefold: preservation of the historic fields; purposeful molding the grounds as a commemorative landscape; and utilization of the battlefields for military study and training. It was not coincidental that the federal government's first initiative in battlefield preservation paralleled an

⁴ Address of the Gettysburg Battle-Field Memorial Association, April 24, 1866. VF, 11-30, GNMP Library; "Minutes of the Gettysburg Battlefield Memorial Association," 1872-1875. Bound volume in the GNMP Library; John Vanderslice, *Gettysburg Then and Now: The Field of American Valor, Where and How the Regiments Fought, And the Troops They Encountered, An Account of the Battle, Giving Movements, Positions, and Losses of the Commands Engaged* (New York: G.W. Dillingham, 1899); John Vanderslice, *Gettysburg: A History of the Gettysburg Battle-field Memorial Association With an Account of the Battle* (Philadelphia: The Association, 1897). McConaughy remained an active member of the GBMA commission, serving as vice-president.

⁵ Ronald F. Lee, "The Origin and Evolution of the National Military Park Idea" (Office of Historic Preservation, Washington, D.C.: Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1973), Gettysburg National Military Park Library, 13. This report is a summary of the Park Service's efforts to acquire the battlefields under the War Department's management.

era of sectional reconciliation. Ignoring the causes of secession and the consequences of emancipation, white northerners and southerners sought a common cause to preserve and memorialize the war's battlefields. David Blight concluded that reconciliation was the "dominant mode" of Civil War memory through the early twentieth century. Considered the defining work in Civil War memory, Blight outlines three competing visions of memory: Reconciliation (centered on the honoring the war's soldiers without attention to the war's causes or results); white supremacist (the white South's "Lost Cause" tradition); and the emancipationist (African American's distinct remembrance of the war and emancipation). Triumphant nationalistic sentiment, reconciliation heralded the bravery of Union and Confederate soldiers and honored their sacrifices and paved the way into the future. The preservation and commemoration of the war's battlefields became a critical element in reconciliation. Timothy Smith argues that "never before had American battlefields been preserved so extensively." Several factors collided to allow for this "golden age of preservation," but mainly decreasing animosities over Reconstruction, Reconciliation sentiment, and veterans' growing influence in state and federal politics.⁶

In order to prepare for the transfer of the GBMA holdings to the War Department, the Secretary of War Daniel Lamont, in May 1893, appointed three men to a newly created park commission, organized to administer the daily functions and development of the battlefield. The first commission included Colonel John P. Nicholson, a Union veteran; Brigadier General

⁶ David Blight, *Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory* (Cambridge: Harvard University, 2001), 381; Timothy B. Smith, *The Golden Age of Battlefield Preservation: The Decade of the 1890s and the Establishment of America's First Five Military Parks* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee, 2008), 28. *The Golden Age of Battlefield Preservation* currently stands as the leading work on the establishment of the Civil War parks. Smith's comparative approach allows readers to see how parks developed in comparison to another. Smith examines the establishment of the Civil War parks; the continual operation of the battlefields is beyond the scope of his scholarship. Much research remains to be done on how the park commissioners operated the battlefields through the late 19th century and early 20th century. Considerably more research needs to be done on the era between the park commissioners' management and the acquisition of the National Park Service—the transition era—when the parks were managed by the Quartermaster Department.

William H. Forney, a former Confederate; and John Bachelder, who had not fought in the battle, but observed it and later became the park's first historian. Two months later, Lamont appointed Colonel Emmor B. Cope to serve as the commission's chief engineer. Arriving in Gettysburg on July 17, 1893, Cope immediately undertook a vigorous project to survey the battlefield boundaries and park roads, constructed a series of teleford roads, marked the positions of Union and Confederate troops, produced a map of troop positions, and made the grounds accessible and enjoyable to park visitors.⁷

After appointing the commission, Lamont and the War Department moved to officially acquire the battlefield from the Gettysburg Battlefield Memorial Association. On December 6, 1894, New York Representative and former Union general Daniel E. Sickles, already a controversial figure in Gettysburg lore, introduced H. R. 8096. Also referred to as the Sickles Bill, it established Gettysburg National Military Park. With little debate, on February 11, 1895, Congress approved "An Act To Establish A National Military Park at Gettysburg, Pennsylvania." The Sickles Bill established the park boundaries at 3,331.5 acres. The GBMA formally deeded its 522 acres to the U.S. War Department, which then formally established

⁷ Colonel Nicholson served with the 28th Pennsylvania and Brigadier General Forney served with the 10th Alabama at the battle. John Bachelder traveled with the Army of the Potomac as a civilian reporter on the war's events. He was not present at the battle of Gettysburg, but arrived a few days after to begin writing the battle's first history. Forney and Bachelder died in 1894 and were replaced by William Robbins, veteran of the 4th Alabama, and Charles Richardson of the 126th New York. According to Major Robbin's journal, the commissioners received three hundred dollars a month for their services. For extensive, minute detail on the daily activities of the commissioners and the development of the Gettysburg Battlefield during the War Department era see, *Journal of William McKenna Robbins, Commissioner, Gettysburg National Park, 1898 to 1905*. The original diary is in the GNMP Archives and a transcript of the diary is held in the GNMP library. For additional reading on the establishment of the first five Civil War parks see, Timothy B. Smith, *The Golden Age of Battlefield Preservation: The Decade of the 1890s and the Establishment of America's First Five Military Parks* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2008). Thomas L. Schaefer, "If You See His Monument Look Around: E.B. Cope and the Gettysburg National Military Park" *Unsung Heroes of Gettysburg: Programs of the Fifth Annual Gettysburg Seminar* (National Park Service: Gettysburg National Military Park, 1996), 107-33; E. B. Cope, "Annual Report, 1893." Folder 1, Box 1, Engineer's Annual Reports, 1893 – 1921 (GETT 41121), Records of the Gettysburg National Park Commission, Office of the Commissioners, Gettysburg National Military Park Archives, 1 [hereinafter cited as (GETT 41121), GNMP Archives].

Gettysburg National Military Park as the third Civil War battlefield to be administered by the War Department.⁸

The battlefield's enabling legislation reflected the War Department's philosophy in managing the battlefield. The legislation provided the Secretary of War with the power to acquire lands that were "occupied by the infantry, cavalry, and artillery" on July 1, 2, 3, 1863 and "other adjacent lands as he may deem necessary to preserve the important topographical features of the battlefield." As stated, the purpose of acquiring such property was for the "preservation and marking of the lines of battle of the Union and Confederate armies at Gettysburg."⁹

Once the federal government acquired the Gettysburg battlefield, formally establishing the site as Gettysburg National Military Park, the park commission established a management philosophy that mirrored that formed by the Gettysburg Battlefield Memorial Association. Park commissioners initiated an aggressive management approach that revolved around four primary goals: to establish a road network, to mark the Federal and Confederate line of battle, to acquire private properties on the battlefield, and to restore the fields to their 1863 condition.

When the War Department took control of the battlefield, only primitive and often dirt roads provided limited access to the park grounds. Visitors who wished to see specific areas on the field, such as the Confederate line on Seminary Ridge, had to traverse through thick briar

⁸ Unrau, *Administrative History*, 78; Elihu Root, Secretary of War, to the Gettysburg National Park Commission, no date. Folder 1, Box 2, General Records, 1922 – 1933 (GETT 41155), U.S. War Department, Office of the Quartermaster General, Gettysburg National Military Park Archives [hereinafter cited as (GETT 41155), GNMP Archives]. Once the GBMA officially deeded its holdings to the War Department, the association was abolished. Like Gettysburg, a park commission, responsible for reporting to the Secretary of War, administered each newly acquired battlefield until its transfer to the National Park Service system.

⁹ *An Act to Establish a National Military Park at Gettysburg, Pennsylvania*, 28 Stat. 651, approved February 11, Gettysburg National Park Commission, "Office of the Commissioners, Record Books of Legislation, 1873-1921." Box 6, Gettysburg National Park Commission, (GETT 41122), Records of the Gettysburg National Park Commission, Gettysburg National Military Park Archives [hereinafter cited as (GETT 41122), GNMP Archives].

patches, high grass, or dense woodlots and foliage. Other sites remained completely inaccessible. Park commissioners wanted to make the entire battlefield accessible, and began a vigorous project to build an extensive road network and contracted with local laborers to perform the work. In 1895, just months after the transfer, laborers built teleford avenues along the main battle lines that allowed visitors to follow parts of the Confederate line along Seminary Ridge as well as the Union line along Cemetery Ridge toward the Wheatfield, the Valley of Death, and the western slopes of the Round Tops. By the turn of the century a significant part of the park's infrastructure had been built; over sixteen miles of roads existed, providing access to many of the battle's key sites.¹⁰

The commissioners also embarked upon the task of erecting markers for regiments, brigades, and divisions of both armies. They painstakingly placed "handsome tablets of iron" where the respective unit fought, ensuring the "utmost possible historic accuracy." Starting in 1894, in the spirit of reconciliation, many Union and Confederate veterans visited the park to help commissioners to mark accurately the positions of their units on the field. For example, on May 29, 1894 Colonel E. P. Alexander, the Confederate artillery officer in Lee's Army of Northern

¹⁰ Gettysburg National Military Park Commission, "Annual Report, 1895," in *Annual Reports to the Secretary of War, 1893 -1901*, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1902), 15 [hereinafter cited as GNPC, "Annual Reports," including the year's report and page number]. GNPC, "Annual Report, 1896," 21; GNPC, "Annual Report, 1898," 31; GNPC, "Annual Report, 1899," 37; GNPC, "Annual Report, 1901," 52. In 1896 and 1897, for example, park commissioners proudly boasted that slightly over seven miles of park roads had been built, including Seminary, Sickles, and Hancock Avenues, Slocum, Sedgwick, Sykes, and Meade Avenues. Most of the initial roads constructed were on the second and third days' battlegrounds, but in 1898 and 1899 laborers laid teleford roads on the first day's terrain, including Howard, Reynolds, Wadsworth, Doubleday, and Robinson Avenues. When these roads were constructed offers an insight into the popular sites of the battlefield. Often tourists flocked to the Soldiers' National Cemetery, Cemetery Hill, and the High Water Mark; very few ventured out to the first day's field because of its distance from the center of town and the train station. For an additional discussion on the development of the park roads as its influence on visitation and popular memory see, John Patterson, "From Battle Ground to Pleasure Ground: Gettysburg as a Historic Site," in *History Museums in the United States: A critical Assessment*, ed. Warren Leon and Roy Rosenzweig (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1989), 128-157; Jim Weeks, "Gettysburg: Display Window for Popular Memory," *Journal of American Culture* (Winter 1998), 21, 41-56; Benjamin Y. Dixon, "Gettysburg, A Living Battlefield," (Ph.D. diss., Oklahoma State University, 2000); and Jim Weeks, *Gettysburg: Memory, Market, and an American Shrine* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003).

Virginia who supervised the bombardment that preceded Pickett's Charge, toured the battlefield with E. B. Cope to indicate the position of the Confederate artillery during the battle. By 1895, with Alexander's assistance and other Confederate veterans, sixty-five Confederate artillery and infantry positions were marked. The War Department also moved to replace the wooden artillery carriages that the GBMA had erected with more durable cast iron carriages. Colonel E. A. Garlington's 1904 inspection report noted that 462 tablets and 324 guns with carriages were located on the battlefield. For ornamental and interpretive purposes ten-inch artillery shells, mounted in the form of a pyramid, were placed alongside the carriages.¹¹

Park commissioners viewed the battlefield itself as the primary interpretive tool. The unit markers and artillery carriages were simply to mark positions and to better explain the battle action to visitors. Toward the same end, in 1895, E. B. Cope designed five steel observation towers, which gave visitors a birds-eye view of the battlefield terrain. Park commissioners erected four of the towers, located on Big Round Top, Culp's Hill, Seminary Ridge near the Wheatfield Road, and Seminary Ridge near the Mummasburg Road that year. The fifth tower, located in Zeigler's Grove, went up the following year. Pleased with the tower's interpretive potential, the commissioners reported that "these are solid and well-built structures, and, located as they are, they afford the observer a complete and satisfactory view of the entire scene of the great battle and enable him to get a consistent and accurate idea of it as a whole."¹²

¹¹ GNPC, "Annual Report, 1896," 21-22; E. B. Cope "1894, Annual Report." Folder 2, Box 1, (GETT 41121), GNMP Archives, 6; E. B. Cope, "1895, Annual Report." Folder 2, Box 1, (GETT 41121), GNMP Archives, 1-2; Colonel E. A. Garlington, "Gettysburg National Park Inspection Report, November 1904, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1904).

¹² GNPC, "Annual Report, 1895," GNMP Library 16; GNPC, "Daily Journals, 1916." Box 25, Daily Journals, 1893 – 1921 (GETT 41144), Records of the Gettysburg National Park Commission, Office of the Commissioners, Gettysburg National Military Park Archives, 87 [hereinafter cited as (GETT 41144), GNMP Archives]; GNPC, "Annual Report, 1896," 23. Cope reported the cost of the four towers at \$ 2, 196.75 and the fifth tower at \$ 3, 260.00. The towers on Big Round Top and Culp's Hill were sixty feet high and the towers on Seminary Ridge were seventy-five feet high.

The GBMA, by the time it relinquished its claims to the War Department, had purchased 522 critical acres of the battlefield, but many of the battle's key areas remained in private ownership. One of the War Department's top priorities thus was to acquire private properties on the historic battlegrounds. Local residents were often unwilling to sell their property or offered to sell at high prices. The first significant problem the newly established commission encountered was the expansion plans of the local trolley line, the Gettysburg Electric Railway Company. Already holding lines through town, as well as along sections of the battlefield at Cemetery Ridge and the southern end of the field, the railway in the spring of 1893 planned to expand into Devil's Den and the Valley of Death.

In January 1896, the United States Supreme Court handed down one of the most significant rulings not only for the history of the Gettysburg battlefield, but also for the preservation of all historic sites. *United States vs. Gettysburg Electric Railway Co.* gave legal authority to the federal government to acquire land through the power of eminent domain. Justice Rufus Peckham delivered the majority opinion, ruling that the federal government had a responsibility to preserve and safeguard nationally historic sites and buildings. He added that Gettysburg was "one of the greatest battles in the world," and that "valuable lessons in the art of war" could be learned from visiting the battlefield. Peckham's words rang strong: "Can it be that the government is without power to preserve the land, properly mark out the various sites upon which this struggle took place... for the benefit of all the citizens of the country, for the present and for the future?"¹³ The Court's ruling set the precedence for early historic preservation law

¹³ GNPC, "Annual Report, 1894," 9; Justice Peckham Majority Opinion, delivered January 27, 1896 in *United States vs. Gettysburg Electric Railway Co.* Box 8, Record Books of Testimony and Proceedings, 1893 – 1905 (GETT 41123), Gettysburg National Park Commission, Office of the Commissioners, Gettysburg National Military Park Archives [hereinafter cited as (GETT 41123), GNMP Archives]. In April 1895 the case was heard before the

and invested in the Gettysburg administrator's the authority to seize historic lands for inclusion into the national park.

Empowered by the ruling the War Department quickly acquired several key properties. In 1899 the commissioners purchased an additional 194.89 acres. The following year, the park obtained nearly forty-one acres on the Culp farm, thirteen acres at the Althoff property, and forty-eight acres at the Biggs farm. By 1901 the War Department's holdings totaled 1,274.57 acres. When property owners were not willing to negotiate with what the commissioners considered a fair price for the holdings, the government, relying on the ruling in the electric railroad case giving the government condemnation authority, condemned the tract.¹⁴

While Park Commissioners pursued an aggressive policy of property acquisition, they continued to struggle to acquire lands along the Confederate line of battle, especially on Seminary Ridge. Park commissioners attempted to negotiate with local residents, but found owners were only willing to sell their property for "exorbitant prices," which the Secretary of War refused to pay. In 1900, the War Department condemned five tracts of land totaling 105.79 acres along Seminary Ridge.¹⁵ For the first time in the park's history, the full Confederate battle line along Seminary Ridge was accessible to visitors.

The Park Commissioners were just as deeply concerned with modern developments on the battlefield grounds. They, after all, were soldiers who had fought on these same fields in 1863. Their personal, if not emotional, attachment toward the battlefield is revealed in their

U.S. Circuit Court, Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and the ruling favored the electric railroad company. The case was appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court.

¹⁴ GNPC, "1894 Annual Report," 11; GNPC, "1900 Annual Report," 47; E. B. Cope, "1901, Annual Report." Folder 4, Box 2, (GETT 41121), GNMP Archives, 15; E. B. Cope, "1905, Annual Report." Folder 3, Box 3, (GETT 41121), GNMP Archives, 5.

¹⁵ GNPC, "Annual Report, 1898," 31-32; GNPC, "Annual Report, 1900," 46-47.

comments on developments around the battlefield, which they believe will “seriously mar and disfigure the park and battlefield.” Upon discovering a pond and “very unsightly shanty used for an ice house” near the Valley of Death, for example, the commissioners immediately initiated efforts to purchase the tract and eliminate the “unsightly shanty.” Within a year they owned the tract and had the building removed.¹⁶ The War Department’s philosophy to preserve the battlefield in its historic condition was fully implemented at Gettysburg, in other words. Preservation to the War Department meant managing and restoring the battlefield to its 1863 condition. The commission’s annual report of 1900 illustrates its aggressiveness in restoration:

Much work has been and is being done to restore and preserve the features of the battlefield, as they existed at the time of the battle. This includes the repairing and rebuilding of the stone fences and walls, which served as important military defenses, the restoring and preservation of buildings, also the renewal of forests where they have been cut away since the battle.¹⁷

The commissioners worked diligently to create a landscape that mirrored the 1863 landscape, including fence patterns, stone walls, and the restoration and maintenance of woodlots and orchards. In 1898, E. B. Cope reported that 3,700 feet of historic rail fences had been reconstructed and 9,000 feet of stonewall rebuilt. Workmen maintained the historic landscape, typically by trimming or clearing brush and undergrowth, burning excessive rubbish, and removing dead trees.¹⁸ Such concerted efforts to restore the battlefield to its historic condition epitomized the continued involvement of veterans in the early establishment of battlefield sites as well as official philosophy. Veterans were both the target audience and the shapers of

¹⁶ GNPC, “Annual Report, 1900,” 47; E. B. Cope, “Annual Report, 1902.” Folder 5, Box 2, (GETT 41121), GNMP Archives. 11; E. B. Cope, “Annual Report, 1903.” Folder 1, Box 3, (GETT 41121), GNMP Archives, 10.

¹⁷ GNPC, “Annual Report, 1900,” 46.

¹⁸ E. B. Cope, “Annual Report, 1898.” Folder 1, Box 2, (GETT 41121), GNMP Archives, 5-8.

interpretation during the park's formative years. Visitors to the battlefield regularly encountered veterans of the battle, who provided informal interpretation and reminiscences of the battle's history. Increasingly, those veterans were men who had worn gray, not just blue.

Timothy Smith argues that the preservation of Civil War battlefields was critical to the reconciliation sentiment of the 1880s. This conclusion certainly applies to Gettysburg. In the immediacy of General Robert E. Lee's surrender at Appomattox, the collapse of the Confederate States of America, and the perils of Reconstruction, southerners expressed little interest in commemorating the Gettysburg battlefield. It was, after all, a decisive Union victory that resulted in a loss of nearly 28,000 of their comrades and located in a northern state. Southerners instead turned their energies and limited economic resources to the memorialization of Confederate cemeteries and southern battlefields, especially those battles that were Confederate victories, such as Chickamauga.¹⁹

By the 1880s, however, both sides looked toward unification. Southerners began to take an increased interest in the development of the Gettysburg battlefield, and some Union veterans eagerly encouraged such participation. Hoping to facilitate southerners' interest in the battlefield, the Secretary of War appointed one Confederate veteran to the three-man park commission. The commissioners were pleased with southerners' increasing interest in the battlefield and the management of the park. In 1897, after a series of visits from Confederate veterans, the commissioners reported a "favorable indication of growing interest on the part of the Southern States and people in this field." The following year, the commissioners proclaimed their gratification for southerners' "awakening...interest" about the battlefield and their desire to erect monuments to "commemorate the heroism of soldiers here." Reconciliationist sentiments

¹⁹ Smith, *The Golden Age of Battlefield Preservation*.

such as these pervaded the commissioners' reports and correspondence. Continuing to applaud southerners' interest in the development of Gettysburg, for example, Cope wrote, "Many tourists from the South now stop here and go over the field," and underscoring the importance of reconciliation he continued, "There is a growing interest developing in the South in this, The Battlefield of the War, now that we are a Band of Brothers."²⁰ Cope's proclamation reflected both traditional reconciliationist rhetoric and underscored that veterans believed Gettysburg to be "The Battlefield of the War."

The fiftieth anniversary of the battle of Gettysburg became one of the most memorable events to occur in the battlefield's history. In July 1913 this "Peace Jubilee" reflected the heightened sense of reconciliation sentiment that exemplified the nation. Park commissioners, recognizing the importance of this anniversary, began making plans to mark the occasion as early as September 1908. By July 1, 1913, approximately 42,000 veterans of the Blue and Gray were encamped on the battlefield, and nearly 50,000 observers witnessed the famous "Hands Across the Wall" meeting on July 3. The next day, President Woodrow Wilson, the first southern-born president since the Civil War, delivered an address befitting traditional reconciliation rhetoric. He proclaimed that the fifty years since the battle of Gettysburg "meant peace and union and vigor, and the maturity and might of a great nation. How wholesome and healing the peace has been!" Wilson continued, "We have found one another as brothers and comrades, in arms, enemies no longer, generous friends rather, our battles long past, the quarrel

²⁰ GNPC, "Annual Report, 1897," 29; GNPC, "Annual Report, 1898," Folder 1, Box 2, (GETT 41121), GNMP Archives, 34. Brigadier General W. H. Forney of the 10th Alabama was the first Confederate veteran appointed to the commission and served until his death in 1894. Major William Robbins, 4th Alabama, replaced him, serving until 1905. See also Cope, "Annual Report, 1898." Folder 1, Box 2, (GETT 41121), GNMP Archives, 8-9.

forgotten- except that we shall not forget the splendid valor, manly devotion of the men then arrayed against one another, now grasping hands and smiling into each other's eyes.”²¹

In addition to serving as a monument to Blue and Gray fraternalism, the battlefield served as training ground for the tactical and strategic instruction for the Army and National Guard. The 1915 Regulations for the National Military Parks reinforced this purpose, stating that “in order to obtain practical benefits of great value to the country from the establishment of national military parks, said parks and their approaches are hereby declared to be national fields for military maneuvers for the Regular Army of the United States and the National Guard or Militia of the States.” In 1917 the War Department procured Civil War battlefields as training grounds for American doughboys entering into World War I. In March 1918 the War Department established Camp Colt at Gettysburg as a school for tank training. Under the command of Captain Dwight D. Eisenhower, Camp Colt occupied 176 acres on the Codori Farm fields. The camp site required the construction of 17,500 feet of roadways, stone gutters, over 3,000 feet of walkways, forty-nine incinerators, several bridges, telephone poles, and sewer and water lines. Officers even had a swimming pool built in front of the stone wall at the Angle for their comfort and enjoyment. Tank training severely damaged the historic terrain. On January 20, 1919, ten months after the camp was abandoned, the assistant engineer offered an inspection report on the

²¹ *Fiftieth Anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg, Report of the Pennsylvania Commission* (Harrisburg: W. M. Stanley Ray, State Printer, 1914), 6; GNPC, “Annual Report, 1913.” Folder 3, Box 5, Publications, Annual Reports, 1893 – 1921 (GETT 41148), Records of the Gettysburg National Park Commission, Office of the Commissioners, Gettysburg National Military Park Archives, 10 [hereinafter cited as (GETT 41148), GNMP Archives]; GNPC, “Annual Report, 1914.” Folder 4, Box 5, (GETT 41148), GNMP Archives, 4. In this report the commissioners express their pleasure with the turnout of the veterans, but write of their disappointment that more of the public did not attend the celebration. The commissioners expected high visitation ranging from 100,000 to 800,000, but their records show that the number of people in attendance on any one day did not exceed 25,000. In *Race and Reunion*, David Blight counts the number of veterans attending the reunion at 53, 407 (Blight, 8). The “Hands Across the Wall” meeting refers to the handshake between members of Pickett’s Division Association and members of the Philadelphia Brigade Association meeting at the famous stonewall/angle on Cemetery Ridge, where fifty years earlier the Union soldiers repulsed Pickett’s Charge; Woodrow Wilson speech, reprinted in *Fiftieth Anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg, Report of the Pennsylvania Commission*, 174-176.

condition of the site. The Army had removed the tents, but the buildings, drains, ditches, telephone poles, water pipes, sewer pipes, and wood piles still remained. Park commissioners sent a flurry of correspondence to the War Department reporting on the restoration status, or lack thereof, and demanded that the grounds be restored to their pre-Camp Colt condition. The commissioner's top priority became the elimination of the swimming pool, which had "been partly filled with refuse stone, etc., and the top has been blasted off, leaving it in worse condition than ever."²²

Outraged that the Army neglected to restore the historic grounds, park officials lamented that "nothing else on this list has been done and our land is in a bad condition." In December 1919 Congress appropriated fifteen thousand dollars, "or so much as may be necessary," for the restoration of fields of Pickett's Charge. Farmers owning property on the fields of Camp Colt filed for reparations for crop damages. Yet almost two years later, in October 1921, park commissioner Colonel John Nicholson reported that no improvements had been made, and only two tenants received reparation for their claim.²³

²² Unrau, *Administrative History*, 103; GNPC, "Annual Report, 1917." Folder 7, Box 5, GETT 41148), GNMP Archives, 7; "Regulations for the National Military Parks and the Statues under which they are Organized and are Administered" (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1915). Box 1, (GETT 41148), GNMP Archives, 17. The National Guard of Pennsylvania had begun using the Gettysburg battlefield as a training site as early as 1884. West Point cadets began touring the battlefield in 1902; GNPC, "Annual Report, 1917." Folder 7, Box 5, (GETT 41148), GNMP Archives, 7 – 8; GNPC "Annual Report, 1918." Folder 8, Box 5, (GETT 41148), GNMP Archives, 8. In May 1917 the government established a "Camp of Instruction" in the park and by June two infantry regiments were encamped on the Codori farm fields, where over fifty years earlier members of Pickett, Trimble, and Pettigrew's divisions charged across the fields toward the Federal line on Cemetery Ridge; GNPC, "Annual Report, 1918." Folder 7, Box 5, (GETT 41148), GNMP Archives, 8; E. M. Hewitt, Inspection Report, January 21, 1919, in "GNPC Daily Journals, 1919." Box 28, (GETT 41144), GNMP Archives, 4 – 5; GNPC, "Daily Journals, 1919." Box 28, (GETT 41144), GNMP Archives, 41. In addition to occupying 176 acres on the Codori fields, Camp Colt also occupied ten acres on the Smith farm and six acres on the Bryan farm. This was Eisenhower's first introduction to Gettysburg, he liked the area so much Eisenhower purchased a farmstead, buttressing the battlefield, in 1950; GNPC "Daily Journals, 1919." Box 28, (GETT 41144), GNMP Archives, 101 – 102; GNPC, "Daily Journals, 1921." Box 30, (GETT 41144), GNMP Archives, 49-50; 79 – 80.

²³ James B. Aumen memo November 4, 1919 in "GNPC Daily Journals, 1919." Box 28, (GETT 41144), GNMP Archives, 90 – 91; GNPC "Daily Journals, 1919." Box 28, (GETT 41144), GNMP Archives, 101 – 102; GNPC, "Daily Journals, 1921." Box 30, (GETT 41144), GNMP Archives, 49-50; 79 – 80. This list of claims notes that

Other uses of the battlefield during World War I proved less damaging. Fearing food shortages during the war, local school children cultivated over twenty-five acres of ground on East Cemetery Hill, Culp's Hill, and Oak Ridge as "Victory Gardens" for the production of hundreds of bushels of corn, potatoes, beans, tomatoes, and other vegetables.²⁴ While less disruptive to the historic landscape, the "Victory Gardens" reinforced a growing counter-vision of the Gettysburg battlefield as not only a historic site, but also public grounds to be used for practical purposes.

Gettysburg notably was not the only park to be used for military purposes. Chickamauga and Chattanooga battlefields were also commandeered for the instruction and encampment of military personnel. Georgia State Militia troops began using the battlegrounds for training purposes as early as 1890. In early 1898 the Chickamauga battlefield became a staging ground for American troops mobilizing for war with Spain. On April 14 the first troops arrived and within a month more than 50,000 regulars and volunteers were stationed at Camp George H. Thomas. As with Camp Colt at Gettysburg, Camp Thomas also devastated the Chickamauga landscape; trees were destroyed, army vehicles damaged park roads, trash was scattered throughout the grounds, and historical markers broken. Congress allocated \$25,000 to restore the Georgia battlefield to its pre-Spanish American War condition. Camp Thomas and its resultant damage to the park, however, did not deter future use of the Chickamauga battlefield for military purposes. In 1902, the government used 813 acres of the battlefield to establish Fort

William Shields claimed \$150.00 for crop damages, William Abell claimed \$90.00, and the Spangler family claimed \$405.00.

²⁴ William C. Storrick memo, January 12, 1918 in "GNPC Daily Journals, 1918." Box 27, (GETT 41144), GNMP Archives, 4 – 5. Storrick reported that the gardens produced over 400 bushels of corn, 200 bushels of potatoes, and large quantities of other vegetables. He also recommended that the same tracts would be set aside for "Victory Gardens" the following year, 1919.

Oglethorpe. In the summer of 1906 over 2,000 troops were encamped at Fort Oglethorpe, conducting training and maneuvering exercises.²⁵

As the Gettysburg commissioners struggled to restore the grounds of the battlefield damaged by Camp Colt, a War Department official, Robert Parker, Clerk to the Assistant Secretary, inspected the battlefield parks to assess the damages of recent military use. Visiting both Chickamauga and Gettysburg battlefields, Clark reported to Colonel Nicholson that “after seeing the destruction by the military at Chickamauga, your damages appear to be very slight.” Parker reported the ongoing use of the battlefield grounds at Chickamauga and concluded “this is all wrong as these great national memorials should be preserved.” Though a War Department official, Parker did not condone the military use of the Civil War battlefields, but instead encouraged Nicholson to pursue legislation that would prevent future military use of the battlefields.²⁶

Initially the War Department, more concerned with preserving the historic landscape and marking the location of troops with monuments and tablets, devoted little attention to structured visitor education programs. And because many of the park’s visitors were veterans of the battle, park commissioners felt there was little need to develop an extensive educational program for uninformed audiences. By the early twentieth century, however, the changing demographics of battlefield visitors forced park commissioners to reevaluate their interpretive approach. Aging

²⁵ John C. Paige and Jerome A. Greene, *Administrative History of Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park* (Denver: Denver Service Center, National Park Service, February 1983). This document is available online at www.nps.gov/archive/chch/adhi/adhi.htm. It does not include page numbers, but information on the military use of the battlefield can be found in Chapter VI. The camp was named after the Union hero, or Rock of Chickamauga, George H. Thomas. Conditions at Camp Thomas would parallel the nature of the Spanish-American War: soldiers were more likely to die from disease than combat action. Unsanitary conditions plagued the soldiers; the water was not drinkable, the sewer system was inadequate, and proper bathing facilities were lacking. By the fall of 1898, when the camp disbanded, 425 soldiers died there from the unsanitary conditions.

²⁶ Robert E. Parker to Colonel John Nicholson, April 10, 1920, in “GNPC Daily Journals, 1920.” Box 27, (GETT 41144), GNMP Archives, 18 – 19.

Civil War veterans were becoming vanishing relics, while the new visitors to Gettysburg did not have the first hand experience of assaulting Culp's Hill, defending the line at the Peach Orchard, or participating in Pickett's Charge. A generation removed from the combat horrors of Gettysburg and other battles, visitors now needed some orientation and explanation to the battlefield. The principal orientation to the battlefield was the topographical map known as the Cope Map, designed by Emor Cope. Park commissioners proclaimed the Cope map "continues to afford to the student and visitor the greatest satisfaction, nor should this be a matter of surprise, inasmuch as illustrative of a battle field map has no equal."²⁷

In the years after 1865, Gettysburg residents sought to capitalize on the historical event that occurred within the town and on their farm fields. Some locals proclaimed themselves to be battlefield guides, and sold their services to visitors wanting a tour. After receiving a considerable number of complaints about the self-declared guides, often because of their unbearable solicitation and inaccurate information, park commissioners resolved to gain control over these local interpreters by bringing them within the control of the War Department. Two years later, in 1915, the commissioners announced that applications would be taken from individuals interested in taking the examination to become a battlefield guide licensed by the War Department. The establishment of the Licensed Battlefield Guides whose purpose was to

²⁷ E. B. Cope, "1904 Annual Report." Folder 2, Box 3, (GETT 41121), GNMP Archives, 9; GNPC, "Daily Journals, 1893." Box 2, (GETT 41144), GNMP Archives, 14; GNPC, "Annual Report, 1914." Folder 4, Box 5, (GETT 41148), GNMP Archives, 10 – 11. Cope based his map on the General Gouverneur Warren's survey as well as his own research on troops positions and terrain features. The Cope map is a large topographical map, illustrating key terrain features as well as lines of battle, and represented twenty-four square miles of the battlefield. The map was initially displayed at the World's Fair in St. Louis and then returned to Gettysburg for visitor orientation. The park commissioners' first headquarters was located on Chambersburg Street (Rt. 30 West). The commissioners rented four rooms from Martin Winter for \$125.00 per year. In 1909 ground was broken for the Public Building for various U.S. government agencies. In 1915 the commissioners moved their headquarters to the Public Building located on Baltimore Street (south of the town square). Their offices/museum were housed on the first floor of the building, which they shared with the Post Office; GNPC, "Annual Report, 1911." Folder 1, Box 5, (GETT 41148), GNMP Archives, 9.

“assist visitors in visualizing the position and movements of troops by describing the action and pointing out landmarks etc., thus enabling them to appreciate quickly and fully the magnitude of the struggles which took place on the battlefield.”²⁸

The War Department, using the historic landscape, as well as placards and monuments, the Cope Map, and the Licensed Battlefield Guides, all resulted in the initial framework of educational programming. In addition, guidebooks on the battle were also available to assist the visitor. In 1873 John Bachelder, the battlefield’s first historian and a park commissioner, authored the battle’s first guidebook, *Gettysburg: What to See, And How to See It*. It provided visitors with a basis of “reliable information” for touring the battlefield. Luther W. Minnigh, a veteran of the 1st Pennsylvania Reserves, published in 1924 *Gettysburg: What They Did Here*. He reiterated the battlefield’s significance, writing, “There is one Gettysburg! And it is without doubt the most picturesque and interesting point in America for the tourist, either soldier or citizen, to visit.” Many other local residents, capitalizing on the increasing popularity of touring the battlefield, also designed and sold tour booklets. For example, visitors could purchase J. Warren Gilbert’s *The Blue and Gray: A History of the Conflicts During Lee’s Invasion and Battle of Gettysburg* (1922); *A Short Story of the Battle of Gettysburg* (1925) co-authored by William H. Allison and John E. Slaybaugh; or H. W. Long’s *Gettysburg: As The Battle Was Fought* (1927).²⁹ These inexpensive pamphlets, sold in town, came complete with tour maps, photographs, and sufficient description of the battle’s key areas of fighting.

²⁸ GNPC, “Annual Report, 1913.” Folder 3, Box 5, (GETT 41148), GNMP Archives, 11; GNPC, “Annual Report, 1916.” Folder 6, Box 5, (GETT 41148), GNMP Archives, 7. Reportedly ninety-five people submitted applications to take the exam. Ninety-one passed and received licenses from the War Department; *National Military Park, National Park, Battlefield Site, and National Monument Regulations* (Washington, D.C. : Government Printing Office, 1931). Folder 3, Box 2, (GETT 41155), GNMP Archives, 8 – 9.

²⁹ John Bachelder, *Gettysburg: What To See, And How To See It* (Boston: John B. Bachelder, 1873); Luther W. Minnigh, *Gettysburg: What They Did Here* (Tipton and Blocher, 1924), 133. GNMP Library; Manu Coll, (GETT 42853), Gettysburg National Military Park Archives [hereinafter cited as (GETT 42853), GNMP Archives).

Neither the GBMA nor the War Department ever invested considerable time to develop a battlefield museum. For the most part, the GBMA and park commissioners considered the battlefield itself as the primary educational tool and the battle markers as a means to further understand the battle. Local residents, however, again capitalized on the opportunity to showcase artifacts and provide a service for park visitors. John D. Rosensteel owned the battle's most extensive Civil War relic collection. In the 1890s he opened the Round Top Museum, located on the north side of Little Round Top. He displayed a plethora of Civil War objects gathered from the Gettysburg battlefield, including rifles, shell fragments, cartridge boxes, and various accouterments. In 1921, George Rosensteel, John's nephew, opened his own museum, the Gettysburg National Museum, along the Taneytown Road across from the Soldiers' National Cemetery.³⁰ When John Rosensteel died in 1924, George incorporated his uncle's collection from the Round Top Museum into his museum, establishing the Rosensteel collection as the definitive Civil War artifact display in the country.

After 1917 and with America's involvement in World War I, the Secretary of War had considerably less time to devote to the management of the Civil War parks. By 1922 the Office of Park Superintendent replaced the park commissioners, which started a new era in the battlefield's history. In March of that year, the Secretary of War appointed former park engineer Cope as the first superintendent of Gettysburg National Military Park. The following year, on

³⁰ Mike O' Donnell, "Bring Back Gettysburg's Rosensteel Collection," *The Civil War News*, April 1991; Lawrence Eckert, Jr. letter to Mrs. Douglas Poag, April 26, 1977, VF, 14 – 23, GNMP Library. A sixteen-year-old boy in July 1863, Rosensteel began collecting abandoned weapons and other artifacts immediately after the battle. Rosensteel claimed the first artifact he acquired was a rifle from a dead Confederate soldier on Culp's Hill.

April 1, 1923, the War Department shifted the five Civil War parks from the Secretary of War's jurisdiction to the Quartermaster Department.³¹

On a local level, Cope continued to oversee the daily operations at Gettysburg until his death, at age ninety three, on May 27, 1927. The passing of Cope, one of the most influential commissioners in the development of the park and the last of the war's veterans to manage it, marked another milestone in the administration of the Gettysburg battlefield. Future management of Gettysburg, as well as the other Civil War parks, passed to sons of Civil War veterans, or in time, government officials. Subsequent superintendents and park officials did not possess the direct, personal connections to the battlefield that Cope and the other previous commissioners possessed.³²

While Union and Confederate veterans diligently toiled to preserve blood-stained fields of battle, another preservation effort was gaining momentum in the western United States.

³¹ Unrau, *Administrative History*, 119; E. B. Cope, "Gettysburg National Military Park," (c. 1925), (GETT 41155), GNMP Archives, 3. The Sundry Civil Act of 1912 provided that vacancies on the park commission, either by death or resignation, would not be filled. Instead, the Secretary of War received authority to appoint an ex-officio member to the commission. When all seats became vacant, the Secretary of War was responsible for appointing a superintendent to oversee daily operations and administration of the park. The park commission officially ceased to exist when Nicholson died on March 8, 1922. The five Civil War parks remained under control of the Quartermaster General until July 1, 1930, when the parks were transferred to the Commanding Generals of the Corps area under which the parks were geographically located. This transfer placed Gettysburg under the administration of the Commanding General in Baltimore, Maryland where it remained until acquired by the National Park Service in 1933.

³² Cope's influence on the battlefield was unparalleled. He was actively involved in the administration and daily operations of the battlefield for over three decades. Cope oversaw the construction and placement of the narrative tablets and the cannons. He also designed and positioned the five observation towers. Cope also assisted in the design and location of the road system and the restoration of the historic fences and stonewalls. His *Gettysburg National Military Park, 1925* is an extensive written and visual report on the state of the battlefield at near the end of his administration. This report is located in the park archives under General Records, 1922-1933 (GETT 41155), Records of the Office of the Quartermaster General, GNMP Archives. Upon Cope's death in 1927, Colonel E. E. Davis was appointed superintendent. Davis represented the first of non Civil War veterans to manage the battlefield. Davis served as superintendent until August 1932, when J. Frank Barber replaced him on August 24, 1932, which he held until February 1933. In 1932 the War Department announced the superintendent position under the Civil Service classification. James McConaghie was appointed superintendent on February 7, 1933. Six months later the Gettysburg battlefield, and other sites, was transferred to the administration of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

Veterans campaigned for the preservation of battlefields, while others advocated for the preservation of America's cultural sites. The War Department's Corps of Engineers spearheaded early environmental protection programs. On March 1, 1872, President Ulysses S. Grant signed legislation to create the country's first national park when he authorized the preservation of two million acres at Yellowstone. Continuing through the late nineteenth century additional national parks were established, including Yosemite, Sequoia, and Mount Rainier. On June 8, 1906, the Antiquities Act gave the president the power to proclaim "historic landmarks, historic and prehistoric structures, and other objects of historic or scientific interests" as national monuments.³³ Its primary purpose was to preserve and protect prehistoric Native American sites and ruins. An immediate result of this act was the establishment of Devils Tower National Monument in 1906.

By 1916 the government had established thirty-five national parks and monuments, all west of the Mississippi and all administered by the Department of the Interior. On August 25, 1916 Congress established the National Park Service to administer these sites with a purpose of preservation and interpretation of America's natural and historic sites. The National Park Service's guiding legislation, the Organic Act of 1916, reinforced the Park Service's role in preservation, "to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects, and the wildlife and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such a manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." Stephen Mather became the National Park Service's first director, serving in that capacity until January 1929.³⁴

³³ William C. Everhart, *The National Park Service* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1983), 8; *The National Parks: Shaping the System*, (Washington, D.C., Division of Publications and the Employee Development Division, National Park Service, 1991), 13.

³⁴ Georgie Boge and Margie Holder Boge, *Paving Over the Past: A History and Guide to Civil War Battlefield Preservation* (Washington, D.C.: Island Press, 1993), 25; *The National Parks: Shaping The System*, 19; Conrad L.

During the 1920s the NPS remained principally a western system consisting of natural and cultural sites. Only Acadia, Shenandoah, Great Smoky Mountains, and Mammoth Cave National Parks were east of the Mississippi. The Park Service's opportunity for developing parks in the east lay not in natural sites, but historic sites. Under the leadership of Horace Albright a history enthusiast, the Park Service expressed interest in acquiring the War Department's historic battlefields. Albright and other service personnel argued that the department failed to effectively administer and interpret these sites. The Department of Interior and the National Park Service officials assured the War Department that they were well prepared to manage the battlefield sites, and to pledge to retain their military nature.

While driving through Virginia's Civil War battle sites in early April 1933, Albright discussed the future of the National Park Service with newly elected President Franklin D. Roosevelt and advocated the Park Service acquire the War Department's holdings. Roosevelt agreed, and on June 10, 1933 signed Executive Order No. 6166, which officially transferred the War Department sites to the National Park Service. On August 10, 1933 the National Park Service added twelve natural sites and fifty-seven historical sites, among them Gettysburg National Military Park.³⁵

At Gettysburg, the National Park Service acquired 2,530 acres, 1,728 monuments, and nearly 24 miles of park road. James R. McConaghie became Gettysburg's first NPS superintendent. Educated at Harvard School of Landscape Architecture as an architect, McConaghie lacked formal training as a historian, and prior to his appointment as the

Wirth, *Parks, Politics, and the People* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1980), 1-39; John Ise, *Our National Park Policy: A Critical History* (Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1961).

³⁵ Everhart, *The National Park Service*, 23. This acquisition established the National Park Service as a national preservation organization.

superintendent he worked as a landscape architect for the State Department of Internal Affairs.³⁶ Not surprisingly, McConaghie viewed the park primarily as an architectural landscape and secondarily as a historic battlefield. As a result, he brought created a distinctly different type of management philosophy to Gettysburg.

³⁶ *Final General Management Plan and Environmental Statement, Vol I., Gettysburg National Military Park* (United States Department of the Interior: National Park Service, June 1999), xxvi. (All notes hereinafter cited as *GMP*); James R. McConaghie, "Qualifications of James R. McConaghie for Park Superintendent." Folder 201, Box 2490, RG 79, Central Classified File, 1933-1949, National Parks, Gettysburg National Military Park, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland.

Chapter 2

“We Cannot Hallow This Ground”:

The National Park Service’s Beginnings at Gettysburg, 1933-1940

On June 10, 1933, President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed Executive Order No. 6166, officially transferring the administration of forty-three parks, including Gettysburg National Military Park and the Soldiers’ National Cemetery, from the War Department to the National Park Service. At Gettysburg, the National Park Service obtained 2,530 acres, 1,728 monuments, and nearly 24 miles of park road. James R. McConaghie became the first NPS superintendent. McConaghie had received a Bachelor of Science degree from Grinnell College in Iowa in 1916 and graduated from Harvard University’s School of Landscape Architecture in February 1924 with a Master of Landscape degree. He lacked any formal training as a historian, but did possess extensive experience as a landscape architect. Prior to his appointment at Gettysburg, McConaghie worked for Pennsylvania’s Department of Forest and Waters and the Wheeling Park Commission in Wheeling, West Virginia. Between 1924 and 1929, he served as the landscape architect for Pennsylvania’s Department of Interior Affairs, planning and designing parks, playgrounds, and school grounds. Not surprisingly, he would consistently view the park as an architectural landscape and not a historic battlefield. His philosophy and vision ultimately had inestimable consequences in the early NPS management policies.¹

¹ Harlan D. Unrau, *Administrative History: Gettysburg National Military Park and Gettysburg National Cemetery* (Denver: Branch of Publications and Graphic Design, Denver Service Center, 1991), viii; *Final General Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement*, Gettysburg National Military Park, Pennsylvania, vol. 1 & 2 (U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, June 1999), xxvi [hereinafter cited as *GMP*, vol. 1 or vol. 2]; James R. McConaghie, “Qualifications of James R. McConaghie for Park Superintendent.” Folder 201, Box 2490, RG 79, Central Classified File, 1933-1949, National Parks, Gettysburg National Military Park, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland [hereinafter cited by Box, CCF, RG 79, NARA College Park]. Roosevelt signed the executive order on June 10, 1933 and it took effect on August 10. At this time the National Park Service assumed control of twelve national battlefields, eleven national military parks, two national parks, and three memorials. The Park Service also gained possession of fifteen national monuments that

McConaghie's tenure as Gettysburg superintendent was arguably one of the most critical eras in the history of Gettysburg National Military Park. Several factors collided in this eight-year era that were crucial to the development and administration of the Gettysburg Battlefield, but arguably the most important was his allocation of the many resources supplied through the New Deal and the superintendent's landscape architect philosophy. The McConaghie era, 1933 through January 1941, laid the foundation for the Park Service management of Gettysburg.

When McConaghie assumed management of Gettysburg, he boldly announced that the NPS would be the battlefield's savior. He continually decried the War Department's previous management, and proclaimed the National Park Service would better effectively administer the battlefield. In his 1935-36 annual report, he wrote:

The administration of the area by the National Park Service is beginning to have a most

were previously held by the U.S. Forest Service. The addition of approximately fifty parks established the National Park Service as a truly national organization. At this time the Gettysburg superintendent also oversaw administration of Fort McHenry National Monument, Fort Necessity National Battlefield, Antietam National Battlefield, and Monocacy National Park. For McHenry and Fort Necessity became individual entities in January 1936, while Antietam remained under Gettysburg's management control until December 1935 when the NPS appointed Washington County native and southern sympathizer John Kyd Beckenbaugh as Antietam's site superintendent. Beckenbaugh, the nephew of the famed Confederate officer Henry Kyd Douglas, possessed no NPS experience, but was a prominent figure in the Sharpsburg community as well as the local chapter of the Sons of Confederate Veterans. Trail argues that Beckenbaugh's appointment led to a distinctly pro-Confederate interpretation at Antietam. Beckenbaugh managed the site until his death in 1940, Antietam reverted back to Gettysburg's control, until it was once again separated and given its own administrative staff in 1954. For additional reading on Antietam's history, see Susan B. Trail, "Remembering Antietam: Commemoration and Preservation of a Civil War Battlefield," (Ph.D. diss., University of Maryland, 2005). McConaghie's resume notes he was appointed through the Civil Service examination to GNMP Superintendent on February 7, 1933. In July 1917, McConaghie enlisted with the First Iowa Infantry, U.S. Army, but in September accepted a commission with the 133rd Infantry in New Mexico where he was promoted to First Lieutenant in December 1917. Deployed to France and Germany, he served with the 39th Infantry and was wounded in the Argonne. In September 1919, he was honorably discharged and granted vocational rehabilitation to study at the University of Minnesota, but he completed his academic studies at Harvard University. McConaghie served as the superintendent at GNMP until January 1941, when he was transferred to Vicksburg National Military Park. This resume found in the National Archives represents the only known source on McConaghie's background. This chapter previously appeared as Jennifer Murray, "'Far Above Our Poor Power to Add or Subtract': National Park Service Administration of Gettysburg Battlefield, 1933-1938" *Civil War History* 55, March 2009, 56-81.

favorable effect. For a good many years, activity here had remained about the same. Very little was being done except general maintenance work . . . the assumption being that the Park was complete. The first awakening step was the transfer in August 1933 of the area to the National Park Service.²

Such attitudes pervaded other early memos and reports. In the following year's annual report, for example, he noted that "The general reaction of intelligent critics is that the park is prospering under the National Park Administration. The National Park Service is known and respected. Its direction of activity within this park meets with popular approval."³

Indeed the National Park Service was a known and respected agency, but that did not mean that agency officials automatically understood how to manage battlefield sites. Separate battlefield commissioners managed daily operations at the five original Civil War sites-- Chickamauga/Chattanooga, Shiloh, Antietam, Vicksburg, and Gettysburg-- and each park developed in a unique and individualistic fashion. Park officials did strive to integrate Gettysburg National Military Park into the larger National Park Service system, thereby eliminating the distinctiveness of the Pennsylvania battlefield, but were not always successful.

McConaghie's supervision of the Licensed Battlefield Guides reinforced his perception that the Gettysburg battlefield was only one of the Park Service's many holdings. The War Department had formally recognized the guide service in 1915 in an effort to bring uniformity and control to an otherwise informal system. Immediately upon assuming management duties of the battlefield, the Park Service enacted varying regulations regarding the licensed guides. In May 1934, McConaghie put the guide service on "trial," meaning that the guides had to fulfill Park Service expectations. In his May 1934 Circular No. 1, he reiterated that the Park Service

² James McConaghie, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 1935-1936." Box 2, Park Main (Central) Files, 1933-1954, (GETT 41113), Records of the National Park Service at Gettysburg National Military Park, Gettysburg National Military Park Archives, 18-19 [hereinafter cited by (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives].

³ James McConaghie, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 1936-1937." Box 2, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 29.

believed in the guide system, but offered a warning that “It is necessary that the Guide Service prove itself worthy of being continued otherwise changes may be expected.”⁴

Reigning in the independently employed Licensed Battlefield Guides, and demanding that they conform to NPS standards, proved to be a difficult task. Two years later McConaghie still felt compelled to remind the guides that they were “still on trial” and were also “members of an organization known throughout the world and known particularly throughout the United States.” Apparently disappointed that the Licensed Battlefield Guides would not identify with the National Park Service, McConaghie reminded them that “there has been somewhat of a failure in recognizing the distinct value that comes from being associated with this Service.” Association with the National Park Service, according to McConaghie, meant being part of a greater organization, and as the new superintendent asserted, “Promotion of the Service means promotion of self.”⁵

In the same January 1935 circular to the Licensed Guides, McConaghie added, “You are no longer concerned merely with this famous battlefield, but rather you are concerned with all of the other national parks in the country.” Whereas the War Department diligently worked to preserve and commemorate Gettysburg as an individual, distinct battlefield, the park’s new management philosophy held that “this park is a National Park, and the public is generally being educated to the point where this Park is associated with the many well-known and famous National Parks.” In McConaghie’s view, individuals seeking to tour the grounds of Little Round

⁴ “Circular No. 1, May 3, 1934, by James McConaghie.” Folder 12, Box, 18, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 1.

⁵ “Circular No. 1, January 24, 1935, by James McConaghie.” Folder 10, Box 18, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 6.

Top or the fields of the Peach Orchard needed to recognize that indeed they were touring only “one of a chain of parks.”⁶

The timing of the transfer of War Department sites to the Department of the Interior was otherwise notable. By the summer of 1933, the worst economic downturn in American history gripped the nation. After the stock market crash on October 29, 1929, economic investments contracted, banks collapsed, and businesses closed. Eventually 25 percent of the population became unemployed. Breadlines and “Hooverilles” were common in cities throughout America. Promising Americans a “New Deal,” President Franklin D. Roosevelt brought a fury of unprecedented legislation, intended to provide relief, recovery, and reform to the people and nation. The Department of Interior, and specifically the National Park Service, sponsored several of Roosevelt’s New Deal agencies, and as a result became the recipient of an enormous amount of New Deal money.⁷

Indeed, without the infusion of federal funds and the abundance of available workmen, changes in the Gettysburg battlefield, physical and intellectual, could not have occurred on such a grand scheme. One of the most popular of Roosevelt’s New Deal programs, for example, was the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC). Signed into law on March 31, 1933, the CCC was intended to put to work young men ages eighteen to twenty-five in America’s outdoors. Various tasks included soil conservation, restructuring of natural and historic parks, and building parks,

⁶ “Circular No. 1, January 24, 1935, by James McConaghie.” Folder 10, Box 18, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 4.

⁷ For additional reading about the Great Depression and the New Deal see: David M. Kennedy, *Freedom From Fear: The American People in the Depression and War, 1929 – 1945* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999); Anthony J. Badger, *The New Deal: The Depression Years, 1933 – 1940* (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 1989); William E. Leuchtenburg, *Franklin D. Roosevelt and the New Deal* (New York: Harper & Row, 1963).

trails, and bridges. Four federal departments including the Department of the Interior oversaw the Civilian Conservation Corps work. CCC workers, called “enrollees,” worked under the direction of the site manager, but the U.S. Army supervised camp facilities. The CCC proved to be one of Roosevelt’s most notable New Deal accomplishments, ultimately employing over two million men who performed work in ninety eight national parks and monuments.⁸

Gettysburg National Military Park housed two Civilian Conservation Corps camps. The first CCC camp at Gettysburg, Company 385-17 PI, was established on June 16, 1933. Located on the battlefield at Pitzer’s Woods, “Camp No. 1” originally contained 180 enrollees. Apparently the location of the camp, along the prominent Seminary Ridge and one of the park’s main avenues, was a deliberate effort to showcase the camp and dutiful enrollees to tourists. One Gettysburg staffer recalled that the camp was “conveniently located” on the main Confederate battle line so “that thousands of people who might never visit at CCC Camp are enabled to visit this one, and see the Camp in action.” The second camp, “Camp No. 2,” Company 1355 MP-2, established on November 1, 1933, was also located prominently along Seminary Ridge, behind McMillan’s Woods.⁹

⁸ Christopher Waldrep, *Vicksburg’s Long Shadow: The Civil War Legacy of Race and Remembrance*, (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2005), 261; John C. Paige, *The Civilian Conservation Corps and the National Park Service, 1933-1942: An Administrative History*, (Washington: National Park Service, Department of the Interior, 1985), online book. In addition to performing valuable work in America’s national parks, CCC enrollees also worked in 881 state, county, and local parks. The original, official name of this agency was the Emergency Conservation Works (ECW). Because most Americans, and the media, typically referred to the agency as the CCC, its name was officially changed to the Civilian Conservation Corps in 1937. For the sake of consistency the term CCC will be used in this paper. The three other departments overseeing CCC work included the Departments of War, Labor, and Agriculture. The Department of War, specifically the Army, was responsible for the conditioning and transportation of the enrollees, as well as supervision of the camps/barracks. Though the camps were supervised by a military officer, the daily activity in the parks was supervised by NPS personnel.

⁹ R. L. Jones, “CCC Files,” undated report. Folder 6, Box 9, Historians’ Files, 1933- 1965 (GETT 41151), Records of the National Park Service at Gettysburg National Military Park, Gettysburg National Military Park Archives [hereinafter cited by (GETT 41151), GNMP Archives].

What must have struck many gawking visitors as significant about the CCC camp on Pitzer's and McMillan's Woods was that the camps were comprised of African-American enrollees. While many national parks, as well as state and local parks, sponsored CCC camps, Gettysburg, as well as Shiloh National Military Park and Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park, used black labor. In the early months of the camps, to be sure, a few white enrollees performed clerical duties, but by July 1935 all white CCC workers had been transferred and the park housed only black enrollees. Ironically, the hierarchy of black CCC camps mirrored the structure of the Civil War's United States Colored Troops (USCT); blacks could enlist, but officer positions belonged to whites. Black activists, however, pressured the federal government to place blacks in supervisory positions. Perhaps then it was only "fitting and proper" that the CCC camp at Gettysburg National Military Park served as the model, or test case, for an all black camp, including the CCC supervisors, gradually phased out white supervisors. By 1937, black supervisors worked in the camps. In 1940, the last white supervisor was replaced by a black supervisor.¹⁰

As one of the Civil War's most significant battlefields and certainly the war's most visited site, Gettysburg would frequently be in the vanguard of other new practices and policies. Though segregation defined the "Jim Crow" South as well as other areas in America, the use of African-American CCC labor blended reasonably seamlessly with Gettysburg's management and local residents. One theory why the black enrollees were tolerated, if not accepted, by Gettysburg residents was that camp labor was not confined to the park boundaries, but was often

¹⁰ Unrau, *Administrative History*, 156-162; Timothy B. Smith, "Black Soldiers and the CCC at Shiloh National Military Park," *CRM: The Journal of Heritage Stewardship*, 3, (Summer 2006): 73-84; John C. Paige, "The Civilian Conservation Corps and the National Park Service, 1933-1942: An Administrative History," (Department of Interior, National Park Service, 1985), on-line NPS publication. Available at www.nps.gov/history/history/online_books/ccc.index.htm. Smith reports that 400 black World War I veterans arrived to Shiloh in 1934 and began work in two CCC camps.

used in area projects. CCC enrollees frequently removed snow from the borough streets. Whenever “an emergency arose,” according to a CCC historian, “the camp was always ready to lend a helping hand.” Yet black enrollees also confronted daily reminders that they held a secondary place in American society, even in the Pennsylvania camps, for CCC housing was segregated by race. Dr. Louis E. King arrived as the park’s new technician and the supervisor for the black CCC camps. Upon his arrival, McConaghie told him that the colored housing was already full, but he would not be granted living accommodations in the housing for white supervisors. The situation was no better at Shiloh; Timothy Smith concludes that black CCC laborers there were “denied full equality in the CCC camps, even on a hallowed battlefield where their very freedom and citizenship had been partially gained.”¹¹

Beginning in 1933 education, field interpretation, and visitor services became of primary importance to McConaghie’s fledgling administration. In fact the new superintendent noted that educational services were the “most important work facing the service.” Inheriting the War Department’s educational programs, park service officials dutifully began to lay the foundation

¹¹ “History of CCC Camp No. 2 at Gettysburg,” June 22, 1936. Reproduced in Unrau’s *Administrative History*, appendix S, 418-419; Memo from Superintendent James McConaghie to Region 1 Director, September 14, 1939. ID: 24444: Folder: NMP, CCC, Gettysburg, Part 12 [2], 1939- 1940, Records of the National Park Service, Northeast Regional Office, Historic Shrines, Sites, Monuments, and Parks, Subject Files, RG, 79, Box 35, Philadelphia Regional Archives [hereinafter cited by Box, SF, RG 79, NARA Philadelphia]; Smith “Black Soldiers and the CCC at Shiloh National Military Park,” 84. Interestingly McConaghie’s 1939 memo is the only document found to date that mentions Dr. Louis King as being African American. None of the other correspondence, including memos from the park superintendent, disclosed King’s racial background. At a time when few blacks obtained doctorate degrees, or were placed in supervisory roles, King’s accomplishments should have warranted a discussion in the official correspondence. Similarly, however, none of the CCC correspondence indicates that the enrollees were black. Unless researchers examine the park’s photographic collection, the tendency is to assume the camp workers were white. Again, the failure to explicitly address the camp laborers as black seems odd, given the racial climate of the 1930s. According to Kathy Harrison, Senior Historian at Gettysburg National Military Park, King rented a home on South Washington Street, Kathy Harrison, Senior Historian, interview by author, 15 February 2009. To date, no documented source on King’s living arrangements has been found.

of an extensive educational and interpretive program. A significant portion of the educational advancements made during McConaghie's tenure were accomplished with New Deal funding. By the time the NPS assumed control, Civil War veterans were vanishing relics who no longer visited the war's battlefields or provided firsthand interpretation. By the battle's 75th anniversary, only an estimated 15,000 veterans were still alive; many were not Gettysburg veterans. As the new century progressed, the majority of visitors were descendants of the Civil War generation, who lacked personal knowledge of the battlefield that was once characteristic of visitation to the historic site. NPS officials lamented how visitors to the battlefield in the 1930s lacked that "direct touch" or "personal interest" in the battlefield. Park officials were increasingly aware of the changing demographic of its visitors and recognized that "a promoted educational program is definitely needed to replace the personal knowledge of yesterday."¹²

With its headquarters located in the second floor of the Post Office building, and limited by spatial considerations, the Park Service offered at first little more than the War Department in the way of museum education. Possessing few battle artifacts, the park relied on the Cope Map as well as historic troop movement maps and photographs as its primary interpretive tools. Using the Cope Map as the main orientation object, park rangers provided daily orientation talks to interested visitors. Within six months of the Park Service acquisition, New Deal workers thus proposed an extensive "Historical Education Program." Included in this historical project were plans to develop informative signs to better direct visitors through the battlefield and the compilation of an extensive reference bibliography for the battle. Most significantly,

¹² Superintendent James McConaghie, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 1936-1937." Box 2, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 22; 46-47; Paul L. Roy, *Last Reunion of the Blue and Gray* (Gettysburg: Paul Roy, 1950), 29. By 1933 approximately 12,000 Civil War veterans were still living. By the eve of World War II, only 2,500 were still alive.

recognizing deficiencies in the museum facilities (even when compared with contemporary museums, namely the Rosensteel Museum on the Taneytown Road), the project proposed the development of a new museum designed to offer the visiting public a “greater appreciation” of one of the most “decisive battles of the world.” Disconcerted by the lack of original Civil War artifacts for exhibit purposes, New Deal workers urged that the government acquire historic material for preservation and interpretation purposes. Such display of historic artifacts, weaponry, uniforms, and personal effects would provide visitors with the “best means of vitalizing and visualizing the Gettysburg Battlefield.”¹³ More modern visual elements, including collections of pictures, slides, films, and maps, would supplement these surviving material cultural objects of the Civil War.

Within a few months it was apparent that the admirable ideal of developing a Park Service museum would not easily come to fruition. Several constraints prohibited the development of a museum facility, including the agency’s inability to acquire relevant objects, inadequate display and storage space, and the competition of at least three privately owned museums in town. Because the privately operated museums seemed superior to anything the Park Service could feasibly develop in the foreseeable future, historical technician R. L. Jones recommended to the NPS Chief Historian, Verne Chatelain, that the government purchase one of those collections and develop it into a NPS facility.¹⁴ His recommendation fell on deaf ears as the government grappled with higher budget priorities of how to provide basic economic relief and recovery for millions of Americans during the Great Depression. The economic capital necessary to purchase or develop a museum facility simply was not available. Instead park

¹³ “Museum and Visual Education, CWA Educational Program, 1933.” Folder 8, Box 9, (GETT 41151), GNMP Archives.

¹⁴ R. L. Jones to Verne Chatelain, February 5, 1934. Folder 9, Box 9, (GETT 41151), GNMP Archives.

employees coped within their limited and antiquated contact center, but still strove to develop alternative methods for educating the visitors, while museum education remained in the hands of private business.

Without doubt the most extensive and popular museum in Gettysburg was the Rosensteel's Gettysburg National Museum on Taneytown Road, directly across the street from the National Cemetery. Visitors to the Gettysburg National Museum wandered through a cavernous structure filled with various artifacts. In April 1939 George Rosensteel unveiled a 6,000 foot fire-proof addition to his museum. The added displays, totaling sixty seven cases, and a newly constructed relief map, made the Rosensteel collection the most popular museum in Gettysburg. To house the growing collection, he added subsequent new spaces to the original structure; one in December 1940 enlarged the privately owned museum to an impressive three stories.¹⁵

The Gettysburg National Museum provided to interested visitors what McConaghie and the early Park Service administration could not. Asserting his prominent role in the battlefield's story, Rosensteel commented that he found "more cars parked at the National Museum than at any other point of interest on the battlefield," including the High Water Mark, Little Round Top, and the Peace Light. The Park Service's relation with the privately owned Rosensteel museum remained mostly amicable. At times, however, McConaghie appeared to harbor animosity

¹⁵ Lawrence Eckert, Jr., to Mrs. Douglas Poage, April 26, 1977. Vertical Files 14-23 (Rosensteel Collection), Gettysburg National Military Park Library [hereinafter cited as VF, GNMP Library]; "National Museum Will Be Enlarged," unnamed news article, April 1938. Folder 0-31, Box 2489, RG 79, CCF, NARA College Park, Maryland; Superintendent James McConaghie, "Superintendent's Monthly Report," July 1939, written on August 5, 1939. Folder 2, Box 4, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 1; Superintendent James McConaghie, "Superintendent's Monthly Reports, December 1940," written on January 8, 1941. Folder 1, Box 4, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 4-5.

toward the Rosensteels, referring to their museum as the “so-called Gettysburg Museum.”¹⁶ Such characterizations could simply reflect McConaghie’s professional contempt for what was a rather amateurish museum. The Gettysburg National Museum offered little in the way of interpreting the Civil War, but simply showcased thousands of objects in glass cases, typical of a “curiosity room” of the nineteenth century. Yet until the National Park Service could offer museum services, the Rosensteel’s National Museum served tens of thousands of Gettysburg visitors each year.

One alternative, and an accustomed sight at other National Parks, was to establish a Park Service presence on the battlefield. To enhance the visitor’s experience, ranger historians worked at various points on the battlefield to engage in visitor contact. Typically rangers roved through the frequently visited places, including the Pennsylvania and Virginia Memorials, the Peace Light Memorial, Little Round Top, Devil’s Den, and East Cemetery Hill.¹⁷

Although plans to develop a museum education program did not come to fruition, smaller scale educational projects were accomplished during the Great Depression era, often again with the help of New Deal labor. In addition to the proposal for more extensive museum services, workers from the Civil Works Administration (CWA) placed suitable maps in exhibit cases throughout the battlefield to provide visitors with an on-site orientation and an explanation of the events at that site. In the summer of 1939, with CCC funds, the park published a 4,000- word orientation booklet, containing fifteen pictures and two maps. During the 1930s era, CWA

¹⁶ George Rosensteel to Congressmen Harry Haines, June 29, 1938. Folder 0-31, Box 2489, CCF, RG 79, NARA College Park; James McConaghie, “Superintendent’s Monthly Reports, December 1940,” written on January 8, 1941. Folder 1, Box 4, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 4-5.

¹⁷ James McConaghie, “Superintendent’s Monthly Reports, July 1939,” written on August 5, 1939. Folder 2, Box 4, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 4; J. M. Sheads to James McConaghie, September 4, 1939. Box 7, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives.

employees also established a system of walking trails, totaling nineteen miles, which allowed visitors to traverse terrain not easily accessible from the park avenues. CWA workers undertook historical studies on the history of Adams County and developed an extensive bibliography on the battle and its participants. Undoubtedly without the efforts of the New Deal employees, little of significant value could have been accomplished during these transitional years. R. L. Jones praised the work of the CWA, stating that their work “more than justified the expenditure it involved. Much permanent good has been accomplished and much would not have been accomplished under other circumstances.”¹⁸

Recognizing the need for an institutional memory, Park Service staff and New Deal historians meanwhile undertook numerous historical studies of the battle. In July 1937 the director of the National Park Service instructed its historians to devote the majority of their off-season time to historical research and during the tourist season to educational programs. Gettysburg quickly took advantage of this directive to increase the park’s interpretation. In 1937 the NPS hired Assistant Historian Dr. Frederick Tilberg to oversee the park’s history program and specifically to increase the park’s educational programs and prepare detailed reports on nearly every aspect of the battle. Tilberg’s responsibilities were listed as follows: “Plans, directs, supervises all historical research, interpretation and museum activities... Prepares historical publications. Prepares studies for historical restoration. Directs and supervises public contact work.” The park also hired two seasonal ranger/historians, whose primary duties were to present

¹⁸ James McConaghie, “Superintendent’s Monthly Report,” May 1939, written on June 13, 1939. Folder 2, Box 4, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 4; R. L. Jones to Verne Chatelain, February 5, 1934. Folder 9, Box 9, (GETT 41151), GNMP Archives; R.L. Jones, “Report of the Historical Technician, Gettysburg National Military Park, December 1933,” written on January 2, 1934. Folder 9, Box 9, (GETT 41151), GNMP Archives; “Report Historical Technician, April 23-28, 1934” by R. L. Jones. Folder 9, Box 10, (GETT 41151), GNMP Archives.

educational programs, assist with visitor services, and conduct historical research.¹⁹ During this early period, park historians researched a myriad of topics including historic farms, Meade's headquarters at the Leister House, cavalry at Gettysburg, and Pennsylvania soldiers at Gettysburg to name a few.

Superintendent McConaghie commented on the inestimable value of relief funds in providing educational services, stating that emergency work "afforded an opportunity to accomplish more research both to establish facts on things questioned of what has been done before and on newly developed questions . . . Their contribution has been extremely valuable." The park, for example, received financial assistance from the Civilian Conservation Corps to hire historians to develop park brochures and research the battle. At this time, the Park Service also developed one of its earliest tour maps of the battlefield. Dated February 1938, it noted points of special interest, including Little Round Top, Devil's Den, the Wheatfield, the Peach Orchard, Culp's Hill, Cemetery Hill, the High Water Mark, and the National Cemetery. It also indicated that further information pertaining to the battlefield could be obtained in the Federal Office Building or at the park entrance stations. The park brochure added that guides were available for personalized tours for three dollars per car.²⁰

Eager to utilize the park's structures themselves for educational purposes, in November 1938 park staff proposed to restore the historic Lydia Leister farm, used during the battle as the

¹⁹ Arno B. Cammerer, Director of the National Park Service, July 12, 1937. Folder 3, Box 18, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives; Superintendent Kittridge Wing, "Superintendent's Monthly Narrative Report, November 1965," written on December 15, 1965. Box 192, A2823, Administrative Files, 1949-1971, RG 79, National Parks, Gettysburg National Military Park, National Archives and Records Administration College Park, Maryland, 2 [hereinafter cited by Box, AF, RG 79, NARA College Park]; Unrau, *Administrative History*, 169; Superintendent James McConaghie, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 1936-1937." Box 2, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 25. Tilberg received his doctoral degree from the University of Iowa in 1928.

²⁰ Superintendent James McConaghie, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 1934-1935." Box 2, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives; National Park Service, Gettysburg National Military Park Brochure, 1938. GNMP Library.

headquarters of the Army of the Potomac's commanding general George G. Meade. Upon complete restoration of the historic scene, the park would utilize the historic site as a field museum. With their main contact station downtown in the Post Office building, park officials were eager to develop a museum/visitor contact facility on the battlefield and believed that Meade's headquarters "from a historical viewpoint" was the "logical place," but never proceeded with this proposal.²¹

While the educational, interpretive program at Gettysburg would eventually become one of the National Park Service's most significant accomplishments, early management actions often focused on management of the landscape. Lacking a uniform battlefield landscape management policy, park management had the freedom to utilize the park's landscape at their discretion, with little oversight or direction from national offices. It is in this realm that McConaghie's administration made its most permanent, and often adverse, impact on the battlefield.

As with advancements in educational programs, physical changes to the landscape occurred within the broader realm of Roosevelt's New Deal. As the Great Depression strangled the American economy and people found themselves unemployed, the federal government pumped enormous amounts of money into creating what Roosevelt's critics called "make-work projects." Much of the physical work on the battlefield during this decade was completed with

²¹ "Materials Pertaining to the Proposed Redistribution of Lands, Gettysburg National Military Park, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania," November 1938. Folder 3, Box 7, (GETT 41151), GNMP Archives, 32.

money from Roosevelt's New Deal projects. Between 1933 and 1940, for instance, the National Park Service received 220 million dollars to fund New Deal projects in the parks.²²

In an era of high unemployment, bread lines, "Hooverilles," and catastrophic dust storms in the Midwest, park management meanwhile strove to augment tourism by emphasizing the scenic beauty of the battlefield. In an October 1937 letter to the NPS Director, McConaghie noted that the autumn foliage was nearing its best and that attention should be drawn to the park's natural beauty. Following McConaghie's memo the park issued a press release offering a typical narrative of the "sanguine struggle" of July 1, 2, 3, 1863, but further encouraged Americans to realize that "there is another side to the notable Battlefield." While driving through the famed fields of Little Round Top, Culp's Hill, Cemetery Ridge, visitors "cannot help but observe the natural beauty of the area." The autumn foliage defined the landscape in the fall, while the redbuds and dogwoods rejuvenated the fields in the spring.²³

Throughout the Great Depression the park frequently issued similar press releases promoting the scenic beauty of the natural landscape. In May 1940, park officials pleasingly reported that over 16,000 visitors traveled to the battlefield on the weekend of the 10-12 to see the spring foliage, particularly with the dogwood "at its best." Park maintenance undertook various to beautify the park, including "tree surgery" that was practiced along park avenues and around monuments, so the park and its historic structures could have a "dressed up appearance."

²² William C. Everhart, *The National Park Service* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1983), 31.

²³ Superintendent James McConaghie to Director, NPS, October 5, 1937 and attached Press Release October 5, 1937. Folder 10, Box 11, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives.

New Dealers often cleaned up brush, briars, and vines, and cut and removed dead trees. On one occasion CCC enrollees cleaned off a total of 26.75 acres on Culp's Hill.²⁴

Presumably management's intent in advocating the scenic beauty of the park was to increase visitation while raising citizens' spirits in a time of economic uncertainty and despair. Not all of the park staff, however, favored this duality of the Gettysburg battlefield. Voicing opposition to McConaghie's promotion of the rosebuds, dogwoods, and autumn foliage, Jones lamented, "Gradually the area is ceasing to be a Military Park and becoming a mere spot of scenic beauty." Moreover, the National Park Service expected to provide particular amenities befitting to a national park, notably picnic accommodations. Early proposals to erect picnic tables on the battlefield generated extensive debate among park service employees. The historical staff chided the absurdity of placing picnic tables on historic grounds and voiced such sentiment in letters to the superintendent. "The Nation, as a whole," Jones wrote, "is not and never can be interested in the Park as a scenic or recreational spot. The Government should not compete with municipalities in the development of such parks. This is a hallowed spot. We should not desecrate it by encouraging picnics, even with a few rustic tables." Other minor, though symbolically significant pleasurable amenities included the addition of coin-operated telescopes at Little Round Top, the High Water Mark, and the Peace Light in the winter of 1940.²⁵

²⁴ Frederick Tilberg to Superintendent James McConaghie, "Historians' Narrative Reports, May 1940," written on June 6, 1940. Folder 4, Box 7, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives; R. L. Jones letter to Verne Chatelain, March 7, 1934; J. Howard Diehl, Narrative Report to Superintendent James McConaghie, July 17, 1934. Folder 10, Box 9, (GETT 41151), GNMP Archives.

²⁵ R. L. Jones to Verne Chatelain, November 1, 1934, Folder 1, Box 1, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives; R. L. Jones to James McConaghie, February 9, 1934. Folder 2, Box 1, (GETT 41151), GNMP Archives; Superintendent James McConaghie, "Superintendent's Monthly Report, December 1940," written on January 8, 1941. Folder 1, Box 4, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 3. As reflected in his comment, Jones became disillusioned and discouraged by McConaghie's constant efforts to change the battlefield's historic landscape and as a result left Gettysburg in 1937, Senior Historian Kathy Harrison, interview by author, 15 February 2009. This assertion comes

At Gettysburg, park administrators paid meticulous attention to visitor services, adhering to the Organic Act that the NPS “shall promote and regulate the use of the Federal areas known as national parks.” On July 9, 1936, the Park Service opened the historic George Weikert farmhouse as an information station. The historian’s report noted that visitors were “highly pleased” with the new contact station and were “profuse in... thanks” and complimented the Park Service on this type of work. Using the Weikert house as a makeshift visitor center, however, necessitated the construction of a driveway and parking lot to accommodate vehicles. To make the battlefield itself more accessible to visitors, thus promoting the use of national parks, park management approved the addition of extra parking at Little Round Top in the summer of 1937.²⁶

The Park Service ultimately constructed and opened four buildings within the park boundaries to increase visitor services, as well as expanding a small utility building for maintenance and storage. In 1936, it added comfort stations at Devil’s Den and Spangler’s Spring. Two additional buildings opened as entrance stations in May 1937, one along the Chambersburg Pike and the other along Emmittsburg Road, both designated to further increase visitor contact and services. Applauding the agency’s efforts to provide a visitor-friendly atmosphere, the superintendent commented in the annual report that “the year just passed has

from Harrison’s personal interview with R. L. King conducted in 1994. There is no record of the King interview in the GNMP archives or library. The foundation for the coin-operated telescopes were laid on December 1940.

²⁶ The National Park Service Organic Act, 39, Stat. 535, approved August 25, 1916, available at www.nps.gov/legacy/organic-act.htm; “Historians’ Narrative Reports, September 1936.” Folder 3, Box 8, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives; Superintendent James McConaghie, “Superintendent’s Monthly Report, August 1937.” Box 5, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives.

witnessed a better satisfaction on the part of the tourist and has afforded a better plan with which to serve both the visitor and the ideals of the National Park Service.”²⁷

It could be argued that management’s intent in constructing the comfort stations and additional parking lots was to provide logical visitor access and services. Though the erection of modern buildings altered the historic landscape, such construction fulfilled a larger need. Gettysburg was, after all, a national park and basic visitor needs must be met. Yet not all of the physical changes occurring during the 1930s were executed with visitor service in mind. The irreversible damage that the McConaghie administration inflicted on the Soldiers’ National Cemetery served no greater good for visitor convenience. Instead physical alterations in the National Cemetery proved to be one of the most damaging and long-lasting initiatives implemented during the National Park Service’s administration.

By the 1930s, the Soldiers’ National Cemetery had become perhaps the most renowned in America. It was where 3,512 Union soldiers were interned from the battle and where President Abraham Lincoln had delivered his “Gettysburg Address.” The McConaghie administration proclaimed that while under the management of the War Department, however, “little or no improvements” were made to the cemetery, and the sacred burial grounds had taken on “an appearance unbecoming to a National Shrine.” Thus the National Park Service developed a plan to preserve and protect the cemetery. Between June 1933 and August 1935, again with financial assistance from New Deal agencies, the NPS instituted significant changes and modifications to this national landmark.²⁸

²⁷ Superintendent James McConaghie, “Superintendent’s Monthly Report, May 1937.” Box 5, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives; Superintendent James McConaghie, “Superintendent’s Annual Report, 1936-1937.” Box 2, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 1.

²⁸ “The Gettysburg National Cemetery: An Exposition of Emergency Conservation Work Projects, September 1935.” Folder 10, Box 1, (GETT 41113), Gettysburg National Military Park Archives, 1 [hereinafter cited as “The Gettysburg National Cemetery,” GNMP Archives].

One of the more significant changes was the restructuring and resetting of the soldiers' headstones. The original stones, placed in 1863 and 1864, were elevated approximately twelve inches above ground level, but they lacked proper foundational support. After decades of harsh winter weather and frost heaves, the stones had shifted and became misaligned. According to park officials, that produced an "unsightly vista, lacked the symmetry that was originally intended, and produced in one a feeling of a lack of care." To correct this problem the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) temporarily removed the headstones, dug trenches to create a concrete foundation for them, and reset them.²⁹ To provide for a contiguous and level landscape that could more easily be mowed, they also introduced new grading to gravesite through the introduction of dirt throughout the historic burial section. This left the headstones level with the ground, however, which drastically affected the cemetery's original design. They were no longer easily visible from the drives, and visitors often left unaware of their existence.

Aside from lowering the elevation of the headstones, park staff discontinued the War Department's policy of painting names on them. As early as 1866 loved ones coming to Gettysburg to pay respects and mourn their fallen sons, brothers, husbands, and friends, had been dismayed by the etching of the names on the granite stones. After numerous complaints to the War Department, cemetery administrators began the practice of using black paint to fill the etching on the stones, providing for greater visibility of the soldiers' names. When the National Park Service assumed management duties of the cemetery, it argued that there was insufficient historic evidence of this practice, and the painting of the names ended.³⁰

²⁹ "The Gettysburg National Cemetery," (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 10.

³⁰ "Friends of the National Parks at Gettysburg" Newsletter, Fall 1996, 1. In the 1970s and 1980s visitor complaints caused the park historians to research the practice of painting the names on the granite headstones. Research

The Park Service freely made other changes to the cemetery that ignored William Saunders' original design. Saunders had included a pipe fence and adjoining hedge to separate the Soldiers' National Cemetery from the Evergreen Cemetery, which was the adjacent public cemetery. In 1933, park management removed the pipe fence for "aesthetic reasons," for it was "neither artistic in character, nor valuable from a utilitarian viewpoint." Park Service employees instead relocated a much higher fence from East Cemetery Hill to separate the two cemeteries.³¹ Another change to the original design was the removal of the arboretum of evergreens that lined the pipe fence. The Soldiers' National Monument, dedicated in 1869, was the only monument in the cemetery that was part of Saunders' original design. An iron fence and shrubbery surrounded it until 1933 when the Park Service removed both features, which further changed the historic landscape from its original intent. The NPS eliminated the gravel circular walkway between the soldiers' graves. Combined with the grading of the landscape, this hindered visitors from easily seeing the headstones and forced them to the periphery of the graves.

Clearly the desire to beautify the cemetery, and to provide easy vehicular access to the hallowed grounds, was paramount to park officials. In terms of beautification, the NPS removed many of the cemetery's landscape trees, most notably the Norway spruces along its western boundary and Norway maples along the upper drive of the eastern boundary. In their stead, the Park Service planted ornamental trees-- rhododendrons, spruces, and hemlocks-- to beautify the cemetery with trees that required less maintenance. In just one month, employees planted over

confirmed the War Department's practice, initiated in 1866, and the park resumed this practice in 1996. The stone selected for the headstone did not adequately provide contrast when incised, thus limiting its readability.

³¹ "The Gettysburg National Cemetery," (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 6. This was done as part of an 1863 agreement with Evergreen Cemetery to erect the boundary fence at an ordinary height of the battle-era picket and rail fence it replaced. See also Reed Engle, *Cultural Landscape Report: The Soldiers' National Cemetery Gettysburg, Pennsylvania 1994*. Uncataloged report, Gettysburg National Military Park Archives, 18 [hereinafter cited as *CLR*]. The fence from East Cemetery Hill originally surrounded Lafayette Square and was placed on the battlefield in 1888 by a Congressional order.

two hundred holly trees and rhododendrons. Decades earlier Saunders had cautioned against such additions by stating that his design was one of “simple grandeur.”³²

To provide for convenient visitor vehicular access to the cemetery, and to accommodate tour buses carrying veterans for the July 1938 reunion festivities, park officials also determined to widen the cemetery’s gates. Prior to the 1938 reunion the Park Service had removed the cemetery gates along the Baltimore Pike to widen the entrance from fourteen feet apart to twenty feet. Though intending to reset the gates at the wider width immediately, maintenance officials discovered considerable structural damage in the gates, and thus the gates were not set in time for the July 1938 reunion. Local veteran organizations decried the Park Service’s actions, arguing that the removal of the gates left the cemetery open to vandalism. The cemetery’s posts were reset at a greater distance between them, accommodating for modern vehicular access, in the spring of 1939. This increased width, however, necessitated removing the historic 1865 gates and fabricating new generic gates modeled after the historic ones. New Deal laborers also reset the brick walkways outside the Soldiers’ National Cemetery along Baltimore Pike.³³

The end result of the National Park Service’s changes to the National Cemetery was disregard for the resource and for an historic integrity that focused visitor attention inward to the graves and a sense of loss to landscape details that reflected pride in enormous sacrifice.

³² Gettysburg National Military Park National Register Documentation, Adams County, PA, (NRIS 66000642), National Register of Historic Places, Washington, DC, 1/23/2004, 251-252 [hereinafter as “National Register”]; *CLR*, 116; Ronald F. Lee, “The Origin and Evolution of the National Military Park Idea” (Office of Historic Preservation, Washington, D.C.: Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1973), 18. This report is a summary of the Park Service’s efforts to acquire the battlefields under the War Department’s management.

³³ Superintendent James McConaghie to NPS Director, July 11, 1938; “S. of V. Protest Removing of Gate Pillars,” *Gettysburg Times*, 4 February 1939. Folder 0-1, Box 2489, RG 79, CCF, NARA College Park; Superintendent James McConaghie, “Superintendent’s Monthly Report, April 1939,” written on May 15, 1939; Superintendent James McConaghie, “Superintendent’s Monthly Report, July 1939,” written on August 5, 1939. Folder 2, Box 4, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives. CCC laborers were used for this work. Based on conducted research, it appears as though only the gates along the Baltimore Pike entrance were removed and reset; the ones along the Taneytown Road remained in place.

Such alterations illustrate the influence and importance of Superintendent McConaghie's vision, one grounded in landscape architecture, but also point to management's tendencies to lean toward utilitarian purposes instead of honoring original historic intent. The resetting of the headstones was necessary to reset to correct the alignment from frost heaves, but resetting the stones at a lower elevation, flush with the ground, was done purely for the ease of maintenance in mowing. Thus, within thirty-six months after assuming control of the battlefield and cemetery, the National Park Service had irrevocably altered the cemetery's design. Local veterans' camps readily spoke out against such changes in the cemetery's design, decrying that "The general impression here is that the Department of the Interior, since it has had charge of the Battlefield and Cemetery, seems to treat the National Cemetery and the Battlefield as public parks rather than as sacred Memorials. Such was not the case when the Cemetery and Battlefield were in charge of the War Department."³⁴

Meanwhile, McConaghie's administration also embarked on a multitude of other changes in the park's infrastructure, designed to provide visitors with a safe and orderly journey throughout the park. Financed with New Deal money, significant time went particularly into the battlefield avenues that had been built by the War Department. These avenues had been constructed for nineteenth century horse-drawn carriages, not modern automobiles, and by the early thirties they were quickly deteriorating. Recognizing their inefficiencies and poor design, McConaghie stipulated that "no new road work is contemplated until the present evils are eliminated." Projects 501 and 502 provided \$15,000 in federal monies to improve the park's avenues, gutters, and culverts. Other improvements included the installation of new catch basins to provide proper drainage, the removal of

³⁴ William L. Meals to Hon. Joseph Guffey, February 9, 1939. Folder 0-31, Box 2489, CCF, RG 79, NARA, College Park.

headwalls along the battlefield roads, the elimination of approximately seven thousand feet of concrete and stone gutters, the replacement of culverts, and the reinforcement of bridges. New Deal funds also went to widen intersections and restructure park avenues. WPA workers, for example, labored on the removal of stone gutters and widened avenues and intersections until November 13, 1939 when the project was terminated due to lack of funds.³⁵

The NPS made greater changes to many of the battlefield's historic structures after the park received \$13,000 from the Public Works Administration (PWA) to repair and restore buildings that had existed during the battle. Beginning on July 30, 1934, PWA employees repaired "the structures in all the necessary places in a manner following the original construction," which included walls, windows, floors, and roofing. Eventually park staff and the PWA selected and repaired twelve historically significant buildings.³⁶

Perhaps the most controversial project was the demolition and removal of the John Forney farm. On May 19, 1937, the NPS finally established a uniform policy for battlefield restoration. "Restoration Policies" stipulated guidelines for the restoration of historic sites, but specifically detailed restoration procedures for battlefields. Regarding the preservation of battlefields, the policy states, "In a sense a wise policy might better be described as one of

³⁵ Superintendent James McConaghie, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 1936-1937" (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 43; "Report on Roads and Trails, National Parks, Emergency Construction Act June 19, 1934." Folder 8, Box 8, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives; Superintendent James McConaghie, "Superintendent's Monthly Report, November 1939," written on December 8, 1939. Folder 2, Box 4, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 5.

³⁶ Cornelius Howry, "Final Construction Report Reconditioning of House and Farm Structures, February 25, 1936." Folder 7, Box 8, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives; "Report to the Chief Architect on the Historic Farm Groups, Gettysburg National Military Park Gettysburg, Pennsylvania." Folder 10, Box 1, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives. The buildings repaired were the Basil Biggs, Abraham Bryan, Michael Bushman, Nicholas Cordori, Henry Culp, Jacob Hummelbaugh, Daniel Klinge, Edward McPherson, John Slyder, Abraham Trostle, John Wentz, and George Weikert buildings. The Lydia Leister farm, used as General George G. Meade's headquarters during the battle, was also restored at this time.

stabilization rather than restoration.” The “Restoration Policies” approved the removal of “undesirable modern encroachments,” such as recent buildings, gas stations, and other “incongruous elements.” These policies also allowed the restoration of natural and historic landscape and structures. Accordingly, a guiding restoration policy stipulated, “better preserve than repair, better repair than restore, better restore than construct.”³⁷

McConaghie and his administration, however, gave little heed to the new policies in its destruction of the Forney farm buildings. Located northwest of the town on Oak Ridge, the Forney farm was the scene of heavy fighting between General Robert Rodes’ Confederates and General John Robinson’s Union forces on July 1st. The Forney buildings became obstacles to Confederate troop movements, but also provided shelter from the Union fire. As a result the property suffered minor structural damage from the battle, notably bullet holes. Later the house and barn became temporary field hospitals, and the surrounding fields served as burial sites for Confederate soldiers.

The Pennsylvania Commission for the 75th Anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg, in consultation with the National Park Service, purchased land on Oak Ridge for the Eternal Peace Light monument that was to be dedicated for the battle’s anniversary in July 1938. In the fall of 1937, the commission secured land on the north and south side of the Mummasburg Road to provide for proper placement and view of the memorial. The Forney buildings, located on the south side of the Mummasburg Road, were by this time in a “dilapidated condition.” The Pennsylvania Commission offered the buildings to the Park Service, but the park refused to salvage them. McConaghie argued that the Forney property was of “questionable historic value,” and also cited “the expensive and questionable problem of restoration.” In his

³⁷ “Restoration Policies, May 19, 1937,” reprinted in Unrau, *Administrative History*, 415-417, Appendix R.

estimation, his priority was not to restore or salvage historic buildings, but to demolish them in order to “provide a proper setting for the new monument.”³⁸ Shortly thereafter, the commission signed an agreement with a third party to demolish the Forney property by January 1, 1938.

Interestingly enough, not until the demolition began, and subsequent concern over the importance of the Forney buildings surfaced, did park historian Frederick Tilberg prepare a report on their historical significance. In his November 1937 memo to the NPS director, McConaghie had claimed that the Park Service knew of “no special historical significance” connected with the Forney buildings. The superintendent argued that because these buildings were not marked by previous administrations as historically significant, and because the Park Service was unaware of any importance of the property that “razing proceedings should be continued.” Within months after the Forney buildings were demolished, the NPS director authored a memo to all parks noting, “a basic function of the National Park Service is the preservation and interpretation of historic sites . . . Once an inaccurate restoration or reconstruction has been made, it is difficult, if not impossible to repair the error.”³⁹

Meanwhile the NPS attempted to reconcile its mission of preservation with the more immediate need in the midst of economic depression to utilize the battlefield ground. At times

³⁸ Superintendent James McConaghie to the Director of the National Park Service, November 20, 1937, Box 5, unprocessed collection (GETT 41161), Records of the National Park Service at Gettysburg National Military Park, Gettysburg National Military Park Archives [hereinafter cited as (GETT 41161), GNMP Archives]; James McConaghie to the Director of the National Park Service, November 20, 1937. Box 5, (GETT 41161), GNMP Archives. For additional reading on the dedication of the Peace Light, see Amy Kinsel, “From Turning Point to Peace Memorial: A Cultural Legacy” in *The Gettysburg Nobody Knows*, edited by Gabor S. Boritt (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997, 203-222).

³⁹ Superintendent James McConaghie to Director of the National Park Service, November 20, 1937. Box 5, (GETT 41161), GNMP Archives; Memo from Arno B. Cammerer, NPS Director, June 20, 1938. Box 18, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives.

the McConaghie administration failed to comply with other agency's policies on preservation, including the Organic Act of 1916, which noted that government land would be left "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."⁴⁰ The best example of neglecting to fulfill its roles to preserve and protect the landscape was the alteration of the battlefield's farm policies.

When the NPS assumed management of the Gettysburg National Military Park, it immediately altered the War Department's prior farm policy. The department had established a practice of leasing battlefield property to private residents, called the "revocable lease system." The lessee rented the property and cultivated the land for a specified number of years determined by the Secretary of War. The War Department then worked directly with the lessees to protect historic structures and landscape features. For example, the department was authorized to condemn and gain possession of any historic ground if commercial or private development started to infringe on these grounds. This aggressive action preserved many of the battlefield's historic fences, property boundaries, woodlots and orchards. The system also provided cultivation of over one thousand acres and operated for forty years.⁴¹

NPS officials, however, decided that the War Department's farm policy was plagued with "imperfections." In 1935, Louis King developed a new farm policy, designed to redress the failures of the War Department's policies and not incidentally to extract maximum profit from the battlefield land, which by 1935 comprised 2,530.32 acres. King advocated taking "into consideration the trend of progress at the same time preserving the historical continuity of the areas involved." Historical records indicated that 50 percent of the current park grounds had

⁴⁰ Georgie Boge and Margie Holder Boge, *Paving Over the Past: A History and Guide to Civil War Battlefield Preservation* (Washington, D.C.: Island Press, 1993), 25.

⁴¹ Unrau, *Administrative History*, 189; *GMP*, vol. 1, xxvi; Louis E. King, "Farm Policy: Farm Areas in the Gettysburg National Military Park, May 1937." Folder 9, Box 1, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 2 [hereinafter cited as King, "Farm Policy," (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives].

been cultivated at the time of the battle. King, however, suggested that continuous cultivation of all areas was impracticable and a change in farming practices was necessary.⁴²

One of the first changes was the termination of the revocable lease system. In its place management announced a new lease policy that granted one-year special use permits, issued and renewed by the park superintendent. The most significant change in the NPS farm policy, however, was the consolidation of farms and farmland. King argued that the War Department “distributed [land] indiscriminately and without regard to future agricultural development.” This system resulted in a condition in which the land “was cut up into small areas that can neither be farmed economically from the viewpoint of the tenant or satisfactorily from the viewpoint of the administration.” In 1933, when the NPS assumed control of the battlefield, there were sixteen separate farms within the park’s boundary, ranging from three to 304 acres. King’s policy advocated consolidation into eight farms, ranging in size from 82 to 304 acres. The small William Patterson farm, for example, officially ceased to exist when it was incorporated into the George Weikert farm. According to park officials, the consolidation of farms and farmland importantly “reduced maintenance and also reduces bookkeeping and the handling of numerous records that must be kept.”⁴³

Clearly, profit was the major factor. King’s report included a detailed study on each of the existing farms with recommendations on how best to extract the maximum agricultural production from the land. For example, he argued that Edward McPherson’s fields, where much of the early morning fighting on July 1 occurred, were farmed “to a great disadvantage,”

⁴² King, “Farm Policy,” (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 1-3.

⁴³ King, “Farm Policy,” (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 30; 55; Unrau, *Administrative History*, 190. Additionally, in 1936-1936, the small farm properties of Weikert, Bryan, and Hummelbaugh were removed from agricultural cultivation.

particularly because no system of regular cropping was being executed in these fields. Nor were farmers taking advantage of the excellent soil conditions that allowed for a wide variety of crop productions. King added that the McPherson farm's proximity to town and shipping locations could be used to a "splendid advantage." He concluded that "the greatest evil . . . lies in the fact that no attempt is made at regular cultivation over the entire farm."⁴⁴

King's earlier criticism of the War Department's farm policy and distribution of property was both inaccurate and unfair. The commission had not disregarded property lines, as King argued, but had maintained farm properties and boundaries to their 1863 historic condition. Gettysburg area farms, at the time of the battle, were small, generally less than fifteen acres. Most Pennsylvania farmers lacked the economic resources to purchase large acres of land and because the majority of farms were subsistence production, not market production, the necessary labor-intensive practices limited the amount of land that farmers could feasibly cultivate.⁴⁵

A summary of the condition of the battlefield farms, written by agriculturist John G. Wilson, on January 30, 1934, reinforced the Park Service's priority for maximizing agricultural production. This memo divided the historic farms into three categories. Farms to be abandoned included the Slyder, Masenheimer, Althoff, Hummelbaugh, Bryan, and Wentz farms. The Bushman and Weikert farms were to be "conditioned or abandoned as forest." The Culp, McPherson, Biggs, Codori, Klingle, and Trostle farms would be improved. Wilson further suggested that the park "eliminate the pasture evil by removing all field fences, save those of the permanent pasture," and recommended removing "rocks, brush, and other obstructions to the extent that will make it possible to farm them economically." Wilson, echoing King's

⁴⁴ King, "Farm Policy," (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 56-60.

⁴⁵ "National Register," 10

complaints regarding the McPherson farm, suggested that park management “rearrange available farm land for more economical labor costs.”⁴⁶ Both reports failed to give any consideration to the historic farming practices.

To extract the greatest agricultural profit from the farmland, and to implement Wilson’s 1934 policy, NPS employees began removing any other impediments, historic and non-historic, from the landscape. Park officials prepared a series of farm maps that documented necessary changes to the farm fields for utilitarian purposes. Such notations frequently referred to the removal of rocks, stonewalls, fences, brush, and trees. Alterations to the Culp farm included removal of 8,850 feet of fence, as well as the elimination of rocks and trees, and the combination of two fields for easier cultivation. The map for the Weikert farm noted “too many rocks and brush to farm,” while the map for the Trostle farm stated “too many rocks; good soil; condition these fields and add to Weikert.” Two maps were developed for the Bushman farm. The first map indicated “arrangement not as profitable or economical [sic] as that of Map 2.” The preferred method called for the removal of all fences, stone walls, trees, and brush, and suggested fields for permanent pasture. Each map marked previously conducted soil samples and acidity tests, but lacked reference to potential historical significance of the fences, stone walls, or trees that the park service eagerly sought to remove. A 1938 report on the redistribution of lands echoed the need to remove any fence that impeded modern farming practices.⁴⁷

⁴⁶ John G. Wilson, “Brief summary of survey study of Battlefield farms to date, January 30, 1934.” Folder 10, Box 9, (GETT 41151), GNMP Archives.

⁴⁷ “Series of Farm Maps.” Park Maps and Drawings, 1933-1960 (GETT 41107), Gettysburg National Military Park Archives [hereinafter cited as (GETT 41107), GNMP Archives]; “Materials Pertaining to the Proposed Redistribution of Lands, Gettysburg National Military Park, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania.” November 1938. Folder 3, Box 7, (GETT 41151), GNMP Archives.

A March 1934 letter from R. L. Jones, the park's historical technician, reinforced the park service's disregard for historic integrity. At the time of the battle, there was minimal undergrowth in the woodlots because farmers and cattle frequently grazed among the trees actively used them. The War Department, in keeping with maintaining the woodlots in their 1863 condition, annually burned excess tree foliage and shrubbery. As early as 1934, the Park Service stopped the practice. Instead of controlling undergrowth through annual burns, the agency adopted a policy that would "encourage undergrowth," believing that controlled burns would reduce the "fertility of the soil."⁴⁸ In places such as Oak Hill, the Codori-Trostle Thicket, McMillian Woods, and the slopes of Big Round Top, trees and underbrush quickly developed.

Five years later, in November 1938, park officials continued to debate how best to use the historic landscape and proposed more redistribution of lands. Continuing with King's consolidation policies of 1935, a new report suggested additional redistribution of farmlands, but better recognized the need of maintaining some historic integrity to the original farmlands. Park officials, for example, advocated that part of the historic Codori farm, situated in the field of Pickett's Charge along the Emmitsburg Road be abandoned as farmland and acquired by the park. In order to compensate the owner for the loss of property on the east side of the Emmitsburg Road, they would provide land in return. Like King's earlier suggestions, the 1938 report also recommended consolidating small farmlands into larger existing farms. But while King had failed to consider the historical significance of the farmlands, he instead focused on maximizing profit. The 1938 report demonstrated more sensitivity to managing a historic

⁴⁸ R. L. Jones to Verne Chatelain, March 7, 1934. Folder 10, Box 9, (GETT 41151), GNMP Archives. Part of the current battlefield restoration and rehabilitation program is to eliminate the excessive undergrowth that developed during the early Park Service administration.

landscape as noted in the conclusion, “It has been pointed out that the farm areas are inextricably bound up with the historical significance of the park.”⁴⁹

NPS farm policy, in short, undermined the integrity of the historic landscape. Earlier park commissioners had managed the landscape in a manner that remained relatively consistent to the battlefield’s 1863 condition so that visitors could understand how the terrain, including fencing patterns and field patterns, influenced the course of the battle. To the NPS, however, utilization, efficiency of the farm grounds, and profit became more important than preservation. The NPS “understood its mission to preserve the land across which the battle was fought literally and consequently placed the highest priority on conservation of the soils of the battlefield.” Park Service officials, intent on accommodating modern agricultural practices, destroyed historic fences, consolidated farms, removed of boulders, and allowed excessive undergrowth to spread in non-historic woodlots in areas not suitable for farming. Such practices and changes to the historic landscape remained an unfortunate legacy of the NPS takeover until the 1990s.⁵⁰

The Park Service’s farm policy, in part, was likely influenced by contemporary environmental events, namely the Dust Bowl of the late 1930s. Consequent of extreme overuse of millions of acres of mid-western farmland, as well as ignorance of soil conservation policies, the Dust Bowl became an environmental and economic disaster. Hapless farming practices

⁴⁹ “Materials Pertaining to the Proposed Redistribution of Lands, Gettysburg National Military Park, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania.” November 1938. Folder 3, Box 7, (GETT 41151), GNMP Archives, 30. This report, for example, recommended that part of the Klingel farm that adjoins the Trostle farm to the east be incorporated into the larger Trostle farm.

⁵⁰ *GMP*, vol. 1, xxvi; 61. The NPS defines rehabilitation as “making possible compatible uses through repair, alterations, and additions while preserving those historic features that are significant and convey historical values.” This allows visitors to see the landscape features, as accurate as possible, as the soldiers would have seen them in July 1863, and thus assist the visitors in understanding the landscape features and its impact on the fighting. Specifically, woods that have grown up since the battle are being cut back, historic orchards are being replanted, and historic fence lines are being reconstructed. Complete “restoration,” recreating the exact battlefield landscape, is impossible.

combined with extreme weather conditions caused seemingly unnatural dust storms throughout the mid-western states. Roosevelt's New Deal addressed concerns for farmers displaced by the dust storms, but also provided for long-term soil conservation practices. Logically, the federal government's environmental agency, the Department of the Interior, pioneered soil conservation policies. Within the Department of Interior, President Roosevelt created the Soil Erosion Service, headed by Hugh Hammond Bennett, in October 1933. The context of the Dust Bowl does help to explain, if not justify, why McConaghie and the Park Service emphasized combining farms and proper farming techniques.⁵¹

While some of the new administration's physical management decisions detracted from the historical integrity of the battlefield, park officials in the late 1930s began a landscape restoration program to rehabilitate other parts of the battlefield to their 1863 appearance. The key vista alterations occurred in the southern end of the battlefield, where Confederates of General James Longstreet's 1st Corps assailed the Union line at Little Round Top, Devil's Den, and the Wheatfield. Though the park commissioners attempted to maintain a historically accurate landscape, over seventy five years after the battle woods and undergrowth grew extensively, particularly on properties not owned by the NPS, and thereby changed the landscape where the two armies fought. Park historians, led by Frederick Tilberg, dutifully researched historic conditions to establish a base for the restoration, and in order to open limited historic views, recommended extensive cutting of post battle vegetation growth. Tilberg suggested that four vistas be clear cut: from Little Round Top north toward the Wheatfield; from Little Round

⁵¹ Leuchtenberg, *Franklin D. Roosevelt and the New Deal*, 173.

Top west toward Plum Run and the Trostle buildings; from Little Round Top to Devil's Den; and from Sedgwick Avenue south toward Little Round Top.⁵²

The vista cutting project was approved on August 8, 1940, with the "purpose of removing woodlot growth which had come into existence since 1863 and also for the purpose of transplanting in those areas so indicated by the study where none now exist." CCC laborers started work on the vista restoration and the restoration of historic fences in August 1940. Two months later McConaghie reported that the Devil's Den area was cleared of trees and shrubbery. The following month the superintendent reported that the east side of the Wheatfield was stripped of wood, which presented a clear view from Little Round Top to the Wheatfield.⁵³ The cutting project near Little Round Top marked a small advancement in park management, but ultimately park staff did not manage the cut and the undergrowth returned to once again obscure a historic view from Little Round Top.

As park officials strove to restore the battlefield to its 1863 landscape, they also had to contend with modern intrusions on the historic grounds. Like many Civil War battles, the fighting at Gettysburg in July 1863 occurred in and around a small town. Within a mere three days the quaint Pennsylvania town and surrounding farmsteads were transformed into one of the most famous, and largest, battlegrounds in American history. While early preservationist groups, including the Gettysburg Battlefield Memorial Association and the War Department, secured a significant amount of land, private properties remained scattered throughout the historic grounds.

⁵² Frederick Tilberg, "Vista Cutting Project: Area of Little Round Top, Devil's Den, the Wheatfield, and Peace Orchard," December 28, 1939. Folder 30, Box 7, (GETT 41151), GNMP Archives. The main sources used to obtain an understanding of the historic landscape are the Warren Map and Brady and Tipton photographs.

⁵³ Frederick Tilberg, "Research Program Report," December 28, 1939. Box 7, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives. Tilberg's report notes that as many as 80 CCC laborers worked on the vista cutting during the winter of 1940-1941. In June 1941, CCC labor was discontinued on the project, but had logged a total of 5,762 mandays; Superintendent James McConaghie, "Superintendent's Monthly Reports, October 1940," written on November 14, 1939, 14; Superintendent James McConaghie, "Superintendent's Monthly Reports, November 1940," written on December 12, 1940. Folder 1, Box 4, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 4.

In 1933 the National Park Service acquired 2,530 acres from the War Department, a rather sizable holding, particularly when compared with other Civil War battlefields. But given that the three days' battle raged over twenty five square miles, north, west, and south of the borough district, Park Service officials were faced with modern intrusions and private development on all fronts.

Modern housing developments encroached on the historic terrain. An area of particular concern was along Warfield Ridge, which anchored the Confederate right flank and was part of the key terrain the Confederates advanced over on the July 2nd attack of Little Round Top and Devil's Den. By the mid-1930s the area around Warfield Ridge was home to a refreshment stand, a dancing pavilion, and a series of tourist cabins. A May 1936 memorandum expressed that acquiring property along the Confederate line would be "highly desirable," and noted that such acquisition "would help to round out the park property and allow the immediate removal of the unsightly tourist cabins that now front on West Confederate Avenue." Also located along West Confederate Avenue was a small building that "according to all available information" was used by General Longstreet for his headquarters. The park historian recommended securing this building and identifying it as Longstreet's headquarters.⁵⁴

Increasing numbers of modern houses also stood alongside the Emmitsburg Road. This road was a key north/south artery for the movement of troops and supplies during the battle, and it separated the Confederate battle line along Seminary Ridge from the Union battle line on Cemetery Ridge. Only a few properties were situated along the road at the time of the battle,

⁵⁴ H. L. Garrett memorandum to Mr. Chatelain, May 26, 1936, included in Louis E. King's "Information and Historical Notes Concerning the Swope Property, Known in 1863 as Warfield Property," written on April 21, 1936. Folder 30, Box 6 (GETT 41151), GNMP Archives. The refreshment stand and dancing pavilion were located at the northeast corner of West Confederate Avenue and the Wheatfield Road. The tourist cabins were scattered throughout West Confederate Avenue.

including the farmsteads of Henry Spangler and Joseph Sherfy. By 1940, however, the Spangler and Sherfy farms were surrounded by twentieth century homes. McConaghie, in the fall of 1940 after another house was built along the Emmitsburg Road, took action to initiate efforts to acquire the Spangler and Sherfy properties and to “forestall any further residential development” along the Emmitsburg Road.⁵⁵

In July 1938 the eyes of the nation, once again, turned to the Gettysburg battlefield. From June 29 through July 6 America celebrated the 75th anniversary of the battle of Gettysburg. As the last grand reunion of the Blue and Gray, this event stands as one of the shining moments in the park’s history, offering a fitting closure to the era of Reconciliation, but also embodying President Lincoln’s vision of a “new birth of freedom” and American patriotism. To commemorate their heroic efforts 1,845 Civil War veterans—1,359 Union veterans and 486 Confederate veterans—attended the week long festivities.⁵⁶ For one week the veterans, whose average age was ninety-four, rejoiced in American brotherhood by sharing war stories, reminiscing, signing, playing cards, and sitting for pictures.

To prepare for the grand event, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania created a special anniversary commission to plan and manage the reunion. The state appropriated \$90,000 for the

⁵⁵ James McConaghie, “Superintendent’s Monthly Reports, September 1940,” written on October 24, 1940. Folder 1, Box 4, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 3.

⁵⁶ Paul L. Roy, *The Last Reunion of the Blue and Gray* (Gettysburg: Bookmart, 1950), vii. Surprisingly little scholarship exists on the 1938 reunion. Roy served as the Executive Secretary of the Pennsylvania State Commission for the 75th Anniversary and produced a small book detailing the week’s events. Also of value in this book is a complete listing of veterans who attended the reunion.

gala and the federal government contributed \$1,186,000. In April commission workers began constructing “Tent City,” located north of the borough limits to accommodate the veterans. Ironically, reconciliation sentiment had not permeated housing facilities, as Union and Confederate camps were separated. The Stars and Stripes flew above the Union camp while the Confederate flag flew above the Confederate camp. The Commission spared no expense to accommodate the veterans. Veterans camping in “Tent City” found eight miles of wooden sidewalks, 396 street lamps, toilets, showers, bathhouses, three kitchens, fifty-five mess tents, a field hospital, a post office, telegraph service, and a telephone exchange. Buses transported the veterans throughout the battlefield and to the various festivities. A medical staff, the fire department, and policemen were on constant duty.⁵⁷

The July 1938 event marked the last grand reunion of the Blue and Gray. Ceremonial speeches reinforced the reconciliation sentiment that had been trumped for the past fifty years. On July 1, Secretary of War Harry Woodring, offered, “We remember the Battle of Gettysburg because it ranks deservedly with the decisive battles of the world. We remember it because the deeds of heroism that were the rule of this great field are a priceless heritage of American courage and sacrifice—a heritage that belongs both to the North and to the South.” But the 75th anniversary represented more than reconciliation; it was more than a sectional love feast, or a peace jubilee. In the darkest days of the Great Depression and on the eve of intervention in World War II, the reunion heralded American patriotism and underscored a common heritage and history. Foreshadowing the necessity of American unity in years to come, Woodring

⁵⁷ Unrau, *Administrative History*, 183. The Federal Government appropriated money to pay for the cost of the veteran’s transportation to and from his home. The government also provided for attendants to accompany the aging men on their journey. This is detailed in H.R. 7112, introduced in the House of Representatives on June 29, 1937. The bill can be found in Folder H.R. 7112, Box 2489, CCF, RG 79, NARA College Park; Roy, *The Last Reunion of the Blue and Gray*, 34.

asserted the American people are “united in one front against aggression from without and within.”⁵⁸

The “High Water Mark” of the 75th anniversary was the dedication of the Eternal Peace Light Memorial on July 3, 1938. Towering over Oak Ridge, where seventy five years earlier the opening fighting of the battle of Gettysburg raged, stands a forty-foot shaft adorned with a gas flame. On the shaft of the monument are two women, symbolizing the unity between the North and the South. “Peace Eternal In A Nation United” is inscribed at the base of the monument. The Eternal Peace Light Monument stands as a physical, tangible symbol of the era of Reconciliation. Standing before an assembly of 1,800 aging Civil War veterans and throngs of spectators, President Franklin D. Roosevelt delivered the dedication speech. “Immortal deeds and immortal words,” President Franklin Roosevelt declared, “have created here at Gettysburg a shrine of American patriotism.”⁵⁹ At the close of Roosevelt’s speech, two veterans, one Union and one Confederate, unveiled the monument and ignited the eternal flame.

The effects of the Great Depression apparently did not stop Americans from touring their national parks, and particularly Gettysburg. A February 5, 1939, article in the *New York Times*, declared Gettysburg the “most visited battlefield” in America. Estimated visitor statistics seemingly support the *Times* declaration. In a balmy winter month of January 1939 the park reported 3,080 visitors and for the 76th anniversary month of July, the park received over 112, 264 visitors.⁶⁰

⁵⁸ Secretary of War Woodring’s speech reproduced in Roy, *The Last Reunion of the Blue and Gray*, 91 -100.

⁵⁹ Franklin D. Roosevelt’s speech reproduced in Roy, *The Last Reunion of the Blue and Gray*, 113.

⁶⁰ Superintendent James McConaghie, “Superintendent’s Monthly Reports, February 1939,” written on March 17, 1939; Superintendent James McConaghie, “Superintendent’s Monthly Reports, January 1939,” written on February 20, 1939; Superintendent James McConaghie “Superintendent’s Monthly Reports, July 1939,” written on August 5, 1939. Folder 2, Box 4, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives.

The truest way to discern the uniqueness of the management of Gettysburg National Military Park is to compare it with other Civil War parks, specifically the other War Department sites that were transferred to the National Park Service in 1933. When the National Park Service assumed control of the War Department sites Park Service officials did not articulate a unifying philosophy on how the newly acquired battlefield sites should be managed. By failing to develop a long-term management vision for the newly acquired sites in 1933, the National Park Service set a precedent of allowing these early site superintendents to develop and execute each park's guiding philosophy. James McConaghie directed the management at Gettysburg, while other superintendents developed and implemented policies at the other battlefield sites. At no time during the Park Service's early tenure did NPS officials try to establish a guiding policy on how to preserve, interpret, and manage historic battlefields, which would have provided uniformity and consistency among the Civil War parks.

What actually did bring much uniformity to the development of Gettysburg and the other Civil War battlefields was not an overarching vision, but rather economic crisis and the New Deal. Gettysburg, like Antietam, Shiloh, Chickamauga/Chattanooga, and Vicksburg, received an enormous amount of federal money through Roosevelt's New Deal projects, which provided for some of the first significant National Park Service accomplishments. Capitalizing on the make-work projects, Gettysburg as well as other sites benefited from infrastructure improvements, mainly to roads and trails, as well as advancements in research and educational opportunities.

At Antietam National Battlefield, for example, Civil Works Administration money, totaling \$ 3,046.88, funded a "Historical Survey Project," which in addition to employing nine

people, resulted in the first thorough, and reasonably professional, study done about the September 1862 battle since the early War Department studies. Significant clean-up work was also accomplished at Antietam through the Federal Emergency Relief Act Projects of 1934. Emergency Relief Act funds provided for the clean up of debris, dead timber, poison vines, the Antietam Creek near Burnside Bridge, and repairs to several monuments. Similar improvements were accomplished at Chickamauga/Chattanooga National Military Park where Civilian Conservation Corps workers improved road access and constructed restroom facilities on Lookout Mountain.⁶¹

Just as at Gettysburg, Shiloh National Military Park and Vicksburg National Military Park also housed extensive and productive Civilian Conservation Corps camps that relied upon black labor. Over 400 black World War I veterans worked at two camps on the Tennessee battlefield from 1934 until the camps closed in 1942. Whereas Gettysburg became a test ground for the introduction of black supervisors, however, white officers always oversaw the activities at Shiloh's CCC camps. Mirroring the work at Gettysburg, Shiloh's CCC enrollees were responsible for a myriad of jobs on the battlefield, including roadway repairs, and improvements, as well as landscape beautification. The CCC workers also built a network of walking trails, parking areas, picnic facilities, a restroom facility, and retaining walls. At Vicksburg, black CCC enrollees undertook tasks similar to their counterparts in Gettysburg, including the beautification of the landscape and repair of infrastructure.⁶²

⁶¹ Charles W. Snell and Sharon A. Brown, *Antietam National Battlefield and National Cemetery: An Administrative History* (U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Washington, D.C., 1986), 151-158; John C. Paige and Jerome A. Greene, *Administrative History of Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park* (Denver: Denver Service Center, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, February 1983). Accessed online at www.nps.gov/archive/chch/adhi/adhi.htm.

⁶² Timothy B. Smith, "Black Soldiers and the CCC at Shiloh National Military Park," in *CRM: The Journal of Heritage Stewardship* 3 (Summer 2006), 73-84; Waldrep, *Vicksburg's Long Shadow*, 257-288.

Less than a century before on the fields of Gettysburg and Shiloh and along the muddy banks of the Mississippi River, thousands of Union and Confederate soldiers were wounded and thousands more sacrificed their lives in the bloodiest war in American history. At Shiloh National Military Park, black CCC enrollees toiled in the Tennessee fields, in a state that in 1861 seceded from the Union and joined the Confederate States of America. Black CCC enrollees dutifully labored in Vicksburg, Mississippi, in a state in which on January 9, 1861 voted to leave the Union proclaiming that the decision to secede was “thoroughly identified with slavery.”⁶³ Perhaps then it was only “fitting and proper” that black laborers would be placed at Gettysburg, Vicksburg, and Shiloh, battles where the Union was preserved and blows were struck on the South’s “peculiar institution.”

An examination of the National Park Service management from 1933 to 1938 at the other Civil War battlefields highlights some similarities with McConaghie’s administration. At Shiloh, Vicksburg, Antietam, Chickamauga/Chattanooga, considerable work was accomplished through the infusion of New Deal funds. Improvements to roads took place not just at Gettysburg, but at other Civil War sites as well. Civilian Conservation Corps camps became common in national parks, and sites such as Shiloh and Vicksburg also housed black enrollees. Where early Park Service management at Gettysburg differed from sites such as Shiloh or Antietam was in James McConaghie’s quest to beautify the landscape and to make the landscape more utilitarian. An example of the extremity of McConaghie’s administration can be seen in the resetting of the headstones in the National Cemetery, undertaken to beautify the cemetery and to provide for easier maintenance. The removal of the John Forney property in the fields of the first day’s action likewise reaffirmed McConaghie’s obsession with landscape beautification.

⁶³ Mississippi Secession Declaration. The full text of the secession declaration can be found online at: http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/csa_missec.aspn.

Showing no concern for the historical nature of the buildings, McConaghie approved the destruction of the property to provide for the “proper setting” of the Peace Light Memorial. Improvements to deteriorating roads and the removal of unwieldy brush and shrubbery were a positive good for the park, and similar advancements were seen in the other Civil War sites examined. Other changes to the landscape, including the regrouping of historic fields to provide for more farm production, severely altered the historic landscape. Such dramatic and adverse alterations did not occur at Shiloh, Antietam, or Vicksburg, or Chickamauga/Chattanooga.

In November 1940 Superintendent James McConaghie announced his transfer to Vicksburg National Military Park. McConaghie’s eight-year tenure brought many “important changes on the battlefield,” and reportedly the purpose of the transfer was to use McConaghie’s management skills to enhance the Mississippi battlefield in the same way he had developed Gettysburg. McConaghie’s successor was J. Walter Coleman, ironically the former superintendent at Vicksburg, who arrived on duty at Gettysburg on February 1, 1941.⁶⁴ The end of McConaghie’s administration offers a fitting closure to the first era of the National Park Service’s administration of Gettysburg. From his earliest days of management, McConaghie set the operation of Gettysburg National Military Park on a different path. In the decade following McConaghie’s administration considerably fewer changes occurred to the battlefield landscape, mainly because America was heavily involved in World War II. And again in a time of national crisis the Gettysburg battlefield was commissioned to serve the nation’s needs.

⁶⁴ *Gettysburg Times*, 30 November, 1940. Folder 9, Box 11, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives; Superintendent James McConaghie, “Superintendent’s Monthly Reports, December 1940,” written on January 8, 1941. Folder 1, Box 4, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 1.

Chapter 3

“From These Honored Dead We Take Increased Devotion”:

World War II Comes to a Civil War Battlefield, 1941-1945

On February 1, 1941, J. Walter Coleman arrived at Gettysburg to become the second National Park Service superintendent. The Gettysburg battlefield he would manage looked considerably different than it had just eight years earlier.¹ Superintendent James McConaghie’s vision, shaped by his career as a landscape architect as well as the infusion of New Deal monies had drastically affected the battlefield during the 1930s. By 1941, however, federal funds for continued improvements on the battlefield were becoming increasingly scarce. On the morning of December 7, 1941, the Japanese attack at Pearl Harbor suddenly jolted the nation out of isolation, and Americans turned their attention to world affairs. Declaring the bombing of the naval installation at Pearl Harbor a “day to live in infamy,” President Franklin D. Roosevelt led the nation into war. While American soldiers fought in Africa, landed at Normandy, and ‘island hopped’ throughout the Pacific, the events of World War II further shaped the Gettysburg battlefield. Military necessity brought significant changes to the battlefield, notably the establishment of a German prisoner of war camp on the site of Pickett’s Charge, the planting of “Victory Gardens,” and the collection of Civil War ordnance for scrap drives. Meanwhile, orators and guest speakers commonly invoked the sacrifices of Gettysburg’s soldiers to bolster American’s support for the war. Memorial Day orations took on a new meaning evolving from a tribute to the Civil War dead to justification of America’s involvement in World War II.

¹ Superintendent James McConaghie, “Superintendent’s Monthly Reports, December 1940,” written on January 8, 1941. Folder 1, Box 4, Park Main (Central) Files, 1933 – 1954, (GETT 41113), Records of the National Park Service at Gettysburg National Military Park, Gettysburg National Military Park Archives, 1 [hereinafter cited as (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives].

The demands of World War II indeed dictated nearly every aspect of the daily operations of the battlefield. Unlike the first eight years of park service management, the physical elements of the battlefield changed little during the World War II era, excepting for minor restoration on several historic homes and minor landscape changes along the fields of battle of July 2, 1863. Yet while wartime cutbacks hindered internal park operations, significant advancements did occur, including the acquisition of the Gettysburg Cyclorama from a private owner and the introduction of evening campfire programs. NPS management also initiated a serious discussion for the construction of a new visitor center and museum facilities. Superintendent Coleman also struggled to improve deteriorating relations with the Licensed Battlefield Guides.

Arriving in Gettysburg during the winter of 1941, Coleman brought a considerably different management philosophy than Superintendent McConaghie. While McConaghie was a trained landscape architect, Superintendent Coleman was a professionally trained historian. A Pennsylvania native, he received his bachelor's and master's degrees from Pennsylvania State College in 1929 and 1931, respectively. He worked as a Civilian Conservation Corps historian at Vicksburg National Military Park in 1933, and then as a historian at the Library of Congress. In 1936, Catholic University awarded Coleman a doctorate degree in history. Coleman served as Superintendent of Petersburg National Military Park, a position he held from June 1935 until March 1938. At that point the NPS transferred him back to Vicksburg to serve as superintendent there before moving to Gettysburg in the winter of 1941. The second NPS superintendent

arrived as an extremely qualified and capable individual, bringing with him years of academic training and a diversity of management experience.²

Eager to greet the new park superintendent and to establish cordial relations between the park and the community, local businessmen sponsored a “Welcome to Gettysburg” dinner for Superintendent Coleman in April 1941. At this meeting, Coleman presented his vision for the future of the Gettysburg battlefield and discussed concerns with local residents. He stressed that amicable relations between the battlefield and the community were critical to the successful operation of the Gettysburg battlefield. He aimed to create a visitor-friendly park that would attract “as great a number of visitors” as possible. Local businessmen were pleased when Coleman added that the National Park Service was in the “tourist business,” although he cautioned against commercializing the historic grounds, for such actions would undermine the purpose of the park.³

While Adolf Hitler’s Nazi troops raged across Europe in the summer of 1941, the Gettysburg battlefield successfully attracted thousands of visitors. Americans traveled to Gettysburg to enjoy the scenic spring vistas of the blooming redbuds and dogwoods or to tour through the historic grounds. During the summer of 1941, the Gettysburg staff also first initiated a practice that became a time-honored National Park Service interpretation tradition, the evening campfire programs. On July 13 park staff hosted the first campfire program on East Cemetery Hill, along Wainwright Avenue. More than 250 people gathered on the battleground for the slide

² “Dr. Coleman To Take Over Park Duty On Saturday,” *Gettysburg Times*, 31 January 1941. Folder 2, Box 35, (GETT 43663), Records of the National Park Service at Gettysburg National Military Park, Gettysburg National Military Park Archives [hereinafter cited by (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives]. Upon moving to Gettysburg, the new superintendent announced that the historic Codori farmstead would be remodeled and transformed into superintendent’s quarters, “Old Codori Home To Be Park Lodge,” *Gettysburg Times*, 11 September 1941. Folder 7, Box 35, (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives.

³ “Coleman Tells Broad Policy on Battlefield,” *Gettysburg Times*, 9 April 1941. Folder 2, Box 35, (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives.

presentation of “Our National Parks in Color,” presented by Donald E. McHenry, a park naturalist from the National Capital Parks. The popularity of the opening program was encouraging. Throughout the summer, a total of nearly 600 people attended two additional presentations on Crater Lake National Park and Hopewell Village.⁴

After America’s declaration of war and the nation mobilized for war, visitors traveling to the park during the summer months still could participate in the park’s evening campfire programs. In the summer of 1942 the park offered twelve. Opening the campfire season Randall Truett, Custodian of Historic Buildings and Sites, spoke about historic landmarks in Washington, D.C. Weeks later visitors enjoyed a presentation on “The Historic Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Along the Potomac River” by Sutton Jett, capital park historian. In addition to traditional slide presentations, several 1942 campfire programs introduced color films of various national parks. For example, later summer programs featured films on Revolutionary War encampments, Colonial National Historical Park, the Old Dominion State, Bryce Canyon in Utah, and “Our Great Southwest: Land of Colorful Sunsets.”⁵

⁴ Superintendent J. Walter Coleman, “Superintendent’s Monthly Report, April 1941,” written on May 13, 1941. Folder 4, Box 3, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 4; Superintendent C. S. Dunn, “Superintendent’s Monthly Report, April 1943,” written on May 10, 1943. Box 2443, RG 79, Central Classified File, 1933-1949, National Parks, Chickamauga/Chattanooga National Military Park, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland, 5 [hereinafter cited as Folder, Box, CCF, RG 79, NARA College Park]; Superintendent J. Walter Coleman, “Superintendent’s Monthly Report, July, 1941,” written on August 12, 1941. Folder 4, Box 3, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 3; “250 Hear Talk on U.S. Parks Here on Sunday,” *Gettysburg Times*, 14 July 1941. Folder 6, Box 35, (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives; Superintendent J. Walter Coleman, “Superintendent’s Monthly Report, August 1941,” written on September 9, 1941. Folder 4, Box 3, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 2. Additional presentations on Yellowstone, Glacier National Park, and the Oregon Trail were scheduled for the summer of 1941 but were canceled due to an epidemic of infant paralysis in the county.

⁵ Superintendent J. Walter Coleman, “Superintendent’s Monthly Report, June 1942,” written on July 9, 1942. Folder 3, Box 3, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 2; “Sutton Jett To Discuss Canal Along Potomac,” *Gettysburg Times*, 18 July 1941. Folder 6, Box 35, (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives; Superintendent J. Walter Coleman, “Superintendent’s Monthly Report, July 1942,” written on August 12, 1942. Folder 3, Box 3, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives 2; “Color Slides To Illustrate Talk On Field,” *Gettysburg Times*, 25 July 1942. Folder 6, Box 35, (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives.

The campfire programs proved to be a resounding success; several hundred visitors attended each of the presentations. Aside from the informal programs around the Cope Map presented in the park's headquarters, however, the park offered few interpretive experiences directly related to the Civil War. The campfire programs remained the only ranger programs presented on the battlefield. Moreover, wartime constraints and declining visitation forced the park to cancel the evening programs in 1943, although the programs resumed in the summer of 1944. Frederick Tilberg did offer six campfire lectures at that time focusing on "instruction rather than entertainment." He stated that the purpose of the lectures was to give local residents "an opportunity to hear the subject of the Campaign and Battle explained and also to take part in a discussion period at the close of the talk."⁶

From an interpretive perspective, the topics of the campfire programs are interesting in several ways. The overwhelming majority did not focus on the battle of Gettysburg, or even broader Civil War topics, but rather on other National Parks, reflecting McConaghie's earlier assertion that Gettysburg was only one part of a chain of parks. Likewise, many of the films explored natural parks, not historical parks. Before the featured program began, a park ranger offered a ten-minute summary on the Gettysburg campaign and battle, followed by a short overview of the park administration.⁷ Park staff wanted to introduce Gettysburg visitors to other national parks rather than educating them about the Gettysburg campaign and battle. Although

⁶ Harlan D. Unrau, *Administrative History: Gettysburg National Military Park and Gettysburg National Cemetery* (Denver: Branch of Publications and Graphic Design, Denver Service Center, 1991), 222; Frederick Tilberg, "Historians' Monthly Reports, July 1944," written on August 4, 1944. Folder 3, Box 7, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 1.

⁷ Superintendent J. Walter Coleman to NPS Director, May 27, 1941. Folder 201-06, Box 2490, CCF, RG 79, NARA College Park.

hundreds of visitors gathered weekly on East Cemetery Hill, a key piece of the Union army's battle line, they received little meaningful interpretation of the battle or key Civil War moments.

Yet it is not unreasonable to assume that fostering a sense of nationalism and American patriotism was another underlying purpose for the programs. During the war years, the government mastered the art of propaganda with productions such as Frank Capra's *Why We Fight*. Films illustrating the majestic beauty of the Grand Canyon, Yellowstone, or Olympic National Parks celebrated America's natural resources, while presentations about Saratoga and Revolutionary War encampments celebrated its cultural resources and reminded viewers of America's triumphant struggle for independence and democracy. In an era defined by democracy versus fascism and good versus evil, visitors could feel proud of their heritage, their national parks, and the National Park Service.

Ultimately Coleman's administration still must be credited for instituting the regular interpretive summer tradition. Whatever their deficiencies, the summer programs were extremely popular with park visitors, as reflected in the weekly attendance of several hundred people, who came despite dwindling overall park attendance figures. Some attendees enjoyed the programs so much that they requested the park initiate a similar indoor interpretive series for the winter months.⁸

The decline in battlefield visitation was one daily reminder of the influence of World War II. As visitation decreased, Coleman issued directives to conserve fuel and manpower within the park. In November 1942, he requested permission to close the West End and South End Guide

⁸ "Historians' Narrative Reports, September 1944," written on October 3, 1944. Folder 3, Box 7, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 1.

Stations, intending to conserve fuel and rubber associated with detailing park staff to operate these facilities. Guides continued to solicit tours by sitting in their cars in the parking lot and offering their services to interested visitors. Normal travel conditions severely declined when President Roosevelt issued a declaration for gas rationing in May 1942 and a ban on pleasure driving in early 1943. Typically one of the busiest months at the battlefield, May 1942 brought reportedly the lightest attendance seen in “many, many years.” During the winter months, park visitation was virtually nonexistent: in January 1943 a mere 84 people visited the battlefield. Additionally, the demographics of visitors to the battlefield during the Second World War mirrored Gettysburg’s early visitation. Most of the visitors who came to Gettysburg during World War II were servicemen because travel restrictions prevented civilians from visiting. In February 1943, Superintendent Coleman declared that “park travel virtually ceased except for men in uniform.” A few months later he reported that 95 percent of the park visitors were servicemen.⁹

⁹ Superintendent J. Walter Coleman to Associate Director, November 23, 1942. Folder 201, Box, 2490, CCF, RG 79, NARA, College Park; Superintendent J. Walter Coleman, “Superintendent’s Monthly Report, May 1942,” written on June 10, 1942. Folder 3, Box 3, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 1; “Sunday Travel Curtailed by Gas Rationing,” *Gettysburg Times*, 18 May 1942. Folder 8, Box 35, (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives. This issue also reported the estimated visitation for the first fifteen days in May 1941 was 28, 872 compared to the first fifteen days in May 1942 was only 13, 727; Superintendent J. Walter Coleman, “Superintendent’s Monthly Report, January 1943,” written on February 10, 1943. Folder 2, Box 3, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 2. The park recorded 3,858 visitors in January 1942; Superintendent J. Walter Coleman, “Superintendent’s Monthly Report, January 1943,” written on February 10, 1943. Folder 2, Box 3, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 1. Most of the literature on tourism explores the post World War II era when tourism expanded as an industry. Kathryn Grover, *Hard at Play: Leisure in America, 1840-1940* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1992) offers a discussion of travel and tourism up to the outbreak of World War II. For additional reading on American tourism during the twentieth century, and specifically during the World War II era see: John A. Jakle, *The Tourist: Travel in the Twentieth-Century* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1985). Jakle devotes a chapter to pre-war and post-war tourism, but does not offer a discussion of tourism between 1941 and 1945. He concludes that “travel for recreation fell off sharply during World War II. Gas rationing cut substantially into the use of automobiles, and many resorts closed for the duration of hostilities,” 185-186. For a discussion another discussion of tourism during this era see Warren James Belasco, *Americans on the Road: From Autocamp to Motel, 1910-1945* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1979). Belasco offers a discussion of American automobile tourism from the introduction of the automobile in 1910 through the immediate end of World War II. He offers a discussion of facilities that support the automobile tourist, namely autocamps and the development of hotels.

In addition to initiating interpretive field programs Coleman's administration was responsible for the acquisition of the Gettysburg Cyclorama in April 1942. The Gettysburg Cyclorama is a 360-degree panoramic painting depicting the climatic scene of Pickett's Charge. Painted by French artist Paul Philippoteaux in 1883-1884, the painting premiered in Boston in 1884 before being showcased in several American cities. In 1913 local interests brought the painting to Gettysburg in time for the battle's 50th anniversary and displayed it in a specially constructed rotunda on Cemetery Hill. The Park Service as early as 1936 had recommended acquiring the painting from its owner, Jeremiah Hoover. After years of negotiations, Hoover finally signed an agreement, on April 1, 1942, and transferred the Gettysburg Cyclorama to the National Park Service. The Park Service agreed to pay Hoover \$3,000 per year until his death, and thereafter pay his widow the yearly sum until her death. The Gettysburg Water Company leased the cyclorama building to the National Park Service, charging the park a monthly rent of \$375, for display of the painting. Although the Park Service acquired the painting, they did not immediately manage daily operations. Instead the park retained the services of Charles Cobean, the long time local interpreter of the painting and paid him \$600 a year for his services.¹⁰

¹⁰ Earl H. Brown, "Audit Report," to NPS Director, April 20, 1942. Folder 204-20, Box 2491, CCF, RG 79, NARA College Park. The negotiations stipulated that Cobean's salary came from the Cyclorama ticket sales. Conceivably, this meant that in some years when ticket sales were not profitable enough (after paying Hoover the required \$3,000), Cobean would not be paid for his services. For additional reading on the Gettysburg Cyclorama see, Sue Boardman and Kathryn Porch, *The Battle of Gettysburg Cyclorama: A History and Guide* (Gettysburg: Thomas Publications, 2008). This book offers an excellent overview of the history of the painting. After Philippoteaux completed the painting, it premiered in 1884 in Boston. "The Battle of Gettysburg," as his painting was called, remained in Boston for nearly twenty years, at which time Americans lost interest in cyclorama paintings. Thereafter, a local entrepreneur, Jeremiah Hoover, purchased the painting and moved in to Gettysburg in time for display for the 50th anniversary in 1913. The cyclorama painting was housed on Baltimore Street on East Cemetery

Unfortunately, the National Park Service soon discovered that the building which housed the cyclorama was woefully inadequate. A leaking roof, uncontrolled humidity, and fluctuating room temperatures already had caused irreversible damage to the cyclorama. Moreover, the brick entrance to the building was cracked and misaligned. Unable to do much in response but always concerned for aesthetic appearances, the Park Service at least ordered the walkway to be repaired in the summer of 1943.¹¹

Despite the unattractiveness of the building and the poor level of maintenance of the painting, the Gettysburg Cyclorama continued to be one of the most popular interpretive attractions in town. Within the first month of Park Service operations of the cyclorama, the park collected \$145 in admissions. But again, after President Roosevelt instituted rationing of gasoline and a ban on travel, visitation to the cyclorama precipitously declined along with general park attendance. Thus on December 1, 1942, just months after acquiring the Philippoteaux painting, park management determined to close the cyclorama building to visitors during the winter. Visitors who wanted to see the painting found a sign that informed them the painting was closed and directed them to the park museum on Baltimore Street. The cyclorama

Hill, in a building owned by the Gettysburg Water Company. After the NPS acquired the cyclorama, the service continued to display the painting in the building on Cemetery Hill until it relocated the cyclorama to its new visitor center in 1962. Philippoteaux actually painted two Gettysburg cycloramas and the "Boston cyclorama" is his second painting. When Philippoteaux came to the United States in 1879 business entrepreneurs commissioned him to paint a battle scene for display in Chicago. The artist travelled to Gettysburg in 1882 and began to study the terrain, interview battle veterans, and make scene sketches for the cyclorama. "The Cyclorama of the Battle of Gettysburg" premiered in Chicago in 1883, complete with the three dimensional foreground objects. Based on its popularity, Philippoteaux was asked to paint a second cyclorama for display in Boston. After its hey-day of display, the "Chicago cyclorama" fell into private hands and was eventually donated to Wake Forest University in North Carolina.

¹¹ "Historians' Narrative Reports, August 1943," written on September 3, 1943. Folder 3, Box 7, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 1.

reopened on April 1, 1943. Reportedly 364 visitors viewed the painting during the month—all of them servicemen who were admitted for free.¹²

Meanwhile park officials continued discussing the necessity of a new museum facility. Constrained by the economic realities of the New Deal programs, NPS officials had postponed plans to develop a museum, and worked within the confines of cramped spaces in the Post Office building. The privately owned Rosensteel museum on Taneytown Road provided visitors with educational opportunities distinct from the park service's headquarters. At the outbreak of World War II, the Rosensteel museum remained the most popular of the privately-owned attractions in town. Thousands of Civil War artifacts displayed in glass exhibits attracted throngs of curious visitors. Recognizing their own deficiency in museum services, park officials readily declared the Rosensteel museum as "outstanding." In 1940, moreover, Joseph Rosensteel developed the Electric Map presentation, a large-scale relief map surrounded by auditorium-style seating for two hundred visitors. The thirty-minute presentation summarized the campaign and three-day battle using colored lights to illustrate the position of the Union and Confederate armies.¹³ Visitors thoroughly enjoyed the Electric Map program, and the Rosensteel museum further solidified its place as the most popular privately-owned attraction in town.

¹² Superintendent J. Walter Coleman, "Superintendent's Monthly Report, April 1942," written on May 12, 1942. Folder 3, Box 3, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 1; "Historians' Narrative Reports, November 1942," written on December 4, 1942. Folder 3, Box 7, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 2; "Historians' Narrative Reports, April 1943," written on May 3, 1943. Folder 3, Box 7, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 2. The admission charge was 30 cents per adult and 20 cents per children.

¹³ "Museum Prospectus: Gettysburg National Military Park," January 23, 1947. Folder 4, Box 17, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 19; Benjamin Y. Dixon, "Gettysburg, A Living Battlefield," (Ph.D., diss. Oklahoma University, 2002), 186. The Electric Map was designed by Joseph Rosensteel, the son of George who owned the museum. The map, measuring twenty nine feet square, was placed into a room in the rear of the museum that was constructed in 1939.

Keenly aware of the inadequacies of their own museum facilities and the now deplorable conditions of the cyclorama building as well, Park Service officials once again opened discussions about building a Civil War interpretive center. While they agreed that a modern building was necessary for better preservation of the cyclorama painting and enhanced visitor services, they could not reach a consensus about where the new museum should be built. Debate involved whether the eventual site should be privately or federally owned, its proximity to the Rosensteel museum, accessibility to the High Water Mark and the National Cemetery, visitor access to the tour route, and convenience from well traveled highways.

Throughout 1942 Gettysburg and regional staff members devoted considerable time to developing plans for the new facility. On June 24 and 25, Park Service architects visited Gettysburg to consider potential sites. After examining the battlefield acreage, the architects proposed four locations for the new museum: a site near the cyclorama building on East Cemetery Hill, a site along Hancock Avenue near the Angle on Cemetery Ridge, a triangular site adjoining the northern section of the Soldiers' National Cemetery at the Emmitsburg and Taneytown Road intersection, and a tract adjoining the National Cemetery on the west. By September, management had narrowed potential sites to either the tract along the Emmitsburg and Taneytown Road intersection or northeast of the Angle along Hancock Avenue. Park management agreed to prepare a study of proposed locations, but fiscal and personnel constraints ultimately prevented detailed assessments of the locations.¹⁴

¹⁴ "Historians' Narrative Reports, June 1942," written on July 3, 1942. Folder 3, Box 7, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 1. The two architects were Harry Thompson and Walter Sheffield; Memo from Frederick Tilberg to Superintendent J. Walter Coleman, October 19, 1942. Folder: Gettysburg 620-46: Administration, Museum Building, 1942 – 1947, Box 44, RG 79, Historic Shrines, Sites, Monuments, and Parks, Subject Files, 1937-1957, Northeast Regional Office, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania [hereinafter cited by Folder, Box, SF, RG 79, NARA Philadelphia]; Superintendent J. Walter Coleman memo to the Regional Director, February 19, 1945. Folder 9, Box

Gettysburg and regional officials nonetheless scrutinized the advantages and disadvantages of each proposed site in the ensuing months. Many individuals favored the proposed location along the northern section of Cemetery Ridge. It seemed to provide the most benefits based upon level of visitor access and interpretive opportunities. The tract was federally owned, enabling construction to begin immediately without the cost of purchasing additional land. Moreover, the surrounding area was relatively undeveloped and easily accessible, and it offered an “excellent panorama of the battlefield.” While the thought of constructing a facility on historic ground contradicts modern preservation practices, NPS philosophy at the time strove above all for convenient visitor access and interpretation. A short walk would place visitors in the heart of the battlefield, allowing them to see the Union line along Cemetery Ridge, visit The Angle, and stand at Meade’s Headquarters. Visitors short on time could see most of the best-known battle action without taking the driving tour.¹⁵ The site also would offer visitors the “excellent panorama” that Paul Philippoteaux studied before painting the Gettysburg Cyclorama.

As World War II intensified in 1943 and 1944, and as federal funding seemed more and more remote, park officials temporarily redirected their attention to smaller, more economically feasible projects. By early 1945, with an imminent Allied victory on the horizon and the loosening constraint of federal monies, however, Park Service officials resumed the museum discussion. Superintendent Coleman urged regional officials to undertake plans for a new museum quickly; he believed that the project would lose its “proper place in post war construction” if plans were not soon finalized. He also reminded interested parties that

7, Historians Files, 1933 – 1965, Records of the National Park Service at Gettysburg National Military Park, (GETT 41151), GNMP Archives [hereinafter cited as (GETT 41151), GNMP Archives].

¹⁵ Fred Johnson, Acting Regional Director, to Coleman on October 14, 1942. Folder 9, Box 7, (GETT 41151), GNMP Archives.

continued delay would only further damage the cyclorama. Days later the regional director wrote the NPS Director and stated that a new museum facility was a top priority for the region due to the deteriorating condition of the cyclorama painting. The regional director urged the Director to approve the Hancock Avenue site.¹⁶

Although many Park Service officials also favored the northern section of Hancock Avenue, some continued to argue that the museum be built on private property. After surveying potential sites for the interpretive center, Chief Historian Herbert Kahler and Chief Landscape Architect Thomas Vint recommended that the government purchase a tract of privately-owned property adjacent to the National Cemetery along the Baltimore Pike for the new facilities. Kahler and Vint maintained that the proposed site offered the best accessibility to the National Cemetery and to the tour route. If the private property could not be acquired, then the new museum should be situated in Ziegler's Grove, fronting the Emmitsburg Road." Superintendent Coleman doubted that funding for the acquisition of private property would be available, however. He wished to pursue the project without delay of obtaining a title to the land. He consistently noted his opposition to building the facilities on privately owned property.¹⁷

As discussions on site selection continued, no one questioned the wisdom of constructing a modern facility on historic battlegrounds. Such a decision paralleled the agency's prevailing philosophy that made visitor accessibility a priority over historic site integrity. In fact, Park

¹⁶ Superintendent J. Walter Coleman to the Regional Director, February 19, 1945. Folder 9, Box 7, (GETT 41151), GNMP Archives; Memo from Thomas Allen to Director, February 26, 1945. Folder: Gettysburg 620-46: Administration, Museum Building, 1942 – 1947, Box 44, SF, RG 79, NARA Philadelphia.

¹⁷ Herbert Kahler and Thomas Vint to Director, NPS, March 27, 1945. Folder 201, Box 2490, CCF, RG 79, NARA College Park; Superintendent J. Walter Coleman to Regional Director, February 19, 1945. Folder 9, Box 7, (GETT 41151), GNMP Archives; Memo from J. Walter Coleman to Regional Director, January 4, 1946. Folder: Gettysburg 620-46, Box 44, SF, RG 79, NARA Philadelphia.

Service officials lauded the proximity to the fields of Pickett's Charge as a key criterion for site selection. Roy Appleman, NPS Regional Historian, asserted the new facility should be "on commanding ground and in the heart of the historic area." Situating modern visitor centers on "commanding ground" of historical significance had become a precedent for the National Park Service. Appleman approvingly cited the newly constructed visitor center on Henry House Hill at Manassas as justification for building Gettysburg's visitor center on Cemetery Ridge.¹⁸

If some park officials were hesitant to approve construction on historic grounds, the site's interpretive potential and accessibility offset those concerns. For example, Frederick Tilberg voiced his support for the location that was "as accessible as possible," but he cautioned that the Union battle line on Cemetery Ridge "should remain free from any building development." He downplayed Ziegler's Grove's historical significance, stating that "only the left flank of Pickett's Charge" moved over the ground. In an effort to reconcile the construction of the facilities on historical ground, Tilberg added that "the Museum-Administration building would be in clear view of the Angle, the central point of the Cyclorama painting and within easy walking distance, but not on battle ground of as great importance as that further south."¹⁹

Tilberg's rationale for approving the site found support among higher ranking NPS officials. Superintendent Coleman recognized that development on Cemetery Ridge would constitute an intrusion into the historical scene but also trumpeted visitor accessibility and the panoramic view of the site. Regional Historian Roy Appleman provided the most revealing

¹⁸ Roy Appleman to Regional Director, November 6, 1946. Folder: Gettysburg 620-46, Box 44, SF, RG 79, Philadelphia NARA.

¹⁹ Fredrick Tilberg to Superintendent Coleman, February 19, 1945. Folder 4, Box 9, (GETT 41151), GNMP Archives.

justification of all for constructing the museum facilities on historic battleground. Mindful of potential criticisms for disturbing hallowed ground, Appleman stated, “Any building or monument on the battlefield is an intrusion in one sense, but it is placed there for a purpose. Just as a monument or memorial has been placed there for a purpose, so with an interpretive center it should be placed where it will do the most good on behalf of the visitors who come to the scene.”²⁰

Discussion of the proposed museum-cyclorama building paralleled a re-evaluation of the battlefield tour route. Visitor accessibility again was to be a dominating factor in consideration of a site for the interpretive facilities. A significant portion of park visitors did not visit park headquarters on Baltimore Street, allegedly because of its remote location from the battlefield and because the museum offered few interpretive attractions. The museum needed to be built in a location that would complement the driving route and serve the largest number of visitors. The tour was to function as a “primarily education feature” that permitted visitors to drive through the battlefield while following a chronological narrative of the three-day battle.²¹

Although the Park Service had designed a standard touring brochure in preparation for the 1938 reunion, many visitors to the field simply meandered through the battlefield following the designated routes. Park management believed this haphazard style of touring the field failed to provide the visitor with an understanding of the battle action. The existing tour route further complicated visitor understanding of the battle. It began at the West End Guide Station along

²⁰ Superintendent Walter Coleman to the Regional Director, February 19, 1945. Folder 9, Box 7, (GETT 41151), GNMP Archives; Roy Appleman to the Regional Director, November 6, 1946. Folder: Gettysburg 620-46, Box 44, SF, RG 79, NARA Philadelphia.

²¹ Superintendent J. Walter Coleman to the Regional Director, October 16, 1942. Folder 9, Box 7, (GETT 41151), GNMP Archives.

Route 30, where a park ranger would greet visitors and provide them with a battle orientation. The ranger then directed them to the Day 1 action along Oak Ridge, including a stop at the Eternal Peace Light Monument. After viewing the Confederate position along Oak Ridge, visitors proceeded to East Confederate Avenue to cover the third day's action at Spangler's Spring and the second and third day's fighting at Culp's Hill. After visiting ground along the right flank of the Union army, tourists then moved to the Soldiers' National Cemetery. The tour continued southward along Cemetery Ridge, highlighting the climactic third day's action of Pickett's Charge, before proceeding to the second day's action at Little Round Top, Devils' Den, the Wheatfield, and the Peach Orchard. They then traveled northward along West Confederate Avenue, the position occupied by Lee's Army of Northern Virginia on July 2 and 3. The tour finally returned visitors to their point of origin at the Chambersburg Pike.²² The prescribed tour route was not only difficult to navigate, but did not follow the battle's chronology. Visitors toured the climactic ground of Pickett's Charge on July 3 before seeing the July 2 action at Little Round Top, Devil's Den, the Peach Orchard, or the Wheatfield. While the National Cemetery could have been the final stop, visitors went to the burial grounds during the first half of their tour.

Gettysburg's revised tour route, which included eight designated stops, traversed the battlefield in a chronological order. Starting at the first stop at West End Guide Station along Route 30, the tour proceeded along Reynolds Avenue to the second stop at the Eternal Peace Light on Oak Hill. Next, visitors traveled south along Doubleday Avenue to the third stop at the observation tower, which overlooked the Union army's position on the afternoon and evening of

²² Superintendent J. Walter Coleman to the Regional Director, October 16, 1942. Folder 9, Box 7, (GETT 41151), GNMP Archives, 2.

July 1. The tour then passed through West Confederate Avenue to the fourth stop at the Virginia Memorial. Visitors crossed through town to the Union army's flank position at Spangler's Spring and Culp's Hill, and then returned to the scenes of fighting on July 2: the Wheatfield, Peach Orchard, and the sixth stop at Devil's Den. The tour then proceeded to the Union army's left flank position at Little Round Top at stop seven. Exiting from the slopes of Little Round Top, visitors finally traveled north on Hancock Avenue to the final stop at the High Water Mark.²³

Gettysburg management intended the location of the proposed interpretive facilities to complement the revised tour route. As the tour proceeded through the second day's action and then north onto Hancock Avenue, visitors routinely stopped at the High Water Mark and walked the grounds where, on July 3, nearly seven thousand Union soldiers of the Second Corps repulsed the Confederate infantry assault led by Generals George Pickett, Joseph Pettigrew, and Isaac Trimble. After viewing and walking the grounds where General Lee's army suffered approximately 5,600 casualties, visitors concluded their battlefield tour with a stop at the interpretive center to view the Cyclorama painting. In deliberating on which site was best suited for placement of the new interpretive facilities, park management believed that visitors' battlefield experience would be enhanced if they viewed the Cyclorama painting at the end of the tour, after they had the opportunity to walk the ground of Pickett's Charge. After concluding the auto tour and viewing the Cyclorama, visitors could walk a short distance to the National Cemetery, and view the burial grounds of 3,555 Union soldiers as well as the location of

²³ Superintendent J. Walter Coleman to the Regional Director, October 16, 1942. Folder 9, Box 7, (GETT 41151), GNMP Archives, 4.

Lincoln's "Gettysburg Address."²⁴ Additionally, as increased vehicle traffic became more intrusive in the National Cemetery, park management began discussing restricting cemetery visitation to pedestrian traffic only.

The proposed tour route changes in the 1940s paralleled Americans' changing interest in particular parts of the battlefield. Culp's Hill and Cemetery Hill had been the most visited sites during the early decades of the park's history, but considerably fewer tourists traveled to Culp's Hill or Cemetery Hill during the 1940s. As the Union army's right flank position decreased in visitation, however, the site of Pickett's Charge on July 3 retained its prominence. The popularity of the High Water Mark area can be explained by several factors. First, the Park Service's auto tour started at the High Water Mark, while Culp's Hill and Cemetery Hill remained on the auto tour, it is not unreasonable to assume that many park visitors did not drive through the entire battlefield and therefore did not see the ground of the Union right flank. Similarly, the Park Service had not been cutting excessive tree growth on Culp's Hill, and as the site became heavily wooded visitors struggled to understand the fighting on the federal right flank and the hill's role in the battle. Moreover, the Park Service promoted the significance of the High Water Mark by erecting the scenic viewer near Lieutenant Alonzo Cushing's Battery and prominently displayed an American flag at the Angle. The Park Service had recently acquired the Gettysburg Cyclorama, which further shifted the agency's interpretive focus to the third day's battle. Popular literature also reinforced the High Water Mark thesis. In the mid 1930s, Virginian historian Douglas Southall Freeman published his multivolume biography on Robert E. Lee, which offered a distinctly positive interpretation of the Confederate general. Less

²⁴ Superintendent J. Walter Coleman to the Regional Director, October 16, 1942. Folder 9, Box 7, (GETT 41151), GNMP Archives, 2-5.

than a decade later, he published his three volume *Lee's Lieutenants: A Study in Command* in 1942-1944.²⁵

Meanwhile, the Soldiers' National Cemetery became one of the most visited sites on the battlefield. The widening of the cemetery gates in 1938, accomplished in order to accommodate automobile traffic through the cemetery, contributed to this increased visitation. Following the Lower Drive through the cemetery, visitors easily drove by the graves of the Civil War soldiers before proceeding onto the Upper Drive to view the Soldiers' National Monument. President Lincoln's rising popularity in American culture in the 1940s as well as the general patriotic mood also brought more visitors into the National Cemetery. Memorial Day speakers frequently invoked the "Gettysburg Address" and crowds swarmed the Lincoln Speech Memorial. While driving or walking through the cemetery, visitors now commonly sought out the spot where the sixteenth president stood on November 19, 1863. In the spring of 1943, the Park Service responded by erecting two signs in the National Cemetery- one at the Soldiers' National Monument, indicating the proximity of where Lincoln stood, and one interpreting the speech at Lincoln Speech Monument.²⁶

Since their establishment in 1916, the Licensed Battlefield Guides had expressed varying degrees of antagonism toward the War Department and early NPS management. Superintendent

²⁵ Dixon, "Gettysburg, A Living Battlefield," 174-191. This is the only site on the battlefield grounds where an American flag was displayed. The other flags were flown from the observation towers and at Meade's Headquarters. See also Douglas Southall Freeman, *R.E. Lee: A Biography*, 4 vol. (New York: Scribner Sons, 1934); Douglas Southall Freeman, *Lee's Lieutenants: A Study in Command*, 3 vol. (New York: Scribner Sons, 1942-1944).

²⁶ Frederick Tilberg, "Historians' Monthly Report, May 1942," written on June 3, 1942. Folder 3, Box 7, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 2. For additional reading on Lincoln's growing popularity see Merrill Peterson, *Lincoln in American Memory* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994).

McConaghie first mandated placing the guide system on “trial” while encouraging the guides to foster an emotional connection to the new National Park Service administration. By the 1940s, however, problems with the guides’ behavior had increased considerably. When Superintendent Coleman attempted to exert more control over the often unmanageable guides, however, the relations between the two organizations worsened considerably.

One of Coleman’s main concerns was the accuracy of the guides’ information provided to visitors during a tour. To ensure that each guide offered consistent and accurate information to park visitors, Coleman requested that a group of ten guides report to park headquarters each month to be examined by the superintendent and the park historians on the battle’s history. According to Coleman, the monthly meetings revealed “wide discrepancies” in the information guides were presenting to park visitors. Unwilling to accept what he deemed historical fallacies in the guide’s interpretation, Coleman decided to prepare a statement of facts relating to the campaign and battle for each guide to learn and discuss at future meetings. He planned for the monthly meetings to resume after the hectic summer season. At that time park staff would take groups of guides around the battlefield to assist them in learning the correct information about the battle. Upon hearing Coleman’s intentions, some guides organized an “indignation meeting,” contacted their political representatives, and refused to participate in the testing. Unable to change the mindset and habits of the obdurate guides, Coleman postponed the monthly meetings but predicted that soon a “show down will be necessary.” He believed the guides were intent on “pulling political strings and running this Park.”²⁷

²⁷ Superintendent J. Walter Coleman, “Superintendent’s Monthly Report, April 1941,” written on May 13, 1944. Folder 4, Box 3, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 5; Superintendent J. Walter Coleman to NPS Director, August 13, 1941. Folder 201, Box 2490, CCF, RG 79, NARA College Park; Letter from Superintendent J. Walter Coleman to NPS Director, August 13, 1941. Folder 201, Box 2490, CCF, RG 79, NARA College Park.

The relationship between the Park Service and the guides grew worse. Some guides deliberately avoided giving visitors any information pertaining to Park Service facilities or activities. They flatly refused to take tourists to the agency's headquarters or the newly acquired Cyclorama, believing the park museum and Cyclorama would "spoil" their story. Coleman wrote the NPS Director to explain the hostile relations between the park and the guides, claiming that "no visitors are being brought to the Park Museum and it is obvious that the guides will proceed to take over the area if they are permitted to do so."²⁸

The guides' conduct with park visitors was also less than professional, at least as far as park management was concerned. Visitors to Gettysburg frequently encountered uniformed guides soliciting tours by "running out to the roadside upon the approach of a car, waving arms and shouting to attract attention." Unsuspecting visitors thought that they were being hailed by a policeman and stopped, only to be harassed into hiring a guide to tour the battlefield. On the town square, NPS management charged that guides could be frequently seen running down cars or jumping on the running boards of the moving vehicles. When approached for directions on how to reach a particular site on the battlefield, they informed visitors they would take them to the requested site for a fee.²⁹

Coleman argued that the guides' aggressive and unprofessional behavior reflected poorly on the National Park Service at Gettysburg. "The reputation of the National Park Service," wrote the regional director, "has undoubtedly suffered considerably because of them since the

²⁸ Superintendent J. Walter Coleman to NPS Director, August 13, 1941. Folder 201, Box 2490, CCF, RG 79, NARA College Park.

²⁹ Oliver Taylor, Herbert Evison, and J. Walter Coleman, "Recommendations for Gettysburg Guide System Prepared Jointly By the Regional Director, the Associate Director, and the Park Superintendent," March 17, 1944. Folder 201, Box 2490, RG 79, NARA College Park, 3-5.

Service is held responsible... for permitting them to exist.” Unwilling to have the Park Service’s image be tarnished by some disreputable guides, he believed that the permanent solution to improving the guide system was to place the guides on Civil Service status. Licensed first by the War Department and then the National Park Service, guides were not federal employees, and park management had little control over their behavior. Guides were self employed; they were able to dictate their own hours and rates for battlefield tours. Park Service management believed that making them federal employees, paying the guides per diem or a salary, would at least eliminate the aggressive solicitation of their services. As outlined, guides would receive six dollars per day for an eight-hour shift. Visitors who desired guide services could arrange for a tour at one of three locations. In order to provide standardized tour rates NPS officials determined a three-hour tour would cost three dollars and a one-to-two hour tour two dollars.³⁰

Park Service officials believed that granting guides Civil Service status would bring professionalism and standardization to the informal guide system. More importantly, placing the guides on the federal payroll would make them directly responsible to the park. The guides immediately opposed the proposal to place them in Civil Service status. Coleman’s proposal received minimal support from the guides and local congressmen refused to introduce the legislation.³¹ Licensed guides retained their independent, self-employed status and park management, wary of how the guides’ behavior reflected on the Park Service, kept a watchful eye on the guides.

³⁰ Oliver Taylor, Herbert Evison, and J. Walter Coleman, “Recommendations for Gettysburg Guide System,” 4 – 8. Folder 201, Box 2490, CCF, RG 79, NARA College Park. It was also determined that guides would be eligible for sick leave and annual leave and that the guides would be required to wear the standard green and gray NPS uniform.

³¹ Newton Drury to the Secretary of the Interior, December 10, 1945. Folder 201, Box 2490, CCF, RG 79, NARA College Park; Unrau, *Administrative History*, 240.

The Licensed Battlefield Guides also exerted an ultimate influence over park management decisions. As the Park Service considered revising the tour route to a chronological progression and the addition of interpretive tour markers, the guides opposed both initiatives. In 1942, the acting regional director suggested that the park use interpretive markers accompanied with short descriptive text to assist in visitors' understanding of the battle action, but management decided to postpone the installation of the wayside exhibits, due in large part to guide opposition. Licensed guides opposes these measures because the more accessible the Park Service made the battlefield to self-guiding tours, the less imperative guided tours became for park visitors.³²

Success in World War II depended on full mobilization of the American people and American resources. For four years, Americans made personal sacrifices, whether by the loss of a loved one overseas, rationing food stocks, purchasing victory bonds, or adhering to evening curfews. Millions of people "did their part" by contributing to the war scrap drive. Citizens donated spare tires and salvaged tin cans, rubber and other valuable war materials.³³ The Gettysburg battlefield administrators contributed to the scrap drive by salvaging Civil War cannons, ordnances, tablets, and other decorative materials and donating it to the war drive.

³² Fred T. Johnson to Superintendent Coleman, October 14, 1942. Folder 9, Box 7 (GETT 41151), GNMP Archives; Unrau, *Administrative History*, 223.

³³ "February Tops January Scrap Mark, 135 Tons," *Gettysburg Times*, 6 March 1943. Folder 9, Box 35, (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives. Gettysburg civilians and Adams County residents also donated a significant amount of material to the war drive. Superintendent Coleman served as the local salvage chairman. *The Gettysburg Times* frequently reported on the area's contribution to the war effort. The March 6, 1943 paper reported 278.5 tons of scrap materials collected during February.

In the decades after the war, park commissioners had acquired hundreds of surplus cannons, many of which were not displayed on the memorial landscape, but instead were housed in maintenance sheds for future recasting as tablets or other commemorative devices. Other surplus cannon and ordnance went to Civil War parks that did not have artillery pieces positioned along the battle grounds. At least eighteen of Gettysburg's guns and shells ended up at Antietam National Battlefield, while sixty-five others went to National Capital Parks.³⁴

Yet millions of tons of scrap metal were needed to arm America's aircraft, battleships, and fighter planes. In a June 1942 memo to the regional director, Superintendent Coleman itemized the items removed from the battlefield for the scrap drive: thirty-six panels of iron fence, thirty-six iron posts, twelve iron cautionary signs, and eighty-two directional signs. The park further donated eighty-six guns to the scrap drive, all taken from the surplus stockpile rather than from the battlefield landscape. The park additionally removed more than 800 spherical shells that had been placed by War Department commissioners to represent the ordnance supply of Civil War artillerymen. The Department of Interior mandated that all non-essential rubber from the battlefield be donated to the war effort, and thus park management turned over truck and office floor mats and automobile tires to the War Department.³⁵

³⁴ "Historians' Reports," July 1942, written on August 4, 1942. Folder 3, Box 7, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives; "Other Parks To Get Local Surplus Metal," *Gettysburg Times*, 28 July 1942. Folder 9, Box 35, (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives; Bernard Levine, "Historians' Reports, August 1942," written on September 3, 1942. Folder 3, Box 7, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives. The surplus cannon went via rail to Antietam and the National Capital Parks.

³⁵ Superintendent J. Walter Coleman to Regional Director, June 30, 1942. Cultural Resource Management Files, GNMP; "May Release Field Shells to War Effort," *Gettysburg Times*, 11 July 1942. Folder 9, Box 35, (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives. The iron fence panels had been removed from the Soldiers National Monument in the Cemetery several years earlier. The cautionary signs included "Keep Off This Mound" and "Do Not Drive on this Ground" signage. The guns included twenty-six bronze siege guns, thirty-eight bronze guns, eight bronze howitzers, and fourteen iron guns.

By September 1942 the Gettysburg battlefield had contributed eighteen tons of scrap metal. The demands of mobilization, however, required more. On October 13, Superintendent Coleman wrote to the NPS Director that a survey of available metals on the battlefield revealed that more pyramidal piles of artillery shells could be “removed without serious interference with the visitor’s understanding of the battle.” Coleman indicated that 194 pyramidal castings were available for scrap, totaling near 80,000 pounds. He also reported that the battlefield held nineteen Union and Confederate bronze itinerary tablets, which had been placed on the battlefield in the 1880s by park commissioners. These, he said, could be scrapped and “replaced with a simple painted sign and map.” In their place, Coleman proposed the erection of three exhibits; one map of the campaign, and a short narration detailing the Union and Confederate army’s approach to Gettysburg.³⁶

At the end of the month, Director Newton Drury wrote to congratulate Coleman on the “success” of the park’s scrap metal drive. Drury nonetheless cautioned park management to evaluate the historical value of the metals designated for the scrap drive, saying that ordnance produced during the Civil War was to be retained, but pieces cast after 1865 could be delegated for the metal drives. Seeing little value in the nineteen bronze itinerary plaques erected by the park commissioners, Drury approved the disposal of the markers and their replacement with painted signs and maps, believing the latter would be “far more understandable and effective.”³⁷ Fortunately these itinerary tablets were never salvaged.

³⁶ Superintendent J. Walter Coleman to the Director, NPS, October 13, 1942. Vertical Files, 17-3, GNMP Library; Superintendent J. Walter Coleman, “Superintendent’s Monthly Report, October 1942,” written on November 17, 1942. Folder 3, Box 3, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives.

³⁷ Newton Drury to Superintendent J. Walter Coleman, October 30, 1942. Vertical Files, 17-3, GNMP Library.

While eighteen tons of metals had been donated from the battlefield, more materials might be needed if the war intensified. In preparation for additional sacrifices, in December 1942 agency officials produced a report that grouped the park's markers and monuments in order of priority. This report, totaling more than twenty pages, divided the park's markers into nine groupings, with group one being the first priority for removal for the scrap drive. The report included representative photographs along with estimated calculations of the total weight of the metals. The report essentially presented a plan for the dismantling of the battlefield and the destruction of the memorials and monuments designed and dedicated by the veterans of the bloodiest battle in American history.

Priority group one, the first to be removed for the scrap drive, consisted of the nineteen bronze itinerary tablets. Priority group two contained 197 Civil War cannons, including napoleons and howitzers, as well as artillery tubes marking the headquarters for the generals of the two armies. Priority group three included the deposition of 256 explanatory tablets. These markers, placed by the park commissioners, interpreted the battle action of each of the Union and Confederate units.³⁸ Group four categorized various decorative miscellaneous objects on monuments, including muskets, drums, canteens, or flags. The survey indicated that 250 monuments on the field were cast with decorative accouterments, totaling over 20,000 pounds in metal. The report listed nineteen symbolic statues as the fifth priority for removal. These monuments were cast with an unknown individual adorning the monument, but they held "some special symbolism." Priority group six included the bronze inscriptive tablets on regimental or state markers. The report listed 317 tablets; eighty four were located on the Pennsylvania monument and displayed the name of the state's soldiers present at the battle. Reliefs depicting

³⁸ Corps, division, brigade tablets were erected for infantry units as well as the artillery, cavalry, and engineer units. Tablets were also erected to mark hospital sites.

battle scenes or individuals were listed as the seventh priority for removal. The forty three statues honoring individuals appeared further down on the priority list. This grouping included the Union corps commanders' equestrian monuments, as well as the bust of President Lincoln positioned on top of the speech memorial in the National Cemetery. The final group of monuments prioritized for scrap consisted of three monuments, listed last for their "highly artistic merit." Ironically, those monuments commemorated Confederate soldiers and included the Virginia Memorial, the North Carolina Memorial, and the Alabama Monument.³⁹

Fortunately, the hardships of the Second War World did not become desperate enough to warrant the removal and scrapping of the tablets or monuments itemized on the inventory. Itemizing the battlefield's monuments and markers for donation to the scrap drive nonetheless reinforced the notions of full-scale mobilization and the nation's willingness to sacrifice for victory in World War II. But the readiness to dismantle and melt irreplaceable monuments and markers erected by the battle's veterans also suggests an indifference to the veteran's commemorative markers on behalf of the National Park Service at Gettysburg. To compensate for the loss of the battlefield's markers, Park Service officials proposed taking photographs of the monuments and their inscriptions for archival purposes. In February 1943, Director Drury added that the NPS would consider the donation of the battlefield monuments only with the assurance that the monuments could be recast after the war. Referring to the balance between preserving the nation's historical treasures and necessary wartime sacrifice, he wrote, "Each war memorial in the parks represents the last possible debt payment of the Nation to some soldier or

³⁹ Superintendent J. Walter Coleman to Regional Director, June 30, 1942. Cultural Resource Management Files, Gettysburg National Military Park.

group of soldiers in our national past. It would be little comfort to the soldiers of the present day if such evidence of the Nation's gratitude should come to be lightly regarded."⁴⁰

Gettysburg had donated such a sizable amount to the salvage because the park had the surplus ordnance, but other Civil War parks made similar contributions to the war's scrap drive. In his 1943 annual report, Superintendent James McConaghie outlined the state of the salvage drive at Vicksburg National Military Park. Vicksburg's staff had made a survey of the battlefield's iron markers and tablets, erected during the War Department era and now considered "obsolete," to prioritize them for removal. By October 1942, Vicksburg had condemned and removed twenty-five tons worth the iron markers.⁴¹

As American and Allied troops proceeded to liberate Europe in the spring of 1944, Allied nations struggled to accommodate the increasing number of German prisoners of war. During fall 1942, U.S. War Department officials agreed to house enemy prisoners of war. In doing so, they elevated the increasingly crowded prisoner of war camps in Great Britain. By war's end more than 400,000 German soldiers were imprisoned in roughly five hundred POW camps scattered throughout America, many in abandoned Civilian Conservation Corps camps. In May 1944, the War Department received permission to establish a prisoner of war camp at Gettysburg National Military Park.⁴²

⁴⁰ Newton Drury to Thorton Smith, War Production Board, February 10, 1943. Vertical Files, 17-3, GNMP Library.

⁴¹ Superintendent James McConaghie, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 1943," written in September 1943. Folder 207-01, Box 2560, CCF, RG 79, NARA College Park, 14.

⁴² A considerable amount of literature exists regarding prisoner of war camps in America during World War II. For additional reading see: John Hammond Moore, *The Faustball Tunnel: German POWs in America and Their Great Escape* (New York: Random House, 1978); Arnold Krammer, *Nazi Prisoners of War in America* (New York: Stein

Located south of the borough lines on the Emmitsburg Road, the POW camp occupied fifteen acres of the historic Bliss and Benner fields. Its relatively remote location made central Pennsylvania an ideal location for prisoner of war camps. The first German prisoners of war arrived in Gettysburg in June 1944. They were temporarily housed in the Pennsylvania National Guard Armory, located on West Confederate Avenue, while the stockades were being built. Surrounded by barbed wire fencing, the camp was four hundred feet by six hundred feet, and protected by four guard towers at the corners of the stockades. On June 22, 1944, the War Department relocated the prisoners to the camp along the Emmitsburg Road. On that same day, the local newspaper reported that “the prisoners, sent here to help harvest and process the county’s expected large fruit and vegetable crops have already begun their work in canneries despite the fact that their stockade camp is incomplete.” By month’s end more than 250 prisoners were stationed in the camp.⁴³

By the middle years of the war, most men of working age had enlisted in the military, leaving Adams and surrounding counties with a severe labor shortage and inadequate manpower to harvest the area’s lucrative crops. After the area’s leading fruit producers requested

and Day, 1979); Robert Billinger, *Hitler’s Soldiers in the Sunshine State* (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 2000); David Fiedler, *The Enemy Among Us: POWs in Missouri During World War II* (St. Louis: University of Missouri Press, 2003); Michael Waters, *Lone Star Stalag: German Prisoners of War at Camp Hearne* (College Station: Texas A&M Press, 2004); Walter Schmid, *A German POW in New Mexico* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2005); Robert D. Billinger, *Nazi Prisoners of War in the Tar Heel State* (Gainesville: University of Florida, 2008). Other Civil War battlefields similarly met wartime demands. For example, the War Department established a WAAC (Women’s Auxiliary Army Corps) training facility at Chickamauga/Chattanooga National Military Park. After two years of service, the War Department disbanded the camp on April 1, 1945. Approximately 50,000 women passed through the training camp, Superintendent C. S. Dunn, “Superintendent’s Monthly Report, December 1944,” written on January 11, 1945. Box 2443, CCF, RG 79, NARA, College Park, 1.

⁴³ Superintendent J. Walter Coleman, “Superintendent’s Monthly Report, May 1944,” written on June 14, 1944. Folder 1, Box 3, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 4; Unrau, *Administrative History*, 219; Frederick Tilberg, “Historian’ Monthly Report, October 1944,” written on November 3, 1944. Folder 3, Box 7, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 2; “War Prisoner Camp Nearly Ready For Use,” *Gettysburg Complier*, 22 June 1944. Vertical Files, 11-40, GNMP Library. A lot of the fruit was processed for C. H. Mussleman Company; Superintendent J. Walter Coleman, “Superintendent’s Monthly Report, June 1944,” written on July 10, 1944. Folder 1, Box 3, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 1.

manpower assistance from the U.S. Army, several hundred prisoners of war to Gettysburg worked in fruit production and packing. Any farmer, producer, or fruit packing plant in need of help for crop production could contact the United States Employment Service board in Gettysburg, headed by E. A. Crouse, and request camp laborers.⁴⁴

With the end of the fruit season and approach of winter weather, the War Department relocated the German prisoners from the tent camp along the Emmitsburg Road to the old CCC Camp NP-2, displacing a Signal Corps detachment. In early November 1944, the prisoners settled into more weather resistant barracks along West Confederate Avenue. Through the winter of 1944-45, the Germans cut pulpwood in Adams and Franklin counties. Over 160 German prisoners worked eight-hour days cutting wood, and then were returned to the POW camps on the battlefield.⁴⁵

The German prisoners performed a much needed and appreciated service for the local community. The head of the USES office reported that the “use of German prisoners of war in Adams county’s canneries and orchards during the last two years allowed the production of thousands of dollars worth of food that otherwise would not have been processed.” Records indicate that in July 1944, nearly one thousand prisoners engaged in various types of manual labor in Adams, Franklin, York, and Cumberland counties.⁴⁶

⁴⁴ Superintendent J. Walter Coleman, “Superintendent’s Monthly Report, May 1944,” written on June 14, 1944. Folder 1, Box 3, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 4-5; *Gettysburg Compiler*, April 13, 1946. Vertical Files, 11- 40, GNMP Library.

⁴⁵ “Nazi Prisoners From Camp Here Cutting Wood,” *Gettysburg Compiler*, 10 February 1945. Vertical Files, 11- 40, GNMP Library. Prior to its use as a POW camp, CCC Camp NP-2 had been used by the War Department as a high security U.S. Signal Corps training camp, which at that time had been doing security and propaganda work for the planned D-Day invasion. It was still being used by the Signal Corps when the German POWs arrived and therefore the prisoners had to be temporarily housed in the tents along the Emmitsburg Road.

⁴⁶ *Gettysburg Compiler*, April 13, 1946. Vertical Files, 11-40, GNMP Library.

The prisoners seemed to have blended relatively seamlessly with the local community. Shortly after the first group arrived in July 1945, one guard proudly proclaimed, “The prisoners are not hard to handle.” By all accounts, guards treated the German prisoners remarkably well. According to Captain Laurence Thomas, the camp commandant, all prisoners were informed of their rights as prisoners of war provided by the Geneva Accords.⁴⁷

Other uses of the Gettysburg battlefield during World War II were less subtle, and in some instances, more covert. In the summer of 1944 the U.S. Department of War commandeered the Lee-Meade Hotel, a privately-operated facility located near the Peach Orchard, for use in the U. S. Navy’s War Mapping Project. This work, conducted by the Forest Service, was considered “highly confidential.” Five armed guards, employed by the National Park Service, entered on duty on July 6, 1944 providing twenty-four hour security for the map makers.⁴⁸

Beginning in the 1880s and lasting through the 1938 reunion, the Gettysburg battlefield stood as a symbol of reconciliation and fraternity to Civil War soldiers. By 1941 only a few thousand Civil War veterans were living and the events of the war were slowly becoming a distant memory. The 1941 summer celebrations offered a fitting prelude to the patriotic

⁴⁷ “Tells How War Prisoners Are Treated Here,” *Gettysburg Compiler*, 15 July 1944. Vertical Files, 11-40, GNMP Library.

⁴⁸ Mackey White to Arthur Demaray, June 28, 1944; Arthur Demaray to W. E. Reynolds, June 30, 1944. Folder 201, Box 2490, CCF, RG 79, NARA College Park; Superintendent J. Walter Coleman, “Superintendent’s Monthly, July 1944,” written on August 7, 1944. Folder 1, Box 3, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives. The Lee- Meade Inn stood along Business 15, just south of the historic Peach Orchard.

festivities exhibited during the war years. The aftermath of the attack on Pearl Harbor and the mobilization of millions of American men, transformed the Gettysburg battlefield from a landscape of reconciliation into a place that fit more contemporary needs. As young men marched off to war in distant lands to fight for freedom of millions and the sovereignty of nations, Americans sought to reconnect with the heroism and sacrifices of their forefathers in order to find strength and conviction to triumph in a war against evil.

As despotic rulers conquered nations around the world Americans found guidance in President Lincoln's words that "government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth." The freedom for which Civil War soldiers fought resonated deeply with Americans in a time when millions of people around the world were losing personal liberties. During World War II, American citizens, dignitaries, politicians, and park management purposefully molded the Gettysburg Battlefield into a landscape of American patriotism. Eight American flags flew over various spots on the battlefield as a visible symbol of the battlefield and nation's heritage.⁴⁹

Contemporary world events and a belief in America's inevitable entrance into World War II prompted other significant changes to the Gettysburg battlefield in the summer of 1941. Guests and dignitaries increasingly used the battlefield as a platform to espouse noble ideals of patriotism, democracy, and liberty. These public and highly patriotic gatherings illustrated not only how Americans of the 1940s remembered the battle of Gettysburg, but also how they used the battle, and the soldiers' sacrifices, to address the nation's contemporary issues. From the

⁴⁹ Dixon, "Gettysburg, a Living Battlefield," 188. American flags flew from the five observation towers, Meade's headquarters, the Soldiers' National Cemetery, and the Angle. All of these flags, however, except the one at the Angle had been designed by the War Department's Park Commission.

grounds of the Soldiers' National Cemetery on Memorial Day 1941, for example, Major General Edward Martin, a Pennsylvania native currently serving as the Commonwealth's Adjutant General, declared that the best memorial to the nation was the preservation of America's ideals of democracy and freedom. At the time of his speech, he held the post of the President of the National Guard Association of the United States. He urged Americans to stand united and to prepare for war, in order to uphold the ideals of the nation. Indeed, he called on the United States to enter the war effort against dictators determined to violate inalienable rights. For a nation that still retained a relatively isolationist mindset, Martin's speech encouraging the nation to enter the European conflict, must have been controversial with listeners.⁵⁰

One month later, in late June, the Grand Army of the Republic convened in Gettysburg for their annual reunion. More than 1,000 delegates attended, including three Civil War veterans. Discussions commonly turned to the clouds of a new war forming over the United States. "We've got to get into this war," noted Civil War veteran Albert Gabrio, "We've got to get into it to preserve the principles of freedom. We've got to fight to preserve the principles of democracy that we fought for and which this nation has always stood for." A. T. Anderson, who served with the U.S. Cavalry, disagreed with his comrade, stating that the "fighting in '63 was

⁵⁰ "Preservation of U.S. Ideals Best Memorial- Gen. Martin," *Gettysburg Times*, 30 May 1941. Folder 3, Box 35, (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives; "Co. E. to Escort Gen. Martin in May 30 Parade," *Star & Sentinel*, Gettysburg, 24 May 1941; "National Guard Opens Convention," *Pittsburgh Press*, 12 October 1935. Gettysburg's Co. E escorted Martin through the parade and to the Soldiers' National Cemetery. For additional reading on Martin see his autobiography, Edward Martin, *Always Be On Time: An Autobiography* (Harrisburg: Telegraph Press, 1959). Martin was born in Green County, Pennsylvania and graduated from Waynesboro. After a short career as a lawyer, he joined the army and served in the Spanish American War and World War I. As noted below, Martin would serve as the Pennsylvania Governor from 1943 to 1947 and then concluded his career in public service as a state Senator from 1947 to 1959. For a discussion of World War II patriotism see: Robert B. Westbrook, *Why We Fought: Forgoing American Obligations in World War II* (Washington: Smithsonian Books, 2004); Susan Brewer, *Why America Fights: Patriotism and Propaganda from the Philippines to Iraq* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009).

fun compared to war today,” for ruthless commanders and soldiers no longer accounted for the protection of women and children.⁵¹

If patriotic rhetoric and calls to duty were not enough to stir the emotions of residents, during the summer of 1941 the battlefield and town hosted thousands of American soldiers traveling from various posts. As in World War I, the U.S. Army commandeered the battlefield for maneuvering and training exercises. After the excitement of Memorial Day celebrations and the GAR reunion, for example, approximately 1,700 soldiers of the 71st Coast Artillery traveling from Fort Story, Virginia arrived at the battlefield. The unit came equipped with 300 vehicles sporting the “latest type of motor transportation,” several rolling kitchens, anti-aircraft guns, and machine guns. Upon arriving, the unit pitched more than 800 tents in the abandoned CCC Camp along West Confederate Avenue. Over the next five days, the soldiers, equipped with their anti-aircraft weaponry, conducted training maneuvers over the fields of Pickett’s Charge. These maneuvers simulated warfare conditions the soldiers expected to encounter in the European theater. On July 3, 1941, the 71st Coast Artillery also honored their ancestral unit, the 71st Pennsylvania Infantry, by re-enacting its movements during Pickett’s Charge seventy eight years earlier.⁵²

In the spirit of reconciliation, the 71st Coast Artillery also participated in the dedication of the site selected for a monument honoring Confederate General James Longstreet. Through the unwavering devotion of the general’s second wife, Helen Dortch Longstreet, and the Longstreet

⁵¹ “1,000 Delegates Begin State GAR Sessions; Parade on Wednesday,” *Gettysburg Times* 24 June 1941. Folder 4, Box 35, (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives; “3 Veterans Receive Greetings From Allied Organizations,” *Gettysburg Times*, 25 June 1941. Folder 4, Box 35, (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives.

⁵² “Pennsylvanians Greet Sons As Coast Artillery From Fort Story Carries Out Maneuvers Here,” *Gettysburg Times*, 30 June 1941. Folder 5, Box 35, (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives; “1,700 Soldiers Coming Here on Saturday,” *Gettysburg Times*, 26 June 1941. Folder 4, Box 35, (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives.

Memorial Association, General Lee's trusted subordinate would finally be memorialized with a equestrian statue situated near Warfield Ridge. Actress Mary Pickford and other prominent guests participated in the ceremonies despite Longstreet's Confederate record. Representing President Roosevelt, Assistant Secretary of State H. Breckenridge Long used the dedication as an opportunity to link the valor of General Longstreet and the sacrifices of the Civil War soldiers to the call to duty. Particularly connecting the battle of Gettysburg to President Roosevelt's recent declaration of a national emergency, Long declared, "Let us respond to it with the spirit and courage exhibited by the men of Gettysburg... Gettysburg echoes the call to the service of a united and determined nation."⁵³

Having secured the site for a monument to her husband, Mrs. Longstreet announced plans to lay the cornerstone of the monument on July 2, 1947. The *Gettysburg Times* unveiled the model of the Longstreet Memorial, which was planned to be an enormous equestrian statue of Longstreet fixated to the top of a solid granite base foundation. She estimated the monument to cost \$200,000, for which she needed to raise \$6,000 to lay the cornerstone in 1947. Fiscal constraints and hardships imposed on Americans during the Second World War prevented Dortch Longstreet from securing the money, and consequently, the granite tribute to the Confederate army's 2nd Corps commander would have to wait another fifty years.⁵⁴

The patriotic displays exhibited at Gettysburg during the summer of 1941 offered a fitting prelude to the ensuing war years. Of the three million men who served in the Union and

⁵³ "Site For \$200,000 Longstreet Statue Is Dedicated; 71st Coast Artillery Re-Enacts '63 Battle Scene," *Gettysburg Times*, 2 July 1941. Folder 5, Box 35, (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives. The National Park Service in consultation with Mrs. Longstreet had selected the site along Warfield Ridge, the right flank of the Confederate army, for Longstreet's monument.

⁵⁴ Frederick Tilberg, "Historians' Monthly Report, October 1946," written on November 4, 1946. Folder 2, Box 7, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 2; "Site For \$200,000 Longstreet Statue Is Dedicated: 71st Coast Artillery Re-Enacts '63 Battle Scene," *Gettysburg Times*, 2 July 1941.

Confederate military approximately 622,000 died in the conflict. Seventy years later, Americans entered a war that far surpassed the destruction and carnage of the American Civil War. In the aftermath of the surprise attack at Pearl Harbor, the nation mobilized to become “an arsenal of democracy” and to eradicate despotic rulers around the world. The “hard hand of war” again would leave left its mark on the Gettysburg battlefield.

Patriotism and flag waving reached its zenith on Memorial Day during the war years. As the site of the war’s bloodiest battle and later the site of Lincoln’s famous speech, Memorial Day activities had been an integral part of the commemorative process at the Gettysburg battlefield and National Cemetery since 1868. Each year, thousands of spectators gathered in the National Cemetery to pay proper tribute to the war’s dead, to witness wreath-laying ceremonies, and to hear speeches of invited dignitaries, including presidents Theodore Roosevelt, Calvin Coolidge, Herbert Hoover, Franklin Roosevelt, and a myriad of congressmen and governors.⁵⁵

In a time of national crisis, Americans’ attention turned once again to the Gettysburg battlefield. More than 2,200 spectators gathered in 1943 for the Memorial Day ceremonies. Traditionally, civic organizations, such as the Sons of Union Veterans, arranged the Memorial Day ceremonies without any NPS participation. The 1943 exercises marked the first time that they were invited to participate in the ceremonies. Edward Martin, now governor of Pennsylvania, offered a recitation of Lincoln’s “Gettysburg Address.” The millions of

⁵⁵ Superintendent J. Walter Coleman to Regional Director, June 21, 1946, Folder 510, Publicity, 1945-1952, Box 41, SF, RG 79, NARA Philadelphia.

Americans who were unable to travel to Pennsylvania for the day's festivities could listen to the speeches on an afternoon radio broadcast.⁵⁶

The May 30, 1944 Memorial Day celebrations generated more visitation and national attention, as the festivities coincided with the thirty-sixth Annual Governor's Conference in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. In preparation for the celebrations, park staff got the park in "tip top" shape by repainting cannons and fences, whitewashing Meade's headquarters, clearing brush, and filling ruts in the tour roads. The 1944 ceremonies that followed reflected the nation's heightened sense of patriotism. Exercising care to maintain a sectional balance, Massachusetts Governor Leverett Saltonstall and North Carolina Governor J. Melville Broughton delivered the keynote speeches. Both governors readily invoked the meaning of the battle of Gettysburg and applied the sacrifices made on Civil War battlefields and home fronts to World War II. "We are assembled before a shrine sacred to North and South alike," Governor Broughton decried. "It is all together fitting that these great sections of our nation, once divided but now united, should in this momentous hour of world history join in solemn pledge of unity and loyalty," he added. Speaking to what the Gettysburg battlefield meant to 1940s-era Americans, Broughton declared the battlefield to be a "shrine" where "victor and vanquished alike are honored." Massachusetts Governor Saltonstall's speech invoked similar reconciliationist and patriotic rhetoric. Using the language and cadence of Lincoln's "Gettysburg Address," Saltonstall encouraged listeners to support American troops abroad. "We here at home must do our utmost to help our boys end that war with an early and complete victory," the governor declared. Saltonstall continued, "At the same time we must see to it that we preserve for them the freedom of opportunity and of life

⁵⁶ Superintendent J. Walter Coleman, "Superintendent's Monthly Report, May 1943," written on June 12, 1943. Folder 2, Box 3, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 1.

that we now enjoy; and thus uphold those principles which Abraham Lincoln so clearly advanced.”⁵⁷

Although wartime budget constraints imposed economic restrictions on the park’s operating budget, several significant if small alternations occurred on the battlefield during the World War II era. Long-term projects included the restoration of several historic vistas, the adoption of new farming practices, the removal of the Round Top Railroad bed, and the rehabilitation of several historic farms and homes. Like his predecessors, Superintendent Coleman battled for acquisition of key areas of land from private owners. By the end of World War II, commercialism at the Gettysburg battlefield reached new heights.

One decade after acquiring the Gettysburg battlefield and other military parks, the National Park Service determined to establish an agency-wide policy concerning the preservation and maintenance of historical sites. In a statement issued in the fall of 1943, the NPS Acting Director declared that “the guiding principles of battlefield park administration and development should be to present to the public the original battlefield scene as nearly as possible.” The Acting Director suggested that park management enter into leases with farmers to maintain the historical accuracy of the field. For example, he noted that while the Peach Orchard was a critical feature of the battle, it was not feasible for the park service to maintain the orchard. Instead, the director suggested the park lease the Peach Orchard to a local farmer for cultivation.

⁵⁷ “Battle in Spring Dress and Summer Color for Nation’s Governors,” *Gettysburg Times*, n.d. [no date]. Folder: Gettysburg OOO, Box 35, SF, RG 79, NARA Philadelphia; “Address Delivered at Gettysburg Memorial Day Exercises, May 30, 1944.” Folder 502, Box 2500, CCF, RG 79, NARA College Park.

Furthermore, the Acting Director declared that vista cutting, though perhaps objectionable to the local community, was acceptable in order to re-establish the historic vistas and landscape or to maintain the proper setting of monuments and markers.⁵⁸

During the 1940s, the Park Service began to implement small projects that sought to rehabilitate a particular section of the battlefield to its 1863 condition. The Sherfy Peach Orchard, situated on the Emmitsburg Road, was one of the critical pieces of key terrain during the fighting on July 2 and 3. On July 2, Confederate infantry captured the orchard. The following day Confederate artillery bombarded the Union line from the elevated terrain at the Peach Orchard. After receiving approval to restore the Peach Orchard, Gettysburg maintenance workers planted 270 trees to restore the historic setting of the famous orchard. During the winter of 1942 CCC laborers restored the vistas along Little Round Top to their 1863 condition.⁵⁹

Just years following the nation's worst economic disaster, the Dust Bowl, the federal government actively explored improved farming techniques. Farming methods initiated in the 1940s deviated considerably from the 1863 practices. In the summer of 1944, Soil Conservationist O. B. Taylor examined the farming practices and land conditions on the Gettysburg battlefield.⁶⁰ Upon the advice of Soil Conservationists, Superintendent Coleman's

⁵⁸ Oliver Taylor memorandum to Region One Superintendents, October 30, 1943. Folder 4, Box 12, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives.

⁵⁹ Superintendent J. Walter Coleman, "Superintendent's Monthly Report, December 1941," written on January 10, 1942. Folder 4, Box 3, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 1; Superintendent J. Walter Coleman, "Superintendent's Monthly Report, January 1942," written on February 11, 1942. Folder 3, Box 3, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 3.

⁶⁰ Superintendent J. Walter Coleman, "Superintendent's Monthly, August 1944," written on September 13, 1944. Folder 1, Box 3, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 2.

administration began practicing large scale contour farming on the battlefield. Park management disregarded historic fencing patterns to provide for greater agricultural accessibility to the fields.

In addition to the changing farm fields, the removal of the Round Top Railroad bed, one of the most intrusive features on the battlefield, became one of the more noticeable improvements on the battlefield landscape during the early 1940s. Built in 1884, the railroad line transported thousands of tourists to the southern end of the battlefield. After the Interstate Commerce Commission granted the railroad's request to abandon the line in 1935, the federal government acquired the 15.29 acre right of way on June 6, 1944. Gettysburg National Military Park received the deed from the Reading Railroad Company in the spring of 1944 and began restoration procedures to "erase a scar" of the railroad tracks cut through the fields of Pickett's Charge and Cemetery Ridge. This "scar" included wire fencing and non-historic hedgerows that lined the entire route of the railroad.⁶¹

The park also proposed the rehabilitation of several historic homes on the battlefield to their wartime appearance. In 1863, a family of freedmen, the Brians, owned farmland along Cemetery Ridge slightly west of Ziegler's Grove. In the decades after the war, the home underwent several additions, including the addition of a second story and the construction of an adjoining wing onto the southern side of the home. By the time of the Park Service acquisition, the Brian farmstead, like many other historic structures, had fallen into a state of disrepair. Given the Brian home's prominent location near the High Water Mark and its popularity with visitors, the park initiated efforts to restore the farm house to its historic appearance in the

⁶¹ Frederick Tilberg, "Narrative Report, November 1950," written on December 4, 1950. Folder 1, Box 7, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 2; Superintendent J. Walter Coleman, "Superintendent's Monthly Report, May 1944," written on June 14, 1944. Folder 1, Box 3, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 2-3.

summer of 1943. In addition to the removal of the non-historic features, Tilberg also recommended replanting the historic orchard. The following year, Tilberg prepared a similar report on the rehabilitation of the Lydia Leister House, better known as General George Meade's headquarters during the battle. Tilberg's reports were well received at the regional and national level. Perhaps mindful of the debacle over the Forney property in 1938, Hillory Tolson, Acting Director, advised thoroughness in rehabilitation, noting that all aspects of the plan should be verified, since the Park Service "cannot afford to take anything for granted." Intending to furnish Meade's headquarters to its July 1863 appearance, Tolson recommended acquiring original, not reproduction, furniture pieces. Other physical changes to the battlefield were perhaps less noticeable; befitting of the World War II era, park maintenance painted the 419 Civil War cannon, previously green, army-issued olive drab.⁶²

The mass acquisition of the automobile brought increased visitation to the Gettysburg battlefield, which resulted in increased commercialism of the historic grounds. Though travel was curtailed during World War II, the era finally saw increased development of tourist facilities. Private developers capitalized on the battlefield's popularity by building motels, cabins, restaurants, and museums near, or on, the battlefield grounds.

The Peace Light Inn, one of the more prominently situated private enterprises on the battlefield, was located just two hundred yards south of the Peace Light. The facility offered visitor accommodations and food services, and in the winter of 1945 the owners added several

⁶² Frederick Tilberg, "Historians' Monthly Report, April 1951," written on May 4, 1951. Folder 1, Box 7, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 2; Frederick Tilberg, "Report on the Proposed Restoration of the Bryan House," November 20, 1943. Folder 15, Box 17, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 13; Letter from Hillory Tolson to the Regional Director, January 5, 1944. Folder 15, Box 17, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives; Frederick Tilberg, "Historians' Monthly Report, October 1943," written on November 4, 1943. Folder 3, Box 7, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 1.

new cabins to the complex. Other overnight accommodations could be found on the southern end of the battlefield, including the Lee-Meade Inn, located south of the Peach Orchard, and the Home Sweet Home, located west of Ziegler's Grove. Other burgeoning tourist facilities included the Round Top Restaurant, located at the northern slope of Little Round Top and the Shields Museum near the West End Guide Station. "Longstreet's Headquarters," located at the intersection of Wheatfield Road and West Confederate Avenue, was one of the more popular attractions. Samuel and Rosalind Swope owned and operated several cabins, a refreshment stand, and an outbuilding interpreted as General James Longstreet's headquarters. Wartime demands and budget constraints prevented the acquisition of additional land during the early 1940s. Coleman's administration did, however, initiate condemnation proceedings to acquire a twenty eight acre property along Oak Ridge, owned by William Shields.⁶³

On a daily basis World War II defined basic operations at the Gettysburg battlefield. More importantly, the war forced Americans to reconnect to their past and to reshape the meaning of the battle, making it relevant to their lives and struggles. During this period of national crisis, Americans looked to Gettysburg to find meaning and a sense of national identity. While standing on the Gettysburg battlefield and reflecting upon the heroism of the Union and Confederate soldiers, Americans found strength to fight the Nazis in Europe or the Japanese in the Pacific. From the Gettysburg battlefield, Americans renewed their commitment to "preserve an America worthy of Washington and Jefferson, Lincoln and Lee."⁶⁴

⁶³ Superintendent J. Walter Coleman, "Superintendent's Monthly, December 1945," written on January 3, 1946. Folder 3, Box 7, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives; Dixon, "Gettysburg, A Living Battlefield," 198; "Two Testify On Value Of Sought Land," *Gettysburg Times* 27 August 1941. Folder 7, Box 35, (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives.

⁶⁴ Governor J. Melville Broughton, "Address Delivered at Gettysburg Memorial Day Exercises, May 30, 1944." Folder 502, Box 2500, CCF, RG 79, NARA College Park.

Americans also renewed their interest in the Gettysburg battlefield during the World War II era. Victory in Europe and victory in Japan brought unparalleled economic prosperity to the nation. Freedom from the constraints of the Great Depression, millions took to the roads in the post war era. Many of the NPS facilities, Gettysburg included, were inadequate to effectively manage the expected increase of visitation. Thus, in the years after 1945, Park Service officials explored ways to make the national park more accessible and appealing to visitors. The decade following 1945 served as a steppingstone to reshaping the park for the Civil War Centennial.

Chapter 4

“The World Will Little Note Nor Long Remember”

Postwar Tourism, Patriotism, and Commercialization, 1946-1955

Victory in Europe on May 8, 1945, and the final surrender of Japanese forces on August 14 brought to an end the deadliest war the world had ever seen. As the military demobilized, American GIs returned home and took their place in a burgeoning, vibrant domestic economy. In the decade after World War II millions of people took to the road to reacquaint themselves with America and its national treasures in what one historian has termed “the golden age of family vacations.” Americans often traveled to national parks in the postwar era because it reinforced “their status as citizens in the American nation.”¹ At Gettysburg, park staff quickly realized that their facilities were woefully inadequate for such an increase in visitation. Between 1946 and 1955 Superintendent Coleman and Gettysburg management struggled through a decade of planning, interpretive changes, celebrations, and sprawling commercialism to bring Gettysburg National Military Park into the postwar era.

Visitation at the Gettysburg battlefield between 1941 and 1945 was the lowest in the national park’s history. By August 1945, however, as Americans claimed victory in Japan and the federal government removed the gas rationing, visitation to Gettysburg immediately

¹ Susan Sessions Rugh, *Are We There Yet?: The Golden Age of American Family Vacations* (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 2008), 2-15; John A. Jakle, *The Tourist: Travel in the Twentieth-Century* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1985), 185-199. Given the importance of tourism in the postwar period, surprisingly little scholarship has been devoted to the topic and Rugh and Jakle’s book stand among the most complete and thorough. Rugh examines family vacations in the thirty year period after 1945. She defines this period as the “golden age of family vacations” because “unprecedented prosperity and widespread vacation benefits at work meant most middle-class families could afford to vacation” (2-15). Jakle, on the other hand, offers a discussion of tourist trends in the twentieth century, by exploring the influence of the automobile and the rise of commercial strips.

increased. In August 1945 approximately 45,000 people toured the battlefield and over 57,000 people visited in September. War's end brought a surge of visitation that continued through the Civil War centennial and into the 1970s. In the first full year of peace, 1946, park visitation totaled 508,641. For the 83rd battle anniversary alone 83,678 people visited the park. Annual visitation for the 1948 to 1949 fiscal year reached 659,222, the third busiest year in the history of the Gettysburg battlefield. By 1954 park visitation totaled 705,519 and the park recorded 724,037 during the 1955 calendar year.²

Such a rapid increase in visitation at Gettysburg was only part of the larger growth of tourism in the postwar era that spread across the nation. Historians attribute the surge in tourism to several factors including mass ownership of automobiles, the development of a truly national highway system, pent-up buying power, and shorter work weeks that provided for increased leisure time. Visitation statistics at Vicksburg National Military Park reinforce an evident rise in nationwide tourism. Just three years after war's end, Vicksburg reported an annual visitation of 122,184. More telling, however, than pure numbers was that park staff noted an "interesting fact that in no month...was less than forty states represented on our museum register." In December

² Superintendent J. Walter Coleman, "Superintendent's Monthly Report, May 1945," written on June 6, 1945. Box 2497, RG 79, Central Classified File, 1933-1949, National Parks, Gettysburg National Military Park, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland, 1 [hereinafter from this collection will be cited by Folder, Box, CCF, RG 79, NARA College Park]; Superintendent J. Walter Coleman, "Superintendent's Monthly Report, June 1945," written on July 10, 1945, 1; Superintendent J. Walter Coleman, "Superintendent's Monthly Report, August 1945," written on September 13, 1945, 2; Superintendent J. Walter Coleman "Superintendent's Monthly Report, September 1945," written on October 5, 1945. Box 2497, CCF, RG 79, NARA College Park, 2; Frederick Tilberg, "Museum Prospectus: Gettysburg National Military Park and Cemetery," written on November 27, 1956. Folder 10, Box 8, Historians Files, 1933 – 1965, Records of the National Park Service at Gettysburg National Military Park, (GETT 41151), Gettysburg National Military Park Archives, 16 [hereinafter cited by (GETT 41151), GNMP Archives]; Historians' Files, "Monthly Statistical Report of Interpretive Services, 1939-1953." Folder 15, Box 9, (GETT 41151), GNMP Archives; Frederick Tilberg, "Historians' Monthly Report, September 1949," written on October 5, 1949. Folder 2, Box 7, Park Main (Central) Files, 1933 – 1954, (GETT 41113), Records of the National Park Service at Gettysburg National Military Park, Gettysburg National Military Park Archives, 1 [hereinafter cited as (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives]; Frederick Tilberg, "Museum Prospectus: Gettysburg National Military Park and Cemetery," written on November 27, 1956. Folder 10, Box 8, (GETT 41151), GNMP Archives, 16. Annual visitation is calculated from October 1 through September 30 of the following year. The 659, 222 reached in 1948-1949 was the third busiest season, following 1929 and 1938.

1947 Vicksburg's museum registered showed visitors from forty six states and six foreign countries.³

Programming at Gettysburg reflected growing attendance. Briefly curtailed during the war years, the park resumed the campfire programs in the postwar era. Like those of the war years, many of the presentations were about America's national parks and were not Gettysburg or usually even Civil War specific. "It is the aim to limit the subjects to national parks of this and other countries," wrote Superintendent Coleman "to wildlife and important historical areas." During the first summer after the war, hundreds of visitors thus enjoyed presentations about Yellowstone, Zion, Bryce, Mount McKinley, Carlsbad, and Grand Canyon National Parks. The following summer Park Service employees presented programs about the Battle of Fredericksburg, the assassination of Abraham Lincoln, the Statue of Liberty, Historic Pennsylvania, Colonial Williamsburg, and Saratoga National Park.⁴

A few of the campfires featured a guest speaker, but typically the main presentation involved the showing of a national park produced film. The color film, usually forty to sixty

³ Jakle, *The Tourist*, 185-199; Rugh, *Are We There Yet?*, 2-15. Jakle, for example, notes that an average work week in 1940 was 44 hours, but by 1950 the average work week had fallen to the standard 40 hours. This created an increase in leisure time where Americans could escape their routines at work and take advantage of their leisure time. The mass ownership of the automobile also accounts for the dramatic increase in tourism. Rugh finds that 54 percent of families owned automobiles in 1948, by 1960 72 percent owned automobiles, and 82 percent by 1970. Americans were traveling by automobile more than ever before and the development of a nation-wide highway system allowed for tourists to easily reach their destination. Commercial developments and road side services became a spin-off industry to accommodate tourists on their travels; Superintendent James McConaghie, "Superintendent's Advance Annual, 1948," written on June 1, 1948. Folder 207-01.4, Box 2560, CCF, RG 79, NARA College Park, 5. This is an impressive figure, considering that Alaska and Hawaii had not yet become states, meaning that Vicksburg received visitation from all but two states during the 1947-1948 fiscal year.

⁴ Frederick Tilberg, "Annual Report on Information and Interpretive Services, 1955," written on January 31, 1956. Folder Y2623, Box 16, RG 79, Historic Shrines, Sites, Monuments, and Parks, General Correspondence, 1952-1966, Northeast Regional Office, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 8 [hereinafter cited by Folder, Box, GC, NARA Philadelphia]; Superintendent J. Walter Coleman, "Superintendent's Monthly Report, July 1946," written on August 5, 1946; Superintendent J. Walter Coleman "Superintendent's Monthly Report, August 1946," written on September 12, 1946. Box 2497, CCF, RG 79, NARA College Park, 2; Frederick Tilberg, "Historians' Monthly Report, July 1947," written on August 4, 1947. Folder 207-03, Box 2498, CCF, RG 79, NARA College Park, 2; Superintendent J. Walter Coleman "Superintendent's Monthly Report, August 1947," written on September 11, 1947. Box 2497, CCF, RG 79, NARA College Park, 3.

minutes long, commonly was a silent movie. Each spring Superintendent Coleman wrote the regional office requesting the use of films for the summer programs. On April 22, 1948, for example, Coleman wrote asking for films on the natural parks of Isle Royale, Grand Canyon, Great Smoky Mountains, Acadia, Big Bend, and Mt. Rainer. One week later the chief of museums informed Coleman that the Park Service did not have films on the Great Smokey Mountains, Acadia, or Isle Royale, but suggested that Coleman show a film on Big Bend that reportedly was an “excellent picture covering the general scenery of the park.” During the annual summer campfire series hundreds of visitors enjoyed other motion pictures of Olympic, Grand Teton, and Bandelier National Parks, Skyline Drive, the Shenandoah Valley, Historic New England, and the national parks of Japan.⁵

On occasion visitors to the evening campfires encountered non-National Park Service productions and enjoyed promotional films from various companies or government agencies. For instance, on August 29, 1948 over 250 people attended a showing of United Airlines’ featured presentation, “Highway to Hawaii,” which explored the scenic, recreational, and agricultural features of the islands. In July 1951 the Pennsylvania Department of Commerce’s promotional film “Pennsylvania Pleasureland” drew an audience of over 150 people.⁶

Live programs continued as well. During 1941 and 1945 many Memorial Day speakers had evoked the sacrifices of the Union and Confederate soldiers on the Gettysburg battlefield as

⁵ Ned Burns to J. Walter Coleman, April 30, 1948; Superintendent J. Walter Coleman to Region One Director, April 22, 1948. Folder 503-10, Box 2500, CCF, RG 79, NARA College Park; Frederick Tilberg, “Historians’ Monthly Report, June 1948,” written on July 2, 1948. Box 2498, CCF, RG 79, NARA College Park; Superintendent J. Walter Coleman, “Superintendent’s Monthly Report, July 1953,” written on August 6, 1953, 2; Superintendent J. Walter Coleman, “Superintendent’s Monthly Report, August 1952,” written on September 11, 1952. Box 191, CCF, RG 79, NARA College Park, 2.

⁶ Frederick Tilberg, “Historians’ Monthly Report, August 1948,” written on September 3, 1948. Folder 207-03, Box 2498, CCF, RG 79, NARA College Park; Superintendent J. Coleman, “Superintendent’s Monthly Report, August 1951,” written on September 13, 1951. Box 191, RG 79, NARA College Park, 2.

a means to foster support for the war in Europe and Japan. Coleman identified patriotic expressions as the park's most important activities, stating that "people want to come to Gettysburg at such times and they look to our community to provide them with patriotic programs." The superintendent encouraged the town's full participation in battlefield celebrations because the community "would profit in a material way."⁷

In the postwar years, Memorial Day celebrations remained a popular event, but became extremely politicized. The 1945 ceremonies especially foreshadowed the highly partisan and politicized Cold War rhetoric to come. Before a crowd of nearly 3,500 powerful Republican Senator Robert Taft of Ohio spoke of the inherent dangers of peacetime conscription and warned listeners of the dangers of a growing government bureaucracy. The following year, fellow conservative Republican John Bricker, also of Ohio, offered a similar oration that lambasted the increasing power of the federal government. Over 4,000 people gathered in the Soldiers' National Cemetery to hear Bricker's speech, while thousands more listened to the speech through a radio broadcast. The decidedly political sentiment left some listeners unhappy. Pennsylvania Governor James Duff delivered a less partisan Memorial Day oration in May 1947. Duff's address received "favorable comment," particularly when compared to the "partisan, political display" of the previous celebrations.⁸

⁷ "For a Bigger and Better Gettysburg," *Gettysburg Times*, 26 October 1946. Folder 501- Publicity, 1945 – 1952, Box 41, RG 79, Historic Shrines, Sites, Monuments, and Parks, Subject Files, 1937-1957, Northeast Regional Office, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania [hereinafter cited by Folder, Box, SF, RG 79, NARA Philadelphia].

⁸ Superintendent J. Walter Coleman, "Superintendent's Monthly Report, May 1945," written on June 6, 1945, 1; Superintendent J. Coleman, "Superintendent's Monthly Report, May 1946," written on June 11, 1946, 2; Superintendent J. Coleman, "Superintendent's Monthly Report, May 1947," written on June 13, 1947, 1. Box 2497, CCF, RG 79, NARA College Park, 1. For additional reading on Senator Robert Taft, see Russell Kirk, *The Political Principles of Robert A. Taft* (New York: Fleet Press Corp, 1967) or James T. Patterson, *Mr. Republican: A Biography of Robert Taft* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1972). A conservative Republican, Taft, along with conservative southern Democrats, had been a regular critic of President Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal Programs. During World War II, Taft maintained an isolationist perspective and argued that America should not become involved in European affairs. Taft had sought the Republican nomination for president three times, 1940, 1948, and

While evoking the sacrifices of the Federal dead in their efforts to preserve the Union, Memorial Day speakers also increasingly referenced Lincoln and his “Gettysburg Address” as a model for a utopian postwar world free of communism. In May 1948, Massachusetts Republican Congressman Joseph Martin reminded the crowd of the power of Lincoln’s words, stating that “On this field of sacrifice, the most beautiful evaluation of the service rendered our Nation by those who have fought in her defense was uttered by the immortal Abraham Lincoln.” Martin further linked the Union soldiers’ sacrifice and the rhetoric of “immortal” Lincoln’s words to the present struggle against communism and evil. “The Union which was held together then has today become the hub of the world,” Martin continued, “The Union which was held together then has today become the pivot upon which turns the fate of civilization.” In May 1951, Republican Maryland Governor, Theodore McKeldin, offered a similar vision. After outlining the hardships endured by America’s Civil War population, McKeldin noted, “These times are not unlike those, except that our troubles and our dangers are magnified, not only by our own growth and the growing complexity of our economic life, but by our closer relations with the rest of a very troubled world... and unfortunately by the thirst for power of the madmen in Russia’s Kremlin and those who live in the false light of the madmen’s imitation glory.”⁹

1952, but was unsuccessful, but is probably best known for his labor relations policies, authoring the famed Taft-Hartley Act in 1947. As indicated by the title of Patterson’s work, Taft became the leading Republican figure and earned the nickname “Mr. Republican.” Taft was also an ally of fellow conservative Republican John Bricker, also of Ohio. Taft supported Bricker’s nomination for the 1944 presidential bid, but New York Governor Thomas Dewey, who led the more moderate Republican faction, received the Republican nomination and selected Bricker as his running mate. The ticket, of course, lost to incumbent President Roosevelt. To date the best biography on John Bricker is Richard Davies, *Defender of the Old Guard: John Bricker and American Politics* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1993). As mentioned the National Park Service had no association or influence on who was invited for the Memorial Day, or later Dedication Day, speakers. These celebrations were coordinated by the local chapter of the Sons of Union Veterans, the Lincoln Fellowship, and the borough council. For a complete discussion of the social and cultural currents of the Cold War era see, Stephen J. Whitfield, *The Culture of the Cold War* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991).

⁹ Congressman Joseph Martin’s Memorial Day speech, reprinted in “Congressman Martin Asserts United States Seeking Peace,” *Gettysburg Times*, 31 May 1948; “Governor of Maryland Says America Must “Set Example” For Government Of People In Memorial Day Address Here,” *Gettysburg Times*, 31 May 1951. Vertical Files, 10-32,

In the fall of 1946, as the chill of Cold War spread, through a joint resolution Congress declared November 19 “Dedication Day,” to mark the original dedication of the Soldiers’ National Cemetery. President Harry S. Truman suggested that the Gettysburg Address be read in “public assemblages in the United States and throughout its possessions, on our ships at sea, and wherever the American flag flies.” On November 19, 1946, Gettysburg celebrated its first annual Dedication Day, with Congressman Jennings Randolph, a Democratic Congressman from West Virginia, delivering the keynote address. Sponsored jointly by the Lincoln Fellowship of Pennsylvania and the Sons of Union Veterans (SUV), the Dedication Day celebrations soon became as popular as Memorial Day, attracting several thousand spectators as well as various well known politicians and distinguished guests. For example, on the 88th anniversary of the dedication of the Soldiers’ National Cemetery, on November 19, 1951, Pennsylvania Governor John Fine and Illinois Governor Adlai E. Stevenson, the latter a 1952 Democratic candidate for president, delivered a “few appropriate remarks.” Interested attendees could also see an original copy of the “Gettysburg Address” displayed at the Gettysburg National Bank.¹⁰

Gettysburg National Military Park Library. All notes hereinafter cited as VF, GNMP Library. Similar to Taft and Bricker, Martin was a conservative Republican and an outspoken critic of the New Deal. He did, however, become more moderate toward the end of his political career and served as Speaker of the House between 1947 and 1949 and again in 1953 to 1955. McKeldin served as a two-term Maryland governor from 1951 to 1959. Politically, McKeldin offered a more moderate view than earlier Memorial Day speakers, namely Taft and Bricker. While many of the Memorial Day ceremonies thus carried a decidedly anticommunist message, both the battle anniversary and Independence Day remained a celebratory event see: Superintendent J. Coleman, “Superintendent’s Monthly Report, July 1953,” written on August 6, 1953. Box 191, CCF, RG 79, NARA College Park, 1. In 1953 nearly 15,000 people attended the anniversary events and the Fourth of July parade. Vice President Richard Nixon delivered the battle anniversary speech before a crowd of 3,000 at the Gettysburg High School athletic field and the United States Air Force Drum and Bugle Corps entertained the crowd with drilling maneuvers and field music. The battle anniversary and Independence Day celebrations were hosted by the Gettysburg Fire Department. Following the anniversary events, Nixon visited the grave site of his great-grand father, George Nixon, of the 73rd Ohio Infantry.

¹⁰ 79th Congress, Joint Resolution, Folder Gettysburg Legislation 1948, Box 37, RG 79, NARA Philadelphia; Superintendent J. Walter Coleman, “Superintendent’s Monthly Report, October 1946,” written on November 13, 1946. Box 2497, CCF, RG 79, NARA College Park, 2; James Holland to Regional Director, written on November 20, 1951. Box 675, CCF, RG 79, NARA College Park. The Lincoln Fellowship and the Sons of Union Veterans, Gettysburg Camp sponsored the Dedication Day festivities. Stevenson received the Democratic nomination for president in 1952 and again in 1956, but lost both times to Republican nominee Dwight D. Eisenhower. After

In addition to the Dedication Day celebrations, Pennsylvania Boy Scouts and local chapters of the SUV additionally began holding commemorative events in February to honor President Lincoln's birthday. In 1949 the Harrisburg Council of the Boy Scouts of America initiated an annual pilgrimage for Pennsylvania Boy Scouts to Gettysburg. On February 12, nearly 2,000 scouts gathered to commemorate Lincoln's birthday and to celebrate American freedom and liberty. Befitting to the context of the Cold War and the desire to spread democracy and contain communism, the Boy Scouts carried torches lit from the flame of the Eternal Light Peace Memorial through the battlefield in a nationwide program to "Strengthen the Arm of Liberty." The following year, nearly 3,000 scouts attended the ceremonies and paraded through town to the Soldiers' National Cemetery. Following the parade the SUV held commemorative services in the Soldiers' National Cemetery. Actress Colleen Townsend's oration of the "Gettysburg Address" was reportedly the first time a woman read the speech in the Gettysburg ceremonies. In 1951 over 4,000 Boy Scouts participated in the third "Annual Lincoln Pilgrimage" and celebrated the birth of a man whose visions of the nation and civic duty resonated with young scouts. Not only was it fitting to celebrate Lincoln's birthday, Rear Admiral Antrim told the assembled scouts, but it was also "especially fitting" for the scouts to travel to Gettysburg, "for Lincoln believed in and stood for the same ideals which made scouting such a potent force in the development and continuance of good citizenship."¹¹ Each of these

winning the presidency in 1960, John F. Kennedy appointed Stevenson as the Ambassador to the United Nations. For additional reading on Stevenson see John Bartlow Martin, *Adlai Stevenson and the World: The Life of Adlai Stevenson* (New York: Doubleday, 1977); Porter McKeever, *Adlai Stevenson: His Life and Legacy* (New York: Morrow, 1989); and Jeff Broadwater, *Adlai Stevenson and American Politics: The Odyssey of a Cold War Liberal* (New York: Twayne, 1994).

¹¹ Superintendent J. Walter Coleman, "Superintendent's Monthly Report, February 1949," written on March 8, 1949. Box 2497, CCF, RG 79, NARA College Park, 1; Superintendent J. Walter Coleman, "Superintendent's Monthly Report, February 1950," written on March 10, 1950. Box 191, CCF, RG 79, NARA College Park, 1-2; "More than 4,000 Boy Scouts Participate in Annual Lincoln Pilgrimage Here Saturday," *Gettysburg Times*, 12 February 1951.

events were radio broadcast, allowing thousands more to join in the celebrations. They further increased Lincoln's popularity as well as the central role of the Gettysburg battle in American history.

Periodically the town and battlefield would host other, special anniversary events. In the fall of 1952, the town celebrated the 100th anniversary of the opening of the Western Maryland Railroad line. The October 18 celebrations featured a reenactment of President Lincoln's train ride to Gettysburg in November 1863 to dedicate the Soldiers' National Cemetery. Aboard a Civil War era train, President Lincoln, portrayed by screen actor Ray Middleton, arrived at the historic train station on Carlisle Street. Upon disembarking from the train, "Lincoln" and his accompanying party proceeded to the town square and stopped at the David Wills House. The Western Maryland Railroad Company had constructed a stage front to make the Wills House appear as it did in 1863. After a brief stop, the party proceeded to the Soldiers' National Cemetery for a reenactment of the Dedication Day ceremonies. Over 50,000 reportedly attended the event, and the restaging of the dedication events was later broadcast on NBC.¹²

Carl Sandburg famously noted that Abraham Lincoln became the "mirror" in which Americans could "see themselves." The popularity of Lincoln and the Gettysburg Address certainly increased in the years after World War II, namely through the Congressional establishment of Dedication Day. To many Americans the vision of a "new birth of freedom" rang poignant in the wake of the Second World War and the heightened tension of the Cold War.

¹² Superintendent J. Walter Coleman, "Superintendent's Monthly Report, October 1952," written on November 7, 1952. Box 191, CCF, RG, 79, NARA College Park, 2-3.

Lincoln's image had been originally casted as a folk-hero, but by 1945 Americans looked to the Lincoln image as a source of strength and political inspiration.¹³

In the 1880s and 1890s the War Department had overseen the installation of hundreds of explanatory itinerary tablets that detailed the movements of brigades, divisions, and corps in the Union and Confederate armies. After World War II the National Park Service began to build its own interpretive tablets. In the early months of 1947 local and regional officials began preparation for the design and installation of field exhibits. In mid-March the regional director urged Superintendent Coleman to expedite the installation process so the field exhibits would be in place for the spring and summer season. At this time the standard field exhibit consisted of an orientation map, several historic photos, and a small narrative passage explaining the events of the area, mounted with a glass-enclosed standing exhibit.¹⁴

That spring the Park Service installed interpretive field exhibits at Spangler's Spring, the Angle, and Devil's Den. While all three "attracted considerable attention," the exhibit at Devil's Den became the most popular, simply because more visitors walked through Devil's Den than

¹³ For additional reading on Lincoln and memory see: Garry Wills, *Lincoln at Gettysburg: The Words That Remade America* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1992); Merrill Peterson, *Lincoln in American Memory* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994); Gabor Boritt, *The Gettysburg Gospel: The Lincoln Speech That Nobody Knows* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2006). To date, Peterson's work offers the best analysis on Lincoln within popular culture and memory. He explores Lincoln's image in literature, biography, history, art, and politics and identifies five prevailing themes to the Lincoln image: Savior of the Union; Emancipationist; Man of the People; First America; and Self Made Man. Peterson also identifies two periods critical to the making of the Lincoln image. The first era, 1870s and 1880s, produced the first Lincoln memories and collections. In the second period, the 1920s and 1930s, scholars (namely Carl Sandburg and James G. Randall) tried to separate the Lincoln folk-image from Lincoln the politician and statesman. He concludes that the diversity to the Lincoln image makes him appeal to all Americans.

¹⁴ Albert Cox to J. Coleman, March 17, 1947. Folder Gettysburg National Military Park, Exhibits, General From September 1941. Box 46, SF, RG 79, NARA Philadelphia. At this time, no records can be found indicating who constructed the exhibits, though Frederick Tilberg did author the historical passage.

the other sites. In November 1947, the Park Service installed an additional field exhibit at the Lydia Leister Farm. Accompanied by several historic photographs, the wayside offered a simple explanation to curious visitors: “Meade’s Headquarters, the Lydia Leister house, was under heavy fire just before Pickett’s Charge when the post of Command was moved to Powers Hill. At the famous consultation held in this house on the night of July 2, Meade’s generals confirmed his intention to ‘stay and fight’ in the same position.”¹⁵

The following year, the NPS installed new field exhibits at Culp’s Hill, East Cemetery Hill, McPherson’s Ridge, Oak Ridge, and Seminary Ridge. The exhibit placed along Seminary Ridge, for example, consisted of a panoramic picture of the battlefield highlighting sites relevant to Pickett’s Charge, photographs of the commanding Confederate officers in the assault, and a short explanation of the Confederate offensive. The field exhibit at Pickett’s Charge declared the Confederate offensive as “one of the great charges in all warfare” and then noted that 10,000 Confederates were killed, wounded, or captured during the assault’s repulse. Within the decade the park staff installed ten field exhibits and planned on placing four more, at the Eternal Light Peace Memorial, Barlow’s Knoll, Warfield Ridge, and the Soldiers’ National Monument. The National Park Service’s interpretive field exhibits proved successful as Superintendent Coleman reported that “all of these exhibits are in almost constant use.”¹⁶

¹⁵ Frederick Tilberg, “Historians’ Monthly Report, May 1947,” written on June 5, 1947, 2; Frederick Tilberg, “Historians’ Monthly Report, November 1947,” written on December 2, 1947. Folder 2, Box 7, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 1; Director Drury to Regional Director, March 11, 1947. Folder Exhibits, Box 46, SF, RG 79, NARA Philadelphia. The phrase “post of command” refers to Meade’s Headquarters.

¹⁶ Frederick Tilberg, “Historians’ Monthly Report, August 1948,” written on September 3, 1948; Frederick Tilberg, “Historians’ Monthly Report, October 1948,” written on November 2, 1948. Box 2498, CCF, RG 79, NARA College Park. The July 1948 monthly report contains a photograph of the field exhibit placed along Seminary Ridge; Director Drury to Regional Director, March 11, 1947. Folder Exhibits, Box 46, SF, RG 79, NARA Philadelphia. The stated 10,000 casualty number is incorrect. It is generally accepted that the Confederates suffered approximately 5,600 casualties (killed, wounded, captured, or missing in action) during Pickett’s Charge. Of the approximately 13,000 infantrymen in the assault this amounts to a fifty-percent casualty rate; Frederick Tilberg,

Touring the historic grounds provided visitors with an understanding of the July 1863 battle action, and the newly constructed interpretive exhibits offered simple explanations of the tactical complexities at various points on the battlefield. Still park officials continued to explore other ways to explain the battle to the increasing number of tourists. To further assist visitors' understanding of the battle, in the spring of 1949 the Park Service designed and distributed free leaflets. Visitors could also pick up free guide brochure, stacked in wooden boxes at one of three locations: Devil's Den, Spangler's Spring, and Oak Ridge. Apparently the pamphlets were extremely popular with the touring public; approximately 5,600 brochures were distributed in April 1949 alone.¹⁷

In the summer of 1947 the Park Service had experimented with posting rangers on the battlefield to make contact with visitors and to offer informal interpretation. Throughout August a park ranger remained at Little Round Top, where he reportedly made contact with over 2,000 visitors. Historian Frederick Tilberg was pleased with the success of the park staff's interpretation at Little Round Top and believed that it offered "a good indication of what can be done in public contact work on the field." Tilberg suggested creating additional posts at the Eternal Light Peace Memorial, the Pennsylvania Memorial, and in the Soldiers' National Cemetery. While stationed on the battlefield providing informal interpretation, the rangers also sold the park's informational booklets from their stations at Devil's Den and Little Round Top. Interested visitors could purchase a copy of *The Gettysburg Handbook* for twenty-five cents or a copy of *Abraham Lincoln From His Own Words* for thirty-five cents. Other than the summer

"Annual Report on Information and Interpretive Services, 1955," written on January 31, 1956. Folder Y2623, Box 16, GC, RG 79, NARA Philadelphia, 7.

¹⁷ Superintendent J. Walter Coleman to the Regional Director, May 5, 1949. Box 42, SF, RG 79, NARA Philadelphia.

campfire programs and the rangers stationed throughout the battlefield, however, the National Park Service still did not offer regular, structured interpretive programming. On special occasions park rangers offered tours to military, student, or organized groups. The ranger-led tours were thorough and detailed, often lasting over four hours. Yet for a thorough discussion of the battle, the Park Service still recommended that visitors hire a Licensed Battlefield Guide. In fact, the Park Service recommended “the employment of a Licensed Guide as the best means of seeing the battlefield” on the field exhibits.¹⁸

Increasing numbers of visitors preferred to see the battlefield from the comfort of their own automobile, but in the late 1940s the park also dealt with calls to offer organized bus tours. In 1949 Charles Pitzer, manager of the Pitzer Bus Company, approached Superintendent Coleman with the suggestion of providing daily tours through the battlefield during the summer. Pitzer recommended offering two daily tours (one in the morning and one in the afternoon), lasting two or three hours. He also proposed charging a fee of one dollar and employing a licensed guide to narrate the battle action. Coleman enthusiastically supported the proposal. For

¹⁸ Frederick Tilberg, “Historians’ Monthly Report, August 1947,” written on September 3, 1947. Folder 2, Box 7, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 2; Frederick Tilberg, “Annual Report on Information and Interpretive Services, 1955,” written on January 31, 1956, 7; Frederick Tilberg, “Annual Report on Information and Visitor Services, 1956,” written on February 6, 1957. Folder Y2623, Box 16, GC, RG 79, NARA Philadelphia, 1; Frederick Tilberg, “Historians Monthly Report, July 1948.” Folder 2, Box 7, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives. J. M. Sheads was the ranger initially assigned to Little Round Top. During the month of August 1947 he sold 225 Gettysburg guide booklets and 220 Abraham Lincoln booklets. Tilberg was particularly pleased with the volume of sales on Little Round Top, for they even exceeded the pamphlet sales in the cyclorama building. At the Cyclorama building visitors could also purchase *Artillery Through the Ages* for 35 cents or *The National Parks* cloth bound for \$5.00 or in paperback for \$1.00. The park also sold Cyclorama prints for 25 cents. *The Gettysburg Handbook* was by far the most popular sales item, with over 5,000 booklets sold in 1953, 1954, and 1955. The sale items were operated by the park historian, who acted as an agent of Eastern National Parks and Monuments Association. Eastern National was Gettysburg’s non-profit partner organization, but also operated in over 100 other national park sites, namely on the east coast. Congress authorized the creation of such non-profit partner associations to enhance visitor experience to America’s national parks in 1946. A year later, in May 1947, several NPS rangers met at Gettysburg National Military Park to establish such a non-profit called, Eastern National Parks and Monuments Association (or Eastern National, for short). Gettysburg was Eastern National’s first sales outlet and partner park. For additional reading on Eastern National and its role in the NPS system see www.easternnational.org

battlefield visitors who arrived via railroad, or for the individuals who would enjoy a guided tour on a bus, Coleman urged the regional office to carefully consider Pitzer's plan.¹⁹

Pitzer's proposal to operate a battlefield bus tour was well received at the regional and national offices. Director Newton Drury believed that a guided bus tour would be a "desirable service to the public." The director cautioned the park to consider the reaction from the Licensed Battlefield Guides, however, for if the NPS agreed to battlefield bus tours, guides would lose business. Although the Licensed Battlefield Guides held considerable power, the Park Service in the end accepted Pitzer's proposal, beginning in the summer of 1949.²⁰

While the National Park Service operated its official headquarters in the downtown post office, the primary visitor contact station was the cyclorama building. Due to its remote and undistinguishable location, few visitors stopped at the post office facility. Visitation statistics show that the building received no more than two hundred visitors in the summer months and fewer than fifty in the spring, fall, and winter. Visitors instead flocked to the cyclorama building to view the painting of Pickett's Charge. The NPS did oversee some minor cosmetic work to the exterior of the cyclorama building, but for the most part visitors still found an unattractive exterior and a rapidly deteriorating painting. According to Frederick Tilberg, the cyclorama

¹⁹ Superintendent J. Walter Coleman to the Regional Director, March 8, 1949. Folder 900 Concessions, 1944-1951, Box 46, SF, RG 79, NARA Philadelphia.

²⁰ Newton Drury to Regional Director, June 2, 1949; Thomas Allen to J. Coleman, June 6, 1949. Folder 900-Concessions, 1944-1951. Box 46, SF, RG 79, NARA Philadelphia.

building was “unsightly, poorly ventilated, and lighted, has no heat... the building leaks, and sometimes water runs down and streaks the surface of the canvas.”²¹

Park Service officials realized that more immediate action had to be undertaken to prevent further deterioration of the cyclorama painting. On May 21, 1948 Ned Burns, Chief of the Museum Branch, submitted his findings on the cyclorama building to the regional director. Burns reported that “one serious problem still remains which relates to the building itself. Daylight can be seen through the hollow tile wall and at many points where the vertical steel beams which support the roof are fastened together.” Burns continued, “if the painting is to remain in this building for a considerable length of time much more work will be required beyond the limited repairs which can be made at this time. It is hoped the erection of the permanent museum building will not be delayed overlong. Otherwise extensive and expensive repairs will be needed in the building to prevent the loss of the painting.”²²

On October 5, 1944 Congress had designated the Gettysburg Cyclorama a National Historic Object. Given the historical significance of the painting, any significant restoration monies would have to come from Congress. In 1947 it appropriated \$10,000 for the restoration of the painting. The National Park Service awarded the contract to New York conservationist E. Richard Panzironi. The restoration work was to be completed no later than July 30, 1948. By late June Panzironi and crew had completed the restoration work on the painting. The

²¹ Frederick Tilberg, “Annual Report on Information and Interpretive Services, 1955,” written on January 31, 1956. Folder Y2623, Box 16, GC, RG 79, NARA Philadelphia, 10; Frederick Tilberg, “Museum Prospectus: Gettysburg National Military Park and Cemetery,” written on November 27, 1956. Folder 10, Box 8, (GETT 41151), GNMP Archives, 1 [hereinafter cited as Tilberg, “Museum Prospectus, 1956”].

²² Ned Burns to Director, May 21, 1948. “Gettysburg National Military Park, Exhibits, General From September 1941.” Box 46, SF, RG 79, NARA Philadelphia.

cyclorama's canvas was stabilized, the painting retouched, and the wooden support beams repainted.²³ But this restoration work was only a temporary solution to a long-term problem.

Meanwhile, National Park Service officials were not the only ones voicing concern over both the preservation and display of the Gettysburg Cyclorama. On occasion visitors to the building voiced their disapproval with the display of the painting and the building. One visitor from Illinois, Charles D. Drew, wrote the NPS Director that he was “very much disappointed in the way this wonderful picture is set up.” As the Park Service displayed the painting the viewing platform was positioned below the horizon of the painting, forcing visitors to look up to see the panorama. Drew correctly noted that the observer should be on the same level as the horizon, and unless the viewer is at eye level with the painting the cyclorama's illusion is destroyed. He also recommended the restoration of the painting's three-dimensional objects—shrubs, fences, artillery pieces—in the foreground of the painting. Proper display of the cyclorama continued to be a debated topic among Park Service management as plans were being developed for the new museum facility. Regional Director Thomas Allen, agreed that he was “particularly impressed by the poor presentation which we give the cyclorama building.” Allen recommended that the government repaint the building's exterior, improve the walkways, and post new signs—investments which would not entail a considerable amount of money.²⁴

Interested visitors could view the painting only from April through November. During the spring and fall seasons, the cyclorama building opened for four hours in the afternoon and in

²³ Harlan D. Unrau, *Administrative History: Gettysburg National Military Park and Gettysburg National Cemetery* (Denver: Branch of Publications and Graphic Design, Denver Service Center, 1991), 246; Ned Burns to Director, May 21, 1948. Folder Exhibits, Box 46, SF, RG 79, NARA Philadelphia. Congress had appropriated the money a year earlier, in 1947; Frederick Tilberg, “Historians' Monthly Report, June 1948,” written on July 2, 1948. Box 2498, RG 79, NARA College Park, 2. The cyclorama building remained open during the restoration process.

²⁴ Charles D. Drew to Director, August 4, 1951. Folder Gettysburg 833- Exhibits, 1942-1952. Box 46, RG 79, NARA Philadelphia; Thomas Allen to Director, May 26, 1942. “Gettysburg National Military Park, Exhibits, General From September 1941.” Box 46, SF, RG 79, NARA Philadelphia.

the summer season remained open for seven hours. The facility closed for four months during the winter season because the building lacked heat. The interpretation of the cyclorama consisted of a seventeen-minute recorded audio presentation that explained the Gettysburg campaign, including the three-day battle, and concluded with a brief history of the painting.²⁵

Notwithstanding the unattractive condition of the building and the deteriorating condition of the painting, the last remaining exhibited cyclorama of the Battle of Gettysburg remained a popular tourist attraction. During the 1951 calendar year 20,335 admission tickets were sold. In addition to interested tourists, many military groups and school students on field trips viewed the painting. Public relations further increased interest in the painting. The July 5, 1954 issue of *Time* magazine presented a feature article on the cyclorama. In late August *Time* donated 5,000 copies of the featured cyclorama color prints to the park and with permission to sell the color prints for profit at twenty five cents. Other promotional flyers encouraged visitors to see “The World’s Largest War Painting” and declared that the “cyclorama is the key to the battlefield. The Battlefield Park can only be intelligently understood by seeing the cyclorama.”²⁶

During the World War II years, Park Service officials also debated the various merits of potential sites for the cyclorama’s future home, the proposed new visitor center and museum.

²⁵ Frederick Tilberg, “Annual Report on Information and Interpretive Services, 1955,” written on January 31, 1956. Folder Y2623, Box 16, GC, RG 79, NARA Philadelphia, 4. The NPS assigned a ranger(s) to operate the Cyclorama building and sell tickets, informational brochures, and start the recorded audio presentation.

²⁶ Frederick Tilberg, “Annual Report on Operation of Gettysburg Cyclorama, 1951.” Folder 833-Exhibits, 1942-1952, Box 46, SF, RG 79, NARA Philadelphia; Tilberg, “Museum Prospectus, 1956.” Folder 10, Box 8, (GETT 41151), GNMP Archives, 17; Superintendent J. Walter Coleman, “Annual Report on Information and Interpretive Services, 1955,” written on January 31, 1956. Folder Y2623, Box 16, GC, RG 79, NARA Philadelphia, 4-5; Frederick Tilberg, “Annual Report on Information and Interpretive Services, 1955,” written on January 31, 1956. Box 16, GC, RG 79, NARA Philadelphia, 8; “Gettysburg Cyclorama” flyer. No author, no date. Folder 503-Pictures, General, 1934-1949. Box 2500, CCF, RG 79, NARA College Park.

Much of the debate centered on visitor access and proximity to the battlefield. Management had narrowed potential sites to either the tract between the Emmitsburg Road and Taneytown Road, south of Ziegler's Grove, or the site northeast of the Angle, between Hancock Avenue and Emmitsburg Road. After weighing the merits of these two sites, on January 28, 1946, Director Drury wrote the regional director approving the site between Hancock Avenue and Emmitsburg Road, on the northern section of Hancock Avenue, situated in Ziegler's Grove.²⁷ Drury advised Gettysburg's staff to initiate discussions about museum displays and to prepare a formal museum prospectus.

In early 1947 park officials developed a "Museum Prospectus," outlining a vision for the interpretive facilities. The prospectus reiterated the reasoning for the selected location along Hancock Avenue, which offered maximum visitor accessibility, and also within convenient walking distance of the battlefield's most popular attractions, the Soldiers' National Cemetery, the High Water Mark, and Hancock Avenue. Once in the building, visitors would walk through a large lobby, decorated with historic pictures of the battlefield and scenic pictures of other national parks. An admission fee would be charged to enter the museum, but several free displays would be offered in the lobby as a "gesture of free service to the public."²⁸

²⁷ Newton Drury to Regional Director, January 28, 1946; Roy Appleman to Regional Director, November 6, 1946. Box 44, SF, NARA Philadelphia; Frederick Tilberg to Superintendent J. Walter Coleman, October 19, 1942. Folder Gettysburg 620-46, Box 44, CCF, RG 79, NARA Philadelphia.

²⁸ "Museum Prospectus: Gettysburg National Military Park," January 23, 1947. Folder 4, Box 17, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 1-15; 16-24. This report, 45 pages in length, does not have an identified author, though it was likely written by Frederick Tilberg, the park historian. All notes hereinafter will be cited as Tilberg, "Museum Prospectus, 1947," to distinguish it from Tilberg's 1956 Museum Prospectus. As discussed prevailing NPS wisdom held that facilities should be located as close to the heart of the battlefield as possible. Park Service officials lauded the proximity to the fields of Pickett's Charge as one key reason for the site's selection. Roy Appleman, the NPS Regional Historian, asserted that the new facility should be "on commanding ground and in the heart of the historic area."

Plans for the museum facility itself included three interpretive experiences: the cyclorama painting, a lecture room, and a museum. The lecture room, to hold two hundred people, would offer a fifteen-minute orientation film for the general visitor. For visitors wanting a more detailed orientation, park officials proposed offering special presentations using the Cope relief map and an alternative slide show discussing the campaign and battle in more specifics. The cyclorama painting and slide show would both offer an encompassing interpretation of the campaign and the battle. Although Park Service officials agreed that the primary motive in constructing a new museum was to provide for the proper preservation of the cyclorama, they disagreed on how it should be displayed and used. Ned Burns argued that the cyclorama was over-interpreted because it detailed only one day of the battle of Gettysburg. The museum, on the other hand, would also offer a representation of Civil War artifacts, “to be limited to types of objects and their use.” Park Service officials planned for the building space to be forty feet wide by fifty feet long and for exhibits about artillery, infantry, cavalry, field hospitals, transportation, signal systems, Abraham Lincoln and the Gettysburg Address, and the town during the battle.²⁹

As park management discussed plans for a bona fide museum, they also reevaluated the auto tour route. While Pitzer’s bus tours had proven successful, many visitors still preferred to see the historic grounds from the comforts of their own vehicles. In the late 1940s NPS officials proposed two methods in providing visitors with an accessible, but simplified, tour route: the elimination of numerous park avenues that they deemed unessential to the tour route and the painting of directional arrows on the battlefield roads to facilitate visitor travel through the park.

²⁹ Tilberg, “Museum Prospectus, 1947,” (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 21-45; Ned Burns, “Comments on the Gettysburg Cyclorama-Museum-Administration Building Drawings,” January 2, 1946. Box 44, SF, RG 79, Philadelphia Archives, 45. Contemporary estimates placed the costs of constructing the new facility at \$170,000.

The discussion of removing park avenues from the regular tour route stemmed from a June 1948 inspection of the roads in Gettysburg National Military Park by the Public Roads Administration (PRA). The report, issued by Elmer Haile Jr. of the PRA office in Arlington, Virginia, organized the park avenues recommended for elimination into five categories based on visitor use, accessibility, and maintenance. Upon receiving the report, local and regional Park Service management commenced discussions on which avenues should be eliminated. Superintendent Coleman concurred with the PRA report that Birney and Robinson Avenues, High Water Mark Drive (known as Webb Avenue) and Reynolds Drive should be immediately eliminated, but he opposed the elimination of several other battlefield avenues because of user access and popularity. For example, Haile had recommended that roads through East Cavalry Battlefield be eliminated. Coleman, however, urged that the park retain those avenues because the area represented critical battle action and should remain open to the public. Likewise, Coleman opposed the removal of Sickles Avenue because it afforded visitors the opportunity to drive along Sickles' salient. Coleman admitted that his alterations to Haile's report appeared "conservative," but he emphasized to the regional director that many visitors enjoy riding through the battlefield, reading the markers, and taking pictures. For the people who enjoyed the "thrill" of being at the Gettysburg battlefield, Coleman urged the regional director to reconsider Haile's recommendations.³⁰

Acting Regional Director Albert Cox also offered suggestions for eliminating nonessential roads throughout the battlefield. Cox concurred with Haile that that the existing route offered more avenues than necessary to tour the main battlefield sites. From his perspective in the regional office, Cox believed that Gettysburg visitors were no longer interested

³⁰ Albert Cox to Director, October 22, 1948; Superintendent J. Walter Coleman to Regional Director, September 7, 1948. Box 45, SF, RG 79, NARA Philadelphia.

in seeing specific unit positions, but merely wanted a general overview of the battle. Accordingly Cox believed that “public interest in the engagement at Gettysburg has changed over the recent years from detailed examination of specific unit activities to a more comprehensive review of the larger aspects of the battle as a whole.” As a result, Cox endorsed Haile’s proposals and recommended the elimination of 7.89 miles of tour route, amounting to a thirty-eight percent reduction in battlefield avenues. Cox’s further grouped park roads into three categories: roads for immediate elimination and two groupings of roads for future elimination based on public use. Cox selected thirteen avenues, totaling 2.12 miles, for immediate obliteration. Many of those avenues, constructed during the War Department era, allowed visitors to travel to monuments off the main line of battle or tour route. They included Chamberlain, Berdan, Birney, and Coster Avenues as well as drives at Sedgwick and Reynolds Avenues, and at the High Water Mark. Roads in groups two and three would be eliminated when visitor use diminished, at which time maintenance would no longer be justified. Sixteen roads fell into those groupings, including Ayres, Cross, Brooke, Howe, Hunt, Carmen, Colgrove, Sickles, Wainwright, and Slocum Avenues.³¹

Essentially, what Haile and Cox envisioned was an auto tour route that ran along only the main Union and Confederate lines of battle. Their proposed route would begin along the Day 1 fighting at North Confederate Avenue, run along the Confederate line at West Confederate Avenue, and then circle northward along the Union position at Cemetery Ridge. Visitors would see less of the second day’s total fighting in the Wheatfield and the Peach Orchard, as well as the battle action at Spangler’s Spring and Culp’s Hill. Eliminating park avenues that provided access to lesser known monuments would have been a disservice to the visiting public, however,

³¹ Albert Cox to Director, October 22, 1948. Box 45, SF, RG 79, NARA Philadelphia.

Coleman maintained, “people seem to enjoy the profusion of monuments and markers. They are proud to know that this is the ‘best marked battlefield in the world.’”³²

While the local and regional park offices debated the merits surrounding the elimination of many battlefield avenues, the Park Service explored other alternatives to make touring the battlefield as simple as possible. Several park officials introduced a proposal to paint directional arrows at park intersections and crossings, guiding visitors to the next phase of the tour route. The regional director recommended testing paint samples on a remote section of the battlefield to determine which color would be best suited for marking the tour route. Superintendent Coleman approved, but again warned the regional office that the licensed guides would likely voice opposition, because such markings would facilitate greater access in touring the battlefield. The guides opposition was, of course, self-serving: greater access and touring options for visitors would in turn result in less business for the guides. Articulating visitor services as the highest priority, the regional director wrote to Superintendent Coleman, “In the interest of the public, regardless of what the guides may think on the matter, it seems to us that everything that can be done to help direct visitors around the park is not only justifiable but highly desirable.”³³

Ultimately NPS officials approved of the plan to paint directional signs on the park avenues, but the local management was unable to gain approval from the state highway department. In May 1949 they abandoned the plan. Regional officials then suggested that the battlefield tour route be marked with mileage markers allowing visitors to gauge their progress on the tour route. In November 1950 the Park Service contracted with a local sign company to install fifty-five directional signs along the tour route to facilitate visitor travel. Placed along the

³² Superintendent J. Coleman to Regional Director, September 7, 1948. Box 45, SF, RG 79, NARA Philadelphia.

³³ Albert Cox to Superintendent J. Walter Coleman, March 24, 1949. Box 41, SF, RG 79, NARA Philadelphia.

battlefield avenues, the metal disc signs, containing the words “Battlefield Tour” in white on a background of blue and gray, directed visitors from stop to stop on the auto tour. This decision made the battlefield accessible to self-guiding but also received opposition from the self-interested Licensed Battlefield Guides. As was often the case with the Park Service’s plans, none of Haile and Cox’s road elimination recommendations were implemented.³⁴

Both the tour route debate and the bus tours had raised red flags involving the Licensed Battlefield Guides. Since the National Park Service acquired the battlefield in 1933, relations between the guides and park management had been tenuous at best. Once the guides had vetoed the proposal to be placed on a Civil Service status, they had continued to operate somewhat independently. After the war, National Park Service and Licensed Battlefield Guide relations came to center on several key issues. While the guides had defeated the initiative to be placed on Civil Service status, some guides continued to distrust Coleman, convinced that he was determined to place them on Civil Service status or simply get rid of them altogether. As the battlefield became more accessible to self-guiding, the guides also worried that NPS initiatives would detract from their popularity and services. Meanwhile, Coleman and the regional director continued to receive complaint letters regarding improper guide conduct. Such complaints reinforced the superintendent’s belief that greater control needed to be exercised over the guide system.

³⁴ E. M. Lisle to Superintendent J. Walter Coleman, May 4, 1949. Box 41, SF, RG 79, NARA Philadelphia; Superintendent J. Walter Coleman, “Superintendent’s Monthly Report, November 1950,” written on December 11, 1950. Box 191, CCF, RG 79, NARA College Park, 2. Pattern Works of Erie, Pennsylvania, received the contract, charging the park \$453.75 for the fifty-five signs; Frederick Tilberg, “Annual Report on Information and Interpretive Services, 1955,” written on January 31, 1956. Folder Y2623, Box 16, GC, RG 79, NARA Philadelphia, 7; “Put New Signs on Battlefield,” *Gettysburg Times*, 24 May 1951.

Matters came to a head in 1951 when the Gettysburg Chamber of Commerce called upon the district Congressman to conduct an investigation of Superintendent Coleman's conduct with the guide association. Henry Garvin, president of the Gettysburg Chamber of Commerce and a Licensed Battlefield Guide himself, spearheaded the allegations. He accused Coleman of threatening the elimination of the guides if they refused civil service status. Gettysburg management issued a "blanket denial" of the Chamber of Commerce's allegations, stating that the Civil Service proposal originally initiated with the guides themselves, but when Coleman learned that a majority of the guides opposed the idea, the Civil Service bill was not presented. Relations between local park management, the battlefield guides, and the local Chamber of Commerce deteriorated so much that the regional park service officials and Congressional representatives had to intervene. In late March 1951, Congressman James Lind presided over an informal meeting between the sparring parties. For over two hours, in a crowded, smoke-filled room, Superintendent Coleman, Regional Director Thomas Allen, and historians Ronald Lee and Herbert Kahler addressed concerns before the battlefield guides.³⁵ The meeting seemed to quell the guides' fears, as did Park Service containing insistence that converting the guides' status to a Civil Service appointment was a dead issue.

The self-guided auto tour continued to create problems, however. Guides and local businessmen both voiced their objections to the NPS-produced touring brochure and the newly-installed auto tour signs. The situation worsened when the Park Service produced a fifty-page booklet for self-guiding, inclusive of touring maps, pictures, and accompanying historical text.

³⁵ "7 Chamber Directors Ask Probe of Local National Park Office; Say Coleman Did Not Cooperate," *Gettysburg Times* 13 March 1951; "Coleman Declares Battlefield Guides Requested Civil Service; Denies Chamber of Commerce Directors' Charges," *Gettysburg Times* 14 March 1951; "3 Park Service Officials Will Hear Charges," *Gettysburg Times* 29 March 1951; "Park Service Officials Deny Charges That Guides Will Be Placed Under U.S. Civil Service," *Gettysburg Times* 31 March 1951.

The booklet was available to interested visitors for a small fee. The publication and sale of the brochure created a firestorm of controversy among the guides as well as the local businessmen, and had helped lead to the 1951 collision. Garvin, the president of the Chamber of Commerce, insisted that the booklet would minimize the role of the guides. By providing visitors with a self-guided option, presumably fewer visitors would be interested in hiring the services of the battlefield guides. Businessmen opposed the Park Service brochure because it competed with several other touring brochures locally produced. The booklet therefore, according to Garvin, “puts the government in competition with local business.”³⁶

Coleman maintained a hard line in dealing with criticism of the development of the self-guided auto tour. He stated that 87 percent of park visitors did not employ battlefield guides, necessitating the explanatory brochure and directional signs. In response to the guides’ and Chamber of Commerce’s complaints, Coleman replied, “It appears preposterous to me that we should limit visitor aids to such an extent that our tourists must employ a guide or get lost.” When Chamber of Commerce members and battlefield guides then accused Coleman of trying to establish a monopoly on battlefield tours, the park superintendent reminded his detractors of the Park Service’s favorable treatment of the guides. Coleman noted that the park service “permits the guides to operate a private monopoly of their own on public property without paying any fee. They are provided with two handsome entrance stations which are maintained at no expense to the guides. The National Park Service takes every opportunity to recommend to visitors that they obtain a guide.” Coleman reminded local merchants that they too could purchase the

³⁶ “Dr. Tilberg Is Author of New Book On Park,” *Gettysburg Times*, 24 March 1951; “7 Chamber Directors Ask Probe of Local National Park Office; Say Coleman Did Not Cooperate,” *Gettysburg Times* 13 March 1951. Fred Tilberg authored the historical book, simply titled “Gettysburg.” The cover illustration was a sketch of the Cyclorama. The final five pages of the booklet outlined the fourteen stops of the self-guided tour. The booklet did inform visitors of the availability of the licensed guides.

touring brochure through the Government Printing Office. He then appealed to the merchants' higher sense of purpose and stated, "certainly Gettysburg is too important and sacred a shrine for us to deny this assistance to visitors for purely commercial reasons."³⁷

Yet many guides remained particularly sensitive to any perceived threat to their guiding business. In December 1951, the Retail Merchants Association began operating an information booth on Lincoln Square. Coleman agreed to supply the association's booth with park brochures to distribute to interested visitors driving through the town's square. This decision created a new controversy between the Licensed Battlefield Guides, the Retail Merchants Association, and the National Park Service. As the guides learned that the association's attendants were distributing the touring brochure to visitors, the guides lashed out just as they had against Coleman and the Park Service earlier in the year. They especially accused the information booth's staff of not recommending tourists take the licensed guided tours. Even more egregiously, the guides blamed the staff for distributing self-guided touring brochures. Representatives from the Retail Merchants Association responded that their staff had, in fact, recommended the guide's services, but if a guide was unavailable suggested the visitors tour the field themselves. Moreover, the guides had grown "abusive" of the booth attendants. One guide allegedly threatened a volunteer staffer, "If the merchants association doesn't take you out of the booth, I'll burn it down." The merchant association, like Coleman, thus reminded the guides that they did not monopolize the battlefield. "People who cannot afford or do not want guides cannot be forced to take one," stated a merchant representative, "the battlefield belongs to the public, not the guides."³⁸

³⁷ "Coleman Declares Battlefield Guides Requested Civil Service; Denies Chamber of Commerce Directors' Charges," *Gettysburg Times* 14 March 1951.

³⁸ Superintendent J. Walter Coleman to Regional Director, December 7, 1951. Folder Gettysburg, 504, Leaflets, 1942- 1952, Box 42, SF, RG 79, NARA Philadelphia; "Complaining Guides Met With Counter Charges At Meeting Of Retail Merchants Tuesday," *Gettysburg Times*, 1 July 1953.

Coleman continued to be more generally concerned over the guides' behavior. Such concern was perhaps not unfounded, as shown both by Retail Merchants' reports and in correspondence from park visitors. Visitors complained about guides' unprofessional and sometimes deceitful, behavior. An April 1947 letter from Winnie Langley recounted the story of a guide refusing to give directions to her family on how to get around the battlefield, but instead emphatically stating that they should hire him because only he knew how to negotiate the tour roads. When Mrs. Langley reported that they merely wanted directions, and not a guide, the guide abruptly retorted, "go to the crossroads and turn any way you want to." Appalled at his behavior, Langley wrote Drury that, "I have never been to any historic site where paid personnel were so unwilling to assist visitors." A visitor from McVeytown, Pennsylvania meanwhile reported of his unpleasant guided tour in a letter to the editor published on July 21, 1953 in the *Gettysburg Times*. He wrote, "It has been such a long time since I have had such an unpleasant, uninteresting, sonorous-toned and rushed conducted tour than I had." The visitor then pleaded to Superintendent Coleman, "so much thought, money and time has been put into this great national memorial that it is unfortunate that so many trips to the field are not conducted so that the most may be made of them. Can this guide service be improved?"³⁹

In other instances, according to angry tourists, guides deliberately lied to park visitors about the tour rate and fees. Connecticut visitor Sumner Libbey recounted one guide's duplicity in tour fees. While driving through the battlefield Libbey recalled that he was "stopped...directly stopped by a man in a uniform of a Park Ranger." The uniformed man informed Libbey that he was available to escort people around the field as a "government

³⁹ Winnie Langley to Newton Drury, April 4, 1947. Folder 201, Box 2490, CCF, RG 79, NARA College Park; Unidentified Letter to the Editor, *Gettysburg Times*, 21 July 1953. Folder 6, Box 11, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives.

service.” Libbey consented and the guide proceeded to direct Libbey on a thirty-minute tour of the fields. At the end of the tour the guide informed Libbey that the “government service” would, in fact, cost three dollars. Coleman identified the guide as one of the worst offenders in soliciting tours through misrepresentation as a park ranger. For his misrepresentation of himself and his services the guide received a two-week suspension. Another visitor reported that a guide informed him that the battlefield was not free to drive through, but cost two dollars to enter. The guide then offered his expert tour services for an additional dollar. Upon finding out the battlefield was in fact free, the visitor wrote a complaint letter to his local senator. While Coleman was unable to identify the duplicitous guide, he did assure the upset visitor that the NPS would install signs clearly stating the NPS facilities were free and also showing guide rates. In late June 1951 the park received authorization to install such signs at the guide stations. Ironically, in 1952, because of the increased cost of living, the National Park Service approved a one-dollar increase of the guides’ rates. A short tour of one hour now cost one dollar, while a two-hour tour cost four dollars.⁴⁰

Regardless of deceptive tactics employed by some Licensed Battlefield Guides, many Gettysburg visitors sought the guides’ services. In 1955 over 118,000 visitors toured the battlefield with a guide, either by personal automobile or on a bus tour.⁴¹ Outside of the Park

⁴⁰ Sumner Libbey to the Department of the Interior, April 26, 1946; Superintendent J. Walter Coleman to the Regional Director, June 14, 1946. Folder 201, Box 2490, CCF, RG 79, NARA College Park. It is not certain that the guide was wearing a NPS uniform. It is possible that the visitor mistook the guide uniform for that of a National Park Service ranger; Superintendent J. Walter Coleman, “Superintendent’s Monthly, August 1951,” written on September 13, 1951. Box 191, CCF, RG 79, NARA College Park, 3; Superintendent J. Walter Coleman to Regional Director, June 20, 1951; Regional Director to Superintendent J. Walter Coleman on June 27, 1951. Folder 501-01, Box 41, SF, RG 79, NARA Philadelphia. These locations included the West End and South End Guide Stations, as well as the guide booth north of town and the downtown square; Ellis Arnall to Conrad Wirth, April 18, 1952. Folder 843, Box 45, SF, RG 79, NARA Philadelphia; “Gettysburg National Military Park” brochure, 1946, Folder 630, Box 45, SF, RG 79, NARA Philadelphia.

⁴¹ Frederick Tilberg, “Annual Report on Information and Interpretive Services, 1956,” written on February 6, 1957. Box 16, GC, RG 79, NARA Philadelphia, 2.

Service's seasonal and limited interpretation opportunities, the guide service filled an obvious void in the park's educational opportunities. Yet future conflicts with the guides were always on the horizon.

The struggle to control modern development throughout the battlefield had been a reoccurring problem since 1863. Limited finances and competing priorities often prevented the purchase of vital battle areas. In the years after 1945, the Gettysburg area and the battlefield witnessed the rise of commercialization, and the postwar housing boom further exacerbated problems for park management to protect or acquire historic lands. Hundreds of acres of significant battle action remained privately owned or in the hands of developers. Modern intrusions encroached upon the historic terrain from all directions and the National Park Service commonly remained helpless to stop such development. If the battlefield was not a popular enough attraction in its own right, Gettysburg received more attention and visitation in the years after 1951 when Dwight Eisenhower purchased a 189- acre farm adjacent to the southern end of the battlefield. Through the course of Eisenhower's subsequent administration, the president hosted many prominent dignitaries, making Gettysburg even more popular to contemporary Americans.⁴²

Hotels and inns were among the most prevalent commercial developments on the battlefield landscape and the surrounding area. In early months of 1946 owners of the Peace Light Inn, located at the intersection of Buford Avenue and Mummasburg Road, began

⁴² "General "Ike" Goes To Europe Instead of Moving to His Farm Here; Uncertainty Clouds Plans," *Gettysburg Times*, 1 January 1951.

constructing more tourist cabins. By July, twenty-one brick cabins stood on the Day 1 battlefield. In the spring of 1946, a Harrisburg resident bought the Lee-Meade Inn. Situated on thirty acres of land along the Emmitsburg Road, the Lee-Meade Inn built in 1930, consisted of eighteen cabins and a lodge. A small victory in battlefield preservation occurred in the spring of 1949 when one of the local hotels, the three-story Battlefield Hotel, situated at the intersection of Baltimore Pike and Steinwehr Avenue, was demolished. Yet while the razing of the Battlefield Hotel opened a view shed from the cemetery, in its place soon stood a single story automobile station. Other commercial developments littered the historic landscape. On July 19 the Gettysburg Country Club acquired the Springs Hotel Tract, located between Herr Ridge and Willoughby Run on the First Day's battlefields, as site over which Generals Henry Heth and Dorsey Pender's divisions assaulted the Union forces. The country club purchased the land with the intentions of building a golf course. Upon hearing of the planned development on the First Day's field, Historian Tilberg reported, "The use of this land as a golf course is not regarded as an intrusion in the historic scene."⁴³

Because of their location along the main road into Gettysburg, the Emmitsburg Road tracts were the most desirable for establishing hotels, restaurants, gas stations, and other commercial developments. For that reason the National Park Service listed areas along the Emmitsburg Road as "high priority" to acquire. In September 1952 Superintendent Coleman reported that the park received approval to acquire an option on the Lee – Meade Inn, after

⁴³ Unrau, *Administrative History*, 243; Frederick Tilberg, "Historian's Monthly Report, February 1946," written on March 4, 1946; Frederick Tilberg, "Historian's Monthly Report, May 1946," written on June 4, 1946. Folder 2, Box 7, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 2; Superintendent J. Walter Coleman, "Superintendent's Monthly Report, September 1952," written on October 13, 1952. Box 191, CCF, RG 79, NARA College Park, 3; Frederick Tilberg, "Historian's Monthly Report, April 1949," written on May 5, 1949. Folder 2, Box 7, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives 3; Frederick Tilberg, "Historian's Monthly Report, May 1947," written on June 5, 1947. Folder 2, Box 7, GETT 41113, 2-3; Superintendent J. Walter Coleman, "Superintendent's Monthly Report, June 1950," written on July 12, 1950. Box 191, CCF, RG 79, NARA College Park, 3.

learning that the owner was considering adding a drive-in theater. In October 1953 the federal government accepted the deed to the property that conveyed the 23.8 acre tract. The property appraised for \$17,387.50 and the government purchased the Lee-Meade Inn for \$18,000. Like the Lee-Meade purchase suggests, acquiring private properties remained a piecemeal effort. In early 1952 the park purchased a 6.71 acre property for \$6,200 from Paul and Dorothy Reaver. Situated along Warfield Ridge at the intersection of West Confederate Avenue and Wheatfield Road, the line of battle for General James Longstreet's corps offensive on July 2, the Reaver property consisted of a frame house and a one story brick outbuilding.⁴⁴

Commercial developments nonetheless squeezed the battlefield land from every direction. The postwar population boom moreover brought widespread growth of housing developments. As Gettysburg's population increased, local school facilities became increasingly inadequate to provide a competitive education to the area's youth. New schools followed. When trying to protect threatened land, Coleman and National Park Service officials faced difficult decisions on which tract(s) should be acquired first. In 1947 Coleman had developed a land acquisition program for Gettysburg National Military Park, prioritizing the acquisition of high-risk tracts before they were further developed. One such high-risk area was a forty-acre tract below East Cemetery Hill, a key battleground where General Jubal Early's brigades assailed the Union position on the night of July 2. In early 1946, the park staff learned that Luther Sachs, a local contractor, had purchased a land tract along Wainwright Avenue with the intention of

⁴⁴ "Master Plan Development Outline, Gettysburg National Military Park, Land Status," April 1952. Folder 3, Box 12, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 2-3; Superintendent J. Coleman, "Superintendent's Monthly Report, September 1952," written on October 13, 1952. Box 191, RG 79, NARA College Park, 3; Jackson Price to Chief Counsel to GNMP, October 5, 1953; Appraisal sheet signed by John Bream; Hillory Tolson to Regional Director, written on February 1953. Folder 9, Box 14, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives; Acting Regional Director E. M. Lisle to Superintendent Coleman, February 29, 1952. Folder 6, Box 13, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives; Superintendent J. Walter Coleman to NPS Director, October 25, 1949. Folder 7, Box 13, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives; "Park Buying Tract West of Lee-Meade Inn for \$18,000," *Gettysburg Times* 19 February 1953. In 1952 the park consisted of 2,564.12 acres and by 1956 the park had grown to 2,707 acres and thirty miles of tour road.

building a housing development on the historic land. Tilberg urged the acquisition of the land immediately, in order to preserve the historic vista. Six years passed, however, before negotiations opened between Gettysburg National Military Park, the Gettysburg Area School District, Luther Sachs, and Pennsylvania Congressmen on the feasibility of a land exchange. Tilberg, among others, urged that the NPS acquire the Sachs property before he developed it. The Gettysburg Area School District meanwhile sought a tract on the second day's battlefield, along East Confederate Avenue and Wainwright Avenue, which was part of the Henry Culp farm. It would allow the school district to construct new facilities in close proximity to town without destroying any existing buildings.⁴⁵

Throughout the fall of 1952 Park Service officials, congressman, borough representatives, and school district officials exchanged a series of letters about the feasibility of the land acquisition. In a September letter to the Chairman of the Adams County Republican Committee, Senator Edward Martin observed that land in question "is used solely for farming purposes" and advocated that the development of school facilities "would not harm the National Park in any way for a school building to be placed at this site." The same month Martin wrote NPS Director Conrad Wirth, inquiring into the feasibility of the school district procuring the twenty-acre parcel of government land. National Park Service officials also debated the merits of the proposed land exchange among themselves. The regional director voiced his opinion on

⁴⁵ Frederick Tilberg, "Historians' Monthly, January 1946," written on February 4, 1946. Box 7, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 2-3. Luther Sachs purchased the property from Ada Leister in 1945, see Frederick Tilberg to J. Walter Coleman, "Acquisition of Luther Sachs Property," October 18, 1950. Folder 9, Box 13, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives. See also Frederick Tilberg, "Historians' Monthly, January 1946," written on February 4, 1946. Box 7, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 2-3; "Congress Gets Bills To Sell 20 Acres Of Park Land As Site For New School Building Here," *Gettysburg Times* 27 January 1953; Senator Edward Martin to John Basehore, Chairman of the Adams County Republican Committee, September 10, 1952. Folder 3, Box 12, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives.

the land exchange by writing that the use of lands for school development would “not be detrimental to the interpretive program.”⁴⁶

Federal legislation was needed to approve the transfer because the school district’s desired tract was within the Gettysburg National Military Park boundary. In October 1952, National Park Service Director Conrad Wirth wrote Senator Martin to explain the park’s position. Wirth reminded the senator that it was “not customary” to permit the use of federal park lands for school purposes. The director believed, however, that this case was “worthy of special consideration.” Wirth recommended that the government sell the Culp tract to the school district and use the received monies to purchase privately owned land to be included into the park boundary. The regional director echoed this proposal, believing that the Congressional legislation should have a provision whereby the government could sell the desired lands and use the proceeds to acquire threatened properties.⁴⁷

Through 1953 the National Park Service, Gettysburg School District, and Luther Sachs continued to negotiate the details of the land exchange. Congress finally authorized it in July. At the end of the month President Eisenhower signed the legislation relinquishing twenty three acres of government-owned land to the school district. The Gettysburg School District then purchased the Luther Sachs tract for \$15,000, and upon obtaining title to the tract, conveyed the deed to the National Park Service. In exchange for relinquishing the twenty three acre parcel along East Confederate and Wainwright Avenue, the NPS received Luther Sachs’ twenty nine

⁴⁶ Senator Edward Martin to John Basehore, Chairman of the Adams County Republican Committee, September 10, 1952. Folder 3, Box 12, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives; Unrau, *Administrative History*, 256; Regional Director to NPS Director, October 10, 1952. Folder 3, Box 12, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives.

⁴⁷ Conrad Wirth to Senator Edward Martin, October 1952. Folder 3, Box 12, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives; Regional Director to NPS Director, October 10, 1952. Folder 3, Box 12, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives.

acre tract along the base of Culp's Hill and East Cemetery Hill purchased from the school district.⁴⁸

Though the exchanged land was clearly historically significant, park management chose to downplay the value of the site of the new school. On January 27, 1953 the *Gettysburg Times* reported Superintendent Coleman as saying, "The Park Service has felt that sale of this particular section of battlefield land would not seriously affect the battlefield." When faced with unfavorable choices, park service management had opted to exchange government land for the construction of school facilities in return for the acquisition of private property which could have easily been developed in the future. Over the next three decades Gettysburg school district constructed an elementary school, a high school, and athletic playing fields on the grounds where Confederates of General Early's division advanced in their assault on East Cemetery Hill on July 2, 1863. The new high school football stadium rose exactly where Colonel Isaac Avery fell mortally wounded and hastily scrawled his legendary note, "Major: Tell my father I died with my face to the enemy."⁴⁹

After acquiring the Sachs property, Superintendent Coleman's administration sought to restore the terrain to its historic appearance. At the time of acquisition the twenty nine acres were covered with secondary growth of trees, brush, and vines. To restore the landscape to its wartime condition, the Park Service contracted Battlefield Earthmoving to remove the newer

⁴⁸ "School Land Bill Passes House Monday," *Gettysburg Times*, 21 July 1953. Folder 6, Box 11, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives; Superintendent J. Walter Coleman, "Superintendent's Monthly Report, July 1953," written on August 6, 1953. Box 191, CCF, RG 79, NARA College Park, 2; NPS Director to Superintendent J. Walter Coleman, October 1953. Folder 12, Box 13, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives; Superintendent J. Walter Coleman, "Superintendent's Monthly Report, November 1953," written on December 9, 1953. Box 191, CCF, RG 79, NARA College Park, 2. The government's tract appraised at \$12,500 and the Sachs property appraised at \$10,000. The Sachs tract was covered with dense underbrush, while the school's tract was relatively clear of brush.

⁴⁹ "Congress Gets Bills To Sell 20 Acres Of Park Land As Site For New School Building Here," *Gettysburg Times*, 27 January 1953; Unrau, *Administrative History*, 266.

growth. Equipped with bulldozers, Battlefield Earthmoving eliminated acres of trees, brush, undergrowth, and vines with little regard for topography or archeological resources. The Park Service gave its final inspection of the site and approval of the work on January 13, 1958 and then converted it into farm land.⁵⁰

The restoration of the Sachs property proved to be the climax of a decade of structure and landscape improvement. In the summer and fall of 1946 the park had repainted the War Department's observation towers and several of the historic homes on the battlefield. The restoration of the Brian farm was completed in the spring of 1951. Elsewhere on the fields, the National Park Service continued opening the historic vistas on the battlefield. In the winter of 1949, park staff cleared selective grounds between Cemetery and Seminary Ridges. Park staff removed trees that had been allowed to grow to full height, consequently blocking the view from one ridge line to the other. Historian Tilberg reported that park management intended "to restore a pattern of the historical scene in this area." In the same area, park maintenance for several years had been working to restore the landscape along the abandoned Round Top Railroad bed. By the summer of 1950 most of railroad bed had been leveled and the terrain restored to its 1863 appearance.⁵¹

⁵⁰ "Completion Report for the Sach's Property." Folder 5, Box 29, Park Central Files (1954- 1987), Records of the National Park Service at Gettysburg National Military Park, (GETT 41160), Gettysburg National Military Park Archives [hereinafter cited by (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives]; "Soil and Moisture Control: Removal of Trees and Brush on Sachs Land," November 1957-January 1958. Folder 6, Box 29, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives.

⁵¹ Superintendent J. Coleman to Regional Director, June 4, 1946; S. G. Sollenberger to Regional Director, September 20, 1946; Superintendent J. Walter Coleman to Regional Director, April 20, 1951. Folder 620, Bryan House, 1951, Box 43, SF, RG 79, NARA Philadelphia. Sollenberger was Coleman's assistant superintendent. Coleman's June 4 memo on the repainting of the observation towers notes that the current color of the tower as green, but the Branch of Plans and Design recommended painting the towers an olive green, a prominent color of World War II. Once restored, the Bryan house was turned into park housing; Frederick Tilberg, "Historians' Monthly Report, February 1949," written on March 2, 1949. Folder 2, Box 7, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives, 1; Superintendent J. Walter Coleman, "Superintendent's Monthly Report, June 1950," written on July 12, 1950. Box 191, CCF, RG 79, NARA College Park, 2.

Restoration of properties to their 1863 appearance was not a uniform policy, however. Continuing the practices established during the Great Depression, the National Park Service's agricultural farming methods centered on soil conservation and productivity. With memories of the Dust Bowl fresh in the minds of many Americans, the government established the Soil Conservation Service (SCS). In the early 1940s, Superintendent Coleman requested assistance from the SCS to better manage the battlefield farm lands, but because the Soil Conservation District did not have a representative in Adams County, the park was unable to receive any assistance. Only in 1948 did the Soil Conservation District establish a local office and begin to help park management and the battlefield farmers develop an agricultural program. On February 17, 1948 representatives from the SCD met with Superintendent Coleman, Assistant Superintendent Sollenberger, and local farmers to discuss improved farming practices, contour farming, crop rotation, and fertilization.⁵²

In the fall of 1950, the regional and national offices approved the park's "Soil and Moisture Conservation Master Plan." The Park Service's agricultural plan was to maintain the park in the "same general character as of 1863," but noted that some of the park's acreage had been exhausted from "unwise land-use practices." Concerned for the production of the historic lands, the report stated "there are no records of improved soil in 1863. There should be none today." The conservation master plan called for an established program of soil replenishment, erosion control, proper crop rotation, the establishment of meadows and pastures, watershed protection, and the repair of natural drainage systems. The local representative of the Soil

⁵² Superintendent J. Walter Coleman to Regional Director, March 2, 1948. Folder 201, Box 38, SF, RG 79, NARA Philadelphia.

Conservation District was to work with the Park Service and the farm lessees to implement an agricultural program.⁵³

Representatives of the SCD developed conservation plans for each historic farm, or rather combinations of farms. These plans included detailed descriptions of what fields were to be ploughed and at what grade. To avoid depleting the soil's nutrients, SCD developed a strict system of crop rotation for each farm field. Six fields on the McPherson farm, for example, were to be contour ploughed. They would have a defined crop rotation of small grain, hay, corn, oats, wheat, hay, and hay. Soil Conservation District representatives made regular visits to the Gettysburg battlefield to meet with the park service officials and the farmers on how best to care for the battlefield land. In 1957, for example, the park reported that the historic Bushman farm acres were sprayed to destroy thistles and weeds. The land was then fertilized to facilitate the proper mixture of timothy, blue grass, and orchard grass.⁵⁴ This policy disregarded historic farming patterns and trends, and instead made utilitarian and environmentally sound farming practices a priority.

In the decade following World War II Gettysburg National Military Park's management implemented several reforms in the park. Superintendent Coleman's administration oversaw improvements in park interpretation, largely through the implementation of a thorough self-guided tour, the installation of wayside exhibits, and the stationing of park rangers on the battlegrounds. Simultaneously NPS management continued planning for the park's new visitor center and museum. In January 1956, however, the federal government initiated the MISSION

⁵³ "Soil and Moisture Conservation Master Plan," approved on October 24, 1950 by NPS Director. Folder 201, Box 37, SF, RG 79, NARA Philadelphia, 1-8.

⁵⁴ Superintendent J. Walter Coleman to Regional Director, March 2, 1948. Folder 201, Box 38, SF, RG 79, NARA Philadelphia; "McPherson Farm. Folder 201, Box 37, SF, NARA Philadelphia; "Annual Report of Soil and Moisture Accomplishments for FY 1957." Folder 5, Box 29, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives.

66 program. In the upcoming years the Gettysburg battlefield would experience tremendous changes. The MISSION 66 program also coincided with the Civil War Centennial celebrations and the 50th anniversary of the establishment of the National Park Service. Over the course of the next decade, once again, as had occurred during veterans' reunions and during World War II, the nation's attention turned to the Pennsylvania battlefield to celebrate the rebirth of the United States.

Chapter 5

“The Great Task Remaining Before Us”:

MISSION 66 and Cold War Patriotism at Gettysburg, 1956-1960

Just two decades after acquiring Gettysburg National Military Park, administrative changes implemented under Superintendents McConaghie and Coleman had resulted in a battlefield experience remarkably different from years past. The National Park Service had made significant improvements in the battlefield’s educational opportunities through the establishment of the self-guided tour, the installation of wayside exhibits, and the stationing of park rangers on the battlegrounds. Working within the economic constraints imposed during World War II and its aftermath, Coleman and his staff struggled through a decade of planning, small-scale interpretive changes, celebrations, and sprawling commercialism. Yet, larger, more improvements were needed, not only at Gettysburg, but at hundreds of national parks across the country.

In January 1956 the National Park Service initiated the federally mandated MISSION 66 program. This decade long program coincided with both the Park Service’s fiftieth anniversary and the Civil War centennial. Over the next ten years MISSION 66 brought unparalleled changes to national parks across the country. At Gettysburg National Military Park initiative provided money to finally construct a new visitor center facility. Federal money from MISSION 66 also provided for the rehabilitation of park roads, trails, wayside exhibits, and the construction of an outdoor amphitheater. The Department of the Interior and the National Park Service easily garnered support for MISSION 66 since many of the national parks had fallen into a considerable state of disrepair. At Gettysburg, park management continued to operate within confined facilities at the post office building, and the historic Gettysburg Cyclorama painting

continued to deteriorate in the building along the Baltimore Pike. As Americans' attention turned to the parks system, meanwhile the surge of postwar commercialization at Gettysburg became a highly criticized and scrutinized issue. Historic preservationists and concerned citizens launched a fight to protect historic lands from further development in a "Second Battle of Gettysburg." Befitting of the times, the nation's heightened concern for historic places, especially Gettysburg, served as a way to reaffirm American patriotism during the continuing Cold War.

Though the National Park Service had existed as an agency since 1916, many of its parks in the early years were continually constrained by budget woes. Consequently few significant internal improvements were realized. Ironically, the national parks, Gettysburg included, had benefited enormously from the Great Depression, as New Deal workers constructed or resurfaced roads, designed trails, and built comfort stations. By 1940 the National Park system included 161 parks that recorded nearly seventeen million visitors. The Park Service's operating budget in 1940 was almost \$34 million. During World War II, however, the parks quickly became victims of fiscal choices imposed during the war. In 1945, for example, the entire Park Service budget was a meager \$4.7 million. The postwar era then brought a dramatic increase in park visitation, but park facilities had steadily worsened and many sites were simply ill-equipped to handle the increasing number of visitors. More significantly, the Park Service's budget actually decreased in the postwar years. In 1955, the national park system counted 181 parks and recorded 56 million visitors, but received appropriations of only \$32 million. Visitation had

tripled since 1940, in short, but parks were forced to operate on a more stringent budget than received during the years prior to World War II.¹

In the mid-1950s, the deteriorating condition of the National Park Service became a common subject of columnists and editors. Historian Bernard DeVoto's 1953 column, "Let's Close the National Parks" published in *Harper's*, lamented the state of the national parks. DeVoto estimated that in order to effectively maintain them, the NPS would need an operating budget of at least \$250 million annually. With no money forthcoming, DeVoto believed the only way to continue to preserve the parks' historic and cultural resources was simply to close them. Two years later, in January 1955, Charles Stevenson of *Reader's Digest* offered a scathing critique in "The Shocking Truth About Our National Parks." Stevenson cautioned Americans planning a trip to a national park: "I must pass along a warning: Your trip is likely to be fraught with discomfort, disappointment, and even danger."²

Park Service officials did not deny that deplorable conditions existed at many of the nation's parks. As far back as June 1949, National Park Service Director Newton Drury outlined the current sad status in "The Dilemma of Our Parks." With Congressional funding horrifically low, the parks remained overcrowded and their resources poorly protected. Several years later, the Park Service's director concurred with Drury's sentiment, writing, "It is not possible to provide essential services. Visitor concentration points can't be kept in sanitary conditions. Comfort stations can't be kept clean and serviced."³

¹ Conrad L. Wirth, *Parks, Politics, and the People* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1980), 238.

² Ethan Carr, *Mission 66: Modernism and the National Park Dilemma* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2007), 6-7; Wirth, *Parks, Politics, and the People*, 237-38.

³ Carr, *Mission 66*, 34; Wirth, *Parks, Politics, and the People*, 237.

The National Park Service's situation was complex. Faced with increased visitation, the agency needed to provide quality visitor services, while at the same time following the NPS mission of protecting the park's historic, cultural, and natural resources. Compounding the inherent dilemma between visitor access and historic preservation were continual budget cuts from Congress. The MISSION 66 initiative intended to solve all of these problems.

On December 7, 1951 the Secretary of the Interior had appointed Conrad Wirth Director of the National Park Service. Prior to his promotion, Wirth had served briefly as associate director of the Park Service. His professional experience included a degree in Landscape Architecture from Massachusetts Agriculture College and management of CCC activities in the nation's state parks during the Great Depression. In his book, *Parks, Politics, and the People*, he recounted the creation of the MISSION 66 program. As Wirth remembered, one weekend in February 1955, while pondering the National Parks' fiscal and operative dilemmas, he conceived the idea of a long-range management program. The following week, he established a MISSION 66 committee and a steering committee consisting of high-level NPS management officials to discuss the problems and brainstorm the potential solutions. The timing was critical, as domestic affairs and foreign events provided conditions favorable for increased funding to the national parks. The end of the Korean War in 1953 provided both federal funds and increased interest in the park system.⁴

Changes in the White House also played a role. Whereas Franklin Roosevelt had been an avid proponent of the national parks, his successor, Harry Truman, did not share the same enthusiasm for enhancing or conserving the parks. Wirth now found a sympathetic ally in

⁴ Wirth, *Parks, Politics, and the People*, 237-240; 253-285.

newly-elected President Dwight D. Eisenhower. Having purchased a farm on the southwestern boundary of Gettysburg National Military Park in 1952, President Eisenhower became a frequent visitor to the Pennsylvania battlefield. Wirth's proposal received a public relations boost when Eisenhower addressed the current status of the national parks in his January 1956 inaugural address. "The visits of our people to the parks have increased much more rapidly than have the facilities to care for them," Eisenhower stated. A few days later, on January 27, 1956, the group met with the president and his cabinet to propose the MISSION 66 initiative. As outlined, MISSION 66 required a ten-year budget of approximately one billion dollars to provide necessary improvements to the National Park system. The president readily supported the plan, remarking at the end of the meeting, "This is a good project; let's get on with it."⁵

With the president and his cabinet agreeable to the long-term management program, Wirth now needed to gain the approval of Congress and the American public. His reasoning for submitting a ten-year budget was in the hope of preventing typical yearly cuts. Wirth believed that asking for a decade of funding would ensure that significant long-range advancements would be made within the parks. Ideally congressmen, eager to foster growth in parks in their home district, would approve the appropriations. Wirth's meeting with congressional committees proved successful. Wirth and NPS officials unveiled the MISSION 66 initiative to

⁵ Wirth, *Parks, Politics, and the People*, 237-240; 253-285; Carr, *Mission 66*, 8-10. Wirth's first day in the office was Monday, December 10, 1951. Wirth replaced Arthur Demaray as NPS Director. The Steering Committee consisted of high-level management officials and included: Lemuel Garrison, Chief, Conservation and Protection Branch; Thomas Vint, Chief, Division of Design and Construction; Henry Langley, Chief, Programs and Plans Control Branch; John Doerr, Chief, Natural History Branch; Donald Lee, Chief, Branch of Concessions Management; Keith Neilson, Finance Officer, Administration Division; Jackson Price, Chief, Branch of Lands. The Mission 66 Committee consisted of: William Carnes, Chief Landscape Architect; Harold Smith, Assistant Chief, Programs and Plans Control Branch; Robert Coats, Chief, Economics and Statistical Section; Howard Stagner, Principal Naturalist, Natural History Branch; Jack Dodd, Assistant Chief Forester, Conservation and Protection Branch; Roy Appleman, Staff Historian, History Branch; Raymond Freeman, Assistant Chief, Branch of River Basin Studies.

the public on February 8 at an American Pioneer Dinner in the cafeteria of the Department of the Interior. Those attending the unveiling received an overview presentation by Director Wirth, watched a Walt Disney-produced movie entitled “Adventure in the National Parks,” and received promotional booklets titled “Our Heritage.”⁶

MISSION 66 was underway. Its purpose as outlined was “a forward-looking program for the National Park System intended to so develop and staff these priceless possessions for the American people as to permit their wisest possible use; maximum enjoyment for those who use them; and maximum protection of the scenic, scientific, wilderness, and historic resources that give them distinction.” Reinforcing the objectives of providing for visitor enjoyment while also protecting the resources, the committee declared, “The National Park Service has started a development program designed to furnish maximum visitor enjoyment of the values present in the National Park System consistent with maximum protection.” The target completion date was set as the National Park Service’s Golden Anniversary. Over the next decade, national parks received \$1,035,225,000 for operation and improvements.⁷

Paralleling the agency’s improvement programs and after receiving significant criticism from columnists and journalists on the deplorable condition of the nation’s parks, the NPS also made a concerted effort to improve its image among the American public. Included in this new identity was the agency’s adoption in 1951 of the arrowhead logo. The brown arrowhead with a

⁶ Wirth, *Parks, Politics, and the People*, 256-58.

⁷ “MISSION 66: Gettysburg National Military Park.” Box 733, Administrative Files, 1949-1971, RG 79, National Archives Records Administration College Park [hereinafter from the Administrative Files, 1949-1971 will be cited as Folder, Box, AF, RG 79, NARA College Park]; “Advance Copy Summary of Mission 66 Objectives and Program for Antietam National Battlefield Site,” April 20, 1956. Folder 904, Box 80, Administrative Files, 1949-1971, RG 79, NARA College Park, 1; Wirth, *Parks, Politics, and the People*, 262. Of the \$1,035,225,000 a total of \$412,392,000 was allocated for operation expenses and \$622,833,000 for improvements.

buffalo, tree, and mountain displayed in the background now figured prominently at national park entrances, buildings, publications, and service employees' uniforms. Furthermore in 1956, the first year of MISSION 66, Director Wirth established three NPS style "holidays." September 19 became "Campfire Day" to celebrate the first National Park Service campfire. He established August 25 as "National Park Service Founders Day," honoring the agency's 1916 establishment. Finally, "Establishment Day" was to be celebrated on the anniversary of each park's establishment.⁸ MISSION 66, the arrowhead logo, and the celebratory dates all promised to instill an invigorated sense of pride in and within the National Park Service.

The billion-dollar investment in America's national parks coincided with the National Park Service's mission of ensuring that the nation's treasures would be adequately protected but also enjoyed by future generations. "This program represents an effort on the part of the Department of the Interior," noted Director Wirth, "to improve and expand the National Park System and to assure present and future generations that the park units will be properly preserved for their use and enjoyment." And the improvements made during MISSION 66 were impressive, to say the least. Many national parks received significant new funding to improve visitor service facilities, roads, and trails. Funding from the program provided for development or improvement of 2,767 miles of park roads, 359 miles of reconstructed trails, and construction of 577 miles of new trails. During the MISSION 66 decade the National Park Service constructed 82 campfire circles and amphitheaters and built 221 new administrative buildings. In addition, the Park Service also constructed 32 service buildings and 218 utility buildings, and

⁸ Carr, *Mission 66*, 12; Conrad Wirth to All National Park Service Personnel, January 5, 1956. Folder 1, Box 10, Park Main (Central) Files, 1954-1987, (GETT 41160), Records of the National Park Service at Gettysburg National Military Park, Gettysburg National Military Park Archives [hereafter be cited as (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives].

built 584 new comfort stations and improved 17 others. MISSION 66 monies also provided for improvement of 1,116 park wayside exhibits.⁹

Another hallmark of MISSION 66 was the development of visitor centers and museums. Throughout the system, MISSION 66 promised that “outmoded and inadequate facilities will be replaced.” New funding would also “provide both facilities and personnel for visitor services of the quality and quantity that the public is entitled to expect in its National Park System.” This was not mere hyperbole. Between 1956 and 1966 the Park Service built a total of 114 new visitor centers, which provided basic park information, interpretive displays, museums, and at larger visitor centers food and souvenir concessions. New MISSION 66 visitor centers included such diverse parks as Dinosaur, Rocky Mountain, Death Valley, Cape Cod, Yellowstone, and, of course, Gettysburg.¹⁰

⁹ Remarks by Conrad Wirth, Dedication of the Visitor Center, Gettysburg National Military Park, November 19, 1962. Folder 5, Box 5, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives; Wirth, *Parks, Politics, and the People*, 262-68.

¹⁰ MISSION 66: Gettysburg National Military Park.” Box 733, AF, RG 79, NARA College Park; Wirth, *Parks, Politics, and the People*, 270; Sarah Allaback, “Mission 66 Visitor Centers: The History of a Building Type,” (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Park Historic Structures & Cultural Landscape Program, 2000. This document is available through NPS online books at: www.nps.gov/history/history/online_books/allaback. Since this is an on-line publication, there are no page numbers, only chapter divisions. Arguably, aside from the New Deal programs of the 1930s, MISSION 66 marked the most important period in the development of the National Park Service, yet, for its significance, surprisingly little scholarship has been written about the era. To date, only two works have been produced on MISSION 66 and both focus primarily on its architecture. In an online Department of Interior (DOI) publication Sarah Allaback examines the history of the program’s visitor centers in “MISSION 66 Visitor Centers: The History of a Building Type.” Allaback explores the planning, design, and construction of several visitor centers, including Gettysburg’s. In *Mission 66: Modernism and the National Park Dilemma* Ethan Carr also looks at the architecture of these facilities. Unlike Allaback, Carr provides a better contextual understanding of the purpose, process of planning, and significance of MISSION 66. Carr’s work is well-researched, offers a plethora of photographs, and consequently stands as the definitive work on the project to date.

While Director Wirth championed MISSION 66 in Washington, he instructed each park to develop its own mission prospectus. Between 1956 and 1960, park staff developed a series of Master Plans and proposals for MISSION 66 expenditures. In November 1957 Regional Director Daniel Tobin submitted a four-page prospectus for Gettysburg to Director Wirth. Projected MISSION 66 development costs for Gettysburg National Military Park amounted to \$1,014,750. The prospectus additionally outlined improvements for the development of a new visitor center-cyclorama center, improved field exhibits, minor construction work on the tour roads, and establishment of historic vistas.¹¹

In a September 30, 1955 letter, William Carnes, Chairman of the MISSION 66 Steering Committee, gave special emphasis to the desperate need of a visitor center at Gettysburg. Reflecting on the park's inadequate facilities along the Baltimore Pike, Carnes noted that there is "almost no Service contact with the visiting public." He emphatically added that the NPS needed to fund Gettysburg's proposed facility, one that would provide both a visitor service and interpretive experience for which the public was "entitled." In addition to constructing a new visitor center, Carnes further recommended that the National Park Service acquire the privately owned Rosensteel museum, located directly across from the Soldiers' National Cemetery and adjacent to the proposed NPS site. Carnes believed that the NPS would "never have control of the interpretive program the way it should" until this private museum was theirs.¹²

¹¹ Wirth, *Parks, Politics, and the People*, 249; Carr, *Mission 66*, 10; "MISSION 66: Gettysburg National Military Park." Box 733, AF, RG 79, NARA College Park, 1-4. This included \$665,050 for building and utilities expenses and \$349,700 in roads and trails.

¹² William G. Carnes to the MISSION 66 Steering Committee, September 30, 1955. Box 733, AF, RG 79, NARA College Park.

Allocated money from MISSION 66, Gettysburg's staff revisited its 1947 prospectus on the museum and visitor center. On November 27, 1956 Park Historian Frederick Tilberg submitted a revised fifty-page "Museum Prospectus," which detailed the proposed visitor center and outlined likely exhibits. The proposal explained the park's "urgent need" for new facilities to properly house and interpret the cyclorama painting, provide better preservation for the park's artifacts, and display exhibits. Tilberg estimated the cost of the new facility at \$944,000.¹³

As noted in the previous chapter, Gettysburg's staff had long recognized the inadequacies in Park Service museum facilities. Thus, in addition to suitably housing the cyclorama painting, they wanted the new facility to include a state-of-the-art museum. As outlined, it would include a "Gettysburg Museum" with thirty exhibits including a "Civil War" exhibit gallery that would examine the broader issues and meaning of the war. Tilberg's prospectus strongly advocated a museum that placed the war in historical context, noting, "Especially needed are a few exhibits to explain the background of the battle and its relation to the Civil War as a whole. Such information is not readily obtainable from the monuments and markers on the field." Tilberg believed it was essential that the museum provide basic background information for visitors before they embarked upon their battlefield tour. Appreciating the increasing visitation, especially from school groups, the museum and battlefield experience finally would emphasize a sense of patriotism and appreciation. "It is very important to the welfare of our nation," wrote

¹³ Frederick Tilberg, "Museum Prospectus: Gettysburg National Military Park and Cemetery," written on November 27, 1956. Folder 10, Box 8, Historians' Files, 1933-1965, (GETT 41151), Records of the National Park Service at Gettysburg National Military Park, Gettysburg National Military Park Archives, 1-7 [hereinafter cited as (GETT 41151), GNMP Archives]. All notes referring Tilberg's 1956 prospectus will be cited as Tilberg, "Museum Prospectus, 1956." Reminder that the GNMP 1947 "Museum Prospectus" can be found at Folder 4, Box 17, (GETT 41113), GNMP Archives.

Tilberg, “that the youth of our country learn to understand and appreciate their great American heritage of history.”¹⁴

In the middle of MISSION 66 programming and the planning the new visitor center, Gettysburg National Military Park received its third NPS superintendent. Dr. James Walter Coleman, after serving for seventeen years as superintendent, transferred to a staff historian position in the Washington Office in July 1958. On July 1, 1958, James Myers, a career NPS employee, succeeded him at Gettysburg. Myers began working with the National Park Service in 1937 as a clerk in the regional office in Richmond, Virginia. In 1948 he transferred to Manassas National Battlefield Park to become its custodian and was eventually named superintendent. In 1955, he became superintendent of Roosevelt-Vanderbilt National Historic Site in Hyde Park, New York, a position Myers held until June 1958, when he transferred to Gettysburg National Military Park.¹⁵ As the park’s new superintendent, Myers would now oversee the implementation of the park’s MISSION 66 programs.

Two years after Myers’ arrival as Gettysburg’s new superintendent, the Park Service released its “Master Plan for the Preservation and Use of Gettysburg National Military Park, MISSION 66 Edition” in August 1960. This report outlined the park’s mission, its significant historic resources, and established eighteen guidelines to best preserve and interpret the battlefield. The “Master Plan” also acknowledged a dilemma central to the MISSION 66

¹⁴ Tilberg, “Museum Prospectus, 1956,” (GETT 41151), GNMP Archives, 3.

¹⁵ Harlan D. Unrau, *Administrative History: Gettysburg National Military Park and Gettysburg National Cemetery* (Denver: Branch of Publications and Graphic Design, Denver Service Center, 1991), 254; “James Myers Is Promoted to Hatteras,” *Gettysburg Times*, no date. Box 5, Newspaper Clipping (Unbound), 1958-1961, (GETT 43663), Records of the National Park Service at Gettysburg National Military Park, Gettysburg National Military Park Archives [hereinafter cited as (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives]. Coleman continued to be GNMP Superintendent until July 1, 1958.

objectives, namely how best to preserve park resources while at the same time offering visitor access and enjoyment to the site. Predicting a significant increase in visitation, the “Master Plan” notably recommended increased parking, more parking spaces on the tour route, additional restroom facilities, and drinking fountains. The plan cautioned, however, that “such developments must be made with care, over-development avoided, and unnecessary service facilities eliminated.” The authors furthermore called for additional interpretive facilities on the battlefield, but offered similar cautions that field development “must be done with restraint” to avoid overdevelopment. The eighteen guidelines offered in the report articulated a clear management philosophy. The plan established the Battle of Gettysburg and Lincoln’s “Gettysburg Address” as the park’s principal interpretive themes. Another sought funding to acquire significant historical tracts within the park boundary that were privately owned, which the NPS referred to as “in-holdings.” The “Master Plan” directed that the Park Service rehabilitate the battlefield to its 1863 appearance, but also allowed for the use of modern farming practices and equipment. Moreover, the “Master Plan” established a monument policy stating that future erection of monuments was only to “outstanding” individuals, units, or groups at the battle. The plan recommended cooperation with the local authorities in order to establish zoning regulations and with the newly established Gettysburg Battlefield Preservation Association in order to assist in acquisition of valuable historic tracts.¹⁶

¹⁶ “Master Plan For the Preservation and Use of Gettysburg National Military Park, Mission 66 Edition,” August 1960. Folder 3, Box 10, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives, 4-8, Acting Director Jackson E. Price approved this plan on April 27, 1961. No authors are listed, however, given that Frederick Tilberg authored most of Gettysburg’s reports it is not unreasonable he participated in the development of this plan as well; “MISSION 66: Gettysburg National Military Park.” Box 733, AF, RG 79, NARA College Park, 3; Superintendent James Myers, “Accomplishments, 1959.” Folder Park Service Area & Regional Accomplishments, Box 11, RG 79, Historic Shrines, Sites, Monuments, and Parks, Historical Studies Files, 1952-1967, Northeast Regional Office, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1 [hereinafter cited as Folder, Box, HSF, RG 79, NARA Philadelphia].

On January 28, 1946, then Director Drury approved the site of the visitor center, located in Ziegler's Grove. The Park Service would erect its new facility "along the Emmitsburg Road as far north as park property will permit." Thirteen years later, in 1959, after receiving money from MISSION 66, the design and construction of the park's museum finally became a reality. The National Park Service selected renowned architects Richard J. Neutra and Robert Alexander to design the museum at the country's preeminent Civil War battlefield. Known for his style of "modern" architecture, Neutra was one of the leading architects by the mid-twentieth century. Born in Vienna in 1892, he immigrated to the United States in 1923, first settling in New York City before moving to Chicago. While in Chicago, Neutra joined the architecture firm of Holabird and Roche and also met noted architects Louis Sullivan and Frank Lloyd Wright. Greatly influenced by their architectural philosophy, Neutra eventually moved to Los Angeles to establish his own design firm. There, his vision came to dominate California landscapes.¹⁷

As the National Park Service prepared to implement plans to design and construct the Gettysburg visitor center, park officials sought the services of Neutra. In his memoirs, Neutra

Part of MISSION 66 improvements included a resurfacing of the park roads. The federal government allocated approximately \$350,000 to Gettysburg to develop and improve roads and trails. By late 1959 approximately 30 percent of the park avenues had been resurfaced. In addition, the park received funding to repair many of its historic buildings and improvements had been made on thirty two historic farm buildings by the end of the year.

¹⁷ Newton Drury to Regional Director, January 28, 1946. Folder Gettysburg, 620-46, Box 44, Subject Files, 1937-1957, RG 79, NARA Philadelphia [hereinafter cited as Folder, Box, SF, RG 79, NARA Philadelphia]. For additional reading on the life and architecture of Richard Neutra see Thomas S. Hines, *Richard Neutra and the Search for Modern Architecture* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982) and Arthur Drexler and Thomas S. Hines, *The Architecture of Richard Neutra: From International Style to California Modern* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1982). Hines explores Neutra's six-decade career and his buildings that dominated the California landscape. According to Hines, Neutra believed that designing community buildings, schools, stores, theaters, and museums, were his most important work. Neutra was well known for the design of residential homes. He also constructed schools and hospitals in Puerto Rico. Many of these homes are briefly outlined in Drexler and Hines, *The Architect of Richard Neutra*, 7-15. In the late 1940s, Neutra met Robert Alexander, a recent graduate from Cornell University. Impressed with the young architect's enthusiasm and intellect, Neutra and Alexander formed a partnership that resulted in one of the country's leading architectural firms.

recalled learning of the government's proposal. After delivering a speech at the University of Arizona, he received a telephone call from Secretary of the Interior Fred Seaton and NPS Director Conrad Wirth, both of whom proposed that he design the new visitor center at Gettysburg. After hearing the plan, Neutra remembered "walking on air." He wanted the building to be a "shrine of the American nation."¹⁸

In her study of MISSION 66 visitor centers, Sarah Allaback finds that NPS architects completed a series of preliminary drawings for Gettysburg's new facility as early as February 1957. Whether NPS architects shared the design with Neutra or Alexander is unknown. In April 1958 Neutra and Alexander submitted their set of preliminary plans, including twenty-three drawings for the new facility. The initial design planned for a large rotunda for the proper hanging of the cyclorama painting, an observation platform, a rooftop promenade circling the rotunda, outside gathering space, a reflecting pool, and an office wing. Located between the rotunda and the office wing was a nine-story tower equipped with an elevator to offer visitors a bird's eye view of the battlefield. Although the twenty three drawings were well received, park officials preferred a more modest facility and suggested that Neutra and Alexander revise some of the more elaborate features. The revised design orientated the building in Ziegler's Grove so that it was concealed by the grove's tree foliage. It also eliminated the rooftop promenade and the nine-story viewing tower, although some Park Service architects wanted the tower retained, as it was an "integral part of the architectural design" and "eminently desirable" in providing visitors with a panoramic view of the battlefield.¹⁹

¹⁸ Richard Neutra, *Life and Shape*, (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1962,) 303.

¹⁹ Allaback, "Mission 66 Visitor Centers," Chapter 3; Edward Zimmer to Superintendent James Myers, November 17, 1958. Folder 1, Box 5, Series II, Cyclorama Building Records, 1957-1967, (GETT 41097), Records of the

Park Service officials quibbled with other aspects of Neutra's vision. The architects had designed the building in modern style, intending to offer visitors a stunning yet simplistic interpretive experience. Neutra envisioned a solemn setting as well. "Our building should play itself into the background," he wrote, "and behind a pool reflecting the everlasting sky over all of us- and it will not shout out any novelty or datedness." Neutra's design also intended to draw visitors' attention to President Abraham Lincoln and his "inspiring two-minute address." He wanted to give emphasis to the "wondrous words" of the "Gettysburg Address" and to intensify "the visitor's experience in the Cyclorama building." Indeed he commonly referred to the Park Service visitor center as the "Lincoln Memorial Museum." The reflecting pool was to be constructed at the front entrance, facing Taneytown Road. Both park and regional officials opposed the reflecting pool concept, however, for management and utilitarian reasons, arguing the pool would be hard to maintain and "particularly difficult to keep clean of algae and fungus and the pennies, cigarette packages, and gum wrappers of the usual American tourists." The cyclorama rotunda, that was to house the historic painting and museum exhibits, was to be placed north of the proposed reflecting pool. A ramp leading to an observation deck would provide visitors a panoramic view of the battlefield.²⁰

The proposal also initially called for the main parking lot to be located south of Ziegler's Grove, along Hancock and Meade Avenues and close to General Meade's headquarters. To ensure the parking area blended in with the historic landscape, Neutra proposed the lot be graded

National Park Service at Gettysburg National Military Park, Gettysburg National Military Park Archives [hereinafter cited by Series and (GETT 41097), GNMP Archives].

²⁰ Neutra, *Life and Shape*, 303- 311; Press Release from Bethlehem Steel Company, received at GNMP on July 28, 1961. Folder 4, Box 3, Series II, (GETT 41097), GNMP Archives; John Cabot to Richard Neutra, January 26, 1959. Folder 9, Box 2, Series II, (GETT 41097), GNMP Archives.

slightly as to be out of view from the visitor center building. Overflow parking would be built on the east side of Taneytown Road, with a bridge over the road to ensure visitor safety when crossing. On the building's north side, Neutra envisioned an open courtyard as a public gathering space or an area of reflection. The Vienna architect envisioned this space as an opportunity for "great statesman...of this earth" to speak at Gettysburg to once again evoke the "prophet" Lincoln's timeless words to future generations. The National Park Service, however, again raised objections. Historian Harry Pfanz remarked that the gathering space should be "discarded completely... unless the visitor center area becomes a scene of a latter day Chautauqua, which is both dubious and undesirable." Park staff furthermore opposed the proximity of the parking lot to Meade's headquarters, and recommended its location on the building's north side. Yet, after several revisions, on January 26, 1959, the acting chief of the Division of Design and Construction wrote Neutra to inform him that the National Park Service had finally approved the design. In late April 1959, the National Park Service entered into agreement with Neutra and Alexander to design the new facility. For their architectural and engineering services they would be paid \$39,000 in a series of installments.²¹

On August 29, 1959 the NPS opened the invitation for bids, which had to be received no later than September 29, 1959. On September 30, after opening and reviewing ten, the federal government awarded the construction contract to Orndorff Construction of Camp Hill, Pennsylvania. Following typical government regulations the contract went to the lowest bidder: Orndorff's bid was \$687,349 while other bids ranged from \$735,720 to \$888,725. The Park

²¹ Neutra, *Life and Shape*, 312-13; Harry Pfanz memo, undated. Folder 1, Box 5, Series II, (GETT 41097), GNMP Archives; Donald Nutt, memorandum on November 7, 1958; John Cabot to Richard Neutra, January 26, 1959. Folder 9, Box 2, Series II, (GETT 41097), GNMP Archives; Contact No. 14-10-529-2046. Dated April 27, 1959, but not signed by either party. Folder 9, Box 5, Series II, (GETT 41097), GNMP Archives.

Service awarded additional contracts for heating and ventilating to York Air Cooling and Ventilating Company; for electrical to Keystone Engineering Company of Philadelphia; and for plumbing to Hirsch, Aiken and Pinehurst of Philadelphia. By the end of October 1959 the National Park Service awarded a total of \$895,805 in construction contracts to four Pennsylvania firms.²²

The National Park Service issued a notice to proceed on November 16, 1959. Contract work began on November 20. The new visitor center was to be completed by December 12, 1961. The Eastern Representative of Neutra's architectural firm, Thomas Longstreth, would visit the construction site weekly to direct and supervise the construction process. Longstreth was to operate as a middle-man by offering onsite advice on architectural and aesthetic questions, but any technical questions went to Neutra in California.²³

In order to prepare for the construction of the visitor center, portions of Ziegler's Grove first had to be excavated and landscaped, historic structures had to be moved, and historic avenues realigned. By the end of 1959, nearly 70 percent of the excavation for the parking lot and entrances was complete. Bulldozers removed trees; Myers reported that more trees than

²² Board of Contract Appeals, Department of the Interior, May 29, 1963. Folder 7, Box 3, Series II, (GETT 41097), GNMP Archives; Addendum, 1959. Folder 1, Box 1, Series I, (GETT 41097), GNMP Archives; Joseph Campbell to Secretary of the Interior, March 7, 1962. Folder 3, Box 2, Series II, (GETT 41097), GNMP Archives; John Cabot to Richard Netura, November 3, 1959. Folder 5, Box 2, Series I, (GETT 41097), GNMP Archives; NPS Press Release, "Contracts Awarded For Visitor Center in Gettysburg National Military Park, Pennsylvania," October 30, 1959. Folder 7, Box 8, Series II, (GETT 41097), GNMP Archives. York Air Cooling's contract was for \$91, 938; Keystone Engineering's contract was for \$84,730; and \$31,788 was awarded to Hirsh, Aiken and Pinehurst. The second lowest bidder, R.S. Nooan Inc., appealed the contract award on two occasions, but was overruled by the Department of Interior both times.

²³ Board of Contract Appeals, Department of the Interior, May 29, 1963. Folder 7, Box 3, Series II, (GETT 41097), GNMP Archives; Addendum, 1959. Folder 1, Box 1, Series I, (GETT 41097), GNMP Archives; Superintendent James Myers to Joseph Campbell, Comptroller General, November 28, 1961. Folder 11, Box 4, Series I, (GETT 41097), GNMP Archives; November 20, 1959 meeting minutes on the Gettysburg Visitor Center and Cyclorama. Folder 5, Box 2, Series I, (GETT 41097), GNMP Archives.

necessary were destroyed during the excavation when it became apparent that several were diseased. As landscaping progressed and further terrain changes took place, the Park Service deliberated the status of the War Department's observation tower in Ziegler's Grove. National Park Service officials agreed that the tower was an "intrusion," would serve "no useful purpose," and should be destroyed.²⁴

The site for the new visitor center also rested on key battle-ground, where in the 1880s veterans erected monuments to honor their unit and their comrades. In order to prepare for the construction of the visitor center, the Park Service needed to relocate several monuments including the 88th Pennsylvania, the 90th Pennsylvania, and the 1st Company Massachusetts Sharpshooters, the Battery G, 2nd U.S. Artillery Marker and the Battery F, 5th U.S. Artillery Marker. In order to facilitate automobile access from the Taneytown Road, Steinwehr Avenue, and the tour route, Gettysburg's management decided to realign Hancock Avenue. This road had originally run northward along the spine of Cemetery Ridge. Once past Ziegler's Grove and the Brian farm, Hancock Avenue angled northeast to the intersection at the Taneytown Road, several hundred yards south of the Rosensteel Museum. Contractors removed a section of Hancock Avenue that ran northeast from Ziegler's Grove toward the Taneytown Road to allow parking bays to be built. At this time, the Park Service also removed the historic entrance gates to Hancock Avenue. Construction on the new parking lot and entrance roads were completed on June 15, 1960. The Park Service contracted Glenn Crouse of Littlestown, Pennsylvania in April 1961 to remove the historic Ziegler's Grove observation tower. The War Department built the

²⁴ Superintendent James Myers, "Accomplishments, 1959." Folder Park Service Area & Regional Accomplishments, Box 11, HSF, RG 79, NARA Philadelphia; "Bids For New Cyclorama Top Be Opened on September 29," *Gettysburg Times*, 2 September 1959; Summary Notes, Gettysburg Meeting, February 1-2, 1960. Folder 1, Box 3, Series II, (GETT 41097), GNMP Archives, 6. Maitland Brothers of Littlestown, Pennsylvania won the contract for the construction of the roads and parking lot.

tower in the 1890s to allow military personnel to study the battle and visitors to better observe the fields of Pickett's Charge, but the observation deck on the cyclorama building would now, it was believed, provide visitors with a comparable panoramic view. By July 1961 the tower was completely demolished and removed.²⁵

Construction on the new parking lot and entrance roads were completed on June 15, 1960. While excavation of the landscape progressed quickly as well, construction of the million dollar facility quickly devolved into a fiasco. By February 1960, only one percent of the work was complete. Three months later, Orndorff Construction had completed only eight percent of the building's construction. Much of the early delay to be sure was due to winter, forcing Orndorff to use a more expensive approach to establishing the building's foundation and shell in order to get the building closed for winter. After delays in construction, the Park Service extended the time of the contract, providing construction was complete by January 10, 1962.²⁶

²⁵ "Cultural Landscape Report: Defense of Cemetery Hill," (Department of the Interior, National Park Service, June 2004), 180-181; Superintendent James Myers, "Superintendent's Monthly Report, April 1961," written on May 12, 1961. Box 192, AF, RG 79, NARA College Park, 3; Superintendent James Myers, "Superintendent's Monthly Narrative Report, June 1960," written on July 13, 1960. Box 192, AF, RG 79, NARA College Park, 1; "Steel Tower at Zeigler's Grove Razed," *Gettysburg Times*, 25 July 1961. Box 4, Newspaper Clipping (Unbound), 1958-1961, (GETT 43663), Records of the National Park Service at Gettysburg National Military Park, GNMP Archives [hereinafter cited as (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives]. Though the NPS removed the tower in Ziegler's Grove, four other War Department observation towers remained (Oak Ridge, Culp's Hill, West Confederate Avenue, and Big Round Top). For payment of the job, Crouse was permitted to use the tower as scrap metal. Ziegler's Grove is spelled incorrectly in this title. The road bed of Hancock Avenue would have run near where the third parking lot bay of the visitor center was developed. The agency also moved the Hancock Avenue sign from its original location at the intersection of Taneytown Road and Hancock Avenue to the west side of the avenue at Ziegler's Grove as well as the Gettysburg National Military Park designation marker from its original location near the northern section of Ziegler's Grove to the intersection of the realigned Hancock Avenue and Steinwehr Avenue.

²⁶ Superintendent James Myers, "Superintendent's Monthly Narrative Report, June 1960," written on July 13, 1960. Box 192, RG 79, NARA College Park, 1. The National Park Service made the final inspection of the new parking lot and entrance roads on June 28, 1960. "Appeal of Orndorff Construction," decided on October 25, 1967. Folder 5, Box 8, Series II, (GETT 41097), GNMP Archives, 23; David Smith to Superintendent James Myers, June 16, 1960. Folder 4, Box 3, Series I, (GETT 41097), GNMP Archives; Richard Neutra to John Cabot, February 22, 1961. Folder 1, Box 4, Series I, (GETT 41097), GNMP Archives; "Appeal of Orndorff Construction," decided on October 25, 1967. Folder 5, Box 8, Series II, (GETT 41097), GNMP Archives, 7. Some of the delay also resulted from a slight change in the placement of the building's foundation. The excavation for the building was conducted by Maitland Brothers and during this work the pivot point of the building was moved from the point originally

With the eve of the Civil War Centennial quickly approaching, Gettysburg's visitor center was far from complete.

NPS restoration crews meanwhile were diligently and more successfully working toward restoring the Gettysburg Cyclorama. In October 1959, the Park Service closed to the public the cyclorama building on East Cemetery Hill as restoration work began on the historic painting. Walter Nitkiewicz, Chief of Museum Services, supervised the restoration, and by July 1960 over half of the painting's second restoration was completed. Superintendent Myers reported in September 1960 that Nitkiewicz and his crew were doing a "simply superb job" on the painting's restoration.²⁷

While the construction of the park's new visitor center and the restoration of the historic Gettysburg Cyclorama were the main interpretive developments between 1956 and 1960, management continued the sorts of minor additions and initiatives that had marked the first half of the decade. Park staff placed new field exhibits at Barlow Knoll, Oak Hill, along General James Longstreet's battle line, and at the Wheatfield Road. Additionally, in 1960 park officials

shown in the drawings. For a detailed explanation of the contractual reasoning for moving the building's pivot point, see David Smith to Superintendent James Myers, March 12, 1962. Folder 3, Box 2, Series II, (GETT 41097), GNMP Archives.

²⁷ "Will Begin Restoration of Painting," *Gettysburg Times*, 29 October 1959. Folder Gettysburg 1957-1961, Box 6, AF, RG 79, NARA Philadelphia; Superintendent James Myers, "Superintendent's Monthly Narrative Report, July 1960," written on August 12, 1960. Box 192, AF, RG 79, NARA College Park, 5; Superintendent James Myers to Jeremiah Hoover, September 29, 1960. Folder Gettysburg 1957-1961, Box 6, HSF, RG 79, NARA Philadelphia. A detailed history of Gettysburg Cyclorama as well as the restoration work performed on the cyclorama painting is viewable at: <http://memory.loc.gov/pnp/habshaer/pa/pa3900/pa3988/data/pa3988.pdf>. This is a report produced by the Historic America Buildings Survey on the Gettysburg Cyclorama Building, project number HABS-PA-6709.

developed a new walking tour to complement the new visitor center facility. Termed the High Water Mark Walking Tour, it took interested visitors to key spots pertaining to Pickett's Charge. The walking tour was designed to attract visitors who, after seeing the Gettysburg Cyclorama, would be interested in walking the historic fields of the July 3 action. Initially, regional officials proposed a relatively elaborate walking tour complete with benches and the construction of a flagstone terrace at the Angle. The Gettysburg staff, however, opposed such developments arguing the benches and terrace would be a "serious intrusion" on Cemetery Ridge. Park staff lost the argument with the regional office, however, and the benches and terrace became part of the walking trail. In order to access the High Water Mark Walking Tour from the visitor center in Ziegler's Grove visitors also had to cross Hancock Avenue. For visitor safety the regional office recommended the removal of Hancock Avenue, but Superintendent Myers maintained that removal was not practical because it was a main road on the tour route. This new trail consisted of ten exhibit signs leading visitors from the visitor center, to Meade's Headquarters, and at several stops near the Angle. The trail was completed on August 6, 1962 at a cost of \$5,161.02.²⁸

The development of walking tours promoted in turn a re-evaluation of non-essential driving roads. In July 1960 the Park Service decided to eliminate two battlefield avenues, the loop around the U.S. Regular Monument on Hancock Avenue and Chamberlain Avenue, which

²⁸ Superintendent James Myers, "Superintendent's Monthly Narrative Report, September 1960," written on October 14, 1960. Box 192, AF, RG 79, NARA College Park, 3; Superintendent James Myers to Regional Director, October 11, 1960. Folder K1815, Box 13, General Correspondence, 1952-1966, RG 79, Historic Shrines, Sites, Monuments, and Parks, Northeast Regional Office, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania [hereinafter cited by Folder, Box, GC, RG 79, NARA Philadelphia]; Superintendent James Myers to Assistant Superintendent Sollenberg, October 10, 1960; Frederick Tilberg to Superintendent James Myers on October 10, 1960. Folder K1815, Box 13, GC, RG 79, NARA Philadelphia; Individual Building Data File, Building Reports, A-V Files. Folder 1, Box 23, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives. Hancock Avenue ran from the southern slope of Little Round Top northward along the spine of the Union line at Cemetery Ridge.

ran along “Vincent’s Spur” on Little Round Top toward the 20th Maine Monument. Both of these avenues were short in distance and were significant intrusions upon vital battlefield terrain. Local and regional officials also proposed that Webb Avenue (a small circular avenue running on the west side of Hancock Avenue around the High Water Mark Monument) be eliminated, but did not set a date for its removal.²⁹

The Park Service also won some minor victories in preservation. During the winter of 1960, Gettysburg management advertised for bids to remove buildings on the recently acquired Lee-Meade Motel property, near the historic Peach Orchard. The tract included twelve cabins, two garages, the service station, and the lodge building. Upon removal of the non-historic structures, the Park Service intended to restore the ground to its historic topography. Meanwhile, in the spring of 1960, the Park Service announced plans to remove the non-historic Wentz house. Located near the Peach Orchard at the intersection of Emmitsburg and Wheatfield Roads, it dated to 1885, which by 1960 was in a considerable state of disrepair.³⁰

In the years leading up to the Civil War Centennial park rangers, historians, politicians, civilians, and newspaper editors engaged in vociferous debates over commercialization. As housing developments and commercial establishments continue to proliferate on the battlefield

²⁹ “Two Battlefield Avenues Will Be Removed,” *Gettysburg Times*, 28 July 1960. Box 4, (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives; Frederick Tilberg to Superintendent James Myers on October 10, 1960. Folder K1815, Box 13, GC, RG 79, NARA Philadelphia.

³⁰ “Park Service Going To Sell All Buildings At Lee-Meade Inn,” *Gettysburg Times*, 1 February 1960; “Park Service Will Remove Wentz House,” *Gettysburg Times*, 29 April 1960. Box 4, (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives.

and surrounding areas, preservationist groups opened a “Second Battle of Gettysburg.” Many debates centered on Congressional appropriation for land acquisitions at Gettysburg and other Civil War parks to combat commercialization.

In the spring of 1959 a series of newspaper articles reported on the development of the town and of Gettysburg National Military Park. The April 5, 1959 issue of the Harrisburg *Patriot News* headlined “Commercialism Launches 2nd Battle of Gettysburg.” Unless America cares enough to prevent subsequent development, writer Hans Knight warned, commercialization would eventually overrun the battlefield. While only one insignificant sign marked the entrance of the battlefield, he added, other state roads proliferated with commercial signs advertising for museums, souvenir shops, and visitor accommodations. Three days later, Jean White of the *Washington Post* authored a comparable article similarly entitled, “The 2nd Battle of Gettysburg.” White then wrote that, “If they restage the battle of Gettysburg on the centennial four years from now, some of Pickett’s men may be making their charge through a custard stand or souvenir shop.” Picking up on the possibility of custard stands dominating the fields of Pickett’s Charge an editorial titled “Custard’s Last Stand” appeared on April 12 in the *Reading Eagle* of Reading, Pennsylvania. Once again, the theme of patriotism and preservation intermingled as the author asked, “Why do Americans insist on blighting even a historic site like the battlefield with blinding neon signs, garish souvenir shops and junky frozen custard stands?”³¹

These editorials and articles deliberately forged a connection between preservation and American patriotism. The implication in each was that development and commercialization of

³¹ Hans Knight, “Commercialism Launches 2nd Battle of Gettysburg,” *Gettysburg Times*, 5 April 1959; Jean White, “The 2nd Battle of Gettysburg,” *Gettysburg Times*, April 8, 1959; Editorial, “Custard’s Last Stand?” *Reading [Pennsylvania] Eagle*, 12 April 1959. Box 4, (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives.

the Gettysburg battlefield was un-American. “Patriotism,” Adlai Stevenson had extolled in 1952, “is the love of something.” To be American and patriotic meant opposing commercialization on the historic battlefield. Only unpatriotic Americans, those who disregarded the nation’s heritage, wanted neon lights and tourist trappings. The *Rochester* [New York] *Democrat Chronicle* offered an explanation of “How to Mess Up a U.S. Shrine” and challenged readers “Cannot our great, proud, free, rich America somehow find the way to preserve such a heritage as this against desecration? Is this tragic commercialization inevitable?” Unwilling to appreciate the value in preserving historic sites, some Americans were more concerned with profiting from the sacrifice of American soldiers. “On each field where the trumpets sounded, the cash register now jingles,” declared Ashley Hasley of the *Saturday Evening Post*.³²

Cold War patriotism and the desire to preserve the nation’s treasures also offered interested civilians the opportunity to approach Congress for funding to protect the nation’s patriotic battlefields. Director Wirth informed Congress that time was of the essence; it was “now or never” to acquire additional lands for Gettysburg National Military Park. In 1959 he requested \$5,368,585 for land acquisitions, of which \$2,415,185 would be allocated for the purchase of over 600 historic acres. Wirth’s proposal met opposition in Washington. When the Department of Interior’s budget reached Congress, including funding for land acquisition at Gettysburg, the House eliminated \$1,250,000 of the requested funds. Some House members argued that the federal government already owned a sufficient amount of land at Gettysburg.

³² Stephen J. Whitfield, *The Culture of the Cold War* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991), 53; Editorial, “How To Mess Up A U.S. Shrine,” *Rochester* [New York] *Democrat Chronicle*. Undated; Ashley Hasley Jr., “Let’s Not Surrender Our Battlefields,” *Saturday Evening Post*, 19 September 1959. Box 4, (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives.

Ohio Representative Michael Kirwan, for example, opposed the land acquisition, remarking, “We have enough land at Gettysburg. There is no use in taking any more... They have the land where the important part of the battle was fought.” He continued, “Why not take the land where they marched up the valleys nearby in Maryland? Why not take that? That has about the same significance as the area where the battle was fought.”³³

Civil War preservationists and other concerned Congressmen fought to have the appropriations reinstated into the bill. On April 20, 1959, Pennsylvania Representative James Quigley offered an emotional yet reasonable appeal to his fellow Congressmen to approve increased appropriations for land acquisition. Quigley acknowledged the necessity of some development and commercialization, since tourism was a basic component for the battlefield’s 750,000 visitors. Tourism had developed into the town’s most profitable business, and park visitors had to be fed, housed, and entertained. By 1959, however, as additional developments encroached upon the historic land and federal funding became limited Gettysburg management struggled to protect and preserve the battle grounds. Quigley’s emotional appeal rested on the historical significance and collective memory of the Pennsylvania battlefield: “Gettysburg just isn’t any battlefield of any war. It isn’t even just any battlefield of the Civil War. Gettysburg is Gettysburg: the site of one of the truly decisive battles in the whole of history. At Gettysburg the future of this country came to the cross roads. Here brave men fought and died not only that this nation might live but to resolve how it would live.”³⁴

³³ “Now or Never to Buy ‘Field, Says Wirth; Ask \$2,415,185,” *Gettysburg Times*, 17 March 1959. Kirwan served as a Democratic Congressman from Ohio from 1937 to 1970. Interestingly, he supported conservation projects in his home state, namely a canal from Lake Erie to the Ohio River via rivers in his district of Youngstown.

³⁴ Speech delivered in the House of Representatives by Congressman James Quigley, April 20, 1959. Folder L1417, Box 1630, AF, RG 79, NARA College Park [hereinafter cited as “Quigley, April 1959,” NARA College Park].

Quigley's solution to the continual debate of commercialization versus preservation centered on instituting effective zoning policies. Local townships and boroughs often opposed the Park Service acquiring private lands because once the federal government owned title to the land the it was removed from the local tax rolls. He advocated local townships partnering with the NPS to establish reasonable zoning regulations. In return for the loss of tax revenues from private properties, the Congressman suggested that the federal government provide the local taxing authorities a portion of the rent collected from properties leased or rented on federally owned land.³⁵

With the Centennial celebrations less than four years away, Quigley finally urged Congress to act quickly to protect the battlefield. He pleaded, "We are well on our way to losing the Second Battle of Gettysburg." Appealing directly to House members, Quigley proclaimed that looking forward to 1963 "when the spot light of the nation and the world is focused on Gettysburg to commemorate the 100 anniversary of the battle, we will discover too late and to our sorrow that the second battle of Gettysburg—the fight to prevent the desecration of this sacred monument by unwarranted commercialization—already has been lost."³⁶

The backlash toward commercialization and opposition to cuts in the Park Service's budget was immediate. Newspapers throughout the country regularly printed letters from

³⁵ "Quigley, April 1959," NARA College Park. Specifically Quigley proposed that the annual rent of a particular tract or farm be increased by the amount of taxes that the owner previously paid to the local authorities. In this situation, the NPS would receive title to the land, and thus the assurance the property would not be further developed, plus annual rent from the leasee. The leasee would be responsible for paying the property tax to the local taxing authority. Quigley acknowledged that the financial burden would fall on the leasee, but believed that since the Federal Government's rental rates were reasonable, the annual increase should be acceptable to the leasee. His proposal would be implemented later in the twentieth century. The Gettysburg battlefield lies within the Cumberland Township.

³⁶ "Clark To Ask Hearings on Acquiring Battlefield Land," *Gettysburg Times*, 24 March 1959; "Quigley, April 1959." Folder L1417, Box 1630, AF, RG 79, NARA College Park. Portions of Quigley's speech were reprinted in this article on 24 March 1959.

concerned citizens speaking out against development on America's battlefields. One letter to the editor in the *Gettysburg Times* questioned if the nation had become "morally bankrupt" and noted that "the land may be in Adams County but the battlefield belongs to the nation. It must be kept intact to remain meaningful for our children's children long after you and I are dust." Jess Gorkin, editor of *Parade*, led the national appeal to preserve Gettysburg National Military Park in an open letter to Congress. He took readers through a tour of Gettysburg: past a souvenir stand where Confederate General William Barksdale was mortally wounded on July 2, to a hotel on the left flank of the infantry line of Pickett's Charge, and souvenir stands along the fields of the first day's fighting he then urged Congress to make necessary funding available to Gettysburg to purchase threatened historic land. He also challenged the Senate to restore the appropriations cut by the House, declaring "Now it is up to you in the Senate. And for each day lost, a part of our heritage is lost. Next year or the year after may be too late to save Gettysburg." Gorkin finished with reference to November 19, 1863 that appealed to "the memory that inspired Lincoln's stirring words must be worth more to America than the \$750,000 needed to stop the advance of commercialism. How will you vote, gentleman of the Senate?"³⁷

In mid-May the Senate appropriations committee held hearings for funding the National Park Service. Major General Ulysses S. Grant III, the grandson of the Civil War general and recently appointed chairman of the Civil War Centennial Committee, voiced his support for the increased funding, stating, "the threat of commercial encroachment are both imminent and real." Grant urged the Senate to restore the \$1,250,000 for the purchase of threatened areas before the upcoming centennial celebrations. Harry Scharf, president of Hotel Gettysburg; Dr. S. K.

³⁷ "Many Protests Registered Against Commercialization of Gettysburg Battlefield," *Gettysburg Times*, 15 October 1959; Jess Gorkin's essay reprinted in "Editor of Parade Magazine Appeals to U.S. Senators To Preserve Gettysburg Shrine," *Gettysburg Times*, 18 May 1959.

Stevens, the executive director of the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission; West Virginia Senator Robert Byrd; and Pennsylvania Senators Joseph P. Clark and Hugh Scott also spoke in favor of restoring the money. The media coverage and public pressure proved successful. In early June, the Senate appropriations committee approved \$650,000 to acquire land at Gettysburg National Military Park and Manassas National Battlefield, but a Congressional subcommittee decreased the final amount to \$450,000. Yet, this appropriation remained a hallowed victory, however, because Congress agreed to authorize the money for land acquisition dependant on the enactment of community zoning laws. In June 1959 Cumberland Township formed a planning commission to consider zoning laws, but despite the Park Service's efforts the township did not enact the necessary zoning laws. Consequently, the entire appropriation of \$450,000 went to Manassas.³⁸

Unwarranted commercialization by 1960 entailed not only housing developments and concessionary establishments. In 1959 Carroll Voss had begun operating helicopter tours over the battlefield. He initially approached Superintendent Myers for permission to base the helicopter pad near the Eternal Peace Light. Myers denied Voss's request. Not to be discouraged, Voss successfully negotiated with Henry Wright to use his property, located along

³⁸ "Scharf Tells Committee Importance of Providing Funds To Preserve Shrine," *Gettysburg Times*, 19 May 1959; "Two Senators Favor Saving Battlefield," *Gettysburg Times*, 20 May 1959; "Scott Urges More Funds to Save 'Field,'" *Gettysburg Times*, 21 May 1959; "Senate Committee Votes \$650,000 To Acquire Land For Gettysburg, Manassas," June 6, 1959, *Gettysburg Times*; Unrau, *Administrative History*, 267-272; Joan Zenzen, *Battling for Manassas: The Fifty-Year Preservation Struggle at Manassas National Battlefield Park* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1998), 60-65. Manassas received their appropriation from the 1959 budget because Prince William Board of County Supervisors had already enacted zoning laws surrounding the Manassas battlefield.

the Taneytown Road and directly across from General Meade's headquarters, for his helicopter enterprise.³⁹

During the summer helicopters ran continuous tours, giving customers a birds-eye view of the battlefield. Nearly every five to seven minutes a helicopter departed from or landed on the eastern slopes of Cemetery Ridge. Taking off near Meade's headquarters, pilots directed their aircraft south along Hancock Avenue, towards Little Round Top and Devil's Den, before returning to the Wright property. By July helicopter tours had become a serious intrusion on the historic landscape, according to critics, as they flew at relatively low altitude and created an "earth shattering noise." When the pilots approached Little Round Top they dropped their altitude to one hundred feet, forcing visitors to scurry when they saw them approaching so low.⁴⁰

The National Park Service, at this date, did not have any regulations that prohibited low altitude flying of aircraft over federal property. After receiving many complaints regarding the helicopters' disruption to the visitor experience, Myers wrote Voss on July 22 outlining problems caused by the new tour service. He stated that "there appears no doubt from the complaints we received, that your low level flights over this crowded section of the park seriously interfered with the enjoyment of this area by many individuals, and alarmed others." The superintendent had approved of the helicopter sight-seeing tours at a "reasonable altitude," believing that they have "interesting possibilities, and can serve a useful purpose." Myers did, however, make clear to Voss that the helicopter tours cannot "be allowed to deprive thousands of visitors from the

³⁹ Superintendent James Myers to Regional Director, July 27, 1959. Folder W4168, Box 11, GC, RG 79, NARA Philadelphia.

⁴⁰ Superintendent James Myers to Regional Director, July 27, 1959; Superintendent James Myers to Regional Director, July 21, 1959; James Myers to Carroll Voss, July 22, 1959. Folder W4618, Box 11, GC, RG 79, NARA Philadelphia. In this letter, Myers included a time chart of the helicopters' landings and take offs, showing an entry or departure every five to six minutes.

right to see, and hear about, use and enjoy the best known National Military Park in the United States.” Moreover, their “continuous roar” by flying at such low altitude, caused serious interruptions to the ranger’s interpretive tours at Little Round Top.⁴¹

After an exchange of letters Superintendent Myers met with Voss in the hope of reaching an agreement on the copter tours. Unwilling to abandon his profitable enterprise, Voss did agree to stop “buzzing” Little Round Top. Myers believed Voss would continue to operate the business as long as it was profitable, and the residents along Taneytown Road did not complain of the noise disturbance.⁴² As a result of these negotiations, the sight-seeing helicopter tours of the Gettysburg battlefield continued, at least for a while.

Taneytown Road meanwhile remained a popular strip for commercialization. In addition to the helicopter service, just a few hundred yards further south, a local resident opened a children’s amusement park. On June 16, 1959 the *Gettysburg Times* reported that Fantasyland would open in July. Designed and operated by Kenneth Dick, a Biglerville native, the forty-acre park offered a “wonderful world of make believe” for children. The park consisted of an array of children’s attractions including a twenty-foot Mother Goose, The Old Lady Who Lived in a Shoe, Santa’s Village, and Rapunsel’s Castle. Fantasyland also offered a sugar plum snack bar overlooking a miniature lake with ducks, nursery rhyme time, a playground with swings, and a caboose. On July 18 the “child’s paradise” opened to the public. Assailed immediately by preservationists as being unconcerned for the integrity of the battlefield, Dick maintained his establishment did not interfere. In a letter to the *New York Times*, he reminded his critics that he

⁴¹ Superintendent James Myers to Regional Director, July 27, 1959. Folder W 4618, Box 11, GC, RG 79, NARA Philadelphia.

⁴² Superintendent James Myers to Regional Director, July 27, 1959. Folder W 4618, Box 11, GC, RG 79, NARA Philadelphia.

was a World War II veteran who was sympathetic to the nation's history. Not only was Fantasyland built in a wooded area relatively concealed from the battlefield tour route, but the amusement park was situated on ground that was not used during the battle. Dick encouraged critics to use restraint in assaulting his new establishment, and reminded readers that Lincoln did not save the nation to have the federal government deny its citizens of individual rights.⁴³

The establishment of a children's amusement park on the periphery of historic battle ground reinforced the changing nature of the tourist by the mid- twentieth century. Jim Weeks argues that during the Cold War mass consumption and marketing of Gettysburg battlefield centered on families touring in personal automobiles. The postwar wave of family tourists necessitated the development of family-oriented lodging, but also attractions that would appeal to families with young children. The storybook village of Fantasyland was devoted exclusively to entertaining children in a family setting.⁴⁴ As families made "civic pilgrimages" to Gettysburg, in other words, commercial businesses such as Fantasyland capitalized on attracting families, providing the opportunity to spend a few hours on the battlefield and then relax with Mother Goose and other storybook characters.

The regular display of patriotism and Americans' desire to connect with historical events were common during the Cold War. Several historians have examined the relationship between

⁴³ "Fantasyland Opens in July," *Gettysburg Times*, 16 June 1959; "Fantasyland, Wonderland of Make Believe Open on Taneytown Road Saturday or Old and Young," *Gettysburg Times*, 17 July 1959; "Letters: View on Gettysburg," *New York Times*, 14 June 1959. Box 4, (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives.

⁴⁴ Jim Weeks, *Gettysburg: Memory, Market, and an American Shrine* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003), 161-163; Rugh, *Are We There Yet?* Recent scholarship by Susan Rugh confirms the popularity of family vacations in the years after World War II. In *Are We There Yet?* Rugh explores family outings from 1945 to the 1970s. In the wake of World War II, as fathers returned from war, the government lifted the ban on gas rationing, and the economy boomed, families took to the roads to see America. These vacations often involved what Rugh terms "civic pilgrimages" to historic, or patriotic sites.

the nation's anti-Communist attitudes and the surge of Americanism. John Fried offers a compelling examination of how the Cold War shaped commemorative events. The Cold War, he writes, "encouraged efforts to patriotize the American calendar." Such patriotic events included the establishment of Flag Day, I Am an American Day, Armed Forces Day, Constitution Day, and patriotic parades across the country. In 1954 Congress added the phrase "under God" to the Pledge of Allegiance. Anniversaries of historic events or people were popularized during the Cold War as well. One of the era's most spectacular display of patriotism occurred at the celebration of Jamestown's 350th anniversary in 1957. Historic Jamestown, a park in the National Park system, privately endowed Colonial Williamsburg, and the federal government allocated \$25 million to construct new facilities or upgrade existing ones. To honor the settling of Jamestown, replicas of the *Susan Constant*, *Discovery* and *Godspeed*, the three ships that landed at Jamestown were constructed. England's Queen Elizabeth II attended the ceremony. Such ceremonies served to strengthen and inspire Americans' sense of civic and patriotic heritage. Stephen Whitfield further forges a connection between patriotic displays and the Cold War. "The search to define and affirm a way of life, the need to express and celebrate the meaning of "Americanism," was the flip side of stigmatizing Communism," concludes Whitfield.⁴⁵

For American families interested in taking excursions to historic sites and patriotic places, in order to revel in their Americanism, the town of Gettysburg and the battlefield were the perfect place to vacation. Moreover, Americans found plenty of celebratory dates "patriotizing the calendar" in Gettysburg. During the Cold War era, public celebrations were

⁴⁵ John Fried, *The Russians Are Coming! The Russians Are Coming! Pageantry and Patriotism in Cold-War America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 86-117; Stephen Whitfield, *The Culture of the Cold War* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1991), 53. "Patriotizing" is Fried's phrase.

common. Gettysburg battlefield remained a landscape for patriotic expressions and a place for Americans to reaffirm their heritage. Throughout the year the eyes of the nation turned to the battlefield to celebrate President Lincoln's birthday, Memorial Day, and Dedication Day. Adding to the list of celebratory occasions, in the late 1950s, Director Wirth designated February 11 as "Establishment Day" to commemorate the day in which Gettysburg National Military Park was established.⁴⁶

In 1959 Gettysburg's calendar, and the nation's, become even more patriotic with the celebration of the sesquicentennial of Abraham Lincoln's birthday. On November 19, a special radio program "In Search of Lincoln," broadcast by Voice of America, could be heard around the world. During this program several of the world's leading statesman paid tribute to America's sixteenth president, including President Dwight D. Eisenhower, British Prime Minister Harold Macmillan, India's Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, and notably President General Ngo Dinh Diem of the Republic of Vietnam. Locally, at Gettysburg on the 96th anniversary of the dedication of the Soldiers' National Cemetery, renowned Lincoln scholar Carl Sandburg read the Gettysburg Address. The U.S. Army Band headed the Dedication Day parade.⁴⁷

Meanwhile, events such as the battle anniversary continued to draw a sizable crowd. In July 1959, the Gettysburg Fire Company hosted a series of celebrations for the battle's 96th anniversary that foreshadowed future elaborate battle festivities. On July 1, 2, and 3, the Gettysburg Civil War Round Table, the local chapter of the Sons of the Union Veterans, and the

⁴⁶ Superintendent J. Walter Coleman to Regional Director, February 11, 1958. Folder A8219, Box 675, AF, RG 79, NARA College Park.

⁴⁷ "Many Salutes To A. Lincoln Are Broadcast Around The World," *Gettysburg Times*, 19 November 1959; "Carl Sandburg, World Famous Authority on Lincoln, Will Speak at Exercises Here November 19 Closing Lincoln Sesquicentennial Year," *Gettysburg Times*, 12 November 1959. Box 4, (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives.

North-South Skirmish Association sponsored special commemorative programs at the U.S. Regular Monument. The main attraction, however, was the first ever reenactment of the Battle of Gettysburg and the first reenactment on any Civil War battlefield. On July 5, several hundred members of the newly formed North-South Skirmish Association re-enacted the last moments of Pickett's Charge near the Angle. Superintendent Myers reported that over 8,000 spectators attended this "pageant" display. In town, the annual Fireman's Parade, complete with floats, often historically themed, entertained hundreds. The events of 1960 offered a fitting preamble to the planned festivities for the Civil War Centennial. To celebrate the ninety-seventh anniversary of the battle the North-South Skirmish Association again re-enacted Pickett's Charge. Events at the Angle commenced at 2:45 P.M. with a short narration of the Confederate assault. Promptly at 3 P.M. a signal gun was fired from the Virginia Memorial to symbolize the beginning of the artillery barrage. Thirty minutes later the re-enactors stepped off from Seminary Ridge and advanced toward Cemetery Ridge. As the Confederate infantry approached the Union center, the American Legion and the V.F.W. unfurled the American flag. Approximately 14,000 people turned out for the commemorative program at the Angle on July 3.⁴⁸

⁴⁸ Superintendent James Myers, "Superintendent's Monthly Report, July 1959," written on August 13, 1959. Folder 192, AF, RG 79, NARA College Park, 2; "Re-enactment of Pickett's Charge July 5 Will Climax Battle Anniversary Events," *Gettysburg Times*, 25 June 1959; "Several Hundred Uniformed Men to Take Part in Re-enactment of Pickett's Charge on Saturday," *Gettysburg Times*, 3 July 1959; "Special Battle Anniversary Ceremonies Today; Pickett's Charge and Service Sunday," *Gettysburg Times*, July 2, 1960. Box 4, (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives; Superintendent James Myers, "Superintendent's Monthly Report, July 1960," written on August 12, 1960. Box 192, RG 79, NARA College Park. The North-South Skirmish Association was established in 1950 to commemorate the Civil War and particularly focused their commemorative and educational efforts on firing demonstrations and weapon displays. By the end of the decade, the NSSA had attracted enough interest in Civil War reenacting that they were able to perform a "reenactment" of Pickett's Charge. Though the 1959 demonstration of the final moments of Pickett's Charge pales in comparison to the spectacular reenactment displays of the modern era, because it was the first reenactment done, not just at Gettysburg, but on any battlefield, it does mark a significant point in popular trends in Civil War culture.

The surge of Americanism during the Cold War often compelled Americans to want to preserve their heritage. Unfortunately, Congressional appropriations dictated the acquisition of historic lands at Gettysburg and other Civil War parks. Consequently, park management was forced to make difficult decisions to protect historic areas. Timely media releases about the “Second Battle of Gettysburg” and the excitement of the approaching Civil War Centennial assisted them by raising public awareness for the need to protect the battleground. Patriotic fervor and concern for historic preservation further caused concerned citizens to form the Gettysburg Battlefield Preservation Association (GBPA) in September 1959. The GBPA was established to solicit public donations to purchase threatened areas, which would then be donated to the National Park Service. Major General U.S. Grant III and Robert E. Lee IV, the great-grandson of the Confederate general, served on the GBPA Advisory Board. Within three months of its establishment, the GBPA had reportedly received \$6,000 in donations. By March 1960, the GBPA reportedly raised over \$25,000 for land acquisition.⁴⁹

Park officials at Gettysburg were not the only ones struggling to preserve historic Civil War sites from encroaching developments. The preservation issues at Gettysburg did, however, attract most of the attention of the national media and interested Americans. Land acquisition issues at Antietam were equally as desperate. There one of the key management goals was to “purchase all the land within the area over which the battle was fought, necessary to the proper development and preservation of the historic scene.” Park Service officials estimated that to purchase “all the land within the area over which the battle was fought,” would require the

⁴⁹ “Form Group To Preserve Battlefield,” *Gettysburg Times*, 14 September 1959; “Distinguished Men Helping to Save Field,” *Gettysburg Times*, 11 January 1960; “Over \$6,000 Received By Group to Save Battlefield,” *Gettysburg Times*, 21 December 1959. Box 4, (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives; Superintendent James Myers, “Superintendent’s Monthly Narrative Report, March 1960,” written on April 14, 1960. Box 192, AF, RG 79, NARA College Park, 3. The GBPA opened their headquarters in the Weaver Building at the Lincoln Square.

acquisition of 1,300 acres. The federal government owned less than 200 acres at Antietam National Battlefield. Federal legislation, however, prevented the Secretary of Interior from purchasing historic tracts at Antietam, except with donated money. Susan Trail notes that this land acquisition program in the MISSION 66 prospectus was the first of its kind in the history of the park. Park officials desired historic tracts that included the farms of David R. Miller, Joseph Poffenberger, William Roulette, Samuel Mumma, and Henry Piper, as well as tracts of land in the East and West Woods. As at Gettysburg, Antietam officials urged immediate acquisition before the Civil War Centennial celebrations. “Time is running out,” declared Roy Appleman, Historian, NPS History Branch, in September 1956, “Land acquisition at Antietam should have the very highest priority among the Civil War Battlefield parks.”⁵⁰

The Civil War Centennial celebrations and the decade-long improvement program of MISSION 66 raised awareness of the deteriorating conditions of the nation’s Civil War parks. Park funding increased to a level not seen since President Roosevelt’s New Deal programs. MISSION 66 provided for a system-wide improvement program, which provided hundreds of national parks with monies for construction of new visitor centers, improvement of roadways, and the introduction of additional interpretative exhibits. Like Gettysburg, other Civil War parks, including Antietam, Vicksburg, Shiloh, Chickamauga/Chattanooga, benefited enormously from the increased funding. Yet, the Pennsylvania battlefield consistently received considerably more funding from MISSION 66. Established in 1890 Chickamauga and Chattanooga was not

⁵⁰ “MISSION 66 For Antietam National Battlefield Site and Cemetery,” no date, no author. Box 731, AF, RG 79, NARA College Park, 2; Susan W. Trail, “Remembering Antietam: Commemoration and Preservation of a Civil War Battlefield” (Ph.D. diss., University of Maryland, 2005), 375-376; “Mission 66 for Vicksburg National Military Park,” no author, no date. Box 735, RG 79, NARA College Park, 2-3. The situation at Vicksburg was somewhat better, though NPS officials often lamented the modernization of the area, and were especially concerned regarding the city’s expansion along the southern boundary of the park. Vicksburg’s population had grown to 35,000 by 1956, which resulted in an incursion of developments, construction of new roads, and increased traffic. The National Park Service declared, “infringement and overlapping of the city have adversely affected park values.”

only the first national military park but at 8,190 acres was also the largest. Yet that park only received \$462,500 through the decade long initiative. Vicksburg National Military Park meanwhile received slightly over one million dollars of MISSION 66 funding for park improvements, which included the construction of a modern tour road and expanded interpretation displays.⁵¹

As noted, MISSION 66 visitor centers were one of the hallmarks of this national improvement program, which would ultimately provide funding for construction of 114 visitor center facilities in the national park system. Antietam National Battlefield, thus also received funding to build a new visitor center. And like Gettysburg, Antietam officials debated and argued over the visitor center's most suitable location. Antietam's MISSION 66 prospectus expressed the need for a modern facility of "sufficient size" equipped with comfort facilities, exhibits, and interpretive displays to familiarize visitors to the battle. The center was to be "oriented locally so as to be able to tour the field in the chronological order of the battle." As with the selection of the Ziegler's Grove site at Gettysburg, close proximity to key battle action and visitor accessibility was a determining factor in the site's selection. Roy Appleman, a proponent of the Gettysburg's Ziegler's Grove site, argued that Antietam's visitor center should be located close to the New York and Maryland monument since it would be "near the center of

⁵¹ NPS Press Release, "MISSION 66 Program for Chickamauga and Chattanooga Military Park Announced," July 23, 1956. Folder 904, Box 80, AF, RG 79, NARA College Park; "Mission 66 For Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park," no date, no author. Box 80, AF, RG 79, NARA College Park, 5-7. As outlined in the report the \$462,500 included \$265,000 for roads and trail improvements, \$60,000 for buildings and utilities, and \$137,500 in miscellaneous expenditures. Planned construction at Chickamauga and Chattanooga included the improvement of the tour routes, additional parking areas at Chickamauga and at Point Park at Lookout Mountain, and improved visitor access to the battle action at Snodgrass Hill. Visitor facilities were deemed adequate, but park officials recommended improvements for the comfort station at the entrance to Point Park; "MISSION 66 for Vicksburg National Military Park," no author, no date. Box 735, AF, RG 79, NARA College Park, 5- 6. At Vicksburg, the MISSION 66 funding provided for the construction of a closed circuit one-way route, which offered visitors a comprehensive tour of the 1863 siege grounds.

the most important field of action” and conveniently located to the Hagerstown Road. As he had at Gettysburg, Director Conrad Wirth would make the decision; he chose the New York Monument location.⁵²

MISSION 66 thus offered unparalleled challenges and opportunities to improve the wider National Park system. At a time when modern developments and commercialization continually encroached upon the battlefields of Gettysburg, Vicksburg, Antietam, Chickamauga/Chattanooga, and Shiloh, the decade-long program provided needed funding to improve these parks, while at the same time provided for their preservation. Coupled with the Civil War Centennial, the 1956-1966 decade proved to be extremely significant in the history of Gettysburg National Military Park, and other Civil War sites.

While Director Conrad Wirth and various committees planned MISSION 66, others were initiating preparations for the Civil War Centennial. The Civil War Centennial was born in a period of heightened foreign and domestic conflict. Americans united to stop the spread of Communism abroad, while at home the nation remained divided on Civil Rights. Remembrance celebrations were held at various sites throughout the country, but the most elaborate celebration was planned for Gettysburg National Military Park, under the theme of “A Nation United.”

⁵² Wirth, *Parks, Politics, and the People*, 270; “Mission 66 For Antietam National Battlefield Site and Cemetery,” no date, no author. Box 731, AF, RG 79, NARA College Park, 2; Trail, “Remembering Antietam, 373-375. Trail’s “Remembering Antietam” explores the controversy between two proposed sites--- either near the New York and Maryland State Memorials or adjacent to the Antietam National Cemetery. Appleman opposed the alternative site adjacent to the cemetery because “the ground of action cannot be seen, and it is distant from the scene of that action.”

Chapter 6

“Dedicated to The Proposition That All Men Are Created Equal”:

The Civil War Centennial at Gettysburg, 1961-1965

In the hundred years since the surrender of Robert E. Lee’s Army of Northern Virginia to General U.S. Grant at Appomattox, the causes, meaning, sacrifice, and implications of the Civil War had been willfully constructed and distorted by generations of Americans. Quick to selectively forget the causes of the war or the sufferings on the battlefield, many Americans readily embraced a romanticized notion of the courage and valor of Civil War soldiers. Through difficult times Americans found comfort and inspiration in the deeds and valor of Union and Confederate soldiers. As the 100th anniversary of the Civil War approached, the nation and the world were again mired in international and national turmoil. The Cold War and a collective determination to destroy Communism dictated foreign and domestic politics. The threat of war, nuclear or conventional, loomed large. In October 1962 the nation stood on the brink of nuclear war with the Soviets during the Cuban Missile Crisis, and America steadily became more deeply involved in Vietnam. On the home front the nation recoiled from the assassination of President John F. Kennedy on November 22, 1963, battled over racial equality, and hysterically greeted the British music invasion. In this political and social background, America celebrated its Civil War Centennial.

Director Conrad Wirth’s MISSION 66 already had provided the foundation for the centennial celebrations. Over the decade-long initiative the National Parks received \$1,035,225,000 for operation and improvements. The Park Service was now prepared for the millions of visitors eager to celebrate the Civil War Centennial and the 50th anniversary of the

establishment of the National Park Service. Projected MISSION 66 development costs for Gettysburg National Military Park amounted to \$1,014,750 and with this funding the Park Service constructed a new visitor center, developed new interpretive exhibits, and improved the park's infrastructure in time for the battle's centennial celebrations.¹ Meanwhile, between 1961 and 1965 scores of centennial celebrations took place throughout the country, but none galvanized the nation more than those held at Gettysburg in July 1963. The Gettysburg battlefield became a focus of patriotic expression and once more the nation's attention turned to a small town in south-central Pennsylvania to celebrate America's "new birth of freedom."

MISSION 66's most visible achievement at Gettysburg was the construction and dedication of the park's new visitor-cyclorama center. While construction of the visitor center progressed, Superintendent Myers and his staff continued planning for the new facility's opening, which was expected in late 1961. The new visitor center brought much excitement, but also apprehension. Relatively few visitors, estimated at less than 5 percent of total park visitors, had taken the time to stop at the park's old visitor center located in the center of the town along Baltimore Street. But with the début of the new facility, combined with the Civil War Centennial, Myers anticipated that over 1.5 million visitors would come to Gettysburg in 1961, and estimated that 95 percent of those visitors would stop at the new visitor center. Such drastic changes in visitor services, as Myers noted, were "rather startling to contemplate." In order to

¹ Conrad L. Wirth, *Parks, Politics, and the People* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1980), 249-262; "MISSION 66: Gettysburg National Military Park." Box 733, Administrative Files, 1949-1971, RG 79, National Archives and Records Administration College Park, Maryland, 1-4 [hereinafter cited as Folder, Box, AF, RG 79, NARA College Park]. As discussed, this included \$665,050 for building and utilities expenses and \$349,700 in roads and trails.

effectively handle the expected dramatic increase in visitation, Myers recommended to the regional director that additional staff be hired.²

Yet the park staff, while understandably concerned about handling thousands of visitors in the new facility each day, was hesitant to allow non-NPS personnel to provide additional visitor services. In early 1961, a secretary from the Gettysburg Travel Council (GTC) contacted Superintendent Myers about the feasibility of establishing desk space in the visitor center lobby for a GTC member to distribute information on the local area. Myers denied the request. Months later, GTC President and owner of Fantasyland A. Kenneth Dick wrote Myers again requesting that the GTC be allotted desk space. Confident that the new facility would be an “immense attraction,” Dick maintained that the travel council could assist visitors in finding hotels, restaurants, and other community attractions. “This sort of service you are not equipped to handle,” wrote Dick, “and all these requests will only take up your time and still leave the visitor dissatisfied in these respects.” Myers argued that “on the surface” the GTC request did not “appear unreasonable,” but he argued that the travel council would ultimately be more of a hindrance than beneficial. Central to Myers’ opposition was a belief that park staff would not be able to prevent GTC representatives from handing out information about the battlefield, the visitor center, or the National Park Service. Moreover, since the GTC was comprised of representatives from local businesses, Myers believed that it would be impossible to prevent

² Appeal of Orndorff Construction,” decided on October 25, 1967. Folder 5, Box 8, Series II, (GETT 41097) Cyclorama Building Files, 1957-1967, Records of the National Park Service at Gettysburg National Military Park, Gettysburg National Military Park Archives, 12 [hereinafter cited as Series and (GETT 41097), GNMP Archives]; Board of Contract Appeals, Department of the Interior, May 29, 1963. Folder 7, Box 3, Series II, (GETT 41097); Addendum, 1959. Folder 1, Box 1, Series I, (GETT 41097), GNMP Archives; Superintendent James Myers to Joseph Campbell, Comptroller General, November 28, 1961. Folder 11, Box 4, Series I, (GETT 41097), GNMP Archives; Superintendent James Myers to Regional Director, July 24, 1961. Folder 4, Box 3, Series II, (GETT 41097), GNMP Archives. In this letter Myers wrote that he anticipated the visitor center to be completed on September 14 and open shortly thereafter. In this memorandum Myers recommended hiring two GS-07 Interpretative Rangers and a GS-09 Supervisory Ranger.

favoritism toward particular establishments. Acting Regional Director Hillory Tolson also voiced concern in allowing non-NPS personnel staffing in the new facility. Understanding that cooperation with the travel representative was critical to amicable relations between the park and the town, Myers and Tolson suggested that NPS staff distribute GTC brochures about local attractions, but they still denied the travel council's request to provide desk space.³

While the debate between the National Park Service and GTC continued, the construction of the visitor center soon evolved into a series of debacles, culminating in court cases between Orndorff Construction and the Federal government. In early 1961, Orndorff claimed that the project was forcing his company into "serious financial loss," estimated at \$150,000 due to the delay in placing the building's foundations in good weather. In a June 23, 1961 memo Myers reported to the regional director that he believed Orndorff Construction would "probably go in the red" because of project delays caused by weather and the ensuing overhead expenses.⁴

Myers further reported that the building's construction was plagued by poor craftsmanship and quality, which only served to further stymie the timeliness of its completion. Correspondence between Park Service offices, Orndorff Construction, and the architects detail a series of construction problems noted during construction. A "Finding of Fact" report from Myers, dated August 11, 1961, stated that a "wide crack" had developed near the viewing deck, one that caused several leaks in the second floor office. As problems mounted, the Park Service had little choice but to extend the completion date to January 10, 1962. National Park Service

³ A. Kenneth Dick to Superintendent James Myers, October 19, 1961; Superintendent James Myers to Regional Director, November 2, 1961. Folder 4, Box 3, Series II, (GETT 41097), GNMP Archives; Hillory Tolson to Senator Joseph Clark, February 5, 1962. Folder 5, Box 3, Series II, (GETT 41097), GNMP Archives. Kenneth Dick was also the business owner of Fantasyland.

⁴ Richard Neutra to John Cabot, February 22, 1961. Folder 1, Box 4, Series I, (GETT 41097), GNMP Archives; Superintendent James Myers to Regional Director, June 23, 1961. Folder 3, Box 4, Series I, (GETT 41097), GNMP Archives.

officials made the final inspection of Orndorff's work and formally accepted the visitor center on January 9, 1962. Myers, however, wrote Orndorff Construction three days later regarding several problems that still needed to be corrected before the NPS would dispense final payment. The Park Service now planned a soft opening for the general public in March with the grand opening scheduled for July 3, the anniversary of the battle's climactic Pickett's Charge.⁵

On March 12 over 1,000 people attended the visitor center's open house. Six days later after decades of planning and preparation the Gettysburg Visitor-Cyclorama Center opened to the public. Myers declared it "simply wonderful" and noted that park rangers received "many, many complimentary remarks" about the building's "architectural beauty." Fittingly, former president Dwight D. Eisenhower, signer of the MISSION 66 initiative, spent over an hour touring the new facility on June 8. During the first summer the new visitor center, visitation to the battlefield increased more than in previous years, which the park superintendent attributed to "extensive publicity" about the new visitor center. The superintendent reported 404,768 visitors to the battlefield in July 1962. Nearly 20 percent of the battlefield's visitors, almost 80,000, toured the new facility.⁶

⁵ Superintendent James Myers "Finding of Fact," August 11, 1961. Folder 3, Box 1, Series 1, (GETT 41097), GNMP Archives; "Appeal of Orndorff Construction," decided on October 25, 1967. Folder 5, Box 8, Series II, (GETT 41097), GNMP Archives, 7. Some of the delay also resulted from a slight change in the placement of the building's foundation. The excavation for the building was conducted by Maitland Brothers and during this work the pivot point of the building was moved from the point originally shown in the drawings. For a detailed explanation of the contractual reasoning for moving the building's pivot point see: David Smith to Superintendent James Myers, March 12, 1962. Folder 3, Box 2, Series II, (GETT 41097), GNMP Archives; Superintendent James Myers to Orndorff Construction, January 12, 1962. Folder 13, Box 4, Series I, (GETT 41097), GNMP Archives. In this letter Myers informed Orndorff that the federal government would withhold \$5,000 until the final corrections were made; Superintendent James Myers to Mrs. Dion Neutra, May 25, 1962. Folder 5, Box 3, Series II, (GETT 41097), GNMP Archives.

⁶ "Gettysburg Visitor Center Opening Set," *Hanover Evening Sun*, March 11, 1962. Box 5, Newspaper Clipping (Unbound), 1962-1963, (GETT 43663), Records of the National Park Service at Gettysburg National Military Park, Gettysburg National Military Park Archives [hereinafter cited as (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives]; Superintendent James Myers to Regional Director, March 20, 1962. Folder 4, Box 7, Park Main (Central) Files, 1954-1987, (GETT 41160), Records of the National Park Service at Gettysburg National Military Park, Gettysburg National Military Park Archives [hereinafter be cited as (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives]; Superintendent James Myers to Mrs. Dion Neutra, May 25, 1962. Folder 5, Box 3, Series II, (GETT 41097), GNMP Archives; Superintendent James Myers,

The visitor center offered many new interpretive experiences. A sixteen-minute introductory slide program ran in the auditorium. The museum featured thirty new exhibits on the Battle of Gettysburg and the Civil War, as well as four dioramas depicting scenes from the battle. Superintendent Myers approvingly spoke of the museum exhibits, writing that, “This center is the kind of feature that is ideal for a park. There people with only a casual interest in the battlefield can go away feeling rewarded, and those curious to learn about their ancestors’ units on the field can gain intimate knowledge.”⁷

The Gettysburg Cyclorama, after years of improper display in a poorly ventilated and heated building, was hung in the new facility in May 1962. On July 1, the restored painting was unveiled for a special showing for forty two governors attending the annual Governor’s Conference in nearby Hershey. During the next two days, the public was invited to view the painting free of charge. Visitors could now immerse themselves in the historic painting, as a light and sound show explained the fighting on July 3 and highlighted specific historic battle participants and places on the canvas. Following the battle anniversary, the NPS charged visitors fifty cents to view the painting; by the end of the month 22,251 admissions were counted. Meanwhile, the demolition crews took down the old cyclorama building on East Cemetery Hill. The Park Service did not own this land, and eventually the Gettysburg Travel Council constructed a visitor parking lot on the site of the old cyclorama building.⁸

“Superintendent’s Monthly Narrative Report, June 1962,” written on July 12, 1962. Box 192, AF, RG 79, NARA College Park, 1; Superintendent James Myers, “Superintendent’s Monthly Narrative Report, July 1962,” written on August 15, 1962. Box 192, AF, RG 79, NARA College Park, 1. Myers reported 294,997 visitors in July 1961. Though the visitor center’s 80,000 people seems small when comparison to the nearly 404,800 battlefield visitors, receiving 80,000 in the park’s information center was a significant amount given how few people stopped in the post office building along Baltimore Pike.

⁷ “Gettysburg Visitor Center Opening Set,” *Hanover Evening Sun*, 11 March 1962; John Stepp, “A New Look for Gettysburg,” *Star Magazine*, February 11, 1962. Box 5, (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives.

⁸ Sarah Allaback, “Mission 66 Visitor Centers: The History of a Building Type,” (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Park Historic Structures & Cultural Landscape Program, 2000).

While the dream of a state-of-the-art visitor center was now realized, problems with the building continued to plague the Park Service. In May Myers reported that more cracks had developed in the terrazzo stairway treads as well as in the building walls, which in turn created several leaks in the roof. Another “substantial crack” had developed along the wall near the office wing Myers requested that Orndorff Construction make immediate repairs before more leaks developed. Less than three weeks later, Myers again wrote Orndorff to inform them that three additional leaks had developed. Unable to have the issues satisfactorily resolved, Myers contacted the Federal Insurance Company, the bondsman for Orndorff Construction in July. Noting that Orndorff Construction’s contract provided for a one-year guarantee on its work, Myers reported that the construction company “has made no move, in spite of our urgings, to repair these leaks nor have they replied to our letter.”⁹

Myers had reason to complain. Not until five months after the opening of the visitor center did Orndorff Construction send a subcontractor to repair the leaks in the roof. The Park Service remained unsatisfied. The roof continued to leak. In October 1962 Myers forcefully imposed a twenty-day deadline on Orndorff to correct “various deficiencies” in the building. Orndorff Construction, however, maintained that the company was not accountable for the leaking roof. “Alleged deficiencies referred to,” Orndorff responded, “are a consequence of design of these features and, therefore, the responsibility of the agency and not this company. Your letter demands a performance which the Government is not entitled to.” On November 2,

This document is available through NPS online books at: www.nps.gov/history/history/online_books/allaback. Since this is an on-line publication, there are no page numbers, only chapter divisions; Superintendent James Myers to Mrs. Dion Neutra, August 22, 1962. Folder 6, Box 3, Series II, (GETT 41097), GNMP Archives; Superintendent James Myers, “Superintendent’s Monthly Report, July 1962,” written on August 15, 1962; Superintendent James Myers, “Superintendent’s Monthly Narrative Report, January 1963,” written on February 14, 1963. Box 192, AF, RG 79, NARA College Park, 4.

⁹ Superintendent James Myers to Federal Insurance Company, July 16, 1962. Folder 4, Box 2, Series II, (GETT 41097), GNMP Archives.

1962 Park Service officials met with Orndorff in hopes of resolving the issue. Orndorff continued to maintain that the issue was poor design, not improper construction, but he finally did agree to make the necessary repairs to the roof.¹⁰

Meanwhile, other problems forced Myers to again delay the dedication. The date for the Gettysburg Visitor-Cyclorama Center originally had been planned for July 3, 1962, but landscaping delays forced park officials to postpone. Finally, they set November 19, 1962, the 99th anniversary of the Gettysburg Address, as a “most appropriate time” to dedicate the Gettysburg Visitor-Cyclorama Center.¹¹ November 19 also would offer a fitting capstone to Neutra’s vision as a memorial to President Lincoln and to the nation’s increasing interest in the sixteenth president.

When the day came, Superintendent Myers offered the welcoming remarks and Regional Director Ronald Lee served as the Master of Ceremonies. Director Conrad Wirth, the architect

¹⁰ Superintendent James Myers to Orndorff, August 14, 1962. Folder 4, Box 2, Series II, (GETT 41097), GNMP Archives; Superintendent James Myers to Orndorff, October 9, 1962; Orndorff to Superintendent James Myers, October 23, 1962. Folder 4, Box 2, Series II, (GETT 41097), GNMP Archives; Superintendent James Myers to Regional Director, November 6, 1962; Superintendent James Myers to Orndorff, November 9, 1962. Folder 4, Box 2, Series II, (GETT 41097), GNMP Archives; Superintendent Myers to Joseph Campbell, Comptroller General, November 28, 1961. Folder 11, Box 4, Series I, (GETT 41097), GNMP Archives; Richard Neutra to Donald Nutt, June 30, 1961. Folder 6, Box 4, Series I, (GETT 41097), GNMP Archives; Board of Contract Appeals, Appeal of Orndorff Construction Company, October 25, 1967. Folder 5, Box 8, Series II, (GETT 41097), GNMP Archives; Christian V. Graf, Attorney at Law, to Thomas Whitecraft, Assistant to the Regional Director, August 3, 1964. Folder 5, Box 8, Series II, (GETT 41097), GNMP Archives; Board of Contract Appeals, Appeal of Orndorff Construction Company, October 25, 1967. Folder 5, Box 8, Series II, (GETT 41097), GNMP Archives, 87. On August 15, 1960 Myers received a letter from Orndorff Construction stating that an error was made in calculating the total square feet of ribbed wall for the building. Instead of a \$687,349 bid, Orndorff believed the construction job would now cost \$701,353. Even with the readjusted bid of \$701,353, Orndorff Construction remained the lowest bidder. Orndorff’s bid was \$34,367 less than the second lowest bidder; Moreover, Orndorff claimed that construction was unnecessarily delayed because Longstreth had to consult with Neutra, who often remained in California, before making any field decisions. The National Park Service and Richard Neutra denied this claim, arguing that just because the architect remained on the West Coast, field decisions “were no more delayed than for a typically local job.” Consequently, in June 1961, a year before the building opened, the company had filed suit for twenty two claims against the National Park Service for additional compensation, totaling \$165,735.22. The issue remained unresolved until October 1967 when the Board of Contract appeals finally dismissed Orndorff’s claims. The National Park Service was not to be held liable for any construction errors incurred during the construction of the visitor center.

¹¹ Superintendent James Myers to Mrs. Dion Neutra, May 25, 1962. Folder 5, Box 3, Series II, (GETT 41097), GNMP Archives.

of the MISSION 66 initiative, gave the keynote speech before 350 invited guests and a crowd estimated at 30,000. Wirth proclaimed November 19, 1962 as a “great day in the history of the Gettysburg National Military Park and of the City of Gettysburg.” Not merely dedicating a new visitor center and museum, Wirth declared the building to be “fully worthy” as standing as “headquarters for one of America’s greatest historic places.”¹²

The opening of the visitor center presented the National Park Service with a golden opportunity to finally gain control over the Licensed Battlefield Guides. As discussed in previous chapter, relations between the Park Service and the guides had been volatile since 1933 as the parties often sparred over professional conduct of the guides. The operation of a central facility, however, gave the National Park Service the ability to strengthen its management of the guides by keeping a closer watch on their behavior and professionalism. In February 1961, NPS Director Wirth stipulated that guides were no longer permitted to operate from the Lincoln square, or from their stations north of town along Route 15 or on East Cemetery Hill. The director, however, allowed the guides to continue soliciting tours from the guide stations along Route 30 west and Route 15 south. He mandated that their main station of operation would be in the park’s new visitor center, creating a “guide room” adjacent to the NPS information desk. Inserting the guide service into the park’s visitor center allowed the NPS staff to keep a diligent watch on the guides’ behavior and conduct.¹³

¹² Superintendent James Myers, “November 1962 Monthly,” written on December 13, 1962. Box 192, AF, RG 79, NARA College Park, 1-2.

¹³ Harlan D. Unrau, *Administrative History: Gettysburg National Military Park and Gettysburg National Cemetery* (Denver: Branch of Publications and Graphic Design, Denver Service Center, 1991), 286-287. The new visitor center included a lounge for the guides to arrange tours for interested visitors. At this time, in November 1963, the park service also developed a new examination, complete with 200 questions, for prospective guides.

MISSION 66 also had made funds available to expand the park's interpretative field exhibits. During the centennial anniversary, the park began experimenting with audio-visual exhibits to complement the traditional exhibits, complete with a short narration, a historic map and photos. Gettysburg's staff installed the first audio station near Meade's Headquarters on May 12, 1964. A year later audio-visual stations went up at Little Round Top, the Virginia Memorial, and Oak Ridge. All of these exhibits consisted of a wayside marker with a historic map, photographs, a textual summary, and push-button narration of the site's battle action. The audio-visual station at the Virginia Memorial, for example, provided a short narration of the Confederate infantry assault on July 3.¹⁴

Finally, the National Park Service, at the urging of the Pennsylvania Centennial Commission, began to explore the possibility of a sound and light program that would be shown on the battlefield. Termed a Lumadrama, the program would consist of various colored lights projecting off the battlefield terrain while a sound narration dramatized the three-day battle. Reasonably popular in Europe at the time, Lumadramas had not yet been developed in the United States, although Independence Hall was in the process of approving the nation's first Lumadrama program, "The American Bell: The Story of the Liberty Bell and Independence Hall." In early 1961 several Park Service officials met at Gettysburg to explore the proposal. To familiarize park officials with the light and sound shows, architect Donald Nutt assembled a series of slides from European programs. Park officials were impressed and agreed that a similar program

¹⁴ Superintendent Kittridge Wing, "Superintendent's Monthly Narrative Report, May 1964," written on June 15, 1964. Box 192, AF, RG 79, NARA College Park, 2; Individual Building Data File, Building Reports, HWM Tour Files. Folder 1, Box 23, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives.

would be beneficial at Gettysburg. They even suggested the Lumadrama be displayed near the Codori farm fields.¹⁵

From both a management and economic perspective, the sound and light show seemed to be a preferable alternative to the sort of circus-like centennial reenactment that had just occurred at Manassas, as discussed below. Myers approvingly reported that “a sound and light program, if properly produced and presented, would be preferable to a reenactment that would be all over at the close of day on which it was presented.” He continued, “If successful, the sound and light program might be considered as continuing long after 1963, and even after the centennial years are over.” Many of Gettysburg’s business owners favored a reenactment because of the income a multi-day event would generate for the local businesses. Myers disagreed and informed business owners that the light sound show “would do the commercial interests of this community far more good than a one-day reenactment.”¹⁶

In mid-August 1961, Gerard Simon, the executive director of the Sound and Light Corporation of America visited Gettysburg National Military Park and met with Myers to discuss a Lumadrama for the battlefield. He promised that “through technological magic of automation, all the courage, color, and high drama of the battle of Gettysburg can be virtually re-created over and over again for an endless stream of audiences.” In May 1962 Simon submitted a proposal for the light and sound show. Simon believed, however, that Little Round Top, not the Codori farm, offered the best location, because it provided a panoramic view of the battlefield.

Logistically, Simon proposed that “to convey all the drama and meaning of the climactic three-

¹⁵ Independence Hall Lumadrama Brochure. Undated. Folder K1815, Box 13, General Correspondence, 1952-1966, RG 79, Historic Shrines, Sites, Monuments, and Parks, Northeast Regional Office, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania [hereinafter cited as Folder, Box, GC, RG 79, NARA Philadelphia]. This program opened in 1962; Superintendent James Myers to Regional Director, February 17, 1961. Box 1497, AF, RG 79, NARA College Park.

¹⁶ Superintendent James Myers to Regional Director, February 17, 1961. Box 1497, AF, RG 79, NARA College Park.

day battle of Gettysburg at Little Round Top site” the company needed to erect a “lighting installation with a front of approximately 2,500 feet and a depth of about 1,000 feet.” Surround sound would be simulated through the construction of sound columns--six on Little Round Top, two in Plum Run Valley, three on Big Round Top and Devil’s Den, and three near Crawford Avenue. Aware of the potential damage fourteen sound columns and a mammoth lighting installation might cause on the battlefield, Simon assured the Park Service that “we would hope that the bulk of equipment can be installed on a permanent basis without making any objectionable intrusion on the site.”¹⁷

Simon also proposed the Lumadrama be held each evening from May 15 through September 15. He estimated 3,000 spectators daily. Interested visitors would park along the Wheatfield Road, pay the \$1.50 admission charge, and ride a shuttle to the viewing area at Little Round Top. The proposal did not call for the construction of grandstands or bleachers, so visitors would sit on the battle grounds to watch. The show would begin promptly at 8:45 P.M. The hour-long program would commence with a summary of the causes of the war, a discussion of the Confederate invasion into Pennsylvania, and the heart of the narration would recount the battle with Generals Lee and Meade “featured as the star antagonists.” The program’s climax would dramatize Pickett’s Charge with the “jubilation and the despair as the attack fails.” The light and sound show would then conclude with a “dramatic statement” on the meaning of the battle, the casualty results, and President Lincoln’s Gettysburg Address. “Certainly there is no site in America, with the possible exception of Independence Hall, so full of significance to the Nation,” he concluded. Simon ultimately estimated the projected costs for the program at

¹⁷ Superintendent James Myers, “Superintendent’s Monthly Report, August 1961,” written on September 14, 1961. Box 192, AF, RG 79, NARA College Park, 2; Proposal, Sound and Light Corporation of America, undated. Box 49, AF, RG 79, NARA College Park; Gerard Simon to Ronald Lee, May 19, 1962. Folder K1815, Box 13, GC, RG 79, NARA Philadelphia.

\$435,000, and suggested the Park Service enter into a five-year contract agreement to cover the company's start up costs and financial returns.¹⁸

The novelty of the Lumadramas in America, and not the intrusion of the program on the battlefield's historic terrain, finally caused the National Park Service to reject the proposal. As Director Wirth explained, "This type of program is too new and untried in the United States, in the unusual conditions of a Civil War battlefield and in the spotlight of national attention that is being focused on observances to commemorate the Civil War." Wirth added that the Park Service might reconsider their proposal once other historic sites adopted similar programs. Though the Park Service rejected the Lumadrama proposal, it was still hoped that evening and "modest" campfire programs at the newly constructed amphitheater would offer visitors a new interpretive experience appropriate to the Civil War Centennial.¹⁹

Observing the pageantry of the Civil War Centennial in April 1962, distinguished historian John Hope Franklin declared, "One searches in vain for an event in our history that has been commemorated with the same intense and elaborate preparation that characterizes the Civil War Centennial."²⁰ Though the centennial was celebrated across the nation, none of the events compared to the glamorous event planned for Gettysburg in 1963. Elaborately prepared since April 1956, the centennial celebrations would culminate on the Pennsylvania battlefield.

¹⁸ Gerard Simon to Ronald Lee, May 19, 1962; Edward Hambleton to Ronald Lee, August 28, 1962; Gerard Simon to Ronald Lee, May 19, 1962. Folder K1815, Box 13, GC, RG 79, NARA Philadelphia.

¹⁹ Conrad Wirth to Henry Scharf, December 12, 1961; Ronald Lee to Lumadrama, undated. Folder K1815, Box 13, GC, RG 79, NARA Philadelphia.

²⁰ John Hope Franklin, "A Century of Civil War Observance," *Journal of Negro History*, vol. 47, (April 1962), 103.

For all the planning, activities, and media attention it received beginning in the late 1950s until its conclusion in 1965, the Civil War Centennial has received surprisingly little attention from scholars. Indeed, historian Robert Cook authored the only book to date on the centennial as a whole. He places the centennial celebrations into the larger, more turbulent events of the 1960s: heightened Cold War tensions, the election of President John F. Kennedy, the Cuban Missile Crisis, and the nation's volatile race relations. Cook provides a detailed examination of the origins of the commemoration, racial undercurrents, and the divisiveness of the memory of the Civil War. He also explores issues of civil rights within the celebrations of the Civil War.²¹

Richard Fried examined patriotic displays within the larger perspective of anti-Communist fervor and the Cold War. Examining an array of historical pageants within the background of the Cold War, he argues the Civil War Centennial was the “culmination,” or perhaps even the “last gasp” of the Cold War era celebrations. Like Cook, Fried finds the centennial celebrations to be divisive. “No earlier observance,” Fried states, “triggered so many resonances within the nation’s global role or became so embroiled in politics, media and popular culture.”²²

²¹ Robert Cook, *Troubled Commemoration: The American Civil War Centennial, 1961-1965* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2007); Robert Cook “(Un)Furl That Banner: The Response of White Southerners to the Civil War Centennial of 1961-1965,” *Journal of Southern History*, vol. 68, (Nov. 2002), 879-912; Robert Cook, “Unfinished Business: African Americans and the Civil War Centennial,” in *Legacy of Disunion: The Enduring Significance of the American Civil War*, edited by Susan-Mary Grant and Peter J. Parish (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2003). In an essay “(Un) Furl That Banner: The Response of White Southerners to the Civil War Centennial of 1961-1965” published in November 2002 in *The Journal of Southern History*, Cook explores the role of race and racism in the planning and celebration of the centennial. Tapping into an unexplored and certainly controversial topic, nearly fifty years after the centennial, Cook authored *Troubled Commemoration*. Scholarship on the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s is voluminous and includes works on Martin Luther King, SCLC, SNCC, CORE, and white opposition. The most thorough summary of the Civil Rights Movement can be found in Taylor Branch, *Parting The Waters: America in the King Years, 1954-1963* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1988) and Taylor Branch, *Pillar of Fire: America in the King Years, 1963-1965* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1998).

²² Richard M. Fried, *The Russians Are Coming! The Russians Are Coming! Pageantry and Patriotism in Cold-War America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 122.

The roots of the centennial were to be found in the popularization of the Civil War during the mid-20th Century. At Gettysburg, the last grand reunion of Civil War veterans occurred in July 1938, and by the middle of the century only a handful of the war's veterans remained. As tangible connections to the nation's bloodiest war disappeared, Americans sought to reconfigure a shared, and often romanticized, memory of the conflict. The result was what Edward Linenthal termed a "Civil War subculture." In part this "subculture" developed in the proliferation of Civil War Round Tables. Chicago developed the first round table in 1940. The establishment of the North-South Skirmish Association followed in 1950. On the literary front, historian and author Bruce Catton did more than any other individual to reinforce the "Civil War subculture." A Michigan native and founder and editor of *American Heritage*, Catton's prolific prose and readable narratives entertained and educated millions of Americans. In 1954 Catton he won the Pulitzer Prize for *A Stillness at Appomattox*, the final installment of his Army of the Potomac trilogy. Capitalizing on Americans' insatiable appetite for anything Civil War, he authored another trilogy on the war that included *The Coming Fury* (1961), *Terrible Swift Sword* (1963), and *Never Call Retreat* (1965). Beginning in 1955, other contemporary professional Civil War historians, including Bell Wiley and Allan Nevins, would engage in academic debates in the newly inaugurated journal, *Civil War History*. In 1961 Robert Penn Warren, the famed American poet, novelist, and historian, offered *The Legacy of the Civil War: Meditations on the Centennial*.²³

²³ Edward Tabor Linenthal, *Sacred Ground: Americans and Their Battlefields* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1991), 10; Cook, *Troubled Commemoration*, 19; Robert Penn Warren, *The Legacy of the Civil War: Meditations on the Centennial* (New York: Random House, 1961). Born in Kentucky in 1905, Warren attended Vanderbilt University where he became involved with the Southern Agrarians. Warren, along with eleven other southern writers, authored the southern, agrarian manifesto *I'll Take My Stand* (1930). Catton's trilogy included: *Mr. Lincoln's Army* (1951), *Glory Road* (1952), and *A Stillness at Appomattox* published in 1953.

The popularity of the “Civil War subculture” thus created an amicable atmosphere for the celebration of the Civil War Centennial. Civil War enthusiasts and historians became the driving forces behind the creation of a centennial commission. Just as President Eisenhower warmly received Director Wirth’s proposal for MISSION 66, he was equally receptive to celebrating the centennial. In the summer of 1957, Congress passed bipartisan legislation establishing the Civil War Centennial Commission (CWCC). President Eisenhower signed the bill in September. This newly approved federal commission comprised twenty-five members appointed by the president in December 1958. Officially the CWCC was an agency within the National Park Service whose purpose was to plan and coordinate events with the NPS, interested organizations, and state commissions for the celebration of the Civil War.²⁴

NPS Director Conrad Wirth facilitated CWCC’s first meeting. In electing a chairman, the commission unanimously approved Major General U.S. Grant III, grandson of the Union’s most determined and successful commander. Aside from being the descendent of the commander who accepted General Robert E. Lee’s surrender at Appomattox in April 1865, Grant had proven himself worthy of the family name. Like his grandfather, he was a graduate of the United States Military Academy. He saw extensive combat in Cuba, the Philippine -America War, World War I, and World War II. Although Grant was a high-profile appointee, Cook nonetheless argues that his selection in one respect was a “poor one...because his inflexible right-wing views rendered him incapable of presiding over a genuinely inclusive national pageant at a time when the country was undergoing rapid social change.” The commission also appointed Karl Betts as executive director. Betts, a Kansas native and World War I veteran, had

²⁴ Cook, “(Un)Furl That Banner,” 882-883; Cook, *Troubled Commemoration*, 31; Cook, “Unfinished Business,” 51. President Eisenhower announced the members from his home in Gettysburg. It is worth noting that the twenty-five member commission was comprised entirely of white men. Most of the members were from northern states. For a complete listing of the twenty-five members see Cook’s *Troubled Commemoration*, 31.

served as chairman of the Civil War Round Table of the District of Columbia and was the driving force behind making the centennial. From his position as chairman of the DC Round Table, Betts repeatedly encouraged the federal government to take charge of the centennial commemorations.²⁵

Thus, by the spring of 1958, the Civil War Centennial Commission existed under the leadership of Grant and Betts. Yet work remained to be done on a more grassroots level. Grant and Betts worked with state and local communities as well as patriotic organizations to garner support for the centennial celebrations. By March 1959 twenty-three states had established Civil War Centennial Commissions. And by May 1961, a total of forty-four states had done so. Yet news of the proposed activities was received differently in the various states and regions. Cook concludes that the centennial celebration was well received in states that had been affected directly by the war. Virginia, for example, made preparations with alacrity, believing that the centennial would increase tourism and revenue to the state. In the spring of 1962 John Hope Franklin observed the South's enthusiasm for the centennial writing, "In some southern states whose systems of education are among the shabbiest in the country, incredibly large amounts of money have been appropriated to observe the centennial." On the other hand, other southern states, primarily Texas, were reluctant to embrace centennial activities, speculating that the centennial was merely an excuse to celebrate Federal victory.²⁶

²⁵ Cook, *Troubled Commemoration*, 33-36. For additional reading on Karl Betts see: Victor Gondos, Jr., "Karl Betts and the Civil War Centennial Commission," *Military Affairs* (27) 1963: 51-57.

²⁶ "Re-enactment of 8 Civil War Battles Planned for Centennial Celebration," *Gettysburg Times*, 18 March 1959; Franklin, "A Century of Civil War Observance," 97-107; Cook, *Troubled Commemoration*, 44-45; Cook, "(Un)Furl That Banner," 884-885. At this time fourteen states reported their intentions of forming similar state commissions. In March 1959 the Civil War Centennial Commission announced the re-enactment of eight Civil War engagements. As announced the eight re-enactments included Vicksburg, Burnside's Bridge at Antietam, Manassas, Philippi (West Virginia), Fort Sumter, Merrimac-Monitor, Antietam, and Gettysburg.

In February 1961 the South initiated centennial events by hosting “The Man and the Hour” pageant in Montgomery, Alabama. The weeklong pageant commemorated Montgomery’s role as the first capital of the Confederate States of America and the inauguration of Jefferson Davis as president. An estimated 50,000 southerners participated in the events, complete with costume balls and regales. During the week school teachers dressed in period clothing taught their students about the Civil War. On February 17 the event culminated with the recreation of the inauguration of Jefferson Davis, portrayed by a local attorney.²⁷⁻

At the same time, the CWCC was planning its first annual meeting to be held in Charleston, South Carolina in April 1961. In early February, the New Jersey Civil War Centennial Commission expressed concern to the national organization that one of its members, Madeline Williams, an African American, would probably not be well received in the Jim Crow South. As expected, the conference hotel refused to accommodate Williams. Northern state commissions boycotted the national convention and criticized the executive board for its ambivalent stance on racial issues. Eager not to lose southern support for the centennial activities, and unwilling to take a stand against Jim Crow laws, the CWCC transferred its national meeting to a naval base in Charleston. In the wake of the racial crisis in South Carolina, and the controversy that followed, Betts and Grant resigned from the executive board. Two historians, Allan Nevins and James I. Robertson, replaced them.²⁸

Preparation for the centennial celebrations in Pennsylvania had actually predated the establishment of the CWCC. On April 20, 1956, the Pennsylvania General Assembly created “The One Hundredth Anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg and Lincoln’s Gettysburg Address

²⁷ Cook, *Troubled Commemoration*, 80-85.

²⁸ For a more detailed discussion of the Charleston crisis see: Cook, *Troubled Commemoration*, 88-119 and Cooke “(Un)Furl That Banner” in *The Journal of Southern History*, 879-912; Susan W. Trail, “Remembering Antietam: Commemoration and Preservation of a Civil War Battlefield” (Ph.D. diss., University of Maryland, 2005), 394.

Commission.” The legislation created a nine-member commission and charged it with the “proper and fitting recognition and observance” of the centennial celebration of the nation’s two defining events. Acting independently from the national CWCC, Pennsylvania’s commission, in cooperation with the National Park Service and other local agencies, remained responsible for the celebratory events at Gettysburg. On April 22, 1961, Gettysburg and Adams County kicked off the centennial by re-enacting the “Departure of the Independent Blues.” Over four hundred men participated in the event commemorating the first men from Adams County to volunteer.²⁹

In anticipation of Gettysburg’s centennial, media attention precipitously increased in regard to the Battle of Gettysburg and President Lincoln’s remarks at the dedication of the Soldiers’ National Cemetery. During the winter of 1961 CBS television and the *New York Times* visited Gettysburg to film in the park for a special television show, “Carl Sandburg at Gettysburg,” scheduled to appear on April 13, 1961. Park Historian Harry Pfanz accompanied the film crew to offer historical advice. Not to be outdone, on April 1, 1961, NBC aired “The Gettysburg Address Story.” In addition to special television programming, the Gettysburg National Military Park turned up in many national magazines during the centennial years. The 1962 MISSION 66 calendar featured a color photograph of the battlefield. *National Geographic*, *Life*, *Trailways*, and *Ford Times* ran articles complete with color photographs on touring the Gettysburg battlefield. Just months before the start of the centennial, on March 31, 1963, President John Kennedy, accompanied by his wife Jackie and daughter Caroline, visited the battlefield. President Kennedy arrived driving a Mercury convertible and secured the services of J. Melchoir Sheads, a Licensed Battlefield Guide and former park historian. Sheads guided the

²⁹ Official Program, “A Nation United on the 100th Anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg, July 1-3, 1963.” Folder 6, Box 8, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives, 2; Superintendent James Myers, “Superintendent’s Monthly Report, April 1961,” written on May 12, 1961. Box 192, AF, RG 79, NARA College Park, 2. The Independent Blues were organized into Company E of the 2nd Pennsylvania Regiment.

presidential party over the battlefield for an hour and a half, stopping at the Eternal Light Peace Memorial, Little Round Top, the North Carolina and Virginia Memorials, the Angle, and the 20th Massachusetts marker.³⁰

The media attention continued to raise issues on how best to preserve the Gettysburg battlefield. The Cold War had created a belief that preserving historic sites would in turn strengthen American patriotism. Anyone who advocated developments that threatened historic terrain, for example, were considered non-patriotic. In this heightened era of patriotism, the Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States (MOLLUS) and the Gettysburg Battlefield Preservation Association (GBPA) purchased endangered tracts and then donated them to the federal government. Between 1960 and 1961, MOLLUS purchased several key properties including the Shields property, owned by Glenn and Margaret Shields, for twelve thousand dollars. Nearly twelve acres, the Shields property sat on the field of the first day's fighting, west of the town along Buford and Reynolds Avenues. The Order also purchased the Olyer tract on Reynolds Avenue. Legion members formally presented both tracts to the federal government during the centennial celebrations. The first private/public partnership at Gettysburg, the GBPA, established in 1959, meanwhile raised thousands of dollars to purchase threatened lands to donate to the federal government. In the spring of 1962, the GBPA donated fifty-five acres of the historic Wolf farm, located near Devil's Den.³¹

³⁰ Superintendent James Myers, "Superintendent's Monthly Report, March 1961," written on April 14, 1961, 2-3; Superintendent James Myers, "Superintendent's Monthly Report, April 1961," written on May 12, 1961. Box 192, AF, RG 79, NARA College Park, 1; Superintendent Kittridge Wing, "Superintendent's Monthly Narrative Report, March, 1963," written on April 17, 1963. Box 192, AF, RG 79, NARA College Park, 2; "President And Family Visit 'Field Sunday,'" *Gettysburg Times*, 1 April 1963, Box 5, (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives. The presidential party had made prior arrangements for Sheads to be their tour guide.

³¹ Superintendent James Myers, "Superintendent's Monthly Narrative Report, March 1960," written on April 14, 1960. Box 192, AF, RG 79, NARA College Park, 2-3; "Loyal Legion Plans 12-Acre Gift to Park," *Gettysburg Times*, 27 October 1960. Folder K3827, Box 24, GC, RG 79, NARA Philadelphia; Superintendent James Myers, "Superintendent's Monthly Report, September 1961," written on October 13, 1961. Box 192, AF, RG 79, NARA

In November 1961, in preparation for the increased visitation and media attention, park historian Pfanz proposed an extensive landscape program to the park superintendent. While managing the lands within its boundary, the Park Service continued to struggle with effective control of non-historic woods. Since many acres of the battlefield were no longer actively grazed or farmed, thickets and brush overran historic view sheds. Pfanz recommended cutting along the newly developed High Water Mark Walking Trail. He also suggested historic vistas be opened at key stops along the auto tour route. Other areas in need of cutting included the Eternal Light Peace Memorial area, Little Round Top, Devil's Den, the Wheatfield, the Peach Orchard, the Rose Farm, and Spangler's Spring. Once the non-historic growth was removed, Pfanz recommended sustainable actions, such as spraying, mowing and farming, to control future vegetation growth.³²

While the media continued to draw attention to Gettysburg in anticipation of the July 1963 celebrations, and preservation organizations purchased threatened lands, the first large-scale centennial reenactment occurred at Manassas National Battlefield Park in Virginia. In 1960, Virginia's Civil War aficionados had formed the First Manassas Corporation, a nonprofit association, to organize and coordinate the reenactment. Though the Park Service was not initially involved in its establishment, Francis Wilshin, park superintendent, served as its

College Park, 4; "Will Present Land to U.S.," *Gettysburg Times*, 16 May 1962. Box 4, (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives.

³² Harry Pfanz to Superintendent James Myers, November 21, 1961. Folder 9, Box 37, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives. To determine which lots were non-historic the park staff relied on the Historic Base Map, which was based on the Warren Map of 1868. In this memo Pfanz also suggested areas for eventual cutting, including lots around the Forney Farm, the Bushman Farm, the Slyder Farm, areas along South Hancock Avenue and Sedgwick Avenue.

director. In May 1961, the National Park Service entered into a cooperative agreement with First Manassas Corporation to produce the reenactment. The corporation was responsible for providing all facilities and visitor services, while the Park Service agreed to allow the reenactment to occur on park property. Entrance fees to view the centennial's first reenactment were \$4.00 for grandstand seating or \$2.50 to rent a folding chair. Over the weekend of July 21 approximately two thousand re-enactors participated in the ninety-minute event, executing artillery barrages and infantry assaults, and hand-to-hand combat. Not to be distracted by anachronisms, the Stonewall Jackson statue upon Henry Hill was camouflaged. Confederate re-enactors, many clad in gray clothes from Sears and Roebuck, portrayed the 33rd Virginia Infantry assaulting a Federal artillery position at Henry Hill, just as the Virginians had successfully done one hundred years earlier. The mostly southern crowd stood and applauded as the Yankee troops fell back. The reenactment proved to be overwhelmingly popular, with nearly 100,000 visitors attending the event.³³

Manassas set the standard for subsequent Civil War celebrations. While the reenactment provided spectators with a chance to visualize a Civil War engagement, some newspaper reporters were not as complimentary. Some criticized it as a “sham” or “farce.” Others believed the event was too commercialized, creating a “Coney Island” atmosphere. The *Gettysburg Times* declared the Manassas reenactment a “strange spectacle” that mocked the sacrifices of the Civil War soldiers in an atmosphere befitting of a “Roman circus.” The *Times* further encouraged the CWCC to abandon future plans for similar events. Looking toward the events of July 1963, it

³³ Joan Zenzen, *Battling for Manassas: The Fifty-Year Preservation Struggle at Manassas National Battlefield Park* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1998), 65-71; McCandlish Phillips, “Two Sides Leave Fierled At Bull Run,” *New York Times*, 24 July 1961, 8; “Manassas Gun Boom Again As Colorful Show Begins,” *Gettysburg Times*, 21 July 1961; “Civil War Battle Reenacted,” *Gettysburg Times*, 25 July 1961. Box 4, (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives; McCandlish Phillips, “Confederates Carry Day Again at Bull Run,” *New York Times*, 23 July 1961, 1.

declared, “There can be no such excuse for desecration of Gettysburg and other Civil War battlefields. Future commemorative events should be conducted with dignity and in a spirit befitting to the occasion.” The National Park Service voiced similar concerns in the aftermath of Manassas. Over 2,000 re-enactors, 100,000 spectators, and hundreds of cannon and wagons had trampled over the battlefield, causing considerable damage to the war’s first major battlefield. As a preservationist agency, the Park Service’s role in the reenactment seemed misplaced. Out of concern for preservation of the historic resource, Director Conrad Wirth banned future reenactments on Park Service property.³⁴

Yet that ban was not ironclad. Antietam National Battlefield opened its own MISSION 66 visitor center on April 9, 1961. Keynote speakers included the president of Hagerstown’s Civil War Round Table and P.G.T. Beauregard, the great-grandson of the Confederate general. In contrast to the events at Gettysburg, the dedication and opening of Antietam’s visitor center tellingly received minimal attention from Americans and the national press. The Park Service permitted the 1962 Antietam reenactment because planning was already underway. Beginning on August 31, 1962 the Antietam commemorations offered nearly three weeks of pageantry, reenactments, and monument dedications. During the next three weeks a cast of a thousand local residents performed “The Hills of Glory,” which restaged sixteen different events of the Antietam campaign and battle. The climactic event occurred on September 17 and 18, when nearly 2,000 re-enactors ‘refought’ the engagement at Bloody Lane before a crowd of over 18,000. Other Antietam centennial activities included the dedication of the 2nd and 3rd Delaware monument and a new Texas state memorial. Over 1750,000 journeyed to Antietam in 1962, yet

³⁴ Zenzen, *Battling For Manassas*, 69-71; McCandlish Phillips, “Two Sides Leave Field at Bull Run,” *New York Times*, 24 July 1961, 8; “A Strange Spectacle at Bull Run,” *Gettysburg Times*, 25 July 1961. Box 4, (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives. The total cost of the Manassas reenactment was \$170,000.

the reenactment of the nation's bloodiest day received only a few short paragraphs on the eighty-sixth page of the *Times*.³⁵

Meanwhile, on March 11, 1963, only three months before its own centennial celebration, a new superintendent arrived at Gettysburg National Military Park. Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall announced Kittridge A. Wing to succeed Superintendent Myers, who transferred to Cape Hatteras National Seashore in North Carolina. A graduate of Harvard College, Wing had continued his education at the University of Arizona and taught in the university's English department. During World War II, he served as an engineering officer. Before transferring to Gettysburg, Wing served as the assistant superintendent of Shenandoah National Park in Virginia; the assistant superintendent, then superintendent, at San Juan National Historic Site in Washington state; and superintendent at Fort Union National Monument in New Mexico. Superintendent Wing, the park's fourth supervisor, would supervise the largest and most sensationalized of the Civil War Centennial celebrations.³⁶

Gettysburg planners intended to emphasize a "nation united," but in reality the country remained fiercely divided over racial issues in 1963. Generations of Americans continued to seek hope and inspiration from the deeds of Civil War soldiers and from the power of Lincoln's 272-word address. Speaking to a crowd of 3,000 on Memorial Day in 1963, Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson also invoked the power of history and the power of Gettysburg to urge racial equality. Linking the battlefield to the struggle for Civil Rights, Johnson pleaded, "Our nation

³⁵ Zenzen, *Battling For Manassas*, 71; Trail, "Remembering Antietam," 300-418. Trail attributes the low turnout to the poor weather and suggests that the logistical complications of parking deterred visitors from attending; "Antietam Marked By Reenactment," *New York Times*, 16 September 1962, 86.

³⁶ "Successor to James Myers Is Announced," *Gettysburg Times*, 2 April 1963. Box 5, (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives; Superintendent Kittridge Wing, "Superintendent's Monthly Narrative Report, March 1963," written on April 17, 1963. Box 192, AF, RG 79, NARA College Park, 1-2. Wing moved into the superintendent's quarters at the Codori farm on March 9, officially entered on duty on the 11th, and spent March 21-22 at the Northeast Regional Office familiarizing himself with the regional staff and procedures.

founded its soul in honor on these fields of Gettysburg 100 years ago. We must not lose that soul in dishonor now on the fields of hate.”³⁷

“A Nation United” centennial celebrations at Gettysburg commenced one month after Vice President Johnson’s plea for racial equality. Sensitive to the “sham battle” and “child’s play” which occurred at Manassas, Gettysburg’s park staff carefully planned centennial celebrations befitting for a national shrine.³⁸ No one would stand for a “Coney Island” atmosphere for the nation’s most treasured battlefield.

Activities commenced on June 21 with a ceremony at the Pennsylvania State Memorial. Three days later a memorial service was held at the 150th Pennsylvania Regimental marker. On June 28 a Civil War period locomotive, Georgia’s “The General,” arrived at the Gettysburg Train Station as part of a thirteen state centennial tour. The train remained open to the public until its departure on July 4. Former President Eisenhower explored the meaning of the Battle of Gettysburg in a memorial program sponsored by the Gettysburg Fire Company on June 30 at the Gettysburg High School. “It remained for one man,” Eisenhower told a crowd of 6,000, “not a soldier or a historian, but the President of the United States, Abraham Lincoln, to tell us in a few immortal words the true meaning of the battle fought here.” Linking the words of the “Gettysburg Address” to current events, as so many speakers before had done, Eisenhower continued, “Lincoln’s words should be read, pondered and pondered still again, by every American, for they apply today as profoundly as they did on that November day when they were first spoken.” The former president warned of the threats imposed from the Communist world,

³⁷ “Vice President Pleads For End Of Hate Among Men in May 30 Address,” *Gettysburg Times*, 31 May 1963. Box 5, (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives.

³⁸ “Sham Battle,” *Gettysburg Times*, 23 July 1961. Box 4, (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives.

which the free world could not ignore. In the Cold War environment that pitted Democracy against Communism, Eisenhower extolled, “We, in our time, shall win the battle for freedom!”³⁹

On July 1 at 2 P.M. the centennial program opened with an “Our Heritage” ceremony at the Eternal Light Peace Memorial. The ceremony, narrated by NBC’s Ben Grauer, included a “mass tribute” to the sacrifices of the Union and Confederate soldiers. The opening day’s program included speeches from governors of states that had contributed troops to the battle, a welcome address from Pennsylvania Governor William Scranton, the issuance of a Day One commemorative stamp, and the presentation of battlefield land tracts from the Military Order of the Loyal Legion. At the conclusion of the “Our Heritage” program, the ceremonies moved to West Confederate Avenue for the rededication of the North Carolina State Memorial. That afternoon members of the Civil War Centennial Commission for New York’s Hudson Valley organized wreath-laying ceremonies at the 120th New York and 80th New York regimental monuments.⁴⁰

A “Strength Through Unity” parade took place on July 2. The parade formed at the south end of town at the historic Codori farm, moved through Lincoln Square, and concluded near the Eisenhower Elementary School, north of town. Over 6,500 people marched in the parade,

³⁹ “‘The General’ Goes On View Until July 4,” *Gettysburg Times*, June 29, 1963. Box 5, (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives; “Gettysburg National Military Park: General Plan and Orders Centennial, June-July 1963.” Folder 4, Box 7, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives. In the mid 1850s “The General” was commissioned by the Western and Atlanta railroad. During the war Union troops, in their efforts to destroy the railroad lines in Atlanta, captured the locomotive. Other small scale centennial celebrations included ceremonies at several monuments or the rededication of others on the Gettysburg battlefield, including a rededication of the 20th Maine and the unveiling of a plaque at the Father Corby Memorial; “Eisenhower Tells Audience Of 6,000 That Lincoln Gave True Meaning Of Battle Here,” *Gettysburg Times*, 1 July 1963. Box 5, (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives; Edith Evans Asbury, Special to *New York Times*. “Eisenhower Cites Perils to Liberty: Risks as Great as in 1863, He Asserts at Gettysburg ‘A Certain Uneasiness,’” *New York Times*, 1 July 1963, 17.

⁴⁰ Jim Weeks, *Gettysburg: Memory, Market, and an American Shrine* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003), 138-139; Official Program, “A Nation United on the 100th Anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg, July 1-3, 1963.” Folder 6, Box 8, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives, 3;7; “Place Wreaths at N.Y. Monuments,” *Gettysburg Times*, 2 July 1963. Box 5 (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives.

including re-enactors representing various units, women dressed as Civil War era belles, several thousand modern military personnel, and Armed Forces bands. In addition, more than 1,500 Sons of Union Veterans participated. Re-enactors from South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia units marched as well as did several Pennsylvania regiments including the famed Pennsylvania “Bucktails.” Though a severe thunderstorm moved through the area just before the parade started, the weather did not dampen the spirits of participants or spectators. Newspapers reported that over 35,000 turned out for the parade. The two men who portrayed President Lincoln and John Burns, the aged local resident who defended his home and town as the Confederate forces invaded, received favorable applause from the crowd. But the loudest applause was for Robert E. Lee IV, the great-grandson of the Army of Northern Virginia’s leader, who rode through the town streets in an Army Jeep.⁴¹

The cheers for Lee were not surprising. Gettysburg’s centennial coincided with a new reemergence of the “Lost Cause” phenomena. This romantic version of the Civil War manifested itself in the unveiling of several Confederate state memorials on the Gettysburg battlefield during the 1960s. Lacking economic resources and reluctant to commemorate a Confederate defeat, during the first half of the twentieth century only three southern states (Virginia, North Carolina, and Alabama) had placed state memorials on the battlefield. The nation’s renewed interest in the Civil War, however, provided the catalyst for former Confederate states to erect new monuments at Gettysburg. The first occurred on September 21, 1961 when Secretary of State Ben Fortson, Jr. and Georgia Governor Ernest Vandiver dedicated the Georgia State Memorial along West Confederate Avenue. Park Service Regional Director Ronald Lee accepted the monument on

⁴¹ Official Program, “A Nation United on the 100th Anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg, July 1-3, 1963.” Folder 6, Box 8, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives; “Rebel Yells and Dixie Bells Are Part of Spectacle at Gettysburg,” *Chattanooga Daily Times*, 3 July 1963. Box 5, (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives; Edith Evans Asbury, Special to *New York Times*. “Gettysburg Fete Depicts 2 Armies: Parade Recalls Events in Battle 100 Years Ago Confusion Like That in Battle Many Units Depicted,” *New York Times*, 3 July 1963, 28.

behalf of the National Park Service. During the Centennial events, the Virginia, Alabama, and North Carolina monuments were also rededicated.⁴²

Some used the Gettysburg centennial and monuments in particular as a platform to espouse beliefs on civil rights. Northern liberals used the centennial and their understanding of the sacrifices made by the Union soldiers to emphasize the ideal that America was “dedicated to the proposition that all men were created equal.” At a mass held at the Eternal Light Peace Memorial on the morning of June 30, Father Theodore Hesburgh, President of Notre Dame, offered an emotional appeal for African American equality. Appointed as the fifteenth president of Notre Dame, at the age of thirty-five, in June 1952, Father Hesburgh boasted a strong Civil Rights record, serving as a charter member to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Before an estimated crowd of 4,000, Hesburgh declared that the Civil War was fought for black freedom, but because of the continual racial oppression in the country, the Civil War remained “unfinished business.” “It is freedom denied from one American to another American,” Hesburgh remarked, “and until every white American decides to act morally towards every Negro American, there is no end to the unfinished business.” The following day New Jersey Governor Richard Hughes while re-dedicating a state memorial devoted his entire speech to explaining how America and its people had failed to provide justice for all its citizens. Hughes extolled, “The Civil War was not fought to preserve the Union ‘lily white’ or ‘Jim Crow,’ it was fought for liberty and justice for all.” Standing before the New Jersey marker, Hughes declared, “It is a shame that at this

⁴² Superintendent James Myers, “Superintendent’s Monthly Report, September 1961,” written on October 13, 1961. Box 192, AF, RG 79, NARA College Park, 2; Official Program, “A Nation United on the 100th Anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg, July 1-3, 1963.” Folder 6, Box 8, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives, 4; 7; Unrau, *Administrative History*, 263. The Virginia State Memorial was the first to be erected on June 8, 1917. North Carolina’s state memorial was dedicated on July 3, 1929 and Alabama’s on November 12, 1933.

monument the full benefits of freedom are not the possession of all Americans a full century after the war which was fought to save America's soul."⁴³

Just weeks after the stand in the school-house door, George Wallace, Alabama's segregationist governor, attended Gettysburg's centennial celebrations to honor Confederate soldiers. On July 2 he placed a wreath at the Alabama State Memorial and also gave the dedication speech for the South Carolina State Memorial. Wallace reminded his listeners, "This is a solemn occasion. We stand among the descendents of brave men who fought for North and South and we still stand for defense of the Constitution of the United States."⁴⁴

The centennial's main event was the "Reunion at the High Water Mark," on July 3. Honoring the one hundredth anniversary of Pickett's Charge, five hundred Confederate re-enactors advanced from their positions along Seminary Ridge, with the Confederate battle flag unfurled, toward the Union center at Cemetery Ridge. Five hundred soldiers representing the Union Army's II Corps greeted the southern re-enactors with handshakes as they approached the Angle. Northerners and southerners again joined as Americans in "brotherhood and amity to pledge their devotion to the symbol of their common unity the Stars and Stripes!" As those donned in gray met those wearing blue, everyone began to sing the "Star Spangled Banner" and

⁴³ "Negroes' Liberty Held 'Unfinished'": Notre Dame's Head Urges Action in Gettysburg Talk," *New York Times*, 30 June 1963, 39. Hesburgh was born in New York in 1917, graduated from Notre Dame, and earned his doctorate degree from Catholic University in Washington, D.C., in 1945. Upon graduation Hesburgh served as a faculty member at Notre Dame before being appointed president in 1952; Edith Evans Asbury, Special to *New York Times*. "Hughes Charges Moral Failure To Aid Negroes Since Civil War," *New York Times*, 2 July 1963, 14. Hughes spoke at Gettysburg as a recently elected governor, having served in the state's supreme court before entering the gubernatorial race. For additional reading on Richard Hughes see, John Wefing, *The Life and Times of Richard H. Hughes* (New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 2009).

⁴⁴ Edith Evans Asbury, Special to *New York Times*. "Hughes Charges Moral Failure To Aid Negroes Since Civil War," *New York Times*, 2 July 1963, 14. For additional reading on George Wallace see, Dan T. Carter, *Politics of Rage: George Wallace, the Origins of the New Conservatism, and the Transformation of American Politics* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2000); Dan T. Carter, *From George Wallace to Newt Gingrich: Race and the Conservative Counterrevolution, 1963-1994* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1996); Stephan Leshner, *George Wallace: American Populist* (New York: DeCapo Press, 1995).

then proceeded to recite the “Pledge of Allegiance.” Unlike the “sham” battle contrived at Manassas, the dramatization did not include live artillery barrages. Instead sound systems replicated the sound effect of cannon and rifle fire, while a smoke screen simulated the black powder’s smoke. Actor Walter Albel and Major George Fielding Eliot offered a narration of the events of Pickett’s Charge.⁴⁵

During the three-day ceremonial event visitors also journeyed through the battlefield to witness “vignettes of history.” Over one hundred Adams County residents participated in “poignant episodes” that were “staged near the very spots where they were supposed to have occurred.” These vignettes included: “Brother Captures Brother,” “The Barlow-Gordon Incident,” “John Burns, Venerable Citizen-Warrior,” “Friendly Enemies,” “The Hour of Decision,” “A Sharpshooter’s Rest, Devil’s Den,” and “Lee and Longstreet, two Confederates with different views on how to fight a battle.” The vignettes, or “footnotes of history,” gave visitors a chance to experience the “daily behavior of men under the stress of battle.” Pfanz did caution against some of the vignettes’ historical inaccuracies. Indeed, as he reviewed the scripts, he lamented, “In each of these imagination and fact are mixed and in some, particularly that of Spangler’s Spring, imagination has full sway. While some of this sort of thing is desirable the distortion should be kept at a practicable minimum.”⁴⁶

Centennial celebrations at Manassas brought immediate backlash. While those at Gettysburg were, for the most part, carried out in a more dignified and solemn manner, some

⁴⁵ Official Program, “A Nation United on the 100th Anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg, July 1-3, 1963.” Folder 6, Box 8, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives, 5; “Nation Eyes Gettysburg As Centennial Re-creation Of Battle Draws Near,” *Gettysburg Times*, June 26, 1963. Box 5, (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives; Edith Evans Asbury, Special to *New York Times*, “Battle of Gettysburg Relived at Centennial: Pickett's Charge Is Re-enacted, Then Amity Prevails,” *New York Times*, 4 July 1963, 1.

⁴⁶ Official Program, “A Nation United on the 100th Anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg, July 1-3, 1963.” Folder 6, Box 8, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives, 6; Harry Pfanz to Superintendent Kittridge Wing, April 22, 1963. Folder 1, Box 8, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives.

observers still criticized the events. On July 14, Don Robertson of the Cleveland *Plain Dealer* reported on the “Vulgar Show at Gettysburg” and reminded readers of the sacrifices made at Gettysburg by poignantly listing the casualty statistics in his article. Robertson found the commercialization of the centennial unacceptable, writing “Observances should be kept out of the reach of commercial elements. The anniversary of a battle should be no occasion for a hot-dog proprietor to triple his business. The anniversary of a battle should have nothing to do with balloons and fake bullets and The Old Woman Who Lived in a Shoe. And no drum majorettes are necessary.” The editorial included a famous Matthew Brady photograph of the Confederate dead at the Rose Farm. Its caption declared, “Some dead at Gettysburg. This picture is no re-enactment.”⁴⁷

Local businesses did, in fact, capitalize on the bloodshed of 1863, just as Robertson observed. By 1963 Gettysburg’s Steinwehr Avenue, the Baltimore Pike, Emmitsburg Road, and Taneytown Road were littered with commercial businesses. Jim Weeks has explored how mass culture transformed Gettysburg, a transformation that reached its climax during the centennial years. Local bus companies encouraged visitors to park their cars and receive guided bus tours through the battlefield grounds. Strategically positioned nearly across from the park’s visitor center, the National Civil War Wax Museum opened in time for Gettysburg’s centennial events and offered paying visitors life-sized soldier replicas, displays of weapons and relics, and a dramatization of Lincoln’s Gettysburg Address. On Baltimore Street, Actor Cliff Arquette, also known as Charlie Weaver, already had opened the Soldiers Museum several years before in 1959. But it was LeRoy Smith, a Midwesterner by birth, who served as a primary force behind the marketing of Gettysburg. Purchasing land along Steinwehr Avenue, directly west of

⁴⁷ Don Robertson, “Vulgar Show at Gettysburg,” *The Plain Dealer*, 14 July 1963. Box 5, (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives.

Ziegler's Grove, he opened the Lincoln Train Museum and the Hall of Presidents Wax Museum on the Baltimore Pike. Several years later Smith opened the Old Gettysburg Village, which he marketed as a period shopping mall. Since Adams County lacked zoning ordinances, the Park Service remained powerless to stop such development on battlefield peripheries. "By the time the park service opened its new visitor's center in 1962," Weeks concludes, "Gettysburg resembled Niagara Falls or Gatlinburg."⁴⁸

To further commemorate the battle's centennial, the Park Service also offered evening campfires at its newly constructed amphitheater. While the stories and friendship found at the campfire gatherings on East Cemetery Hill offered a sentimentality of the veterans' camaraderie on the battlefield in the years after the battle, the park envisioned a more "suitable place" to hold the evening programs. In December 1962 at the monthly meeting of the Pennsylvania Centennial Commission, Regional Director Ronald Lee suggested that the newly produced thirty-five minute MGM film "Gettysburg" be incorporated into the centennial observance, perhaps at an evening campfire program. The committee responded favorably to Lee's suggestion, and recommended the Park Service explore options to establish a proper venue for the film. In mid-January 1963 Park Service officials met at Gettysburg to explore potential sites and uses for an outdoor amphitheater.⁴⁹

⁴⁸ Weeks, *Gettysburg*, 137-140. Cliff Arquette was a popular television and radio personality. In 1948 Arquette developed a comic character of "Charlie Weaver." In the mid 1950s, he purchased Gettysburg's Orphan Home, near the Soldiers' National Cemetery on Baltimore Pike and opened his museum on March 2, 1959. Several years later Arquette renamed the museum Charlie Weaver's American Museum of the Civil War.

⁴⁹ Superintendent James Myers to Louis Simon, February 6, 1963. Folder 1, Box 8, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives. Louis Simon was the Secretary of the Pennsylvania Civil War Commission; Harry Pfanz to Superintendent Kittridge Wing, "Report on Campfire Programs, Gettysburg," July 22, 1963. Folder K1815, Box 13, GC, RG 79, NARA Philadelphia, 1; Superintendent James Myers, "Report On Proposed Campfire Program," not dated. Folder 3, Box 7, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives; "Gettysburg Centennial Campfire Program," January 17-18, 1963. Author unknown. Box 675, AF, RG 79, NARA College Park, 1. Six park rangers met at the battlefield to explore the potential sites for the outdoor amphitheater and included: Harold Peterson, Staff Historian WASO, Warren Lewis, Supervisory Landscape Architect EODC, Murray Nelligan, Chief, Division of History and

Park officials wanted to construct the amphitheater on the battlefield to retain the historic atmosphere of the programs, but also desired a site with open terrain to avoid the unnecessary alteration of the historic ground. Unlike the campfires on East Cemetery Hill, the amphitheater setting necessitated a rear screen projector, storage space for movie equipment, proper sound and lighting, electricity, plus water. Park officials wanted seating for 1,000 people and ample parking. Upon examining several sites in the park, the task force chose Pitzer's Woods, the site of the old CCC camp along West Confederate Avenue, as the most suitable location. Park officials wanted the amphitheater to provide space for special events for the centennial, but also believed it could become a permanent programming facility for the park.

The interpretive structure of the outdoor programs at the amphitheater differed from the traditional campfires held in previous years. Whereas the programs on East Cemetery Hill took place weekly, park service officials planned to hold daily campfire programs at the new venue six days a week, beginning on July 1 and running through Labor Day. The program began at 8:30 PM and consisted of a thirty to forty-five minute presentation by a park ranger. The ranger offered a discussion of the life of a Civil War soldier, explained and demonstrated the weaponry of the war, and led group sing-alongs. Since the rangers had little experience in formal interpretation, they simply read from a script about the life of a Civil War soldier. The scripted interpretation included a short summary of the historical significance of the Pitzer's Woods area, an overview of the life of the Union and Confederate soldiers, a demonstration of the nine-step process of loading and firing a rifle, and a brief discussion of the memorialization on the battlefield. After the scripted narration, and as darkness descended along Seminary Ridge, the

Archeology, Northeast Region, GNMP Superintendent James Myers, GNMP Assistant Superintendent Sam Sollenberger, and Supervisory Park Historian Harry Pfanz.

ranger would show the MGM film “Gettysburg.” The park officials recommended lighting “one or more symbolic campfires to add historical character to the scene.”⁵⁰

On May 29, 1963 the National Park Service awarded E.D. Plummer and Sons the contract to build the new amphitheater. Work on the amphitheater began two days later with a planned completion time for the centennial. It soon became apparent, however, that the deadline would not be met, yet the Park Service remained determined to open the amphitheater for the 100th anniversary of the battle. Park management requested temporary seating, a projection booth, and electrical equipment, all of which were installed in time for the park’s first campfire to be held, fittingly, on the opening day of the battle’s anniversary July 1, 1963. George Wallace attended the inaugural program. Approximately 3,000 people enjoyed the campfire programs held during the three-day battle anniversary, and by the end of the month the park estimated nearly 7,600 attended the outdoor programs. E. B. Plummer’s construction men finally completed the amphitheater construction on September 20. The construction of the amphitheater, projection booth, wooden benches, parking area, and sidewalks totaled \$40,169.66.⁵¹

⁵⁰ Harry Pfanz to Superintendent Kittridge Wing, “Report on Campfire Programs, Gettysburg,” July 22, 1963. Folder K1815, Box 13, GC, NARA Philadelphia, 1-4. The four-page scripted narration is attached to Pfanz’s report on the campfire programs; “Gettysburg Centennial Campfire Program,” January 17-18, 1963. Author unknown. Box 675, AF, RG 79, NARA College Park, 1-5. The programs were held every day except for Mondays. It is worth noting that though GNMP had offered summer campfires since 1941, the programs were generally given by a special guest. None of the GNMP park rangers had experience in delivering campfire programs, or at this point, any type of regular interpretation.

⁵¹ Individual Building Data File, Building Reports, Park Amphitheater. Folder 1, Box 23, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives; Harry Pfanz to Superintendent Kittridge Wing, “Report on Campfire Programs, Gettysburg,” July 22, 1963. Box 13, K1815, GC, NARA Philadelphia, 1; Harry Pfanz to Superintendent Kittridge Wing, “Report on Campfire Programs, Gettysburg,” July 22, 1963. Folder K1815, Box 13, GC, RG 79 NARA Philadelphia, 4; Superintendent Kittridge Wing, “Superintendent’s Monthly Report, July 1963,” written on August 14, 1963. Box 192, AF, RG 79, NARA College Park, 4; “2,000 Initiate Amphitheater Here For NPS,” *Gettysburg Times*, 2 July 1963. Box 5, (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives. The superintendent estimated that approximately 1,000 people attended each program on July 1-3, nearly 400 people on July 4, and approximately 180-200 people each night for the remainder of the month. The park attributed the high attendance to the improved publicity. Park rangers advertised for the program in the visitor center, posted signs, and local motel owners informed their patrons about

For many Americans the Civil War Centennial culminated in the commemorative activities at Gettysburg. As expected, battlefield visitation reached an all time high during July, with 404,017 guests visiting the national military park. By the end of the year, the battlefield had recorded over two million visitors.⁵²

While America celebrated “A Nation United” at Gettysburg, a more modest commemoration of the siege of Vicksburg took place simultaneously in Mississippi. While General Robert E. Lee marched his Army of Northern Virginia into Pennsylvania in the spring of 1863, Union General Ulysses S. Grant continued an offensive to capture the “Confederate Gibraltar” along the Mississippi River. The nation, while galvanized by the July 1963 centennial events at Gettysburg, paid considerably less attention to the celebrations at Vicksburg. Centennial celebrations there in fact were relatively modest. Whereas Gettysburg held parades, monument dedications, re-enactments, campfires, and historical vignettes, Vicksburg celebrated its centennial with seminars and battlefield tours. Park superintendent Jack Anderson reported that “the seminars enjoyed excellent attendance and participation with outstanding speakers conducting each individual session.” During the four-day anniversary, park rangers placed regimental flags at important battle sites and provided battle walks and tours. Over 200,000 visitors went to Vicksburg National Military Park during the centennial month, and the park reported that visitation during the first three days in July reached an all-time high. Yet the

the park’s evening campfire program. The construction work was delayed because several stop orders had been issued because the contractor had difficulty in finding the proper seating materials.

⁵² Superintendent Kittridge Wing, “Superintendent’s Monthly Narrative Report, July 1963,” written on August 14, 1963. Box 192, AF, RG 79, NARA College Park, 1; Superintendent Kittridge Wing, “Superintendent’s Monthly Narrative Report, December 1963,” written on January 14, 1964. Box 192, AF, RG 79, NARA College Park, 1. Wing recorded a total of 2,041,378 visitors, not including December’s total.

centennial celebrations at Vicksburg merited minimal print space, when compared to Gettysburg. The *New York Times* included a mere paragraph, noting simply that the grandsons of General U.S. Grant and General John C. Pemberton met each other on this Mississippi field of battle.⁵³

The month following centennial celebrations at Gettysburg and Vicksburg, Martin Luther King Jr. spoke in the shadow of the Lincoln Memorial in the nation's capital and evoked the Gettysburg Address to appeal to America to fully and completely emancipate its black citizens. "Five score years ago, a great American, in whose symbolic shadow we stand today, signed the Emancipation Proclamation," King declared. "But one hundred years later, the Negro still is not free. One hundred years later, the life of the Negro is still sadly crippled by the manacles of segregation and the chains of discrimination."⁵⁴

The final centennial celebrations in 1963 occurred at Chickamauga-Chattanooga National Military Park. To commemorate the Battle of Chickamauga, on September 19 and 20, 1863, the Park Service scheduled two days of parades, contests, and ceremonies. September 19 became "Michigan Day" and "Tennessee Day," while the 20th was celebrated as "South Carolina Day" and "Georgia Day." The park's acting superintendent reported that a total of 2,115 visitors attended the two days' festivities. He remarked that "Georgia Day" was "by far the most notable of the observances" and attracted about 1,400 spectators. Additional celebrations were scheduled for November 24 and 25 to commemorate the Union offensive at Chattanooga. Unfortunately, as the nation prepared to celebrate Chattanooga's centennial, President John F.

⁵³ Superintendent Jack Anderson, "Superintendent's Monthly Narrative Report, July 1963," written on August 5, 1963. Box 307, AF, RG 79, NARA College Park, 1-3; "Generals' Grandsons Meet," *New York Times*, 4 July 1863, 7. By this time Grant had been removed as the chairman of the CWCC.

⁵⁴ Martin Luther King, Jr. "I Have A Dream Speech," August 28, 1963.

Kennedy was assassinated on November 22 in Dallas, Texas. As the nation mourned its slain president, the National Park Service cancelled all planned events.⁵⁵

Gettysburg's centennial observances meanwhile ended that month with the centennial commemoration of Lincoln's "Gettysburg Address," in November 1963. Secretary of State Dean Rusk and former President Dwight D. Eisenhower were among the guest speakers on November 19. For the occasion President John Kennedy telegraphed, "Lincoln and others did indeed give us 'a new birth of freedom,' but the goals of liberty and freedom, the obligations of keeping ours a government of and by the people are never-ending." Yet the battlefield continued to be one of the most popular attractions in America. The media attention and the centennial celebrations seemed only to reinforce Americans' interest in the Battle of Gettysburg. Visitation to the battlefield in 1964 remained as high, and in some months higher than during the centennial year. In July 1964, for example, the battlefield attracted slightly over 400,000 visitors. The park reported a total of 147,990 visitors in November, which represented a 70 percent increase from visitation in November 1963. Superintendent Wing recorded 2,215,543 visitors by the end of November 1964, surpassing the park's 1963 attendance.⁵⁶

By then visitors could hike a nature trail on Big Round Top using a self-guiding brochure at the base of the trail to learn about the park's natural environment. The one-mile trail began in

⁵⁵ Acting Superintendent John Fisher, "Superintendent's Monthly Narrative Report, September 1963," written on October 7, 1963, 1-3; Superintendent John Cook, "Superintendent's Monthly Narrative Report, November 1963," written on December 5, 1963. Box 150, AF, RG 79, NARA College Park, 1-2. On November 24 a group of U.S. Army Rangers had planned to assault a fortified position near Ochs Museum. After reaching the designated position, the modern infantry unit was to plant an American flag commemorating the offensive by made the 8th Kentucky one hundred years earlier. The following day an assortment of local high school bands were to follow the route of Union soldiers in their assault against Missionary Ridge.

⁵⁶ Superintendent Kittridge Wing, "Superintendent's Monthly Narrative Report, November 1964," written on December 14, 1964. Box 192, AF, RG 79, NARA College Park, 3; "An Account of the Centennial Commemoration," Report of the Commission to the General Assembly," edited by Louis M. Simon (Harrisburg: Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, 1964). This publication includes all of the speeches offered during the centennial ceremonies as well as several pictures of the celebrations.

the parking lot at Big Round Top and took visitors through fifty nine marked stops to the top of Big Round Top. Park rangers offered tours on the nature trail to school groups during the fall and spring season. The Big Round Top nature trail proved to be extremely popular with visitors interested in taking extended hikes or learning about the battlefield's environment. Hikers claimed their favorite stop on the tour was a cut tree where they could count the rings to date the tree to the time of the battle.⁵⁷

The summer programs at the new amphitheater continued to attract several thousand spectators each week. Rangers continued to present the same interpretive programs used during the centennial. In 1964, the park did introduce a new touring brochure, which provided visitors with self-guiding directions to fourteen stops complete with descriptive information at each site. The brochure also included four battle maps (one for the campaign and one for each of the three days battle) and the text of the "Gettysburg Address."⁵⁸

During the balance of the national centennial, the Park Service, with the help of the Gettysburg Battlefield Preservation Association, worked to add historic tracts to the park boundary. On April 14, 1965 the GBPA deeded the one-hundred acre Meals farm to the federal government. The same month the NPS purchased a one-acre tract adjacent to the Soldiers'

⁵⁷ Superintendent Kittridge Wing, "Superintendent's Monthly Narrative Report, March 1964," written on April 11, 1964, 2; Superintendent Kittridge Wing, "Superintendent's Monthly Narrative Report, July 1964," written on August 14, 1964. Box 192, AF, RG 79, NARA College Park, 2; "Nature Trail Organized On Battlefield," *Gettysburg Times*, 6 August 1964. Box 6, (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives. The trail markers were marked by red cedar posts; Superintendent Kittridge Wing, "Superintendent's Monthly Narrative Report, October 1964," written on November 13, 1964. Box 192, AF, RG 79, NARA College Park, 2; "Newly Developed Nature Trail on Battlefield Proves Very Popular," *Gettysburg Times*, 7 November 1964. Box 6, (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives.

⁵⁸ Superintendent Kittridge Wing, "Superintendent's Monthly Narrative Report, July 1964," written on August 14, 1964. Box 192, AF, RG 79, NARA College Park, 2. Wing estimated 2,500 visitors weekly to the campfires; "Issue New Park Folder," *Gettysburg Times*, 28 August 1964. Box 6, (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives; Superintendent Kittridge Wing, "Superintendent's Monthly Narrative Report, November 1965," written on December 15, 1965. Box 192, AF, RG 79, NARA College Park, 2. The park service distributed this brochure at the new visitor center, the guide stations along Route 15 and 30, and the information/guide booth in the Soldiers' National Cemetery. Much of Gettysburg's interpretive programming had been developed and conceptualized by park historian, Dr. Frederick Tilberg, who after twenty-eight years of service at Gettysburg National Military Park retired November 30, 1965. Harry Pfanz remained as the park's senior historian.

National Cemetery. Park Service officials continued in their goal to restore the battlefield to its 1863 appearance, with mixed results. During the winter of 1964 the park used money from public works programs to hire eighty local men to remove non-historic brush and trees. Workers began removing brush on the slopes of Little Round Top, but made a “special effort to preserve the healthy redbud and dogwood trees which color the hill’s slope in the springtime.” The workers cleared over 130 other acres, including fields near Devil’s Den, Crawford Avenue, and the Rose farm.⁵⁹

The National Park Service also began at last to develop long-term management plans. These Master Plans served as philosophical statements to better preserve, manage, and interpret. Pfanz recommended that to reach out to a greater number of visitors the park should open entrance stations along Route 140 and Route 30 East, build interpretative walks on Little Round Top and Devil’s Den, and construct park roadways to facilitate direct traffic access between the visitor center and the Confederate positions along Seminary Ridge. In an attempt to appeal to a wide variety of visitors, park management began to consider recreational activities. In the 1962 Master Plan, for example, Pfanz noted that “few individuals find the park a pleasant place for hiking and nature study.” In the 1965 Master Plan, he suggested that the park develop recreational opportunities that were not “incompatible with the Park’s historical program.” The existing recreational activities included a horse trail on the edge of the park’s boundary, hiking and bicycling on park roads, and sledding on park avenues during the winter season. Believing the recreational opportunities to be limited, the Park Service sought to expand the horse trail to

⁵⁹ Superintendent Kittridge Wing, “Superintendent’s Monthly Narrative Report, April 1965,” written on May 14, 1965, 2; Superintendent Kittridge Wing, “Superintendent’s Monthly Narrative Report, November 1965,” written on December 15, 1965. Box 192, AF, RG 79, NARA College Park, 3; “Battlefield is Presented in 100-Year-Ago Appearance by Tree, Brush Removal Work,” *Gettysburg Times*, 12 February 1964. Box 6, (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives. The NPS purchased the one-acre tract from the Evergreen Cemetery. The tract was adjacent to the Taneytown Road. The Meal’s property was officially presented to the National Park Service on November 19, 1965. Donald Lee, Chief, Museum of Lands accepted the property on behalf of the NPS Director.

an area of “lesser historical appearance” and to open additional hiking trails within the park. The writers of the 1965 Master Plan desired to expand sledding areas as “a measure to further community relations” and believed that sledding on the battlefield would be of “little inconvenience to visitors.”⁶⁰

The MISSION 66 program, the surge of patriotism engendered by the Cold War, and the Civil War Centennial all ultimately served to recast the image and significance of the Battle of Gettysburg and Gettysburg National Military Park. The celebrations at Gettysburg in July 1963 represented the climax of the Civil War Centennial. While some spoke on the battlefields for full emancipation of African Americans, the centennial’s theme of “A Nation United” proved to be more idealized than realized. To many African Americans, the Civil War Centennial continued to remind them of the war’s “unfinished business.” John Hope Franklin concluded, “To the extent the war failed to confer complete freedom on the Negro the war was a failure. Any observance worthy of associating itself with the Civil War must acknowledge this incontrovertible fact.”⁶¹ By 1964 and 1965, however, the nation’s attention turned to more crucial affairs, such as America’s heightened involvement in Vietnam and the nation’s worsening race relations, the Civil War Centennial eventually faded into the country’s background. The next decade, however, the Battle of Gettysburg would once again help to reshape the country as America prepared to celebrate its national bicentennial.

⁶⁰ “Master Plan for the Preservation and Use of Gettysburg National Military Park,” prepared by Harry W. Pfanz, February 1962. Folder 3, Box 10, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives, 9; “Master Plan of Gettysburg National Military Park,” prepared by Harry W. Pfanz on February 18, 1965. Folder 2, Box 11, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives, 1-37. Acting Superintendent S. G. Sollenberger approved this plan on February 18, as well.

⁶¹ Franklin, “A Century of Civil War Observance,” 107.

Chapter 7

“Our Fathers Brought Forth On This Continent A New Nation”:

A New Direction at Gettysburg, 1966-1976

Between 1961 and 1965 many Americans commemorated the Civil War Centennial with great enthusiasm. While some likened the celebrations to a “national circus” and criticized the “sham” reenactments of Manassas or the “vulgar” demonstrations at Gettysburg, the centennial period further cemented the “Civil War subculture” into America’s consciousness. During 1963, and for the first time in the history of Gettysburg National Military Park, over two million people visited the battlefield. Moreover, the centennial activities only piqued interest in the Battle of Gettysburg. The following year, Superintendent Kittridge Wing recorded over 2.2 million visitors. Park officials anticipated that visitation would continue to increase, predicting five million within the next decade.¹

The surge in visitation from the Civil War Centennial and the nation’s obsession with the Battle of Gettysburg forced the National Park Service to reexamine its management philosophy and operational strategy at the Pennsylvania battlefield. During the decade following the centennial, National Park Service management undertook a long-range planning initiative that explored revised tour routes, interpretive objectives, landscape management, and just years after

¹ John Hope Franklin, “A Century of Civil War Observance,” *Journal of Negro History*, vol. 47, April 1962, 91-107; Superintendent Kittridge Wing, “Superintendent’s Monthly Narrative Report, December 1963,” written on January 14, 1964, 1; Superintendent Kittridge Wing, “Superintendent’s Monthly Narrative Report, November 1964,” written on December 14, 1964, 1. Box 192, Administrative Files, 1949-1971, RG 79, National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland, 1 [hereinafter cited as Folder, Box, AF, RG 79, NARA College Park]. The 1963 visitation was 2,041,378; “Master Plan, 1969.” No author, revised edition, July 1969. Folder 3, Box 1, Gettysburg National Military Park, General Management Plan Records, 1968-1983, (GETT 41105), Records of the National Park Service at Gettysburg National Military Park, Gettysburg National Military Park Archives, 81 [hereinafter cited as (GETT 41105), GNMP Archives] and references to this report hereinafter cited as “Master Plan, 1969.”

the opening of the Gettysburg Visitor-Cyclorama Center, proposed the construction of a new information facility. This planning initiative manifested itself in a series of so-called Master Plans. Meanwhile, as the park's planning team mapped out the long-term management future of Gettysburg National Military Park, preservationists fought a "Second Battle of Gettysburg" against encroaching developments and commercialization. In 1974 they lost critical ground when the Gettysburg National Tower opened on private property, casting a 307-foot shadow on the historic battlefield. Nonetheless, thirteen years after Gettysburg's centennial celebrations, thousands of Americans once again gathered there in July 1976 to celebrate both the birth of the nation and America's new birth of freedom.

When the National Park Service acquired Gettysburg National Military Park in 1933, the agency had little understanding of how to manage or preserve a historic battlefield. Superintendents' educational or professional background often guided daily operational policies. Four National Park Service superintendents had since managed the battlefield: James McConaghie, J. Walter Coleman, James Myers, and Kittridge Wing. In the decade after the centennial, however, change in upper management at Gettysburg occurred much more often. Between 1966 and 1977 alone three superintendents administered the battlefield: George Emery (January 1966-November 1970), Jerry Schober (December 1970- August 1974), and John Earnst (August 1974-September 1988).² This reoccurring leadership transition prevented the Park

² Harlan D. Unrau, *Administrative History: Gettysburg National Military Park and Gettysburg National Cemetery* (Denver: Branch of Publications and Graphic Design, Denver Service Center, 1991), 254-255; 291. Kittridge Wing served as park superintendent until January 16, 1966 when George F. Emery replaced him. Emery's previous

Service from establishing and implementing a long-term philosophy for the management of the battlefield.

In the decade after the Civil War Centennial the National Park Service also undertook a momentous planning initiative to provide continuity to the battlefield's operation. The impetus for long-range planning had its roots in the surge of centennial visitation. One fundamental assumption of the park's Master Plans held that exceptionally high visitation would continue into the upcoming years. The 1969 plan projected five million visitors to the battlefield by 1972. Park planners explored options to accommodate for this projected increase while also protecting the resource.³

These four preliminary Master Plans, produced between 1966 and 1976, as well as the final General Management Plan, were intended to create a coherent philosophy of visitor use, interpretation, land acquisition, and cultural and historic resource management. Short-term and long-range planning required the Park Service to adapt to changing circumstances within the community, differing opinions within the agency, and the public's reaction to the proposed

management experience included appointments as superintendent at Andrew Johnson National Historic Site and Petersburg National Battlefield. In November 1970 the Park Service transferred Emery to the Washington Office and appointed Jerry Schober as superintendent. Schober had previously served as superintendent of Abraham Lincoln Birthplace National Historic Site. John Earnst replaced Schober after serving as park superintendent for four years. Arriving at Gettysburg, Earnst had nearly a decade of upper-management experience, serving as superintendent at Perry's Victory & International Peace Memorial National Monument (Ohio) and Badlands National Monument (South Dakota). Previously Earnst served as Chief, Operations Evaluation in the Pacific Northwest Regional Office in Seattle.

³ Harry W. Pfanz, "Master Plan for the Preservation and Use of Gettysburg National Military Park," February 1962. Folder 3, Box 10, Park Main (Central) Files, 1954-1987, (GETT 41160), Records of the National Park Service at Gettysburg National Military Park, Gettysburg National Military Park Archives, 9 [hereafter cited as (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives]; Harry W. Pfanz, "Master Plan of Gettysburg National Military Park," February 18, 1965. Folder 2, Box 11, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives, 1-37; "Master Plan, 1969." Folder 3, Box 1, (GETT 41105), GNMP Archives, 81. The park estimated that half of its visitors came during the summer months. In addition to managing the Civil War battlefield, in 1967 Congress created Eisenhower National Historic Site, which was placed directly under Gettysburg's management authority. The government permitted Mammie Eisenhower to continue to live in the house until her death; the site opened in 1980. All notes hereinafter will be cited by "Master Plan" its corresponding year.

planning measures.⁴ In each plan officials recommended several significant alterations to the battlefield and its interpretative plan. Through the decade of planning, team officials additionally focused on several key issues that became evident in each of the revised plans. The main proposal underlying each Master Plan, however, was the construction of a new visitor center north of Gettysburg and the rerouting of the tour road to follow the battle in chronological order.

Park planners thus first proposed a new visitors center less than five years after Neutra's visitor-cyclorama center opened. Just as the Army of Northern Virginia and the Army of the Potomac approached the town in 1863, visitors of the twentieth century approached Gettysburg using nearly a dozen roads, reaching Gettysburg with confusion comparable to Robert E. Lee's army. Although local, regional, and National Park Service personnel had carefully selected the visitor center site in Ziegler's Grove, by the mid-1960s Park Service management concluded that the visitor center was not conveniently located. "One of the great problems of the Gettysburg area," the 1969 team planners concluded, "is that immediately on arrival visitors find themselves in a state of confusion. There are many things to see and do, and they are assaulted on all sides with billboards, signs and a multitude of options competing for their time and money." Park

⁴ The main influence in writing these plans at the local level was park historian Thomas Harrison and at a regional level Richard Giamberdine, of the Environmental Planning and Design office. Giamberdine served as the Team Captain of the 1972 Master Planning Team. The 1972 planning team included: Hobart Cawood, Historian; Fred Eubanks, Park Planner; Frank Ugolini, Park Planner; James Killian, Landscape Architect; Richard Giamberdine from the Office of Environmental Planning and Design; Allan Kent, Interpretative Specialist, Washington Office; Joseph Monkoski, Engineer, Northeast Regional Office; George Emery and Jerry Schober, GNMP Superintendents; William Birdsell, Chief Ranger GNMP; Joseph Virostek, Maintenance Supervisor GNMP; Thomas Harrison, Chief, Resources, GNMP; David Dupee, Chief, Division of Federal Coordination, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation; Frank Masland, Special Consultant, Conservationist. The 1969 Master Plan was completed, but never approved by the regional or national offices. The Park Service also never presented the plan to the public. The regional and national offices would not approve the plan until the team compiled an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on the proposed recommendations, Superintendent John Earnst, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 1972." Folder 2, Box 1, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives, 12.

Service officials suspected that it was not uncommon for visitors to spend hours in town without seeing anything on the battlefield or spending sufficient time there due to the distracting commercial lights and billboards.⁵

What the team planners now proposed was a “Williamsburg style facility,” that would be “strategically located” where tourists could “make a knowledgeable choice of what to see and do, and how best to do it.” Visitors could make hotel or dining arrangements with the Gettysburg Travel Council or acquire information on the area’s attractions. Once informed about the local area, Park Service rangers would be available to offer assistance on how to see the battlefield, the Soldiers’ National Cemetery, and the newly established Eisenhower National Historic Site. To accommodate as many visitors as possible in a timely fashion, the authors also recommended a “short high impact visual presentation” to provide basic touring information on the three sites.⁶

As noted above, a fundamental reason that then-NPS Director Conrad Wirth and other Park Service officials had selected the Ziegler’s Grove site was its convenient location to U.S. Route 15 and Steinwehr Avenue. By 1969, however, this proposed site seemed inconvenient. Over 60 percent of traffic arriving in Gettysburg now traveled on roads in the northern quadrant of the borough, the east-west corridor of U.S. Route 30. To capitalize on the traffic coming from the east and west, the Park Service proposed building a new facility on the northern part of the battlefield, on privately owned lands between Route 30 and Route 34. Pennsylvania’s Department of Transportation’s (PennDOT) had proposed constructing a U.S. Route 30 bypass

⁵ “Master Plan, 1969.” Folder 3, Box 1, (GETT 41105), GNMP Archives, 41.

⁶ “Master Plan, 1969.” Folder 3, Box 1, (GETT 41105), GNMP Archives, 41-42.

north of Gettysburg. The existing U.S. Route 30 took visitors traveling east and west through the town's narrow streets and around the Lincoln Square. The seven-mile bypass north of the borough, would reduce automobile traffic downtown. The plan for the new visitor center thus recommended the acquisition of approximately fifty acres near Barlow's Knoll, ground held by the Union Army's 11th Corps on July 1. The proposed site near Barlow's Knoll or the Eternal Peace Light Memorial would allow visitors to exit the Route 30 bypass and proceed directly to the park's visitor center. Realizing the impact that the Route 30 bypass would have on the daily operations of the battlefield, Director George Hartzog urged PennDOT to complete construction before the bicentennial celebrations of 1976. He argued that the Route 30 bypass would "serve to enhance the quality of the visitor experiences to Gettysburg and would facilitate our interpretation to the visitor of the national significance of this great park."⁷

Not everyone agreed with the proposed location near Barlow's Knoll, however, including Superintendent George Emery. Noting the historical significance of the Barlow's Knoll and the extensive fighting on the ground on July 1, Emery declared that the information center would "constitute a gross intrusion upon a prime historic site." Moreover, Emery believed that since the park had expressed interest in acquiring threatened properties on Barlow's Knoll, it would be hypocritical to develop the area for the information center. To facilitate easier access to the beginning of the tour route, planners had also proposed constructing a road from the visitor

⁷ "Master Plan, 1969." Folder 3, Box 1, (GETT 41105), GNMP Archives, 41-43. The 1969 Master Plan believed the ground near Barlow's Knoll was the most desirable because the information center would be conveniently located to state roads and would be relatively close to the town's business community; Superintendent George Emery to Chairman, Master Plan Team, Gettysburg NMP, November 7, 1969. Folder 2, Box 1, (GETT 41105), GNMP Archives; "Completion of Route 30 Bypass Urged Immediately at NPS Session This Morning," *Gettysburg Times*, 29 July 1971; George Hartzog to Shane Creamer (Pennsylvania Attorney General), November 11, 1971. Folder 5, Box 1, (GETT 41105), GNMP Archives.

center, near Barlow's Knoll to the Eternal Peace Light Memorial. Emery pointed out that the construction of such a road would not only damage the historic landscape, but would also create a "visual infringement" from the Peace Light and Oak Hill. Agreeing that the park needed a new, more centrally located information center, Emery proposed an alternate site west of town, between the Peace Light and U.S. Route 30 (the Chambersburg Pike). He maintained that this area was better suited because the terrain was "practically devoid of battle action," and the site's proximity to the Peace Light offered the park an opportunity to develop its interpretive theme of "Peace Eternal In A Nation United." The proposed site offered as well a panoramic vista of the terrain used by Lee's Army on its approach to Gettysburg, while providing visitors the opportunity to park at the facility and walk the battlegrounds of the first day.⁸

While PennDOT explored the feasibility of a bypass north of Gettysburg, Park Service officials proposed an Eisenhower Parkway, which would be constructed west of the borough and connect the proposed Route 30 bypass to the existing U.S. 15 bypass. The ten-mile Eisenhower Parkway would also provide visitor access from the proposed information center northwest of town to Eisenhower National Historic Site. Park Service officials expected the parkway to serve primarily as a tourist route, much like the existing battlefield roads.⁹

⁸ Superintendent George Emery to Chairman, Master Plan Team, Gettysburg NMP, November 7, 1969. Folder 2, Box 1, (GETT 41105), GNMP Archives.

⁹ "Environmental Impact Statement, Part I," February 1972. Author unknown. Folder 1, Box 2, (GETT 41105), GNMP Archives, 13-14. The Eisenhower Parkway was intended as the final piece of the "emerging beltway pattern" that would "intersect all of the radial roads entering Gettysburg." Park officials intended for the Eisenhower Parkway to serve as the town's western bypass, like the existing Route 15 served as the town's eastern bypass. The parkway would be a two-lane road with controlled speed and truck restrictions. Park officials also believed that in addition to connecting U.S. Route 30 bypass to U.S. Route 15, running north and south, that the parkway would alleviate pressure on Steinwehr Avenue, a heavily used road that bisected the battlefield. The Eisenhower Parkway was first proposed by the planning team in 1969. For a map of the proposed route and a circulation study, see "Gettysburg Circulation Study," September 1969, Thomas Harrison. Folder 10, Box 1, (GETT 41105), GNMP Archives.

The development of a chronological tour, beginning at the proposed site north of town, was the other key component of the Master Plans. Gettysburg's staff had contemplated restructuring the tour route for years, but because of resistance from the Licensed Battlefield Guides and the local community they had never been able to implement it. The existing route did not follow the battle's chronology, but instead took tourists through the park in a sequence opposite of how the battle unfolded. To rectify this problem, the staff once again in 1966 proposed developing a chronological auto tour, in conjunction with a new information center on the first day's field. The exact nature of the chronological tour varied slightly from draft to draft, but each assumed that the tour would enhance visitors' experience by traversing the route as the battle unfolded.¹⁰

Projected dramatic increase in visitation also forced the Park Service to reexamine its management objectives in regard to visitor access and protection of the resource. Concession-operated bus tours had served the Gettysburg tourist for some time, and while they provided limited interpretation, they were helpful in reducing the number of private cars on the battlefield. Consequently, in 1966 park officials first proposed developing a mass transit system to serve visitors and to "relieve the park from excessive automobile traffic." In 1969 officials went a step

¹⁰ "Master Plan, 1966," 6-18; Ronald Lee to Chief EODC, July 1965. Folder 2, Box 11, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives. Park officials proposed in the 1966 Master Plan, for example, the elimination of sections of Hancock Avenue from the Pennsylvania Memorial north to the park's visitor center. Although Hancock Avenue was one of the most highly traveled roads, park staff believed that removing the avenue would offer better protection to the High Water Mark area. In exchange for closing Hancock Avenue park officials proposed constructing walking trails to service the fields of Pickett's Charge. To facilitate better circulation, park officials proposed building a road to directly connect the visitor center to Confederate Avenue, the construction of a Rock Creek Parkway that would connect Spangler's Spring and Culp's Hill to the main tour road and the visitor center. The 1972 Master Plan, for example, outlined a twelve-stop tour beginning at the information center, then proceeding to the Eternal Light Peace Memorial, the Railroad Cut, the Virginia Memorial, the Wheatfield, Devil's Den, Little Round Top, the Pennsylvania Memorial, and Culp's Hill. After visiting Culp's Hill, visitors would be directed to the cyclorama center to see the Gettysburg Cyclorama, before proceeding to the Soldiers' National Cemetery. The tour would then direct visitors downtown before returning them to the information center.

farther by proposing a ban on automobile traffic during the peak season. Visitors wanting to see the battlegrounds would board a concession-operated tour bus for an eleven-mile ride that included stops at ten key locations. Those interested in walking the fields could get off at particular points, explore the terrain, and then board another shuttle. If visitors were interested in visiting a specific point on the battlefield, they could drive their automobile to designated peripheral parking. The plan, however, did allow visitors to drive through the Soldiers' National Cemetery. While park staff estimated the standard bus tour would take over two hours, to accommodate for heightened visitor demand in the summer season the plan suggested shortening the battlefield tour to one hour. Staff envisioned the bus tour mainly as a way to transport visitors through the battlefield; interpretation provided on the bus would remain "reasonably minimal." More detailed battle information would be available to visitors at each of the stops through the existing audio-visual stations or the wayside exhibits. The park advocated for the concession-operated tour by arguing that, "It is cars, not people, which congest roads and parking areas, such a system would increase the number of visitors who could visit the park without crowding or damaging the resource."¹¹

¹¹ "Master Plan, 1966." Folder 2, Box 11, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives, 9; "Master Plan, 1969." Folder 3, Box 1, (GETT 41105), GNMP Archives, 44-57; 82; "Information Relating to Alternate Tour Center Sites," No author, no date. Folder 3, Box 49, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives. The 1969 plan declared that the Park Service would determine at what point in the year vehicles would be restricted from the tour route. Boarding the bus from the information center, visitors would hear a recorded narration introducing them to the battlefield, and then proceed to the first stop at the Eternal Light Peace Memorial. Continuing the theme of "A Nation United" from the Civil War Centennial, the 1969 Master Plan used the inscription on the Eternal Light Peace Memorial, "Peace Eternal in a Nation United," as the park's interpretive theme. At this spot the recorded narration would "climax" and underscore to visitors that the monument symbolized the "true meaning of the park story." At the Eternal Light Peace Memorial visitors would receive an explanation of the campaign before proceeding to the second stop near the fields of the first shots of the battle. The bus would then take visitors to the Virginia Memorial where the interpretation would "stress human interest stories and the character of men like General Lee." From the Virginia Memorial, the bus would depart from the tour route to take visitors to the Eisenhower farm. After visiting the president's home, visitors would continue exploring the battlefield at the Wheatfield. At the Wheatfield visitors would have the option of walking into Devil's Den, the Rose Farm, and the Valley of Death. The bus would then transport visitors to Little Round Top where they would learn about the defense of the Union left on July 2. Proceeding from Little Round Top, the bus would stop at the Pennsylvania Memorial, considered by park officials to

Near the end of the year park officials released the 1969 Master Plan for informal review. It received minimal attention from the public and was never fully approved by the national offices. Over the next two years Gettysburg's staff, led by historian Thomas Harrison, continued to refine the plan, ultimately producing a revised Master Plan in early 1972. It included many of the same aspects of the 1969 Master Plan. Three years later, however, circumstances forced the park to reevaluate its management philosophy again. In a May 1972 meeting, PennDOT officials informed local representatives and Park Service officials that the Route 30 bypass, estimated to cost \$21 million, remained a low priority project. They estimated its earliest completion date to be eight years away. To date all the Park Service's long-term objectives, including the new information center and development of a chronological tour route, were intrinsically linked to the completion of the Route 30 bypass. Planning officials retained the development of a new information center as the preferred alternative, but as the bypass seemed more unlikely, they began to explore short-term improvements in visitor services.¹²

be a "good picture-taking and rest-stop." From the Pennsylvania Memorial visitors could walk to the High Water Mark. Leaving from the Pennsylvania Memorial, the bus would transport visitors to the Cyclorama Center. Still considered to be the park's "primary interpretive facility," once reaching the Cyclorama Center, visitors had several options. Inside the building they could enjoy the museum exhibits, the film, or view the Gettysburg Cyclorama presentation. By 1969 park officials believed the Gettysburg Cyclorama presentation needed to be updated to provide for a "more satisfying experience." To enhance the painting park officials suggested building a three-dimensional foreground and installing revolving seating and stereo sound. Those interested could walk to the Soldiers' National Cemetery, take the self-guided High Water Mark tour, or explore the Bryan farm or General Meade's headquarters. After spending time in the Cyclorama Center, the bus would then stop at several commercial locations to allow visitors to shop or explore privately operated museums. The final stop on the tour route would be in the town's historic district before returning visitors to the information center. The bus tour covered eleven miles of the battlefield and offered a basic introduction to the history of the three-day battle. For visitors wanting a more detailed tour, the park proposed establishing an alternative tour where visitors could drive their automobile to Culp's Hill, Spangler's Spring, or East Cavalry Field.

¹² "History of Planning at Gettysburg," no author, no date. Folder 6, Box 4, (GETT 41105), GNMP Archives; Richard Schweiker to John Volpe, February 24, 1972; Meeting minutes on Route 30 Bypass, May 5, 1972. Folder 7, Box 1, (GETT 41105), GNMP Archives. Schweiker was Pennsylvania's State Senator and John Volpe the Secretary of Transportation. A clarification on terminology: after the NPS acquired the Rosensteel/Gettysburg National Museum building it was referred to as the park's visitor center, while the visitor-cyclorama center situated in Ziegler's Grove would be called the cyclorama center.

One such improvement came in the form of the acquisition of the Rosensteel museum along Taneytown Road in 1971. The Park Service had wanted to acquire the privately owned museum as early as the 1930s, but not until August 18, 1971 did it buy the Gettysburg National Museum for a sum of \$2,350,000. The purchase included the 6.76 acres of land along Taneytown Road and Steinwehr Avenue, the museum building, and the popular Electric Map. In December, the family also donated its extensive artifact collection. Acknowledging the Park Service's appreciation of the donation, Regional Director Chester Brooks wrote a letter to Emily Rosensteel saying that the National Park Service would preserve the artifact collection "in the high standards" associated with the Rosensteel family. The Rosensteel's operation of the Gettysburg National Museum contractually terminated on October 31, 1973 at which time the National Park Service assumed daily operations.¹³

In the spring of 1972, meanwhile Park Service officials developed an interpretive plan for the new visitor center. After receiving the copyright to the Electric Map, park planners explored rewriting the program to offer listeners a "shorter, more punchy and more dramatic"

¹³ "GNMP Museum Collection Background," no date, no author. Box 71, W32, Park Main (Central) Files, 1987-present, Records of the National Park Service at Gettysburg National Military Park, Gettysburg National Military Park Archives [Files from this collection have not yet been processed and all notes hereinafter will be cited by Box, File Code, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives]; Thomas J. Harrison to Superintendent Jerry Schober, January 5, 1971. Folder 9, Box 1, (GETT 41105), GNMP Archives. The Deed of Sale was recorded in the Book of Deeds for Adams County the following day. Technically the Gettysburg National Museum, Inc. liquidated its assets on August 31, 1971 when the museum collection was divided among nine owners. Emily Rosensteel received the largest share of the collection at 69.8%. Emily Rosensteel and eight others who received portions of the museum collection each signed a "Gift of Personal Property," donating their share of the museum holdings to the National Park Service. The National Park Service did not appraise the Rosensteel collection, neither in total nor by individual item. As part of the exchange, the National Park Service agreed to hire Lawrence Eckert, Jr., who had previously served as President of the Gettysburg National Museum, as a GS-12 Curator for the newly acquired collection. His appointment was effective January 9, 1972. In this purchase, the NPS also acquired the copyright to the Electric Map. Just ten years after the opening of the Park Service's visitor center in Ziegler's Grove, the acquisition of the Rosensteel museum brought new operational challenges to Gettysburg's staff. In addition to maintaining the daily operations of the cyclorama center, park staff also responsible for the operations of the Rosensteel building, including the Electric Map, sales and museum operations, as well as providing basic visitor information. Lacking adequate ranger staff to operate both buildings, the Park Service entered into a concession contract with Eastern National Park and Monument Association to operate the Electric Map, the book and gift store, as well as daily maintenance and cleaning of the building.

presentation. Suggestions presentation included an improved lighting system, projected images, sound effects, and “odors.” During the summer season when visitation would be highest the Electric Map program would be shortened further to “provide quick in-and-out service” and “proper turnover.”¹⁴

Given that “ordinarily the National Park Service does not operate centers of such in-depth interpretation,” park planners admitted that the acquisition of the Rosensteel museum marked a “departure from tradition.” Ultimately, the National Park Service made the Rosensteel museum, equipped with the artifact collection and Electric Map, its primary visitor center, while the 1962 Neutra building became an interpretative facility now increasingly referred to as the cyclorama center. Ideally, visitors seeking general battlefield information would be served at the Rosensteel museum, while those wanting “in-depth interpretation” on the Civil War, the Battle of Gettysburg, or Abraham Lincoln and the Soldiers’ National Cemetery, would visit the Cyclorama Center. At the Cyclorama Center, visitors could see the feature film “These Honored Dead” and learn about the war and battle through a series of exhibits and dioramas. The main interpretative tool, however, remained the Gettysburg Cyclorama. Park officials confessed the current program was “not very exciting or dramatic,” and suggested developing a new program that would “leave visitors literally limp and has no ands, buts or thereafters.” Planners again considered using sound effects and “smells,” as well as a “live performer” to tell the story of Pickett’s Charge.¹⁵

¹⁴ Alan E. Kent, Senior Interpretative Planner, Denver Service Center, to Superintendent John Earnst, April 3, 1972. Folder 9, Box 1, (GETT 41105), GNMP Archives.

¹⁵ Alan E. Kent, Senior Interpretative Planner, Denver Service Center, to Superintendent John Earnst, April 3, 1972. Folder 9, Box 1, (GETT 41105), GNMP Archives.

The Park Service did not advocate operating from the Gettysburg National Museum on a long-term basis, however. The planning team, instead noted that, “Inasmuch as this land area is severely limited and is in the midst of high density traffic and limited vehicular arteries, it cannot be considered as a long-range solution.” Thomas Harrison argued that converting the Rosensteel building to a permanent center would simply defeat the primary purpose of the Master Plan because the building was not “capable of taking care of visitation to the year 2000.” In 1974 the park did begin extensive renovation to bring the facility up to National Park Service standards and to better accommodate visitors. Nonetheless, park planners continued to argue for a “Colonial Williamsburg style facility” in a more convenient location. Its feasibility, however, depended on both the construction of the Eisenhower Parkway and the Route 30 bypass. The Eisenhower Parkway proved to be a lofty ambition. The Park Service could not gather popular support for it; over 1,200 acres of farmland would have been destroyed to build the ten-mile bypass. Nor could the NPS obtain the financial resources necessary, estimated at \$10 million. As a result, the NPS finally abandoned plans for the Eisenhower bypass in 1974. Management already had begun to consider explore alternative sites for the new information center. Four sites came under consideration included: the Mehring farm along McPherson Ridge, near the Fairfield Road; the Winebrenner Farm between Route 30 and the Mummasburg Road; the intersection of the proposed Route 30 bypass and the Mummasburg Road; and the Cobean farm, along Route 34.¹⁶

¹⁶ “A Master Plan Report, 1972.” Thomas Harrison, Richard Giamberdine et.al, March 1972. Folder 1, Box 2, (GETT 41105), GNMP Archives, 42-47 [hereinafter this report will be cited as “Master Plan, 1972”]. Officially the 1972 draft retained the site northwest of town as preferable for the new information center. Harrison and planners advocated for the site between Route 30 West and the Mummasburg Road, first proposed in the 1969 plan. As noted this location depended on the construction of the Route 30 bypass and the Eisenhower Parkway; Thomas J. Harrison, Memorandum For the Master Plan Files, March 1, 1974. Folder 11, Box 2, (GETT 41105), GNMP Archives. Harrison also opposed using the Rosensteel building as a permanent center because it did not provide

In 1973, the Park Service concluded that the historic Cobean farm directly north of town was the best alternative location for the new facility. In May, A. W. Butterfield, the current owner of the Cobean farm, announced his intentions to sell his ninety-six acre farm. Superintendent Schober urged the acquisition of the Cobean farm because the “tract of land would provide the park for the first time with an ideal location for the new visitor use facilities proposed in the Master Plan.” The Cobean sit was “ideal” because it provided better visitor access, off the U.S. Route 30 bypass. Although the Cobean farm was located near the first day’s action, the development of the information center would not intrude upon key battle action ground.¹⁷

Adams County Commissioners, however, filed a suit in the U.S. Middle District Court on December 24, 1974 to prevent the federal government from acquiring the Cobean tract. The commissioners proclaimed that the Park Service’s acquisition of the site posed “a potential threat

visitor parking (expected for 2,000 cars), and because using the permanent facility would not allow management to close the Soldiers’ National Cemetery to vehicle traffic because of inadequate parking; Superintendent Jerry Schober, “Superintendent’s Yearly Report, 1974” written on January 25, 1973. Folder 2, Box 1, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives, 7. Harry Siler and Dave Colby of Washington developed the building’s renovation plans; “Local Groups Have Until January 30 To Comment On Park Service Master Plan,” *Gettysburg Times*, 11 December 1974; Richard Schweiker, Senator, to John Volpe, Secretary of Transportation, February 24, 1972. Folder 6, Box 1, (GETT 41105), GNMP Archives; “Gettysburg, Preliminary Environmental Impact Statement, 1972,” unknown author. Box 4, Thomas J. Harrison Files, Records of the National Park Service at Gettysburg National Military Park, Gettysburg National Military Park Archives [hereinafter cited as TH Files, GNMP Archives]; “Information Relating to Alternate Tour Center Sites,” unknown author, unknown date. Folder 3, Box 49, (GETT 41105), GNMP Archives; “A New Tour Center For the Gettysburg National Park,” unknown author, unknown date. Folder 3, Box 3, (GETT 41105), GNMP Archives. Park officials developed a ten-point criterion for the selection of the new information center’s site. These criteria included: proximity to the Day 1 battlefield, access to a good public highway, access to public water and sewer, isolation from encroaching commercialism, not on historically significant ground, land of twenty-five to fifty acres, convenient to the Eisenhower Parkway, if built; near the beginning of the proposed chronological tour; on land already owned by the NPS; and new site should not create any adverse traffic problems. Using the ten criteria listed above, the Merhing farm seemed to offered the most advantages—it was close in proximity to the starting the auto tour, offered convenient access to the proposed Eisenhower Parkway, and commercial developments could be controlled since the park owned all the adjacent land.

¹⁷ Superintendent Jerry Schober to Northeast Regional Director, May 24, 1973. Folder 5, Box 2, (GETT 41105), GNMP Archives. The Cobean Farm dates to a land claim in 1741 and consists of a Georgian brick house constructed in 1805. Schober also favored the Cobean tract because it fronted the Reading Railroad, which the superintendent believed had the potential to be used as a visitor transit service along the east coast. Because Cobean is the proper historical name of this farmstead it will be used in this essay.

of serious and irreparable environmental damage to the area,” thereby violating the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969. Construction would create excessive dirt, noise, and air pollution that would “irreparable environmental damage to the area.” Commissioner Harry Biesecker also reminded residents that the Park Service had only recently built a million dollar facility, and he voiced his opposition to the construction of a new one by saying that “with the nation’s economy and the energy crunch we’re wondering whether we need a new visitor center.”¹⁸ Buttressing the commissioners’ arguments, however, was a simple concern for economic stimulus. Federal government property was not taxable and therefore did not contribute to the local tax base.

Judge William J. Nealon ruled against the commissioners’ claim on January 30, 1975, stating that since the Cobean property was within the fixed boundary of Gettysburg National Military Park, the National Park Service could accept the offer to buy the property from Albert and Ethel Butterfield. The Park Service purchased the land for \$500,000 within an hour of Nealon’s ruling. Yet having acquired the title to the Cobean farm, the fate of the Master Plan still remained dependent upon the construction of the Route 30 bypass. One park official admitted that, “without the new Rt. 30 bypass, nothing is likely to happen.” Planning team captain Richard Giamberdine warned the public, “this is the last opportunity to put the park

¹⁸ “County Alleges Farm Sale To NPS Would Cause Area ‘Environmental Damage,’” *Gettysburg Times*, 27 December 1974. Harry Biesecker, Robert Klnunk, and Kenneth Guise filed the claim individually and as commissioners of Adams County. The defendants were listed as Secretary of the Interior Rogers Morton; Ronald Walker, Director of the NPS; Chester Brooks, Northeast Regional Director; and Gettysburg Superintendent John Earnst.

together properly” and encouraged the town’s support on the matter because “additional delays threaten the options to provide a convenient facility for visitors.”¹⁹

Considering the growing unpopularity of the Master Plan within the community, Superintendent Jerry Schober reported, “Our posture with the community on this subject is rather difficult to uphold.” To improve park-local relations, interested parties established a Community Public Relations Committee in 1973. Each month the superintendent held a meeting in his office with representatives from the Gettysburg Area Council of Governments, the Gettysburg Travel Council, Gettysburg Retail Merchants, Gettysburg College, Gettysburg Lutheran Theological Seminary, Cumberland Township, and the Gettysburg Borough. These monthly meetings allowed the interested parties to “discuss matters of mutual interest and concern.” Superintendent Schober reported these meetings as having been “quite successful in bringing the park and the community closer together.”²⁰

Despite Schober’s confident words, some citizens continued to voice their concerns over the Master Plan. Local businessmen, believing that the park’s proposal to move the visitor center out of town would endanger their businesses along Steinwehr Avenue and the Baltimore Pike, led the opposition. Paul Armstead, Vice President of the Fudge Kitchen located on Baltimore Street, voiced his objections in a letter to the National Park Service’s director. “With the building of a new Visitor Center,” Armstead contended, “visitors have virtually no access to

¹⁹ “U.S. Buys Tract in Gettysburg,” *Philadelphia Inquirer*, 1 February 1975. Albert Butterfield, a retired professor at Gettysburg College, purchased the land in 1949 for \$13,000; *Biesecker v. Morton*, Civil Action No. 74-1244, Filed December 24, 1972. Folder 7, Box 7 (GETT 41105), GNMP Archives; “Local Groups Have Until January 30 To Comment On Park Service Master Plan,” *Gettysburg Times*, 11 December 1974; “Earnst Says Master Plan To Be Flexible To Fit Needs,” *Gettysburg Times*, 17 January 1975. The National Park Service is required to release its Master Plans to the public for an open comment period. The plan then has to be approved by the regional office.

²⁰ Superintendent Schober, “Superintendent’s Yearly Report, 1973,” written on January 25, 1974. Folder 2, Box 1, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives, 7-12.

the town and its merchants who depend so heavily on their traffic.” He further objected to the proposal for a chronological tour. Once the tour route became to one-way, a “closed tour” with a designated entrance and exit, visitors’ ability to leave the battlefield and frequent local establishments, would be severely reduced.²¹

Businessmen who stood to profit from the proximity of the existing visitor center were not the only ones who remained skeptical of the park’s ambitious management proposal, however. Other local residents articulated similar concerns as years of resentment came to the fore. One lifelong Gettysburg resident informed the superintendent, “I have seen a lot of poor management and bad decisions by park officials. Each time a new superintendent and new historians come in we get more poor management and more bad decisions. This is very costly to all taxpayers.” Based on a survey conducted by the Gettysburg Area Chamber of Commerce, 80 percent favored not moving the current visitor center.²²

²¹ Paul Armstead to Gary Everhardt, January 30, 1975. Folder 5, Box 11, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives; “Earnst Says Master Plan To Be Flexible To Fit Needs,” *Gettysburg Times*, 17 January 1975. A “closed tour” meant that visitors would enter at one designated point and proceed to see the battlefield on the park road, without having to access state or county roads. In order to develop the “closed tour” the park service needed to build a series of underpasses and overpasses where the park road intersected a state or local road. Park officials told area businessmen that visitors could get off the tour route at eight different locations. Park staff recommended for the construction of an overpass at the intersection of Mummasburg Road and Doubleday Avenue as well as another overpass at U.S. Route 30 at the West End Guide Station. Gettysburg’s staff recommended several underpasses at the intersection of West Confederate Avenue and U.S. Route 116 and at the intersection of Hunt Avenue and U.S. Route 140.

²² James Reaver to Superintendent John Earnst, January 29, 1975; Ruth Detwiler to Superintendent John Earnst, February 1975. Folder 5, Box 11, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives. In this survey Detwiler reports that 7 percent of those surveyed favored the proposed Cobean farm site.

In the midst of debate over the park's management philosophy, the nation's attention turned to the "Second Battle of Gettysburg." The National Park Service, the Gettysburg Battlefield Preservation Association, and concerned citizens had been fighting the battle against development encroachment for years. Hindered by economic constraints, inadequate zoning regulations in Adams County and a profit-oriented business community, historic lands often fell victim to hotels, gas stations, fast-food restaurants, and an assortment of tourist venues that would be less than desirable to the historic atmosphere.

The war against commercialization and profiteering crystallized in September 1970 when Thomas Ottenstein, a Maryland attorney and developer, announced his proposal to build a 307-foot observation tower near the battlefield.²³ This "classroom in the sky," claimed Ottenstein, would offer visitors a bird's eye view of the battlefield while trained interpreters presented an audio-visual presentation on the battle action. Ottenstein estimated that his million-dollar investment could attract 700,000 visitors annually. The tower's dominating size threatened the historic scene; the tower would be visible from every spot on the battlefield. Compared to the War Department's observation towers, at a mere 75 feet, the 307-foot tower would dominate the landscape. Indeed, the "space needle" would stand taller than any other building in Gettysburg, taller than the Statue of Liberty, and taller than the U.S Capitol in Washington. Assailed for his profiteering intentions, Ottenstein maintained that he was simply providing a visitor service that the National Park Service failed to offer. In fact, he blamed the area's commercialization on the

²³ Thomas Ottenstein, from Bethesda, Maryland, was a successful and wealthy businessman. He established the National Gettysburg Battlefield Tower, Inc. in 1969 and became president of the organization. Ottenstein had received a bachelor's degree from Syracuse University and a law degree from Georgetown University Law School. He also served as a Special Agent in the Counterintelligence Corps of the U.S. Army between 1954 and 1956. Prior to founding NGBT, Ottenstein had served as Director of State National Bank in Bethesda from 1961-1970. For a complete resume on Thomas Ottenstein see, Thomas Ottenstein resume in "Tower For One Nation." Box 1, Gettysburg National Tower, Gettysburg National Military Park Library [hereinafter cited as GNT, GNMP Library].

Park Service's inadequate visitor services, saying, "there would be no commercialism at Gettysburg if the Government had the facilities to provide what people demanded. The Park Service can't handle the people."²⁴

Ottenstein's "classroom in the sky" immediately absorbed a barrage of criticism from the American public and preservationist agencies. In an editorial to the *New York Times*, one concerned citizen urged Americans to speak out against the tower's development because the issue "merits the concern of every American." The National Park Service, the Gettysburg Battlefield Preservation Association, Gettysburg's Civil War Round Table, the Pennsylvania Historical Association, and the Lincoln Fellowship all voiced their opposition to the tower. NPS Director George Hartzog called it an "environmental insult" and added, "of all the unfortunate projects planned or carried out in Gettysburg, this tower is the most monstrous." Local residents meanwhile formed the "Concerned Citizens of Adams County for a Quality Environment" and opposed the tower on the grounds that it constituted "visual pollution." They portrayed Ottenstein as a greedy businessman who was unconcerned for the historical integrity of the Gettysburg battlefield. Ottenstein met the criticism by responding, "I am certainly not in this for the money, although that is the American way... sure I am going to make a profit. But let me tell you, I don't need this tower to live on. I believe in it." To build popular support for his

²⁴ "Gettysburg: Local Planning Adjacent to a Federal Park," no author, no date. Folder 1, Box 1, (GETT 41105), GNMP Archives; "History of Planning at Gettysburg," no author, no date. Folder 6, Box 4, (GETT 41105), GNMP Archives; Ben A. Franklin, "Tower Plan Stirs Battle at Gettysburg," *New York Times*, 20 December 1970, 64. In addition to the regular newspaper coverage on the events surrounding the Gettysburg Tower, several other pieces have been written on the history of the tower. For additional reading on the National Tower see: John Oyler, "Pickett Charges; Everyone Else Pays: The Story of the Gettysburg Tower Controversy" (Senior Thesis at Princeton University, April 17, 1972); Charles R. Roe, "The Second Battle of Gettysburg: Conflict of Public and Private Interests in Land Use Policies," *Environmental Affairs* 2, (Spring 1972), 16-64; Dorn C. McGrath, Jr, "A Proposed Observation Tower Overlooking The Gettysburg National Military Park, Review of the Proposed Undertakings and Evaluation of Its Probable Effects, A Report to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation," April 1972. Oyler's Thesis is considered the most comprehensive study on the early history of the tower, but since it is written in the spring of 1972 it doesn't cover the later years of the tower's history, including its opening.

proposal, Ottenstein reminded area citizens that when the federal government acquired properties the land was removed from the local tax rolls. The National Tower, comparatively, would support the community's economic infrastructure from its revenues and payment of the borough's yearly 10 percent admissions tax. This approach worked; Mayor William Weaver and the Gettysburg borough enthusiastically supported the tower, eager to receive the estimated tax return of \$500,000 within ten years.²⁵

The tower's proposed location also generated debate. Ottenstein had initially approached LeRoy Smith, a town resident, and offered to purchase his property overlooking the Soldiers' National Cemetery along the Baltimore Pike for the tower's site. Smith entertained the offer, but after consulting with the National Park Service, declined to sell. Not to be deterred, and determined to find a proper site for the tower, in November 1970 Ottenstein purchased a tract of land in Colt Park, a residential area adjacent to Steinwehr Avenue. The newly purchased tract was situated within the hub of commercialization. On ground where Pickett's men charged on July 3, an assortment of business establishments already stood, including the Home Sweet Home Hotel, Hardees and Kentucky Fried Chicken fast-food restaurants, and the American Civil War Wax Museum, which attracted thousands of customers each month.²⁶

²⁵ Frank Masland, Letter to the Editor, *New York Times*, 20 February 1971; Ben A. Franklin, "Tower Plan Stirs Battle at Gettysburg," *New York Times*, 20 December 1970, 64; Ben A. Franklin, "Disputed Gettysburg Tower Going Up," *New York Times*, 16 May 1971, 38; Charles Roe, "Second Battle of Gettysburg: Conflict of Public and Private Interests in Land Use Policies." (M.A. Thesis, Indiana University, 1971).

²⁶ "Give Option On Colt Park Tower Site," *Gettysburg Times*, 18 November 1970. Ottenstein purchased the tract for \$42,900. This property was located immediately behind the Home Sweet Home Hotel at the intersection of Johns Avenue and Long Lane. On July 20, 1970 Nelson J. Graft, Building Official, issued Ottenstein a permit (No. G-378) to begin construction on the tower. A copy of the permit can be found in "Tower For One Nation." Box 1, Gettysburg National Tower, Gettysburg National Military Park Library. All notes hereinafter from this collection will be cited as GNT, GNMP Library; Director George B. Hartzog, Jr. to Secretary of the Interior, May 17, 1971. Folder 6, Box 52, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives; Frank E. Masland, Jr., to Henry Scharf, September 14, 1970. Folder 1, Box 54, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives. Masland served as the Chairman of the Governor's Advisory Committee on the Commonwealth's Natural Resources; Scharf was the president of *Gettysburg Times*. In this letter

As Ottenstein prepared to construct his tower, preservationists and local residents remained helpless to prevent its development because Adams County lacked zoning regulations. On May 8, residents of Colt Park filed a class-action suit to prevent the construction of the National Tower in their community. Ignoring the suit, Ottenstein's contractors began boring holes for the tower's foundation. Meanwhile, the National Park Service finally articulated its stance against the tower. The Secretary of the Interior and the Director of the National Park Service both vehemently declared that the tower would destroy the "integrity" of the battlefield. Secretary Rogers Morton's rhetoric was typical, "The most devastating effect of the tower...will be upon the integrity and character of the historic site...The tower will wholly dominate this historic scene and may well constitute one of the most damaging single intrusions ever visited upon a comparable site of American history." As construction on the tower proceeded Secretary Morton asserted that the department would "use whatever authority exists to prevent completion of the project."²⁷

Hartzog also goes into detail on the basis for the park service's opposition to the tower. In 1970, Gettysburg-Cumberland Township received federal funding for a Housing and Urban Affairs (HUD) plan to study land use plan in Gettysburg. The firm of Wallace, McHarg, Roberts and Todd of Philadelphia was selected to do the study. One problem identified in the plan was traffic circulation. HUD's plan proposed that local traffic congestion be relieved by circumferential routes; that tourist traffic be removed from residential areas; and that new development be located on the periphery of the park to prevent overcrowding town streets. The park service asserted that the location of the tower in Colt Park violated all three recommendations. Specifically, the park service argued that the tower site would disrupt parking for people visiting the park's visitor center. The tower's proximity to the visitor center, at .3 of a mile, would interfere with the ability of visitors to find parking easily in the visitor center. Moreover, park officials asserted that traffic would increase at the intersection of Steinwehr Avenue and Long Lane, the access route to the tower site. Such assertions violated HUD's recommendations.

²⁷ Ben A. Franklin, "Disputed Gettysburg Tower Going Up," *New York Times*, 16 May 1971, 38; Secretary of Interior Rogers Morton to Pennsylvania Governor Milton Shapp, June 14, 1971. Folder 8, Box 1, (GETT 41105), GNMP Archives; Secretary of Interior Rogers Morton to Pennsylvania Governor Milton Shapp, June 14, 1971. Folder 6, Box 52, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives. In this letter Morton also urged Pennsylvanians to voice their opposition to the project to protect the "integrity of this site in your state." Local residents formed the Defenders of Gettysburg National Military Park, Inc. and opened negotiations with New York attorney Victor J. Yannacone, Jr. to file a suit to stop the construction of the tower.

Yet without zoning regulations in Adams County, even the federal government remained powerless to stop the construction. Ultimately it gave in. The Park Service decided to at least minimize its impact by quietly proposing to Ottenstein that the tower be moved to a less significant historically area. Several NPS officials visited with Gettysburg's staff on June 18, 1971 to explore potential sites where "the tower might not be objectionable to the National Park Service." The Department of Interior sent special assistant, J. C. Herbert Bryant Jr., a twenty nine year old special assistant to negotiate an agreement between Ottenstein and the Park Service. After considering several sites on the battlefield for the commercial tower, including Little Round Top, Barlow's Knoll, and the Virginia Memorial, the Park Service, through Bryant's negotiations, recommended a location adjacent to the park boundary, near the Soldiers' National Cemetery along the Baltimore Pike. John Maitland, president of Apple County Lodge, owned the desired property, but leased it to Hans Enggren and George and Elizabeth Moose, who operated the Stonehenge Hotel and Restaurant on the tract. Maitland noted that the property was for sale, but reported that Ottenstein had never approached him to purchase it.²⁸

On July 2, 1971 the National Park Service accordingly entered into a land exchange agreement with Ottenstein. The agreement, executed by Bryant but unknown to Gettysburg's staff, stipulated that Ottenstein would immediately cease construction in Colt Park and within five years donate the tract of land to the National Park Service for inclusion into Gettysburg National Military Park. Additionally, the agreement specified the tower would not exceed 307

²⁸ Log of events on the tower's construction. Box 1, GNT, GNMP Library. Officials who participated in this June 1971 site inspection included William Everhart of the Washington Office; Richard Giamberdine of the North East Region; and Superintendent Schober and park historian Tom Harrison. The following day, June 19, Tom Harrison and Frank Masland reviewed the previous day's field trips to explore potential sites for the tower; Richard Giamberdine to Northeast Regional Director, June 23, 1971. Folder 5, Box 1, (GETT 41105), GNMP Archives; "Court Upholds Proposal for Tower at Gettysburg," *New York Times*, 27 October 1971, 28; "Work Begins On New Site Of Ottenstein Tower Today," *Gettysburg Times*, 12 July 1971; "Say Gov. Shapp Will Come Here Monday To File Court Action To Stop 'Field Tower,'" *Gettysburg Times*, 17 July 1971.

feet in height, “on a parcel of land located in the rear of the Stonehenge Motel...or in such other location as may be approved by the Director of the National Park Service.” Ottenstein also agreed to donate 5 percent of the tower’s taxable income to a nonprofit preservation organization. In exchange, the federal government granted Ottenstein a twenty-two foot unrestricted right-of-way across park property to the Stonehenge tract. Interestingly, in the campaign to stop the tower’s construction at the Colt Park site, the Secretary of the Interior and the Director of the National Park Service had both underscored the proximity of the tower to the Soldiers’ National Cemetery. In May 1971, for example, Director Hartzog declared that the tower at Colt Park would be within a quarter a mile from the Soldiers’ National Cemetery entrance and a mere 1,200 feet from the High Water Mark. Per the July 2 agreement, however, the Park Service’s recommended site was actually closer to the Soldiers’ National Cemetery than Ottenstein’s original site.²⁹

The National Park Service’s agreement with Ottenstein became public on July 10, 1971 when the *Gettysburg Times* headlined “Ottenstein-U.S. Deal Moves Tower Site.” Local park officials only learned of the agreement by reading the newspaper article. Two days later on July 12, Ottenstein started clearing land, before he actually acquired ownership rights to the preferred

²⁹ Agreement between the National Park Service and National Gettysburg Battlefield Tower, Inc., July 2, 1971. Folder 2, Box 51, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives. The July 2, 1971 agreement did not specify what nonprofit corporation Ottenstein was to donate the 5 percent of the taxable income to. The NPS stipulated that the right-of-way would be a one-lane road, limited to twelve feet in width, and include a sidewalk for pedestrian traffic. This access route was located along the Taneytown Road just north of Hunt Avenue. The 2.5-acre parcel of land in Colt Park was valued at \$42,775; Director George B. Hartzog, Jr. to Secretary of the Interior, May 17, 1971. Folder 6, Box 52, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives.

site. The day after construction crews initiated work at the Stonehenge site, property owner John Maitland threatened to sue Ottenstein for trespassing.³⁰

After months of firm opposition to the tower's construction, the agency's acquiescence to the tower seemed surprising to most, even to the park staff at Gettysburg, who had been kept in the dark. In an interview with the *Washington Post*, Director Hartzog said that while he had discussed the terms of the agreement with Bryant while on business at the Grand Canyon, Bryant had negotiated the right-of-way exchange without his approval. Hartzog reported that once he returned to Washington and learned of the specifics of the agreement, he tried to redefine the government's position, but it was too late. On July 13, eleven days after the tower agreement was signed and one day after construction began, Schober informed the *Gettysburg Times* that he still had "not yet received any official information on the agreement" from his superiors. Schober claimed that he was not even informed of the agreement until a week after the national office signed it. In a letter to the regional director, Schober blasted the breakdown in communication: "the park was not and has not been officially informed as to the United States Department of Interior National Park Service position on the Gettysburg tower." Schober informed the regional director that he only found out about the agreement from a July 11th news release, "which we had to personally request from the Washington Information Office in an attempt to remain equally as informed as the public." Schober did not obtain a copy of the agreement until a month after the signing, when he received a copy from a local county commissioner. Nearly six weeks after the agreement was signed, the national office finally provided Superintendent Schober with a copy. "We interpreted the agreement not to be an

³⁰ "Ottenstein-U.S. Deal Moves Tower Site," *Gettysburg Times*, 10 July 1971; "Work Begins On New Site Of Ottenstein Tower Today," *Gettysburg Times*, 12 July 1971; "Say Gov. Shapp Will Come Here Monday To File Court Action To Stop 'Field Tower,'" *Gettysburg Times*, 17 July 1971.

endorsement of the tower by the National Park Service,” Schober wrote to the regional director, “but simply an agreement entered into in an effort to have the tower relocated to a less adverse site.” The National Park Service had failed to provide a consistent stance on the construction of the tower. Voicing displeasure with the perceived hypocrisy in the agency’s stance, Superintendent Schober declared, “We personally felt that it would have been unethical to do an about-face and come out supporting the tower after publicly denouncing it for more than a year.”³¹

Even though the National Park Service had acquiesced to the construction of the obtrusive tower, Governor Shapp continued the fight. On July 20, 1971, he filed an injunction in the Adams County Court. The state maintained that the 307-foot tower intruded on the historical integrity of the battlefield and caused irrevocable damage to the landscape and the environment. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania cited the state’s new constitutional environmental amendment, which provided for “clean air, pure water and the preservation of the natural scenic, historic and esthetic values of the environment.” Noted Civil War historian Bruce Catton testified on behalf of the state. Commenting on the tower’s intrusion, Catton told Judge John MacPhail that the tower would “break the spell” of the battlefield. After hearing arguments from both sides, MacPhail dismissed the case on a technicality on October 26, 1971. He upheld the state’s environmental amendment, but declared that since Ottenstein had acquired the building permits before the amendment had been passed, the environmental law was not applicable.

³¹ Oyler, “Pickett Charges; Everyone Else Pays,” 140-146; Bill Richards, “Tower Power: Battlefield Vista Facility Rises Despite Pa. Officials’ Opposition,” *Washington Post*, 28 October 1973. In April 1971 Bryant was selected to serve as the special assistant to Nathaniel Reed, Secretary of Fish and Wildlife; “Commissioners Pleased Over Tower Switch,” *Gettysburg Times*, 13 July 1971; Superintendent Jerry Schober to Regional Director, December 14, 1971. Folder 2, Box 53, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives. Schober writes that he received a copy of the July 2 agreement from Harry Biesecker, a county commissioner.

MacPhail also noted that while the federal government had complete jurisdiction within its boundaries, the Ottenstein site was on private property. Because Adams County and Cumberland Township did not have zoning regulations, the federal government had no authority to prevent the tower's erection. The county judge ultimately concluded that the burden of protecting the historic battlefield fell on the National Park Service. The agency had acquiesced to the tower's construction, so he could not prevent its development. Upon learning of the court's ruling, Ottenstein exclaimed, "Now I am going to build my goddamn tower!"³²

Eager to build his "goddamn tower," Ottenstein faced more obstacles throughout the next year. In the spring of 1972 the President's Advisory Council on Historic Preservation prepared a report examining the impact of the proposed tower. The twenty-member council urged the Secretary of Interior to take any possible actions to assist the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in its legal battle against the tower. In late July arguments were once again heard in the Adams County court. Finding no reason to overturn his previous ruling, Judge MacPhail's opinion read, "If the department was of the opinion at that time the construction of the tower at the proposed site would irreparably harm those values, they would not or should not have signed that

³² Log of events on the tower's construction. Folder 8, Box 1, (GETT 41105), GNMP Archives; *Commonwealth of Pennsylvania v. National Gettysburg Battlefield Tower, Inc.* Folder 1, Box 7, (GETT 41105), GNMP Archives, 1-15; "Court Upholds Proposal for Tower at Gettysburg," *New York Times*, 27 October 1971, 28; "Bruce Catton Tells Court Ottenstein Tower Would 'Break Spell' Of History," *Gettysburg Times* 5 August 1971; "Opposition to Ottenstein Tower, 1973," Folder 3, Box 53, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives; "Encroachments: Proposed Ottenstein Tower," Folder 3, Box 52, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives; Unrau, *Administrative History*, 321-324. This case was *Commonwealth of Pennsylvania vs. National Gettysburg Tower, Inc.* The majority opinion read, in part: "The proposed tower at the proposed site will not irreparably damage the natural, historic, scenic or aesthetic values of the environment of the Gettysburg area, including the Gettysburg National Military Park."

agreement.” He continued to declare that the burden of protecting Gettysburg National Military Park fell, not on the courts, but on “those empowered by law to provide such protection.”³³

Gaining yet another victory in the county courts, Ottenstein’s construction of the tower seemed imminent. He finally acquired a lease to the controversial 6.5-acre tract from Hans Enggren, operator of the Stonehenge facilities. Foundations for the tower were laid in early November 1972. Meanwhile, as construction progressed, and not to be deterred by the county court rulings, Governor Shapp appealed the Adams County Court’s decision to the Pennsylvania Supreme Court. A court order stopped construction while the state supreme court heard the case. On October 3, 1973, the Pennsylvania Supreme Court heard the state’s case against the National Gettysburg Battle Tower, Inc. The following day the court ruled in a four to two decision not to block the construction of the tower. Upon hearing of the Supreme Court’s decision, Governor Shapp lamented, “I consider this a loss for the people of Pennsylvania and the nation. It’s a victory for crass commercialism in the heart of one of our most historic places.” Local officials, however, still eyeing the economic revenue generated from the tower, applauded the court’s decision. Evidently informed of the significance of the events of July 1863, Adams County

³³ “‘Pennsylvania Is Tired Of Exploitation,’ Shapp Tells Advisory Council Here Today,” *Gettysburg Times* 4 May 1972; “President’s Advisory Council Is Told State Can Stop Tower If Interior Dept. Kills Site Pact,” *Gettysburg Times*, 4 May 1972; “President’s Advisory Council Urges All Possible Aid to Pa. In Efforts To Stop Tower Here,” *Gettysburg Times* 8 May 1972; “MacPhail Rules Burden Of Protecting National Shrine Rests On Law- Not His Court,” *Gettysburg Times* 28 July 1972. Under the 1966 Historic Preservation Act, the President’s Advisory Council (PAC) is responsible for commenting on matters effecting National Register sites. The twenty-member council convened in Gettysburg in early May to investigate the tower and to hear statements from proponents and detractors. As reported, the Advisory Council looked “unfavorably” on the negotiations made, and their consequences, between Ottenstein and the National Park Service. Council members also noted that the Department of Interior should have presented the agreement to the PAC for approval. Park service officials noted that they did not submit the agreement to the council because “there wasn’t time” since Ottenstein had already initiated construction at the Colt Park site. Attorney Shane Creamer, representing the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the Department of Interior, argued that the negotiations with Ottenstein on the right-of-way over parkland were illegal because the land exchange violated the Historic Preservation Act. During the hearings, the DOI argued that though they approved the land exchange that did not mean that the NPS approved the tower. When questioned, government officials stated that the agreement did not mean the agency “sanctioned” the construction of the tower.

Commissioner Henry Biesecker stated, “we’re a small county with not much to boast about but this thing is beautiful. It’s like someone came in here and built a new Eiffel Tower, right here in Adams County.”³⁴

After years of controversy and court suits the National Tower opened to the public on July 29, 1974. Ottenstein dedicated the tower to America and “free enterprise.” He promised visitors an “unprecedented” view of the battlefield, which would allow them to “understand more clearly than ever before the daring strategies of the largest battle ever fought on our own soil and the most important of the Civil War.” The tower’s \$1.50 admission included a “high speed” elevator ride to the viewing platform poised 300 feet above ground where visitors would “become a participant in an engrossing and stirring sound and sight interpretative program.” A fourteen-year-old boy from New Jersey purchased the tower’s first admission ticket. After the “skycapsule” experience, visitors could view the battlefield through high-powered telescopes, proceed through a sutler’s store to purchase local trinkets, or relax near the natural spring pond. Visitors were promised that “touring of the actual battlefield and museums will become more

³⁴ Oyler, “Pickett Charges; Everyone Else Pays,” 164; Log of events on the tower’s construction. Folder 8, Box 1, (GETT 41105), GNMP Archives; “Phase I Environmental Site Assessment of the National Tower Site, Gettysburg National Military Park, Cumberland Township, Adams County Pennsylvania.” Prepared for the National Park Service by Synergist Incorporated, April 1999. Folder “National Tower, FY00,” Box 72, W32, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives; “Stonehenge Equity Suit Begun Here,” *Gettysburg Times*, 30 March 1972. In late March 1972, Hans Enggren and the George and Elizabeth Moose, operators of the Stonehenge Restaurant and Motel, filed suit against property owner John Maitland and Apple County Lodge. The suit was filed to force Maitland to sell the property the six-acre tract to them under their purchase option clause. The lease, signed June 2, 1970, gave Enggren an option to purchase the property for approximately \$300,000. The *Gettysburg Times* reported that Enggren notified Maitland of his interest in buying his option in late February, but Maitland declared that the purchase option had been violated when Enggren permitted Ottenstein to clear the site for the tower the previous year. Enggren won the court suit and provided Ottenstein with a ninety nine year lease to the property; “Opposition to Ottenstein Tower, 1973,” Folder 3, Box 53, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives; “Encroachments: Proposed Ottenstein Tower,” Folder 3, Box 52, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives; *Gettysburg Times* “State Supreme Court Refuses to Block Ottenstein Battlefield Tower” 4 October 1973. Justice Henry X. O’Brien wrote the majority decision and Chief Justice Benjamin R. Jones authored the dissenting opinion. One judge, Thomas W. Pomeroy, abstained from the decision. Construction of the tower had stopped in June after the court order, but continued upon hearing the court’s favorable decision. When the court ruling stopped construction, the tower was about 160-feet high; Bill Richards, “Tower Power: Battlefield Vista Facility Rises Despite Pa. Officials’ Opposition,” *Washington Post*, 28 October 1973.

meaningful and worthwhile after visiting the National Tower.” Regardless of the outcry from battlefield preservationists, the National Tower became an extremely popular attraction.

Ottenstein reported approximately 30,000 visitors during the tower’s opening week.³⁵

Many critics still bitterly complained that Ottenstein, with his 307-foot steel monstrosity was financially benefitting from the battle’s 51,000 casualties. Characterizing him as a profiteer, they labeled the tower the “cash register in the sky.” With a nod toward Lincoln’s “Gettysburg Address” the *New York Times* offered, “One score and eighteen months ago, Thomas R. Ottenstein, a wealthy Washington news dealer and real estate developer, brought forth on this hallowed ground the massive concrete footings of a new tourist observation tower, dedicated to the proposition that all men among the millions of person who visit this historic Civil War battlefield every year should see it better from the air- at \$1.35 a ticket.”³⁶

One year after the tower opened, on June 30, 1975, Ottenstein and the National Park Service revised the original 1971 land exchange agreement. This revision specified that the 5 percent taxable income would be donated to the National Park Foundation, a nonprofit preservation organization chartered by Congress in 1967 to raise money for the National Park System. The agreement stipulated that the donation would be earmarked for land acquisition or improvements at Gettysburg National Military Park.³⁷

³⁵ National Gettysburg Battlefield Tower Brochure. Undated. Folder 4, Box 45, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives; “Gettysburg Tower Opens ‘For The People’ and Profit,” *New York Times*, 28 July 1974, 28; “Ottenstein Dedicates His Tower To ‘Our Nation and Free Enterprise,’” *Gettysburg Times*, 19 August 1974; “Tourists High on Gettysburg Tower,” *Philadelphia Inquirer*, 4 August 1971.

³⁶ “Gettysburg Tower Opens ‘For The People’ and Profit,” *New York Times*, 28 July 1974, 28.

³⁷ Agreement and Land Exchange Amended, June 30, 1975. Box 73, W32, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives. The contract also stipulated that the National Park Foundation provide the donor (Ottenstein) with an accounting of the expenditure of the donated funds.

In the years after the opening of the tower, the National Park Service continually received criticism for cooperating with Thomas Ottenstein. Responding to one letter from an outraged Indiana resident, the acting regional director defended the Park Service's decision by maintaining, "The National Park Service exerted all the force and persuasion at its disposal to prevent construction of the tower, but all was in vain because the development was in private hands." Some Americans nonetheless felt betrayed by the Park Service's cooperation with a commercial business, declaring the agency "was bought off" and betrayed its preservationist philosophy. One Virginian asserted, "The National Park Service abdicated its responsibility to the American people for 5 percent of the profits of the new observation tower." Others saw the secret negotiations of the tower as part and parcel of the corruption of President Richard Nixon's administration. In a *Detroit Free Press* article, "The Hucksters Close in on Gettysburg's Grandeur," Civil War historian Bruce Catton summed up critics' feelings on the tower, writing, "The tower is a damned outrage. While it isn't located on the battlefield, it is so high that it dominates everything and jolts you back to the present. I only hope that someday people will come to their senses and remove the tower."³⁸

³⁸ Benjamin Zerbey to Acting Regional Director, James Gowen; William Doherty to Ronald Walker, NPS Director, November 23, 1973. Folder 3, Box 53, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives; "Bryant Denies Allegations In New Tower Court Action," *Gettysburg Times*, 21 December 1973; Bill Richards, "Tower Power: Battlefield Vista Facility Rises Despite Pa. Officials' Opposition," *Washington Post*, 28 October 1973. In this article, Richards explores political connections between Ottenstein and high ranking Republican officials. Reportedly, Ottenstein and his family made regular donations to Republican campaigns, amounting to at least \$6,000. When questioned about the donations, Ottenstein denied that they were made to solicit political support for the tower. Richards reports that Ottenstein approached Baltimore mortgage banker I.H. "Bud" Hammerman to secure financing for the tower. Hammerman was a long time friend of former Maryland Governor, and current Vice President, Spiro Agnew. The United States Attorney General's office accused Hammerman of funneling payments from state engineering consultants to Governor Agnew. Opposing the construction of the tower was Pennsylvania Governor Milton Shapp, a Democrat. In the 1973 Pennsylvania Supreme Court case, Shapp and company accused Bryant of being a "political operative" for high ranking Republican officials; "The Hucksters Close in on Gettysburg's Grandeur," *Detroit Free Press*, 12 May 1974.

In the decade following the Civil War Centennial, Gettysburg developed a full interpretative schedule offering visitors the opportunity to participate in a variety of educational programs and living history demonstrations. For decades the self-guided auto tour had been the park's primary interpretive tool, while the park rangers offered limited programs. The campfire program, first offered in 1941, gained more popularity during the centennial and remained a well-attended summer program. By the 1970s visitors to the battlefield during the summer season enjoyed expanded interpretive and recreational opportunities. During this period, the Park Service continued the landscape management philosophy of restoring the terrain to its 1863 appearance, adopting a practice of "screening" visual intrusions, and securing private properties within the park boundary.

Interpretive operations during the 1970s followed into three themes: "The Men Who Fought," "The Folks Who Stayed Home," and "The Man Lincoln." Visitors interested in learning more about the fighting that occurred could join a park ranger for a twenty-minute talk on Day 1, Little Round Top, or Pickett's Charge. Expanding beyond traditional battlefield interpretation, the park's "Women in the War" offered a living history interpretation of a civilian woman and her experiences in "coping with the heat, stench, pain, and sorrow of Gettysburg after the Battle." Park rangers also offered a guided tour through the Soldiers' National Cemetery to explore the impact of Lincoln's words in the Gettysburg Address. During the summer, rangers offered two children's programs. Over 75,000 visitors attended these battlefield programs during the 1972 summer season.³⁹

³⁹ Superintendent Jerry Schober, "Superintendent's Yearly Report, 1972," written on January 22, 1973. Folder 2, Box 1, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives, 2-3; "Gettysburg: Summer Programs, 1974," (Eastern National in Cooperation with Gettysburg National Military Park). Folder 7, Box 21, Interpretive Program Files, 1930-present, Records of the National Park Service at Gettysburg National Military Park, (GETT 43970), Gettysburg National

In addition to the formal battlefield talks, park rangers offered several living history programs. These programs, conducted in the first-person, intended to give visitors an awareness of the life of Civil War soldiers or civilians. The Civil War soldier program remained a popular living-history demonstration. The focus of this program was not simply to show visitors the weaponry or uniforms of the war, but to “give meaning” to the 19th century way of life. Park supervisors instructed their staff to chew tobacco, go barefoot, and not to shave. The men wore Union uniforms equipped with a “distinctive aroma” that “added” to the interpretive “environment.” This program occurred thirteen times each day outside the visitor center near the historic Bryan Farm; during the summer of 1969 approximately 108,000 visitors attended. In the summer of 1972, the park followed up with two new living-history interpretive programs, “Civil War Cavalryman” and “Women in the Crisis.” The “Civil War Cavalryman,” a park ranger dressed as a Union cavalry soldier, told “a tale of a man and a horse who joined the cavalry for a good time, but found bad times as well.” Both of the new programs proved to be popular with visitors, as indicated by the nearly 40,000 in attendance during the 1972 summer season. The Park Service also began preparing the historic Snyder farm for use as a living-history farm. Dressed in period costume, rangers demonstrated the daily workings of an 1863 Adams County farm in the program “Man and the Land at Gettysburg.” Receiving a generous grant from Eastern National, the park’s non-profit partner, for farm equipment, the Park Service opened the Snyder farm to the public in the summer of 1973.⁴⁰

Military Park Archives [hereinafter cited as (GETT 43970), GNMP Archives]. Between 1964 and 1972 the National Park Service did not require park superintendents to submit annual reports. In 1972, NPS Director George Hartzog reinstated the policy of superintendent’s annual reports.

⁴⁰ Thomas Harrison to Superintendent George Emery, September 17, 1969. Folder 10, Box 37, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives. After visitors saw the cyclorama program, they were escorted with a park ranger outside to the overlook where the ranger pointed out significant landmarks associated with Pickett’s Charge. During the summer

Following to the larger environmental awareness trends in the late 1960s and 1970s, Gettysburg's staff initiated environmental interpretive opportunities for park visitors that explored issues of "experiment in awareness," including universal issues of pollution and conservation. These evening programs held at the amphitheater featured an environmental film, followed by a discussion on the natural environment. At the conclusion of the program, rangers were given the opportunity to "stump speak" on environmental issues. The public, however, greeted the environmental awareness programs with mixed reviews. A total of thirty-six programs were presented to 6,905 visitors. Harrison reported that phrases of "environmental awareness" and "conservation" drove more people away than they attracted.⁴¹

season, after the overlook talks, visitors had the option of proceeding to the Bryan farm for the Civil War soldier demonstration. Crowds of 100-200 gathered around the fence at the Bryan farm to listen to the living historian explain the life of a Union soldier; Superintendent Jerry Schober, "Superintendent's Yearly Report, 1972," written on January 22, 1973. Folder 2, Box 1, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives, 2-3; "Gettysburg: Summer Programs, 1974," (Eastern National in Cooperation with Gettysburg National Military Park). Folder 7, Box 21, (GETT 43970), GNMP Archives; Superintendent Schober, "Superintendent's Yearly Report, 1973," written on January 25, 1974, 3;9; Superintendent John Earnst, "Superintendent's Yearly Report, 1976," written on March 9, 1977. Folder 2, Box 1, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives, 2. Eastern National provided the park with a \$5,141 donation for the farming tools. During the bicentennial summer over 11,000 people visited the living-history farm. Several NPS officials formed Eastern National in May 1947 to serve as a non-profit partner to National Parks on the east coast. Eastern National operates bookstores, films/theaters or other interpretive media, and also provides funding for enhanced educational opportunities. The May 1947 meeting occurred in Gettysburg and GNMP was Eastern National first sales outlet.

⁴¹ Thomas J. Harrison to Superintendent George Emery, November 18, 1969. Box 21, (GETT 43970), GNMP Archives. Once the park began offering the environmental campfires, the M.G.M film was shown twice each evening in the park's visitor center. These programs included: "The Monuments of Man," "The Sounds Of Silence, Or Where The Noise Is At," "A Matter of Guns and a Matter of Time," and "The New Frontier"; Thomas Harrison, "Experiment in Awareness: Amphitheater Report for July 21 through August 30, 1969." Box 20, (GETT 43970), GNMP Archives, 1-11. Harrison also reported that these environmental programs represented a change in interpretative style. In years past the campfire's film was the main attraction, but during the environmental programs, however, the film was secondary to the ranger's talk. Films included, "A Matter of Time," "For All To Enjoy," "Living Heritage," and "This Land." The park rangers also led an open question and answer session and talked informally with the attendees about various conservation issues in their home towns. Park staff, in addition to the public, expressed some resistance to environmental conservation programs. Harrison reported some "apathy and downright hostility" among the staff, which may have stifled the enthusiasm of potential visitors. The 1970s marked the beginnings of an actual environmental movement where the federal government took active steps in regulating environmental policies. For example, Earth Day was designated as April 22 and first celebrated in 1970. President Richard Nixon also signed legislation creating the Clean Air Act in 1970 and he also provided for the Environmental Protection Agency in 1970. One of the works responsible for contributing to environmental awareness in this period is Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring*, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1962).

Aside from expanding interpretive programming, Gettysburg park staff worked to increase recreational opportunities within the park boundaries. Beginning in 1966, park planners again recommended the development of recreational opportunities on the battlefield. They called for building lunch and camping facilities at a non-intrusive area of the battlefield. In the 1972 Master Plan, Harrison and park planners recommended that the park “encourage” recreational activities on the battlefield, including but not limited to sleigh riding, ice skating, Easter egg hunts, and kite flying. These recreational activities were an effort to appeal to the local community and to strengthen relations between the Park Service and the surrounding area by making the battlefield accessible to uses other than exploring the events of July 1863. This report further recommended additional historic or environmental trails, which “should not disturb the historic scene and mood of the park.” In 1972 eight miles of horse trails on the battle grounds were constructed.⁴²

Yet Gettysburg staff continued to work on restoring the landscape to its 1863 historical appearance. The park’s eight historic farms and buildings, and preservation of the historic structures remained a critical component of park management. In 1972 work began on the extensive restoration of the Brian house on Hancock Avenue, which involved disassembling the farmhouse structure and rebuilding the one and a half story home. Once restored, the house was furnished and used as a look-in-exhibit. During the same year park staff started an extensive project in preserving the Moses McClean house on the first day’s battlefield.⁴³

⁴² “Master Plan, 1966.” Folder 2, Box 11, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives, 6-18; “A Master Plan Report, 1972.” Folder 1, Box 2, (GETT 41105), GNMP Archives, 84; Superintendent Schober, “Superintendent’s Yearly Report, 1973,” written on January 25, 1974. Folder 2, Box 1, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives 8-11.

⁴³ Superintendent Schober, “Superintendent’s Yearly Report, 1972,” written on January 22, 1973. Folder 2, Box 1, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives, 5

In the same vein, the Park Service examined the feasibility of removing several landscape features placed on the battlefield during the War Department period. In 1969 the park's planning team recommended removing the 1890s observation towers because they were "aesthetically unpleasing" and lacking in "interpretive potential." Chickamauga-Chattanooga and Vicksburg National Military Parks had already removed their towers as early as 1962. Using the actions at Vicksburg and Chickamauga as precedent, and because the towers did not possess any historical significance and were difficult to maintain, the Park Service had recommended their removal in 1967. Moreover, Superintendent Emery argued that since the Park Service had installed interpretive wayside exhibits on the battlefield, fewer visitors made use of the observation towers. Emery recommended the Big Round Top tower be immediately removed, because it was not on the park tour and received minimal use. The superintendent did not anticipate any serious opposition to the removal, but he did expect some individuals to oppose the decision "since the battlefield has become so much a part of the community and any change brings reaction or raises questions."⁴⁴

In places where modern developments interfered with the historic landscape, the Park Service meanwhile developed a philosophy of screening visual intrusions. By the 1970s, Steinwehr Avenue and Baltimore Pike had evolved into a whirlpool of tourist attractions, complete with souvenir shops, hotels, restaurants, and private museums. Located directly across

⁴⁴ "Master Plan, 1969." Folder 3, Box 1, (GETT 41105), GNMP Archives, 53; Superintendent John Cook, Chickamauga-Chattanooga, to Superintendent George Emery, January 3, 1967; Superintendent W. R. Sund, Vicksburg, to Superintendent George Emery, January 3, 1967; Superintendent Albert W. Banton, Jr., Lincoln Boyhood Home, to Superintendent George Emery, January 4, 1966. Folder 1, Box 17, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives; Murray H. Nelligan, Assistant to the Regional Director, Historic Preservation, to Northeast Regional Director, December 14, 1967. Folder 1, Box 17, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives. In this memo Nelligan called for the immediate removal of the tower on Big Round Top and Oak Ridge. Since the park service had recently rehabilitated the observation tower on West Confederate Avenue (referred to as the Longstreet Tower) it would be retained; Superintendent George Emery to Regional Director, February 9, 1968. Folder 1, Box 17, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives.

from the park's visitor center and cyclorama center, Steinwehr Avenue in particular drew a tremendous amount of criticism for its overdevelopment and zealous commercialization. The avenue bisected the battlefield, specifically the field of Pickett's Charge, and remained home to a number of hotels, restaurants, neon lights, and tourist venues. Unable to contain the perpetual growth of profiteering businesses, the National Park Service adopted a landscape management program by planting seedlings or mature tree growth to screen these commercial intrusions from key interpretive areas. This landscape management philosophy recommended tree screening, "within the bounds of historical integrity," when the historic view shed was impaired. Implementing the screening policy, the Park Service initiated a "Steinwehr Avenue Beautification" project. Using a grant from the National Park Foundation, the project provided landscaping, re-signing, and beautifying four blocks of Steinwehr Avenue.⁴⁵ The landscaping and use of simple signage for business establishments offered a visual screen for the park's visitor center, cyclorama center, and battlefield tour route.

In combination with the development of the planning documents, park officials also advocated a new land acquisition policy. Sustaining the status quo of battle acreage was not an option because, "a no-land program will allow the continuing deterioration of the historic environment that has been deemed a vital part of the Nation's heritage." Authors of the "Justification of Land Acquisition Proposal for Gettysburg National Military Park," written in 1973, recommended the park acquire an additional six hundred acres. Three significant high

⁴⁵ Superintendent Schober, "Superintendent's Yearly Report, 1972," written on January 22, 1973. Folder 2, Box 1, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives, 4; "Master Plan, 1972." Folder 1, Box 3, (GETT 41105), GNMP Archives. This plan also recommended that utility lines be placed underground; Superintendent Schober, "Superintendent's Yearly Report, 1973," written on January 25, 1974. Folder 2, Box 1, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives, 5; Superintendent John Earnst, Request For Grant from the National Park Foundation, December 14, 1976. Folder 5, Box 11, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives.

priority acquisitions included acreage at the Peace Light Inn, land near the newly acquired Gettysburg National Museum and the Fantasyland Amusement Park.⁴⁶

While the Park Service set out to institute a land acquisition policy, local commissioners fought to prevent the park from acquiring any more privately owned property in order to retain the property on the local tax rolls. In the fall of 1971 Superintendent Earnst mailed out letters to fifty-five residents who owned land that the Park Service wished to acquire. Earnst's letter simply asked the landowners if they would be willing to sell their property to the NPS on an "opportunity purchase basis." The superintendent's inquiry created a new firestorm of controversy within the local community. Some residents alleged the Park Service wanted to "take" or "condemn" residents' land. County Commissioner Harry Biesecker led the opposition. Other local officials, including Congressman George Goodling, supported him. Goodling asked when the federal government would stop acquiring land for the battlefield, saying he did not believe "it is necessary for the Park Service to own every foot of ground on which a soldier may have stepped. Maintenance is becoming increasingly more costly and every additional purchase means more permanent maintenance." In a letter to NPS Director Hartzog, Goodling reinforced his position on limiting battlefield land acquisitions, noting that he would not "condone the continual buying of more and more property." The Congressman encouraged fiscal constraint

⁴⁶ "Justification of Land Acquisition Proposal for Gettysburg National Military Park," unknown author, 1973-1974. Folder 10, Box 2, (GETT 41105), GNMP Archives. Of the recommended 600 acres, the authors proposed a direct purchase of 379.52 acres and the acquisition of scenic easements on 221.62 acres; Superintendent George F. Emery, "Land Acquisition Program," July 29, 1970. Folder 1, Box 49, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives. In this 1970 report Superintendent Emery offers a listing of ten tracts under option or owned by the National Park Foundation or Eastern National. In this report Emery listed the tract, its historical significance, and speculated on scenarios if the property was not acquired.

stating, “With a government that has operated in the red rather consistently since the early 1930s isn’t it about time that some of us give a little thought to belt-tightening?”⁴⁷

These issues manifested themselves in the controversy over a proposed vocational school on the fields of Day 1. In March 1973 the Adams County School Board announced its intentions to acquire the Barlow’s Knoll for the construction of a county Vocational Technical School. Adams County owned the land in question, totaling nearly fourteen acres, adjacent to the park’s northern boundary. The land selected for the Vo-Tech school had been a high priority for acquisition by the Park Service. Seeking to prevent the school’s construction on Barlow’s Knoll, the Gettysburg Battlefield Preservation Association filed a suit in the U.S. District Court in March 1974, arguing that federal funds should be withheld for the school’s construction on historic terrain. A month later and in the face of vehement criticism, the Adams County School Board withdrew its plans.⁴⁸

In the face of local criticism and even court suits, the National Park Service refused to back down. Park management maintained that the federal government would acquire lands only with the owner’s consent and that the owner would be paid a fair market value. The National Park Service, moreover, upheld the view that the acquisition of private properties did not harm the local tax base, as summarized by Assistant Director Edward Hummel: “The Service’s current land acquisition program consists solely of purchases from owners who wish to sell land and is a hardship to no one.” In fact, the assistant director reminded detractors that the battlefield

⁴⁷ “National Park Service Has Sent Letters To 55 Asking If They Wish To Sell Land,” *Gettysburg Times*, 29 October 1971; Congressman George Goodling, memo, November 29, 1971; Congressman George Goodling to Director George Hartzog, June 22, 1971. Folder 1, Box 49, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives; Goodling, a Republican, served as the 19th Congressional District Representative from 1960 until 1974.

⁴⁸ Kent Frizzell, Solicitor, to Carla Hills, Assistant Attorney General, July 1974; William Everhart, NPS Director, to Honorable William Ford, House of Representatives, July 1974. Folder 2, Box 54, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives.

generated more income in tourist dollars than would be lost from property taxes. Hummel asserted that, “The taxable values of the land in Federal ownership are inconsequential indeed when compared with the vast revenue accruing to the region from visitors who come to see the battlefield.” He continued, “These people come to see the historic battlefield; they do not come to see hamburger stands. Surely it is not asking too much of those who benefit so greatly economically from the park to refrain from desecrating the very values that bring in their revenues.”⁴⁹

Commercialization meanwhile continued to intrude on the battlefield from many directions, especially along the main arteries into town: Steinwehr Avenue, Emmitsburg Road, Taneytown Road, and Chambersburg Pike. Consequently, the Park Service concentrated much of its land acquisition efforts to purchase the tourist shops along these four roads. On April 5, 1974 the federal government purchased Fantasyland, located on the Taneytown Road. The 43.04-acre amusement park cost \$1,382,650. Under the provisions of the agreement, Fantasyland’s owner, A. Kenneth Dick, would continue to operate the amusement park while leasing it from the government for ten years. The local community supported this leasing agreement since Dick continued to pay county, township, and school taxes. County Commissioner Biesecker gave his approval of the negotiations and called the agreement a “step in the right direction.” One year later, the Park Service purchased the twenty-two acre Peace Light Inn on the first day’s battlefields.⁵⁰

⁴⁹ Assistant Director Edward Hummel to Congressman George Goodling, undated; Assistant Director Edward Hummel to Major William Weaver, September 11, 1970. Folder 1, Box 49, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives.

⁵⁰ “U.S. Buys Fantasyland For \$1,382,650; Mother Goose Will Move Within 10 Years,” *Gettysburg Times*, 8 April 1974; Chester Brooks, Regional Director, to Honorable Herman Schneebeil, September 1974. Folder 2, Box 49, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives; “H. Biesecker Praises NPS For Tax Plan,” *Gettysburg Times*, 10 April 1974. The agreement between the park service and Dick also held that he was unable to relocate his business to any site within

In the midst of the tower fiasco, the lawsuit to prevent construction of the Vo-Tech school, and continual commercial development within the Gettysburg community, local and national governments passed several ordinances to better protect Gettysburg National Military Park. First, in 1966 Gettysburg National Military Park went on the National Register of Historic Places with the passage of the National Historic Preservation Act. While the battlefield had received federal recognition and protection since its enabling legislation of 1895, the borough of Gettysburg had not had status as a historic site. Consequently, many residents and businessmen made structural changes to historic buildings or established businesses in historically significant areas without any state or federal oversight. Finally, in 1972, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania recognized Gettysburg as a historic district. The National Tower, by highlighting an underlying issue between Park Service officials and the local community on the park boundary led to more legislation. In 1974, Congress established a limit of 3,874 acres for the park boundary. For the next two decades, this boundary guided Gettysburg's land acquisition program. In 1975, two additional developments better protected the battlefield. One year after the National Tower opened and after years of development around the park's boundary, Adams County finally implemented zoning restrictions. More significantly, though the battlefield had been listed on the National Register in 1966, there was no documentation that defined its significant features or what mandated preservation. Thus, on March 18, 1975, the Gettysburg Battlefield Historic District (GBHD), which incorporates approximately 11,000 acres of the battle action area as well as the surrounding townships, was added to the National Register of

the boundaries of Gettysburg National Military Park. Allowing Fantasyland to continue to operate for a decade also meant that the company would retain its 200 employees, as well as paying the local taxes. Under this contract Fantasyland paid \$13,826 to the Gettysburg Area School District as a realty transfer tax; "Offer To Sell Real Property" agreement between Gettysburg National Military Park and the Peace Light Inn, September 26, 1975. Folder 3, Box 49, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives. The Park Service purchased the 22.15 acres for \$630,000.

Historic Places. The GBHD included the appropriate documentation, strict boundary definition, and statement of significance for the historic resources.⁵¹

To some Americans the Civil War Centennial events mirrored a “Roman circus” and made a mockery of the sacrifices made by Civil War soldiers. The nation’s bicentennial events, however, while offering some degree of entertainment, primarily buttressed patriotism through educational opportunities. Bicentennial celebrations at Gettysburg National Military Park were nearly as elaborate as the Civil War Centennial commemorations held thirteen years earlier. Superintendent John Earnst reported, “our participation in Bicentennial activities was surprisingly extensive for a “non-Bicentennial” park.”⁵² Pennsylvania capitalized on the state’s role in two critical events in American history, the signing of the Declaration in Philadelphia in July 1776 and the climactic Civil War battle at Gettysburg in July 1863, by promoting the July

⁵¹ Unrau, *Administrative History*, 312-313; Superintendent John Earnst, “Superintendent’s Yearly Report, 1976,” March 9, 1977. Folder 2, Box 1, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives, 19; *General Management Plan*, Gettysburg National Military Park and National Cemetery, (Prepared by Mid-Atlantic Regional Office, December 1982), 13-16 [hereinafter cited by *GMP*, 1982]; *Land Protection Plan*, October 1993. (Gettysburg: Gettysburg National Military Park, 1993), 1-92. This plan was submitted by Superintendent Jose Cisneros on October 19, 1993 and approved by Regional Director B.J. Griffin on November 5, 1993. Since the 1880s, the War Department and subsequently the National Park Service based their practice of land acquisition on the Sickles Map and the park’s 1895 enabling legislation, which provided for 15,360 acres. The GBHD includes the acreage of Gettysburg National Military Park as well as battle action land outside of the park boundary, as well as surrounding townships of Cumberland, Straban, Mount Joy, and Mount Pleasant. The National Register of Historic Places was authorized under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 and is officially administered by the National Park Service. This register lists cultural and historic resources, including buildings, sites significant to American History, that are worthy of preserving. To date, over 80,000 properties are listed on the register. For more information on the National Register of Historic Places, see: www.nps.gov/history/nr or www.nationalregisterofhistoricplaces.com.

⁵² “A Strange Spectacle at Bull Run,” *Gettysburg Times*, 25 July 1961. Box 4, Newspaper Clipping (Unbound), 1958-1961, (GETT 43663), Records of the National Park Service at Gettysburg National Military Park, Gettysburg National Military Park Archives [hereinafter cited by (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives]; Superintendent John Earnst, “Superintendent’s Yearly Report, 1976,” written on March 9, 1977. Folder 2, Box 1, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives, 2.

1976 celebrations as the “200th Anniversary of Our Glorious Nation; 113th Anniversary of The Battle That Saved Our Nation, July 2, 3, 4, 5, 1976.”

Various bicentennial events occurred on other Civil War battlefields in 1976. The National Park Service, at a national and regional level, encouraged participation in the nation’s bicentennial celebrations. In early January 1976, the Mid-Atlantic Region received \$563,000 for its regional parks to develop bicentennial activities. The Regional Director, Chester Brooks, impressed upon park superintendents that the Park Service needed to “enhance the heritage of each citizen we contact.” Bicentennial activities at Gettysburg kicked off in the summer of 1975 with the raising of America’s bicentennial flag and a display of various traveling exhibits. The following summer, Gettysburg National Military Park, like many other national parks, hosted special bicentennial performances. In May, Gettysburg sponsored a film festival featuring films on NPS revolutionary sites. For the bicentennial, Harper’s Ferry Center produced and sponsored two traveling plays, “We’ve Come Back for a Little Look Around” and “People of ’76,” which portrayed figures of the American Revolution. On June 20 performers offered three showings of “We’ve Come Back for a Little Look Around” before an estimated crowd of 1,600. Nearly 3,000 attended four performances of “People of ’76” held on September 3 and 4. Designed principally for children, a traveling troupe of actors called “The Dreammakers” visited Gettysburg to perform “USA ’76” for 175 children on the battlefield during July. In addition to the national traveling shows, the park staff, in cooperation with Footlight Ranch of Pennsylvania, produced a series of bicentennial vignettes. These “light-hearted playlets” celebrated the “courage and character of America.” Billing the vignettes as the “The Carol of Courage,” over the summer season park staff performed 464 shows for nearly 20,000 spectators. In addition the

park hosted several traveling exhibits, including Listening Chairs, Artist-in-Parks Paintings, and a Woody Williams Photograph exhibit.⁵³

If the 200th anniversary of American independence did not offer enough patriotic celebrations, Americans gathered at Gettysburg to commemorate the 113th anniversary of the battle with affectionate zeal. Regularly a symbolic gathering spot during the battle anniversary, on July 3 a crowd of over 3,500 gathered at the Eternal Light Peace Memorial to witness a symbolic relighting of the monument's flame. The following day nearly 35,000 spectators attended a re-enactment held on private property south of the battlefield. On July 5 over 400 re-enactors marched across the battlefield and fought in a symbolic "Tug of War Between the North and South."⁵⁴

During the summer of 1976 the ranger staff prepared to handle the "bicentennial rush" by offering visitors an assortment of educational opportunities. To better inform visitors of the park's offerings, the National Park Service designed a summer brochure, "Four Score & Seven," to distribute to visitors. To make the visitor experience "more meaningful" the park rangers

⁵³ Chester Brooks to Park Superintendents, January 30, 1976. Folder 3, Box 6, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives. The Mid-Atlantic Region's allocation of \$563,000 was the largest sum received by any region with the National Park Service. The "What You Can Do: A Bicentennial Idea Book" included suggestions on how to develop cookbooks, art displays, anti-pollution campaigns, or folk culture displays. To facilitate creative ideas on how the parks could "enhance" visitor's heritage, the National Park Service developed "What You Can Do: A Bicentennial Idea Book"; Superintendent John Earnst, "Superintendent's Yearly Report, 1975," written on February 11, 1976. Folder 2, Box 1, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives, 2; Barry Mackintosh, "Interpretation in the National Park Service: A Historical Perspective." History Division, National Park Service, Department of Interior, Washington, D.C., 1986. Online book http://www.nps.gov/history/history/online_books/mackintosh3/index.htm. Harper's Ferry Center had been established in 1970 to design various interpretive media, exhibits, and pamphlets for the National Park Service. The center also provides conservation and restoration assistance. For more information on Harper's Ferry Center see: <http://www.nps.gov/hfc>; Superintendent John Earnst, "Superintendent's Yearly Report, 1976," written on March 9, 1977. Folder 2, Box 1, (GETT 41160), 2-3; Gettysburg Administrative Officer to John Shreve, President of Footlight Ranch, February 27, 1976; Superintendent John Earnst to Regional Director, September 24, 1976. Folder 3, Box 6, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives; Superintendent John Earnst, "Superintendent's Yearly Report, 1976," written on March 9, 1977. Folder 2, Box 1, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives, 2.

⁵⁴ Superintendent John Earnst to Regional Director, September 24, 1976. Folder 3, Box 6, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives. The reenactment was held on the Hartman Farm, located adjacent to Big Round Top.

offered interpretive programs at the Eternal Light Peace Memorial, Little Round Top, and the High Water Mark. In addition, the rangers offered a twenty-minute walking tour in the Soldiers' National Cemetery. As in years past, the rangers presented "Women in the War," held at General Meade's Headquarters, and at the park amphitheater visitors could interact with a park ranger dressed as a cavalryman in the park's "Cavalryman Presentation." The Granite Farm remained open for eight hours daily to allow visitors to attend the "War and the Farmer" presentation, and explore the war's impact on the local civilians.⁵⁵

Hosting approximately two million visitors each year in the decade after the Civil War Centennial, Gettysburg's popularity in American culture continued to soar. Profiteering businessmen capitalized on the battlefield's popularity. Meanwhile, within the agency, the Park Service initiated a significant long-term management philosophy for the first time in the history of Gettysburg National Military Park. The series of Master Plans offered several significant alterations to the operation of the battlefield, namely the establishment of an information center north of town and the development of a chronological tour route. By 1976, though the prospects of the U.S. Route 30 bypass seemed remote, park planners continued to advocate the new information center and restructured tour route as the preferred alternative. Team planners revised the series of Master Plans and in 1977 produced a draft copy of the General Management Plan. Five years later, after further revisions and public meetings, the regional and national offices finally approved the plan. Retaining some ideas proposed in the previous drafts, the 1982 General Management Plan offered a philosophy designed to guide Gettysburg National Military

⁵⁵ "Four Score & Seven: Gettysburg's Bicentennial Newspaper." Published by the National Park Service, vol. 1, no. 1, Summer 1976. Folder 4, Box 45, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives. Visitors were also welcomed to bring their horses and explore the park on the newly constructed bridle trail. Gettysburg's rangers regularly patrolled the park on horseback to set a friendly image of the park ranger to tourists.

Park into the 21st century. Like most of Gettysburg's history, however, the management plans became mired in more heated debate and controversy.

Chapter 8

“So Conceived And So Dedicated”:

A Decade of Planning Without Implementation, 1977-1988

In the decade following the Civil War Centennial, Gettysburg National Military Park remained one of the most popular historic attractions in America, attracting approximately two million visitors each year. As visitation increased, the National Park Service faced a dilemma: how to provide quality visitor services and interpretive opportunities, while also protecting and preserving the site’s cultural and historic resources. As noted in the previous chapter, the Park Service began to express its short term and long-range planning initiatives in a series of Master Plans, beginning in the late 1960s. In 1977 the agency released the culminating effort of these plans, the *Draft General Management Plan (Draft GMP)*. After a period of public review and comment, team planners revised the draft and finally, after a decade of planning, produced the final *General Management Plan* in 1982. Formally approved by the national office, the *General Management Plan (GMP)* articulated a management philosophy for Gettysburg National Military Park that led the park into the final years of the twentieth century.

While the release of the 1982 *GMP* and the controversy surrounding a proposal to close Devil’s Den to automobile traffic, as expressed in the *Development Concept Plan (DCP)*, attracted the headlines, other noteworthy events and policies occurred at the park between 1977 and 1988. Park staff continued pursuing an aggressive policy of land acquisition and landscape restoration, as outlined in the *GMP*. In a period of increasing environmental awareness, Gettysburg staff took steps to address conservation and water issues on the battlefield land. And as tensions mounted over the park’s *DCP* and its management alternatives, thousands gathered

for the “Let Us Have Peace” commemoration to celebrate the 125th anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg and President Lincoln’s Gettysburg Address.

Building on the Master Plans of the 1960s and 1970s, the Park Service laid the foundation to its long-term management objectives in the *Draft General Management Plan* of May 1977. The *Draft GMP* offered planning guidelines, a statement for management, a resource management plan, a visitor use plan, and a general development plan. Team planners divided park objectives into short-range proposals, intended to “make the park as good as it can be through more immediate actions,” and long-term goals, which sought to achieve the “ideal of ‘what the park should be.’” Newly appointed Superintendent John Earnst lead Gettysburg through this period of planning. Earnst had arrived to Gettysburg in August 1974, in the wake of the fiasco over the construction of the National Tower but in time to prepare the park for its bicentennial celebrations. After earning a Bachelor of Science degree in Education and Biology, Earnst began his career with the National Park Service in 1966 as superintendent at Perry’s Victory and International Peace Memorial in Erie, Pennsylvania. Between 1967 and 1970, Earnst worked at Badlands National Monument in South Dakota before transferring to the Pacific Northwest Regional Office in Seattle where he worked until his appointment as Gettysburg’s superintendent.¹

¹ *Draft General Management Plan, Gettysburg National Military Park and National Cemetery*, May 1977. Box 3, Thomas J. Harrison Files, Records of the National Park Service at Gettysburg National Military Park, Gettysburg National Military Park Archives, D-5 – D-7 [hereinafter cited as *Draft GMP, 1977* and notes from this collection will be cited as TH Files, GNMP Archives]; Traci A. Lower, “Farewell After 14,” *Gettysburg Times*, 27 August 1988.

Consistent with earlier versions of the Master Plan, main features of the 1977 *Draft GMP* were the call for a new visitor center and the implementation of a chronological auto tour route. Proposed as long-range goals, both objectives remained closely tied to the proposed U.S. Route 30 bypass. Park planners still maintained that the Cobean site offered the most advantages for the new “Williamsburg style facility.” To complement the new visitor center, the 1977 plan also retained the idea of a chronological tour route through the three day battle. Upon leaving the center at the Cobean farm, visitors would be directed to the first stop at the Eternal Light Peace Memorial on Oak Hill, then proceed south toward the Confederate battle line along Seminary Ridge. Tourists would then drive along the second day’s terrain, then travel along Cemetery Ridge and conclude the tour at the High Water Mark. Interested visitors could then explore the Soldiers’ National Cemetery and the site of Lincoln’s Gettysburg Address. To provide better visitor access and to alleviate heavy automobile traffic in a concentrated area, planners explored the possibility of a shuttle tour to serve the cyclorama center, the Soldier’s National Cemetery, and the High Water Mark.²

The 1977 *Draft General Management Plan* also proposed the elimination of several park roads and favored restricting visitor access to highly used areas. Among the most popular stops on the tour route were Devil’s Den and Little Round Top, both for the panoramic vistas and for understanding the brutal fighting on the afternoon of July 2. Visitors approached Little Round Top, the Federal left flank, by driving along Sedgwick Avenue. After exploring the rocky mountain, visitors drove down Sykes Avenue and turned right on Warren Avenue to approach Devil’s Den. For visitor convenience the government had built a comfort station and small

² *Draft GMP*, 1977. Box 3, TH, GNMP Archives, D-7; D-12.

parking lot in the Slaughter Pen area in the 1930s. Leaving Devil's Den, visitors followed the auto tour along the narrow, circuitous Sickles Avenue to the Wheatfield and the Peach Orchard.

By the mid-1970s, however, as thousands of cars and buses traveled into Devil's Den, park officials concluded that current visitor use of the area was not only "detrimental to the site's natural values," but also "hazardous to the visitor." To alleviate pressure on the resource and to better preserve and protect the historic scene of Devil's Den, they recommended removing the roads, parking lot, and comfort station entirely. Moreover, the proposed new the tour route would bypass Devil's Den. Once automobile traffic was eliminated from Devil's Den, team planners recommended the complete removal of all the roads serving the area, including Warren and Crawford Avenues and a section of Sickles Avenue.³

Superintendent John Earnst defended the proposal by stating that, "the park is attempting to restore some sort of historic integrity and natural beauty to those names so familiar in American history- Devil's Den, Little Round Top, Slaughter Pen, and the Valley of Death." He added that "by eliminating the roadway, with its lumbering cars and buses, the massive boulders will look all the more majestic and forbidding when not dwarfed by the confusion brought into its very heart by an intrusive belt of asphalt." In order to "restore some sort of historic integrity," yet still allow visitors to explore the rock formations, planners additionally proposed a new roadway, or bypass, around the western side of the Devil's Den. As outlined in the 1977 *Draft GMP*, the bypass would follow the tracings of the nineteenth century electric trolley bed from

³ *Draft GMP*, 1977. Box 3, TH, GNMP Archives, D5-D28.

Brooke Avenue across Plum Run to the western slope of Big Round Top.⁴ Once Crawford and Sickles Avenue were removed, visitor access would be provided by a walking trail.

The Devil's Den bypass, a new visitor center, and a chronological tour served as the basis to the park's long-term management plans as described in the 1977 *Draft GMP*. Team planners also offered other short-term goals that were intended to ameliorate immediate problems and improve upon existing conditions within the park. The most significant short-term proposal was that the Park Service would manage and operate the newly acquired Gettysburg National Museum as its current visitor center along Taneytown Road "until the building becomes inadequate for its needs." Park planners had no intentions of making the Rosensteel building a permanent visitor center, noting in the *Draft GMP* that the building would ultimately be removed, although that would not occur any earlier than 1983. Until such time, officials recommended rehabilitating the Gettysburg National Museum and upgrading the Electric Map. Other short-term recommendations included closing the Soldiers' National Cemetery to vehicular traffic. Using the same logic for closing Devil's Den, planners argued that vehicle access endangered the burial spaces and violated the cemetery's solemn environment.⁵

The Park Service released the *Draft General Management* plan to the public in May 1977. Determined to build cooperative relations with the local community, park personnel hosted three public workshops to explain specific sections of the plan and accepted public comments until the end of the year. During the public comment period, the park received ninety

⁴ Superintendent John Earnst, Letter to the Editor, *Gettysburg Times*, 3 June 1977. Folder 2, Box 12, Park Main (Central) Files, 1954-1987, (GETT 41160), Records of the National Park Service at Gettysburg National Military Park, Gettysburg National Military Park Archives [hereafter cited as (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives]; *Draft, GMP, 1977*, D6 – D12.

⁵ *Draft GMP, 1977*, S3-S9; D18- D20.

written comments, most of which opposed the plan. Much of the opposition came from local businessmen who favored retaining the visitor center along Steinwehr Avenue because it offered visitors convenient access to their commercial businesses. The Executive Director of the Gettysburg Travel Council, for example, James Cole, voiced his opposition to the plan. He remarked that moving the visitor center north of town would create a “negative impact” on the “commercial and tourist interests of Adams County.” Cole recommended that the Park Service continue to use the present visitor center and cyclorama building, both of which were conveniently located near the center of commercial businesses.⁶

Local businessmen were not the only ones to oppose the *Draft GMP*, however. Many local residents also voiced their concern on the park’s management philosophy. Some expressed fears that the visitor center’s relocation would bring financial calamity to local establishments on Steinwehr Avenue and Baltimore Pike, leaving only “skeletons” in the town’s business district. Others believed the costs incurred from building a new facility simply to be unnecessary because the park had just opened a million dollar facility in 1962. One resident declared that the new visitor center would be a needless “exorbitant expense,” an “extravagant waste of public funds to produce a colossal SNAFU!” Still others criticized the plan as an example of poor management, declaring, “the National Park Service is a bigger threat to the town of Gettysburg than the Confederate Army ever was!” One local resident wrote that the “*General Management Plan* has

⁶ Sandra Hauptman to Regional Director, April 3, 1979. Folder 3, Box 5, Gettysburg National Military Park, General Management Plan Records, 1968-1983, (GETT 41105), Records of the National Park Service at Gettysburg National Military Park, Gettysburg National Military Park Archives [hereinafter cited as (GETT 41105), GNMP Archives]. Hauptman served as the Outdoor Recreation Planner, Division of Planning; James Cole to Superintendent John Earnst, July 29, 1977. Folder 7, Box 4, (GETT 41105), GNMP Archives.

been designed to satisfy the whims of some over-zealous planners instead of meeting the needs of the general public.”⁷

Yet while the proposed visitor center and chronological tour route generated a fair amount of debate, it was the agency’s plans for Devil’s Den that generated the most fervent criticism. One resident commented on the contradictory philosophies of restoring the battlefield to its 1863 condition and encouraging visitor access, writing, “if you wish to have visitors you must make it convenient for them. This means roads and cars that intrude on the historic scene.” Voicing his opposition to the closure of Devil’s Den to automobiles and the removal of Sickles Avenue, another Gettysburg resident wrote, “Old Dan Sickles, Poor Dan, what did he do to deserve his fate. Practically the father of the battlefield, and surely your benefactor, his avenue will be changed and mostly destroyed.” Some letters did support the Park Service’s management plans. One resident found the *Draft GMP* to be the most “complete and thorough” analysis offered by the National Park Service. A Pennsylvania State University professor offered his “enthusiastic endorsement” for the *Draft GMP* and encouraged the Park Service to remove the visitor center and the cyclorama center, declaring the two buildings to be a “blemish” on the historic scene.⁸

The 1977 *Draft GMP* offered foundations for to the park’s planning proposals. Over the next few years team planners revised the draft and considered new management alternatives for

⁷ Louise Hartzell to Superintendent John Earnst, July 28, 1977. Folder 10, Box 4 (GETT 41105), GNMP Archives; Richard Michael, Sr. to Superintendent John Earnst, August 3, 1977; W. G Weaver to Superintendent John Earnst, July 29, 1977. Folder 9, Box 4 (GETT 41105), GNMP Archives; J. P. Censsa to Superintendent John Earnst, July 13, 1977. Folder 2, Box 12 (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives.

⁸ J. P. Censsa to Superintendent John Earnst, July 13, 1977; Robert Sheads, Jr., to Superintendent John Earnst, July 25, 1977. Folder 2, Box 12 (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives; John MacAskill to Superintendent John Earnst, August 18, 1977; John Patterson to Superintendent John Earnst, August 9, 1977. Folder 9, Box 4 (GETT 41105), GNMP Archives.

the battlefield. After nearly two decades of planning and revisions, Gettysburg National Military Park released its *General Management Plan* in 1982. Superintendent Earnst recommended the plan on November 8 and Regional Director James W. Coleman, Jr. approved it on December 1. Upon receiving approval from the regional director, the park then released the plan to the public. The 1982 *GMP* offered a “synthesis of the best ideas concerning the future” of Gettysburg National Military Park and the Soldiers’ National Cemetery. It also provided for long-range strategies for meeting the park’s management objectives, resource strategies, visitor use, and development within and near the park boundary.⁹ Like the 1977 draft, the fundamental aspects of the 1982 *GMP* included a new visitor center, improved visitor use patterns, and new facilities. The plan also recommended that the park acquire additional land and implement a landscape restoration program.

As in earlier drafts, the 1982 *GMP* planners stated that the preferred alternative visitor center site remained north of town at the Cobean farm. But since the Route 30 bypass still had not come to fruition, and planners consequently focused on meeting the park’s other management objectives. The cyclorama center would continue to operate as before, offering visitors the introductory film, some exhibits, and the cyclorama painting. The plan did call for

⁹ “Public Meeting on Draft General Management Plan and Environmental Assessment for Gettysburg National Military Park and Gettysburg National Cemetery,” August 4, 1982. Folder 4, Box 12 (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives. In July 1982 the National Park Service released the *Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Assessment* to the public, who could then submit comments until September 7. On August 4, park leaders held a public meeting on the management plans to explain the park’s position and to answer questions. During the sixty-day comment period the majority of comments focused on the Devil’s Den alterations, changes in the Soldiers’ National Cemetery, the chronological tour, and excessive spending; *General Management Plan, Gettysburg National Military Park and National Cemetery*, (Prepared by Mid-Atlantic Regional Office, National Park Service, United States Department of the Interior, December 1982), 130-131. Approved on December 1, 1982 [hereafter cited as *GMP*, 1982]. The 1982 GMP Planning Team included: Sandra Hauptman, Outdoor Recreation Planner, Mid-Atlantic Region; John Earnst, Superintendent, Gettysburg National Military Park; David Kimball, Chief, Division of Planning, Mid-Atlantic Region; Thomas Harrison, Historian, Gettysburg National Military Park; Hal Greenlee, Natural Resource Management Specialist, National Park Service.

significant renovations in the visitor center, however. Built in the 1920s and used by the Rosensteel family as both a museum and living quarters, the building by the 1970s seemed inadequate to serve the park's visitors. Planners recommended additional parking and relocating the building's main entrance, currently located on Taneytown Road and directly across the Soldiers' National Cemetery, to the north side of the building.¹⁰

Park planners also still maintained that a chronological battlefield tour would best serve park visitors. As noted, the park's current battlefield tour began at the visitor center in Ziegler's Grove and proceeded south to the grounds of Pickett's Charge, then to the July 2 terrain, before concluding northwest of town at the Day 1 action. Consistent with earlier proposals, the 1982 planning team recommended a chronological tour that would start on the fields of July 1 fighting and then route visitors south to Day 2. It would climax at Pickett's Charge on July 3. The chronological tour excluded the battle action at Barlow's Knoll, Culp's Hill, Spangler's Spring, Benner's Hill, and East Cavalry Field, offering all as supplemental tours. In order to make the tour route transition as smooth as possible, the planning team also recommended commencing the chronological route over the winter months when the park received fewer visitors.¹¹

¹⁰ *GMP*, 1982, 49-50; 66-67. Park Service officials recognized that closing the Soldiers' National Cemetery to vehicles would necessitate additional parking spaces in the visitor center lot. The planners also noted that the opening of Eisenhower National Historic Site created a need for seventy-five additional spaces.

¹¹ *GMP*, 1982, 62-66. As projected the battlefield tour would lead visitors through the park in a chronological fashion. As visitors left the park's visitor center, they would proceed north into town, head west on the Fairfield Road, and begin the tour by entering onto Reynolds's Avenue. Visitors would then travel northward to the Eternal Light Peace Memorial and begin their journey south along the Confederate battle line of Seminary Ridge/West Confederate Avenue. Visitors would be directed along Wheatfield Road to see the Peach Orchard, Devil's Den, and Little Round Top. The tour would then proceed from the northern slopes of Little Round Top along Sedgwick Avenue to the Union line of battle on Cemetery Ridge. The tour would conclude at the High Water Mark, where visitors would have the option of entering the Soldiers' National Cemetery or proceeding to the supplemental sites. This tour route did not take visitors along South Confederate Avenue, near the Confederate right flank at Warfield Ridge.

Opposition developed quickly. Much of it came from two rivals, the Licensed Battlefield Guides and the Comprehensive Communications Incorporated (CCI) Auto-Tape Tour Company. Both organizations believed the new tour route would adversely affect their business. The battlefield guides maintained that a chronological tour would be easier for visitors to understand and follow, thereby reducing the popularity of their services. Similarly the auto-tape company opposed the chronological tour. In 1970, CCI had developed an audio tour for park visitors who wanted a more detailed tour but did not want to make use of the guide or bus service. A restructured auto tour would necessitate the development of a new audio-tape tour, which CCI executives believed would be an unnecessary expense, one that the president claimed might even force the company out of business. Some residents also opposed the chronological tour. Voicing his objections in a letter to the editor to the change in the tour route, Harmon Furney commented, "Wake up Gettysburg before it is too late!" noting that only a helicopter tour could provide a chronological tour of the battlefield.¹²

The planning team also proposed the development of several self-guided tours and trails. The park favored retaining the Gettysburg Heritage Hiking Trails, of five and ten miles in length, as well as the bicycle and equestrian trails. The 1982 planning team added that the park amphitheater, constructed for the battle centennial, intruded on the historic scene. They

¹² "Opposition Voiced to Proposed Changes in Traffic by the NPS," *Gettysburg Times*, 1 October 1982. Folder 18, Box 7 (GETT 41105), GNMP Archives; Lawrence M. Johnson to Superintendent John Earnst, September 10, 1982; Harmon Furney, Letter to the Editor, *Gettysburg Times*, 12 August 1982. Folder 5, Box 12 (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives. CCI Auto Tape Tours was based out of Scarsdale, New York and developed the audio tour in cooperation with the NPS.

recommended that it be removed to Guinn Woods, south of the visitor center along Taneytown Road at the former site of Fantasyland.¹³

The *Draft GMP* of 1977 had recommended closing the Soldiers' National Cemetery to vehicular traffic, and the proposal remained in the 1982 *GMP*. Management argued that the "solemn environment" befitting to honor the soldiers buried there could only be obtained by removing vehicles from the grounds. Superintendent Earnst explained the agency's decision to eliminate automobile traffic by stating, "How does a visitor in a car or bus driving through this "hallowed ground" develop any sense of respect or awe for the deeds of the dead soldiers and the words of President Lincoln?" The public had opposed this initiative too when it was released in 1977, and expressed opposition again when released in the 1982 *GMP*. As with the outcry over the Devil's Den bypass, much of the reasoning for retaining vehicle access simply centered on convenience. Keeping the cemetery open to vehicle access was an important matter to local residents who used the cemetery as a short cut to access Taneytown Road or Baltimore Pike, thereby avoiding the often crowded Steinwehr Avenue. Others argued that closing the cemetery and Devil's Den to vehicles would prevent handicapped visitors from viewing the sites. In response to the public's reaction, Superintendent Earnst and staff reconsidered their position and decided only to close the upper drive to vehicle traffic. Visitors desiring to see the cemetery would enter the gates along Taneytown Road, proceed through the lower drive, and exit along the Baltimore Pike. While the Park Service offered this olive branch to the public, it maintained

¹³ *GMP*, 1982, 62-66. The Gettysburg Heritage Hiking Trails allowed for hiking, cross-country skiing, and other recreational activities. The 1982 *GMP* also called for the development of an Appalachian Mountain Trail Spur that would connect the park to the Appalachian Trail at South Mountain. As noted in earlier Master Plans, the park staff tolerated year-around recreation on the battlefield, including jogging, camping, sledding, skiing, picnicking, or horseback riding.

if the “appropriate atmosphere does not prevail,” the agency would close the cemetery to automobile traffic completely.¹⁴

The 1982 plan finally called for continuing the policy of restoring the terrain to its 1863 condition and acquiring intrusive properties. Team planners identified 150 acres of non-historic tree and shrub growth that obscured the historic scene and made interpretation of the battle tactics difficult, and recommended that those acres of post-battle growth be cut and removed. After clear cutting intrusive vegetation, park planners advised the park to adopt a long-term maintenance program to keep the lands open to their historic condition. The Park Service would continue the practice of vegetative screening in developed areas. The theory behind vegetation screening held that although the landscape could not be restored to its exact 1863 appearance, the park could build a screen of trees sixty to seventy-five feet wide to block out the undesirable intrusions.¹⁵

While the proposal to eliminate historic avenues had generated considerable public opposition in the *Draft GMP* of 1977, many of the proposed avenue changes were retained in the 1982 plan. Team members, for example, proposed the removal of Webb Avenue from The Angle, Birney Avenue from the Peach Orchard, and Crawford Avenue from the Valley of Death. They also recommended the section of Sickles Avenue through Devil’s Den and the Wheatfield

¹⁴ *GMP*, 1982, 77; 130-131; Superintendent John Earnst, Letter to the Editor, *Gettysburg Times*, 3 June, 1977. Folder 2, Box 12 (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives.

¹⁵ *GMP*, 1982, 53-57.

be removed. The most significant road elimination, and ultimately the most controversial, continued to be the recommended changes in Devil's Den and Little Round Top. This proposal intended to meet three objectives: scene protection and restoration, visitor access, and vegetation management. Because the Park Service had implemented extensive landscape restoration along the slopes of Little Round Top, vehicle traffic moving along Crawford Avenue and through Devil's Den had become more visually intrusive. Moreover, upon surveying road conditions in Devil's Den, especially at Sickles Avenue, Park Service engineers found that because of the extreme curves and grades the road did not meet minimum transportation standards for tour buses. The third management objective advocated extensive vegetation management in the Valley of Death and Devil's Den. The park staff intended to introduce livestock into the area as a cost effective method of managing vegetation. Outlined in the 1982 *GMP*, team planners promised to prepare a *Development Concept Plan (DCP)* to thoroughly examine the alternatives.¹⁶

In 1985 and 1986 planners evaluated the changes to Little Round Top and Devil's Den in a series of *Development Concept Plans (DCP)*. The Park Service produced its first assessment of the management changes on Little Round Top in the *Draft Development Concept Plan, Environmental Assessment, Little Round Top and Devil's Den (Draft DCP)* in May 1985. The service released the *Draft DCP* to the public on June 20, 1985. It offered three alternatives for changes at Little Round Top and Devil's Den. The first, and the park's preferred alternative, endorsed the same concept as the 1982 *General Management Plan*. It involved the construction of a new park road and the Devil's Den bypass, using the abandoned electric railroad bed

¹⁶ *GMP*, 1982, 67-68. Webb Avenue was located slightly north of the Copse of Trees. Birney Avenue ran off of the Emmitsburg Road and around the Peach Orchard before connecting to the Wheatfield Road. Crawford Avenue serviced visitors traveling from the Wheatfield Road into Devil's Den.

running along the southern end of the battlefield. Following the path of the rail bed, the bypass would run around the western side of Devil's Den to connect Brooke and Warren Avenues. Like the *GMP* of 1982, the *Draft DCP* also recommended the elimination of Birney Avenue at the Peach Orchard, sections of Sickles Avenue, and all of Warren and Crawford Avenues. Team planners estimated this alternative to cost \$1,415,000. A no-action alternative was presented as a second option. Deteriorating conditions, including access problems, visual intrusions, and erosion at Little Round Top and Devil's Den, would remain uncorrected. A third option offered a minimum improvement to the existing avenues that notably involved favored a realignment of Sickles Avenue to provide adequate transportation through Devil's Den.¹⁷

The Devil's Den bypass, first proposed in the 1977 *Draft General Management Plan*, had caused immediate controversy. The public's reaction to the new *DCP* was no different. Many citizens expressed concern over the anticipated damage that the construction of a new road would create in the Little Round Top and Devil's Den area. In a letter to the regional director, Civil War historian William Marvel voiced his objections to the park's proposal, writing, "Must the Park Service step in and turn its own hand to destruction? Sir, that bypass road will do nothing but disturb another yet untouched portion of our most precious National Park." Another letter addressed to the regional director criticized Superintendent Earnst for approving the alterations to the southern end of the field. "Unfortunately, the historic significance of the areas has made no impression upon Mr. Earnst," wrote James McClean of Maryland, "It is sad that the superintendent of the national military park can not perceive the implications of placing the proposed road and thereby violating an area that should be preserved in its present state for

¹⁷ *Draft Development Concept Plan/ Environment Assessment, Little Round Top/Devil's Den, Gettysburg National Military Park, Pennsylvania.* (United States Department of the Interior: National Park Service, May 1985), 1-72 [hereinafter cited as *Draft DCP*].

future generations of Americans.” The “Civil War Subculture” rallied as well to oppose these management proposals. The Gettysburg Civil War Round Table submitted a petition with approximately seventy signatures opposing the Devil’s Den bypass, while the Baltimore Civil War Round Table submitted another with approximately fifty signatures.¹⁸ In addition to the unnecessary construction and damage to the historic resource others expressed concern that once the roads were eliminated the den would no longer be accessible to handicapped visitors.

As a result of the public outcry against proposed construction along the southern end of the battlefield, and after numerous planning meetings and on-site visits, the National Park Service reevaluated its plans and released a new *Draft Development Concept Plan Supplement* in May 1986. The public had thirty days to review it. On June 11 nearly 100 individuals attended a public meeting to discuss and comment on this newly revised plan. Notably the new *DCP* offered a fourth alternative to the 1982 *GMP* and the previous *DCP*, which the Park Service selected as its new favored alternative. It retained the idea of restricting access to Devil’s Den, but offered a new alternative to the bypass. This was a new road to provide access into Devil’s Den from the east. This 900-foot access road would also follow the tracings of the electric railway bed from Brooke Avenue to Houck’s Ridge, near the 4th New York Light Artillery Monument. It would provide better access for visitors with disabilities through a 100-foot by 150-foot turnaround, with parking for 24 cars and three buses at the end of the extension. Though this alternative necessitated new construction, unlike the bypass around the western face

¹⁸ William Marvel to Regional Director James Coleman, November 23, 1985; James McLean, Jr., to Regional Director James Coleman, July 12, 1985. Folder 5, Box 13 (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives; “Petition From Gettysburg Civil War Round Table,” July 18, 1985, submitted to Superintendent John Earnst; “Petition From Baltimore Civil War Round Table,” July 31, 1985. Folder 6, Box 13 (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives. Janet Licate, president of the CWRT, challenged Earnst to advertise the park’s *GMP* to the nation, arguing that many Americans were unaware of the park’s management changes.

of Devil's Den, the 900-foot extension into Devil's Den seemed to create less of a disruption of the historic terrain. Team planners noted that "only one boulder" would need to be removed, one boulder that they suspected had "already been disturbed" by the construction of the electric railroad.¹⁹

Additional recommendations in the new supplemental plan included the construction of a roadway on the eastern slope of Little Round Top to better circulate traffic along the Federal left flank. As conceived, visitors would approach the Day 2 fighting from the Wheatfield Road, turn right on Sickles Avenue and then proceed to Devil's Den along DeTrobriand and Brooke Avenues. Visitors wanting to explore Devil's Den then would drive along the newly constructed 900-foot access route and park in the cul-de-sac near the 4th New York Light Artillery Monument. After exploring the sharpshooter's nest in Devil's Den, they would continue the auto tour via Wheatfield Road and proceeded along Sykes Avenue toward the Federal left at Little Round Top. As visitors approached the summit of Little Round Top, signs would direct them to an improved parking area. After walking the grounds of the Union left flank visitors would drive

¹⁹ Superintendent John Earnst Memo, May 27, 1986. Folder 1, Box 14, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives; *Draft Development Concept Plan/Environmental Assessment Supplement, Little Round Top/Devil's Den, Gettysburg National Military Park, Pennsylvania* (United States Department of Interior: National Park Service, May 1986), 1-18 [hereinafter cited as *Draft DCP, Supplement*]; *Development Concept Plan: Little Round Top, Devil's Den, Gettysburg National Military Park, Pennsylvania*, (United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1986), approved by Regional Director James Coleman, Jr. on November 25, 1986 [hereinafter cited as *DCP, 1986*]. The NPS actually accepted public comment until August 4th because of the concern over the proposal. The Park Service announced the release of the *Draft DCP, Supplement* by sending news releases to fifty five newspapers, radios, and television stations in the local area. The Park Service also mailed over 200 copies of the plan to agencies, groups, and individuals on the park mailing list. During the May 27 – June 27 comment period, the park received fifty written comments. The *DCP* Planning Team included: Linda Romola, Team Captain, Outdoor Recreation Planner, Denver Service Center; J. Fred Eubanks, Park Planner, GNMP; Superintendent John Earnst, GNMP. Planning Consultants included: Edwin Bearss, Chief Historian, Washington Office; Frederick Babb, Supervisory Outdoor Recreation Planner, Denver Service Center; Kathy Georg, Park Historian, GNMP; James Roach, Chief of Interpretation and Visitor Services, GNMP; John Fiedor, Interpretive Specialist, GNMP.

along Sykes Avenue, turning left onto the newly constructed road on the east side of Little Round Top before continuing the auto tour along Sedgwick and Hancock Avenues.²⁰

After the open meetings and public input on the plan, the Park Service once again reevaluated alternatives and released the final version of the *Development Concept Plan for Little Round Top and Devil's Den*, recommended by Superintendent Earnst and approved by Regional Director Coleman, in November 1986. The principal feature of the 1986 *DCP* favored using South Confederate Avenue as an access approach to Little Round Top. As in the supplemental *DCP*, park planners abandoned the bypass idea but retained the idea of a cul-de-sac near the 4th New York Light Artillery Monument. This option still allowed the Park Service to eliminate vehicle traffic from Devil's Den and also to remove surrounding roads, namely Sickles and Crawford. Park planners estimated the cost of the proposal at \$968,000.²¹

While the approved 1986 *Development Concept Plan* abandoned many of the more controversial earlier proposals, including the development of the Devil's Den bypass and the

²⁰ *Draft DCP, Supplement*, 6-8. The supplemental plan retained the elimination of Birney Avenue around the Peach Orchard, as well as sections of Sickles, Warren, and Crawford Avenues, which would be returned to their historic appearance. The park developers estimated that 53,000 square feet of area would be completely restored to its natural condition and an additional 65,000 square feet partially restored by obliterating and reseeding these avenues. Like the earlier Draft *DCP*, the supplement's developers also retained the walking trails into Devil's Den and the handicapped access cul-de-sac along Houck's Ridge. Team planners recommended the newly constructed road east of Little Round Top to be one-way and approximately twenty-feet wide. Park planners declared that the road's construction would not interfere with historic boulders. Park planners estimated the development costs of alternative four at \$1,402,000.

²¹ *DCP*, 1-23. Park Service officials clearly articulated the need for the establishment of a chronological tour in the 1982 *GMP* and the proposed development work at the southern end of the battlefield accomplished this objective. After touring the sites of the fighting on July 1, visitors would travel south along West Confederate Avenue to explore the Army of Northern Virginia's line of battle. As visitors approached the intersection of West Confederate and the Wheatfield Road, earlier tour routes directed traffic onto the Wheatfield Road allowing visitors to proceed directly to the second day's fighting. By 1986, however, team planners recommended that visitors drive along South Confederate Avenue toward the extreme right flank of Lee's Army of Northern Virginia. Visitors would then drive up Big Round Top to Little Round Top. After exploring the terrain of the Union army's left flank, the tour continued north along Sykes Avenue and then west along Wheatfield Road. Tourists would explore the battle action in the Wheatfield by driving along Ayres, Cross, and the northern section of Sickles Avenue before reconnecting with the Wheatfield Road and then driving to the Peach Orchard

construction of a new road on the south side of Little Round Top, the plan remained extremely controversial, and not only among the public, but also within the Park Service staff. Park Historian Kathy Georg voiced her opposition to the proposed road construction near Devil's Den and the Valley of Death to both Superintendent Earnst and Regional Director Coleman, stating such road construction would "irretrievably alter the topography of the Gettysburg battlefield." Georg encouraged Coleman to intercede and oppose the park's construction plans. Park Historian Thomas Harrison likewise opposed the plan. State Representative Kenneth Cole, a former Licensed Battlefield Guide, meanwhile declared the park's plan a "waste of tax payer's money."²²

Although Superintendent Earnst and Regional Director Coleman had approved the plan, the Park Service still had not secured funding for the proposed alterations. While the agency awaited appropriations, local citizens mounted a strong opposition. At the grassroots level, the Licensed Battlefield Guides and other concerned citizens formed the Devil's Den Access Committee. On September 12, standing before local press and a small gathering of witnesses in Devil's Den, the citizen's group and Representative Cole presented Representative William Goodling with approximately 11,000 signatures opposing the park's *Development Concept Plan*. A representative from the access committee warned Goodling, "we're counting on you to take our message to Washington to see that the funds are not approved." Goodling, who had voiced his own objections to the plan, assured spectators that their opinions would be heard in Congress and thanked them for standing with him to oppose the Park Service's latest initiative. In

²² Kathy Georg to Superintendent John Earnst, September 3, 1982. Folder 1, Box 13 (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives; Kathy Georg to Regional Director James Coleman, July 19, 1985. Folder "Development Concept Plan, 1985-1989." Box 6, TH Files, GNMP Archives; Senior Historian Kathy Harrison, interview by author, December 11, 2009, GNMP; "Devil's Den Group Plans to Present Goodling Petitions," *Gettysburg Times*, 19 August 1988. William Little served as the Chairman of the access group.

response, Earnst reaffirmed that the proposed changes remained “in the best interest of the preservation of the park” and reminded dissenters that the Park Service has “an obligation to preserve the park for infinity.” Detecting no change in the park’s stance, Goodling organized a meeting between representatives from the access committee and William Penn Mott, Director of the National Park Service. In late September the director visited the park to evaluate the plan. Director Mott continued to support the *DCP*. Unable to gain an alliance with the NPS Director, Goodling responded, “It seems that everyone except the Park Service is opposed to this.”²³

Meanwhile, Superintendent Earnst’s popularity precipitously declined, both within the community and also among park staff. In late August, after fourteen years of service at Gettysburg, Earnst announced his transfer to North Cascades National Park in Washington State. To succeed him, the National Park Service named Daniel R. Kuehn, a twenty year veteran of the National Park Service. Prior to his appointment Kuehn had served as superintendent at Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area near Los Angeles. He had also worked at Salem Maritime National Historic Site, Manassas National Battlefield Park, Chickamauga-Chattanooga National Military Park, Sitka National Historical Park, and Mount McKinley National Park.²⁴

²³ “Devil’s Den Group Plans to Present Goodling Petitions,” *Gettysburg Times*, 19 August 1988; “Devil’s Den Petition To Be Presented Sept. 12,” *Gettysburg Times*, 8 September 1988; “Goodling To Receive Devil’s Den Petitions,” *Gettysburg Times*, 9 September 1988; “Park Service Stands By Its Plans For Battlefield Change,” *Gettysburg Times*, 12 September 1988; “Message to Washington: No Dollars for Devil’s Den,” *Gettysburg Times* 13 September 1988; “Devil’s Den Access Committee Is Optimistic After Meeting in D.C.,” *Gettysburg Times*, 17 September 1988; “Mott Plans to Visit Military Park,” *York Dispatch*, 22 September 1988; “Mott Supporting Road Elimination,” *York Dispatch*, 25 October 1988.

²⁴ “Farewell After 14,” *Gettysburg Times*, 27 August 1988; “Earnst Transferring to North Cascade Park,” *Evening Sun* (Hanover), 30 August 1988; “Gettysburg National Military Park,” *Record Harold* (Waynesboro), 4 October 1988; Bobbie Platt “Superintendent Daniel Kuehn Looks Forward to New Job at Historic Park,” *Gettysburg Times*, 3 November 1988. Prior to his tenure at Santa Monica Mountains, Kuehn had worked as a chief planner and compliance officer at the Pacific Northwest Regional Office in Seattle, Washington. He received his bachelor’s degree in history from the University of Minnesota. At Manassas Kuehn worked as the supervisory historian.

When Kuehn assumed his new duties on October 9, 1988 the Gettysburg community remained bitterly opposed to the *Development Concept Plan*, even though the Devil's Den Access Committee's protest seemed to have fallen on deaf ears within the National Park Service management. Shortly after arriving in Gettysburg, Kuehn, aware of the plan's controversy, promised to review the *Development Concept Plan* for Little Round Top and Devil's Den. He noted that the plans, while approved by the regional director, were not "written in stone." Subsequently, in early February 1989, much to the delight of many, Kuehn announced a revision in the *DCP*: the Park Service would not close Devil's Den to vehicle traffic. The fundamental justification for the *DCP* as recommended by John Earnst was to reduce damage to the historic resource of Little Round Top and Devil's Den. In order to protect the terrain, but also to provide access to the area, Kuehn did propose removing Devil's Den from the auto tour, but he did not favor the elimination of the park roads. Buses and large vehicles would be prohibited from traveling along Sickles Avenue, and Devil's Den would not be a designated stop on the driving route, but interested visitors could continue to access the area from Warren and Sickles Avenue. Kuehn stressed the sensibility of his compromise plan. Not only would the new initiative save the agency money, but it also limited significant development from the historic terrain.²⁵

Daniel Kuehn earned instant popularity when he announced his decision to keep Devil's Den open to vehicle traffic. Comparing Kuehn to John Earnst, Representative Goodling

²⁵ "Mott Supporting Road Elimination," *York Dispatch*, 25 October 1988; David Perlis, "Devil's Den Road Will Stay Open," *Evening Sun* (Hanover), 9 February 1989; Martin Sipkoff, "Devil's Den Plan Ok'd," *York Dispatch*, 9 February 1989. Box 27, Newspaper Clipping (Unbound), 1989 (GETT 43663), Records of the National Park Service at Gettysburg National Military Park, Gettysburg National Military Park Archives [hereinafter cited as (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives]; David Perlist, "New Park Chief Keeps Open Mind on Devil's Den," *Gettysburg Times*, 26 November 1988. The new plan for Devil's Den retained the chronological tour route and using South Confederate Avenue as the access to Little Round Top. After visiting the Federal left flank, visitors would travel west along the Wheatfield Road to visit the Wheatfield and the Peach Orchard. Visitors interested at stopping at Devil's Den could do so by accessing Sickles and Warren Avenue. This revision had also been approved by Regional Director Coleman.

commented, “This new guy seems to have a better way about him than his predecessor.” A founding member of the Devil’s Den Access Committee remarked, “His attitude is super. I’ve thought ever since I met him that he appreciates our problem. There is simply no public support for that plan.” Another member of the Access Committee and a Licensed Battlefield Guide noted, “Dan Kuehn has healed wounds between this community and the park service.” The *Gettysburg Times* offered, “The decisions can only get tougher for Dan Kuehn, but he’s off on the right foot.” In addition to gaining favor with the local community and newspaper, Kuehn’s new policy for Devil’s Den also earned him favor with his staff. Park historian Kathy Harrison, who had written the regional director requesting his intervention on the proposed plan, expressed her pleasure with Kuehn’s decision, “I am pleased with it. I was horrified with the original plan. I was one of those what was screaming the loudest from the inside.”²⁶

Although the finalization of the *General Management Plan* and the contentiousness of the *Development Concept Plan* shaped much of the late twentieth century at the park, daily operations remained largely at a status quo. Gettysburg’s staff continued to provide an array of summer interpretive programs and living history demonstrations for park visitors. The era’s hallmark interpretive event occurred in July 1988 when the park and community celebrated the 125th anniversary of the battle. Highlighted with a three-day reenactment, living history

²⁶ Martin Sipkoff, “Park’s Superintendent Makes Mark on Gettysburg,” *York Sunday News* 12 January 1989; Martin Sipkoff, “Park Chief’s Job A ‘Sacred Trust,’” *York Sunday News* 8 January 1989; Martin Sipkoff, “Devil’s Den Proposal To Be Revised,” *York Sunday News* 5 February 1989; “As The Times Sees It: New Superintendent Gets Down To Work,” *Gettysburg Times* 10 February 1990; David Perlis, “New Battlefield Route Draws Mixed Reaction,” *Evening Sun* (Hanover) 11 February 1990. Box 27, (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives.

encampments, and the rededication of the Eternal Light Peace Memorial, the 1988 festivities served as a welcome diversion to the bitter debates over the park's future.

Since acquiring the battlefield in 1933, the National Park Service had made considerable advancements in interpretation. By the late twentieth century, park staff offered an assortment of interpretive programs for summer season visitors. Park pamphlets encouraged tourists to orient themselves to the park and the battle's history by stopping at the visitor center and viewing the museum collection and the Electric Map. Thereafter, personnel encouraged visitors to tour the battlefield by hiring a Licensed Battlefield Guide or by traveling on the fifteen-mile self-guided tour. Visitors interesting in supplementing their knowledge were invited to attend various ranger walks, including tours of Little Round Top, the Soldiers' National Cemetery, or the High Water Mark, as well as the evening campfire or special interest programs. Rangers also offered regularly scheduled two hour battle-walks on the Valley of Death, Pickett's Charge, the First Day, or East Cemetery Hill to explore a specific aspect of the battle in extensive detail. Hundreds of tourists regularly participated in these programs. In 1981 the park's supervisor of interpretive operations reported that 47,621 visitors attended at least one interpretive program. The following year the park reported 61,184 attendees for ranger programs. The most popular programs remained the High Water Mark, Little Round Top, and the tour of the Soldiers' National Cemetery.²⁷

²⁷ "Summer Events 1982, Gettysburg National Military Park." Folder 7, Box 21 (GETT 43970), GNMP Archives; "Today In The Park: What To See And Do At Gettysburg National Military Park and Eisenhower National Historic Site, June 20-August 23, 1987." Folder 7, Box 21, Interpretive Program Files, 1930-present, (GETT 43970), Gettysburg National Military Park Archives [All notes hereinafter cited as (GETT 43970), GNMP]; Laurie E. Coughlan, Supervisor, Interpretive Operations, Memo, December 2, 1982. Folder 2, Box 21, (GETT 43970), GNMP Archives. In 1982 Coughlan reported that 18,174 attended the Cemetery walk; 13,752 attended the Little Round Top tours; and 18,747 attended the High Water Mark programs. The two-hour intensive battle-walks generated less interest than the twenty minute programs on Little Round Top or Pickett's Charge. A recorded 380

The interpretive programs were designed to give visitors a first-hand experience with a park ranger and afforded interested individuals the opportunity to advance their knowledge on the battle. There were few provisions for handicapped visitors interested in touring the park, however. Seeking to expand interpretive opportunities for all visitors, on September 27, 1981, the park inaugurated a self-guided walking tour of Pickett's Charge for the blind. Following the route of the previously established High Water Mark Trail, the walking tour for the blind included a textured surface trail, topographic relief maps, and tactile exhibits.²⁸

Although the Park Service had finalized and approved the *General Management Plan* for the battlefield, the *GMP*, while offering broad interpretive planning concepts, lacked detail in establishing guidelines for park interpretation. Consequently, in November 1983 Gettysburg's staff produced an "Interpretive Prospectus." The prospectus, like the *GMP*, pointed to the automobile tour as an interpretive problem. Because the self-guiding tour did not follow the battle's chronology, it was "sometimes considered an obstacle rather than an asset" in understanding the battle. The prospectus outlined the park's primary and secondary interpretive themes and offered suggestions on how to better improve battlefield interpretation. Staff continued to argue that the visitor and cyclorama centers remained difficult to find and suggested

people attended the Pickett's Charge battle-walk; 313 the Valley of Death battle-walk; 285 the East Cemetery Hill battle-walk; and 162 the First Day battle-walk.

²⁸ NPS Press Release, "Walking Tour For the Blind," September 8, 1971. Folder 14, Box 20, (GETT 43970), GNMP Archives; Superintendent John Earnst, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 1981," written on April 6, 1982. Folder 2, Box 1 (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives, 11. Eastern National provided a grant to fund the walking tour and it was developed with the cooperation of the Pennsylvania Association of the Blind.

improving directional signage. Planners also recommended the installation of forty new wayside exhibits to provide adequate visitor orientation and in-depth site analysis.²⁹

The success of the Civil War Centennial confirmed Gettysburg National Military Park's undisputed claim as the nation's preeminent battlefield. The 1983 "Interpretive Prospectus" recorded the park's annual visitation for 1982 at 1,225,541, down from the two million annual visitors of the 1970s, but still an impressive figure. They noted that the stated demographics and statistics were only a "rough estimate" of the park's visitor, and recommended additional study on visitor use. Though the Park Service had been tabulating annual battlefield visitation and attendance at interpretive programs, it was not until the mid-1980s that a comprehensive study occurred. In 1986, the University of Idaho conducted a study on the demographics of Gettysburg's visitors and their experience in the park. Researchers distributed questionnaires to park visitors in order to learn more about visitors' demographics, engagement to the subject, and impressions of the park. Following trends clearly established during World War II, the University of Idaho study showed that the majority of visitors to the park were families, often traveling in groups of two or four, and were first-time visitors. The average visitor spent three to six hours touring the park. The most visited sites on the battlefield were the Virginia Memorial, the Soldiers' National Cemetery, Little Round Top, Culp's Hill, and the Eternal Light Peace Memorial. The majority of visitors noted that they found their visit to be educational as well as enjoyable. Some, however, offered suggestions on improving comfort amenities. One person

²⁹ "Interpretive Prospectus: Gettysburg National Military Park, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania." Approved by Regional Director James W. Coleman, Jr. on November 29, 1982. Folder 11, Box 24 (GETT 43970), GNMP Archives, 1-29.

noted that the park needed more water fountains, while another complained that their family “could not locate enough places on the tour to buy refreshments.”³⁰

Summer months brought nearly half of the park’s yearly visitors and many traveled to Gettysburg during the battle’s anniversary month. In late June and early July of 1988 thousands of tourists swarmed into the local area to celebrate the 125th anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg. Borrowing a phrase from Union General U.S. Grant’s 1868 Presidential campaign, the 125th anniversary celebrations of “Let Us Have Peace” offered a perfect theme for a battlefield and town that had recently been embroiled in a myriad of controversies. Pennsylvania Governor Robert P. Casey established the 125th Anniversary Commission, consisting of eleven members, to coordinate events for the battle’s anniversary. These celebrations offered nearly two weeks of reenactments, living history encampments, lectures, monument rededications, and concerts.³¹

As usual the main attraction of the anniversary period was the three-day battle re-enactment held on June 24-26 and sponsored by American Civil War Commemorative Committee (ACWCC). Approximately 60,000 spectators gathered at the private farmland south of the battlefield to watch the re-enactment staged with Napoleonic Tactics. After the encampment opened at 8:00 on the morning of the 24th, visitors strolled through the camp site,

³⁰ “Interpretive Prospectus: Gettysburg National Military Park, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania.” Approved by Regional Director James W. Coleman, Jr. on November 29, 1982. Folder 11, Box 24 (GETT 43970), GNMP Archives, 2. Nearly half of the park’s visitors toured during the summer season. The 1982 estimated visitor demographics included 110,000 non-English speaking tourists, 36,000 minority visitors, and 60,000 handicapped visitors. Authors also estimated that approximately 44 percent of the visitors stayed more than one day; “Visitor Services Project: Gettysburg National Military Park,” Cooperative Park Studies Unit, University of Idaho, 1986. Folder 3, Box 18, (GETT 43970), GNMP Archives, iii-18. The visitor surveys were distributed between July 22 and July 26 at eleven different battlefield sites. Questionnaires were administered to 1,093 visitors and 454 returned the survey.

³¹ “Coordinating Commission For ’88 Battle Anniversary Meets,” *Gettysburg Times*, 6 January 1988.

witnessed drills and marching maneuvers, and later that evening watched a reenactment of the first day's fighting on McPherson's Ridge. The second day offered the opening of a "Sanitary Fair" and the morning action highlighted nearly 400 horse soldiers in cavalry engagement. The afternoon fighting re-enacted the bloody engagement of the second day's fighting in the Wheatfield. The final day's climactic event depicted 8,000 "soldiers" demonstrating Pickett's Charge.³²

While a private organization sponsored the re-enactment for the 125th anniversary, the National Park Service held a three-day living-history encampment. Situated on the battlefield, near the Pennsylvania Monument, re-enactors entertained and educated thousands of visitors with tactical maneuvers and weapons demonstrations. Curious tourists visited through the encampments, listened to Civil War music, and talked with the re-enactors. While not as glamorous as the battle re-enactment, the living history demonstrations drew a sizable crowd; approximately 1,000 attended the opening ceremonies on July 1.³³

During the 75th reunion in 1938, President Franklin Roosevelt had stood before a crowd of aging Union and Confederate veterans to dedicate the Eternal Peace Light Memorial. Prominently situated on the Oak Hill overlooking the fields of the first day's fighting, the

³² Dick Sage, "125th: Tourist Barrage Expected for Gettysburg Battle Anniversary," *The Patriot* (Harrisburg), 19 February 1988; David Perlis, "Record Crowd Relieve 3-Day Battle," *Evening Sun* (Hanover), 27 June 1988. Box 24, (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives; "Commemorative Battle Re-enactment Announced For 125th Anniversary," *Gettysburg Times*, 4 January 1988; "Coordinating Commission For '88 Battle Anniversary Meets," *Gettysburg Times*, 6 January 1988. The ACWCC also sponsored several reenactments for the 125th anniversary of the Civil War. Over 5,000 re-enactors participated in the festivities at Manassas in July 1986 and reportedly over 35,000 spectators attended the weekend event. The following year, September 1987, ACWCC sponsored the 125th anniversary reenactment at Antietam, also held on private farmland. Over 2,000 reenactors participated in the event and approximately 20,000 attended. Following Gettysburg's reenactment, ACWCC sponsored reenactments at Chickamauga and Wilderness and Spotsylvania.

³³ "Anniversary Events," *Gettysburg Times*, 24 June 1988; Jerry Price, "Events Mark Anniversary On First Day," *Evening Sun* (Hanover), 2 July 1988. Box 25, (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives. Regional Director James Coleman delivered the opening remarks at the Pennsylvania Monument.

memorial's base proclaimed "Peace Eternal In A Nation United" while the top of the monument adorned an eternal gas flame. From 1938 until 1973 the flame brilliantly illuminated Oak Hill. Due to the energy crisis of the 1970s, however, the gas flame had been extinguished in 1973 and replaced with an electric light in 1976. Fifteen years later, with the help of a generous donation from Columbia Gas, Pennsylvania's Governor Robert Casey flipped the switch to reignite the gas flame atop the Eternal Peace Light Memorial. As nine large American flags flapped in the mild-July breeze, thereafter the ceremonial relighting of the memorial Dr. Carl Sagan, world-renowned astronomer and popular television personality, delivered the keynote address.³⁴

Four months later, in November, Gettysburg celebrated the 125th anniversary of President Lincoln's Gettysburg Address by recreating the president's arrival and speech. "Lincoln" portrayed by area resident James Gettys, and his entourage arrived to the rail station on Carlisle Street aboard a 1902 steam train, to be greeted by "David Wills" and Gettysburg's mayor, Frank Linn. The procession proceeded to the Wills House where the "president" briefly addressed a crowd of spectators from the second-story window. After his brief statement at the Wills House, "Lincoln" proceeded on horseback to the Soldiers' National Cemetery as part of a ceremonial parade that also included 2,000 Civil War re-enactors. Once the crowd of 15,000 had gathered in the cemetery, braving the steady rain, at noon Gettys offered a recitation of the 272-word address. Thereafter, United States Supreme Court Chief Justice William H. Rehnquist delivered

³⁴ "Firm Gives \$8,500 To Fuel Peace Light," *Gettysburg Times*, 28 April 1988; "Gas Utility May Help Relight Peace Light," *Gettysburg Times*, 29 March 1988. Box 24, (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives; "Columbia Gas Contributes To Restoration Of Flame," *Gettysburg Times*, 3 June 1988; "Peace Burns Brightly In Gettysburg," *Gettysburg Times*, 5 July 1988; "Beautiful American Flags Were Part of History Making Festivities," *Gettysburg Times*, 5 July 1988; "History's Alive In Pageantry, Color 125 Years After Three Heroic Days," *Gettysburg Times*, 2 July 1988. Box 25, (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives. The nine flag were part of the National Park Service's "Take Pride in America" program and were hung vertically in positions around the Peace Light. The planning committee had invited President Ronald Reagan to the rededication, but he was unable to attend.

the keynote speech.³⁵ The events of November 19, 1988 concluded the park's "Let Us Have Peace" activities and offered a fitting end to an era that had been mired in controversy.

The decade of planning for the park's *General Management Plan* and the *Development Concept Plan* for Devil's Den underscored a larger philosophical debate over how battlefield landscape should best be preserved, managed, and accessed. By the mid-1970s, managers of nearly 4,000 acres of battlefield land also had to consider contemporary trends in soil conservation. During this time, the park staff also undertook gradual efforts to restore the landscape to its 1863 condition and continued an active practice of acquiring threatened lands.

The 1974 Congressional act limited the park's boundaries to 3,874 acres. By 1980 Gettysburg National Military Park consisted of 3,587.87 acres. The following year, the park acquired an additional five acres, including a non-historic house adjacent to the recently acquired visitor center. Management made admirable progress in purchasing vital tracts and demolishing post-1863 structures. In 1982 the Park Service contracted for the removal of one of the field's most intrusive commercial developments, the Peace Light Inn, on the Day 1 fields along the Mummasburg Road, and restored the area as best as possible to its 1863 condition. Three years later the park acquired and removed the Shields Museum along the Chambersburg Pike. It was

³⁵ "Coordinating Commission For '88 Battle Anniversary Meets," *Gettysburg Times*, 6 January 1988; "Lincoln Coming To Gettysburg!" *Gettysburg Times*, 19 November 1988; Martin Sipkoff, "Gettysburg Celebration Today," *York Dispatch*, 19 November 1988; Traci A. Lower, "Gettysburg Address Events Draw 15,000," *Gettysburg Times*, 21 November 1988. Other dignitaries present for the 125th Anniversary of the Gettysburg Address included Pennsylvania Governor Robert Casey; Representative Kenneth J. Cole; Representative William Goodling; NPS Director William Penn Mott; Gettysburg Mayor Francis Linn; and Adams County Judge John MacPhail.

the last remaining commercial museum located within park boundaries, and one of the last intrusions on the fields of Day 1. In addition the Park Service removed the non-historic Hotel Springs Road and purchased and removed the Baum House, located adjacent to the Soldiers' National Cemetery, in 1986.³⁶

Over the years park staff had made some piecemeal improvements in restoring the historic landscape by clearing non-historic woodlots, rebuilding historic fence patterns, and controlling vegetation growth. Much of the restoration work was accomplished by the labor of the Young Adult Conservation Corps (YACC). In 1981, for example, fifty-enrollees logged 47,866 hours of landscape clearing at Little Round Top and Houck's Ridge. The youth workers also replaced 2.62 miles of fencing. On May 31, 1982, however, the YACC was terminated after five year's operation at Gettysburg. Other volunteer groups also contributed to the management of the park's 3,600 acres. A local high school Future Farmers of America (FFA) club maintained the historic Peach Orchard, and in 1986 a Rotary Club harvested over 125 bushels of peaches, sharing the profits with the park.³⁷

The environmental movement of the 1970s and an increasing awareness of energy conservation had expressed itself in the management of Gettysburg National Military Park. In

³⁶ Superintendent John Earnst, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 1980," written on March 17, 1981, 15; John Earnst, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 1981," written on April 6, 1982. Folder 2, Box 1, (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives, 4. After acquiring the 5.03 acres for \$112,750 the park consisted of 3,596.37 acres. The park demolished the non-historic house adjacent to the visitor center; Superintendent John Earnst, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 1982," written on April 6, 1983, 2; Superintendent John Earnst, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 1981," written on April 6, 1982. Folder 2, Box 1 (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives, 16; Superintendent John Earnst, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 1985," written on March 14, 1986, 30; Acting Superintendent Robert Davidson, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 1986," written on April 6, 1987. Folder 3, Box 1 (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives, 14.

³⁷ Superintendent John Earnst, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 1982," written on April 6, 1983, 2;15; Superintendent John Earnst, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 1981," written on April 6, 1982. Folder 2, Box 1 (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives, 16; Acting Superintendent Robert Davidson, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 1986," written on April 6, 1987. Folder 3, Box 1 (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives, 14. The Rotary club picked the fruit and sold it off-site, sharing half of the profits with the park service.

1979 the NPS Director ordered all park superintendents to “substantially” increase attention to environmental programs and education for park visitors. Advancing visitors knowledge of the environment supported the agency’s mission of preservation. The director noted that the mission of the park’s environmental programs was to educate visitors to “appreciate more fully the natural, historic and cultural values of the park system, and thereby, to change their attitudes toward the parklands, making their preservation and maintenance a cooperative effort of park management and park visitors.” To fulfill this mission, in part, parks were to develop on-site and off-site energy exhibits and programs. In September 1979 the Department of Energy sponsored an “Energy Mobile Exhibit” in the visitor center parking lot. Superintendent Earnst reported that the exhibit attracted “hundreds of conservation-minded persons.”³⁸

The Park Service simultaneously began to pursue an aggressive soil conservation policy on the battlefield and implemented practical farming initiatives as part of the widespread environmental consciousness. In 1981, for example, the park installed 4,000 feet of sub-surface field drains on the Biggs, Klinge, and Whitman farm fields. Since many of the farm acres commonly lay wet, these drains were designed to dry the swampy fields, but also to provide a system of reusable water for livestock. Two years later, using funds obtained from the Significant Resource Problem (SRP) program, the Park Service issued six contracts to address soil conservation and water control issues. These contracts provided for an additional 9,000 feet in underground drainage systems and 6,000 feet of grassed waterways.³⁹

³⁸ Memo from NPS Director to all NPS Superintendents, October 25, 1979; Memo from Chester Harris to all Mid-Atlantic Superintendents, October 14, 1977. Folder 2, Box 24, (GETT 43970), GNMP Archives; Superintendent John Earnst, “Superintendent’s Annual Report, 1979,” written on March 13, 1980. Folder 2, Box 1 (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives, 3.

³⁹ Superintendent John Earnst, “Superintendent’s Annual Report, 1981,” written on April 6, 1982, 8; Acting Superintendent Robert Davidson, “Superintendent’s Annual Report, 1983,” written on March 15, 1984. Folder 2,

In addition to improving field drainage another aspect of the agency's landscape philosophy centered on maintaining an active farm scene. In 1982 there were 1,439 acres of crop fields, which represented approximately 95 percent of the lands in agricultural production at the time of the battle. Staffing and economic limitations prevented the Park Service from cultivating over 1,400 acres of crops. In order to actively cultivate the farm fields, Gettysburg's management entered into cooperative agreements with area farmers to maintain the battlefield crops. Through a system of Agricultural Special Use Permits (SUPs) the government leased parcels of land to farmers, who in turn used the land for pasture or crop production. Agricultural SUP allowed the park to manage historic fields at minimal cost, yet kept farmland in active production, thereby adding to the economic base of Adams County. In the early 1980s, for example, for the first time in a century, farmers planted and harvested wheat in the historic Wheatfield. Farmers also planted oats and corn in the fields at the historic Brian farm, while others began to use the Bushman and Rose farm fields as a pasture for livestock.⁴⁰ The Agricultural SUP evolved into an integral component of the park's landscape management philosophy.

After a decade of planning the Park Service finally had produced a viable *General Management Plan*, one that offered policy recommendations to better protect and interpret the battlefield. In some respects, however, the 1982 *GMP* ultimately did little to change the day-to-day management of the park. The key features of the plan-- the establishment of a new visitor

Box 1 (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives, 7-8; Acting Superintendent Robert Davidson, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 1984," written on March 8, 1985. Folder 3, Box 1 (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives, 18.

⁴⁰ *GMP*, 1982, 56; Acting Superintendent Robert Davidson, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 1983," written on March 15, 1984. Folder 2, Box 1 (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives, 7-8; Acting Superintendent Robert Davidson, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 1984," written on March 8, 1985. Folder 3, Box 1 (GETT 41160), GNMP Archives, 18.

center north of town and revised visitor access to Devil's Den--were never implemented. Other central points, namely the establishment of a chronological tour and the partial closure of the Soldiers' National Cemetery, met with fierce opposition from the local community. Recommendations for landscape management, including vegetative screening, vista cutting, and the reliance on Agricultural SUP, proved to be the most enduring and significant aspect of the 1982 *General Management Plan*.

Planning aside, Daniel Kuehn proved remarkably adept at improving relations between the park and community, becoming even more popular when he decided to retain vehicle access into Devil's Den. The "era of good feelings" at Gettysburg proved short-lived, however, as more acrimonious tensions loomed on the horizon. As the battlefield moved into the last decade of the twentieth century park management faced issues altering the future of the battlefield, including a revised boundary, wildlife management, a railroad, and a land exchange.

Chapter 9

“Now We Are Engaged In A Great Civil War”: Confusion, Controversy, and Criticism, 1989-1994

The 125th anniversary theme of “Let Us Have Peace” seemed befitting to a battlefield and town that had been mired in several years of controversy. Daniel Kuehn’s announcement in 1989 that he would reverse his predecessor’s plan to eliminate traffic from Devil’s Den further improved relations for a time between the battlefield and the local area. Events occurring between 1989 and 1994 once again strained the credibility of the Gettysburg management, however, and weakened the park’s relationship with both the town and the wider Civil War community. This period in the history of the Gettysburg battlefield was particularly fraught with turmoil and controversy that centered on three main issues: the Memorial Landscape Philosophy, boundary revision, and a land exchange.

Although the NPS had adopted the 1982 *GMP* as the park’s guiding management philosophy, Gettysburg management soon judged the plan to be inadequate. Lacking a clear vision on how the battlefield should be managed, park management in the early 1890s adopted the Memorial Landscape Philosophy. It proposed to restore the battlefield not to its 1863 condition, but instead to its 1880s and 1890s era appearance when Gettysburg gained federal recognition and was administered by the veterans’ commission. The idea increased tensions with the Civil War community as many people expressed concern over returning a historic battlefield to its post-battle landscape. Meanwhile, in the late 1980s, at the request of Congress, Gettysburg National Military Park undertook a boundary study to explore the park’s holdings and desired land acquisitions. On August 17, 1990, President George Bush signed Public Law 101-377, adding approximately 1,900 acres to the park and thereby expanding the battlefield boundary to

nearly 5,600 acres.¹ As part of this boundary revision, the National Park Service agreed to a land exchange with Gettysburg College. The Park Service acquired a scenic easement on forty seven acres of college-owned land on the first day's fields, but in turn deeded seven acres of park property along the Seminary Ridge railroad cut to the college. In mid-December 1990 contractors began excavating the railroad cut. The destruction of what many deemed to be significant battle terrain unleashed more controversy within the town and Civil War community, as many observers questioned the Park Service's management abilities.

Two additional events occurred that irrevocably changed the management and interpretation of the Gettysburg battlefield. First, in 1989, preservationist-minded historians formed a cooperating association known as The Friends of the National Parks at Gettysburg (FNPG, or simply referred to as "the Friends"). It proved to have a significant long-term impact on the management and history of the Gettysburg battlefield. Meanwhile, the Battle of Gettysburg again became a popular cultural phenomenon when Ron Maxwell released his cinematic production *Gettysburg* in 1993.

During this tumultuous period, no less than three different superintendents served at Gettysburg National Military Park. The frequency in superintendent turnover further contributed to the agency's inability to establish a consistent management philosophy. While popular with park staff and within the community, Daniel Kuehn retired in November 1989, after serving only eleven months at the battlefield. In late March 1990, Jose Cisneros reported as the park's new superintendent. Four years later, after enduring heavy criticism for both the Memorial

¹ Superintendent Jose Cisneros, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 1990," written on April 10, 1991. Box 1, Thomas J. Harrison Files, Records of the National Park Service at Gettysburg National Military Park, Gettysburg National Military Park Archives, 5 [hereinafter cited as TH, GNMP Archives].

Landscape Philosophy and the railroad exchange debacle, Cisneros announced his transfer. In the midst of the continuing management crisis and deteriorating credibility of the National Park Service, Dr. John Latschar arrived as the park's superintendent in August 1994, inaugurating a new era at the park.

Daniel Kuehn's tenure was the shortest administration in the battlefield's history. Before he retired, Kuehn cited his discontent with the abuses of the bureaucracy as the key reason for his decision. "I've been absolutely frustrated by the lack of support the park service has received from the federal government, from Congress, and the executive branch," stated Kuehn. Befitting to his most significant legacy as superintendent at Gettysburg, volunteers cleaned the Devil's Den and Slaughter Pen areas as a farewell gift to Kuehn. Five months later, on March 26, 1990, Jose Cisneros began his new duties as Gettysburg's superintendent. Prior to transferring to Gettysburg, Cisneros had served as superintendent of San Antonio Missions National Historic Park in Texas and Bandelier National Historic Monument in New Mexico.² Cisneros would lead Gettysburg National Military Park through the crises of the early 1990s.

² Martin Sipkoff, "Park Chief Quits Post Out Of Anger," *York Sunday News*, 17 September 1989; Bobbie Platt, "Frustrated Park Superintendent Decides To Retire," *Gettysburg Times*, 6 September 1989; "Slaughter Pen Cleared As Farewell Gift To Park Superintendent," *Gettysburg Times*, 1 November 1989; Bill Neil, "Park Superintendent Retires: Daniel Kuehn Bids Farewell," *Gettysburg Times*, 4 November 1989. Park employees and friends held a farewell reception for Kuehn in the Gettysburg Fire Hall. Approximately sixty-five people attended to express their respect and thanks for Kuehn's leadership during his short tenure; Management Team Meeting Minutes, October 31, 1989. Folder Copies of Meeting Minutes, 6/27/89-12/20/89, Box 8, A40, Park Main (Central) Files, 1987-present, Records of the National Park Service at Gettysburg National Military Park, Gettysburg National Military Park Archives [Files from this collection have not yet been processed and all notes hereinafter will be cited by Box, File Code, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives]; Management Team Meeting Minutes, February 27, 1990. Folder Copies of Meeting Minutes, 6/27/89-12/20/89, Box 8, A40, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives; Bobbie Platt, "New Park Superintendent Arrives," *Gettysburg Times*, March 30, 1990;

The first issue centered on the 1982 *General Management Plan*. It articulated a piecemeal landscape management philosophy and failed to offer an overarching proposal on how the battlefield's landscape should be managed. Planners recommended the removal of 150 acres of non-historic trees and woodlots and continued the policy of minimizing modern developments with vegetative screening practices. Perhaps the most significant landscape policy recommended in the *GMP* was the utilization of Agricultural Special Use Permits (SUPs), which allowed the Park Service to maintain hundreds of acres of crop and farm fields at little cost to the government.³

Cisneros described the park's 1982 *GMP* as "outdated" and recommended that the park explore new management objectives.⁴ Helping to shape those new goals was Reed Engle, the park's new cultural resources manager. Engle spearheaded the new landscape philosophy. Entitled the Memorial Landscape Philosophy, Engle's vision intended to offer a park-wide policy on how the historic terrain should be managed. Convinced that the Gettysburg battlefield could never be restored to its 1863 condition, Engle crucially proposed restoring the grounds to its appearance during the veterans' commemorative, or memorial, era.

"New Park Service Superintendent Ready," *Gettysburg Times*, 13 March 1990; Martin Sipkoff, "Military Park Gets New Chief," *York Sunday News*, 11 February 1990. Officially Gettysburg NMP also had two interim superintendents between Kuehn's departure and Cisneros's arrival, Frank Deckert, whose regular position was superintendent of Petersburg National Battlefield, and Robert Davidson, who served as Gettysburg's assistant superintendent. Cisneros received his Bachelor of Science degree from Texas A&I in Kingville. He worked at the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) between 1970-1973 and then at the Southwest Regional office as a personnel officer (stationed in Santa Fe, New Mexico) from 1973 to 1978. In 1978 Cisneros assumed his first superintendent duties at the newly established San Antonio Missions National Park where he served until 1988 when he transferred to Bandelier National Historic Monument.

³ *General Management Plan*, Gettysburg National Military Park and National Cemetery, (Prepared by Mid-Atlantic Regional Office, National Park Service, United States Department of the Interior, December 1982), 53-60. Approved on December 1, 1982 [hereafter cited as *GMP*, 1982].

⁴ Superintendent Jose Cisneros, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 1993," written on March 11, 1994. Box 3, A26, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives, 6.

Gettysburg's staff first outlined the concept of the Memorial Landscape in a "Statement For Management," written in May 1991 and approved by Regional Director James Coleman Jr. on July 3, 1991. Superintendent Cisneros offered as a statement of management for the Memorial Landscape Philosophy: "To manage the park as a memorial landscape which not only reflects the pre-battle 1863 agricultural environment, but includes those superimposed post-battle elements (monuments, avenues, interpretive devices, facilities, etc.) which are necessary for commemoration and visitor understanding of the battle." In essence, Cisneros would acknowledge two distinct landscapes: the pre-battle 1863 agricultural landscape and the memorial landscape of the veterans' commemorative era. As defined by the National Park Service, he continued, Gettysburg's landscape was significant "not only for the events of 1863, but for the designed landscape of commemoration that was superimposed on the battlefield by the Gettysburg Battlefield Commission from 1895-1922." The most obvious features of the memorial landscape were the approximately 1,320 monuments and markers dedicated by the veterans in the years after the battle. Other features of the memorial landscape included park avenues, bronze identification plaques or tablets, pipe fencing, ornamental fencing, and artillery shell pyramid markers placed along the tour roads. Park planners described this memorial landscape as "superimposed" on the 1863 pre-battle terrain.⁵

⁵ "Statement For Management: Outline of Planning Requirements, May 1991." Gettysburg National Military Park. Approved by Regional Director James W. Coleman, Jr. on July 3, 1991. Folder 32, Box 24, D18, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-Present), GNMP Archives [hereinafter cited as "Statement For Management, 1991"]; Superintendent Jose Cisneros to Division Chiefs, April 13, 1992. Folder 26, Box 24, D18, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-Present), GNMP Archives; Director Roger Kennedy to Congressman James A. Traficant, Jr., November 23, 1994. Folder 30, Box 44, H30, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives; Regional Director B.J. Griffin to R. Michael Kaar, December 21, 1993. Folder 28, Box 24, D18, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-Present), GNMP Archives. An example of iron ornamental fencing is exhibited at the Copse of Trees at the High Water Mark.

The basis for the Memorial Landscape Philosophy rested on four fundamental assumptions. First, the Park Service believed that the battlefield could never be restored to its 1863 appearance. Documentation originating from the park and regional office as well noted that, “there is little factual evidence available for restoration to 1863” B.J. Griffin argued that “there is no way we can accurately make the Battlefield appear as it did just before the Battle in 1863.” The 1863 battlefield appearance could not be preserved because “it no longer exists.”

Second, the agency believed that the changes made on the battlefield by the veterans during the commemorative period were equally significant. Restoring the battlefield to its 1863 condition “would require the removal of countless features judged worthy by battle veterans who began to alter the battlefield in 1864.” Moreover, while sufficient evidence did not exist to restore the battlefield to its 1863 appearance, adequate documentation was available to reconstruct the commemorative appearance. Consequently, Park Service officials maintained that the earliest the agency could restore the battlefield to “with any consistency,” “accuracy,” or “respect for those who fought in July 1863,” was its appearance when Gettysburg National Military Park received congressional recognition in 1895. Finally, management believed that the commemorative restoration would offer visitors the best interpretive experience. Even before Cisneros arrived, Acting Superintendent Frank Deckert had argued that in order to “be honest” to park visitors, the service should “present an accurate picture of this Memorial period since we cannot ever return to the 1863 period.”⁶

⁶ Regional Director B.J. Griffin to R. Michael Kaar, December 21, 1993. Folder 28, Box 24, D18, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-Present), GNMP Archives; Superintendent Jose Cisneros to Stephen Killian, January 22, 1991; Acting Superintendent Frank Deckert to Terry Fox, January 29, 1990. Folder 27, Box 24, D18, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-Present), GNMP Archives.

Yet when the Park Service explained the Memorial Landscape Philosophy to the public during the spring of 1990, many concluded that the agency's goal was to deemphasize the 1863 landscape in favor of the commemorative era appearance. Concerned individuals expressed their opposition to the Memorial Landscape Philosophy in letters to the park, congressional representatives and the regional offices. One Pennsylvania resident wrote that he was "shocked" to learn of the new landscape philosophy, and argued that the 1863 landscape warranted primary preservation efforts. "Visitors, knowledgeable historians and novices alike, come to Gettysburg to learn about the battle that took place there," he maintained, "Visitors do not come because of the memorials. The memorials are there because of the battle, not visa versa." In a letter to National Park Service Director Roger Kennedy, Ohio's Congressional Representative James Traficant, Jr. wrote that "thousands" of his constituents had contacted him regarding the park's new Memorial Landscape Philosophy. Finding no rationale for the memorial landscape concept, the Congressman noted that he was "deeply troubled" by the philosophy and believed its implementation would have a "negative impact" on the operations of the park. Traficant further declared the agency's reasoning that the battlefield could not be restored to its 1863 condition because of the lack of sufficient primary documents as "shallow" and contradictory to the opinions of noted Civil War historians. Echoing the opinion of others, he concluded that his constituents "tour the battlefield to get a feel for what it was like those three fateful days in 1863. They don't care or are not particularly interested in what visitors saw at Gettysburg in the 1890s." Local congressmen expressed similar concerns. In a letter to Superintendent Cisneros, Pennsylvania Congressman Tim Holden questioned why "a historical Civil War site would be restored in the fashion of a later period."⁷

⁷ R. Michael Kaar to Regional Director B.J. Griffin, December 9, 1993. Folder 28, Box 24, D18, (Unprocessed

Yet, in the face of widespread criticism on the Memorial Landscape Philosophy, the Park Service remained steadfast in their newly developed philosophy. Park Historian Kathy Harrison summarized the park's intentions, writing, "while we can't let you see what it looked like the first time, in the battle, we can still make it the way it was the second time, when the veterans came back. We can still look at it with the veterans' eyes." Superintendent Cisneros defended the policy as well, remarking that the Memorial Landscape Philosophy allowed the NPS to "preserve a preservation" that was created by the men who fought in the battle. In 1994 Director Kennedy reminded detractors that the National Park Service had the dual responsibility of preserving not only the terrain associated with the battle, but also the monuments and memorials created by the battle's veterans. While some questioned the park's purpose of restoring landscape features from the veterans' commemorative era, and believed that such restoration threatened the integrity of the battlefield, Reed Engle tried to allay their concerns, stating that the battlefield "is like a mattress, and we're putting a different sheet on top of it. It's all restorable—we can always put it back."⁸

In retrospect, the most evident fallacy of the Memorial Landscape Philosophy was the Park Service's inability to settle on a consistent era of restoration. Park produced documents and agency correspondence consistently articulated differing dates for the commemorative era. In 1990, Deckert defined the commemorative period as 1863 to 1900. The "Statement for Management," written in 1991 under Cisneros, defined the Memorial Landscape period as 1863

Central Files, 1987-Present), GNMP Archives; Congressman James A. Traficant, Jr. to Director Roger Kennedy, November 4, 1994. Folder 30, Box 44, H30, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives; Congressman Tim Holden to Superintendent Jose Cisneros, October 12, 1993. Folder 29, Box 44, H30, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives. Roger Kennedy became the agency's new director on June 1, 1993.

⁸ Deborah Fitts, "Gettysburg Battlefield Is Being Taken Back To 1890s," *Civil War News*, May 1990.

to 1910. A 1993 letter from Regional Director B. J. Griffin fixed the period of commemoration as 1895 to 1922. Aside from the inability to define the commemorative era, the obvious problem with the Memorial Landscape Philosophy was that it sought to restore the battlefield to a condition that post-dated the battle. The very reason for the creation of Gettysburg National Military Park in 1895, was of course, to preserve and protect the grounds associated with the three-day battle. The philosophy disregarded the park's enabling legislation, which stated that the purpose of establishing Gettysburg National Military Park was to protect the terrain associated with the three-day battle. In a 1994 article in *Ranger: The Journal of the Association of National Park Rangers*, Gettysburg supervisory historians, John Andrews and Scott Hartwig, discussed the interpretive dilemma of restoring the battlefield to its 1880s or 1890s appearance. They questioned why the Park Service should present a battlefield landscape that "post dates the defining event responsible for the park's establishment."⁹

In the end, the staff never systematically implemented the Memorial Landscape Philosophy. A change in management in 1994 finally brought about the swift termination of this philosophy. Reed Engle transferred to Shenandoah National Park and Jose Cisneros left Gettysburg for Big Bend National Park in Texas. The new superintendent, John Latschar, immediately asked his staff to embark on the necessary research for a new *General Management Plan*, which eventually called for the restoration of the battlefield to its 1863 condition.

⁹ Acting Superintendent Frank Deckert to Terry Fox, January 29, 1990. Folder 27, Box 24, D18, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-Present), GNMP Archives; "Statement For Management, 1991," Folder 32, Box 24, D18, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives, 65; Regional Director B.J. Griffin to R. Michael Kaar, December 21, 1993. Folder 28, Box 24, D18, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-Present), GNMP Archives; John Andrews and D. Scott Hartwig, "Cultural Landscape Management and Interpretation: A Dilemma," *Ranger: The Journal of the Association of National Park Rangers* vol. 10, No. 2 (Spring 1994): 14-16.

While Gettysburg's enabling legislation, passed on February 11, 1895, pointed to commemorating the 1863 battle, it did not define an exact boundary for the battlefield. The legislation simply authorized the Secretary of War the power to acquire the necessary lands to protect the battlefield's terrain, and stipulated that any acquisitions were not to exceed the parcels shown on the Sickles Map. Consequently, it was not until the 1970s that the federal government sought to establish an acreage limit at Gettysburg. In 1974, the U.S. Senate established a limit of 3,874 acres for the park boundary. That legislation guided Gettysburg's land acquisition program a decade. In October 1987, however, President Ronald Reagan signed Public Law 100-132, which directed the National Park Service to conduct a boundary study and submit the findings to Congress within one year. The catalyst for the executive order requiring Gettysburg to complete a boundary study resulted from a land donation made by the Gettysburg Battlefield Preservation Association (GBPA) in 1986. Two years earlier, in 1984, the GBPA had purchased the thirty-one acre Taney farm, located near Spangler Springs and used as a Confederate hospital during the battle, with the intentions of donating it to the national park. The thirty one acre donation, however, surpassed the battlefield's 3,874-acre limit.¹⁰

Needing Congressional approval to accept the Taney property, Pennsylvania Congressman Peter Kostmayer of Bucks County sponsored a bill accepting the donation of the farm, thereby violating the established ceiling. Opposition to the bill came from Adams County

¹⁰ *Boundary Study, Gettysburg National Military Park: Draft Report To Congress, Environmental Assessment*, August 1988, 1 [hereinafter cited as *Boundary Study, Draft*]; Martin Sipkoff, "Historian Answers Call to Arms in Latest Battle Over Battlefield," *Gettysburg Times*, June 2, 1986; Traci A. Lower, "Park Service Accepts Taney Farm," *Gettysburg Times*, September 16, 1988. The GBPA purchased the Taney farm in 1984 from Harriet Carter for \$50,000. Union General Daniel Sickles defined the park boundary at 15,360 acres.

Representative William Goodling, who maintained that the 1974 acreage limit must be upheld. Goodling reasoned that the federal government had acquired sufficient amount of land in his district to adequately interpret the battle, remarking, “Must we acquire every inch of land on which some rebel or yankee soldier walked?” On June 16, 1986 the House narrowly defeated the bill to expand the battlefield’s boundaries. Kostmayar remained undeterred. His efforts were successful. Over a year later, on October 16, 1987, Congress authorized Public Law 100-132, which permitted Gettysburg National Military Park to accept the donation of the Taney farm. Goodling had finally conceded his support to the bill on two provisions. He recommended that the government freeze future land acquisitions until the Park Service complete a boundary study, and demanded that local officials be consulted in any future boundary study process.¹¹

Consequently, as a result over the acquisition of the Taney farm, and Goodling’s subsequent stipulations, in May 1987 the National Park Service undertook a study of the battlefield’s boundaries and land use. As Congressman Goodling requested, the Park Service regularly involved local officials and area residents by holding public meetings and workshops and distributing “Boundary Study Newsletters.” Jonathan Doherty of the Mid-Atlantic Regional Office served as the Boundary Study Planning Team leader. The service held its first public meeting in May 1987 at the Gettysburg Junior High School and recorded over one hundred

¹¹ Jeffrey B. Roth, “Boundary Study Draft Report For Battlefield Now Complete,” *Gettysburg Times*, September 7, 1988. Box 26, Newspaper Clipping (Unbound), (GETT 43663), Records of the National Park Service at Gettysburg National Military Park, Gettysburg National Military Park Archives [hereinafter cited as (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives]; “Battle Grows as Politicians Trade Votes,” *Hanover Evening Sun*, June 2, 1986; Gerald Jordan, “Expansion at Gettysburg is Rejected by House vote,” *Philadelphia Inquirer*, June 17, 1986; Shelley Jones, “‘Second Battle of Gettysburg’ Over: 31-Acre Taney Farm to enter Park,” *Gettysburg Times*, July 17, 1986. Box 22, (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives; *Boundary Study, Draft*, 52. The House vote fell ten short of the necessary two-thirds majority (264-146). The exact language of Public Law 100-132 read “The Secretary of the Interior through the National Park Service shall conduct a boundary study and shall submit a report to Congress within one year of the date of enactment of this Act, with recommendations with respect to the final development of the Gettysburg National Military Park. In conducting the study, the Secretary shall consult with the people of the community and their elected representatives at all levels as well as with other interested individuals and groups.”

attendees. Through the summer months, the Park Service held three more public meetings and regularly mailed updated issues of the “Boundary Study Newsletter” to approximately 800 interested individuals. As required by Public Law 100-132, the National Park Service also prepared a draft report of the boundary study in August and submitted the final version to Congress in October 1988.¹²

Doughtery’s planning team identified three main problems with the existing park boundary. Most significantly, the existing boundary did not include all “sites of significant battle events.” Key areas of battle action not protected included South Cavalry Field, Neill Avenue, the Spangler Farm, East Cavalry Field, and the First Shot Marker along Chambersburg Pike. In addition, forty-seven monuments and markers placed by the battle’s veterans were not within the park boundary. Moreover, planners found that “existing modern land uses intrude upon visitor experience” and unprotected battle lands could be threatened by future land use. The final issue concerned areas within the park boundary that should be considered for removal or deletion. According to boundary planners “certain park landholdings are of diminished integrity” or were recommended for removal because of maintenance problems. For example, two areas identified

¹² Congressman William Goodling Testimony, U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Government Operations. *Land Exchange Between National Park Service/Gettysburg National Park and Gettysburg College*, 103rd Cong., 2nd sess., 9 May 1994, 7-8; “Boundary Study: Gettysburg National Military Park” Newsletter, (Gettysburg: National Park Service, 1987), July 1987, No.1; “Boundary Study: Gettysburg National Military Park” Newsletter, (Gettysburg: National Park Service, 1987), March 1988, No.2. Folder 1987, Box 76, W32, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives; Jeffrey B. Roth, “Boundary Study Draft Report For Battlefield Now Complete,” *Gettysburg Times*, September 7, 1988. Box 26 (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives; *Boundary Study*, 1-15. Other members to the planning team included several Gettysburg rangers: Superintendent John Earnst, Assistant Superintendent Robert Davidson, Historian Kathy Harrison, Assistant Chief Laurie Coughlan, and Fred Eubanks, park planner.

for potential removal included Jones Battalion Avenue and a small parcel of land between the park boundary and the Gettysburg College property.¹³

Given that the Battle of Gettysburg occurred over twenty-five square miles, boundary planners then tried to establish a criterion to determine which lands outside the park boundary were significant enough to incorporate. They evaluated these areas based on four criteria: cultural resource significance; interpretive importance; visual significance; and management feasibility. Using this criterion, the planning team proposed a new park boundary that provided federal protection of most of the existing lands, the addition of approximately 1,900 acres, and removal of several “minor” holdings. The boundary revision team notably identified fourteen areas as having historical value and recommended their inclusion into the park’s new boundary. These fourteen tracts included: 65 acres along General Jubal Early’s line of battle on the first day’s fields; 65 acres along the Union army’s 11th Corps line also on the first day’s fields; 208 acres at Herr’s Ridge; four acres at the First Shot Marker along the Chambersburg Pike; seventeen acres along the Union army’s 1st Corps line along Seminary Ridge; 227 acres at Pitzer Farm; 210 acres at South Cavalry Field; 210 acres at Howe and Wright Avenues, which included the 20th Maine Monument; 85 acres at the George Spangler Farm; 121 acres along Neill Avenue; 55 acres of the Baltimore Pike corridor; eleven acres at Hospital Woods; and 630 acres at East Cavalry Field.¹⁴

¹³ *Boundary Study, Draft*, 17-38.

¹⁴ *Boundary Study, Draft*, 25-38. The cultural resource significance was based on four specific criteria: type and concentration of activity and tactical importance of the battle related events on the site; the association with individuals of importance to the battle; concentration and value of commemorative monumentation in the area; and the current historic integrity of the existing resource. The interpretive importance element was based on two criteria: the ability of the area to contribute to the visual understanding of the battle and the ability of the area to convey information on the battlefield not covered by the park’s interpretive programs. The visual significance element offered four detailed criteria: visibility from park avenues; importance to maintaining the cultural resource;

While the boundary team identified approximately 1,900 acres of historically significant terrain to be incorporated into the park boundaries, direct purchase of the tracts would not be feasible. In fact, planners recommended the purchase of only 250 acres. For the majority of the lands, the government should negotiate scenic easements with landowners in order to preserve the property. Scenic easements theoretically would prove beneficial to both parties because the easements allowed owners to continue to live on their property, while still paying taxes into the local economy, but the land was protected by limiting development and purchase rights on the property. Planners also recommended the removal of eight areas within the existing boundary because of “management considerations or decreased site integrity.” Those eight sites were: the Washington Street Garage; Seminary Avenue; Jones Battalion Avenue; West Confederate Avenue/Reynolds Road Connector; Taneytown Road by-pass; Colt Park tracts; and the Cemetery Annex driveway along Baltimore Pike. Another area identified for removal was the boundary between the battlefield and Gettysburg College.¹⁵

Upon receiving Gettysburg’s boundary study in October 1988, Congress deliberated authorizing the inclusion of the recommended 1,900 acres. The following year a Congressional subcommittee held a hearing on the proposed boundary revisions. At this meeting Edwin Bearss, National Park Service Chief Historian; James Coleman, Regional Director; and Superintendent Daniel Kuehn represented the National Park Service. In November the subcommittee travelled to Gettysburg to personally examine the areas identified in the boundary proposal. After

feasibility of screening land uses outside the park; and visual compatibility of the current land use with the battlefield. The final criterion, management feasibility was based on three elements: proximity to the existing boundary; law enforcement consideration and accessibility; and provision of development identified in the park’s operational documents. Officially these tracts total 1,849 acres.

¹⁵ Jerry L. Gleason, “Senate Approves Plan To Expand Gettysburg Park,” *Harrisburg Patriot-News*, 26 January 1990. Box 28, (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives; *Boundary Study, Draft*, 35-38.

additional deliberations and subsequent onsite inspections, and without any objections from interested parties, Congress in the spring of 1990 approved the battlefield's boundary proposal. On August 17, 1990, President Bush signed Public Law 101-377. It added the requested 1,900 acres and established a procedure for disposing of non-essential lands. Gettysburg National Military Park now consisted of 5,733.05 acres. The new law further established a Gettysburg National Military Park Advisory Commission to advise park management on stewardship of the battlefield. The Advisory Commission consisted of eleven members appointed by the Secretary of the Interior to serve three-year terms.¹⁶

Area residents, businessmen, and politicians, while bemoaning park expansion because federally owned properties were tax-exempt and lowered the local tax base, nonetheless applauded the firm definition of what lands the government could acquire. Leery of park staff and historians who broadly identified areas of historical significance, Congressman Goodling commented, "This bill means to me that once and for all these are the boundaries, and every time we turn around someone doesn't have another great idea of what should be added to the park." Clearly defined boundaries would prevent controversy between the Park Service and community

¹⁶ Congressman William Goodling Testimony, U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Government Operations. *Land Exchange Between National Park Service/Gettysburg National Park and Gettysburg College*, 103rd Cong., 2nd sess., 9 May 1994, 9-11; Management Team Meeting Minutes, October 24, 1991. Folder October 24, 1991, Box 78, A1619, (Unprocessed Central Files 1989-present), GNMP Archives, 4-18; "President Signs Gettysburg Boundary Bill," *Gettysburg Times*, 20 August 1990. Box 28, Newspaper Clipping, 1990, (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives. The House passed the legislation on May 1, 1990 and the Senate on August 4, 1990. The Advisory Commission held its first meeting on October 24, 1991. The eleven members were carefully selected to broadly represent the interests of the Gettysburg area and included: representatives from each local government of the four surrounding townships, (Mount Joy, Mount Pleasant, Cumberland, and Straban); a representative from the borough of Gettysburg; one member from the Adams County government; a representative from the State Historic Preservation Office; two area residents (one of whom owns land within the park boundary); and a member considered an expert on historic preservation. Gettysburg's superintendent served on the commission as the federal representative, but did not have a vote on issues. Officially the Mid-Atlantic Regional Office contacted the agencies on the commission for nominations of individuals and their qualifications; the nominations were then sent to the Secretary of the Interior who made the selection. The three-year terms were staggered so that one-third of the commission would be replaced each year. The boundary legislation did not name or number the properties to be removed from within the park boundary.

leaders that erupted, according to Goodling, when “some would-be historian decided there was some other spot that was important.”¹⁷

Once Congress approved the new boundary for Gettysburg National Military Park, the government immediately accepted a donation of 266 acres of East Cavalry Field from the Richard Mellon King Foundation. This Pittsburgh foundation had purchased the land for \$660,000 with the intention of donating it to the Park Service, but the agency was unable to accept the property until the boundary study was complete. The Mellon Foundation’s donation allowed the government to acquire one of the sites identified in the boundary report and to preserve the terrain of the cavalry battle fought between General J.E.B. Stuart’s Confederates and General Alfred Pleasanton’s Union horsemen. In addition to donating the 266 acres at East Cavalry Field, the Mellon Foundation also bought and donated land to Antietam National Battlefield and Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania National Military Park.¹⁸

In the wake of the boundary revision, the federal government acquired another significant parcel of land on the southern end of the battlefield, the Yingling Auction property, now included within the park boundary. The acquisition of this property, through the process of condemnation, caused a disturbance in the Gettysburg community and opened a new debate over

¹⁷ Joanne E. Morvay, “House Panel Approves Gettysburg Park Expansion,” *York Daily Record*, 14 March 1990. Box 28, (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives.

¹⁸ Robert Holt, “Battlefield Land Donation On Hold By Congress,” *Gettysburg Times*, 3 July 1990; Kathleen Teltsch, “U.S. Gets 100,000 Acres In Largest Gift of Land,” *New York Times*, 1 July 1990, 1;20, Box 28, (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives; Michael J. Ybarra and Brooke A. Masters, “Largest Land Gift to U.S. Includes Important Historical, Ecological Sites,” *Washington Post*, 2 July 1990, A1;A6. Box 28, (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives. In total the Mellon Foundation donated over 100,000 acres. At Antietam the Foundation purchased and donated the famed Cornfield and at Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania National Military Park the Foundation donated lands from the Wilderness battlefield. The Mellon Foundation also donated land at Alligator River in North Carolina, Pecos National Historical Park in New Mexico, Mackay Island National Wildlife Refuge in North Carolina, the Rachel Carson National Wildlife Refuge in Maine, and Rocky Mountain National Park in Colorado.

individual property rights. The Yingling property, located along the Taneytown Road near Howe and Wright Avenues, comprised 18.67 acres and included an auction gallery and a 200-car parking lot. The Yingling family, however, began constructing their auction facilities in September, one month after the passage of the expanded boundary that clearly indicated their property fell within the new boundary. In fact, the regional director offered written warning to Yingling informing him that his auction shed fell within the battlefield's new boundary and that his property had been identified as a high priority acquisition tract. Yingling ignored the Park Service's warnings and proceeded to construct his auction facility. Because Yingling proved unwilling to cooperate with the Park Service's attempt to obtain his property at a fair market value, and because the development of an auction facility on ground now within the NPS boundary threatened the battlefield's historic integrity, the NPS initiated condemnation proceedings to acquire the property. After a hotly disputed condemnation case, the Park Service obtained the Yingling Auction facilities for \$548,000 and title to the land on December 17, 1992.¹⁹

The revised boundary increased the battlefield's land holdings by approximately 1,900 acres and proved to be one of the most influential events in the history of the Gettysburg battlefield. As indicated, the boundary study not only explored areas deemed vital to the battlefield preservation and interpretation, but further recommended areas to be removed from

¹⁹ Yingling Property Files. Folder 8, Box 55, L1425, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives; Superintendent John Latschar, interview by author, 4 January 2010. The NPS would later use a condemnation proceeding to acquire Thomas Ottenstein's National Tower.

the park's holdings because of "management considerations" or "decreased site integrity." One of the areas recommended for removal was the boundary between the battlefield and the Gettysburg College.²⁰

When park planners initiated the boundary proposal in 1987, Gettysburg College representatives met with National Park Service staff to discuss the possibility of a land exchange. The small, liberal arts school, located north of town, buttresses the park's boundary to the east along the first day's battlefield. College officials wanted to re-route a section of the Gettysburg Railroad that bisected the eastern edge of the campus because it created safety hazards to students and faculty who crossed the tracks to get to the college facilities on the west side of campus. College representatives proposed that the railroad track be relocated off the campus to the base of Seminary Ridge, near Larson's Motel on the Chambersburg Pike/U.S. Route 30. The Park Service had identified this section of land in the boundary study as a site recommended for removal.²¹

In return for the eight-acre tract along Seminary Ridge, Gettysburg College proposed to offer the National Park Service a scenic easement on forty-seven acres of college land stretching from the Carlisle Road on the east to the Mummasburg Road on the west. This was ground where the Confederate army's 2nd Corps routed the Union army's 11th Corps on the afternoon of July 1. Eager to construct new facilities for the student body, college officials led by William VanArsdale, the college's treasurer and business manager, announced his intention to use this

²⁰ *Boundary Study, Draft*, 36-37.

²¹ Bill Walker, Public Relations Official at Gettysburg College, to Faculty, Administrators, and Staff, February 1, 1991. Exhibit 20, U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Government Operations. *Land Exchange Between National Park Service/Gettysburg National Park and Gettysburg College*, 103rd Cong., 2nd sess., 9 May 1994, 284-285.

forty-seven acre tract for athletic fields. Herein lay the college's proposal to the National Park Service: if the Park Service would not relinquish title to the eight acres of ground near the Seminary Ridge railroad cut, thus preventing the college from rerouting the railroad line off its campus, the "only alternative" would be to continue developing the area north of town along the first day's battlefield. The college agreed to provide a tree screen along the eastern border of the railroad line to screen the visual intrusion of the railroad.²²

The National Park Service was open to discussion of the issue. According to text in the boundary study, "A possible re-routing of 3,600 feet of the Gettysburg Railroad line from its current location on the Gettysburg College campus to one along the park/college boundary would require minor boundary alterations. This change would provide benefits for the college and would not have an adverse impact on known historic resources." A congressional subcommittee in 1989 also discussed the proposed exchange. On November 18, 1989 Congressmen inspected the Seminary Ridge railroad cut and met with Gettysburg College officials, who explained the details of the proposed relocation and the anticipated impact on the historic resource.²³

Once President Bush signed the park's new boundary legislation, the National Park Service and Gettysburg College negotiated the final details for the land exchange. Since the Park

²² Bill Walker, Public Relations Official at Gettysburg College, to Faculty, Administrators, and Staff, February 1, 1991. Exhibit 20, U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Government Operations. *Land Exchange Between National Park Service/Gettysburg National Park and Gettysburg College*, 103rd Cong., 2nd sess., 9 May 1994, 284-285.

²³ *Boundary Study, Draft*, 36-37; Congressman William Goodling Testimony, U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Government Operations. *Land Exchange Between National Park Service/Gettysburg National Park and Gettysburg College*, 103rd Cong., 2nd sess., 9 May 1994, 10. The tour included Congressman Goodling, Congressman Bruce Vento, NPS Regional Director James Coleman, Acting Gettysburg Superintendent Frank Deckert, Gettysburg Assistant Superintendent Robert Davidson, NPS Regional Planner and boundary team leader Jonathan Doherty, and several Interior Committee Staff members.

Service was removing holdings from federal land, the agency was required to consult with the Pennsylvania State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. Both agencies approved. On July 24, 1990, appraisers valued the government's eight acre tract at \$130,000 and estimated the value of the development rights at Gettysburg College's land at \$233,750. The Gettysburg College would "donate" the \$100,000 difference to the federal government. The college also employed a Park Service recommended archeologist to conduct the required archeological investigation, with the agency supervising the work. Team leaders concluded that the proposed railroad construction "will impact no significant cultural or historic resources, nor will it significantly detract from the ability of the National Park Service to interpret the events of 1-3 July to the public." On September 26, one month after Bush signed the boundary bill, the National Park Service and Gettysburg College signed the agreement for the land exchange. The Park Service agreed to relinquish title to the eight-acre tract along Seminary Ridge, and Gettysburg College provided the NPS with a scenic easement on forty-seven acres along the first day's battlefield.²⁴

²⁴ Regional Director Lorraine Mintzmyer to Charles J. McHugh, March 16, 1992. Folder 1992, January-April, Box 75, W32, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives. Section 106 "Compliance" of the National Historical Preservation Act of 1966 stipulated the National Park Service had to consult with noted agencies on matters of land exchange; Gerald Kirwan, Chief, Land Resources Division, to William VanArsdale, Treasurer, Gettysburg College, September 7, 1990. Folder 21, Box 56, L1425, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987- present), GNMP Archives; Robin Lepore, Office of the Solicitor, to Fred Herling, Outdoor Recreation Planner, December 8, 1993. Binder I, Box 73, W32, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives; Briefing Statement, Gettysburg Railroad Re-routing/Synar Subcommittee Oversight, March 9, 1994. Folder January-May 1994, Box 74, W32, (Unprocessed Central Files 1987-present), GNMP Archives; Congressman William Goodling Testimony, U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Government Operations. *Land Exchange Between National Park Service/Gettysburg National Park and Gettysburg College*, 103rd Cong., 2nd sess., 9 May 1994, 10-12; *Phase I Archeological Survey of the Proposed Land Offer from Gettysburg National Military Park to Gettysburg College, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania*. Prepared by R. Christopher Goodwin & Associates, Frederick, Maryland, October 25, 1990. Folder Archeological Survey Materials, Box 75, W32 (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives. The federal government did not have funds appropriated for the land exchange, so the Park Service would not have been in the position to buy the development rights from the Gettysburg College. Archeologists found one minie ball during the dig.

Subsequent events soon revealed that from the beginning of the boundary proposal and land exchange, there had been a fundamental misunderstanding and miscommunication. The National Park Service had originally agreed to the land exchange with the understanding that the railroad would be relocated to the base of Seminary Ridge. In a November 1987 site inspection, a Gettysburg College representative informed Park Historian Kathy Harrison and Park Planner Fred Eubanks that the Gettysburg Railroad track would run at the base of Seminary Ridge. This was a key point because moving the track to the base of the ridge would not have necessitated any excavation of the existing cut. As it turned out, however, such an extensive cut in Seminary Ridge proved necessary for the installation of a west spur line to connect the Gettysburg Railroad to the CSX Railroad. Park officials, including the historian and superintendent, remained unaware of the track's relocation. Gettysburg College had received a survey map from Adams County Surveyors illustrating the excavation of three acres of Seminary Ridge, but Harrison did not receive a copy of this map until February 7, 1991, weeks after the excavation began. Thus, Gettysburg management did not realize that the college intended to excavate the ridge; they continued to believe the rail line would run at its base. In mid-December, 1990, crews began bulldozing the Seminary Ridge railroad cut for the rerouting of the rail line. When local residents, as well as Gettysburg's staff, heard of the destruction of the ridge their outcry far surpassed the noise of the bulldozers.²⁵

Though the public's reaction to the bulldozers removing acres of battlefield was immediate, excavation work still continued into the New Year. For nearly three months

²⁵ Robin Lepore, Office of the Solicitor, to Fred Herling, Outdoor Recreation Planner, December 8, 1993. Exhibit 22, U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Government Operations. *Land Exchange Between National Park Service/Gettysburg National Park and Gettysburg College*, 103rd Cong., 2nd sess., 9 May 1994, 296-306; Martin Sipkoff, "Where Did Seminary Ridge Go?" *Civil War Times Illustrated*, March/April 1992, 42-64. Ironically, this spur line remained inoperable.

construction progressed on the new rail line. During the winter of 1990-91, workers excavated approximately three acres of the Seminary Ridge railroad cut destroyed, nearly four acres of woods removed and sections of Civil War earthworks sites destroyed. In a 1995 *Environmental Assessment* report, park management concluded that the historic topography of the Seminary Ridge cut had been irrevocably destroyed. Meanwhile, on the northern side of town, the Park Service acquired the scenic easement on forty-seven acres of land along the Mummasburg Road. Yet as far back as November 1987 Gettysburg College had already begun filling, grading, and leveling the designated area in preparation for the construction of soccer fields. Therefore, by the time the Park Service acquired the easement on the land, the historical integrity of that terrain had already been destroyed as well. Park Historian Harrison opposed the exchange, arguing that the forty-seven acre tract had been altered such that it had already lost its historical integrity. Historian and GBPA Board Member William Frassanito charged that Gettysburg College, which “ironically attempts to market itself as some kind of a national center for Civil War studies,” used lands where men fought and died to build athletic fields for boys to play.²⁶

At the center of the nation’s outcry, however, was the role of the Seminary Ridge railroad cut in the battle. To be sure, some who were quick to criticize land exchange misunderstood which railroad cut was involved in the exchange. At the time of the battle there were two

²⁶ *Final Report: Gettysburg College- National Park Service Land Exchange, Study of Alternatives/Environmental Assessment* (Gettysburg: National Park Service, Gettysburg National Military Park, May 1995), 3 [hereinafter cited as *Land Exchange, Study of Alternatives*]; Chairman Mike Synar, Opening Statement, U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Government Operations. *Land Exchange Between National Park Service/Gettysburg National Park and Gettysburg College*, 103rd Cong., 2nd sess., 9 May 1994, 1-3; Robin Lepore, Office of the Solicitor, to Fred Herling, Outdoor Recreation Planner, December 8, 1993. Exhibit 22, U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Government Operations. *Land Exchange Between National Park Service/Gettysburg National Park and Gettysburg College*, 103rd Cong., 2nd sess., 9 May 1994, 296-306. Park historian Kathy Harrison expressed reservations about the proposed land exchange because of the leveling work on the forty-seven acres; William Frassanito, Statement, U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Government Operations. *Land Exchange Between National Park Service/Gettysburg National Park and Gettysburg College*, 103rd Cong., 2nd sess., 9 May 1994, 22-23.

railroad cuts located west of the town and north of the Chambersburg Pike; both were excavated, creating deep cuts into the ridge, but were not yet complete with rails. The more famous “second” railroad cut, located on McPherson’s Ridge played a pivotal role on the fighting on July 1. During the afternoon fighting Union Brigadier General Lysander Cutler moved his brigade north of the railroad cut to engage Brigadier General Joseph Davis’ brigade of Mississippi and North Carolina infantrymen. Driving the Union forces back, Davis pressed his men toward the last remaining Union regiment, Lieutenant Colonel Rufus Dawes’ 6th Wisconsin of the Iron Brigade. As the men of this battle-hardened unit poured a withering fire into the Confederates, Davis’ brigade unwisely sought protection in the railroad bed. The 6th Wisconsin moved in on the indefensible Confederate position, capturing hundreds of Confederates, including Davis.²⁷

The section of land that the Park Service gave to the college, in contrast, did not have a significant role in the day’s battle. Termed the “first” railroad cut, the exchanged parcel of land is located on the east side of the more famed railroad cut, closer to town. It did serve as a final defensive position for the Union army’s 1st Corps. After Federal success at the western-most rail cut, Cutler withdrew his brigade back towards town and to a position slightly north of the “first” railroad cut. Lieutenant James Stewart’s Battery B, 4th U.S. Artillery, comprising six Napoleons reinforced the infantrymen’s position. Stewart’s battery straddled this railroad cut—three guns were positioned on the north side of the cut and three guns on the south side. As infantrymen from General Henry Heth’s division pressed the Federal position, the Union 1st Corps position by 4:30 along Seminary Ridge remained untenable. Confederate infantrymen converged upon the

²⁷ For additional detailed reading on the first day’s action at Gettysburg see, Harry W. Pfanz, *Gettysburg: The First Day* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001).

“first” railroad cut, forcing Stewart to withdraw his battery. At the end of the fighting on July 1 Confederates occupied the railroad cut and inflicted approximately 30 percent casualties on Stewart’s artillery unit.²⁸

Gettysburg Battlefield Preservation Association (GBPA) fired the first shots in the battle over railroad cut. The preservation association immediately raised objections to the destruction of the Seminary Ridge railroad cut and undertook a public relations campaign to garner support in opposing the issue. Sending hundreds of letters to like-minded organizations, the GBPA encouraged concerned citizens to write their representatives demanding a Congressional investigation into the National Park Service’s abuse of Seminary Ridge. Only through a bonafide Congressional investigation, GBPA Board members urged, could the nation learn “how and why their trust in the National Park Service was so inexcusably abused on the slopes of Seminary Ridge!”²⁹

The GBPA also filed suit in U.S. District Court against the National Park Service, Gettysburg College, and the Gettysburg Railroad on October 29, 1991. The association sought “declaratory and injunctive relief” for the damage done to the historic terrain and demanded complete restoration of the ridge, estimated to cost as much as \$12 million. On July 2, 1992 U.S. District Court Judge Silvia Rambo dismissed the suit, ruling that the exchange followed federal guidelines and the redress the defendants sought was not practicable. Three weeks later the GBPA filed an appeal with the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit. Oral arguments were

²⁸ Pfanz, *Gettysburg: The First Day*, 297-307; Noah Andre Trudeau, *Gettysburg: A Testing of Courage* (New York, Harper Collins, 2002), 567.

²⁹ Gettysburg Battlefield Preservation Association to Inland Empire Civil War Round Table (California), May 30, 1991. Folder November-December 1991, Box 75, W32, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives.

heard before the Court of Appeals in early January 1993 and on February 17, 1993 the court also dismissed the suit.³⁰

While the GBPA fought the National Park Service and Gettysburg College in the courtrooms, Americans expressed their displeasure with the exchange and subsequent demolition of the Seminary Ridge railroad cut in the media and to Park Service and government officials. Many comments reflected skepticism of the Park Service's ability to protect any of the nation's parks. In a letter to the NPS Director, Rudolf Jager, a Californian, declared that the NPS had "utterly failed" at the agency's mission of "protecting our historical sites by letting Seminary Ridge at Gettysburg go to the bulldozers." He sarcastically suggested, "Why not carry this ineptness further and use the Grand Canyon for a garbage landfill for the entire country? We could dump generations of garbage there and nobody would be too upset because they should be used to your department's total lack of sense and right doing by now." Another letter from an Illinois State University professor Lincoln Morris offered similar sardonic sentiment, "Will the rest of our national parks be sold off for condominiums, landfills, or shopping malls?" Asking the director he continued, "If I write you a year from now asking permission to build a home on the Cumberland River, at the base of an insignificant earthen fort, would you sell me Fort Donelson?"³¹

³⁰ GBPA Press Release, "GBPA Files 12 Million Dollar Lawsuit Against Gettysburg College and The National Park Service For Destruction of Battlefield," November 18, 1991. Folder January-April 1992, Box 75, W32, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives; Briefing Statement, Gettysburg Railroad Re-routing/Synar Subcommittee Oversight, March 9, 1994. Folder January-May 1994, Box 74, W32, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives; Superintendent Jose Cisneros, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 1993," written on March 11, 1994. Box 1, TH Files, GNMP Archives.

³¹ Rudolf Jager to Director James Ridenour, April 25, 1992; R. Lincoln Morris to Director James Ridenour, April 22, 1992. Folder May-June 1992, Box 75, W32, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives.

Despite, the criticism agency representatives maintained that the boundary exchange was in fact beneficial to the preservation of Gettysburg National Military Park. As the Park Service interpreted the issue, the problem was not the exchange, but how it was implemented. The agency maintained, “the general concept of the land exchange...has never been the issue...The problem was in the details of the exchange that became known after the Boundary Study and the implementation.” Though the boundary study stated the change would not have “an adverse impact” on the site, and Gettysburg officials concurred with this assertion, the excavation of approximately three acres of the railroad cut resulted in visible erosion of the adjacent park land. The exposed slope rapidly deteriorated and soon a section within the cut had eroded nearly eight feet into the park’s property. To prevent further erosion, in the fall of 1991 Gettysburg College constructed a gabion wall along the side of the cut to stabilize the slope.³²

Nearly four years after the destruction of the Seminary Ridge railroad cut, in the spring of 1994, Congress investigated the land exchange in a hearing before the Environment, Energy, and Natural Resources Subcommittee. On May 9, representatives from the National Park Service, Gettysburg College, and Gettysburg Battlefield Preservation Association came before members of the House of Representatives to examine the issue. Congressman Mike Synar of Oklahoma chaired the subcommittee hearing. Although the Congressional hearing occurred four years after the exchange, the chairman argued that an investigation remained necessary, in part, because “we

³² *Land Exchange, Study of Alternatives*, 7-10; T. W. Burger, “Solution To Oak Ridge Controversy To Be Made At Closed Meeting,” *Evening Sun* (Hanover), 17 August 1994. Folder Gettysburg College, September 1994, Box 74, W32, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives; Kenneth Sulkowski to Chief of Maintenance, Gettysburg, January 27, 1993. Exhibit 27. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Government Operations. *Land Exchange Between National Park Service/Gettysburg National Park and Gettysburg College*, 103rd Cong., 2nd sess., 9 May 1994, 315-319. Such an extensive cut in Seminary Ridge was necessary to allow for the installation of a west spur line to connect the Gettysburg Railroad to the CSX Railroad.

are dealing with Gettysburg, the crown jewel of this Nation's battlefield parks.”³³ In his opening statement, Synar deplored what he called the Park Service's inconsistent guidelines and standards for judging the advantages of land exchanges. During the course of the hearing the subcommittee heard testimony from NPS Director Roger Kennedy; Congressman William Goodling; historians Kent Masterson Brown, Gabor Borritt, and Richard Sauers; Gettysburg College President Gordon Haaland; and Walter Powell and William Frassanito of the Gettysburg Battlefield Preservation Association.

William Frassanito classified the destruction of the Seminary Ridge railroad cut as “the most massive destruction of fully protected historic terrain in the 78-year history of the National Park Service.” He alleged that the Park Service and college had negotiated in secrecy and never disclosed the particulars of the land exchange to the public. The Park Service denied Frassanito's claim, maintaining that the land exchange had been presented to the public as part of the boundary revision. When pressed for answers to the destruction of historic terrain, Frassanito claimed that NPS officials offered only “denials” and “lies” and sought to “cover-up” the issue. He placed the blame squarely on the NPS and Gettysburg College, stating the “disaster” resulted from a “combination of mindboggling incompetence” and “deceit.” He concluded, “The deliberate, cynical, and arrogant responses of both the NPS and Gettysburg College to the

³³ Chairman Mike Synar, Opening Statement, U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Government Operations. *Land Exchange Between National Park Service/Gettysburg National Park and Gettysburg College*, 103rd Cong., 2nd sess., 9 May 1994, 2.

desperate pleas of the public and professional historians can never be condoned, forgiven, or forgotten.”³⁴

To such claims of deceit the National Park Service and Gettysburg College officials maintained that they fully informed the public of the proposed exchange and strictly complied with the necessary federal regulations. Director Kennedy’s testimony remained consistent with the agency’s earlier statements-- the boundary study had in fact clearly articulated the proposed land exchange. Moreover, he reminded critics that no one had expressed opposition to the exchange during the 1989 Congressional deliberations and the subsequent onsite inspections. In fact, he added, Dr. Walter Powell of the GBPA had testified at the Congressional hearings on the boundary’s proposal and advocated for the park’s expansion. Admitting some degree of error in the resulting destruction of the ridge, Director Kennedy noted that the NPS “learned from this situation,” and he informed Chairman Synar that the agency was in the process of revising policies to provide consistent guidelines on future exchanges. For their part, Gettysburg College officials maintained that the overall impact of the land exchange, regardless of the damage to the Seminary Ridge railroad cut, provided the Park Service a vital scenic easement on the first day’s battle grounds. President Haaland conveniently minimized the fact that they had already altered the terrain, and reiterated that the “primary effect” of the land exchange was to “protect in perpetuity the essential historic character” of the forty seven acres of battle land.³⁵

³⁴ William Frassanito, Statement, U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Government Operations. *Land Exchange Between National Park Service/Gettysburg National Park and Gettysburg College*, 103rd Cong., 2nd sess., 9 May 1994, 22-23.

³⁵ Director Roger Kennedy, Statement, U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Government Operations. *Land Exchange Between National Park Service/Gettysburg National Park and Gettysburg College*, 103rd Cong., 2nd sess., 9 May 1994, 163-178; Gordon A. Haaland, Statement, U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Government Operations. *Land Exchange Between National Park Service/Gettysburg National Park and Gettysburg College*, 103rd Cong., 2nd sess., 9 May 1994, 22-23.

As a result of the May 1994 hearings, Congress directed the National Park Service to undertake a study of alternatives for potential restoration of the railroad cut. Gettysburg's new superintendent, Dr. John Latschar, supervised the park's role in the study. Nine months later, in May 1995, the NPS produced the *Gettysburg College-National Park Service Land Exchange, Study of Alternatives/Environmental Assessment*. Congress mandated the NPS conduct the study of alternatives with maximum public involvement and input from key constituent groups. This study considered six alternatives which determined the "best use and appearance for the land exchange site." These alternatives ranged from a no-action alternative to full restoration of the site. The Park Service selected the second alternative: landscape mitigation, as its preferred choice. Landscape mitigation included screening the area to minimize the appearance of the ridge and the retention of the gabion wall to prevent further erosion of the adjacent battlefield land. Officials estimated this option would cost between \$274,500 and \$480,200. In this alternative, most of the implementation of the partial restoration, screening and maintaining the gabion wall would be the responsibility of Gettysburg College.³⁶

³⁶ *Land Exchange, Study of Alternatives*, 3;9; 26-54. The study was prepared by Mid-Atlantic Regional Office, Division of Park and Resource Planning, with the cooperation from Gettysburg National Military Park. The Mid-Atlantic Planning Team included: Fred Herling, Study Manager; Gerald Kirwan, former Chief, Land Resources Division; Allen Cooper, Archeologist; Shaun Eyring, Historical Landscape Architect; Diaan Jacox, former Regional Compliance Coordinator; Bob Gift, former Environmental Review Coordinator. Representing GNMP included: Dr. John Latschar, superintendent; Katie Lawhon, Public Affairs Officer; Kathy Harrison, Chief Historian; and Dave Dreier, Chief of Maintenance. Through this process the Park Service distributed over 1,500 newsletters. Questionnaires were made available to interested parties who could select their preferred alternative and mail their response back to Gettysburg NMP. On August 23 and September 28, the Park Service organized meetings with community representatives to discuss the proposed alternatives. The agency also held two public meetings, September 28 and December 14, which allowed the public the opportunity to voice their opinion on the study's findings. The first alternative was a no-action alternative, which left the ridge cut as it existed. The Park Service's preferred alternative, number two, was landscape mitigation. A partial ridge reconstruction and west spur removal was the third alternative. This option provided for as much reconstruction to the ridge as possible and was estimated to cost \$2,540,000 to \$3,005,000. The fourth alternative was complete reconstruction of the ridge and estimated to cost as much as \$3,643,7000. The fifth option offered complete site restoration and the removal of the railroad facilities. The site would be restored to its pre-1990 condition. This option was estimated to cost anywhere from \$3.9 million to \$6.3 million. The sixth option presented the same site restoration as option number five, but did not include the removal of the railroad. In turn, the federal government would be expected to compensate Gettysburg

The recommended proposals for the restoration of the railroad cut generated as much controversy and debate as the original exchange. The choice of a preferred alternative, however, was as varied as the written comments. Many favored the no-action alternative, arguing that the government should not commit precious economic resources to mitigate the disaster. Others favored the complete restoration of the site, believing that Gettysburg College should be held financially responsible for its mistake. One comment from a Gettysburg resident reflected many similar views, “Most of us can certainly think of better ways to spend our tax dollars than replacing stones and dirt. Buying and dismantling the [national] tower would be nice.” Others believed that only the maximum restoration of the ridge, paid for by Gettysburg College, would be just compensation. “Why should Gettysburg College,” wrote Steven Cassel of Ohio, “be treated any different than the Exxon Cooperation, after the Exxon Valdez oil spill disaster.” While some criticized Gettysburg College for the fiasco at the railroad cut, others placed the blame directly on the shoulders of the National Park Service officials. In Gettysburg, former Superintendent Cisneros became a particular target. “Let’s give Cisneros a pick and shovel and let him begin to clean up the mess he started,” demanded Friends member, Harry Gaul. A member of the Friends responded, “If a travesty of this magnitude occurs again, I will personally recommend to your superior that you be sent to One Tree, Idaho, giving guided tours to foreign tourists in the mating habits of earthworms.” Interpreting the “mating habits of earthworms” seemed a reasonable punishment to some, while others preferred shaming all those responsible. Another Ohioan suggested that the government place a billboard at the destroyed railroad cut that

College for the value of the property. Based on the appraisal value of the land, this option was estimated to cost as much as \$6.3 million. Officially the Advisory Commission presented a seventh alternative. The commission favored partial ridge restoration as outlined in alternative three, but sought economic retribution from “private parties deemed responsible for excavation” that the Park Service could use for future land acquisition. If, however, the government did not receive the donations, the Advisory Commission favored alternative five, complete site restoration.

listed in “bold letters” the names of those individuals who were responsible for the area’s “desecration.”³⁷

Five years after the initial excavation of the ridge, the government and Gettysburg College finally settled the controversial issue. Public opinion on how, or if, the cut should be restored varied, but the final decision rested with NPS Director Roger Kennedy. Congressman William Goodling flatly informed the Kennedy that if the agency requested any funds for full restoration, he would ensure the appropriations would be denied in Congress. Consequently, believing that the expense of millions of dollars to restore the cut could be better spent elsewhere, Director Kennedy in early May 1995 announced that he had chosen alternative two, landscape mitigation, as the preferred course of action. On December 15, 1995 the National Park Service and Gettysburg College signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) outlining the college’s responsibility for maintaining the site. Gettysburg College acknowledged its responsibility for maintaining in perpetuity the gabion wall to prevent further erosion of Park Service land. The college also agreed to landscape the area to mitigate the visual impact of the destroyed railroad cut. Not everyone was pleased with this option, including Congressman Synar, who had chaired the House investigation. He expressed his disappointment in landscape mitigation, stating that “The mistakes made here did not merely result in an embarrassment; the

³⁷ *Land Exchange, Study of Alternatives*, 32-38. This report includes a summary of the comments received. The Park Service mailed 1,500 newsletters that included a questionnaire on the preferred alternative, and the park received 169 comments. Of these 169 comments, 53 favored the no-action alternative; 24 the landscape mitigation alternative; 14 recommended the partial ridge reconstruction; 20 favored the fourth alternative of complete ridge reconstruction and the removal of the western spur; 31 favored the complete restoration of the ridge and the removal of the railroad line; and 23 selected the sixth alternative of complete reconstruction and railroad removal; Mary Lou Kranias to Dr. John Latschar, October 10, 1994; Steven L. Cassel to Dr. John Latschar, October 19, 1994; Harry Gaul, Friends of the National Parks at Gettysburg Questionnaire, undated. Folder Public Comments, Box 74, W32, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives; Scott Newkirk, Friends of the National Parks at Gettysburg Questionnaire, undated; Robert Clark, Jr. to Dr. John Latschar, September 27, 1994. Folder Public Comments, Box 74, W32, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives.

mistakes here resulted in the tragic destruction of a unique piece of America's history. A mistake of this magnitude should be rectified, not merely owned up to and covered over.”³⁸

In the end, the Park Service, the Gettysburg battlefield, and Americans were left with a ruined piece of historic terrain and a gabion wall stabilizing the railroad cut where Stewart's 4th Artillery Battery defended its position on the afternoon of July 1. Although the National Park Service obtained the scenic easement on the forty-seven acre tract, Gettysburg College students regularly play sports on the fields where brave men once fought and died. Perhaps the best summary of the entire chain of events was offered by Daniel Kuehn, park superintendent when the boundary study began, he wrote, “The college should have been sensitive enough to historic values to have never proposed such a desecration. And the Park Service blundered in not having adequate staff review of the final proposal...But that land trade agreement should never have been signed.”³⁹

While the railroad cut fiasco played out the National Park Service drafted a *Land Protection Plan* in the fall of 1993 to outline specific plans on how to preserve the newly acquired acres and articulated a land management plan that addressed issues not stated within the boundary legislation, namely the removal of non-essential tracts. Pursuant to Public Law 101-377 Gettysburg National Military Park contained 5,733.05 acres, including 114 privately-owned tracts totaling 1,695.54 acres. The *Land Protection Plan* evaluated each of these tracts and

³⁸ Director Roger Kennedy to “Friends,” May 2, 1995. Folder 22, Box 56, L1425, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives; Superintendent John Latschar, “Superintendent’s Annual Report, 1995.” Box 1, TH Files, GNMP Archives, 13; President Gordon A. Haaland to Dr. John Latschar, September 28, 1994. Folder September-December 1994, Box 74, W32, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives; Chairman Mike Synar to Director Roger Kennedy, June 9, 1994. Folder June-August 1994, Box 74, W32, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives.

³⁹ Martin Sipkoff, “Where Did Seminary Ridge Go?” *Civil War Times Illustrated*, March/April 1992, 42-64.

ranked them in order of priority for acquisition (high, medium, and low). For example, one tract now included in the park's boundary was the Ford Motor Company, located north of town along the Carlisle Road. This commercial property was situated on the first day's battlefield along the line of battle of the Union army's 11th Corps. Because of its prominent location on a key battle terrain, the NPS rated it as a high priority acquisition. Hindered by budget constraints and concerned over local tax issues, however, the National Park Service could no longer rely on directly purchasing the desired areas. Thereafter, the NPS explored other venues of acquisition, including zoning, cooperative agreements, easements, and simple fee acquisition.⁴⁰

Controversy, criticism, and miscalculations defined much of the period between 1989 and 1994. Yet, other less-known events occurred that permanently influenced the management and interpretation of the battlefield. The land exchange controversy and subsequent lawsuit caused notably weakened relations between the Park Service and the Gettysburg Battlefield Preservation Association. GBPA board members testified at the 1994 Congressional hearing, offered sharp criticism of the Park Service's decision on the land exchange, and questioned the agency's

⁴⁰ *Land Protection Plan*, October 1993. (Gettysburg: Gettysburg National Military Park, 1993), 1-92. This plan was submitted by Superintendent Jose Cisneros on October 19, 1993 and approved by Regional Director B.J. Griffin on November 5, 1993. Of the 1,695 privately owned acres, 190 acres were residential tracts, 1,441 acres were agricultural, and 64 acres were commercial properties. Though the *Boundary Study* identified eight tracts to be removed from within the park property, these tracts were not specifically named in the 1990 legislation. Instead the legislation only articulated a procedure for disposing the lands, without naming specific properties. The *LPP* addressed issues left silent in the legislation. The *LPP* now identified five tracts to be removed from the park. These tracts included: West Confederate Avenue (Seminary Avenue); Colt Park Tracts; Jones Battalion Avenue; Washington Street Garage; and Cemetery Annex Drive. In terms of disposition, the plan states, "The ultimate disposition of the five remaining tracts has not been determined, although there may be a need for the continued use and preservation of these resources. The National Park Service may pursue cooperative means or other protection alternatives by which appropriate preservation and use of these resources would occur," *LPP*, 23-25.

ability to adequately protect the hallowed ground. Consequently, the association found itself on the periphery. In the wake of the decline of the GBPA's influence, however, a new preservation organization emerged. Officially established in 1989, The Friends of the National Parks at Gettysburg quickly rose to become one of the most influential and significant partners within the National Park Service. Often referred to simply as the Friends, this association played a critical role in advocating the park's mission of preserving the battlefield for the enjoyment of future generations.

The Friends of the National Parks at Gettysburg began as a grassroots effort of citizens who shared a concern for the preservation of the battlefield and a love of the park's history. In January 1989, Victoria Greenlee first proposed the idea of a non-profit association to Superintendent Kuehn. Envisioning a partner association, Greenlee explained that the organization would educate its members about the mission of Gettysburg and would raise money for special projects for the parks. Kuehn was immediately interested in the concept, and wrote a letter to 150 area citizens inviting them to attend the organizational meeting on March 16, 1989. The Friends of the National Parks at Gettysburg was officially incorporated on June 16, 1989 with a Memorandum of Agreement between the National Park Service and the Friends signed on May 25, 1990. The Friends was established to "help preserve the important historic scenes of Gettysburg National Military Park," "assist and advise" park management, "implement new volunteer and educational activities," and to help carry out special projects.⁴¹

⁴¹ Barbara J. Finfrock, *Twenty Years On Six Thousand Acres: The History of the Friends of the National Parks at Gettysburg* (Harrisburg: Huggins Printing, 2009), 106-137. The appendix of this work includes the correspondence establishing the association; the Articles of Incorporation, signed on June 16, 1989 and approved by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania on June 22, 1989; and the Memorandum of Agreement between the NPS and FNPG signed on May 25, 1990. Officially the FNPG is an association dedicated to the preservation and education of both Gettysburg NMP and Eisenhower NHS, thus the name The Friends of the National Parks at Gettysburg.

Membership rapidly expanded, as Americans were eager to participate in the preservation of the nation's most famous battlefield. It was open to anyone interested in playing a personal role in the preservation of Gettysburg. In 1990 approximately 2,000 people became Friends members. By 1994, the Friends boasted over 12,000 members, making their organization the largest "Friends" group in the United States. During its first year of existence, the Friends undertook two projects. First, they raised money for the purchase and installation of three handicapped water fountains at the park visitor center and cyclorama center. Foreshadowing future accomplishments, the Friends also partnered with the GBPA to purchase and remove the last remaining house at the intersection of Taneytown Road and Steinwehr Avenue, thereby opening the view shed from the Soldiers' National Cemetery. In 1990, the Friends began planning for one of its most significant and visible contributions towards battlefield preservation—burying the overhead power lines along the Emmitsburg Road. On July 5, 1994, the group signed an agreement with the National Park Service, Metropolitan Edison Company, Sprint/United Telephone Company of Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania Department of Transportation to underground nearly three miles of the power lines visibly intruding on the fields of Pickett's Charge. At a total project cost of \$1.2 million, this agreement buried the lines from the southern edge of town, to the park's southern boundary at the intersection of the Emmitsburg Road and South Confederate Avenue.⁴²

Finfrock's work, to date, is the only study on the history of the Friends. A small narrative, consisting of less than eighty pages of text, offers a quick overview of the history of this influential group. Finfrock served as the FNPG president from 1999-2001 and from 2003-2006. The Friends is a non-profit organization managed by a Board of Directors. The first board members included: Victoria Greenlee, Earl J. Coates, Dean S. Thomas, George Lower, Russ A. Pritchard, George Olinger, and Jerome Miller.

⁴² Finfrock, *Twenty Years On Six Thousand Acres*, 6; 26-27; Superintendent Jose Cisneros, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 1990," written on April 10, 1991. Box 1, TH Files, GNMP Archives, 12; "FNPG Accomplishments, June 1989-June 1994. No author, no date. Folder 1, Box 11, A42, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives; Victoria Greenlee to Superintendent John Latschar, August 9, 1994. Folder 1, Box 11, A42,

Another controversial development concerned automobile traffic. For years Gettysburg officials had advocated the closure of the Soldiers' National Cemetery to vehicle traffic, the removal of park roads that intruded upon prime battle terrain, and the implementation of a chronological tour route to provide a better understanding of the three-day battle. In late May 1989, the Park Service finally closed the National Cemetery to all vehicle traffic. A year later, the agency closed and ultimately removed Webb Avenue, located at the High Water Mark, to automobiles. And in April 1990, after fifty-seven years of a non-chronological tour, the NPS finally initiated the seventeen-mile chronological tour of the Gettysburg battlefield. Tourists would begin their visit at the visitor's center and then proceed north through the town of Gettysburg, to the auto tour's first stops at McPherson's Ridge and the Eternal Light Peace Memorial. Upon touring the first day's action, they would proceed south along the Confederate battle line at Seminary Ridge and explore the battlefields of the second day's fighting. Tourists would then drive north along Hancock Avenue to explore the Union position and the High Water Mark area. If they wished, visitors could conclude their tour by walking through the Soldiers' National Cemetery. Once controversial, the new tour drew little notice amidst the larger boundary issues.⁴³

(Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives. Of the \$1.2 million project, The Friends contributed \$250,000 in donations from Friends members, the Pennsylvania Legislature, and Turner Network Television. As noted, TNT donated \$50,000 to the park and this money was then earmarked for the power line project.

⁴³ Superintendent Daniel Kuehn to Kenneth Adams, March 20, 1989. Folder 13, Box 24, D18, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present) GNMP Archives; Management Team Meeting Minutes, May 16, 1989. Folder Meeting Minutes, 1/8/88-6/20/89, Box 8, A40, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives; NPS Press Release, "Webb Avenue Closed To Traffic," April 25, 1990. Folder GNMP Press Releases, January 1990-September 1992, Box 52, K3415, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives; Superintendent Jose Cisneros, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 1990," written on April 10, 1991. Box 1, TH Files, GNMP Archives, 7; "Auto Tour Makes An About Face," *York Sunday News*, 18 March 1990. Box 28, Newspaper Clipping, 1990 (GETT 43663), GNMP Archives. The alteration of the tour route required changing tour signs, traffic patterns, and printing a new park map.

Popularized reenactments, big-screen movies, and television documentaries, increasingly had drawn Americans' to the Civil War. While many productions often portrayed a romanticized interpretation of the war, they nonetheless heightened popular interest in the war. *Glory*, featuring Denzel Washington and Matthew Broderick, premiered in 1989. This film captured the story of the 54th Massachusetts, an all-black regiment, and their heroic, but failed, effort to capture Battery Wagner in South Carolina. The following year, millions of Americans tuned into PBS to watch Ken Burns' miniseries *The Civil War*. Narrated by David McCollough, and featuring a distinguished group of historians, including Barbara Fields, Shelby Foote, Ed Bearss, and Stephen B. Oates, *The Civil War* became one of the network's most watched productions in history. While historians proclaimed the series a "major contribution to how Americans perceive this central event of their history," some were equally as quick to take Burns to task for historical inaccuracies, questionable interpretations, and improper use of sources. Lincoln scholar, Gabor Boritt, for example noted of his displeasure that Burns "quoted verbatim" from Boritt, but did not attribute the quotation to him. Notwithstanding the nit-picking minutia of the academic crowd, Burns obtained reached and captivated a far larger audience than the works of the professional historians, as nearly 14 million Americans watched his series.⁴⁴

In the early 1990s Gettysburg's popularity in American history and culture was propelled to new heights when the movie *Gettysburg* was released in 1993. Based on Michael Shaara's 1974 Pulitzer Prize winning novel, *The Killer Angels*, Ron Maxwell's film reinvigorate the nation's obsession with the battle and introduced a new generation of Americans to the heroics

⁴⁴ Robert Brent Toplin, *Ken Burns's The Civil War: Historians Respond* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), xv. This book contains a collection of essays from noted Civil War historians and their "response" to Ken Burns, including C. Vann Woodward, Gary Gallagher, Catherine Clinton, Gabor Boritt, Eric Foner, and Leon Litwack. It also includes an essay by Ken Burns on the making of the documentary.

of the Union and Confederate soldiers on the Pennsylvania farm fields during the three fateful days in July 1863.

After the debacle of the Manassas reenactment during the Civil War Centennial, then National Park Service Director Conrad Wirth had banned future re-enactments on Civil War battlefields. At Gettysburg, reenactments were sponsored by commercial enterprises and held on private property. Aware of the federal regulations preventing re-enactors to form lines of battle and carry weapons on park property, Maxwell's film crew approached park management to request special permission to film on the battlefield. The National Park Service announced its intention to issue Maxwell a filming permit to a thirty day period of public review and comment. Local residents could obtain a copy of the permit at the county library or the park visitor center, and then write the superintendent expressing any potential concerns or issues.⁴⁵

Concerned for the integrity of the battlefield and wary of potential damage to the resource caused by thousands of re-re-enactors, the Friends firmly opposed the filming of the movie on park property. Friends President Alan Hoeweler, an Ohio businessman, added that the organization would support the filming of the movie if TNT made a "substantial contribution" to the enhancement of the park. Producer Ted Turner and TNT associates agreed to donate \$50,000 to The Friends towards battlefield preservation projects at Gettysburg. The Friends used this money toward the completion of the undergrounding the power lines along Emmitsburg Road. In July 1992 the National Park Service issued a permit which allowed Maxwell's crew to film on

⁴⁵ NPS Press Release, "Public Comment Sought on "Killer Angles" Permit," June 5, 1992. Folder GNMP Press Releases, January 1990-September 1992, Box 52, K3415, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1989-present), GNMP Archives. The public comment period began on June 10, 1992 and concluded on July 9.

the battlefield.⁴⁶ Of the fifty-nine scheduled days of filming, only eight days would use the actual battlefield, notably the battle scenes of Little Round Top and Pickett's Charge. The National Park Service did not, however, allow any scenes that involved opposing lines of battle or combat to be filmed on the battlefield. Actual battle scenes involving hand-to-hand combat were filmed on private property.

For the reenactors who participated in the filming, being part of such an influential movie proved to be a memorable experience. In referring to Pickett's Charge on July 3, Joseph Mayo of the 11th Virginia later declared, "We gained nothing but glory and lost our bravest men." When filming *Gettysburg* many of the reenactors sought the "glory" of participating in Pickett's Charge, often with nebulous allegiance to either side. John Nyste, a reenactor with the 53rd Pennsylvania, recalled that he traded his Yankee uniform for Confederate gray to participate in the filming of the July 3 assault. "It was an unforgettable sight," noted Nyste in reference to the artillery barrage and infantry formation, amounting to over 3,000 "soldiers," for Pickett's Charge, all of which was done without computer graphics. As the "soldiers" advanced toward the Emmitsburg Road and Cemetery Ridge, a small remote helicopter flew overhead to film the advance of the infantry. Several men who participated in the filming recalled being impressed with the prop crew, who dutifully carried around fake stuffed horses to represent dead artillery horses and mannequins to illustrate mortally wounded soldiers.⁴⁷

⁴⁶ Alan Hoeweler, Friends President to John Murphy, Advisory Commission Chairman, June 2, 1992; Advisory Commission Meeting Minutes, July 30, 1992. Folder 1992, Box 78, A1619, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives. Specifically, The Friends argued that since TNT is a private business and would profit from the film, the company should leave the resource better than they found it. TNT also donated \$50,000 to the Association for the Preservation of Civil War Sites (APCWS), though this money was not directly earmarked for projects at Gettysburg

⁴⁷ John Nyste, interview by author, February 16, 2010; Jeff Marks, interview by author, February 16, 2010. Both Nyste and Marks reenact with the 53rd Pennsylvania. Both also recalled the efficiency of the production and being

In August 1992, The Friends hosted a picnic to celebrate the completion of the filming at nearby Carroll Valley. Over a year later, on October 8, 1993, *Gettysburg* premiered at the town's Majestic Theater on Carlisle Street. Director Ron Maxwell and Martin Sheen, who portrayed Robert E. Lee, enjoyed a special cocktail party at the nearby Gettysburg Hotel. Hundreds of people turned out for the premier and a block party celebration on the Lincoln Square. Volunteer Fire Companies provided free food and attendees reported the festivities continued until 2 A.M.⁴⁸

The success of *Gettysburg* brought increased tourism to the Pennsylvania battlefield. Some estimated that the town's tourism increased by 19 percent after the film's release. The year following its release, 1994, the battlefield received 1,748,932 visitors.⁴⁹ General James Longstreet and Colonel Joshua Lawrence Chamberlain particularly became household names. In some respects the National Park Service accommodated the Chamberlain obsession, giving battlefield visitors the interpretation they expected from the movie. Knowing that many park visitors would want to see the ground that Chamberlain defended, the Park Service erected a sign along Sykes Avenue directing tourists to the 20th Maine monument, the only sign on the battlefield indicating to visitors to a regimental marker. Little Round Top had always been a popular spot for veterans and park visitors alike, but *Gettysburg's* interpretation of the fighting

well-cared for by Turner Pictures, particularly in the availability of food and beverages. They spent a considerable amount of time waiting around for the filming, while the crews set up the scenes.

⁴⁸ Stephanie McSherry, Report to the FNPG Board of Directors, October 8, 1993. Folder 1, Box 11, A42, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives.

⁴⁹ Jim Weeks, *Gettysburg: Memory, Market, And An American Shrine* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003), 190; Superintendent John Latschar, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 1996." Folder 25, Box 3, A26, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives, 10.

on the Federal flank on July 2 as the defining moment of the battle dramatically increased visitation to the rocky knoll.

Even prior to the film's release, park management considered redesigning visitor access to Little Round Top in order to better protect the resource. In 1995, the Friends purchased a six-acre tract on the grounds where the Company B of the 20th Maine defended its position on Little Round Top on the afternoon of July 2. Seeking to keep visitors on designated paths, thereby reducing foot traffic on areas prone to erosion, park maintenance installed a post and chain fence on the summit of Little Round Top in 2000. Meanwhile, the film generated more commercialization. Businesses in town quickly capitalized on the film's popularity, marketing Chamberlain t-shirts reading "Don't Call Me Lawrence," and sold other 20th Maine paraphernalia. Maine citizens petitioned to erect a monument to Chamberlain, "one of Maine's most famous sons," but the Park Service would not permit a statue to be erected to the commander.⁵⁰

Gettysburg served to elevate a regimental commander, Joshua Chamberlain and the 20th Maine, to heroic status at the expense of other Union commanders' heroism in defending the Federal left flank. Meanwhile, the film also restored the reputation of General James Longstreet, commander of the Army of Northern Virginia's 1st Corps. For decades southerners had exonerated their beloved General Lee for defeat at Gettysburg and instead placed the blame squarely on the shoulders of Longstreet. After the war, southerners found Longstreet an easy

⁵⁰ "Friends of the National Parks at Gettysburg Annual Report, 1995." Folder 2, Box 11, A42, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives; Superintendent John Latschar, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 2000." Folder 4, Box 3, A26, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives, 12; Congressman John Baldacci to Director Roger Kennedy, July 17, 1995. Folder January 1995-December 1995, Box 4, A36, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives.

scapegoat, for not only did he join the loathed Republican Party, but he also openly criticized Lee's leadership. In the early 1940s, as noted earlier, Longstreet's wife, Helen Dortch Longstreet, had initiated a movement to erect a monument to her husband along Warfield Ridge and even though she had not raised the money for the monument, in cooperation with the Park Service, dedicated the site on July 2, 1941. Subsequent economic constraints of the Second World War prevented Dortch Longstreet from raising the \$200,000, leaving the Confederate commander without an equestrian statute at Gettysburg.⁵¹

In the wake of *Gettysburg*, however, a surge of Longstreet enthusiasts emerged who sought to erect a monument to Lee's "Old War Horse." The North Carolina Division of the Sons of Confederate Veterans established a Longstreet Memorial Fund in 1991 with a specific purpose to raise the necessary funding. On August 8, 1992, while at a meeting in Wilmington, North Carolina, the SCV passed a resolution that absolved Longstreet of blame for failure at Gettysburg, while noting that the proposed monument would "reinststate General James Longstreet...to his rightful place among America's greatest leaders and one of the South's true sons." Longstreet historians, most notably William Garrett Piston, author of *Lee's Tarnished Lieutenant*; and Jeffery Wert author of *General James Longstreet: The Confederacy's Most Controversial Soldier*, joined in the nation-wide appeal to solicit money for the monument. Their efforts came to fruition when the Longstreet Memorial Fund dedicated on July 3, 1998 the

⁵¹ "Site For \$200,000 Longstreet Statue Is Dedicated: 71st Coast Artillery Re-Enacts '63 Battle Scene," *Gettysburg Times*, 2 July 1941.

Longstreet equestrian memorial, sculpted by Gary Casteel and located in Pitzer's Woods before a crowd of approximately 4,000.⁵²

The establishment of the Friends in 1989 became one of the most critical events in the park's history. And the success of Maxwell's *Gettysburg* rejuvenated Americans' interest in the battle and brought a new generation of tourists to the Pennsylvania battlefield. Many came to the battlefield looking for Chamberlain's fictional comrade Buster Kilrain or to see the grounds where Colonel Joshua Lawrence Chamberlain and the 20th Maine routed the Alabamians. The National Park Service, with the cooperation of the Friends, strove to provide tourists with a better interpretive experience. *Gettysburg*'s popularity brought an ironic end to the six-year period between 1989 and 1994, perhaps one of the most tumultuous and defining periods in the history of the Gettysburg battlefield so far. But greater changes and controversies were still to come.

⁵² General James Longstreet Memorial Fund Fact Sheet. Folder 19, Box 41, D66, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives; Superintendent John Latschar, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 1998." Box 3, A26, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives, 9. For additional reading on Longstreet see, William Garrett Piston, *Lee's Tarnished Lieutenant: James Longstreet and His Place In Southern History* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1987) and Jeffery Wert, *General James Longstreet: The Confederacy's Most Controversial Soldier* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1993).

Chapter 10

“A New Birth of Freedom”:

Finding A New Direction at Gettysburg, 1995-1997

By August 1994 Gettysburg National Military Park desperately needed a new leader who could provide a consistent management philosophy and at the same time restore integrity to the National Park Service’s stewardship abilities. Gettysburg also needed a superintendent who could repair the capricious relationships with the local area and the larger Civil War community. John Latschar’s arrival brought someone with a diverse and accomplished background, not only in the National Park Service, but also in academic and military careers. After earning a Bachelor and Master’s degrees from Kansas State, in 1969 and 1973 respectively, in 1978 Latschar received a doctoral degree in American History from Rutgers University, becoming only the second superintendent at Gettysburg to hold a Ph.D. Prior to obtaining his doctorate, Latschar had had a successful career as an Army officer, serving in Vietnam in 1970 and 1971. He retired from the U.S. Army Reserve as a Lieutenant Colonel in 1994. His career with the National Park Service began as a research historian at the Denver Service Center (DSC) and in May 1988 he became the first superintendent of Steamtown National Historic Site in Scranton, Pennsylvania, where he served until his transfer to Gettysburg. Less than one year at his new post, in a speech at the park’s fourth annual seminar, Latschar declared that his first priority would be the protection and preservation of the battlefield’s resources. To provide for public enjoyment and

interpretation was his second priority. Finally he hoped to improve relations with the community.¹

Yet Latschar soon learned that he had walked into a veritable devil's den of controversy at Gettysburg. Immediately upon his arrival, he abandoned the Memorial Landscape Philosophy. Stressing the significance of interpreting the Battle of Gettysburg as a battle, Latschar told an audience that "According of everything I have ever read, the Battle of Gettysburg took place in 1863. 1863 will be-and will always be-our primary emphasis."² While the repeal of the haphazard Memorial Landscape Philosophy gained him immediate favor, two other controversial issues immediately challenged the park's new superintendent.

A decade earlier, in the spring of 1985 the Park Service had partnered with Pennsylvania State University biologists to conduct a study of the white-tailed deer population residing both within the Gettysburg battlefield and at Eisenhower National Historic Site. The research team began capturing and tagging deer in order to determine their living habits and to estimate the population. After a three-year study, team researchers reported that approximately 1,200 white-tailed deer inhabited the parks. Admittedly many visitors enjoyed the deer, as did locals who

¹ Superintendent John Latschar, interview by author, 4 January 2010; Superintendent John Latschar, "Gettysburg: The Next 100 Years," presented at the 4th Annual Gettysburg Seminar, March 4, 1995. This speech is reproduced in the park's seminar proceedings, *The Fourth Annual Gettysburg Seminar, Gettysburg 1895-1995: The Making of an American Shrine* (Gettysburg: Eastern National, 1995), 112-123. While completing his dissertation, Latschar started as a Research Historian for the Western Team of the DSC in July 1977 and subsequently became the Cultural Resource Compliance Specialist for the Western Team in 1981, and later the Chief of Cultural Resources for the Western Team in 1984. As mentioned, J. Walter Coleman, park superintendent from 1941 through 1958, had also earned a Ph.D. in American History.

² Latschar, "Gettysburg: The Next 100 Years," 116.

drove through the battlefield to watch them graze, but the Park Service argued that the sizable population of white-tailed deer presented a threat to the preservation of the battlefield.³

After years of observing the influence of the deer on the historic landscape, park planners argued, “Intensive deer browsing is preventing the parks from meeting specific management objectives for woodlots and cropfields, two elements of the cultural landscape.” In other words park management believed that the white-tailed deer, in damaging battlefield resources, prevented park officials from fully preserving and interpreting the battlefield. Farmers who leased agricultural lands under the Agricultural Special Use Permit (SUP) option repeatedly felt the negative effect of deer grazing. Park natural resource specialists estimated that farmers lost an average of 33 percent of their corn yield and 30 percent of their wheat production to deer grazing. Deer commonly ate twigs and shrubs as well, severely damaging the historic woodlots. As a result, while the Agricultural SUP was intended to be a low cost method of cultivating the battlefield land, the Park Service had to often waive a share of the renters’ fees as a result of deer damage. In 1993, for example, the agency waived \$10,451.25 nearly half of the yearly revenue from the Agricultural SUP program. After losing a significant portion of their crop production, and without any economic gains, other farmers were reluctant to continue farming on the battlefield at all. “The deer are literally eating us out of house and home,” Latschar remarked.⁴

³ Jeffery B. Roth, “Gettysburg National Military—Deer—Park,” *Pennsylvania Wildlife*, Vol. XI, No.3, 27-29. PSU professors Drs. Gerald Storm and Richard Yahner acted as team supervisors and two graduate students, Douglas Cottam and Gary Vecellio conducted much of the field study. The researchers studied deer patterns in a 7,069-acre area. The NPS paid the PSU team \$100,000 for the three-year study.

⁴ *Draft Environmental Impact Statement, White-Tailed Deer Management Plan*, (Gettysburg: Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Gettysburg National Military Park, November 1994), iv-ix; 24-49 [hereinafter cited as *Draft EIS, White-Tailed Deer*]; *Final Environmental Impact Statement, White-Tailed Deer Management Plan* (Gettysburg: Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Gettysburg National Military Park, May 1995) [hereinafter cited as *EIS, White-Tailed Deer*]; Superintendent John Latschar memo, undated. Folder 13, Box 66, N1617, Park Main (Central) Files, 1987-present, Records of the National Park Service at Gettysburg National

Accordingly, the Park Service undertook a study to explore alternative methods to manage the white-tailed deer population. In November 1994, the agency produced the *Draft Environmental Impact Statement, White-Tailed Deer Management Plan (Draft EIS)*. Concerned citizens would have until February 10, 1995 to comment on the plan. The Park Service proposed several alternatives to manage the deer as outlined in the *Draft EIS*. The first option was simply no action at all. The second called for deer reduction either through capture and transfer or shooting. The third alternative encouraged reproductive intervention. The fourth favored cooperative management between the NPS, private landowners, and the Pennsylvania Game Commission for direct reduction, essentially allowing a hunting season on park land. The fifth alternative, which became the Park Service's preferred option, recommended a combination of all the stated alternatives of direct reduction, reproductive intervention, and cooperative management. The NPS selected the fifth alternative because it offered the most flexibility in managing the deer, but they noted that "initially a large number of deer would be killed each year to reduce the deer population to the predetermined density." After a dramatic reduction to the deer population, the service would consider managing the herd through other options as outlined in the fifth alternative.⁵

Military Park, Gettysburg National Military Park Archives [Files from this collection have not yet been processed and all notes hereinafter will be cited by Box, File Code, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives]. The researchers had estimated the current population near 350 deer per forested square mile, whereas they deemed a more controllable number to be 25 per forested square mile; Jack Hubley, "Gettysburg National "Deer" Park," *Sunday News* (Lancaster), 14 March 1993. Folder 1, Box 66, N1615, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives; "Summary of the Agricultural Activities, 1993." Folder April 1993, Box 78, A1619, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives; Latschar, "Gettysburg: The Next 100 Years," 116. One battlefield farmer, Wilbur Martin, offered an example of the crop destruction caused by the deer. Martin farmed approximately 500 acres on the southern end of the battlefield. In 1992 he averaged a mere seventeen bushels of corn, but to break even economically, he needed to yield at least forty one bushels.

⁵ *Draft EIS, White-Tailed Deer*, 1-44; *EIS, White-Tailed Deer*, viii.

Three months later, in May 1995, the Park Service released the *Final Environmental Impact Statement- White-Tailed Deer Management Plan (Final EIS)*, which retained the alternatives originally presented in the draft plan and also included public comments received on the *Draft EIS*. On July 5, 1995, Warren Beach, Acting Associate Field Director of the Northeast Region, signed the Record of Decision approving the park's preferred alternative for the management of the white-tailed deer. This Record of Decision approved "killing deer to reduce and maintain the population at a level where park landscape management objectives are met." This decision gave park personnel authorization to shoot deer within the park boundary between October and April to reduce the deer population. Finding it more economical to shoot the deer themselves instead of hiring other party to remove the deer, Gettysburg's ranger staff, including Latschar, conducted the hunt. Self-described as "highly skilled and trained in the use of firearms," the group of hunters used high-velocity rifles with scopes and were allowed to shoot at night. Direct shooting became the exclusive means of lowering the deer population.⁶

The first season of the implementation of the deer reduction program, October 2, 1995 through March 15, 1996, brought success "beyond the park's expectations," according to Latschar. Park officials reported euphemistically that 503 deer "were taken." In implementing the direct reduction program, the ranger hunters sought to make the removal of the deer as convenient and swift as practicable. Notably, they used techniques that most deer hunters shun, including baiting deer, shooting from tree stands, and spotlighting. Park staff also drove deer

⁶ Warren Beach, Acting Associate Field Director, Northeast Region, "Record of Decision on the White-Tailed Deer Management Plan Final Environmental Impact Statement for Gettysburg National Military Park/ Eisenhower National Historic Site, Pennsylvania," July 5, 1995. This document is available at <http://www.epa.gov/EPA-IMPACT/1995/July/Day-13/pr-1083.html>; *EIS, White-Tailed Deer*, 30-42; Superintendent John Latschar to Malcolm Kunes, February 17, 1997. Folder 6, Box 66, N1615, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives. In fact, many of the ranger staff participated in the reduction program, whether by shooting or dressing and transporting the deer to the meat locker.

toward fellow hunters in tree stands by driving pickup trucks directly into the herds. Superintendent Latschar admitted that some rangers also shot deer “from the back of pick-up truck beds at night.” Hunters particularly targeted female deer to quickly reduce the herd’s reproduction capacity, but some of the deer “taken” on the battlefield were as young as six months old. Hunters dressed the deer on site and donated the meat to local and regional food banks. An additional 355 deer were “taken” during the second hunting season. Within two years, in other words, park staff reportedly “took” nearly 900 deer, reducing the herd to an estimated 102, or about 20 percent of the original population. Realizing that any shooting to reduce the deer population in a national park would be highly emotionally and controversial, park officials attempted to minimize the killings by contrasting the number of deer killed annually by Pennsylvania hunters (395,000) or killed in automobile accidents in the state (40,000).⁷

Yet to many Americans the idea of the National Park Service, the agency charged with preserving America’s historic and cultural sites, killing white-tailed deer seemed shockingly contradictory. One Ohioan commented on this dichotomy, writing that, “Preserving history is fine unless it causes the suffering and death of other creatures.” At an October 1996 Advisory

⁷ Advisory Commission Meeting Minutes, July 18, 1996. Folder July 18, 1996 Minutes, Box 78, A1619, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives; Superintendent John Latschar email to Martha Ansty, February 10, 1998. Folder 11, Box 17, A7221, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives; Log of Deer Taken. Folder 7, Box 17, A7221, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives; Superintendent John Latschar, “Superintendent’s Annual Report, 1996,” 2-3; Superintendent John Latschar, “Superintendent’s Annual Report, 1997,” GNMP Archives, 5-6; *EIS, White-Tailed Deer*; Superintendent John Latschar memo, undated. Folder 13, Box 66, N1617, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives. One female deer killed on Culp’s Hill, for example, was recorded as six months old and a mere forty five pounds. Superintendent John Latschar’s annual reports from 1995 through 2003 can be found in Box 3, A26, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives, while reports from 2004 to 2009 are filed in the Contemporary Administrative Files, GNMP. All references hereinafter to Latschar’s annual will only be cited by the year’s report and page number. Files from the Contemporary Administrative Records, GNMP are “active,” and therefore have not been processed into the park archives, but are part of the public record.

Commission Meeting, Lisa Baumgardner, a local resident and a vocal opponent of the management program declared that “John Latschar is like Hitler.” Speaking directly to the superintendent, she continued, “Why don’t you build a gas chamber and lead the deer into it!” Other animal rights activists sprung into action and campaigned to raise awareness of the “slaughter” of hundreds of white-tailed deer. A poster from the Fund for Animals of Silver Spring, Maryland, proclaimed that, “The fields and forests of Gettysburg National Military Park will again be coated with blood--this time the blood of white-tailed deer.” A flyer found on the visitor center door one October morning in 1996 displayed a picture of a white-tailed deer juxtaposed to a profile picture of Superintendent Latschar with a bold headline declaring, “Warning! Who is really destroying Gettysburg?”⁸

For nearly four years opponents fought the deer management reduction program in the federal court system. National animal rights activist groups, including Last Chance for Animals, the Fund for Animals, and the Animal Protection Institute, as well as several local residents, filed a lawsuit against the National Park Service in October 1996. After the district judge in Harrisburg dismissed their case, the group filed an entirely new case in the U.S. District Court in Washington, D.C. on February 3, 1997. The defendants argued the National Park Service had failed to consider the “adverse impact” of the program on the “historic character of the Park,” nor did the agency fully evaluate less destructive methods of achieving its goal to maintain the

⁸ James Plezia to Superintendent John Latschar, August 18, 1997. Folder 7, Box 66, N1615, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives, 2; Comment by Lisa Baumgardner, Advisory Commission Meeting Minutes, October 24, 1996. Folder October 24, 1996 Minutes, Box 78, A1619, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives, 17; “Action Alert: The Battle of Gettysburg Set To Begin Anew in October: More Than 1,000 Deer Scheduled To Die!” The Fund For Animals Flyer. Folder 7, Box 66, N1615, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives. This flyer encouraged citizens to write Superintendent Latschar and Director Kennedy voicing opposition to the deer management program; Unidentified protest flyer posted to the visitor center door on October 20, 1996. Folder 16, Box 66, N1617, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives.

historic landscape. While the court heard the case, the Park Service suspended the program, but in February 1999, the U.S. District Court ruled in favor of the NPS and Gettysburg resumed the deer reduction program. The plaintiffs appealed the District Court's ruling and finally, on February 22, 2000 the 9th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals in Washington D.C., ruled in favor of the park in a unanimous decision.⁹

As a result of the public outcry over park rangers shooting the deer, in 2003 Gettysburg contracted with the Wildlife Services of the U.S. Department of Agriculture to conduct the hunt. "This contract alleviated the park staff from a lot of stress and strain," reported Latschar. In 2007, however, Gettysburg's staff resumed the deer hunt because of an increase in fees by the Department of Agriculture. During a fifteen day hunt, park rangers removed 115 deer. The white-tailed deer program continues to this day, albeit with considerably less debate. During the park's most recent hunt, the Resource Management Division removed eighty-five deer, with relatively "little controversy."¹⁰

⁹ *Davis vs. Latschar*, Complaint for Declaratory Injunctive Relief, February 1997. Folder 6, Box 66, N1615, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives, 2; Superintendent John Latschar, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 2000," 2-3. Filed in a Federal District Court in Harrisburg, the opponents named Superintendent John Latschar, NPS Director Roger Kennedy, and Secretary of Interior Bruce Babbitt as defendants. Local residents named in the case included, Paul Davis III, Ronald Fox, Barry Kunkel, Dorthy Macks, and Beverly Stanton. During the spring 2000, naturalists estimated the deer population at fifty eight deer per square mile.

¹⁰ Superintendent John Latschar, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 2003," 6-7; Superintendent John Latschar, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 2007," 7; Superintendent John Latschar, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 2009," 14. In 2009 Penn State initiated a two-year study of the park's deer population to determine future removal needs.

In the context of larger management issues at Gettysburg National Military Park, the deer management plan served as a sideshow. The main brouhahas became the establishment of a partnership to construct a new visitor center and the implementation of a battlefield restoration program as defined in the revised *General Management Plan*. For years, Park Service officials had expressed a desire to relocate the visitor center, as described in the park's 1977 *Draft GMP* and again in the 1982 final *GMP*. Due to public opposition and lack of funding, this "Williamsburg style" facility never materialized. In the wake of the celebration of the Civil War's 125th anniversary Congress directed the National Park Service to explore potential sites for a Museum of the Civil War. After evaluating several locations, Chief Historian Edwin Bearss recommended that the new museum be constructed at Gettysburg because "no other Civil War area" offered the "preponderance of advantages" as Gettysburg. The project, itself, however, remained unfunded. Therefore, at Gettysburg, the Park Service continued to operate the existing cyclorama and visitor centers.¹¹ In an era of fiscal constraint, federal funding for a multi-million dollar facility seemed remote. If the vision of a new museum were to be realized, funding would have to come from nonfederal sources.

While Gettysburg National Military Park remained the nation's preeminent Civil War site, consistently receiving over 1.7 million visitors per year, visitor service accommodations were admittedly antiquated. The Park Service continued to use the 1921 Rosensteel building as its primary museum and information center. Gettysburg National Military Park held one of the

¹¹ "Task Directive: Revision of 1989 Development Concept Plan Guinn Woods Site, Gettysburg National Military Park," February 1995. Folder Gettysburg Museum of the Civil War, Box 1, D18, (General Management Plan, Environmental Impact Assessment, 1996-1998), Records of the National Park Service at Gettysburg National Military Park, Gettysburg National Military Park Archives [hereinafter cited as (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives]; *Draft Development Concept Plan, Environmental Assessment: Gettysburg Museum of the Civil War*, April 1995 (Gettysburg: Gettysburg National Military Park, April 1995), 11 [hereinafter cited as *Draft, DCP, Gettysburg Museum*, 1995].

largest collections of Civil War artifacts, estimated at 400,000 objects; nonetheless the park lacked facilities to adequately preserve these historic objects. With no other alternative, the park stored the priceless relics in the basement of the visitor center, exposing the artifacts to fluctuating temperatures and humidity. Conditions in the cyclorama building were equally deplorable. Subject to variable changes in temperature, the Gettysburg Cyclorama itself continued to deteriorate, particularly from excessive moisture in a poorly ventilated building.¹²

By the early 1990s it was obvious that Gettysburg needed an improved, modern facility to properly protect the artifact collection, the cyclorama painting, and to provide better service to visitors. Interpretively, the visitor center merely displayed thousands of objects in glass cases without offering a meaningful understanding of the battle or the Civil War. Moreover, Section 6 of the 1990 boundary legislation mandated that the Secretary of the Interior, “Take such action as is necessary and appropriate to interpret...the Battle of Gettysburg in the larger context of the Civil War and American History, including the causes and consequences of the Civil War and including the effects of the war on all the American people.”¹³

Gettysburg’s staff believed that the construction of a new museum would best fulfill this directive. Yet it seemed unlikely that Congress could give Gettysburg the required funding for the museum’s construction. In 1996 Congress allocated the National Park Service \$1.5 billion of the \$1.6 trillion budget, less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the entire federal budget.

Gettysburg’s operating budget for 1996 totaled \$3,052,000. According to Latschar’s

¹² Superintendent John Latschar, “Superintendent’s Annual Report, 1996,” 10. GNMP visitation for 1994 totaled 1,748,932 and for 1995 totaled 1,717,382.

¹³ *Draft Development Concept Plan, Environmental Assessment: Collections Storage, Visitor and Museum Facilities*, April 1996 (Gettysburg: Gettysburg National Military Park, April 1996), 6 [hereinafter cited as *Draft DCP, Collections Storage*, 1996].

calculations, for every \$100,000 paid in taxes, Gettysburg battlefield received a mere 20 cents. Moreover, he reported a \$75 million backlog in maintenance projects just within Gettysburg National Military Park alone. Finally, Latschar stated simply, “Gettysburg NMP is broke” and added, “97 percent of our problems arise from the simple fact that we’re broke.” A year later, he stated that, “The park is still broke and is nowhere near having enough personnel or financial resources required to carry out our mission of preserving our resources for the enjoyment of this and future generations.”¹⁴ If the Gettysburg battlefield, the cyclorama, and its artifact collection were to be preserved and protected, funding would have to come from sources other than the federal government.

The answer to the park’s problems seemed to have arrived already in the winter of 1994. That December, Robert Monahan Jr., a local businessman and former staffer in President Ronald Reagan’s administration, approached Superintendent Latschar with a proposal to accomplish some of the park’s goals often unrealized as a result of fiscal constraints. Monahan offered to construct a new visitor center at no cost to the federal government. His plan rested on the establishment of a public-private partnership, whereby all funds for the visitor center, estimated

¹⁴ Latschar, “Gettysburg: The Next 100 Years,” 118; Superintendent John Latschar, “Superintendent’s Annual Report, 1996,” 18-19; Superintendent John Latschar, “Superintendent’s Annual Report, 1997,” 15-17. The \$75 million maintenance backlog that Latschar cites in the 1996 Annual included funding for the cost of historic structures rehabilitation, monument rehabilitation, cannon carriage rehabilitation, historic fencing rehabilitation, conservation of artifacts and archives, road and building rehabilitation, and land acquisition. Financially, what compounded problems at Gettysburg was that Congress gave a 2.4 percent pay increase for park employees, but did not give the park the necessary money for the pay raise. Instead, the park was responsible for making up the pay through its operating budget. This “unfunded mandate” was a regular occurrence, making it even more difficult for the park to establish a viable operating budget. Additionally, some of the National Park Service and Department of Interior’s fiscal constraints can be traced back to President Ronald Reagan’s administration and specifically his Secretary of the Interior, James G. Watt. Watt served as Secretary of the Interior between 1981 and 1983 before resigning his post in the fall of 1983. The leader of a department charged to oversee the nation’s environmental issues, Watt was famously hostile to environmentalism and conservation policies. Instead of advocating for the preservation of National Parks and undisturbed lands, he favored drilling and mining and urged such lands be used for utilitarian practices. In short, Watt’s hostility toward preservation issues, which trickled down to the National Park Service can help explain fiscal constraints faced by the NPS in the 1990s.

to cost \$25 million, would be acquired from the private sector and donations. In the face of fiscal hardships, the park staff was receptive to Monahan's proposition. In late January 1995 Latschar presented Monahan's proposal to his superiors, all of whom gave him a "cautious green light" to explore the plan and develop the concept into a detailed proposal. With that approval, on March 28, 1995 the Park Service released a *Draft Development Concept Plan, Environmental Assessment: Gettysburg Museum of the Civil War (Draft DCP, Gettysburg Museum)* with a sixty-day comment period. The Park Service unveiled its plans for the partnership on April 6, 1995.¹⁵

As outlined in the *Draft DCP*, the plan proposed a partnership between the NPS, the Monahan Group, and the Friends of the National Parks at Gettysburg to build a new facility, the "Gettysburg Museum of the Civil War." This museum would be located at the Guinn Woods site, along the Taneytown Road, slightly south of the current visitor center. This draft offered three alternatives. Alternative A presented a no-action option. The second and third options recommended a new museum and the subsequent removal of the existing buildings in Ziegler's Grove and the restoration of the historic terrain. The two alternatives differed only in the precise site location of the museum. Park staff pointed to two potential sites in Guinn Woods, one developed and one undeveloped. The developed section referred to the site which Fantasyland amusement park had occupied. Alternative B recommended the undeveloped, or wooded,

¹⁵ Superintendent John Latschar to Ed Bearss, March 29, 1995. Folder Development of Draft, Box 1, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives; *Draft, DCP, Gettysburg Museum*, 1995; Superintendent John Latschar to Associate Director, Cultural Resources, March 29, 1995. Folder Development of Draft, Box 1, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives; NPS Press Release, "Gettysburg National Military Park Plans New Museum," March 27, 1995. Folder Public Meetings, Box 1, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives. The park facilitated a second public meeting on the topic at the April 20 meeting of the Advisory Commission. Robert Monahan Jr., a life-long Gettysburg resident, founded the Monahan Group, business and real estate company in 1987. Between 1981 and 1986 Monahan worked as Special Assistant to President Ronald Reagan and Special Assistant to the Secretary of Transportation. While Monahan pursued a museum project with the NPS, he also pursued a commercial development/shopping center in Hanover, Pennsylvania.

section of Guinn Woods, located closer to the Baltimore Pike. Alternative C favored placing the facility in the portion of the woods that had been developed as Fantasyland, but closer to the Taneytown Road. Partnered with the Friends and the Park Service, the Monahan Group would obtain the needed funding for the design and construction of the visitor center, which would include a new museum, modern storage space for the park's archival collection, improved accommodations for the cyclorama painting, and a large-scale theater. The museum would be free, but in order to generate revenue, admission would be charged for the theater and cyclorama. In the proposal, the Park Service, in cooperation with the Friends and Eastern National, would operate and maintain the museum; and after a negotiated period, the NPS would assume ownership of the building. Maintaining an ambitious schedule, the partners anticipated the new visitor center would open by March 1, 1997.¹⁶

While Monahan's proposal offered a multi-million dollar facility at absolutely no cost to the federal government, the concept proved hard to sell. Two main issues drove the opposition:

¹⁶ *Draft, DCP, Gettysburg Museum*, 1995, i; 9-16; Superintendent John Latschar to Brenda Barrett, SHPO, February 21, 1995. Folder 106 Compliance, Box 1, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives. Historic Guinn Woods, located along the Taneytown Road near General George Meade's Headquarters, was the site where Kenneth Dick built Fantasyland in 1959. In 1974 the Park Service purchased the amusement park and in 1980 the park closed to the public. The 1982 *GMP* classified two areas within the park boundary for future development (termed Development Zones)-- the Guinn Woods site and the site of the existing visitor center. The Park Service favored the Guinn Woods location for the new construction because the site had already been developed and because it maintained easy visitor accessibility to the fields of Pickett's Charge. During these negotiations, the Park Service did not consider sites outside the park boundary for the museum because it would have required a new boundary adjustment. In 1989 the Park Service authored a *Guinn Woods Development Concept Plan* that proposed relocating the park's administrative, curatorial, and cultural preservation facilities to the site. This forty-three acre development could also accommodate visitor activities, including additional parking and picnicking. Estimated to cost over \$12 million, the agency never received funding for this project. Regional Director James Coleman, Jr. approved the plan on July 12, 1989. A copy of this plan can be found in the park's GMP collection at: Folder Draft of Development Documents, Box 1, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives. Latschar's letter to the SHPO outlines the details of the partnership. Technically the National Park Service was not authorized to enter into direct negotiations with the Monahan Group, but needed a non-profit partner to facilitate the arrangement. The Park Service agreed to make the Guinn Woods site available to the Friends and the FNPG would enter into negotiations with the Monahan Group for the design and construction of the new building. The Monahan Group agreed to fund \$13 million and raise the remainder, estimated around \$12 million, through fund raising and donations. The developer would be permitted to charge an admission fee into the film to regain the capital investment and a reasonable profit.

the noncompetitive selection of a partner and suspicion at the rate at which the negotiations had progressed. In a letter to NPS Director Kennedy, local residents Pauline and Dick Peterson expressed their opposition to the plan because the Park Service did not consider other potential bidders. “Preventing free and open discussions,” wrote the Petersons, “with other possible would-be investors might be likened to the recent NPS cover-up of the railroad cut.” Paul Witt, owner of the Gettysburg Motor Lodge on Steinwehr Avenue, likewise disapproved of the Park Service’s “secretive alliance with the Monahan Group to the exclusion of any other interested party.” Additional comments expressed concern at the speed to which the Park Service pursued negotiations. Local book publisher Dean Thomas noted that while he was not opposed to a new museum, “given the speed with which this proposal is being pushed through” and the “lack of a more broad based public review,” he preferred the no-action alternative. Another letter simply asked “Why the rush?” and advised more careful planning. In an ironic play of words others declared the agency wanted to “railroad this plan through.”¹⁷

Despite public concern over the partnership, Latschar defended Monahan’s as a “good project.” Lacking the necessary federal appropriations, Latschar added, “At this point, I can see no other way to provide for adequate long-term care for our priceless artifact collection, archival collection, and Cyclorama painting.” He did admit that the plan was on “the ultimate fast-track

¹⁷ Pauline and Dick Peterson to Director Roger Kennedy, August 28, 1995; Paul W. Witt to Director Roger Kennedy, August 28, 1995. Unclipped Files of Letters, Box 1, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives; Dean Thomas to Superintendent John Latschar, April 19, 1995; Tom Laser to Superintendent John Latschar, May 15, 1995. Folder Public Comments Received on Draft, Box 1, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives.

process,” but reminded detractors that “private money does not sit around and wait for the wheels of our normal process to grind at their normal speed.”¹⁸

Although the opposition seemed to speak loudest on the issue, the Monahan proposal did receive some support from preservation organizations and individuals. Noted public historian Edward Linenthal of University of Wisconsin wrote Latschar, for example, expressing his enthusiasm for the removal of the existing facilities and the restoration of Ziegler’s Grove to its 1863 condition. Richard Moe, the President of the National Trust for Historic Preservation and a Gettysburg historian, expressed his support as well for pursuing the “creative” idea of a partnership, an idea he believed to be “right on the mark.” Recognizing financial restraints placed on the NPS, Moe agreed that the best way to provide for the preservation of the park’s artifacts and cyclorama painting, while providing quality interpretation, was to engage a private partner. “Because of Gettysburg’s eminence,” concluded Moe, “this project has the opportunity to stand as a model for the improvement, renovation and management of park sites through the National Park system.”¹⁹

Reacting to the public’s concerns over the Monahan proposition, in late August 1995 the Park Service decided to defer further consideration on the partnership. “The proposal offered in April will not be considered, nor will any other, until an in-depth planning process with full public participation can be accomplished,” Latschar stated. After withdrawing from the

¹⁸ Superintendent John Latschar to Associate Director, Cultural Resources, March 29, 1995. Folder Development of Draft, Box 1, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives; Superintendent John Latschar to Brenda Barrett, SHPO, February 21, 1995. Folder 106 Compliance, Box 1, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives.

¹⁹ Edward Linenthal to Superintendent John Latschar, August 22, 1995; Richard Moe, President, National Trust of Historic Preservation, to Superintendent John Latschar, July 15, 1995. Folder Public Comments on Draft, Box 1, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives. Linenthal discusses the meaning of Gettysburg in *Sacred Ground: Americans and their Battlefields* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1991).

negotiations, Gettysburg initiated a multi-year planning process to explore park goals, management problems and feasible solutions.²⁰ This reengagement of the planning process led to the production of another *Development Concept Proposal* for new facilities, a nation-wide *Request for Proposals (RFP)*, and the release of a new *General Management Plan* in 1999.

In April 1996, one year after the release of the *DCP* that considered Monahan's proposal, the National Park Service produced the *Draft Development Concept Plan, Environmental Assessment: Collections Storage, Visitor and Museum Facilities (Draft, DCP, Collections Storage)*. As Latschar indicated after the Park Service withdrew from negotiations with Monahan, park planners proceeded to identify four goals to guide the development of new facilities, as well as the future management of the battlefield. The first underlined the protection and preservation of the artifacts and collections, a problem that had been articulated for several years. As noted, these priceless objects were stored in the basement of the visitor center in substandard environmental conditions that included improper temperature controls, poor humidity regulation, and inadequate fire and intrusion protection. The second goal sought to

²⁰ Questions submitted by the House Appropriations Subcommittee Hearing, March 20, 1996. Folder Congressional Correspondence, Box 1, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives; NPS Press Release, "NPS Will Defer Pursuing Museum Proposal," August 31, 1995. Folder Public Meetings Information, Box 1, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives; Superintendent John Latschar to "Friend," October 17, 1995. Folder Public Comments Received During Scoping, Box 1, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives; Superintendent John Latschar to Pauline and Dick Peterson, September 5, 1995. Unclipped Files of Letters, Box 1, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives. Latschar's exact wording on the anticipated planning stages stated that the NPS will "not consider any further proposals for development of a museum complex, either on or off NPS lands, until after we have completed a preliminary planning effort to determine: the critical park objectives which need to be addressed; the planning assumptions which will guide the search for the most appropriate solutions to these problems; the range of options which could feasibly implement those solutions; and a clear set of planning criteria for the evaluation of the most appropriate locations for development of new visitor facilities, both on and off NPS land."

preserve the Gettysburg Cyclorama. Still displayed in a problematic building, the painting remained exposed to excessive humidity and severe temperature fluctuations. The third goal recommended improved interpretation for park visitors. Admittedly, the visitor center's museum displayed hundreds of objects in glass cases, but interpretation of the battle was minimal, and even less discussion occurred on the larger context of the American Civil War. Consequently, the park delineated an imperative need to expand their interpretive approach to offer a broader story of the Civil War. The fourth and final goal called for the restoration of the Ziegler's Grove site. Paradoxically, when the cyclorama building was constructed in the early 1960s, prevailing Park Service philosophy held that the best location for the building would be in the heart of the battlefield. Forty years later, Gettysburg deemed the buildings as intrusions on the historic terrain.²¹

Park planners began to explore potential methods to meet the four established goals and presented a series of alternatives in the *Draft DCP, Collections Storage* (April 1996). The first presented a no-action alternative, where park collections would remain in the basement of the visitor center and park staff would continue to operate the antiquated visitor center and cyclorama building. The second favored a new building only for storage of the archival collections. The park would continue to maintain and otherwise operate its existing facilities. The third alternative recommended a new facility for collections storage plus a new cyclorama

²¹ *Draft, DCP, Collections Storage*, 1996, 8. Authors and consultants of this plan at GNMP included: Superintendent John Latschar; Assistant Superintendent John McKenna; Deborah Darden, Planner and Team Leader; Richard Segars, Historic Architect; John Andrews, Laurie Coughlin, and D. Scott Hartwig, Interpretation; David Dreier, Chief of Maintenance; Karen Finley, Natural Resource Specialist; Brion Fitzgerald, Chief of Interpretation; Kathy Harrison, Senior Historian; Katie Lawhon, Public Affairs Specialist; and Michael Vice, Curator. Members of the Gettysburg Advisory Commission also participated in the preparation; Deputy Director, Denis P. Galvin, "Statement of Denis P. Galvin, Before the Subcommittee on National Parks, Historic Preservation and Recreation, Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, Concerning the Visitor Center and Museum Facilities Project at Gettysburg National Military Park," February 24, 1998. Folder "Senate Hearing," Box 6, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives.

building, and also called for rehabilitating the existing visitor center, a 3,000 square foot addition to that building would be necessary. Upon construction of the new cyclorama building, the 1962 Neutra building would then be razed. Alternative four, preferred by the Park Service, proposed the construction of an entirely new visitor center and museum complex. The new facility, estimated to cost \$43 million, would house the visitor center, museum, cyclorama painting, collections storage, bookstore, and administrative office space. This building also would include a 300-seat auditorium to accommodate an orientation film and an upgraded version of the Electric Map. Once the new facility was complete, the existing visitor center and cyclorama building would be demolished and the area restored to its historic condition.²²

Responding to concern generated by the Monahan proposal during the previous year, the *Draft DCP, Collections Storage* further intended to explore a greater range of partnership possibilities. The Park Service declared its willingness to consider a variety of strategies to own and operate the new facility, including traditional NPS ownership or the creation of public-private partnerships, either through a for-profit or non-profit partner. The agency remained willing to discuss potential sites for the new building, either within or outside the park boundary. Upon the release of the plan, the NPS held a series of public meetings and opened a thirty-day comment period.²³

The revised *Development Concept Plan* immediately created controversy and divisiveness within the Gettysburg community and across the nation even surpassing the reaction

²² *Draft, DCP, Collections Storage*, 1996, iii; 25-39. Officially the Park Service also considered an alternative that proposed the rehabilitation of the cyclorama center and the construction of a new collections storage facility. After exploring this option, however, park planners decided that because the cyclorama building was plagued with a myriad of construction problems this option was simply not feasible.

²³ *Draft, DCP, Collections Storage*, 1996, iii.

to the Monahan proposal a year earlier. Public comments and concerns focused on the role of the potential partner, anticipated commercialization, and site selection for the new building. Local business owners directed their comments, as expected, to the proposed site for the new facility. For decades businesses along Steinwehr Avenue had profited handsomely off the convenient location of the park's visitor center. If the Park Service relocated away from Steinwehr Avenue, it would "not only devastate our business, it will devastate the entire community."²⁴

Civil War preservation organizations meanwhile differed on the best course of action. The Friends, for example, recommended that the Park Service enter into negotiations with a non-profit partner while stressing that the Park Service maintain authority in the new building. The Association of License Battlefield Guides (ALBG) concurred. The National Parks and Conservation Association (NPCA) meanwhile supported the proposal for a new museum, but expressed concern over both potential partners and the role of the selected partner in the future management of the battlefield. Dennis Frye, a former historian at Harper's Ferry and current President of the Association of Civil War Sites, recommended that the Park Service adopt alternative two: construction of a smaller new facility simply for proper preservation of the

²⁴ Katie Lawhon, GNMP Public Affairs Specialist, "Summary of Comments on Draft Development Concept Plan for Collections Storage, Visitor and Museum Facilities," May 29, 1996; Bruce Groft, Area Director of Shoney's, to Keith Bashore, Community and Economic Affairs Coordinator (Harrisburg), May 21, 1996. Folder Public Comments Received on Draft, Box 1, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives. Lawhon's report shows that the park received fifty-nine written comments during the thirty-day comment period. Of these comments twenty-one supported the park's preferred alternative, while twenty opposed the park's preferred alternative. Of the twenty that opposed the development of a new museum, nineteen were from businessmen along Steinwehr Avenue and the Baltimore Pike.

park's artifacts. He recommended that \$43 million be spent instead to purchase threatened battlefield lands.²⁵

Prepared to pursue the preferred alternative despite such opposition, the Park Service issued a *Request For Proposals (RFP)* on December 11, 1996. As stated in the *Draft DCP, Collections Storage*, the *RFP* reiterated the Park Service's willingness to consider proposals from all possible sources, including government agencies, as well as for-profit or not-for-profit groups. The *RFP* also made clear that since no government funding was available, the NPS would "consider a variety of mechanisms and locations to make the Complex a reality." Interested bidders were to submit their proposal portfolio by April 11, 1997, which the Park Service eventually extended to May 9.²⁶

²⁵ Earl J. Coats, FNPG President, to Superintendent John Latschar, May 22, 1996; James Clouse, Secretary of the ALBG, to Superintendent John Latschar, May 21, 1996; Katie Lawhon, GNMP Public Affairs Specialist, "Summary of Comments on Draft Development Concept Plan for Collections Storage, Visitor and Museum Facilities," May 29, 1996; Dennis Frye to Superintendent John Latschar, April 22, 1996. Folder Public Comments Received on Draft, Box 1, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives.

²⁶ *Request For Proposals: Visitor Center & Museum Facilities, Gettysburg National Military Park* (Gettysburg: United States Department of Interior, National Park Service, Northeast Field Area, December 11, 1996), 1-4 [hereinafter cited as *RFP*, 1996]; Robert Kinsley to Rusty Thompson, April 2, 1997; Robert Monahan to Rusty Thompson, April 8, 1997. Folder *RFP*, Issuance of *RFP* and Extension of Deadline, Box 2, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives. This *RFP* explained the Park Service's goals for the complex, described areas to consider for potential location of the facility, and outlined the evaluation criteria for all proposals. The Park Service established ten criteria to assess the quality of the proposals and included: consistency with the NPS goals; preservation of the battlefield and its resources; environmental stewardship and sustainability; site, organization and management approach; previous experience; financial capability; cooperative agreement; innovation and leverage; and financial benefit to the NPS. Regarding site selection, the *RFP* noted that the site must be NPS owned (i.e. within the park boundary) or if the preferred site was within the park boundary, but not NPS owned, or outside the park's boundary the bidder had to obtain an agreement with the property owner to ensure the site's availability. These criterion were evaluated as "fair," "good," or "strong." Upon release of the *RFP* the Park Service held a pre-submittal conference at the visitor center on February 7, 1997. On April 2, 1997 Robert Kinsley, a bidder, wrote Rusty Thompson requesting a two-week extension to submit the proposal. Kinsley argued that his team needed the extension because they encountered delays in securing title to the appropriate site for the museum. On April 8, Robert Monahan, another bidder, expressed his opposition to the NPS deadline extension for the RFP because it was an injustice to those teams who were prepared to submit their proposal on time.

Six bidders ultimately responded to the park's nation-wide request for proposals. The bidders were Lemoyne, L.L.C. of Lutherville, Maryland; Kinsley Equities of York, Pennsylvania; the McGorrick Group of Dallas, Texas; Sherbrooke Associates and the Springwood Group of Lexington, Massachusetts; Woollen, Molzan and Partners of Indianapolis, Indiana; and the Monahan Group of Gettysburg, Pennsylvania; and each bidder offered a unique vision of how Gettysburg should be interpreted and preserved. In May 1997 the Park Service established an evaluation panel consisting of five voting members and two advisors to select the best proposal it represented a cross section of professional experience. Michael Adlerstein, Associate Regional Director of the Northeast Region, chaired the panel. Officially Latschar was prohibited from serving on the panel because it would represent a conflict of interest. He did, however, urge those who he could entrust "with the future of the park" to accept nomination to the panel.²⁷ After an initial review, the evaluation committee conducted interviews in September with final four bidders.

Sherbrooke Associates and the Springwood Group offered what may be considered the most unique of the six proposals. It recommended interpreting Gettysburg as an "international,

²⁷ In addition to Adlerstein, the committee consisted of: Steve Crabtree, Assistant Regional Director, Pacific West; Caleb Cooper, Denver Service Center; Chuck Baerlin, Gateway National Recreational Area; and Rich Rambur, Superintendent, Lowell National Historic Site. Lars Hanslin, Office of the Solicitor, Department of the Interior, and Debbie Darden, park planner at GNMP served as advisors to the committee. Officially the committee offered a recommendation, but the final decision of acceptance lay with the NPS Director. The selection of the evaluation panel generated some controversy within the local community, particularly with Eric Uberman, owner of the American Civil War Wax Museum on Steinwehr Avenue. Uberman contended that John Latschar stacked the panel in order to ensure his preferred proposal was selected. Committee members received official letters of appointment from Regional Director Marie Rust in April, but the members were notified of their appointment in early February. As park superintendent, John Latschar was not a voting member on the panel, nor was he to have any influence on the selection of the panelists. Email correspondence (FOIA requested by Uberman) suggests otherwise. In a January 22, 1997 email to a panel-voting member, John Latschar writes, "Your overall expertise from the park management point of view is urgently desired on this panel. I will not be on the panel, for local political reasons, and you're one of the very few whom I'd like to entrust with the future of the park." The date of the email confirms that members were in fact notified of their appointment well before it became public in April. Copies of these FOIA requested emails can be found in the park archives: Folder 2, Box 18, A7221, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives.

world-class center for the interpretation and study of Civil Peace.” Maintaining that the “The Gettysburg National Historic Site and Center for Civil Peace” would be an attractive site for peace conferences, Sherbrooke also recommended that the National Park Service partner with the United Nations, the U.S. State Department, and the Department of Defense. The authors estimated the “Center for Civil Peace” to cost \$68 million. On August 8, 1997 Regional Director Marie Rust wrote Sherbrooke Associates and the Springwood Group stating that their proposal was no longer under consideration because it did not meet the requirements stated in the *RFP*.²⁸

At the same time, the evaluation panel also dropped the proposal submitted by Woollen, Molzan and Partners, of Indianapolis. Hoping to act only as a “paid consultant,” the Indiana group recommended that the NPS partner with the Department of Education and the Smithsonian Institute. Their proposal then suggested creating a non-profit corporation, to be named “the Friends of the Gettysburg National Civil War Museum,” to raise the funds necessary for the new museum. First Lady Hillary Clinton would chair the non-profit, while media mogul Ted Turner of TNT, who had produced the film *Gettysburg*, would serve as vice-chair. Reminiscent of

²⁸ “Gettysburg National Military Park Development Proposal,” April 11, 1997. Submitted by Sherbrooke Associates, Inc. and The Springwood Group. Box 2, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives, 1-40; Marie Rust, Regional Director, to Lynn Molzan, August 8, 1997. Folder RFP, Selection Process, Box 2, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives. This plan was submitted by Thomas Cates, Partner of Sherbrooke Associates, and James Kane, President of The Springwood Group. Sherbrooke sought to change Gettysburg’s interpretive focus to a site that symbolized peace, not war. Their proposal “delicately shifts the battle from the central theme to a supporting role.” In this proposal, the authors suggested that battlefield visitation was “low” because the park overemphasized the military events and did not offer enough interpretive opportunities that catered to women and children. Consequently, the authors recommended a “thematic departure from the current Gettysburg experience.” Using Gettysburg as a venue to interpret and promote peace, Sherbrooke theorized a “crack concept” that interpreted the Civil War, or any other comparable conflicts, as a “crack,” or chasm of political, social, or cultural philosophies. The new museum, the “crack’s” epicenter, would be of granite black design and would emerge from the ground and “violently split in two.” From the epicenter, visitors could follow the “crack” to various interpretive sites throughout the town and community. The evaluation committee dropped the Sherbrooke proposal from additional consideration because it did not meet the stated *RFP* requirements of recommending a potential site and demonstrating financial capabilities.

earlier park management proposals, Woollen's plan favored eliminating private automobile traffic from the battlefield and requiring visitors to employ NPS provided transits.²⁹

Two months after the request for proposal deadline, the National Park Service continued to evaluate the final four. Robert Monahan, the local businessman who initially proposed the idea of constructing a new museum in cooperation with a non-profit partner, presented a revised proposal that aimed to create an "American Heritage Campus." Monahan envisioned a non-profit partner, the "National Museum of the American Civil War Foundation," that would manage the fundraising and operation. The actual facility, to be located on ninety acres at the intersection of Interstate 15 and U.S. Route 30, approximately three miles east of the park's visitor center, would mirror the lay out of a college campus. Each heritage site presented its own unique experience, but collectively offered "more than just a museum or visitor center." Complete with a large-scale museum, Monahan's proposal included an IMAX theater, an improved Electric Map, an upgraded cyclorama presentation, a conference center, and separate educational venues offering a variety of interpretive experiences. Monahan anticipated that the "heritage campus" would easily double current battlefield visitation. Predicting yearly visitation to increase to three or four million, the "heritage campus" would make Gettysburg a "destination location rather than a stop-by site." Though this plan met the park's four stated goals, Monahan's proposal retained the existing visitor center to use as a satellite contact station. The

²⁹ "Proposal," May 8, 1997. Submitted by Woollen, Molzan and Partners. Box 2, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives. NPS officials deemed that the Woollen and Molzan proposal would not be considered because the company merely offered the NPS their services as consultants to the project.

non-profit partner would raise the capital for construction, but the facility would be owned and operated by the Monahan Group.³⁰

The McGorrisk Group of Dallas, Texas was also among the final four. Their plan also recommended the establishment of a non-profit, “Gettysburg Battlefield Coalition” to oversee the fundraising. McGorrisk offered four potential sites for the new facility, including a fifty-four acre tract at the intersection of Hunt Avenue and Taneytown Road. The planning team recommended a national competition for the project architect and building design. McGorrisk’s proposal suggested a large-scale I-Werks theater to show interchangeable interpretive films, state-of-the-art technology as a medium to communicate “the emotion of the battle,” and the development of an auxiliary site within the borough district. Unlike Monahan’s offer, their proposal provided for the ultimate return of the facility to the National Park Service once the building’s debt was retired. The only commercial venue recommended in this proposal was a modest bookstore. To generate revenue, however, the plan did recommend an admission fee to the museum as well as a parking fee.³¹

The Lemoyne team, out of Maryland, offered an attractive element to many battlefield preservationists in their proposal to purchase and remove the 307-foot National Tower. The team then proposed a new two-story museum, replicating contemporary Pennsylvania farming architecture that would be built on the site of the razed tower. Their plan also envisioned the construction of a 65,000 square foot museum, an improved cyclorama program, and the

³⁰ The Monahan Group, “Gettysburg National Military Park Visitor Center and Museum Facilities, Request for Proposal Response,” April 11, 1997. Folder 12, Box 18, A7221, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives, 1-1,210. Monahan’s desired site was approximately three miles from the battlefield grounds/auto tour route.

³¹ “Gettysburg Battlefield Coalition,” May 9, 1997. Submitted by Randy Harper. Folder 7, Box 18, A7221, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives, 1-507.

development of state-of-the-art exhibitory that placed the battle within the larger context of the Civil War and American History. The archival collections facility and research center would be located elsewhere on park lands.³²

Finally, the Kinsley proposal recommended the creation of a non-profit partner to oversee the management of the new facility. Once the building became profitable and all debts retired, estimated to be between twenty and thirty years, ownership would pass to the National Park Service. Envisioned as a two-story building, designed in contemporary Pennsylvania barn-style architecture situated on fifty acres near the Baltimore Pike and Hunt Avenue intersection, the building would consist of a welcome center, a museum interpreting the battle placed in the context of the Civil War, and a restored cyclorama painting. Kinsley recommended a 450-seat National Geographic theater for orientation films and a 360-seat theater to display an updated Electric Map. A “small mall” would offer visitors an assortment of commercial opportunities, including an Eastern National operated bookstore; National Geographic Store; Gettysburg Tours Gift Shop; Civil War Arts and Craft Gallery; an upscale restaurant and a family oriented food court. Revenue would be generated by retaining the admission fee from the current interpretive venues, the Electric Map and cyclorama, as well as a fee for the National Geographic film. Kinsley’s proposal also favored a parking fee.³³

³² “A Proposal to the National Park Service, Gettysburg National Military Park for the Visitor Center/Museum Facility and Research Facility,” Lemoyne, L.L.C., May 9, 1997. Folder 15, Box 18, A7221, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives, 1-892; “A Proposal to the National Park Service, Gettysburg National Military Park for the Visitor Center/Museum Facility and Research Facility,” Lemoyne, L.L.C., Supplemental Material, September 10, 1997. Box 2, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives.

³³ “Visitor Center, Gettysburg National Military Park, Visitor Center & Museum Facilities, Request for Proposals,” submitted by Kinsley Equities, May 9, 1997. Folder 17, Box 18, A7221, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives, 1-140. In addition to the proposed retail stores, the Kinsley proposal recommended the development of a family style cafeteria to seat 500 and an upscale, “white tablecloth,” restaurant to seat 150. The

Using the predetermined criteria as an appraisal determination, Mike Alderstein on October 13, 1997 wrote NPS Director Stanton to inform him that the panel unanimously had selected Kinsley Equities, of York, Pennsylvania as “the best overall proposal.” One of the more attractive elements of Kinsley’s proposal was that it did not require a fee for the museum. On the other hand, the evaluation panel found the proposal submitted by the McGorrick Group, with its proposed non-profit the “Gettysburg Battlefield Coalition,” to be less desirable because they recommended charging an admission to the museum. “Under the Kinsley proposal,” justified Director Stanton, “the non-profit owner of the facilities would impose no fee for admission to the visitor center and museum.” He continued, “Fees would be charged within the facilities for additional, optional activities...the major portion of the revenue...would come from optional fees to the visitor rather than from a mandatory visitor entrance fee as proposed by GBC.”³⁴ Latschar, Robert Kinsley, and the NPS sold the American people on the museum complex based on the idea the museum and its artifacts would be free.

Since it did not achieve all of the goals of the *RFP*, however, Alderstein recommended that “several aspects” of the plan be revised and negotiated before entering into a cooperative agreement. On November 6, Director Stanton approved the Kinsley proposal as well. Stanton informed the York developer that his “creative and comprehensive proposal represents an exciting opportunity to enhance the preservation of Gettysburg and the quality of the park’s visitor experience” and stated that the NPS would enter into negotiations. The same day, the Park Service issued letters to the three other bidders thanking them for their submission and to

proposal recommended that rent be charged to the commercial venues and that a combined ticket could be purchased for all venues.

³⁴ Michael Alderstein to Director Robert Stanton, October 13, 1997 in *GMP*, vol. 1, 363-376; Director Robert Stanton to Randy Harper, February 6, 1998 in *GMP*, vol. 1, 393-405.

inform them the Kinsely proposal had been selected. The following day, November 7, the Park Service held a public meeting at the visitor center to announce the selection.³⁵

Before NPS Director Stanton could announce the evaluation panel's selection, however, news of the recommendation was leaked to the *USA Today*. On October 15, 1997, Edward Pound's article headlined, "Developer Selected for Gettysburg Center" and reported that Kinsley would develop the new visitor center and museum. Ironically, Pound also noted that "the Park Service plans to announce the selection next week." After Pound's article in the *USA Today*, three weeks of silence on behalf of the National Park Service followed. Opponents of the partnership, namely Eric Uberman, Frank Silbey, and other local privateers quickly gained the upper hand in the media campaign as a result. Instead of debating the merits of the plan, critics protested the selection process and declared that the NPS had sold out to commercial interests. Two unsuccessful bidders, the Monahan Group and the McGorrick Group, also protested the panel's selection process. Latschar later classified this premature announcement as a "loss of public relations initiative."³⁶

While Alderstein and the evaluation panel evaluated the proposals for the new visitor center, Gettysburg's staff initiated plans to develop a new *General Management Plan*.

³⁵ Michael Alderstein to Director Roger Stanton, October 13, 1997; Director Roger Stanton to Robert Kinsley, November 6, 1997. Folder RFP Selection, Box 2, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives. Both of these documents are reprinted in the appendix of the 1999 *General Management Plan*; NPS Press Release, "Proposal Selected for Gettysburg Museum Project," November 7, 1997. Folder Announcement of Selection, Box 2, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives.

³⁶ Edward T. Pound, "Developer Selected for Gettysburg Center," 15 October 1997; NPS Director Roger Stanton to Randy Harper, the Gettysburg Battlefield Coalition, February 6, 1998, in *GMP*, 393-394; Superintendent John Latschar, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 1998," 1-3. After Monahan and McGorrick's appeal, Director Kennedy reevaluated the panel's recommendations, but still found the Kinsley proposal to be the "best overall proposal received." Monahan filed his protest on November 17 and Randy Harper, representing the McGorrick Group, filed an appeal on November 15. These appeal documents can be found in the appendix of the 1999 *GMP*, 377-410.

Consequently, park staff termed 1997 “the year of planning,” and Latschar declared, “Fiscal year 1997 may be regarded as one of the most important years in the modern history of Gettysburg National Military Park.”³⁷ Circumstances at the battlefield had changed considerably since the approval of the 1982 *GMP*, and by 1997 Gettysburg National Military Park desperately needed a new plan to guide management decisions. Most significantly the 1990 boundary revision had added more than 1,900 acres to the battlefield, and federal funding remained remote for any significant improvements.

On May 5 the National Park Service published a Federal Register notice of intent to begin the development of a new *General Management Plan*. At this point the established *Development Concept Plan* of 1996 became the basis for planning for the *GMP*. In order to prevent confusion over two concurrent planning initiatives, the Park Service “folded” the proposal for a new museum, as initially outlined as the preferred alternative in the *DCP*, into the *General Management Plan*.³⁸ In short, once Director Stanton approved the Kinsley proposal the plan and the creation of a public-private partnership to develop a new museum became the foundation for the new *GMP*. Using the four goals stated in the 1996 *DCP*, protection the park’s collection of objects and artifacts; preservation the cyclorama painting; provide high-quality interpretation and educational opportunities for park visitors; and rehabilitation of Ziegler’s Grove, park planners proceeded to develop long-term policies. Two main philosophies guided the development of the *GMP*-- the creation of the public-private partnership to develop a new museum complex and the rehabilitation of the battlefield to its 1863 condition. These policies would prepare the park for the challenges of the twenty-first century. Through this process,

³⁷ Superintendent John Latschar, “Superintendent’s Annual Report, 1997,” 1.

³⁸ Superintendent John Latschar, “Superintendent’s Annual Report, 1998,” 2.

however, the park would be challenged by the American people and Congress to pursue these management alternatives. A “new birth of freedom” at Gettysburg National Military Park would not come easily.

Chapter 11

“They Who Fought Here”:

Controversy Over A New Direction at Gettysburg, 1998-2000

Events that occurred at Gettysburg National Military Park between 1995 and 1997 laid the foundation for one of the most important changes in management philosophy in the history of the National Park Service. By the end of 1997, the Park Service entered into negotiations with Robert Kinsley and its non-profit partner, the Gettysburg National Battlefield Museum Foundation (simply called the Foundation), to construct the Gettysburg Visitor Center and Museum. Although controversy continued to characterize the management decisions, the Park Service remained steadfast in its endeavors for a new vision at Gettysburg.

After approving the Kinsley proposal, the National Park Service published a Federal Register Notice of Intent to begin a *General Management Plan (GMP)* on May 5, 1997. Officially the preferred alternative of the *Draft Development Concept Plan*, i.e. a new museum, became a primary component of the new *GMP*. Over the next two years park staff, led by Superintendent John Latschar and Park Planner Debbie Darden, developed a new long-term management philosophy. On August 14, 1998 the Park Service released the *Draft General Management Plan (Draft GMP)* for a sixty-day public review period. Less than one year later, on June 18, 1999, the agency released its two-volume *Final General Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement (Final GMP)*. Two philosophies guided the *GMP*: the creation

of the public-private partnership to develop the park's new museum and the restoration of the battlefield to its 1863 condition.¹

For the first time since acquiring Gettysburg National Military Park in August 1933, the National Park Service established a clear, consistent vision on the appearance of the battlefield and how it should be interpreted. In doing so, Gettysburg articulated a management philosophy that supported the battlefield's 1895 enabling legislation. The *GMP*, however, unleashed several vitriolic debates that proved unparalleled in the park's history. Using powerfully and emotionally charged rhetoric, thousands of Americans expressed their opinions on how they wanted the battlefield to be preserved and interpreted. No other American historic site, it would seem, could generate as much interest, controversy, or sensationalism as Gettysburg.

¹ *Draft General Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement*, Gettysburg National Military Park, Pennsylvania (U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, August 1998) [hereinafter cited as *Draft, GMP*]; *Final General Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement*, Gettysburg National Military Park, Pennsylvania, vol. 1 & 2 (U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, June 1999) [hereinafter cited as *GMP*, vol. 1 or *GMP*, vol. 2]. The NPS defined restoration as "the process of accurately depicting the form, features and character of a property as it appeared at a particular time." An example of restoration would be the fabrication of a new bronze sword on a monument where the original sword has been stolen or vandalized. The NPS defined reconstruction as "depicting, by means of new construction, the form, features and details of a non-surviving site, landscape, building, structure or object for the purpose of replicating its appearance at a specific period of time and in its historic location." An example of reconstruction would be replacing a fence in its historic location, only when its construction, details and location can be determined through documentary and physical evidence. Rehabilitation, on the other hand, was defined as "making possible compatible uses for properties through repair, alterations and additions while preserving those historic features that remain and that are significant and convey historical values." An example would include re-grading a historic swale, reclaiming a field that has become overgrown, or replacing missing historic features, *GMP*, vol. 1, 61- 62. During the *GMP* process the National Park Service was careful to use the terminology "rehabilitation," not "restoration" because it is impossible to completely restore the battlefield to its 1863 appearance. To keep the terms consistent and accurate to the Park Service's effort, the term rehabilitation will be used.

Planning began on the new *General Management Plan* in 1997. In April, the Park Service distributed a *General Management Plan* newsletter informing the public of a new *GMP* that park planners promised would take a “fresh look” at the battlefield and explore methods of achieving the park’s goals while providing quality visitor service. This newsletter, ultimately the first in a series mailed to approximately 3,000 individuals, solicited public participation in the process and informed readers of upcoming meetings and workshops. The first meeting on the *GMP* occurred on May 21, where park planners presented two key questions for discussion: “what do you think the park should look like in the future?” and “what concerns do you have now?” Approximately one hundred people attended the meeting to voice their concerns. During the remainder of the year the Park Service held seventeen additional public meetings and workshops to engage the public in planning the future of Gettysburg National Military Park.²

Having dubbed 1997 “the year of planning,” park staff referred to 1998 as “the year of public involvement.” While detractors would later claim that the Park Service did not involve the public enough in formulating plans, the *General Management Plan* was, without a doubt, a process “of the people, by the people, for the people.” Moving simultaneously to develop the *GMP* and to finalize negotiations with Kinsley for the new visitor center, Gettysburg’s staff embarked on a vigorous public relations campaign to inform and educate the public on the park’s goals and to gain support for the planned projects. While the majority of meetings were held in Gettysburg, *GMP* team planners, namely Latschar and Darden, also traveled to Pittsburgh to engage citizens of western Pennsylvania in the planning process. Latschar and staff also briefed

² *General Management Plan* newsletter, Number 1, April 1997. Folder Public Meetings, May 20-21, 1997, Box 4, D18, (General Management Plan, Environmental Impact Assessment, 1996-1998), Gettysburg National Military Park Archives [hereinafter cited as (GMP, 1996-1988), GNMP Archives]; NPS Press Release, “Gettysburg National Military Park Invites Public To Help With *General Management Plan*,” April 21, 1997. Folder Public Meeting Information, Box 4, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives.

fifty-nine Congressional members, while the superintendent campaigned across the nation speaking to numerous Civil War organizations or civic groups. Gettysburg's staff held "open house" days where management encouraged visitors to participate in a behind-the-scenes tour of the park facilities. During 1998, the NPS received over 3,700 written comments, which led to several changes on the visitor center proposal, namely a reduction in commercial facilities. Approximately 85 percent of the comments received supported the park's efforts to restore the battlefield's historic landscapes and called for proceeding with the implementation of the proposed partnership with the Gettysburg National Battlefield Museum Foundation.³

Due to the "loss of public relations initiative" and the vocal opposition to the Kinsley proposal, led by several local businessmen and Concerned Citizens for Gettysburg, some members of Congress nonetheless expressed concern over the proposed Foundation partnership, especially if Gettysburg would be used as a model for future projects. Democratic Arkansas Senator Dale Bumpers, for example, informed Secretary of the Interior Bruce Babbitt that though he did not "object to the concept of the Park Service entering into public-private ventures where

³ NPS Press Release, "Workshops Added For National Park Museum Plans," December 17, 1997; NPS Press Release, "Gettysburg Open Houses Focus on the Goals for a New Museum," January 14, 1998. Folder Public Meeting Information, Box 4, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives; Superintendent John Latschar, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 1998." Folder 3, Box 3, A26, Park Main (Central) Files, 1987-present, Records of the National Park Service at Gettysburg National Military Park, Gettysburg National Military Park Archives, 2-3 [Files from this collection have not yet been processed and all notes hereinafter will be cited by Box, File Code, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives]. Superintendent John Latschar's annual reports from 1995 through 2003 can be found in Box 3, A26, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives, while reports from 2004 to 2009 are filed in the Contemporary Administrative Files, GNMP. All references hereinafter to Latschar's annual will only be cited by the year's report and page number. Files from the Contemporary Administrative Records, GNMP are "active," and therefore have not been processed into the park archives, but are part of the public record; NPS Press Release, "Pittsburgh Area Citizens Invited to Workshop On the Future of the Gettysburg Battlefield," September 15, 1998. Folder News Media, Box 52, K3415, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives. The park held two open houses on January 31 and February 14, which provided visitors an on-site opportunity to view the park's resource protection problems first hand. Visitors were allowed to tour the storage collection facility in the visitor center basement, as well as the archival storage in the maintenance facility, and were later joined by a park ranger to discuss of preservation problems of the cyclorama painting. They also participated in an outdoor program with a park historian, who explained the battle action within the Ziegler's Grove and the necessity of demolishing the existing buildings in this historic area.

appropriate,” he remained concerned “because the Park Service has indicated that this proposal may be used as the precedent for other public-private park ventures.”⁴

Ultimately, on February 24, 1998, the Senate Subcommittee on National Parks requested a hearing on the merits of Gettysburg’s planned partnership. Committee Chairman Senator Craig Thomas a Wyoming Republican, contended that a Congressional hearing was appropriate because the public-private partnership concept at Gettysburg “has potential for expansion to other parks.” It was imperative for the process to be as thorough and open as possible. Testifying on behalf of the NPS, Deputy Director Denis Galvin insisted that Kinsley presented “the best overall proposal” to assist the park in achieving its four outlined goals. Republican Pennsylvania Senator Rick Santorum, as well as representatives of the National Parks and Conservation Association, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, and the Friends of the National Parks at Gettysburg (FNPG) also spoke in favor of the park’s management plan. Speakers from the Association for Preservation of Civil War Sites (APCW) and the Gettysburg Battlefield Preservation Association (GBPA), on the other hand, testified in opposition. Dennis Frye, former historian at Harper’s Ferry National Historical Park and now President of the APCW, offered a compelling argument, declaring that the Park Service had misconstrued its priorities by emphasizing presentation over preservation. “The seductive lure of marbleized corridors, featuring high tech screens and terminals and an IMAX style theater, has blinded the NPS,” stated Frye. Declaring that the battlefield, and not a museum, should accomplish the goals of education, he continued, “No movie or computerized virtual reality will ever substitute for the High Water Mark or Little Round Top or Devil’s Den. Thus, the NPS should focus its

⁴ Superintendent John Latschar, “Superintendent’s Annual Report, 1998,” 1-3; Senator Dale Bumpers to Secretary Interior Bruce Babbitt, November 24, 1997. Folder Congressional Correspondence, Box 2, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives. Bumpers served on the Senate Subcommittee’s Committee on Energy & Natural Resources.

presentation—and hence achieve its goal of education—on the *battlefield*, and not in an artificial environment or marble and glass.” Frye and the APCW also opposed the attempts to restore Ziegler’s Grove, declaring it “fanciful, ingenuous, and a bogus concept.”⁵

Outside of Congress, opposition from the public centered on the amount of commercialization within the new facility. Local business owners often spoke loudest when voicing their opposition to the park’s plan for a new museum. For decades, commercial establishments on Steinwehr Avenue and the Baltimore Pike had benefitted handsomely from their convenient location to the park’s current visitor center. Kinsley’s proposal would now move it just far enough from the commercial lights of Steinwehr Avenue that visitors could no longer simply walk across the street to frequent the local businesses. Restaurant owners opposed the expanded food-service options, while store owners lamented the assortment of commercial shops proposed for the new building.

Consequently, some local business owners rallied to resist the proposal. In May 1998, the Gettysburg Area Retail Merchants Association (GARMA), an association collectively representing the town’s business establishments, unanimously passed a resolution to oppose the Kinsley plan and urged the Park Service to reexamine ways to meet the park’s “retail, restaurant, and commercial needs.” Individual business owners also expressed their opposition to the plan.

⁵ Superintendent John Latschar, “Superintendent’s Annual Report, 1998,” 3; Statement by Chairman Craig Thomas, Subcommittee on National Parks, Historic Preservation and Recreation, Oversight Hearing on the issues relating to the visitor center and museum facilities at Gettysburg National Military Park; Deputy Director, Denis P. Galvin, “Statement of Denis P. Galvin, Before the Subcommittee on National Parks, Historic Preservation and Recreation, Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, Concerning the Visitor Center and Museum Facilities Project at Gettysburg National Military Park,” February 24, 1998; Dennis Frye, “Testimony, Association for the Preservation of Civil War Sites, Before the Subcommittee on National Parks, Historic Preservation and Recreation, Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, Regarding Visitor Center and Museum at Gettysburg National Military Park,” February 24, 1998. Folder “Senate Hearing,” Box 6, D18, (GMP 1996-1998), GNMP Archives. In his testimony, Frye did agree that the NPS needed to provide better facilities for the park’s artifact collection and encouraged Congress to allocate money for such a project.

Eric Uberman, owner of the wax museum directly across from the existing visitor center became a notably vociferous critic of the new museum. Calling the Kinsley's proposal a "new mall" at Gettysburg, Uberman vehemently criticized the number of commercial venues in the facility, declaring they would take the "lion's share" of commerce from the local community. He also launched into direct, personal attacks toward Superintendent John Latschar. It was "absolutely clear," according to Uberman, that the "Park Service cannot be trusted to protect the national interest in Gettysburg."⁶

In an effort to appease local business owners and especially in response to the concerns over the "Disneyfication" of Gettysburg, the Park Service and the Foundation in early March 1998 agreed to considerable changes in the visitor center. As originally proposed the facility was to be 145,802 square feet in size, complete with a welcome center, museum, administrative offices, and archival collections storage. Commercial ventures included a National Geographic operated IMAX; two bookstores, one operated by Eastern National and another by National Geographic; a Civil War Arts & Crafts Gallery; a tour center gift shop; and the Electric Map and Cyclorama painting. The original proposal also called for a 12,144 square foot cafeteria, complete with a fine dining restaurant and a separate cafeteria. The Foundation now modified its proposal. The most significant change called for a 20 percent reduction in the overall size of the facility, to 118,100 square feet. Furthermore, the Foundation agreed to eliminate the National Geographic bookstore, the Civil War Arts & Crafts Gallery, and the tour center gift shop. In response to local restaurant owners' concerns, the Foundation eliminated the fine dining option

⁶ "Resolution," Gettysburg Area Retail Merchants Association, May 27, 1998. Folder Public Relations, October 1997-August 1998, Box 5, A38, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives; Eric Uberman, Peter Bienstock, and Frank Silbey memo, undated. Folder FOIA, July 1999-August 1999, Box 16, A7221, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives.

and reduced the size of the cafeteria restaurant. While the concept of a feature film theater was retained, the Foundation agreed to use a standard design theater instead of an IMAX production. One original reason for the selection of Kinsley's proposal was because it offered a visitor center, museum, and research facilities that would be free to the public. The revised proposal now provided for a 1,700 square foot public library and research center. Eastern National agreed to charge the same admission fee for the Electric Map and Cyclorama as currently charged, \$3.00 per adult, while the admission fee for the film would be set at \$4.00. Kinsley also agreed to eliminate its proposed parking fee.⁷

After working with Kinsley and the Foundation to modify the original proposal, Northeast Regional Director Marie Rust, on July 10, 1998, signed a letter of intent with Kinsley Equities to construct Gettysburg's visitor center and museum. Kinsley signed the agreement on July 16. His proposal established a non-profit partner, the Gettysburg National Battlefield Museum Foundation, to raise the necessary money for the "Gettysburg Visitor Center and Museum."⁸

⁷ Latschar, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 1998," 1; NPS Press Release, "National Park Service Holds Public Workshops on Museum and Visitor Center Plans," March 3, 1998; "Gettysburg National Military Park, Proposed Collections Storage, Museum and Visitor Center," June 17, 1998. Folder Public Meetings, Box 4, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives; Michael Alderstein to Director Stanton, October 13, 1997. *GMP*, vol. 1, 363-376; Statement of Paul Hoffman, Deputy Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife, Congress, House, Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands, *The Future Visitor's Center at Gettysburg National Military Park and the Associated Fundraising Efforts*, 107th Cong., 2nd sess., 21 March 2002, 10-21. The reference to the "Disneyfication" of Gettysburg refers to a proposal made in November 1993 by Walt Disney executives to construct Disney's America, a 3,000-acre historical theme park in Haymarket, Virginia just three miles from the Manassas battlefield. Eventually Disney withdrew their proposal because of the heated controversy and opposition from preservationists. For additional reading on the proposed Disney theme park at Manassas see, Joan Zenzen, *Battling for Manassas: The Fifty-Year Preservation Struggle at Manassas National Battlefield Park* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1998).

⁸ Marie Rust, Northeast Regional Director, to Robert Kinsley, July 10, 1998. Folder Letter of Intent, Box 2, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives.

On one level it seemed that every time Gettysburg received a new superintendent, a change in policies became par for the course as each new leader tried to implement his own new “vision” for the park. Most recently, as mentioned, Jose Cisneros and his staff articulated a Memorial Landscape Philosophy. And once again, John Latschar had conceived his own defined vision for the park landscape within months of his arrival. The practice of allowing the growth of non-historic woods, for example, had created a battlefield that looked remarkably different than it had in 1863. Modern visitors looked upon dense woods where soldiers in 1863 saw clear, open terrain. Licensed Battlefield Guides and park rangers often had to use historic photographs when interpreting key battle action in order to provide visitors with a sense of the 1863 landscape.

Shortly after his arrival, Latschar took a tour with a licensed guide, and in typical fashion that guide offered the historic photographs. Latschar soon declared “something had to be done” not only to enhance interpretation, but also to effectively manage the battlefield.⁹ His background as a military officer enabled him to see the battlefield as a soldier, while his training as a historian allowed him to see the battlefield as a historical source. His landscape philosophy thus sought to correct these inaccuracies and would be a fundamental aspect of the new *General Management Plan*.

The creation of the public-private partnership and plans for the restoration of the landscape to 1863 guided the *GMP* planning process. On August 14, 1998 the Park Service released the *Draft General Management Plan* for a sixty-day comment period. This plan provided a framework for future decisions on the three landscapes within Gettysburg National

⁹ Superintendent John Latschar, interview by author, January 4, 2010.

Military Park: the battlefield, the Soldiers' National Cemetery, and the commemorative landscape. The 1998 *Draft GMP* was unlike any other produced by the park. For the first time, a plan offered a detailed and thorough agenda for the future of the park with limited management alternatives. Team planners outlined four alternatives in the *Draft GMP*.

The first, Alternative A, presented a no-action option. The NPS would continue to operate the existing visitor center and cyclorama buildings, while park officials would manage the battlefield landscape on a case-by-case basis. Alternative B, C, and D all endorsed a new museum outside the defined Battle Action Resource Area, in order to explore the Battle of Gettysburg within the larger context of the American Civil War. These three alternatives differed slightly in the landscape management plan and offered different degrees of battlefield rehabilitation. Alternative B, the most conservative, recommended the rehabilitation of only large-scale elements, mainly open fields and wooded areas which were present in 1863. Alternative C, the park's preferred alternative, offered a moderate level of rehabilitation. It would restore the large-scale elements present in 1863, as defined in Alternative B, but also recommended the rehabilitation of small-scale landscape features that were significant to the outcome of the battle, including fences, woodlots, and orchards. Park staff asserted that Alternative C offered the "most desirable combination of resource preservation, cost-effectiveness, visitor experience, and environmental impact." Alternative D, the most extensive degree of rehabilitation, included all the provisions of Alternative C, plus the rehabilitation of all 1863 documented features, as well as the rehabilitation of the commemorative landscape

features, namely avenues. This option would have removed all visitor facilities from the battlefield, including restrooms, the Boy Scout campground, and picnic areas.¹⁰

Critics responded that Gettysburg's *Draft GMP* essentially only offered two alternatives in reality, a no-action option and one favoring Kinsley's museum proposal and landscape rehabilitation. Members of the Borough of Gettysburg wrote Latschar that, "The entire *GMP/EIS* is predicated on the assumption that Alternative C [the Kinsley proposal] is the predetermined course of action, which renders the document meaningless as a planning vehicle." Several congressional members later expressed similar concerns over the plan's narrow options. In response, the National Park Service maintained they had explored other alternatives to the construction of a new facility in the *Draft Development Concept Plan* issued in April 1996, but selected its preferred alternative as the construction of a new museum. Consequently, park planners had "folded" the preferred alternative of the *Development Concept Plan* into the new *General Management Plan*.¹¹

Rehabilitating the battlefield to its 1863 condition remained an ambitious, if not ambiguous, task. The Battle of Gettysburg was fought over twenty five square miles, and by 1998 the NPS owned 5,733 acres. It thus became the task of the park staff to determine what 1863 features should be rehabilitated, and what wartime features were practical to replace. Again relying on his background as an Army officer, Latschar and his team borrowed the *KOCCOA* method used by the U.S. Army to determine the effect specific terrain features had on the battle. *KOCCOA* is an acronym that analyzes: (*K*) key terrain; (*O*) observation points; (*C*) cover and

¹⁰ *Draft, GMP*, i-vi; 59-150.

¹¹ Borough of Gettysburg Members to Superintendent John Latschar, October 14, 1998 in *GMP*, vol. 2, 36-47.

concealment; (*O*) obstacles to the movement of troops; and (*A*) avenues of approach used by troops to reach their desired position. Relying upon thousands of historic documents, including commanders' official reports, soldiers' accounts, photographs, newspaper accounts, and maps, park historians used *KOCCOA* to evaluate and document the entire battlefield in order to discern those individual landscape features that influenced the course of the battle. Park historians then mapped the battle action for each of the three-day's fighting, showing where troops were positioned, where they moved, and where they were engaged on the field. Staff classified the intensity of the fighting at three levels: minor action with light casualties; moderate action with medium casualties; and major action which resulted in heavy casualties. In doing so, they produced a series of "overlay maps" that displayed key terrain features and battle action for each day, which served as a guiding tool to determine which features should be restored.¹²

The Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative C, emphasized the rehabilitation of landscape features significant to the fighting and the battle's outcome as well as the commemorative period. Such a rehabilitation program theoretically would allow visitors to understand "not only the major landscape patterns that affected the movements of the armies and the tactical decisions of its leaders, but also the details of terrain, obstacles, cover and other features that affected individuals and soldiers within the Major Battle Action Resource Area."¹³ To accomplish this mission, park planners assigned "management prescriptions" to reclaim these significant features. As discussed, woods had grown considerably since 1863. In order to reestablish their historic appearance, the NPS recommended the removal of 576 acres of forest, and for 39.1 miles of missing fencing to be replaced. Originally built by area farmers, these pre-

¹² *Draft, GMP*, 43.

¹³ *GMP*, vol. 1, 124.

1863 fences often served as an obstacle or avenue of approach for the two opposing armies. The plan finally recommended that 160 acres of orchards be replanted and 65 acres of thickets be trimmed to their historic height. Nineteenth century buildings that could be adequately documented to their 1863 appearance were to be rehabilitated.

Plans for the Soldiers' National Cemetery could also be found in the *Draft GMP*. Planners recommended the rehabilitation of features significant to William Saunder's original design, many of which the National Park Service had removed during the 1930s. Park planners sought to restore the historic pipe-rail fencing that had separated the Soldiers' National Cemetery from the adjacent Evergreen Cemetery. Alternative C in the *General Management Plan* sought to rehabilitation the cemetery grade and Civil War headstones to their original level.¹⁴

Yet at times, the park planners articulated contradictory landscape preservation philosophies. Latschar, Darden, and park historians went to great lengths to present a historically accurate battlefield, for example, down to the exact type of fence or specific acreage of peach trees, yet they failed to provide a treatment policy for modern intrusions. The most evident example of that failure was the retention of many of the horse trails. Nearly fifteen miles of occasionally used unimproved horse paths crossed the battlefield. Many intruded on key battle ground, such as the trails that directly crossed the fields of Pickett's Charge or the slopes of Big Round Top. Park planners acknowledged that the trails caused serious erosion problems, often exposing bedrock and creating "large ruts" that were several feet deep. Rainfall exacerbated the condition. Moreover, when riders found the eroded, muddy trails unsafe for

¹⁴ *Draft, GMP*, 43; 122-138. As discussed in chapter 2, these changes were made during the early years of the NPS administration, mainly through the labor of Civilian Conservation Corps workers. As discussed between 1933 and 1935 CCC workers reset the Civil War headstones to a level that was flush with the ground for mowing convenience.

their mounts, they often blazed their own, new trails. While park planners acknowledged the problem in the *GMP*, they failed to provide a solution to the irreparable damage created by the trails, other than recommending that riding be relocated to historic lanes. Indeed, in an effort to balance recreation usage with preservation of the battlefield, Latschar chose to retain, and eventually even expand, the park's bridle trails. Horse enthusiasts themselves Latschar and family regularly enjoyed riding through the battlefield.¹⁵

Meanwhile, critics continued to attack the process through which the agency had quickly pursued its management goals. Although park staff facilitated dozens of meetings, several comments reflected a belief that the park's public involvement was a sham, and the agency had no intentions of deviating from a predetermined management prescription that would be implemented without oversight. Gettysburg Mayor William Troxell, also a Licensed Battlefield Guide, commended the park for holding a series of public meetings, but added that, "the proof in the pudding lies not in the number of hearings, but in whether the NPS takes into account the opinions voiced by the public." Others requested an extension of the sixty-day comment period. Joyce Jackson, President of GARMA, declared, "We are not superhuman. It is unreasonable to expect us to digest this in a mere sixty days." Citing concerns from his constituents, Pennsylvania Senator Arlen Specter requested that the agency extend the public comment period to 120 days. Several area businesses and organizations, including the Gettysburg Borough Council, as well as private citizens, also requested additional time to review the *Draft GMP*. The NPS rejected their pleas, however, maintaining that the agency had publically discussed the proposal for three years, and would not extend the sixty-day comment period. The Park Service

¹⁵ *GMP*, vol. 1, 205-207.

added, “The ultimate responsibility for resource preservation and visitor use of a national park rests with the National Park Service.” Having “considered” all comments and suggestions, the NPS maintained that “the final responsibility for making long-term decisions that are in the best interests of a national park’s resources and the American public lies with the NPS.”¹⁶

Other comments focused on three issues: the public-private partnership, the amount of commercialization in the new visitor center, and the rehabilitation of the battlefield landscape. Despite the fact that the Foundation had made considerable revisions on the museum facility, many Americans still expressed concern over the commercialism of the nation’s “sacred ground.” Again, some commentators also resorted to malicious attacks on Latschar. Other letters criticized the park’s intent to expand its interpretive programming to emphasize the contentious, and often emotional, issue of slavery and causes of the Civil War.

Even within the National Park Service there were skeptics. Former Superintendent Daniel Kuehn, for example, argued that the proposed partnership was “not in the best interest of the American people” and would be an unfortunate model for future NPS management. After reviewing the *Draft GMP*, he maintained the partnership was “one more step down the road to privatization of the parks.” Fearful of the long-term implications of a partnership, which he believed would place the NPS in a secondary role in the management of the park, Kuehn concluded, “This plan was devised by minds that were without concern for the long-term implications for the Service.” Others expressed frustration that the federal government would

¹⁶ William Troxell to Senator Rick Santorum, August 21, 1998; Joyce Jackson to Superintendent John Latschar, September 18, 1998; Senator Arlen Specter to Secretary Bruce Babbitt, August 3, 1998. Folder Congressional Correspondence, Box 6, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives; Donald Barry, Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, to Senator Arlen Specter, September 3, 1998 in *GMP*, vol. 2, 17-18; NPS Response to Gettysburg Borough Members, October 14, 1998 in *GMP*, vol. 2, 37.

not appropriate the necessary funding for a new museum. “It is ridiculous to say that the greatest country in the world can’t afford to do what is needed in the most hallowed of ground,” wrote Philip Stewart of Middletown, Virginia, “It is like privatizing the Arlington National Cemetery, privatizing the U.S. Navy, Army, and Marine Corps.” A Columbia, South Carolina resident offered a similar sentiment, “We spend zillions to support a Bosnian peace, yet we won’t put up a few lousy dollars to adequately fund this National Treasure.”¹⁷

Comments relating to excessive commercialism came primarily from local residents, primarily business owners, who feared that if the park offered comparable shopping and dining venues, visitor spending at their establishments would decline. The Gettysburg Borough undeniably thrived on tourist spending; over 110 small businesses could be found within two-fifths of a mile from the park visitor center. In the eyes of the area’s retail merchants, the new museum would create a monopoly on shopping and dining opportunities. At an April 15, 1998 Advisory Commission meeting, Eric Uberman maintained that, “simply put, commercialization within the Park is cannibalization of the business community by duplicating existing services.” To lend credibility to his argument, Uberman reminded listeners of the park’s previous management mistakes, claiming that the NPS had already “railroad cut” and “towered” Gettysburg. He now encouraged listeners to oppose the *GMP* to prevent the NPS from “mall[ing]” the battlefield.” In a letter to Director Stanton, meanwhile, President of the Gettysburg Area Retail Merchant Association, Joyce Jackson, declared, “The economic ramifications of this

¹⁷ Daniel Kuehn to Superintendent John Latschar, September 20, 1998 in *GMP*, vol. 2, 459-462; Philip Stewart, “GMP Survey Response Form.” Folder Public Comments During Scoping, Response to Newsletter 4, Box 5, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives; Bart Fordham to Superintendent John Latschar, February 9, 1998. Folder Public Comments During Scoping, General Comments, March 1998, Box 5, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives. His comment refers to a peacekeeping mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina undertaken by the United Nations, with considerable assistance from the United States, beginning in the mid-1990s and lasting through the early twentieth-first century.

proposal could be devastating to the local businesses in the Borough of Gettysburg, and ultimately to the Borough of Gettysburg itself.” Admitting the battlefield needed improved facilities, the Gettysburg Convention and Visitor Bureau went on record as opposing the plan because of its commercial components.¹⁸

Some residents did condemn local merchants for hastily opposing the plan simply to protect their self-interests. “I abhor the fact that anything new presented to the greedy businessmen of Gettysburg is immediately disfavored,” one resident stated. During a public meeting, Larry Defuge of Dillsburg, Pennsylvania, expressed his frustrations with the intense local opposition. “These are *national* parks,” Defuge emphasized, “not local parks. They belong to all of us, not just the local residents.” Latschar’s response to these concerns added fuel to the fire. “There’s nothing in our mission statement that says we’re supposed to look out for businesses surrounding the park,” he declared. Republican Congressman James Hansen of Utah later declared Latschar’s statement as “arrogant and self-serving” and “callous and contemptible.”¹⁹

Local business interests aside, others argued that establishing commercial venues at Gettysburg, a site where thousands of men died in battle, was simply not “fitting or proper.”

¹⁸ Holly Giles to John Eline, October 13, 1998. *GMP*, vol. 2, 41; “Statement of Eric Uberman Before the Gettysburg Military Park Advisory Commission,” April 15, 1998; Joyce Jackson, President of the Gettysburg Area Retail Merchant Association, to Director Robert Stanton, June 2, 1998. Folder Public Meetings, May 1997-August 1998, Box 4, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives; Paul Witt, President, Gettysburg Convention and Visitor’s Bureau, to Superintendent John Latschar, June 12, 1998. Folder Comments, Survey Gettysburg Visitors Bureau, Box 5, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives.

¹⁹ Comment on a Gettysburg Visitors Bureau Survey, unidentified author. Folder Comments, Survey Gettysburg Visitors Bureau, Box 5, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives; Larry Defuge, Comment, *GMP* Meeting. Folder Comments Received on Draft, Box 6, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives; James Hansen to NPS Director Robert Stanton, May 7, 1999. Folder “House Hearing,” Box 6, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives. Defuge’s comment continued, “Perhaps you should be thinking of ways to continue to make the locale a little more visitor friendly.”

They believed it would worsen an already bad situation. “Commercialization dominates this battlefield now and allowing more is a disgrace to the veterans buried there,” wrote E.M. Allison of Saratoga Springs, New York. James Brade from Dubuque, Iowa commented, “The importance of Gettysburg should not be defined by how many people visit a gift shop, or how much money can be generated from such facilities. The battlefield speaks for itself and should be appreciated simply.” Randy Harper, President of the McGorrisk Group, that had submitted a *RFP* that was not selected, reminded Americans that a new museum could be constructed without increasing commercial venues. In a letter published in the May 1998 issue of *Civil War News*, Harper declared, “No commercial development of any kind is necessary within the immediate environs of the battlefield. We showed the NPS how this could be done.”²⁰

While the partnership and commercial venues drove much of the public comments on the *Draft GMP*, other critics focused on the proposed landscape rehabilitation. As with the white-tailed deer program, the Park Service’s plans to remove 576 acres of trees seemed contradictory to an agency chartered to preserve natural and historic sites. Using emotionally charged rhetoric, some letters simply defined the proposal to cut woodlots as a “rape” of the battlefield. In a letter to the editor of the *Hanover Sun*, for example, Gene Albright declared, “If allowed to destroy these trees, hindsight will require other superintendents who follow him more than a century to correct.” Others ironically believed that most visitors would not appreciate a landscape

²⁰ James Brade, “Gettysburg Project Response Form”; Randy Harper, “Gettysburg Project Response Form.” Folder Comments, *Civil War News*, May Issue, 1998, Box 5, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives. As noted, however, the McGorrisk proposal required an admission fee to the visitor center and museum.

rehabilitation program because the average tourist does not “give a hoot about whether the trees were there in 1863.” Arendtsville residents Elaine and Bill Jones maintained that, “Even if cutting down the trees gave a better view of the civil war battle tactics, is this more important than protecting the ecosystems of the birds and wildlife that rely on these woodlands?” They continued, “Saying that visitors cannot understand and interpret the Civil War battle without removing the trees that have grown since then, is like saying that visitors to Japan cannot appreciate the devastation of Hiroshima without keeping the city like it was at the end of World War II.” Other extreme arguments declared if the Park Service was serious on its intent of returning the landscape to the 1863 condition, the agency should also remove all the post-battle structures, including the monuments and park avenues.²¹

A significant portion of this resistance came from within the Gettysburg community, adjacent townships and from former residents. At a February 15, 2001 Advisory Commission meeting, concerned citizens presented a petition of approximately 1,400 signatures declaring their opposition. Todd Jones, a professor of philosophy at the University of Nevada, argued that the rehabilitation program would only offer visitors a “marginally different” understanding of the battle. To Jones, Gettysburg was not simply a battlefield, but also his hometown, a place of childhood experiences and personal memories. “The forests of the battlefield are covered with private monuments from our personal histories,” expressed Jones, “places where we lost teeth in

²¹ Aurelia S. Lutton to Bruce Babbitt, Secretary of the Interior, May 17, 1999. Folder 16, Box 25, D18, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives; Gene Albright, Letter to the Editor, *Hanover Sun*, September 27, 1998. Folder Congressional Correspondence Related to *Final GMP*, Box 6, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives; C.K. Roulette comment, “Transcript of Proceedings of Public Hearings,” October 3, 1998. Folder Public Meetings, Hearings, Box 6, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives; Elaine and Bill Jones to Superintendent John Latschar, September 25, 1998; William Wilkinson to Congressman William Goodling, October 9, 1998. Folder Congressional Correspondence Related to *Final GMP*, Box 6, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives.

snowball fights... a place where we experienced first kisses with our sweethearts.” Declaring Gettysburg to be his “home” and more than a Civil War battlefield, Jones declared if the park’s *GMP* was approved, “autobiographical histories of the people of Gettysburg would be bulldozed and destroyed forever.”²²

Critics of the landscape work generally received the most media coverage, but the park received more enthusiastic letters of support for the rehabilitation program. “I applaud the Park Service’s goal of restoring this landscape closer to its 1863 appearance,” wrote Thomas Connell of Reston, Virginia. Another Virginia resident reminded critics of the Park Service’s mission in preserving the battlefield: “The National Military Park is not a wildlife refuge. It was not established to protect squirrels or birds or deer or wetlands. The National Military Park is not an arboretum... The National Military Park is a battlefield. The battlefield is the most important artifact of the battle we have, and it is the Park Service’s mission to preserve and protect this artifact.”²³ In the hierarchy of public concern most Americans focused their opposition on the partnership, which allowed the NPS to proceed with the rehabilitation with relatively minimal resistance.

Issues aside, some detractors simply used the Kinsley proposal and *Draft GMP* as an opportunity to directly, and often vehemently, attack the National Park Service. Often these comments reflected a distrust of the agency and its ability to properly manage the crown jewel of

²² Petition to Oppose the Removal of 576-acres of trees. Presented to the Advisory Commission, February 15, 2001. Folder 15, Box 25, D18, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives; Todd Jones to Superintendent John Latschar, undated. Folder Congressional Correspondence Related to *Final GMP*, Box 6, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives.

²³ Thomas Connell to Bruce Babbitt, Secretary of the Interior, undated. Folder 17, Box 25, D18, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives; Dennis Matthews, Public Comment, “Transcript of Proceedings of Public Hearings,” October 3, 1998. Folder Public Meetings, Box 6, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives, 16-19.

Civil War sites. Frederich and Anne Hott of Waymart, Pennsylvania offered, “I do not trust John Latschar or the National Park Service. To them it is only a job nothing to do with history.” One local resident declared that park employees “have very poor judgment and no common sense. They cannot do anything right.” Many referenced the land exchange debacle with the Gettysburg College as an example of poor leadership. One Arkansas resident wrote, “You’ve already screwed us with your shady little deal on the railroad cut.”²⁴

Such comments in particular often devolved into personal attacks on Latschar, who soon became the most embroiled, controversial individual at Gettysburg since General James Longstreet. “No doubt Latschar will truly turn this town upside down and then,” wrote an anonymous commentator, “as most flunky government bureaucrats do, as he has done before, move on to screw someone else.” Lloyd Devo of New York charged that Latschar was a “moral cripple.” In reference to Latschar’s previous superintendent post at Steamtown, an Indiana resident wrote him that, “You might know your trains, but you know nothing of this hallowed ground that you are responsible for...you are full of more crap than a Christmas turkey!” Richard Burmeister from Connecticut noted, “Superintendent Latschar clearly does not understand or appreciate the significance of Gettysburg and has not in my opinion made any effort to obtain the funding from the government. Under his direction we will wind up renaming the site McGettysburg.” In a misinformed personal attack, Indiana resident Larry Williams wrote Latschar, “Obviously you have never served your country in the military or you would know the importance of that ground and the men who died here.” Williams continued, “Perhaps

²⁴ Frederich and Anne Hott, “Gettysburg Project Response Form”; Aaron Howell, “Gettysburg Project Response Form”; James Reaver, “Gettysburg Project Response Form.” Folder Comments, *Civil War News*, May Issue, 1998, Box 5, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives.

you would better serve the park service and the honor of the military if you were to go back to choo-choo trains in Scranton. Obvious, too, is that you must be a Yankee!”²⁵

The “High Water Mark” of the slanderous attacks against Latschar came on October 1, 1998, at a public meeting to discuss the *General Management Plan*. In front of approximately one hundred people, Robert Monahan, who had initially proposed the partnership concept in 1995 and subsequently submitted a rejected proposal bluntly called for the removal of the superintendent. “I believe that the Superintendent here has not discharged his duties responsibility. I think this administration has lied, misrepresented, and misinformed the American public and the people of this community, and I think that the Superintendent for the National Military Park at Gettysburg should be removed.”²⁶

Latschar did receive letters of personal support as well. In a letter to NPS Director Stanton, Gettysburg College Civil War historian Gabor Boritt sought to “congratulate the Park Service for bringing a trained historian with vision and courage, John Latschar, to head Gettysburg National Military Park.” Margaret Blough, a local Harrisburg resident, expressed similar appreciation of the new superintendent, “With Dr. Latschar,” she wrote, “the Gettysburg National Military Park at last has a superintendent who is both a highly competent administrator and a trained historian who truly appreciates the Gettysburg National Military Park.” When

²⁵ Comment on a Gettysburg Visitors Bureau Survey, unidentified author. Folder Comments, Survey Gettysburg Visitors Bureau, Box 5, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives; Lloyd Devo, “GMP Survey Response Form.” Folder Public Comments During Scoping, Response to Newsletter 4, Box 5, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives; Larry Williams to Superintendent John Latschar, January 25, 1998; Larry Williams to Superintendent John Latschar, April 28, 1998. Folder Public Comments During Scoping, General Comments, January 1998, Box 5, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives; Richard Burmeister, “Gettysburg Project Response Form.” Folder Comments, *Civil War News*, May Issue, 1998, Box 5, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives.

²⁶ Robert Monahan, “Transcript of Proceedings of Public Hearing,” October 1, 1998. Folder Public Meetings, Hearings, Box 6, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives, 57.

considering approval of the *GMP* overall, the vast majority of public comments supported the park's management objectives. During the two-year period of public review between 1997 and 1998, approximately 75 percent of the comments that the park received approved the plan.²⁷

Latschar commented that if public support for the *GMP* could be compared to an election, the results would have been described as a mandate or landslide.

Public comments on the *General Management Plan* also underscored the meaning of the battlefield to Americans. Commentators regularly used emotionally charged, and often religious, rhetoric. Some writers classified the battlefield as "sacred" or termed it a "shrine." Christine Riker, of California, offered a typical expression, "It is a shrine, a holy place." Illinois resident, Nathaniel Reed, referred Gettysburg as "America's most hallowed ground," while Richard Rogers of New York stated the battlefield was "sacred ground." A San Diego resident declared that Gettysburg is "the most significant place in American history." In an especially emotional letter, Anne Masak of Augusta, Georgia, informed Superintendent Latschar, "I am writing this letter to you from my heart. To me, Gettysburg ranks up in the top five items that I treasure the most: God, My Husband, My Family & Friends, My Church, and Gettysburg." Writers usually used such rhetoric to appeal to management to keep the battlefield in its current condition.²⁸

²⁷ Gabor Boritt to Director Robert Stanton, December 10, 1998 in *GMP*, vol. 2, 228-229; Margaret Blough to Senator Murkowski, March 1, 1998. Folder Public Meetings, Constituent Comment, Box 6, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives, 57; Superintendent John Latschar, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 1999," 1. The park recorded over 500 comments during the sixty-day public review period for the *Draft GMP*. The park reported over 75 percent of the comments supported the plan and noted that 85 percent of the comments from within the Civil War community expressed approval. On a more local level, the park reported that roughly half of the writers from south-central Pennsylvania supported the proposal, while half opposed it.

²⁸ Christine Riker to Superintendent John Latschar, January 18, 1998; Nathaniel Reed to Superintendent John Latschar, January 27, 1998. Folder Public Comments During Scoping, General Comments, January 1998, Box 5, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives; Richard Rogers to Superintendent John Latschar, February 5, 1998. Folder Public Comments During Scoping, General Comments, February 1998, Box 5, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives; Rudolph Kosits to Superintendent John Latschar, March 25, 1998. Folder Public Comments

The Park Service's proposal to expand its interpretation unfurled another barrage of controversy. Visitors to the park museum found thousands of artifacts displayed in glass cases, described as by noted historian Eric Foner as a "hodge-podge," that provided minimal explanation of the Battle of Gettysburg and more importantly even less of the American Civil War. Many Americans in contrast believed that the Park Service should strictly interpret the three-day battle. In their opinion, the battlefield should be a place to discuss tactics, strategies, soldiers, and commanders, not slavery, secession, the home front, or Reconstruction. The issue came to a head as a result of the 1990 boundary legislation, when Congress mandated that the Secretary of the Interior "take such action as is necessary and appropriate to interpret...the Battle of Gettysburg in the larger context of the Civil War and American History, including the causes and consequences of the Civil War and including the effects of the war on all the American people."²⁹ Gettysburg's attempt to fulfill this mandate fueled public outrage, especially from Americans who had formed their own definitive opinion of the causes of the American Civil War, or somehow felt that a discussion of slavery dishonored their heritage.

The issue of interpretation exploded as a result of the park's fourth annual seminar, held in March 1995. In a speech entitled, "Gettysburg: The Next 100 Years," Latschar offered a

During Scoping, General Comments, March 1998, Box 5, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives; Anne Masak to Superintendent John Latschar, February 20, 1998. Folder Public Comments During Scoping, General Comments, February 1998, Box 5, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives.

²⁹ *Draft Development Concept Plan, Environmental Assessment: Collections Storage, Visitor and Museum Facilities*, April 1996 (Gettysburg: Gettysburg National Military Park, April 1995), 6 [hereinafter cited as *Draft DCP, Collections Storage*, 1996].

projection of the battlefield over the course of the next century. During his presentation, Latschar suggested that Gettysburg must make a more concerted effort to appeal to a larger contingency of the American public. Admitting bluntly that Civil War enthusiasts were mostly white males, he recommended that for the park to “survive,” the trend of attracting primarily white men “must be reversed.” The park superintendent went on to state that the interpretation at Gettysburg had “utterly failed” to appeal to African Americans, much less the nation’s Hispanic population, who would quickly become the country’s largest minority group. In the current interpretive efforts to honor Union and Confederate soldiers, park staff admitted they “have bent over backwards to avoid any notion of fixing blame for the war.” Latschar then suggested that this narrow interpretation catered exclusively to America’s white male population, at the exclusion of women, blacks, and other minority groups.³⁰

In the weeks and months after Latschar’s presentation, artillery shells of criticism from across the nation befell the park superintendent. Thousands read his speech when it was reprinted in the July 1995 issue of the *Civil War News*. Some interpreted Latschar’s comments as a direct assault against southern heritage and a distortion of the Confederate cause. Letters poured into both the national and park office from individuals determined to express their view point on the real reasons for southern secession and civil war. On letterhead adorned with Confederate battle flags, Scott Williams of Missouri, for example, informed Secretary Babbitt that slavery had relatively little to do with the “Second American Revolution.” Outraged by Latschar’s comments, Williams further advised the Secretary that, “it is time to find another

³⁰ Superintendent John Latschar, “Gettysburg: The Next 100 Years,” presented at the 4th Annual Gettysburg Seminar, March 4, 1995. This speech is reproduced in the park’s seminar proceedings, *The Fourth Annual Gettysburg Seminar, Gettysburg 1895-1995: The Making of an American Shrine* (Gettysburg: Eastern National, 1995), 112-123.

superintendent or send Mr. Latschar to the Antarctic National Park where he can do no damage, I hope.” The Sons of Confederate Veterans’ Heritage Committee, based in Columbia, Tennessee, embarked on a vigorous campaign to express their displeasure with the Gettysburg superintendent. SCV members sent hundreds of prepared comment cards to Babbitt, which claimed Latschar had “modified” and “altered” historical events in order to make them “more palatable to a greater number of park visitors.” Each card insisted the superintendent to “discontinue the policy presenting an altered version of history in attempts at stimulating greater attendance and greater revenue for the park service.” G. Elliott Cummings, Commander of the Maryland Division, Sons of Confederate Veterans, demand that Latschar “publicly repudiate” his “anti-Confederate remarks” and requested the NPS stop its “continual attacks on the history and heritage” of the Confederacy.³¹

In response to the claims that he intentionally dishonored Confederate heritage, Latschar maintained that he did not intend to offend anyone, but merely wanted to open a discussion on ways the NPS could improve its interpretation. Yet the park continued to receive letters in opposition to an “altered” and “modified” version of history. Some letters expressed a mainstream understanding of the Civil War, but more often reflected a vehement pro-Confederate attitude. David Ensor of Alcoa, Tennessee asked, “How could slavery be the main cause of the war if the U.S. Government supported it? President Lincoln freed the slaves on September 22, 1862 and it went into effect on January 1, 1863. The war started in 1861. Was

³¹ Scott Williams to Secretary of Interior Bruce Babbitt, undated; Sons of Confederate Veterans’ Heritage Committee Comment Card, to Secretary of Interior Bruce Babbitt. Folder 6, Box 5, A36, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives; G. Elliott Cummings, Commander, Maryland Division, Sons of Confederate Veterans, to Alan Hoeweler, President, FNPG, September 28, 1995. Folder 5, Box 5, A36, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives. Each card had a prepared, typed statement, and the individuals signed their name and address.

slavery then a main cause of the war? According to the action the U.S. Government took, the answer is no.”³²

While the overwhelming majority of opposition to the park’s expanded interpretation came from the general public, academic and professional historians generally and enthusiastically, supported the change. In the fall of 1998, on behalf of the Organization of American Historians (OAH), three leading Civil War historians-- James McPherson, Eric Foner, and Nina Silber-- announced their support for the *Draft GMP* and the new museum after a two-day site review. They recommended a more comprehensive interpretive museum. "Without slighting tactics, strategy, and movement of regiments or the courage of soldiers on either side," wrote Foner, "the museum ought to place the battle of Gettysburg in context - or rather in a series of contexts, military, political, and social." James McPherson, author of Pulitzer Prize winning *Battle Cry of Freedom*, then the standard history of the war, offered the same conclusions that Latschar had expressed at the park’s seminar, and recommended the park make a greater effort to make Gettysburg relevant to women and minorities.³³

At the core of the debate was the simple fact that interpretation at Gettysburg was essentially pro-Confederate. The “High Water Mark” theory clearly emphasized the Confederate perspective of the battle. It had originated at the 1913 and 1938 reunions when the Gettysburg

³² Superintendent John Latschar to Andy Sterlen, undated. Folder 6, Box 5, A36, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives; David Ensor, FNPG Mailing Survey. Folder FNPG Comments, Box 5, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives. The FNPG mailed out a survey to approximately 60,000 (Friends’ members and non members) to gain feedback on their views of the new museum and *GMP*.

³³ NPS Press Release, “Leading Historians Pledge Support for Gettysburg Plan,” September 29, 1998. This press release is available at: <http://www.nps.gov/archive/gett/gettplan/gmp99archive/press1098.htm>; Eric Foner, “Gettysburg National Military Park Evaluation”; James McPherson, “Gettysburg National Military Park Evaluation”; Nina Silber, “Report for the Organization of American Historians (OAH) and the National Park Service (NPS) on Gettysburg National Military Park,” August 1998. Possession of the author, Auburn, Alabama [All notes herein after cited as “OAH Evaluation, 1998”].

battlefield became a site of symbolic Reconciliation and continued into the late twentieth century. The Park Service's main interpretive presentation, the Gettysburg Cyclorama, likewise heralded the cause of the Confederate soldiers on July 3, while providing scant attention to the men of the Army of the Potomac defending Cemetery Ridge. On the battlefield, park interpretive media, including the audio stations and wayside exhibits, also emphasized the valor of the Confederates and stressed the symbolic significance of Lee's defeat at the Confederate "High Tide." Foner, McPherson, and Silber thus recommended that the Park Service shift its interpretive emphasis from the "High Water Mark" to "A New Birth of Freedom." This theme would provide visitors a better understanding how the Battle of Gettysburg and the American Civil War brought forth a "new birth of freedom" for millions of Americans and would also appeal to a wider audience.³⁴

The OAH team's recommendations reflected the current prevailing trends of academic Civil War scholarship. By the late 1990s, as academic historians ushered in the "new military history," the NPS began concerted efforts to expand its interpretation at all of their Civil War battlefields through the "Holding the High Ground" meeting in 1998, the "Rally on the High Ground" seminar in 2000, and revised interpretation directives in the 2000 Appropriations Bill.

On August 24-27, 1998 Civil War battlefield superintendents convened a conference in Nashville, "Holding the High Ground," to discuss the "ever-increasing threats to battlefield landscapes." The superintendents explored four mutual problems: roads, adjacent land use, interpretation, and managing and interpreting layers of resources. They characterized existing NPS interpretation to be "biased racially and socio-economically," and established a guiding

³⁴ "OAH Evaluation, 1998."

principle which declared, “Battlefield interpretation must establish the site’s particular place in the continuum of war, illuminate the social, economic, and cultural issues that caused or were affected by the war, illustrate the breadth of human experience during the period, and establish the relevance of the war to people today.” At the conference’s conclusion, the superintendents agreed that future action would include close cooperation with the Organization of American Historians to integrate the latest scholarship into parks’ interpretive programs and media.³⁵

Meanwhile, Congressman Jesse Jackson, Jr., of Illinois, led a congressional effort to encourage the Park Service to broaden its interpretive goals. He asserted that Civil War battlefields were “often not placed in the proper historical context.” At Vicksburg, Congressman Jackson maintained that the site’s interpretation overemphasized the military tactics of left and right obliques. He quipped that if “the history of Vicksburg is about obliques, maybe Congress should pass another bill eliminating the National Park Service Civil War battlefields and just turn them over to the Army.” Consequently, Congress in 2000 directed the Secretary of Interior to “encourage Civil War battle sites to recognize and include in all of their public displays and multi-media educational presentations the unique role that the institution of slavery played in causing the Civil War and its role, if any, at the individual battle sites.”³⁶

³⁵ “Holding the High Ground: Principles and Strategies for Managing and Interpreting Civil War Battlefield Landscapes,” Proceedings of a Conference of Battlefield Managers, Nashville, Tennessee, August 24-27, 1998, 1-14. Superintendent’s personal files, draft summary in possession of the author, Auburn, Alabama.

³⁶ Jesse Jackson Jr., “A More Perfect Union,” in *Rally On The High Ground: The National Park Service Symposium on the Civil War*, edited by Robert K. Sutton (Fort Washington, PA: Eastern National, 2001), v-vii; 1-10; “Department of the Interior FY 2000 Appropriations: Joint Explanatory Statement of the Committee of the Conference,” Title I, U.S Congress 1999, 96; Jackson had visited GNMP in 1993. Sutton worked as the Superintendent of the Manassas National Battlefield Park. The full text of this appropriation reads: “The managers recognize that Civil War battlefields throughout the country hold great significance and provide vital historic educational opportunities for millions of Americans. The managers are concerned, however, about the isolated existence of these Civil War battle sites in that they are often not placed in the proper historical context. The Service does an outstanding job of documenting and describing the particular battle at any given site, but in the

As an immediate result the National Park Service sponsored the “Rally on the High Ground” seminar at the Ford’s Theatre on May 8 and 9, 2000 to facilitate a discussion on how the agency could best expand its interpretation at Civil War sites. Invited speakers at the seminar included Jackson, as well as historians Ira Berlin, James McPherson, David Blight, Edward Linenthal, James Horton, and Drew Gilpin Faust. Robert Sutton, Superintendent of Manassas National Battlefield Park, concluded that “people should expect to visit and Civil War battlefield and come away with an understanding of not only who shot whom, how, and where, but why they were shooting at one another in the first place.” The “Rally on the High Ground” seminar was an enormous success and gained national attention because with the coverage by C-SPAN and other national media outlets. The seminar also opened a discussion between Park Service managers, park interpreters, Civil War academics, and the general public. Superintendent Sutton envisioned the discussions as “a new paradigm for interpreting our Civil War battlefields.”³⁷

Using this “new paradigm” of interpretation, Gettysburg initiated plans to develop its museum. Eight prominent Civil War historians agreed to help the park and to serve on the newly created “Gettysburg Museum Advisory Commission.” Superintendent Latschar explained the academic advisors were to help the Park Service “create the most compelling, inspirational, and accurate museum experience that is possible, and to help us avoid “Enola Gay” type situations.”

public displays and multi-media presentations, it does not always do a similarly good job of documenting and describing the historical social, economic, legal, cultural and political forces and events that originally led to the larger war which eventually manifested themselves in specific battles. In particular, the Civil War battlefields are often weak or missing vital information about the role that the institution of slavery played in causing the American Civil War. The managers direct the Secretary of the Interior to encourage Civil War battle sites to recognize and include in all of their public displays and multi-media educational presentations the unique role that the institution of slavery played in causing the Civil War and its role, if any, at the individual battle sites. The managers further direct the Secretary to prepare a report by January 15, 2000, on the status of the educational information currently included at Civil War sites that are consistent with and reflect this concern.”

³⁷ Sutton, *Rally On The High Ground*, xvi.

Heritage groups and scores of private citizens, on the other hand, were outraged. The Sons of Confederate Veterans and HERITAGEPAC, led by preservationist Jerry Russell of Arkansas, expressed their displeasure with the Park Service's new interpretive agenda. Russell declared the new interpretive focus to be a "cosmic threat to all battlefields in this country."³⁸

With the new museum in the future, park staff still worked to expand their present interpretation to discuss non-battle topics, including slavery, African Americans, women, and the home front. In 1999 the park sponsored its first "Summer Scholar" program, designed to forge a better connection between academic historians, the NPS, and the general public, the summer scholar presented a series of lectures exploring several topics, which were not directly related to the Battle of Gettysburg. Peter Carmichael, of the University of North Carolina at Greensboro and a former NPS seasonal, became the first recipient. Befitting to the hullabaloo over the shift in interpretation he presented a lecture on "What Caused the Civil War?" The Park Service

³⁸ Superintendent John Latschar to James McPherson, February 28, 2000. Folder 12, Box 21, A82, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives; Memo, undated. Folder Holt, Box 16, A7221, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives; Dwight T. Pitcaithley, "'A Cosmic Threat': The National Park Service Addresses the Causes of the American Civil War," in *Slavery and Public History: The Tough Stuff of American Memory*, ed. James Oliver Horton and Lois E. Horton, (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 2006), 169-186. This commission consisted of eight renowned Civil War historians: James McPherson, Princeton University; Eric Foner, Columbia University; Gary Gallagher, University of Virginia; Nina Silber, Boston University; Gabor Boritt, Gettysburg College; Dwight Pitcaithley, Chief Historian National Park Service; Robin Reed, Museum of the Confederacy; Olivia Mahoney, Chicago Historical Society. The Museum Advisory Commission held its first meeting on July 27, 2000. The committee was carefully selected to provide for a broad knowledge of the Civil War era. For example, Eric Foner offered suggestions on Reconstruction; Nina Silber assisted with the homefront/civilian section; and Gabor Boritt focused on President Lincoln. The *Enola Gay* was the name of the B-29 Superfortress, piloted by Paul Tibbets that dropped the atomic bomb on Hiroshima, Japan on August 6, 1945. Fifty years later, the *Enola Gay* became part of a political controversy when the Smithsonian's Air and Space Museum wanted to display part of its fuselage for an exhibit commemorating the anniversary of the end of World War II. Some veterans' organizations criticized the "political correctness" of the exhibit, maintaining the display overemphasized the consequences of dropping the bomb, rather than the military necessity of using an atomic weapon in order to prevent a potential land invasion of Japan. As a result of the political turmoil, the Smithsonian decided to cancel the exhibit. For additional reading on this controversy see, Edward Linenthal and Tom Engelhardt, *History Wars: The Enola Gay and Other Battles for the American Past* (New York: Metropolitan Books, 1996).

sponsored its first annual Women's History Symposium in March 2000, and invited George Rable of the University of Alabama to be one of its key speakers.³⁹

If the museum center with its expanded interpretation and the battlefield restoration did not generate enough divisiveness with Gettysburg residents and the Civil War community, the National Park Service's intentions to remove the cyclorama building generated more opposition. The cyclorama building had been continually plagued by constructional problems since its opening in 1962, but the park's announcement to demolish the building created a storm of disagreement, this time from architects. They argued that the cyclorama building, built by renowned Richard Neutra, was historically significant in of itself and should not be demolished.

When the National Park Service began planning for the *DCP* and eventually the *GMP*, park staff produced a series of Section 106 Compliance reports and conducted a study to determine if the building met requirements to be listed on the National Register of Historic Places. In December 1995, park historian Kathy Harrison and park architect Richard Segars prepared a determination of eligibility for the building's inclusion into the National Register. Their study concluded that the cyclorama center failed to meet the criteria to be placed on the National Register and therefore was not eligible. The Pennsylvania Historical Museum Commission concurred. Commissioner Brent Glass remarked that locating the building in the

³⁹ NPS Press Release, "Summer Scholar Presentation," July 21, 1999. Folder Press Release, October 1998-April 1999, Box 52, K3415, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives; "Women's History Symposium Booklet," March 10-12, 2000. Folder Special Events, October 1999-May 2000, Box 21, A82, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives.

heart of Zielger's Grove "was ill conceived and unfortunate," and created an "intrusion in the battlefield historic district and a source of confusion in its administrative function." In February 1998, however, the Society of Architectural Historians appealed the decision to Cathy Shull, the Keeper of the National Register of Historic Places. In September 1998, she reversed the park's findings and declared that because of its "exceptional historic and architectural significance" the cyclorama building was eligible for nomination after all.⁴⁰

While eligible, however, the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) does not require every building on the list to be preserved. The National Park Service had to implement regulatory procedures of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) and "consider the effects" of its actions upon the historic property. Gettysburg began this process in December 1998 when it submitted a "case report" and compliance reports to SHPO and the ACHP to "consider the effects" of demolishing the cyclorama building.⁴¹

The ensuing battle over the fate of the cyclorama building represented an interesting twist in the struggle between preservationists and historians. Civil War historians classified the building as an intrusion on Ziegler's Grove and sought its removal. Architectural historians, on the other hand, argued the building was historically significant in its own right. As the battle lines played out, the Society of Architectural Historians (SAH), with assistance from Dion Neutra, Richard's son, led the opposition in opposing the plan to remove the building. Richard

⁴⁰ Carol Shull, Keeper of the National Register of Historic Places, to Associate Director, Cultural Resource Stewardship, May 12, 1998; Superintendent John Latschar to Carol Shull, March 25, 1998; Brent Glass, Pennsylvania Historical Museum Commission, to Carol Shull, Keeper of the National Register of Historic Places, June 29, 1998. Folder Cyclorama Center Consultation, Box 4, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives.

⁴¹ "Determination of Eligibility Notification," National Register of Historic Places, Cyclorama Building, Gettysburg National Military Park, by Cathy Shull, September 24, 1998 in *GMP*, vol. II 5-7. The NHPA can be viewed at: <http://www.achp.gov/NHPA.pdf>. Shull reversed the park's findings after the *Draft GMP* was released for public review.

Longstreth, President of the SAH, in a letter dated January 6, 1999, argued that the building “ranks as one of the most distinctive and important modernist works of its era in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania as well as one of the most distinguished examples of interpretation facilities erected by the Park Service.”⁴²

Various preservation agencies reviewed and evaluated the park’s compliance procedures. In January 1999, Eileen Woodford, Northeast Regional Director of the National Parks and Conservation Association (NPCA), offered that the agency fully concurred with the Park Service’s assessment. “Removal of the building is in the public’s best interest, as it will result in a decidedly beneficial impact to the park’s historic landscapes,” wrote Woodford.⁴³ Later that spring, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation held a public meeting in Gettysburg to consider the fate of the cyclorama building. On May 14, the agency announced its approval of the park’s *GMP* and the plans to demolish the cyclorama building. This report concluded, “Neutra has a secure place in the pantheon of American architectural history. There are other Neutra buildings; there is only one Gettysburg Battlefield...the Building must yield.” On July 28 the National Park Service signed two Programmatic Agreements with the Pennsylvania State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) to implement the *GMP*, which included the removal of the cyclorama building. As specified in the agreement, the NPS was only compelled to complete a full landscape treatment assessment for Ziegler’s Grove prior to removing the building. Once this assessment was completed, the

⁴² Richard Longstreth, President, Society of Architectural Historians, to Superintendent John Latschar, January 6, 1999. Folder Cyclorama Center Consultation, Comments on Draft, Box 4, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives.

⁴³ Eileen Woodford, Northeast Regional Director of the National Parks and Conservation Association, to Superintendent John Latschar, January 11, 1999. Folder Cyclorama Center Consultation, Comments on Draft, Box 4, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives.

cyclorama building could be removed. It seemed the fate of the cyclorama building was sealed, yet opponents did not surrender, and continued to fight the decision into the twenty-first century.⁴⁴

During 1999, “the year of politics” according to the Gettysburg staff, the Park Service moved toward finalizing negotiations with the Foundation and the release of the *Final General Management Plan*. On February 11, the U.S. House Subcommittee on National Parks held an oversight hearing on the *GMP* and partnership proposal. Senator James V. Hansen (Republican, Utah) chaired the subcommittee. A year earlier, the Senate subcommittee had examined Gettysburg’s intended policy, Hansen, however, believed that problems generated by the plan remained unresolved, and in fact might have worsened since the release of the *Draft GMP*. Not

⁴⁴ “Meeting Notes, Cyclorama Consultation,” April 20, 1999. Folder Cyclorama Consultation Meeting, Box 4, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives; Superintendent John Latschar, “Superintendent’s Annual Report, 1999,” undated. Folder 3, Box 3, A26, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), 2-4; “Draft Memorandum of Agreement,” National Park Service, the Pennsylvania State Historic Preservation Office, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, June 16, 1999. Folder Cyclorama, MOA Draft, Box 4, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives; Superintendent John Latschar, “Timeline.” Superintendent’s personal files, in author’s possession, Auburn, Alabama; “Holding the High Ground,” 1998, 1-14. The ACHP report, “A Problem of Common Ground,” explored the preservation problems of three historic objects in question- the cyclorama building, the Gettysburg Cyclorama painting, and the historic battlefield landscape. Though the expanded interpretation theme received the most attention from the “Holding the High Ground” superintendent’s conference in Nashville, park managers also discussed competing layers of resources. This conference outlined four priorities for managing cultural resources on Civil War battlefields. The highest priority was structures that existed as part of the wartime/historic landscape. The second priority of cultural resources were commemorative features placed by veterans and the third priority was nationally significant post-war structures on the historic landscape. Post-war facilities erected by the government were the lowest level of priority. Using this hierarchy of preservation, the 1962 Neutra building defiantly fell into the fourth category. In fact, the report recognized management’s tendency to preserve and maintain non-historic structures that were incompatible with the historic landscape and declared, “Battlefield managers remain committed to preserving all significant historic resources when they do not constitute a significant degradation of the primary battlefield landscape. When post-war resources adversely affect the primary battlefield landscape, the NPS will develop solutions in close consultation with the SHPO and ACHP, in accordance with NEPA and 106.” One of the Programmatic Agreements outlined the removal of the cyclorama building and the other covered all the action items of the *General Management Plan*, specifically the actions required to implement the battlefield rehabilitation program.

wanting another “mistake” to be made at Gettysburg, the chairman contended that each issue must be addressed carefully and deliberately. Hansen’s opening statement, worth quoting nearly in its entirety, expressed his concerns:

Praised by the Park Service as a model for future public-private partnership involving the Park Service and the construction of visitors centers across the country, this proposal and the surrounding issues have, instead, soured the general public’s perception of the Park Service and this project...The Park Service has been less than forthcoming with information that should have been readily and openly available to the general public. The Park Service has narrowed the alternatives in the management plan rendering public input meaningless. They also have exaggerated and overstated some problems, while at the same time, understated the significance of other issues. These actions clearly were intended to justify the decision they have already made to demolish the Cyclorama, along with the current visitor center and museum, and to proceed with the implementation of the Kinsley proposal. If this, indeed, is a “model” of things to come it does not bode well for future projects of this nature.⁴⁵

Testimony reflected much of the same arguments or criticism offered the previous year during the Senate’s hearing. Speaking in favor of the proposed *GMP*, spokesman for the Friends of the National Parks at Gettysburg and the National Parks and Conservation Association urged Congress to endorse the park’s long-term management plan. Eileen Woodford acknowledged the chairman’s concern over the potential implications of a public-private partnership, but argued that Gettysburg’s *GMP* “met all the tests put to it” she offered the endorsement of the NPCA. Robert Kinsley reiterated to House members that the proposed plan met the park’s stated goals. Moreover, he denied any allegations that the National Park Service failed to involve the public during the planning process.⁴⁶

⁴⁵ Superintendent John Latschar, “Superintendent’s Annual Report, 1999,” 1; James V. Hansen, Chairman, “Opening Statement, Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands, Oversight Hearing, Gettysburg National Military Park,” February 11, 1999. Folder House Hearing, Box 6, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives.

⁴⁶ Eileen Woodford, “Testimony of Eileen Woodford, Northeast Regional Director, National Parks and Conservation Association Before the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands, United States House of Representatives on the Proposed Museum Complex and *General Management Plan* at Gettysburg National Military

Dr. Walter Powell, representing the GBPA, testified in opposition to the plan. One of his main points was the construction of a new visitor center within the “heart” of the battlefield and the proposed commercialization within the facility. He argued that development would “reverse more than a century of precedent in removing commercialism from the Battlefield, declaring that the NPS showed a history of “poor or controversial management decisions.” Powell recommended instead the agency pursue an alternative that would provide for the rehabilitation of the existing visitor center or the construction of a downtown interpretive center. Such a plan would keep the Park Service close to local businesses on Steinwehr Avenue while blocking additional development on battlefield terrain. Franklin Silbey, an independent Washington consultant, also testified in opposition to the proposed partnership. He, too, argued that the NPS should not permit “commercial development of any kind inside boundaries of the GNMP”, and recommended that the Secretary of Interior “scrap” the project and demanded the “immediate transfer and relief from duties of the present superintendent and Regional Director in Philadelphia.”⁴⁷

In the months after the House hearing, the subcommittee continued to seek additional information from the National Park Service regarding the *GMP* and the Kinsley proposal. A week after the hearing, Chairman Hansen submitted to Director Stanton a list of twenty questions not asked during the hearing. Hansen also continued to express concern over the Park Service’s

Park,” February 11, 1999; Robert Kinsley, “Statement of Robert Kinsley, Managing Partner, Kinsley Equities, House Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands, Oversight Hearing on Gettysburg National Military Park and *General Management Plan* and Proposed Visitor Center,” February 11, 1999. Folder “House Hearing,” Box 6, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives.

⁴⁷ Dr. Walter Powell, “Testimony of Walter Powell, President, Gettysburg Battlefield Preservation Association, for House Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands,” February 11, 1999; Franklin R. Silbey, “The National Park Service Should Not Be Allowed To Promote Commercial Development Within Gettysburg National Military Park,” February 11, 1999. Folder “House Hearing,” Box 6, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives.

determination to proceed with the partnership, and particularly with the Kinsley proposal. The NPS presented its responses on April 2. After reviewing the agency's response, Chairman Hansen reported that he found the answers to be "incomplete" and written with the purpose to "dance around a fair and honest answer." Consequently, in light of the "highly contentious issues" raised by the *Draft GMP*, Hansen recommended to NPS Director Stanton that Gettysburg either withdraw from the current plan or offer supplemental alternatives to address the shortcomings of the *Draft GMP*.⁴⁸

The 1998 Senate Subcommittee hearing offered a genuine oversight hearing on the proposed partnership. Republican Senator Craig Thomas (Wyoming) met with park management in Gettysburg prior to the February hearing. After the hearing he expressed his approval of the park's *General Management Plan*. The House hearing a year later, however, proved to be little more than a political exercise in grandstanding. In fact, Chairman Hansen was the only subcommittee member present during the entire hearing. Representative Mark Souder of Indiana and Representative Walter Jones of North Carolina arrived after the hearing started and posed a few questions to the witnesses. Though Chairman Hansen continued to oppose the partnership and the *GMP*, overall other members of the subcommittee expressed little interest in the plan. Consequently the Congressional hearings had no impact upon the final *General*

⁴⁸ Chairman James Hansen to NPS Director Robert Stanton, February 17, 1999; James Hansen and George Miller to Director Robert Stanton, March 29, 1999; James Hansen to NPS Director Robert Stanton, May 7, 1999. Folder "House Hearing," Box 6, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives. Many of these questions required extensive explanations and included questions pertaining to citizens' opposition to the plan, thorough site analysis on the proposed site (why could the NPS support extensive construction on the battlefield), the significance of the cyclorama building, funding questions for the new facility, and extent of commercial activity.

Management Plan. In October 1999, Congress officially endorsed the “need for a new visitors facility” and the partnership in the National Park Service appropriations bill.⁴⁹

While Congress explored the merits of the partnership, the Park Service sought short-term solutions to protect the 400,000 objects within the collection. In December 1997, the agency sought federal funding to construct an interim storage facility to care for the park’s artifacts. After listening to park officials denigrate the visitor center and its deplorable storage facilities, the Rosensteel family confronted the agency, declaring it was no longer able to properly care for the artifacts. When the Rosensteels had donated the collection to the National Park Service in 1973, Regional Director Chester Brooks had ensured them that the artifacts would be cared for “in the highest Service standards.” Representing the Rosensteel family, daughter Angela Eckert, explained that her family had grown “troubled” by the Park Service’s desire to move the artifact collection from the federally owned visitor center to a new museum officially owned by the Foundation. Eckert maintained that the Park Service violated the “spirit and intent” of the donation and thus the family now sought its return. To Latschar, she asserted,

⁴⁹ Congress, House, Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands of the Committee on Resources, *Oversight Hearing On Gettysburg National Military Park General Management Plan And Proposed Visitors Center*, 106th Cong., 1st sess., February 11, 1999, Washington, D.C.; This transcript is available online at: http://commdocs.house.gov/committees/resources/hii55029.000/hii55029_of.htm; Superintendent John Latschar, “Timeline,” December 11, 2007. Superintendent’s personal files, possession of the author, Auburn, Alabama. The full text of the endorsement reads: “The committees, through previous appropriations, have supported the preparation of a new *General Management Plan* for Gettysburg NMP to enable the NPS to more adequately interpret the Battle of Gettysburg and to preserve the artifacts and landscapes that help tell the story of this great conflict of the Civil War. Accordingly, the managers acknowledge the need for a new visitor facility and support the proposed public-private partnership as a unique approach to the interpretive needs of our National Parks.” Since the new building involved no federal funding, the National Park Service did not have to go before the Appropriations Subcommittee. Carlos Romero-Barcelo, Resident Commissioner of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, was also present at the hearing. Barcelo also posed a few questions to the witnesses. Congressman Jones directed a few questions to NPS Deputy Director Denis Galvin about the partnership at Gettysburg, but also used the hearing as an opportunity to voice his concerns about how the National Park Service was operating Cape Hatteras.

“It is obvious that we, as private citizens, can maintain the collection better than the NPS. We can no longer trust the National Park Service with our National Treasures.”⁵⁰

In early March 1999, nine members of the Rosensteel family, including Angela Eckert filed a lawsuit against the National Park Service. The family sought the return of the collection in order that “the artifacts, guns, and relics may be properly maintained and not subject to any further deterioration.” If the collection could not be returned, the Rosensteel family demanded the National Park Service honor its agreement to care for the collection to the “highest Service standards.”⁵¹

Two months later the NPS director appropriated \$536,000 in “emergency lump sum construction funding” to build an interim storage facility at Gettysburg. On December 8, 1999, the Park Service broke ground for its construction adjoining the park’s maintenance building along the Taneytown Road. While construction progressed, a U.S. District Judge dismissed the suit. On March 8, 2000 the family agreed to a settlement with the National Park Service. Both parties agreed to four main provisions. The artifacts would be housed and preserved in the new museum facility upon its completion. The Park Service in turn agreed that the Rosenteel plaques, currently on display in the visitor center, would move to the new building. All medium and high-risk artifacts would go to the interim facility and remain there until permanently housed in the new museum. Finally, the agreement held that the National Park Service, as the proprietor

⁵⁰ Angela Eckert to Superintendent John Latschar, October 1, 1998. Folder Congressional Correspondence, Box 6, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives.

⁵¹ *Eckert et. al vs. the United States of America et. al.* Folder Rosensteel Collection, Box 71, W32 (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives; Superintendent John Latschar, “Superintendent’s Annual Report, 1999.” Folder 3, Box 3, A26 (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives, 7. Congress provides the NPS director with the discretion to use these funds as the director sees fit, with the only requirement that the NPS report how the funds are used to Congress.

of the collection, had full authority to manage it. Three months after the settlement, Butler Construction Company completed the interim storage, and in May 2000, park archivists and curators began to move the Rosensteel artifacts from the visitor center basement to the interim facility. John Latschar soon thereafter declared this storage facility as the “first step in the twenty first century of Gettysburg National Military Park.”⁵²

Meanwhile, on June 18, 1999, after two years of planning, a plethora of public meetings, workshops, and open houses, thousands of public comments, two Congressional hearings, construction of interim collections storage, and after often stormy debate the National Park Service released its two-volume *Final General Management Plan*. Volume I outlined the four alternatives proposed in the August 1998 draft, of which Alternative C remained the Park Service’s preferred option. Volume II included copies of many public comments submitted during the review period. Obviously the final version of the *GMP* superseded the 1998 draft plan.⁵³

In October Congress finally endorsed the proposed public-private partnership in the NPS appropriations bill. On November 23, after a required thirty-day waiting period, Regional Director Marie Rust signed a “Record of Decision,” officially approving Gettysburg’s *General Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement* and the park’s preferred alternative of

⁵² Superintendent John Latschar, “Superintendent’s Annual Report, 1999,” 7; NPS Press Release, “Gettysburg Park Breaks Ground for Artifact Storage Facility,” December 9, 1999. Folder Gettysburg Press Releases, October 1999-September 2000, Box 52, K3415, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives; Superintendent John Latschar, “Superintendent’s Annual Report, 2000,” 3; Settlement, *Eckert, et al. vs. the United States of America, et. al*, March 8, 2000. Folder Rosensteel Suit, Box 71, W32, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives; NPS Press Release, “Gettysburg Park Breaks Ground for Artifact Storage Facility,” December 9, 1999. Folder Gettysburg Press Releases, October 1999-September 2000, Box 52, K3415, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives.

⁵³ The NPS could not release the *GMP* until the Advisory Council approved the demolition of the cyclorama building.

battlefield restoration. Director Stanton signed the “General Agreement” and a “Fundraising Agreement” with Gettysburg National Battlefield Museum to proceed with the development and construction of the new visitor center /museum and Ziegler’s Grove restoration on June 30, 2000. The Foundation board selected Robert C. Wilburn, former President of Colonial Williamsburg, as its president on October 24.⁵⁴

The first implementation of the approved *General Management Plan*, fittingly, occurred on July 3, 2000 when thousands gathered at the battlefield to witness the demolition of the Gettysburg National Tower that the *USA Today* had once described as “the ugliest commercial structure ever to intrude on the sanctity of a national park.” Once dubbed the “cash register in the sky,” the National Tower generated approximately \$400,000 in annual admissions, but the National Park Service never received a penny from it as negotiated. In 1996, the National Park Foundation and Gettysburg officials finally asked Ottenstein to disclose his financial records to account for the “absence of donations.” Ottenstein replied that “the tower has produced no taxable income,” but agreed to produce a record of expenses and revenue from 1974 through 1995. According to his summary, the National Tower recorded a net loss of \$224,000 over its

⁵⁴ “Record of Decision, *Final General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement*, Gettysburg National Military Park,” signed on November 23, 1999 by Regional Director Marie Rust. Folder Record of Decision, Box 6, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives; Superintendent John Latschar, “Superintendent’s Annual Report, 2000,” 19. Superintendent Latschar had signed the “ROD” on November 11. As defined by the NPS, a Record of Decision “is a statement of the decisions made as a result of environmental and socioeconomic analysis over the past two and a half years and in consideration of public input. It describes the background of the planning effort, other alternatives considered, the environmentally preferable alternative, measures to minimize environmental harm, and public involvement throughout the entire planning effort as well as in the decision-making process.” Wilburn arrived as the Museum Foundation’s first president with a wealth of experience. A graduate of the United States Air Force Academy, Wilburn earned a Ph.D. in Economics and Public Affairs from Princeton University. He served as President of the University of Indiana at Pennsylvania from 1976 to 1978. Wilburn also held positions in the Department of Defense, the White House, and cabinet posts in Pennsylvania Governor Richard Thornburg’s administration. He worked as CEO of the Carnegie Institute in Pennsylvania before accepting the position as President of the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation.

twenty-one years of operation. Assuming Ottenstein's accounting summary was correct, the National Tower never attracted the visitation that he had projected.⁵⁵

Upon reviewing the accounting information, the National Park Service decided not to pursue Ottenstein's "absence of donations." Instead the National Park Service decided to acquire the tower itself. The first step had come in 1990 when President George H. W. Bush authorized the park's revised boundary, which included the National Tower property. Three years later, park staff identified the site of the tower as a high priority for acquisition in the *Land Protection Plan*. Speaking at Gettysburg on Earth Day 1999, Secretary Babbitt identified the tower as an intrusion on the historic scene and declared, "There is no better symbol for the need to preserve the Gettysburg battlefield than taking down this tower." Babbitt promised that the tower would be removed from the landscape on "his watch." In November 1999, Congress appropriated \$1.6 million to purchase the tower.⁵⁶

Having now obtained the legal authority and the fiscal appropriations, the Park Service went to work. National Park Service Lands officials already had opened negotiations with Ottenstein, who expressed willingness to sell. He demanded, however, \$6 million, more than three times the appropriated funding. Unable to settle directly with Ottenstein, the National Park

⁵⁵ "Gone!" *Friends of the National Parks at Gettysburg* Newsletter, Fall 2000, 1-3; Edward T. Pound, "Tower Gives Gettysburg Little In Returns," *USA Today*, 16 February 1998. Box 1, Gettysburg National Tower, Gettysburg National Military Park Library [hereinafter cited as GNT, GNMP Library]; John Latschar, "The Taking of the Gettysburg Tower," *The George Wright Society*, vol. 18, No. 1, 2001: 24-33.

⁵⁶ Edward T. Pound, "Tower Gives Gettysburg Little In Returns," *USA Today*, 16 February 1998. Box 1, GNT, GNMP Library; John Latschar, "The Taking of the Gettysburg Tower," *The George Wright Society*, vol. 18, No. 1, 2001: 24-33; *Boundary Study, Gettysburg National Military Park: Draft Report To Congress, Environmental Assessment*, August 1988; *Land Protection Plan*, October 1993. (Gettysburg: Gettysburg National Military Park, 1993), 1-92; NPS Press Release, "Demolishing the Gettysburg Tower," June 27, 2000. Box 72, W32, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives; Superintendent John Latschar, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 2000," 9. Reminder that the *Boundary Study* had been submitted by Superintendent Jose Cisneros on October 19, 1993 and approved by Regional Director B.J. Griffin on November 5, 1993.

Service started condemnation proceedings. On December 9, 1999, the Department of Justice, acting on behalf of the National Park Service, filed a condemnation suit to acquire the tower in pursuant of the Park Service's preservation goals as outlined in the approved *GMP*. Controlled Demolition, Inc. of Baltimore, Maryland offered to donate their services to demolish the tower, which the Park Service had estimated to cost over \$1 million. The National Park Service officially accepted their services on February 24, 2000. Three months later, on May 17, the NPS modified the complaint in condemnation to a Declaration of Taking and on June 15, 2000 the U.S. District court granted possession of the property to the National Park Service. Thomas Ottenstein fought the Park Service to construct the tower in the early 1970s, but now he did not file any objections to the government's condemnation proceedings or the Declaration of Taking. The National Tower officially closed on June 14, when operators vacated the property and possession of the site, totaling 5.79 acres, passed to the National Park Service.⁵⁷

On July 3, 2000, the 137th anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg, thousands gathered to witness the demolition of the largest and most controversial commercial venue within the park boundary. Ceremonies began at 4:30 P.M. with speeches given by Latschar, Barbara Finfrock, President of the FNPG, and NPS Director Stanton. Speaking on behalf of the National Trust for Historic Preservation, Richard Moe summarized, "Sometimes we can correct the mistakes of the past." Babbitt delivered the keynote address and then proceeded to direct the crowd in the countdown leading to the two ceremonial shots fired by a Union and Confederate cannon to

⁵⁷ Superintendent John Latschar, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 2000," 9-11; *National Tower Demolition and Removal Environmental Assessment, Draft* (Gettysburg: Gettysburg National Military Park, May 2000). Box 2, GNT, GNMP Library. In this Environmental Assessment, the Park Service explored two alternatives for the tower: a no-action alternative and the park's preferred alternative of removing the tower. This report also explored methods of removing the tower and evaluated potential environmental impacts. The Park Service released this plan for public review and accepted comments until May 31, 2000.

signal the explosion. Seconds later, Controlled Demolitions fired twelve rounds of charges and within ten seconds the two million pound steel structure, which had dominated the Gettysburg skyline and landscape since 1974, crumbled to the ground.⁵⁸

The National Tower seemed always to generate controversy within the Civil War community, and sure enough, the removal of the tower had created a similar hullabaloo. The park received a barrage of comments from individuals who expressed their “disappointment” in the tower’s removal. Even some area residents opposed the removal. Others viewed the tower as a source of architectural beauty and believed that it enhanced the visitor experience. Chris Bowling of Shippensburg, Pennsylvania, declared the tower’s removal a “boneheaded” decision and remarked, “The tower in no way detracted from the sacred ground of Gettysburg. Instead, it gave the only comprehensive view of the entire battleground, something your Park Service could not do.” John Vockroth of Hanover, Pennsylvania, characterized the tower not as “something ugly and out of place,” but as a “historic structure” and a “work of art.” Another comment offered, “Please don’t tear down this beautiful tower...there will be many fewer visitors to your plain, drab, boring park without the tower.” Clearly oblivious to the significance of the Gettysburg battlefield, an email comment from Matthew Taylor declared, “The National Tower has made Gettysburg more famous as far as I am concerned” and alleged that the removal of the tower would ruin the local economy and “send Gettysburg underground.”⁵⁹

⁵⁸ John Latschar, “The Taking of the Gettysburg Tower,” *The George Wright Society*, vol. 18, No. 1, 2001: 24-33; Superintendent John Latschar, “Superintendent’s Annual Report, 2000,” 9-11.

⁵⁹ Stephanie Dudley to Superintendent John Latschar, undated; Chris Bowling to Secretary of the Interior Bruce Babbitt, July 1, 2000. Folder Tower Comments, FY 2000, Box 72, W32, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives; John Vockroth email to John Heiser, May 25, 2000; Email from an unidentified author to John Heiser, July 3, 2000. Folder 16-21B, Vertical Files, GNMP Library; Matthew Taylor email comment to Superintendent John Latschar, July 3, 2000. Folder Tower Comments, FY 2000, Box 72, W32, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives.

“The demolition of the Gettysburg Tower is more an act of creation and restoration than destruction,” remarked Secretary Babbitt. While some used the removal of the tower to criticize yet another management decision, most still applauded the park’s efforts to restore the historic landscape. John Albright, a lecturer at Colorado State University, declared John Latschar a “hero” and said, “The sight of that tower coming down on the day and at the time of Pickett’s Charge was absolutely lovely!” Perhaps the most indicative comment on the significance of the tower’s removal came from Friends President Barb Finfrock, who declared, “We stand as this battlefield’s caretakers only for a short time- a very short time. The measure of our devotion and our success as its temporary caretakers is- did we leave the battlefield better than we found it?” Finfrock envisioned park visitors looking upon the terrain where the tower formally stood and remarked, “They will see nothing... and they will be able to see everything.”⁶⁰

The removal of the National Tower served as a fitting “High Water Mark” to the National Park Service’s management of the battlefield during the twentieth century. Three score and seven years after the National Park Service acquired Gettysburg National Military Park, largely through the vision of Superintendent John Latschar, the agency had established a definitive, if not controversial plan to manage the battlefield and its historic landscape. After years of discussion and often vitriolic public debate, the *General Management Plan* articulated a long-term landscape treatment philosophy that sought to restore the battlefield to its 1863 condition, and the creation of the public-private partnership which would provide the park with a state-of-the-art museum and visitor center and ushered the battlefield into the twenty-first century.

⁶⁰ NPS Press Release, “Gettysburg Tower Demolition,” June 27, 2000; John Albright to Superintendent John Latschar, September 11, 2000; Barbara Finfrock, “Remarks.” Folder National Tower, FY 2000, Box 72, W32, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives.

Chapter 12

“Shall Not Perish From The Earth”:

A New Beginning at Gettysburg, 2001-2009

The final years of the twentieth century were among the most important in the history of at Gettysburg National Military Park. After years of planning, scores of public meetings, and unparalleled public and political scrutiny Regional Director Marie Rust signed a “Record of Decision,” officially approving Gettysburg’s *General Management Plan* on November 23, 1999.¹ Led by Superintendent John Latschar, Gettysburg implemented this new management vision during the early years of the twenty-first century. Three score and seven years after the National Park Service acquired Gettysburg National Military Park, the new management plan, with its construction of a new visitor center and the rehabilitation of the battlefield, brought about the most dramatic changes to occur on the battlefield in over a century.

After years of planning and fundraising on June 2, 2005 the National Park Service and the Foundation broke ground for the new museum. Three years later, on April 14, 2008, the doors to the new \$103 million visitor center finally opened to the public, followed by a grand opening on September 26. Meanwhile, Gettysburg continued to implement the second aspect of the *GMP*, namely the landscape rehabilitation program. By the end of the decade, park staff had removed hundreds of acres of non-historic woodlots, reconstructed miles of historic fences,

¹ “Record of Decision, *Final General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement*, Gettysburg National Military Park,” signed on November 23, 1999 by Regional Director Marie Rust. Folder Record of Decision, Box 6, D18, (General Management Plan, Environmental Impact Assessment, 1996-1998), Records of the National Park Service at Gettysburg National Military Park, Gettysburg National Military Park Archives [hereinafter cited as (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives].

replanted historic orchards, and removed the visitor center at Ziegler's Grove, establishing a landscape that is relatively consistent to its 1863 appearance.

Yet for all the triumphs the National Park Service and the Foundation achieved, dark clouds loomed over the battlefield. Controversy surrounded the Kinsley proposal, culminated just four months after opening the new visitor center when the NPS and Foundation announced their plans to charge an admission fee to the museum because of revenue shortfalls. On the heels of the controversial fee proposal, the Foundation experienced a change in leadership when Foundation President Robert Wilburn announced his resignation effective July 31, 2009. Three months later, after fifteen years of service at Gettysburg the National Park Service in Washington reassigned Superintendent John Latschar to the Associate Director of Cultural Resources stationed in Frederick, Maryland.

On June 30, 2000, NPS Director Robert Stanton signed two agreements with the Foundation, a "General Agreement" and a "Fundraising Agreement." They outlined the responsibilities of both partners in fundraising, operations, and management of the new visitor center. For its part, the Foundation agreed to acquire the money necessary for the completion of the new building, estimated to be \$39.3 million. A portion, \$27.36 million, was to come from fundraising and grants. The Foundation would "own all portions of the facilities," but the building would be "conveyed in fee simply by the Foundation to the NPS when all debt incurred by the Foundation to develop and construct the project has been paid, estimated to be twenty

years from the date of completion of the project, or at some other appropriate time to be mutually agreed upon.”²

After these agreements cemented the partnership, on October 24, 2000 the Foundation selected Robert Wilburn, the former CEO of Colonial Williamsburg, as its first president. His main task was to raise the money for the building. Over the next five years, the partners focused their combined efforts on four key elements: selecting exhibit designers and architects, developing an interpretive story-line for the museum, pursuing an aggressive fundraising campaign, and initiating restoration work on the Gettysburg Cyclorama. Congress meanwhile once again requested a hearing to examine the partnership between the NPS and the Foundation. It convened on March 21, 2002, when National Park Service officials and Foundation President Wilburn testified before the House Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands.

During *GMP* planning some critics had opposed the preferred location of the new museum as recommended in the Kinsley proposal. As discussed previously, Kinsley selected the old Fantasyland tract, located south of the existing visitor center along the Taneytown Road, as the preferred site. To some, the Park Service’s approval of the site appeared hypocritical; the agency sanctioned new development within the park boundary, while at the same time lamenting modern intrusions on the battlefield. Moreover, it was only after the NPS selected the Kinsley proposal that the agency conducted an analysis to discern if any significant battle action occurred

² “General Agreement Between Gettysburg National Military Park, National Park Service, and the Gettysburg National Battlefield Museum Foundation,” approved by NPS Director Stanton on June 30, 2000. Folder GNBMF, February 2000-September 2000, Box 2, A22, Park Main (Central) Files, 1987-present, Records of the National Park Service at Gettysburg National Military Park, Gettysburg National Military Park Archives [Files from this collection have not yet been processed and all notes hereinafter will be cited by Box, File Code, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives].

on the proposed site. In the winter of 1998 the GNMP Advisory Commission convened a panel of non- Park Service historians, including Mark Snell of Shepherd College and Gary Gallagher of the University of Virginia, to determine what, if any, significant battle action occurred at the proposed site for the visitor center. The committee concluded that only minor artillery action occurred at the proposed site. Consequently, on January 8, 1999, the Foundation purchased an “in-holding” of forty-five acres of privately owned land, but within the battlefield boundary, from David LeVan. Herein lay a key point of the NPS and Foundation partnership: though the new museum was officially within the park boundary, the Foundation owned the property as well as the building.³

Having secured the necessary land, the Foundation began to solicit proposals for an architectural designer, exhibit design firms, and conservators to restore the cyclorama. In early July 2001, the Foundation selected the architectural firm of Cooper, Robertson of New York City to design the building. Gallagher and Associates of Washington, D.C. would design the museum exhibits.⁴ Three years after the purchase of the LeVan tract, on January 12, 2002, the National

³ Dr. Gary Gallagher to Scott Hartwig, February 23, 1998 in *Final General Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement*, Gettysburg National Military Park, Pennsylvania, vol. 1 & 2 (U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, June 1999), vol. 2, 117-118 [hereinafter cited as *GMP*, vol. 1 or *GMP*, vol. 2]; Superintendent John Latschar, “Timeline.” Author’s possession, Auburn, Alabama. The Foundation purchased the tract from property owner David LeVan.

⁴ Superintendent John Latschar, “Superintendent’s Annual Report, 2001.” Folder 5, Box 3, A26, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives, 1-2. Officially the Foundation released a “Request For Qualifications” for the architectural and exhibit designers and received qualifying packages from twenty five architectural firms and seventeen exhibit design firms. The Foundation created a Design Selection Committee (DSC), consisting of Foundation members, NPS officials, and outside consultants to review the submissions. This committee then issued a “Request for Proposals” to eleven architectural firms and eight exhibit design firms. After the DSC reviewed the proposals, they selected Cooper, Robertson and Gallagher & Associates. Cooper, Robertson’s previous work included New York City’s Museum of Modern Art and the Lincoln Center, while Gallagher & Associates had designed the exhibits for the Smithsonian’s National Museum of American History, the Canyon Visitor Center at Yellowstone National Park, and Independence Visitor Center in Philadelphia. Superintendent John Latschar’s annual reports from 1995 through 2003 can be found in Box 3, A26, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives, while reports from 2004 to 2009 are filed in the Contemporary

Park Service and the Foundation unveiled the building plan to the public. Designed to emulate a Pennsylvania farmstead and round barn, the building would stand in existing woods to blend seamlessly into the landscape.

Consistent with the language in the 1990 boundary legislation and the subsequent Congressional directive of 2000, the Park Service, the Foundation, and the Gettysburg Museum Advisory Commission (GMAC) worked to develop a museum story-line that offered a thorough discussion of the Battle of Gettysburg as well as a contextual understanding of the American Civil War. Park staff, led by Supervisory Ranger Scott Hartwig and Superintendent Latschar, developed the story-line, and then the GMAC reviewed their draft and offered comments. By June 2001, park staff, with the assistance of the advisory commission, had completed the story-line and prepared to proceed with the exhibit design. As conceived, the museum would consist of eleven galleries that would guide visitors from secession to the Battle of Gettysburg and through Reconstruction.⁵

Administrative Files, GNMP. All references hereinafter to Latschar's annual will only be cited by the year's report and page number.

⁵ Superintendent John Latschar to James McPherson, February 28, 2000. Folder 12, Box 21, A82, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives; Memo, undated. Folder Holt, Box 16, A7221, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives. As previously mentioned, the GMAC consisted of eight historians including: James McPherson, Princeton University; Eric Foner, Columbia University; Gary Gallagher, University of Virginia; Nina Silber, Boston University; Gabor Boritt, Gettysburg College; Dwight Pitcaithley, Chief Historian National Park Service; Robin Reed, Museum of the Confederacy; Olivia Mahoney, Chicago Historical Society; Superintendent John Latschar, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 2001," 1-2. These eleven galleries include: 1) Impact of War: In A Larger Sense; 2) Causes of War, 1776-1861: Conceived in Liberty?; 3) Approach to War: A New Nation; 4) Civil War, 1861-1863: Now We Are Engaged In A Great Civil War; 5) Campaign to Gettysburg: Testing Whether That Nation Can Long Endure; 6) Battle of Gettysburg: Now We Are Met On A Great Battlefield Of That War; 7) Aftermath: The Brave Men, Living and Dead; 8) Gettysburg Address: A New Birth of Freedom; 9) Civil War, 1863-1865: A Great Task Remaining Before Us; 10) Results of War: That These Dead Shall Not Have Died In Vain; 11) Preservation of the Battlefield: Never Forget What They Did Here. The two galleries on the campaign and Battle of Gettysburg are the largest in the museum. The gallery on the battle consists of five smaller galleries, one focuses on the introduction to battle, three focus on three days of battle, and the fifth explores the outcome of the battle. In addition to the eleven galleries, park planners added a twelfth for special exhibits from the Gilder Lehrman Institute. By all accounts the creation of the story line represented a truly collaborative effort between the NPS and the Advisory Commission.

While the partners moved toward finalizing the story-line for the new museum, however, the fate of the popular Electric Map suddenly became a contentious issue. As discussed, Joseph Rosensteel had designed the original map in 1938 for the seventy-fifth anniversary of the battle. In 1963, the family upgraded the Electric Map for the Civil War Centennial. Situated in a large auditorium of their visitor center, the topographic map used electronic lights and an audio narration to provide a concise overview of the battle. According to the *GMP*, “the Electric Map, the park’s most popular attraction, would be upgraded and modernized” and would “continue to tell the story of the three-day battle, its tactics and actions” in the new museum. Initially, park management envisioned the Electric Map as being part of a film experience where the film would offer a contextual discussion of the Civil War and the upgraded Electric Map would provide an introduction to the battle. In 2001, during the conceptual design phase of exhibit planning, the NPS decided that because of costs to upgrade the map, as well as logistics and interpretive benefits, and its outdated nature, the twelve-ton map would not be displayed in the new facility. Instead a film, *A New Birth of Freedom* would take its place in offering visitors an introduction to the battle. The map had been an integral part of the Gettysburg experience for over six decades, and as expected, many regular visitors expressed disapproval with the Park Service’s decision. Concerned locals and battlefield visitors formed a “Save The Electric Map” group, led in part by Christine Rosensteel, Joseph’s daughter, to express their disapproval. On April 13, 2008 the NPS showed the Electric Map for the final time, had it cut into four pieces, and removed it from the building.⁶

⁶ *GMP*, vol. 1, 90. More information on this organization can be found at: www.savetheelectricmap.com, accessed March 1, 2010. Part of the reason the Park Service decided not to display the map was purely logistical. Additionally, the top layer of the map had been infested with asbestos. After the NPS announced the map would be preserved in storage, nine organizations expressed interest in acquiring the map, but after the NPS informed them of the difficulties in removing and presenting it, none of the organizations pursued the matter.

Other problems characterized the project. As discussed, Kinsley's original proposal recommended a 145,802 square foot building, but the Foundation later reduced the square footage to 118,100. Congress then approved the partnership and the *GMP* based on an understanding that the facility could be built for a price tag of \$40 million. Shortly into the planning process, however, the Park Service, Foundation, and the building's design team recommended upping the size of the building to 139,000 square feet, almost the size of Kinsley's original proposal, to provide for greater visitor circulation. That forced a reevaluation of the construction costs of the project. The partners accordingly revised them upwards to \$95 million, for total project costs, or more than double the original estimate.⁷

The revised cost projections resulted from four main factors. Most evidently, Kinsley originally estimated the project costs in 1998. When the Foundation began fundraising four years later, inflation contributed to a share of the increased costs. Hoffman declared that at least \$7.6 million could be attributed to inflation. Team planners meanwhile recommended an increase in museum exhibit space. The original proposal recommended 23,760 square foot museum, but team planners favored an expansion to 35,350 square feet to accommodate additional exhibits as well as two interactive resource centers for visitor use. Park officials estimated this increase in museum space to cost approximately \$8.5 million. Similarly, the Foundation's agreement to provide full restoration of the cyclorama painting, including the three dimensional figures at the painting's foreground, as well as enhanced exhibitory added costs. Planners estimated that the extensive restoration of the Gettysburg Cyclorama and the proposed state-of-the-art exhibits would cost an additional \$20 million. Finally, when preparing the *GMP*,

⁷ "Gettysburg National Military Park, Proposed Collections Storage, Museum and Visitor Center," June 17, 1998. Folder Public Meetings, Box 4, D18, (GMP, 1996-1998), GNMP Archives; Superintendent John Latschar, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 2002," 1-2.

park officials neglected to include the costs of fundraising or facility maintenance. The Foundation agreed to provide a \$10 million endowment for ongoing facility upkeep and artifact preservation. All total, these factors accounted for a \$55 million increase, bringing the estimated project total to \$95 million.⁸

The revisions to the total size of the building, as well as the considerable cost increase caught the attention of the House Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands. On February 21, 2002, P. Daniel Smith, special assistant to the Director of the NPS, and Congressional staffer Todd Hull visited Gettysburg to question Latschar and Wilburn on the modifications to the building. Previously both Smith and Hull had worked for Congressman James Hansen, the chairman of the House subcommittee in 1999 who had opposed the partnership. They now argued that these changes made the *GMP* null and void, and requested that Gettysburg undertake a new *General Management Plan*.⁹

Consequently, on March 21, 2002 the House Subcommittee, now chaired by Republican Congressman George Radanovich of California, held an oversight hearing, “The Future Visitor’s Center at Gettysburg National Military Park and the Associated Fundraising Efforts,” to explore the merits of the partnership. Pennsylvania Senator Rick Santorum, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife, and Parks Paul Hoffman, and Foundation President Wilburn offered testimony on the building and cost revisions. Hoffman declared the original estimate of \$39 million an “abysmal attempt to forecast the costs of such a visitor’s center” and stated that such a low

⁸ Statement of Paul Hoffman, Deputy Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife, Congress, House, Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands, *The Future Visitor’s Center at Gettysburg National Military Park and the Associated Fundraising Efforts*, 107th Cong., 2nd sess., 21 March 2002, 10-21.

⁹ Superintendent John Latschar, “Superintendent’s Annual Report, 2002,” 1-2. Ironically, Daniel Smith would eventually become the NPS Superintendent at Colonial National Historic Park.

estimate has made the reasonable \$95 million cost “look excessive.” Santorum offered a simpler explanation for the increased construction costs: “you do not build a world class visitor’s center on a shoestring.” Wilburn reminded the subcommittee that the fundraising effort for Gettysburg was no more elaborate than other ongoing partnership projects. At Independence Hall, for example, the National Park Service partnered with the National Constitution Center to raise approximately \$225 million for the creation of a museum devoted exclusively to interpreting the Constitution of the United States.¹⁰

Aside from the increase in the size of the facility and the construction costs, the Congressional hearing also once again explored the terms of the partnership between the National Park Service and the Foundation. Subcommittee members expressed concern over whether the Foundation could raise such a large amount of money for the project. In accordance with Director’s Orders 21, “Donations and Fundraising,” signed by NPS Director Robert Stanton on September 18, 1998, partner associations were prevented from breaking ground for construction until the organization has “sufficient...funds in hand to complete the work so that it is usable.” Additionally, the subcommittee expressed concern over ownership of the building. The language in the 2000 “General Agreement” stated the building would pass to the NPS at a time “estimated to be twenty years from the date of completion of the project, or at some other appropriate time to be mutually agreed upon.” Chairman Radanovich expressed concern over the vague language of “some other appropriate time” and encouraged the Park Service to work with the Foundation to establish a clear, definitive term of ownership. Consequently, after the

¹⁰ Statement of Paul Hoffman, Deputy Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife, 10-21; Statement of Senator Richard Santorum, 4-6; Statement of Robert Wilburn, President, Gettysburg National Battlefield Museum Foundation, Congress, House, Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands, *The Future Visitor’s Center at Gettysburg National Military Park and the Associated Fundraising Efforts*, 107th Cong., 2nd sess., 21 March 2002, 22-28. For more on the Constitution Center visit: www.constitutioncenter.org.

House hearing the Park Service and Foundation revised the terms of ownership, approved in early November to “no later than twenty five years from the date of the original General Agreement (June 30, 2000) or twenty years from the completion of the project, whichever is longer.”¹¹

As also stipulated by Director’s Order 21 and reiterated in the “General Agreement,” the National Park Service required the Foundation to raise \$68.3 million before the agency would allow construction of the building. This \$68.3 million represented the cost of land acquisition, design and construction of the building, exhibit installation, and cyclorama restoration. To assist Wilburn and staff in fundraising, the Foundation established a Board of Directors to help identify potential donors. Officially, Park Service employees are prohibited from soliciting funds, but they were allowed to campaign on the project. Latschar did so with great zeal. By March 7, 2002, just weeks before the House hearing, the Foundation had secured \$8.38 million in donations, including a \$5 million gift from Robert Kinsley. A year later, the Foundation had \$26.6 million on hand, and by the end of 2003 had raised \$41 million, which included a \$10 million grant from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. By the end of 2004, the Foundation secured \$67.4 million, including another \$10 million grant from the Pennsylvania. In April 2005, the Foundation received a \$4.5 million challenge grant from Philadelphia philanthropist and former Comcast cable television entrepreneur Jerry Lenfest, and matched his challenge gift

¹¹ “General Agreement Between Gettysburg National Military Park, National Park Service, and the Gettysburg National Battlefield Museum Foundation,” approved by NPS Director Stanton on June 30, 2000. Folder GNBMF, February 2000-September 2000, Box 2, A22, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives; Robert Stanton, NPS Director, Director’s Order 21, “Donations and Fundraising,” September 18, 1998. Available at: <http://www.nps.gov/refdesk/DOrders/DOrder21.html>; “General Agreement Between Gettysburg National Military Park, National Park Service, and the Gettysburg National Battlefield Museum Foundation,” Revisions, September 30, 2002. Superintendent Latschar’s personal files, in author’s possession, Auburn, Alabama; Superintendent John Latschar, “Superintendent’s Annual Report, 2002,” 3-4.

by June. The Foundation also received sizable contributions from the McCormick Tribune Foundation, the Gilder-Lehrman Institute, and Ford Motor Company donating \$3 million to underwrite the Ford Education Center in the new building. By Memorial Day 2005, in short, the Foundation had secured \$75 million, surpassing the NPS requirement of \$68.3 million to proceed with construction. With the money secured the partners established June 2, 2005 for the ground breaking ceremonies.¹²

The Gettysburg Cyclorama remained one of the park's most impressive interpretive displays. Painted by Paul Philippoteaux between 1883 and 1884, the painting depicted the climactic "High Water Mark" of General George Pickett's ill-fated assault. The original dimensions of the painting were an impressive 42 feet high and 377 feet in circumference, but after years of improper storage and preservation the painting measured 27 feet high and 359 feet in circumference. The new restoration effort sought to restore the fifteen foot section of missing sky as well as the foreground's three dimensional objects, which included carriages, mannequins,

¹² Superintendent John Latschar, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 2003," 2. Upon completion of the Fundraising Feasibility study, and after conducting over sixty individual interviews, the board identified twenty seven prospective donors to give at the \$5 million level and an additional twenty five prospects with the capacity to donate at least \$1 million; Superintendent John Latschar, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 2002," 1-2; Robert Stanton, NPS Director, Director's Order 21; Superintendent John Latschar, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 2004," 1-2. For example, during 2004 alone, Latschar attended a luncheon in Atlanta sponsored by Hall of Fame football coach Vince Dooley, enjoyed dinner with Peter Jennings at his home in New York City, and schmoozed with the rich during a three-day retreat in West Palm Beach. Other dignitaries and celebrities visited Gettysburg to witness the park's conditions first hand and then readily joined the fundraising initiative; Statement of Paul Hoffman, Deputy Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife, Congress, House, Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands, *The Future Visitor's Center at Gettysburg National Military Park and the Associated Fundraising Efforts*, 107th Cong., 2nd sess., 21 March 2002, 10-21; Superintendent John Latschar, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 2003," 1-3; Superintendent John Latschar, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 2004," 1-3; "Philanthropist Issues Challenge," *The Civil War Courier*, June 2005. Folder June 2005, Box News Articles, 2002-2005, GNMP Archives; Superintendent John Latschar, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 2005," 1-2.

and soldiers' accoutrements, all of which were part of Philippoteaux's original painting. When properly restored and hung in a hyperbolic shape the Gettysburg Cyclorama would be displayed in a manner not seen in over a century.¹³

In June 2002, the Foundation released a *Request For Proposals* to restore the Gettysburg Cyclorama and selected the consortium team of Perry Huston & Associates of Fort Worth, Texas and Olin Conservation, Inc., of Great Falls, Virginia. Both firms brought a wealth of experience and qualifications, Huston's firm notably had assisted in the restoration of the Atlanta Cyclorama. David Olin, Chief Conservator of Olin Conservation, had worked on murals in the U.S. National Archives, the U.S. Capitol, and the Department of Justice. By September 2002, the firms negotiated contracts with the Foundation and began the first phase of the conservation.¹⁴

Park officials had stressed the restoration of the Gettysburg Cyclorama as one of the four goals of the *General Management Plan*. Initially they estimated the project to cost approximately \$1 million and only sought to restore the foreground objects, "if possible." The Foundation had recommended a more expansive restoration project including the restoration the foreground and the replacement of fifteen feet of missing sky. Correspondingly, as the scope of the project expanded, so too did the cost, estimated now to be upwards of \$6 million. During the spring of 2003, Huston's and Olin's conservators completed the "Condition Assessment and

¹³ "The Gettysburg Cyclorama," GNMP Available at: <http://www.nps.gov/gett/historyculture/gettysburg-cyclorama.htm>; Gettysburg Foundation, "About the Conservation of the Gettysburg Cyclorama Painting." Author's possession, Auburn, Alabama. After its hey-day of display, the painting was shuffled from owner to owner and endured survived several fires, water damage, and improper display, all of which resulted in a damaging effect. Moreover, while in storage during the early twentieth century, the top section, termed the sky section, had been removed. As noted, the NPS performed limited conservation on the painting in 1962.

¹⁴ Gettysburg Foundation, "About the Conservation of the Gettysburg Cyclorama Painting." Author's possession, Auburn, Alabama; Gettysburg Foundation, "David Olin." Author's possession, Auburn, Alabama.

Treatment Plan,” which revealed the cyclorama had suffered more structural damage than originally thought. Consequently, the price of the full restoration, including cleaning, restoring, and remounting increased again to \$9 million. Fortunately, the Foundation received critical financial assistance for the conservation project from the federal government when Pennsylvania Congressman John Murtha, a proponent of the park’s management goals, who allocated \$2.5 million into the 2002 appropriations bill. A year later, in October 2003, Murtha earmarked an additional \$2.5 million for the project, bringing the total federal commitment to \$5 million.¹⁵

The restoration of the Gettysburg Cyclorama proved to be one of the largest conservation projects undertaken in the United States. Philippoteaux’s original painting consisted of fourteen panels that were sewed together to provide for the ‘painting in the round’ effect, but later owners of the painting had divided it into additional sections. Olin’s restoration crew sought to recreate the continuity of the fourteen original panels. Conservation on the cyclorama began on November 24, 2003 when workers began the first phase of cleaning the painting. In February 2004 conservators removed two cleaned test panels to Olin’s studio in Virginia to further study the extent of the restoration work necessary. The park received additional federal funding in fiscal year 2004 when Murtha once again allocated \$1,987,000 for the project and yet another \$5 million to the 2005 NPS budget to “complete the preservation of the cyclorama painting” and to protect the park’s artifact collection. Including this 2005 appropriation, the federal government contributed \$12 million to the restoration of the Gettysburg Cyclorama. By the time the painting premiered, Congress had allocated a total of \$15 million for the project. On November 20, 2005,

¹⁵ Statement of Robert Wilburn, President, Gettysburg National Battlefield Museum Foundation, Congress, House, Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands, *The Future Visitor’s Center at Gettysburg National Military Park and the Associated Fundraising Efforts*, 107th Cong., 2nd sess., 21 March 2002, 23; Superintendent John Latschar, “Superintendent’s Annual Report, 2002.” Folder 7, Box 3, A26 (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives, 2-3; Superintendent John Latschar, “Superintendent’s Annual Report, 2003,” 1-2.

the Park Service displayed the cyclorama for the final time before closing it to the public to allow for full-scale conservation. Since few American art conservators possessed the necessary skills and talents to complete such a large scale project, in the spring of 2006 the Foundation hired four Polish painting conservators, all of whom had experience in restoring several European cycloramas, to assist Olin's crew.¹⁶

Meanwhile, as the National Park Service and the Foundation progressed on the development of the museum and cyclorama restoration, the Park Service began its long-term project to rehabilitate key terrain features on the battlefield, as outlined in Alternative C in the *General Management Plan*. Never before in the history of Gettysburg National Military Park, or any other Civil War site had the Park Service attempted to implement such a broad, aggressive program. While some remained critical of the agency's intent to remove over 500 acres of trees, the Park Service maintained that "the historical benefits of the project are obvious." Park planners estimated that a park-wide landscape rehabilitation program would take fifteen years. They outlined three goals of the project. First, the rehabilitation would restore the "integrity" of the battlefield. The park's landscape had changed considerably since 1863 and the NPS intended to restore critical features consistent with the historic terrain. Second, park planners declared that the program would enhance visitor opportunities and comprehensive of the battle. "It will offer new opportunities for visitors to see the battlefield through soldiers' eyes," said Latschar.

¹⁶ Superintendent John Latschar, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 2004," 2-3; Superintendent John Latschar, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 2005," 1; "Cyclorama Center Will Close in November," *Hanover Evening Sun*, 28 September 2005; Superintendent John Latschar, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 2006," 1.

And finally, the restoration program would establish a sustainable historic environment by improving wetlands, water quality, and wildlife habitat. Part and parcel of restoring features that influenced the battle as defined by *KOCCOA*, park staff also sought to create an environment consistent with the historic terrain. This component involved the increase of grasslands to accommodate grassland species and the removal of exotic plants to reestablish native species.¹⁷

In 2001 the Park Service initiated its first rehabilitation project at the Codori-Trostle thicket, located on the southern end of the battlefield, west of the Pennsylvania Monument. On July 2, 1863, the 1st Minnesota Infantry advanced through this thicket in a famous counterattack to thwart the Confederate advance along the Emmitsburg Road, and in doing so sustained approximately 82 percent casualties. After preparing a *Cultural Landscape Report and Treatment Plan (CLR)* that evaluated the thicket based on *KOCCOA*, park staff outlined four characteristics to guide the rehabilitation project. First, and most significant from an interpretive stand point, the plan recommended the removal of three acres of non-historic trees. This would allow visitors to see the same landscape experienced by commanders and soldiers during the crucial July 2 fighting. It would reestablish the dynamics of observation, as well as cover and concealment. The plan further recommended the restoration of the historic fencing patterns that served as an avenue of approach or an obstacle to soldiers. The third goal provided for the rehabilitation of missing farm lanes and the fourth the replanting of historic orchards.¹⁸

¹⁷ Superintendent John Latschar, "Battlefield Rehabilitation Goals," FNPG Newsletter, Winter 2000, 3.

¹⁸ Superintendent John Latschar, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 2001," 3-4. Through a \$25,000 grant from the FNPG, the park contracted with the NPS Olmsted Center for Landscape Preservation to assist in the preparation of the *Cultural Landscape Report*. Park historian, Kath Harrison prepared much of the research, including the detailed battle narrative for the fighting in the Codori-Trostle thicket and the *KOCCOA* analysis. Gettysburg's staff also received assistance from Todd Bowersox, a retired forestry professor at Pennsylvania State University to determine how to implement the removal of the non-historic woodlots to ensure protection of exotic species. Gladfelter Paper Company volunteered their services in the removal of the three acres.

Work on the Codori-Trostle thicket began in the spring of 2001. The first phase included the removal of the three acres of woodlots. Upon completion of this phase, Friends members, during their annual volunteer workday in June, assisted the NPS in restoring nearly 3,000 feet of historic fencing. After the initial cut, the Park Service moved to sustain the landscape to its historic appearance, with additional “health cuts” to prevent future growth of excess shrubbery. That fall, the Park Service contracted the removal of another twenty three acres of non-historic trees in and around the thicket. The cutting of twenty-six total acres opened the historic view shed, which allowed park interpreters and battlefield guides to interpret the July 2 battle action better than ever before. After the cut, the Friends purchased and planted low-growing rootstock shrubs in order to restore the thicket appearance. The removal of the excessive tree growth also opened the historic Trostle Farm Lane for interpretation. A year later, in June 2002, Friends volunteers built an additional mile of historic worm fencing around the thicket, along Plum Run, and the recently cleared Trostle Lane.¹⁹

Gettysburg’s first rehabilitation project received enthusiastic support from the Civil War community. The results of the removal of non-historic wood lots offered a view shed not seen in over a century. On his first visit to the battlefield since the rehabilitation of Codori-Trostle thicket, for example, Barry Dusel remarked, “I’m impressed to say the least, the view is magnificent! Keep up the good work!” Though some continued to object to the rehabilitation program, supporters reminded these detractors that “The battlefield is not the Gettysburg National Arboretum, nor is it the Gettysburg National Bird Sanctuary...clearing trees to restore

¹⁹ Superintendent John Latschar, “Superintendent’s Annual Report, 2001,” 3-4; Superintendent John Latschar, “Superintendent’s Annual Report, 2002,” 5; FNPG, “Annual Report, 2001-2002.” Folder 5, Box 12, A42, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives.

the battlefield to the vistas of 1863, as well as restoration of orchards and fence lines...is exactly the right thing to do.”²⁰

For park historians, the landscape rehabilitation program soon proved invaluable to their interpretive efforts. For example, on July 3, during Pickett’s Charge, Union artillery commanded by Colonel Freeman McGilvery occupied ground near the Codori-Trostle thicket and poured devastating artillery fire into the advancing Confederates. As the woodlot grew in the century after the battle, few visitors could no longer visually comprehend the role of McGilvery’s artillery in repulsing the assault. The removal of the thicket dramatically changed their perception of the fighting. Park Ranger Eric Campbell recalled how the rehabilitation assisted him in understanding the battle, stating, “Many of my preconceived ideas completely changed. Many of the battlefield landmarks were much closer than I had imagined, thus changing my perspective of these features and their relationship to one another.” In summarizing the impact of future rehabilitation projects, Campbell declared, “How we see and interpret the Gettysburg battlefield will be radically transformed.”²¹

Building on the success of the first rehabilitation in the Codori-Trostle thicket, Gettysburg proceeded to execute additional projects across the battlefield. Implementation of a park-wide rehabilitation project, however, required detailed studies to determine what landscape features to rehabilitate. After finalizing the *CRL* for the Codori-Trostle thicket, the park submitted a “Treatment Plan for the 1863” to the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum

²⁰ Barry Dusel email to Superintendent John Latschar, March 22, 2002. Folder 43, Box 26, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives; Arthur House, Letter to the Editor, *Gettysburg Times*, 22 June 2005. Folder June 2005, Box News Articles, 2002-2005, GNMP Archives.

²¹ Eric Campbell, “An Interpreter’s View of the Codori-Trostle Thicket Project,” FNPNG Newsletter, Spring 2002, 3.

Commission (PHMC) and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), for their approval as required by the *General Management Plan*. This plan, later revised as “Treatment Philosophy: The 1863 Landscape” served as the principle blueprint for the entire project, while park historians and consultants also prepared more focused *Cultural Landscape Reports* to explore specific treatment philosophies on other areas of the battlefield.²²

During the summer of 2002, several Congressional staffers visited the park, met with park management, and received a tour of the recently rehabilitated Codori-Trostle thicket. In 2003 Congress allocated its first earmark for the park’s landscape rehabilitation project. Between 2003 and 2006, Congress allocated \$1,100,000 for Gettysburg’s rehabilitation program. By 2009, the federal government’s contributions had reached \$1.5 million. With the government’s 2003 earmark of \$300,000, Gettysburg removed sixty acres of trees in the historic Rose Woods during the winter of 2003-2004.²³

Aside from the Codori-Trostle thicket, one of the most dramatic rehabilitation projects took place near Warfield Ridge, along South Confederate Avenue, the site of the right flank of General Lee’s battle line. On July 2, as part of General James Longstreet’s en echelon assault, General John Bell Hood’s division formed along the ridge to assail the Union position at Little Round Top and Devil’s Den. In the 140 years since the battle, woodlots obscured what in 1863 was a relatively clear view from Warfield Ridge to the dominating position of Little Round Top. The Park Service initiated a three-year restoration project to reestablish the view seen by Hood’s

²² Park staff prepared a *CLR* on the “Defense of Cemetery Hill” and “The Fighting at the Emmitsburg Road.” These documents are available in the GNMP Library.

²³ These appropriations include: \$300,000 in 2003; \$300,000 in 2004; \$300,000 in 2005; \$200,000 in 2006; nothing in 2007; \$200,000 in 2008; and \$200,000 in 2009. These figures are obtained from Latschar’s annual reports.

Confederates on the hot, sunny afternoon of July 2. Between the winter of 2003 and the spring of 2008, the Park Service removed ninety acres of trees along Warfield Ridge and in the vicinity of the Snyder and Bushman farms, located between Warfield Ridge and the base of the Round Tops. When the agency completed this project for the first time in over a century, visitors driving along Warfield Ridge could see what Hood's Texans and Alabamians saw before beginning their assault toward the Union left flank at Devil's Den and Little Round Top.²⁴

In 2004 and 2005, the Park Service began to rehabilitate the historic appearance of the right flank of the Union army's battle line at Culp's Hill. This included a series of "health cuts" to thin out the underbrush and the removal of non-historic trees. The cut in 2004 removed seventy-four acres of excessive growth on Culp's Hill and a "health cut" in 2005 that thinned an additional forty one acres. At the same time, the Park Service also worked to restore battle features missing from the existing terrain, namely historic orchards and fence patterns. During the fall of 2004, the park service planted nearly thirteen acres of orchards and rebuilt approximately 3,400 linear feet of fencing, including Virginia worm and post-and-rail. By the following year, the Gettysburg battlefield enjoyed 42.4 acres of historic orchards and the placement of over 10 miles of historic fence line.²⁵

Receiving consistent earmarks from Congress, and with donated funds and NPS money as well, Gettysburg continued to execute additional rehabilitation projects through the remainder of the decade. In addition to continuing the cutting between South Confederate Avenue and

²⁴ Superintendent John Latschar, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 2003," 3; Superintendent John Latschar, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 2004," 4; Superintendent John Latschar, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 2007," 3.

²⁵ Superintendent John Latschar, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 2004," 4-6; Superintendent John Latschar, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 2005," 4-5. These 13 acres included restoring the historic orchards at the Michael Bushman, Joseph Sherfy, Henry Spangler, Abraham Trostle, and Joseph Wentz farms.

Devil's Den, in 2006 the Park Service removed non-historic woods near the Peace Light Memorial on Oak Hill, ground held by the Confederate army's 2nd Corps. Visitors now had a clear view of the fields north of town, which were occupied by General Oliver O. Howard's 11th Corps on the afternoon of July 1. Additionally, between 2006 and 2007, the Park Service restored the historic Peach Orchard, owned by Joseph Sherfy and the scene of intense fighting between General William Barksdale Mississippi troops and General James Birney's Union troops on July 2. The Friends donated the money to acquire and plant the peach trees.²⁶

As the decade neared to a close, Gettysburg National Military Park had conducted the most intensive and extensive landscape rehabilitation program in the history of the National Park Service. With the assistance of generous Congressional funding, totaling \$1.5 million by 2009, the Park Service made considerable progress in implementing the landscape goals as outlined in the *GMP*. By 2009, most of the Gettysburg battlefield portrayed a relatively accurate landscape seen by the Union and Confederate soldiers in 1863. The *GMP* called for the removal of 576 acres of non-historic woodlots and by 2009 the NPS removed 296 acres. Additionally, the agency completed "health cuts" in 381.70 acres of historic woodlots. In their efforts to restore missing features, the NPS replanted 110 acres of historic orchards at 35 different sites and reestablished 12.07 miles of historic fence patterns.²⁷

No other Civil War park within the National Park system has ever undertaken such an expansive landscape rehabilitation program. Several parks have completed small-scale

²⁶ Superintendent John Latschar, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 2006," 3; Superintendent John Latschar, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 2007," 3. By the time the NPS began the rehabilitation program, the existing peach trees were infected by parasites. Consequently, the park planted a cover crop to remove the killing organism (nematode) in 2006 and in 2007 began the process of establishing a healthy, vibrant peach orchard.

²⁷ Superintendent John Latschar, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 2009," 8-10.

rehabilitation projects, including Chickamauga-Chattanooga, Vicksburg, and Antietam. In all of these cases the projects have been specific, not park-wide like Gettysburg, and all were conducted without the controversy surrounding Gettysburg's rehabilitation program. In 2004, the Park Service released its *Cultural Landscape Report* for Chickamauga-Chattanooga that outlined a recommended treatment philosophy of landscape rehabilitation. In fulfillment of prescriptions outlined in the plan, the Park Service has completed two rehabilitation cuts of three and nine acres. Similarly, Vicksburg's staff has also implemented small-scale rehabilitation projects. In 2005 the NPS completed a "partial" battlefield rehabilitation project at the Railroad Redoubt. Vicksburg's staff has completed and released a *Cultural Landscape Report* that, like Gettysburg, seeks to rehabilitate the battlefield landscape to an appearance consistent to the park's enabling legislation. The Park Service's preferred alternative recommends the removal of ninety-acres of existing forest cover to enhance visual accessibility of the key terrain features of the siege of Vicksburg. It also recommends establishing twenty-acres of new forest cover to enhance screening of modern intrusions. Gettysburg's successful rehabilitation projects have set precedence for other park's landscape management treatments.²⁸

Paralleling the efforts to rehabilitate the Gettysburg battlefield, the National Park Service, with assistance from its partner associations, continued its aggressive policy of removing modern structural intrusions from the battlefield. In May 2001 the FNPG donated a scenic easement of

²⁸ *Chickamauga Battlefield: Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park, Cultural Landscape Report*, September 2004. Prepared by John Milner Associates. This publication is available at NPS online books at: http://www.nps.gov/history/history/online_books/chch1/clr.pdf; James Ogden, Senior Historian, Chickamauga-Chattanooga NMP, interview by author, 25 February 2010; *Vicksburg National Military Park, Environmental Assessment for Landscape Rehabilitation, Statement of Findings for Executive Order 11990, (Protection of Wetlands)*. Prepared for the National Park Service by MACTEC Engineering and Consulting, August 3, 2009. This report is also available online at: <http://www.nps.gov/vick/parkmgmt/upload/CLR-EA%20Wetlands%20Statement-of-Findings%20-%20Final.pdf>. John Latschar has given several rehabilitation talks to VNMP staff to guide them in their own landscape program.

23.92 acres of land behind Little Round Top to the National Park Service. The same year, the Park Service purchased Adams County Motors, a Ford dealership located along the Carlisle Road on the first day's battlefield. Union General Oliver O. Howard's 11th Corps had occupied this ground on the afternoon of July 1, until a swift movement from Confederate troops in General Richard Ewell's 2nd Corps routed them. The agreement allowed the dealer to remain at the site for four years, giving him enough time to relocate his business. In 2006, the owner finally vacated the property and the NPS began to restore the 6.44 acres to its historic appearance.²⁹

In 2002, the Friends enjoyed a banner year of success in land acquisition. In late February, they announced acquisition of the famous "First Shot Marker" along the Chambersburg Pike, approximately three miles west of town. Veterans of the 8th Illinois Cavalry erected the "First Shot Marker," a relatively modest obelisk, in 1886 in honor of their comrades who at approximately 7:30 AM on July 1 reportedly fired the first shot of the battle. In 1990, the NPS identified this tract in the *Boundary Study*, which Congress subsequently approved. Park staff initiated discussions with the property owners in 2001 and on January 23, 2002 the Park Service and the Friends acquired title to the property. This four-acre tract included the marker as well as a two-story historic home owned by Ephraim Wisler at the time of the battle. This acquisition increased the Friends' acreage donation, through direct purchases and easements, to 370 acres.³⁰

²⁹ Superintendent John Latschar, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 2001," 7-8; Superintendent John Latschar, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 2005," 9; Superintendent John Latschar, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 2006," 6.

³⁰ FNPG Press Release, "Friends of the National Parks at Gettysburg Transfer Home Sweet Home Property to the National Park Service," July 3, 2002; FNPG, Board of Directors Meeting Minutes, March 16, 2002. Folder FNPG,

Later that year, in one of their most significant purchases, the Friends secured title to the Home Sweet Home Hotel, located along Steinwehr Avenue across from the visitor center. This motel represented the last commercial development within the park boundary. Occupying 1.52 acres, this 1950s era hotel tarnished the landscape of which Confederates on the left flank of Pickett's Charge, specifically General Isaac Trimble's troops, advanced during their famous assault. In the midst of the offensive, the 8th Ohio enveloped the enemy and poured devastating enfilading fire into the flanks of several Confederate units. On July 3, 2002, the 139th anniversary of Pickett's Charge, the Friends presented the Park Service with the deed to the property. By March 2003 contractors had completed demolition and had removed the motel. By the 140th anniversary the fields of Pickett's Charge were finally free of modern intrusions.³¹

Since its establishment in 1989, the Friends of the National Parks at Gettysburg proved to be one of the most successful partner associations within the National Park Service. By 2005, however, board members were discussing a merger with the Foundation that would allow both organizations to pool their resources and collectively work towards the advancement of the park's goals. The merger between the FNPG and the Foundation became effective on June 30, 2006. For their part, the Foundation also assisted the park in acquiring key properties. After obtaining the Levan tract for the construction of the new museum, the Foundation worked to purchase other modern developments along the Taneytown Road and Baltimore Pike to provide

October 2001-September 2002, Box 12, A42, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives; Barbara J. Finfrock, *Twenty Years on Six Thousand Acres: The History of the Friends of the National Parks at Gettysburg, 1989-2002* (Harrisburg: Huggins Printing Company, 2009), 53-54.

³¹ FNPG, Board of Directors Meeting Minutes, January 18-19, 2002. Folder FNPG, October 2001-September 2002, Box 12, A42, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives; FNPG, Newsletter, Spring 2002; "FNPG and Park Complete First Shot Property Acquisition," FNPG, Newsletter, Fall 2002, 4; Superintendent John Latschar, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 2003," 7. The Friends worked with the Conservation Fund (TCF) to secure a \$930,000 loan to purchase the hotel.

for a proper setting for the new facility. For example, between 2007 and 2008, the Foundation acquired and demolished five properties along the Baltimore Pike so that modern developments would not infringe upon the museum.³²

While the construction of the new museum and landscape rehabilitation highlighted much of the new century, the NPS and its partners worked toward expanding interpretive opportunities. Seven decades after acquiring the battlefield, Gettysburg National Military Park developed an interpretive program unmatched at any other Civil War site. Led by both seasonal and permanent rangers, Gettysburg's summer interpretive program now consisted of a daily rotation of approximately twenty different programs, which focused on specific aspects of the battle, as well as more contextual topics that discussed civilians, Civil War medicine, or the aftermath of the battle. For example, in 2005 rangers offered 1,528 interpretive programs, attended by 43,180 visitors. During the battle anniversary, rangers presented special "real-time" programs, offered at the same time of day as the 1863 battle action and explored a specific engagement. In addition they also offered a series of anniversary battlewalks, which often lasted three hours and provided visitors with an extremely thorough analysis of a particular event of the battle. As a testament to their popularity, hundreds of visitors endured the often- stifling July heat to follow rangers across the historic fields. Beginning in 1996, thousands more enjoyed these programs from the comfort

³² Finfrock, *Twenty Years on Six Thousand Acres*, 67-69. Superintendent John Latschar, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 2007" 1. Officially members are called Friends of Gettysburg. For simplicity, I will continue to use the term "Friends."

of their own homes when Pennsylvania Cable Network (PCN) began coverage of the park's anniversary battlewalks.³³

In addition to traditional "green and gray" programs, Gettysburg also offered weekend Living History programs, typically held between April and October. Portraying various infantry, artillery, cavalry, medical, signal, or musical units, volunteer reenactors established camp on the battlefield and conducted weapon demonstrations. This form of interpretation proved popular with visitors who enjoyed strolling through the camps, seeing Civil War equipment, and witnessing live firing demonstrations. Moreover, in an effort to appeal to the technological savvy visitor, the Park Service developed several battlefield podcasts in cooperation with Civil War Traveler that allowed visitors to download an interpretive discussion on a particular engagement, such as Devil's Den.³⁴

Recognizing that "many of the sites that are crucial to understanding the battle are outside of the park boundary" park planners encouraged visitation to other significant sites in town. To accomplish this goal, the park, in coordination with the borough, devised a "Borough of Gettysburg Interpretive Plan," designed to explore the battle's impact on civilians as well as

³³ Superintendent John Latschar, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 2005," 11. Approximately 10 percent of park visitors (1,779,999 during the 2005 calendar year) attended a ranger program. On July 3, 2009, for example, while as a seasonal interpreter I presented one of the anniversary walks that followed the footsteps of Brigadier General James Kemper's brigade during Pickett's Charge, and over 300 people accompanied me and thousands more watched it on PCN. The "real-time" programs, generally lasting forty minutes in length, were set up so that visitors could follow their progression throughout the day. For example, at 7:30 AM on July 1 a ranger (at the West End Guide Station) presented a discussion of the opening shots of the battle. Visitors then drove to the Peace Light for a discussion of the morning phase of the battle. On July 3rd, a ranger presented a discussion of the artillery bombardment at 1:00 and visitors then followed another ranger for a discussion of the infantry assault at 3:00 PM. Generally these programs attracted an average of 70 to 100 people. As opposed to the anniversary battle-walks, these programs were targeted to a more general, but interested, audience.

³⁴ NPS Press Release, "The Battle of Little Round Top: Free Podcast Available From Gettysburg National Military Park," 21 February 2007. Folder 2007, K34, Contemporary Administrative Files, GNMP. Park Ranger Eric Campbell, for example, developed the fifty-three minute podcast for Little Round Top.

President Lincoln and the “Gettysburg Address.” At the time of the release of the *GMP*, the Borough of Gettysburg owned two significant sites associated with the Gettysburg Address, the Wills House and the locally termed Lincoln Train Station. While they intended to develop these sites as museums, the borough could not afford the cost to restore or maintain either site. In March 2004, after Congress approved a boundary adjustment that included the Wills House in the park boundary, the NPS acquired the Wills House from the borough. Mayor William Troxell presented Latschar with the “keys to the city” as a symbol of the friendly relationship between the borough and the park. Receiving a Congressional line-item appropriation of \$6 million the Park Service started construction plans to restore the home to its November 18, 1863 appearance when Lincoln stayed overnight and put the finishing touches on the Gettysburg Address. The restoration project proved to be more time consuming and expensive, nearing approximately \$5 million, than originally proposed. It would not be until February 2009 that the Park Service opened the museum to the public.³⁵

Meanwhile, the Friends assisted the Park Service in its efforts to tell a broader story of the battle by acquiring the historic Rupp Home on August 15, 2002. Located on Baltimore Street, the Friends developed the home into an educational center to explain the battle’s impact on the town’s people. On June 30, 2003, the Friends opened the Rupp House to the public. Not only did the interpretive center offer visitors a better understanding of the civilian story, but it also afford the Friends with a visible location to promote their organization and encourage new

³⁵ *GMP*, vol. 1, 93-94; Superintendent John Latschar, “Superintendent’s Annual Report, 2004,” 5; Superintendent John Latschar, “Superintendent’s Annual Report, 2005,” 6. Typical of 19th century homes, the Wills home shared a common wall with two adjoining buildings. In order to accommodate modern structural and safety codes, the Park Service had to separate the common wall into two distinct load-bearing walls. Though one of the neighbors provided the agency with full access to their property to stabilize the wall, the other neighbor prohibited contractors from entering into his business. During the fall 2004, the U.S. Attorney’s office filed suit in a federal court to obtain an injunction that would allow the NPS to enter the neighboring property and complete the structural work.

members. As many as 500 people toured the Rupp House each day during the summer months.³⁶ During the battle's anniversary, the Friends sponsored various lectures and invited noted historians to book signings held on the lawn of the Rupp House.

At the same time, the Friends undertook several projects to restore some of the park's commemorative resources. One of their long-term projects became the restoration of hundreds of cannon and carriages located throughout the battlefield. These guns, solemn reminders of the war's brutality, had suffered from neglect and the ravages of time and weather and showed considerable signs of deterioration. Due to labor and financial constraints of maintaining nearly 6,000 acres, the park remained unable to properly care for approximately 400 cannon. Eager to help the park to repair and protect these historic artifacts, the Friends opened a Cannon Carriage Repair Shop in March 1999. While park maintenance staff supervised the restoration project, the Friends provided much-needed volunteer labor to help repair the guns. For example, in 1997 the park staff repaired only fourteen cannon and carriages. But in 1999, the year the shop opened, Friends volunteers help to restore twenty-four cannon. In 2001 the park received funding for a five-year contract to refit, repaint, and repair the damaged cannons and in the following year Friends volunteers repaired twenty six cannon. In July 2005 thanks to the efforts of a dedicated volunteer staff, the Friends and the park celebrated the restoration of the 200th cannon. By 2009 volunteers repaired and restored 257 cannon carriages.³⁷

³⁶ FNPG, Board of Directors Meeting Minutes, May 17-18, 2002. Folder FNPG October 2001-September 2002, Box 12, A42, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives; Vickey Monrean, "The Friends' Plan for New Education Facility," FNPG Newsletter, Spring 2002, 1;5; Superintendent John Latschar, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 2004," 14-15; FNPG, Board of Directors Meeting Minutes, September 12-13, 2003. Folder 5 FNPG FY 2003, Box 12, A42, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives. The Friends moved their headquarters to the Rupp House in November 2002.

³⁷ FNPG, "Annual Report, 2001-2002." Folder 5, Box 12, A42, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives; Superintendent John Latschar, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 1997," 8-9; Superintendent John

Other restoration efforts were no less significant. In 1910, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania funded a state monument to honor the heroic deeds of her sons. Dominating Cemetery Ridge, the Pennsylvania Memorial, adorned with nine bronze figures, stands as the largest monument on the Gettysburg Battlefield. Nearly a century later, however, weather elements tarnished the bronze figures and the granite structure showed signs of deterioration. Receiving a \$1 million grant from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the Friends began a five-year “cradle to grave” restoration project on the memorial. This project included cleaning the bronze figures, stabilizing the granite structure, and conserving the eighty six bronze tablets at the base of the monument that displayed the name and unit of nearly 30,000 Pennsylvanians who participated in the battle. On July 23, 2003, Pennsylvania Governor Edward Rendell rededicated the monument.³⁸

Meanwhile, a new potential storm suddenly arose on the horizon. In April 2005, just months before the ceremonial ground breaking, local businessman and former Foundation board member, David LeVan announced a proposal to bring a casino to Gettysburg. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania had passed a new gambling law that allowed the development of new slot machine facilities to generate revenue. As proposed, the state offered two “at large”

Latschar, “Superintendent’s Annual Report, 1999,” 15; Superintendent John Latschar, “Superintendent’s Annual Report, 2001,” 8-9; Superintendent John Latschar, “Superintendent’s Annual Report, 2002,” 13; Matthew Major, “More Than Half of the Battlefield’s Cannon Carriages Are Restored,” *Gettysburg Times*, 13 July 2005. Folder July 2005, Box News Articles, 2002-2005, GNMP Archives; Superintendent John Latschar, “Superintendent’s Annual Report, 2009,” 17.

³⁸ FNPG, “Annual Report, 2001-2002.” Folder 5, Box 12, A42, (Unprocessed Central Files, 1987-present), GNMP Archives; Superintendent John Latschar, “Superintendent’s Annual Report, 2003,” 9-10.

casino licenses. LeVan sought to acquire one of the license to bring slots to Gettysburg. He proposed building the casino near the intersection of U.S. Route 30 and Interstate 15, approximately one mile from East Cavalry Field. While not on the battlefield, Civil War preservation organizations, including the Civil War Preservation Trust, the National Parks and Conservation Association, and the National Trust for Historic Preservation, announced their opposition to the proposal. On the local level, the Friends immediately organized to oppose the slot proposal. Along with area residents they formed a grassroots organization called “No Casino Gettysburg.” Since the casino site was not within the park boundary, however, the National Park Service would not take a stance on the proposal. In 2006, the Civil War Preservation Trust declared Gettysburg National Military Park as one of the nation’s top ten endangered battlefields because of the casino proposal. In December 2007 the Pennsylvania Gaming Commission decided not to award LeVan a license for the proposed casino, and the battlefield, for the time being, remains free of gambling.³⁹

This proved to be a short-lived victory. In January 2010 LeVan once again announced his intentions to bring slots to Gettysburg. He now proposes to add 500 slot machines and 50 gambling tables to the existing amenities at the Eisenhower Resort and Conference Center, located along the Emmitsburg Road, just one-half mile south of the battlefield. On January 26, 2010, the Civil War Preservation Trust, National Parks Conservation Association, National Trust for Historic Preservation, and Preservation Pennsylvania announced their opposition to the casino proposal. A coalition of national and state preservation groups have formed the “No

³⁹ Superintendent John Latschar, “Superintendent’s Annual Report, 2005,” 1-2; Superintendent John Latschar, “Superintendent’s Annual Report, 2006,” 8; Superintendent John Latschar, “Superintendent’s Annual Report, 2007,” 8-9. David LeVan is a Gettysburg native and CEO of Conrail. Ironically, LeVan also held a post on the Foundation’s Board of Directors, but resigned from the board in the fall of 2005.

Casino” group to fight LeVan’s renewed proposal. LeVan maintains that his proposal will create much needed jobs for local residents and will serve as an attractive amenity to the now-struggling Eisenhower Resort and Conference Center.⁴⁰

Meanwhile, by Memorial Day 2005, the Foundation had raised over \$75 million. On June 2 the partners broke ground for the new museum. Immediately thereafter, contractors began construction of the facility and progressed quickly. In 2006 contractors completed site work, evacuation of the foundation, installed utilities, and completed the entrance along the Taneytown Road. They also began erecting structural steel beams for the cyclorama rotunda in September. By September 2007 the exterior was completed and contractors directed their efforts to finish the parking lots, curbs, and sidewalks. With the completion of the visitor center, Olin’s team of conservators hung the first of the fourteen restored panels in their hyperbolic shape in the new cyclorama rotunda. Meanwhile, exhibit designers Gallagher & Associates began installing, or “fabricating,” the museum exhibits and inter-actives.⁴¹

Although the conservation of the cyclorama painting was not yet completed, park and Foundation staffs were eager to move into the new complex and decided upon a ‘soft opening.’

⁴⁰James Campi et.al to David LeVan, January 26, 2010. Letter available online at: <http://www.civilwar.org/aboutus/news/news-releases/2010-news/assets/levan-casino-letter.pdf>. Accessed on March 5, 2010. For more information on “No Casino” visit: www.nocasinogettysburg.org. At this time LeVan does not own the Eisenhower Conference Center, but has secured an option to purchase the property. He maintains that he will not purchase the property unless he can obtain the gaming license.

⁴¹ Superintendent John Latschar, “Superintendent’s Annual Report, 2005,” 1-2; Superintendent John Latschar, “Superintendent’s Annual Report, 2006,” 1; Superintendent John Latschar, “Superintendent’s Annual Report, 2007,” 1-2; Michael Vyskocil, “Up!” *Gettysburg Foundation Newsletter*, Fall 2007, 1;6.

On April 13, 2008, at 5:00 PM, the National Park Service closed the doors to the old visitor center. The following day, April 14, after fourteen years of planning, six years of fundraising, and three years of construction, at a price tag of \$103 million the new Gettysburg Visitor Center and Museum opened to the public.

In the absence of the Electric Map, a twenty-two minute feature film, *A New Birth of Freedom*, narrated by well-known actor Morgan Freeman, served as the main orientation media. The film placed the battle into the larger social and political issues of war and its aftermath: secession, slavery, emancipation, and ultimately Civil Rights. Many people after viewing the film, however, complained that it was a poor substitute for the Electric Map. Some visitors found the film's discussion of slavery and freedom to be too politicized and inappropriate for a battlefield's orientation film. Terry Klima of Perry Hall, Maryland, for example, offered a common sentiment of disappointment of a movie that "obviously was pushing a political agenda that had little to do with the war or Gettysburg."⁴²

Aside from the disappointment in the film and the removal of the Electric Map, some criticized the museum and the exhibitory. Whereas the old visitor center continued the Rosensteel style display of a curiosity room, simply by display hundreds of rifles, shell fragments, bullets, and accoutrements, park curators selectively picked artifacts to display in the new museum that complemented the story line. Objects were now used to interpret, not simply

⁴² Jeffery Bender to Superintendent John Latschar, email, September 11, 2008. Folder 2, Public Comments on the Fee Proposal, A22, Contemporary Administrative Records, GNMP.; Conrad Richter to Superintendent John Latschar, email, September 27, 2008. Folder 5, Public Comments on the Fee Proposal, A22, Contemporary Administrative Records, GNMP. Terry Klima to Superintendent John Latschar, email, August 31, 2008. Folder 1, Public Comments on the Fee Proposal, A22, Contemporary Administrative Records, GNMP. Benders comment on the film read, "It is only twenty two minutes and a significant part of the time is taken discussing slavery as essentially the only cause for the Civil War and tries to link the battle to Martin Luther King and the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s. Not to be too sarcastic, but in this political season, I half expect Barack Obama to come out at the end and say, 'I am Barack Obama and I endorse this message.'"

to be on display. Regular visitors to the museum and Civil War buffs found the new museum disappointing. Peter Jorgensen of the *Civil War News* summarized, “The new Museum and Visitor Center at Gettysburg National Military Park is not a museum at all and it has little on display regarding the battles of July 1, 2 and 3 in 1863.” He continued, “It is a massive, attractively designed structure with vast amounts of exhibit space devoted not to exhibits, but to presentations.” Similarly, Jorgensen addressed a reoccurring point of complaint when he noted that the Park Service praised the partnership as an opportunity to build a new museum and storage facility that would better preserve the objects, but the new museum displayed fewer objects than the old visitor center. In the Park Service’s defense, Latschar explained that “what we’re creating is a storyline museum, where you use artifacts to illustrate the storyline. So we have no need for 40 varieties of rifle muskets.” Moreover, the NPS had included a traditional weapons display outside the museum, complete rifles, shell fragments, belt buckles, and bullets. Simply put, however, most of the battlefield visitors do not understand or care about the differences between an Enfield rifle or a carbine, much less want to see dozens of them on display. But a minority of the Gettysburg visitors remained discontent, as reflected in a comment from a New Hampshire visitor, “I regret being enthused about the project for ten years. I was foolish enough to think they wanted to show the rest of the collection for the public.”⁴³

Other disappointments loomed. Despite high expectations, revenues for the building fell significantly short of projections. Event Network, operator of the center’s bookstore and gift shop, met and actually exceeded profit projections, but revenue from Aramark’s refreshment saloon fell slightly short of projections. Most significantly, the film proceeds were substantially

⁴³ Peter Jorgensen, “Paging Thru: The New Gettysburg Museum and Visitor Center,” *Civil War News*, July 2008; Bill Hallet comment, March 7, 2009, on “Ratings of a Civil War Historian” blog (Eric Wittenburg) accessible at www.civilwarcavalary.com

below projections. The film's original admission price was set at \$8.00 and when the cyclorama opened in September the combined admission ticket became \$12.00 per adult. Many visitors, satisfied with the interpretive opportunities in the free museum, simply opted not to see the film, while others believed the film to be priced too high. "Who is the intellect that proposed \$8.00 for a twenty-two minute movie?" one visitor asked. "They have no business running a lemonade stand, much less one of our country's most treasured historical spots." Park officials soon concluded that "the free museum was outdrawing the fee venues" resulting in a "negative impact on the fee revenues." During the first four months of operation, between April 14 and August 28, the percentage of visitors who paid the admission fee to the film ranged from 18 to 24 percent. The Foundation's pro forma revenue projections were based on 33 percent of visitors purchasing the ticket.⁴⁴

The solution to the revenue shortfall seemed simple: charge an admission to the museum. Consequently, even before the grand opening and the premier of the restored Gettysburg Cyclorama, the NPS and Foundation decided to do so. Since the *General Management Plan* stated the museum would remain free to the public, however, in order to make any fee changes

⁴⁴ F. Zech to Superintendent John Latschar, August 31, 2008; Superintendent John Latschar, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 2006," 3; NPS Press Release, "Gettysburg Museum Fee Proposal Released for Public Comment," August 28, 2008. Folder Public Comments on the Fee Proposal, A22, Contemporary Administrative Records, GNMP. Using the 33 percent projections, this meant that the theater fell \$1,784,780 short of projections of an annual basis. Partners believed that the pro forma budget could be obtained if 33 percent of the visitors paid for the film, but evidently the majority of visitors entering the building were not interested in viewing the film or believed that the \$7.00 admission fee too high for twenty two minute introductory film. As Latschar described the proposal, "Although this proposal increases the cost of a visit to Gettysburg NMP by those who would not choose to experience either the theater or the cyclorama program, it does provide the majority of our visitors with a better visitor experience, by making the theater and cyclorama programs more affordable." Essentially, according to the superintendent, "the proposal spreads the burden of supporting the new facility across a wider percentage of park visitors." Eastern National, Gettysburg's long-time partner, lost the bid for the bookstore concession in the new building and effective November 1, 2007, the Foundation took over ticketing and reservations, as well as the operation of the Electric Map, for the National Park Service. Eastern National continued to operate the bookstore in the old visitor center until it closed in April 2008, at which point their services with GNMP were complete, Superintendent John Latschar, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 2007," 14-15.

the park had to publicly announce the proposal for a thirty-day review period. The new fee structure would include an “all-in-one fee” that included admission to the film, cyclorama and now the museum for \$7.50. The partners attempted to present the new fee proposal as an economic benefit: the \$7.50 all-in-one admission “would be significantly less” than the film/cyclorama combination ticket priced at \$12.00. Besides, park managers stressed that “the majority of the visitor experience,” meaning the battlefield, would remain free. Similarly, the Park Service and Foundation declared “there is no charge to enter and use the visitor center” and reminded visitors that entrance in to the refreshment saloon, bookstore, museum lobby, reference room, and educational center remained “free.” Not everyone was convinced. Recognizing that several of the “free” areas within the building were concession venues, Rebecca Yost of Johnstown, Pennsylvania commented that the only truly free areas in the building were the information desk and restrooms. She then sarcastically declared, “I suppose it is only a matter of time before the Foundation’s financial problems cause pay toilets to be installed and a fee charged per question answered.”⁴⁵

⁴⁵ NPS Press Release, “Gettysburg Museum Fee Proposal Released for Public Comment,” August 28, 2008; “National Park Service and Gettysburg Foundation Proposal to Amend the Fee Structure at the Gettysburg National Military Park Museum and Visitor Center, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania.” Folder Public Comments on the Fee Proposal, A22, Contemporary Administrative Records, GNMP; Rebecca Yost to Superintendent John Latschar, email, September 29, 2008. Folder 6, Public Comments on the Fee Proposal, A22, Contemporary Administrative Records, GNMP. The proposed fee structure was set at \$7.50 for adults; \$6.50 for adult groups; \$5.50 for children (ages 6-12); and \$5.00 for youth groups. Park officials and Foundation managers believed that the fee proposal would accomplish three goals. First, they anticipated a “substantial increase” in the percentage of visitors willing to pay the fee, which would allow for the Foundation to meet its financial goals. Second, the all-in-one fee was “substantially lower” than the proposed \$12 film/cyclorama combination ticket, which created a “higher value for park visitors” and made the film and cyclorama more affordable. And last, the fee proposal allowed visitors multiple opportunities to enjoy the film or cyclorama during their visit. Recognizing that a significant portion of visitors came to Gettysburg several times during the year, the NPS and Foundation devised an annual pass that provided unlimited admission to the venues for \$32.00. The fee for the annual pass was set as the same as the annual membership for the Friends of Gettysburg, and thus the season pass included “complimentary” membership into the Friends.

Most significantly, the fee proposal represented a complete reversal of promises made to the American public and Congress during the *General Management Plan* process. The *GMP* states, “The museum, like the visitor center, would be free to all visitors to encourage them to visit and learn from its exhibits.” In addition, the National Park Service had selected and subsequently touted the Kinsley proposal as the “best overall proposal” because it did not require a fee for the museum. Indeed, the evaluation panel found the proposal submitted by the McGorrick Group, with its proposed non-profit the “Gettysburg Battlefield Coalition,” to be less desirable because they recommended charging an admission to the museum. As described by the evaluation panel and NPS Director Stanton, “Under the Kinsley proposal, the non-profit owner of the facilities would impose no fee for admission to the visitor center and museum.” Stanton continued, “Fees would be charged within the facilities for additional, optional activities...the major portion of the revenue...would come from optional fees to the visitor rather than from a mandatory visitor entrance fee as proposed by GBC.” As for historical precedent, since acquiring the battlefield in 1933, the National Park Service at Gettysburg had never charged an admission fee to the museum and, according to official statements in the *General Management Plan*, “does not intend to do so in the new facilities.”⁴⁶

Latschar reported in his 2008 annual report that the park received 572 comments on admission fees during the thirty-day review period. Of these, 61 percent favored the fee proposal, while 34 percent opposed it. Five percent remained neutral. He added that the park and Foundation were “very pleased” with the public’s response to institute a fee for the museum. To a significant degree, however, these calculations of support were skewed. In order to

⁴⁶ *GMP*, vol. 1, 90; Michael Alderstein to Director Robert Stanton, October 13, 1997. *GMP*, vol. 1, 363-376; Director Robert Stanton to Randy Harper, February 6, 1998 in *GMP*, vol. 1, 393-405.

generate support for the proposal, the Foundation had mailed 22,052 letters to its own members, explaining the reason for the fee proposal and encouraging them to voice their opinion on the proposal. Foundation President Wilburn's letter stated, "Under this proposal, Friends' members—at all levels of annual membership—would receive a season pass providing unlimited admission." Wilburn continued, "We hope that you are supportive of the revised structure that we are proposing, which both the Foundation and the NPS are convinced is in the best interest of both visitors to Gettysburg National Military Park and the accomplishment of our joint mission of preservation and understanding." Essentially the Foundation's mass mailing campaign requested responses from those who would have not have to pay the fee. A significant share of the 572 comments received thus came from Friends members would not pay the fee. Consequently, Latschar's assertion and the tabulation that 61 percent of the comments favored the fee proposal must be carefully considered.⁴⁷

For the majority of visitors and Congressional members who supported the *GMP* and the partnership based on the belief that the museum, including the park's artifacts, would be free to the public remained far from "pleased" with the fee proposal. Some articulated a strong desire that the nation's preeminent Civil War museum should always remain-free for everyone. "The story of Gettysburg should be told, but not a price," commented Robert Blama. Tom Vossler, a Licensed Battlefield Guide and former board member of the Friends, commented, "How sad it is

⁴⁷ Superintendent John Latschar, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 2008," 2-3; Dear Friend of Gettysburg, from Robert Wilburn, Foundation President, August 28, 2008. Folder Public Comments on the Fee Proposal, A22, Contemporary Administrative Record, GNMP. The reason the Foundation set the annual admission pass at \$32.00 was because an annual Friends membership at the basic level was \$32.00. The assertion that a significant portion of the received letters were from Friends members is based on the author's reading of hundreds of the letters. Many of the commentators readily identified themselves as a member of the Friends. For example, of the letters filed into folder 3, of the 66 individuals who identified themselves as Friends members, 57 supported the fee proposal while 9 opposed it. Folder 4 offers similar results- of the 39 people who identified themselves as Friends members, 34 supported the fee increase.

now that the museum exhibits are proving to be the most popular part of the new complex, you are going to tax the visitor in order to increase revenue!” Others felt deceived that after the NPS and Foundation made an “irrevocable pledge” that the museum and its artifacts would be free, opted to charge for the museum just four months after opening. Joe Wurzer from Virginia offered a widespread sentiment, writing, “The museum was promised to be free to the public. This was a key selling point from the start.” More significantly to the purpose of the partnership, Park Historian Kathy Harrison offered that “the public-private partnership was instigated and implemented in order to relieve the taxpayer of the additional burden of paying of a new interpretive complex. But the proposal seems to contradict that notion.”⁴⁸

On October 1, even before the dust settled on the comment period, the Park Service and Foundation announced the approval of the fee structure. The \$7.50 admission to the museum, film, and cyclorama went into effect the next day, a mere two days after the comment period closed and just days after the visitor center’s grand opening and the re-opening of the Gettysburg Cyclorama. Some this suggested that the NPS and Foundation had proceeded with the comment period only as a token gesture, because they already decided to implement the fee. One Johnstown, Pennsylvania resident classified the comment period as an “exercise in futility,” while others called it a “done deal.” A Fort Collins, Colorado resident declared the decision to charge for the museum was “premature” since the Gettysburg Cyclorama had not yet opened.⁴⁹

⁴⁸ Robert Blama to Superintendent John Latschar, September 19, 2008. Folder 4; Tom Vossler to Superintendent John Latschar, email, September 11, 2008. Folder 3; Michael Vice to Superintendent John Latschar, email, September 16, 2008. Folder 4; Joe Wurzer to Superintendent John Latschar, email, September 29, 2008. Folder 1; Kathy Harrison to Superintendent John Latschar, September 25, 2008. Folder 5, Public Comments on the Fee Proposal, A22, Contemporary Administrative Records, GNMP.

⁴⁹ Superintendent John Latschar, “Superintendent’s Annual Report, 2008,” 3; Scot Andrew Pitzer, “It’s Official: Museum Fee Takes Effect Today,” *Gettysburg Times*, 2 October 2008; Rebecca Yost to Superintendent John Latschar, email, September 29, 2008. Folder 6; Carol Hegeman to Superintendent John Latschar, email, September

While the primary purpose of the comment period was to solicit opinions on the new fee proposal, some responders used the comment period as an opportunity to criticize other aspects of the new museum. Gettysburg's effort to incorporate a broader discussion of the Civil War era unleashed a barrage of controversy. Once the museum opened, critics continued to assail the exhibits. Others had complained that the museum did not display the hundreds of rifles, muskets, and artillery pieces that had been on exhibit in the old visitor center. The reduction of displayed artifacts resurfaced during the fee proposal. "You want to begin charging me a fee for seeing less than half of the Gettysburg items I used to see for free?" wrote one commentator. Another letter read, "It's a shame that all those wonderful relics from the battle are sitting in a storage area somewhere, so that you can sell Abe Lincoln bobble-heads in your enormous gift shop."⁵⁰

Public comments also revealed some level of dissatisfaction with the partnership between the Park Service and Foundation, not to mention an overriding sense that Latschar and the NPS had yielded to the demands of the private Foundation. Ron Ciasullo of Connecticut stated that he was disappointed that "our National Park must now yield to the designs of a foundation." Eric Campbell of Knoxville, Maryland, urged Latschar to do the "right thing" by denying the Foundation's request for a fee proposal and instead urge them to find "more realistic and creative ways to solve the financial crisis they have created." During the review period for the *GMP* former GNMP Superintendent Daniel Kuehn, fearful of the long-term implications for the

25, 2008; Karla Flook to Superintendent John Latschar, email, September 22. Folder 5, Public Comments on the Fee Proposal, A22, Contemporary Administrative Records, GNMP.

⁵⁰ Norman Dykstra to Superintendent John Latschar, email, September 14, 2008; Unidentified author to Superintendent John Latschar, email, September 9, 2008. Folder 3 Public Comments on the Fee Proposal, A22, Contemporary Administrative Records, GNMP.

National Park Service had warned contemporary park managers of the danger of entering into a partnership. Kuehn had cautioned, “In the past, the National Park Service was concerned with quality to the point it would never relinquish visitor center management and operation in a major park to an outside entity. The plan for the visitor center gives up that hands-on control... This plan was devised by minds that were without concern for the long-term implications for the Service.” And so it appeared that Latschar and the National Park Service acquiesced and relinquished “hands-on control” to the Foundation.⁵¹

Shortly after the public comment period ended, the Park Service and Foundation celebrated the grand opening of the Gettysburg Museum and Visitor Center on September 26-28, 2008. Not to be deterred by the rainy fall weather, hundreds of dignitaries and donors as well as thousands of spectators turned out for the ribbon cutting ceremony. On September 26, at 11:00 A.M., Latschar, Wilburn, Robert Kinsley, Secretary of the Interior Dirk Kempthorne, and Pennsylvania Governor Ed Rendell cut the ceremonial ribbon to the new building. “For the first time ever at Gettysburg,” remarked Wilburn, “we have a museum that does justice to what happened here.” Ceremonial festivities included Civil War music, a reading of the Gettysburg Address, special NPS ranger presentations, living history demonstrations, guest lectures, and book signings by Civil War historians Eric Foner and Gabor Boritt.⁵² To top off the opening

⁵¹ Ron Ciasullo to Superintendent Latschar, email, September 9, 2008. Folder 1; Eric Campbell to Superintendent John Latschar, September 29, 2008. Folder 6, Public Comments on the Fee Proposal, A22, Contemporary Administrative Records, GNMP; Daniel Kuehn to Superintendent John Latschar, September 20, 1998 in *GMP*, vol. 2, 462.

⁵² Scot Andrew Pitzer, “Civil War Celebration,” *Gettysburg Times*, 27 September 2008; “Gettysburg National Military Park Museum and Visitor Center: Grand Opening Celebration Event Schedule,” September 26-28, 2008. Possession of the Author, Auburn, Alabama.

celebrations, the Foundation secured an original copy of the Gettysburg Address, which they displayed in the special exhibits gallery for the weekend.

The premier of the restored Gettysburg Cyclorama became arguably the highlight of the grand opening. With the addition of the fourteen feet of sky and the vibrant display of colors and detail, the painting bore little resemblance to its former self. Moreover, the three dimensional objects in the foreground blended seamlessly into the canvas, giving spectators the impression they were genuinely in the midst of Pickett's Charge. The cyclorama became so popular that the audio program had to be revised to allow visitors more time to view the painting. Noted museum and art critic Edward Rothstein of the *New York Times* simply described the painting as “stunning.”⁵³

The grand opening was not free of controversy, however. The Foundation spared no expense for the grand opening celebrations. While a nice touch to the weekend, transportation and full time security for the Gettysburg Address cost approximately \$51,000. On the evening of the 27th the Foundation sponsored a white-tie gala, themed “Party Like It's 1863,” complete with dancing, alcohol, and hundred-dollar-a-plate dinners. The Foundation quickly came under fire for what many interpreted to be a tasteless, elitist celebration. After the largest battle of the Civil War and the death of 10,000 soldiers, who was partying in 1863? Moreover, in light of the

⁵³ Edward Rothstein, “Renewed Vantage at Center of Battle,” *New York Times*, 25 September 2008, B1. As discussed, this project proved to be one of the largest restoration efforts undertaken in the United States. The five year process included cleaning the painting, repainting missing or fading features, and securing loose painting. Oddly enough, the conservators' effort were complicated by trying to negate the damage done by previous conservation efforts, mainly removing the lining and wax from the back of the canvas. Olin's team stitched the canvas to a new fabric to replicate the hyperbolic shape of the fourteen panels. Weighing nearly 13 tons, and measuring 42 feet high and 377 feet long, strategically placed tabs along the vertical edge of the panels created the tension to establish the painting's hyperbolic shape, thereby providing the three dimensional illusion that had not been seen in over a century. After seeing the film, visitors ascended an escalator to reach a viewing platform that situates them at eye-level with the horizon of the painting. As they step off the escalator, a dim light projects on the painting as a prelude to the multi-media light and sound show that summarizes the fateful events of July 3.

Foundation's declared revenue shortfall and the museum fee some took umbrage with such elaborate celebrations. Others questioned the Foundation's pleas of financial hardship when their president, Robert Wilburn, made an annual salary of approximately \$390,000.⁵⁴

For all the controversy surrounding the Kinsley proposal and the *GMP*, the construction and opening of new building represented a watershed event in the history of Gettysburg National Military Park. Secretary Kempthorne summarized the emotion of many, stating that "The museum is beautiful. The film is a masterpiece. The restored Cyclorama is, in fact, stunning." Nationally-known columnist George F. Will declared that the Foundation and NPS has "done something resoundingly right" by offering the "sparkling new museum and visitor center that instructs and inspires." From the 'soft opening' in April to the end of December 2008, visitation to the visitor center reached nearly 750,000 visitors. President George W. Bush enjoyed a three-hour visit on September 5.⁵⁵

In the months after the grand opening of the Gettysburg Visitor Center and Museum, and the subsequent hullabaloo over the fee proposal, the National Park Service celebrated another milestone. After a \$7.2 million restoration project, the Wills House opened to the public on February 12, 2009, the 200th anniversary of President Lincoln's birthday. Approximately 300 spectators came for the opening festivities, which included a complimentary tour of the facility. While the Wills House is owned and maintained by the National Park Service, daily operation of

⁵⁴ Evangelina Rubalcava-Joyce to Superintendent John Latschar, September 10, 2008. Folder 6, Public Comments on the Fee Proposal, A22, Contemporary Administrative Records, GNMP; Scot Andrew Pitzer, "Latschar To Leave NPS," *Gettysburg Times*, 8 November 2008.

⁵⁵ Scot Andrew Pitzer, "Civil War Celebration," *Gettysburg Times*, 27 September 2008; George F. Will, "A Gift on Hallowed Ground," *Washington Post*, 16 October 2008, A19; Superintendent John Latschar, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 2009," 1; Superintendent John Latschar, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 2008," 15.

the building is done by Main Street Gettysburg. By the end of the 2009 calendar year, the Wills House reported 35,483 visitors.⁵⁶

After obscuring the historic landscape of Ziegler's Grove since the early 1920s, contractors started to demolish the park's old visitor center on March 23, 2009. A wrecking ball smashed into the brick building and one by one the white porch pillars toppled to the ground. The removal of this building partially fulfilled one of the park's principal management objectives in its efforts to rehabilitate Ziegler's Grove. The former cyclorama building remains, however. In December 2006 the Recent Past Preservation Network (RPPN) sued the NPS for its alleged failure to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act and the National Historic Preservation Act. The RPPN argues that though the NPS declared the "removal" of the building as its objective, the building did not need to be demolished, but instead could be moved. If the RPPN prevails in court, the National Park Service will be forced to reexamine all possible alternatives for removal, including relocating the 1962 building. If the court rules, however, in favor of the NPS, the Park Service will proceed with demolition. The cyclorama building cannot be removed from Ziegler's Grove until the NPS receives a verdict from the District Court Judge. At the end of 2009 no ruling has been issued and the former cyclorama building remains idly vacant.⁵⁷

⁵⁶ Superintendent John Latschar, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 2008," 6. Senator Rick Santorum offered the opening remarks; Superintendent John Latschar, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 2008," 11.

⁵⁷ Scot Andrew Pitzer, "Restoration Contract Awarded for Ziegler's Grove Project," *Gettysburg Times*, 27 February 2009; Superintendent John Latschar, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 2009" 7. After the Recent Past Preservation Network sued the NPS, both agencies filed motions and countermotions before the case was heard before the U.S. District Court in Washington, D.C. on October 20, 2008. On March 23, 2008 a Magistrate Judge submitted his recommendations to the District Judge for final ruling. The Magistrate Judge found that the NPS complied with the National Historic Preservation Act, but ruled in favor of the plaintiff that the agency had not adequately explored environmental impacts of the demolition of the cyclorama building. On April 23, 2008, on behalf of the NPS, the Department of Justice filed an objection to the Magistrate's ruling, and thereafter the plaintiff also filed objections.

Meanwhile, the Gettysburg Foundation was still not meeting its projected revenue. After implementing the \$7.50 museum fee in October 2008, the Foundation increased the admission again to \$10.50 on June 15, 2009. Revenue generated from the admission, bookstore, food services are earmarked to pay down the building's debt and provide for operating costs of the facility. The Washington office of the National Park Service was displeased with the second fee increase, however. As a result, the NPS sent a budget team to examine the Foundation's 2010 operating budget. More significantly, approval of the Foundation's budget would no longer fall within the jurisdiction of Gettysburg's superintendent, but would now have to be approved by the Regional Director. Each of these measures should provide some degree of additional fiscal oversight on the Foundation. Latschar reported that these increased fees "were accepted with virtually no complaint from the visiting public."⁵⁸

In the midst of the excitement of the opening of the new visitor center and the success of the landscape rehabilitation program an ironic last act began. Latschar once again came under fire from critics, and this time from federal investigators. In late August 2008, after helping bring the new museum to fruition, Foundation President Robert Wilburn informed the board that he planned to resign. To replace Wilburn, Board Chairman Bob Kinsley met with Latschar. On October 27, he offered him the job as president of the Gettysburg Foundation. Latschar accepted

At the time of writing, the District Court Judge has the Magistrate's rulings and will, at some point, adopt or change those recommendations. Until the case is legally settled, the NPS will delay removal of the building.

⁵⁸ Superintendent John Latschar, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 2009." CF, GNMP, 2-3.

the remunerative position on the following day, to be effective March 1, 2009. To some of the park's regular critics, Latschar's apparent move to the Foundation, a partner organization that he had helped to create, represented a clear conflict of interest. Eric Uberman, owner of the local wax museum and constant critic of Latschar, declared for example, "It's not unexpected that he's going over to the Foundation. He's never going to leave." The NPS Designated Ethics Official initially approved this transfer, but in mid-December, Latschar learned that the Department of Interior's Designated Agency Ethics Official was reviewing it. At the end of January 2009 the Ethics Office informed Latschar that accepting the Foundation presidency would violate federal post-employment regulations. Consequently, on January 28, Latschar announced that he would remain Gettysburg's superintendent. While he admitted he had been looking forward to working in the private sector, he remained enthusiastic about keeping the "best job in the NPS."⁵⁹

Just as the criticism quelled over Latschar's potential move to the Foundation, a new whirlpool of controversy began when the Inspector General (IG) began a new investigation. In part, it stemmed from the conflict of interest over Latschar assuming the Foundation's presidency, as well as allegations made by Edward Pound in *National Journal* and an editorial by John Summers in *The New Republic*. While Summers' article offered a general discussion of "how the government is ruining America's most famous battlefield," Pound directly took Latschar to task for allegedly misappropriating park funds. Meanwhile, the Inspector General explored similar issues in their official investigation which quickly expanded into an inquiry into a dozen or more alleged abuses of power during his fifteen year reign, which ranged from awarding non-competitive contracts to using federal money for the purchase of a hot tub at his

⁵⁹ Scot Andrew Pitzer, "Latschar To Leave NPS," *Gettysburg Times*, 8 November 2008; Scot Andrew Pitzer, "Latschar to Remain Park Superintendent," *Gettysburg Times*, 29 January 2009; Superintendent John Latschar, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 2009," 3-4.

residence. After nearly six months of investigation, on September 29, the Inspector General released its investigative report. It exonerated Latschar, stating, “Our investigation revealed no evidence that Latschar was involved in criminal activity at the Park.”⁶⁰

While the Inspector General’s report cleared Latschar of the alleged charges, however, the beginning of the end was in sight. As part of the investigation, the IG seized Latschar’s computer. While scanning it, officials found a series of sexually explicit images that the superintendent had viewed and downloaded between 2004 and 2006, in clear violation of the Department of Interior’s computer use policy. Since this was a personnel matter, and therefore protected by privacy regulations, the issue of inappropriate use did not appear in the IG report. As punishment, the regional director recommended a five-day suspension without pay. Befitting of a Greek tragedy, however, a source within either the IG office or the NPS office in Washington leaked a copy of the inappropriate use section of the report to the *Washington Post*. On October 19, 2009 the headlined blared, “Report Ignored Explicit Images Found on Park Official’s Computer.”⁶¹

After fifteen years of service at Gettysburg National Military Park and unparalleled accomplishments, Latschar’s tenure at Gettysburg came to an abrupt and unexpected end. After

⁶⁰ Superintendent John Latschar, “Superintendent’s Annual Report, 2009,” 3-4; 30-32. Edward T. Pound, “Battle Ground” *National Journal*, 21 February 2009, 26-33; John Summers, “Gettysburg Regress: How the Government is Ruining America’s Most Famous Battlefield,” *The New Republic*, 18 March 2009, 22-24; Office of Inspector General, “Investigative Report, John A. Latschar,” September 17, 2009. This report is available online at : <http://www.doioig.gov/upload/Latschar%20ROI%20for%20web%20site1.pdf>. It was posted to the web on September 29, 2009. Some of these investigations included the legitimacy and nature of the partnership; the issuance of non-competitive contracts to Kinsley Construction; coercion of leave donations for the superintendent’s wife; unnecessary firing of a pregnant Eastern National employee; influence and cover-up of a criminal investigation of a relative; the purchase of hot tubs with NPS money; the construction and repair of fences at Latschar’s home with Eastern National money; and Latschar’s efforts to “shroud the park in secrecy.”

⁶¹ Kimberly Kindy, “Report Ignored Explicit Images Found on Park Official’s Computer,” *Washington Post*, 19 October 2009; Scot Andrew Pitzer, “Out! Porn Hobby Gets Latschar Reassigned,” *Gettysburg Times*, 23 October 2009. The *Post* declared that Latschar used his government computer to view “3,400 sexually explicit images.” Latschar did not serve the five-day suspension since the involuntary transfer superseded this punishment.

-serving his punishment as distributed by the regional director, on October 22, Latschar learned that he had been involuntarily reassigned to the Associate Director of Cultural Resources, stationed in Frederick, Maryland. Local newspapers were merciless, “Out! Porn Hobby Gets Latschar Reassigned” declared the *Gettysburg Times*. On October 26, one week after the *Post* story broke Latschar began his new duties. Dr. John Latschar left Gettysburg as the most decorated, accomplished, yet certainly controversial superintendent in the history of Gettysburg National Military Park. Expressing “great sorrow” for the embarrassment he brought to his family and the employees of Gettysburg National Military Park, Latschar remarked in his farewell memo to his staff, “My greatest prayer is that you will not let the circumstances of my departure tarnish the magnificent accomplishments you have achieved.” And magnificent they were.⁶²

⁶² Superintendent John Latschar, “Superintendent’s Annual Report, 2009,” 30-32. In December 2008 Latschar received the Stephen Mather award from the National Parks and Conservation Association, awarded annually for superior work in the stewardship of National Park resources. That same year he also received the National Park Service Preservationists of the Year Award from the Civil War Preservation Trust and the Honor Award from the National Trust for Historic Preservation. In 2008, Latschar also received the Stephen Mather award and in 2005 he received the Man of the Year Award from the New Jersey Civil War Round Table. The Northeast Region named Latschar Superintendent of the Year for Natural Resource Stewardship in 2004 for his work in landscape rehabilitation. In 2001 Latschar received the Northeast Region Superintendent of the Year Award (he also won his award in 1991 for his work at Steamtown National Historic Site). Regional Director Marie Rust lauded Latschar’s work in landscape rehabilitation and forming the partnership with the Foundation to provide for a new museum. In 2000, he received the Northeast Regional award for Outstanding Performance by a Superintendent in Planning, for his work in developing the *General Management Plan*. The NPS Director also awarded Latschar the Cultural Resources award in 2000.

Conclusion

The swift removal of John Latschar came as an unwelcome surprise to many of his staff and supporters, who for years had worked with him to create a better battlefield experience for visitors and a landscape that restored the site's integrity. On the other hand, those who devoted considerable time and effort to criticizing the superintendent, whom they dubbed "King John," readily rejoiced in his reassignment. Undeterred by critics, Latschar conceived and implemented a vision that has provided for an infinitely better interpretive experience. Whatever one's personal opinion of Dr. John Latschar, history will judge him the most effective superintendent in the history of Gettysburg National Military Park.

After Latschar's transfer, the Northeast Region named Mel Poole, superintendent of Catoctin Mountain Park, to be the park's interim superintendent on November 10, 2009. Two months later, on January 8, 2010, Northeast Regional Director Dennis Reidenbach named James Robert (Bob) Kirby the new superintendent of Gettysburg National Military Park. Previously Kirby served as the superintendent of Petersburg National Battlefield in Virginia and Assistant Superintendent at Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area. Kirby assumed his duties at Gettysburg on March 1, 2010.¹ His academic background in Recreation, rather than History, may indicate another shift in philosophy. Meanwhile, in another management transition, the Foundation named Richard Buchanan as its second president on October 8, 2009. A Rear

¹ Other prior assignments include: Chief of Interpretation at Lowell National Historical Park, Lowell, Mass. 1990-1995; Environmental Protection Specialist, Defense Logistics Agency, Ogden, Utah 1986-1990; and Outdoor Recreation Director for the Department of the Army in West Germany, 1983-1986. He also worked as an interpretative ranger at Golden Gate National Recreation Area in San Francisco from 1974-1983. Kirby has a Bachelor of Arts degree in Recreation and Leisure Studies and a Master of Science degree in Recreation and Park Management from San Francisco State University.

Admiral, Buchanan served as vice president of corporate services for First National Bank of Omaha and as president of the Midlands Venture Forum in Nebraska and Iowa. His tenure with the Gettysburg Foundation proved short-lived, however. On January 26, 2010, the Foundation announced his departure to “pursue other opportunities.”² At this writing the Foundation is conducting a nation-wide search for its next president.

Thus, a mere two years after the new museum’s opening, the two power figures behind it, John Latschar and Robert Wilburn, had moved onto other positions. Bob Kirby and the to-be-named Foundation president will be charged with the responsibility of making the partnership viable and solvent. Indeed, improving the public-private partnership will be one of the key questions the new management team faces. In his final annual report, Latschar admitted that his “greatest concern is the future of the magnificent partnership between the NPS and the Gettysburg Foundation, which has accomplished so much and which has so much potential to accomplish more.” The leadership transition of both the park superintendent and the Foundation presidency will exponentially increase these challenges.³

A worsening national economy provides one potentially divisive issue for the new management. Yet the future of the partnership remains unknown. In his final annual report, Latschar declared the public-private partnership with the Gettysburg Foundation to be the “gold standard of partnerships in the NPS.”⁴ The partnership is indeed a “gold standard” of what can

² Gettysburg Foundation Press Release, “The Gettysburg Foundation announces the departure of its president,” January 26, 2010. Contemporary Administrative Files, Gettysburg National Military Park [hereinafter cited as CF, GNMP].

³ Superintendent John Latschar, “Superintendent’s Annual Report, 2009.” CF, GNMP, 29.

⁴ Superintendent John Latschar, “Superintendent’s Annual Report, 2009.” CF, GNMP, 29.

be accomplished, but whether such an elaborate partnership could be duplicated elsewhere seems doubtful. Though some Americans and politicians expressed concern over a partnership at Gettysburg, this is the precise reason why the Foundation was able to raise millions of dollars for the project. Philanthropists, businesses, and thousands of Americans contributed money to establish a better visitor center at the nation's most treasured historic site. They graciously donated funds to provide for a better facility to preserve Gettysburg's priceless Civil War artifacts. Admittedly the \$100 million project at Gettysburg needed nation-wide contributions. But would the American people willingly donate money to a site of little national significance? Could a similar project succeed at Catoctin National Park in Thurmont, Maryland? Though a lesser-known park would not need the fiscal resources obtained during the Gettysburg project, it seems unlikely that Americans would donate money for a partnership at any other national park. Simply put, the project at Gettysburg worked because the project was at Gettysburg. For the National Park Service at Gettysburg the partnership solved the agency's resource problems, provided a state-of-the-art museum, improved archival collections, and a wonderfully restored Gettysburg Cyclorama that otherwise simply would not have been possible.

Yet problems remain. If, however, the Park Service and Foundation partnership will truly become the "gold standard" for partnerships, the Foundation must show improvements in its ability to operate the multi-million dollar facility. Former Foundation President Wilburn and staff proved adept at raising money for the project, but the Foundation, to date, has struggled to remain fiscally solvent. Latschar acknowledged that the partners "have not succeeded" in

developing a reasonable operating budget. Establishing a viable operating budget and spending within its means will be the biggest challenge for the Foundation in the future.⁵

Over three quarters of a century as the stewards of Gettysburg National Military Park, the National Park Service has made marked improvements to sufficiently preserve the battlefield and provide quality visitor interpretation. The 1916 Organic Act outlines the National Park Service's mission: "to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects, and the wildlife and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such a manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." Gettysburg's February 11, 1895 enabling legislation provided future park administrators with a more specific mission, to protect and preserve lands "occupied by the infantry, cavalry and artillery" on the first, second and third days of July 1863 and other lands "necessary to preserve the important topographical features of the battlefield."⁶

Since 1933, the National Park Service has striven to obtain a dual mission of "providing for the enjoyment," while also leaving the site "unimpaired for future generations." Beyond the Organic Mission, the National Park Service does not have a monolithic philosophy on how to preserve each park; instead the management of each national park is site specific based on its enabling legislation. In practice, this leaves an incredible amount of leeway to park managers,

⁵ Superintendent John Latschar, "Superintendent's Annual Report, 2009." CF, GNMP, 29-30.

⁶ Georgie Boge and Margie Holder Boge, *Paving Over the Past: A History and Guide to Civil War Battlefield Preservation* (Washington, D.C.: Island Press, 1993), 25; *An Act to Establish a National Military Park at Gettysburg, Pennsylvania*, 28 Stat. 651, approved February 11, 1895, Gettysburg National Park Commission, "Office of the Commissioners, Record Books of Legislation, 1873-1921." (GETT 41122), Box 6, Gettysburg National Park Commission, Records of the Gettysburg National Park Commission, Gettysburg National Military Park Archives.

namely superintendents and at times park historians, to manage the park in a manner they see fit. Between August 1933 and October 2009 ten superintendents have administered the Gettysburg National Military Park. The eleventh Bob Kirby, reported for duty on March 1, 2010. To a large degree, change in management philosophy is inevitable as superintendents come and go without overarching philosophies. Superintendent's backgrounds, whether as landscape architects, government bureaucrats, or historians, consistently shape their vision for the battlefield. Six decades after acquiring the battlefield in 1999, the National Park Service, through John Latschar's leadership, established a consistent management philosophy by approving the *General Management Plan*. Unlike any of his predecessors, Bob Kirby enters the superintendent position with a clearly defined mission and vision for the future of the battlefield. There is no reason to expect that Kirby or any subsequent superintendents would abandon the philosophy articulated in the *GMP*.

Notwithstanding the degree of change at the battlefield, however, many variables remained constant. For the thousands of Civil War aficionados who have an opinion on what General Robert E. Lee should have done on July 3, an equal number of Americans have expressed their opinions on how the battlefield should be preserved and interpreted. Controversy and heated debates underscore each administration. Policy decisions at Gettysburg regularly play out in the national media as people from Adams County to California write park management and their Congressional representatives to express their point-of-view. The recent popularity of Civil War-related internet sites has only served to increase venues for debate.

The Gettysburg battlefield has also been a common site of patriotic display. During the late nineteenth century, veterans dedicated hundreds of monuments to pay tribute to their fallen comrades. Through the careful work of the War Department's park commissioners, these Civil

War veterans created the park as a memorial to their heroic deeds and sacrifices. During the twentieth century Americans transformed the battlefield from a memorial to the war's veterans to a patriotic landscape, often politicized to fit contemporary problems and issues. In the midst of World War II, for example, Americans found courage in the words of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address to fight evil abroad, and in the early 1960s some Americans searched for similar strength to fight racism at home.

Evaluating the National Park Service's era management at Gettysburg from 1933 to 2009, several landmark eras became evident, all dramatically changing the management, interpretation, and memory of the battlefield. Those four eras are the Great Depression period, 1933-1940; World War II, 1941-1945; the MISSION 66 and Civil War Centennial years, 1955 to 1965; and the fourteen years of John Latschar's administration, 1994 to 2009.

The first watershed occurred when the NPS assumed the battlefield from the War Department and lasted through the Great Depression era. On June 10, 1933, President Roosevelt signed Executive Order No. 6166, which officially transferred Gettysburg National Military Park and the Soldiers' National Cemetery from the War Department to the National Park Service. This administrative transfer also paralleled the passing generation of the war's veterans. A new generation of Americans traveled to the Pennsylvania battlefield to explore the tactics of the battle, to understand the war's bloodiest battle, or simply to visit a place whose very name, "Gettysburg," evokes a deep understanding of meaning.

Until the early 1930s, the National Park system included principally western parks of natural and cultural sites. The early years of the National Park Service's administration at Gettysburg were fraught with what now seems a fundamental misunderstanding of how to care

for hallowed ground. This is not to say the early Park Service administrators were faced with an easy task. When the agency acquired Gettysburg the nation was gripped by the worst economic depression in history. Consequently, the Great Depression actively influenced the early years of the Park Service's era. The battlefield became a site to implement Roosevelt's New Deal programs, which resulted in significant improvements to the infrastructure, construction of entrance stations and restroom facilities, and changes to the Soldiers' National Cemetery. Often the 1930s management, led by Superintendent James McConaghie, struggled to reconcile preservation with utilitarian uses of the historic terrain. A fitting climax to this period occurred when approximately 1,800 aging Civil War veterans gathered for the celebrations of the 75th anniversary and witnessed President Franklin Roosevelt dedicate the Eternal Peace Light Memorial. "Immortal deeds and immortal words," the president declared, "have created here at Gettysburg a shrine of American patriotism."⁷

The Park Service's dilemma between preservation and practical use also underscored the years of the Second World War. At times the battlefield seemed only to serve a larger, and presumably more important, purpose for the federal government. When President Franklin Roosevelt declared the nation would mobilize as the "arsenal of democracy," the Gettysburg battlefield was called upon to contribute to the nation's war effort. The Department of Army built the German prisoner of war camp along Confederate battle lines, while the agency donated Civil War artillery pieces toward the war's scrap drive. Meanwhile, Gettysburg's historian staff, led by Frederick Tilberg, introduced popular interpretive programs. The weekly campfire programs held on East Cemetery Hill introduced educated and entertained visitors on the Battle

⁷ Franklin D. Roosevelt's speech reproduced in Paul L. Roy, *The Last Reunion of the Blue and Gray* (Gettysburg: Bookmart, 1950), 113.

of Gettysburg as well as other sites within the National Park system. Equally significant in developing a genuine educational program, on April 1, 1942 Gettysburg National Military Park acquired the historic Gettysburg Cyclorama.

Beginning in the 1940s, Americans also consciously transformed the battlefield into a patriotic landscape. While Memorial Day had served as a display of patriotism, these celebrations took on a whole new meaning during World War II when orators used the occasion as an opportunity to invoke the sacrifice of the soldiers who fought and died at Gettysburg to foster support for war with Germany and Japan. During the Cold War, Americans looked to President Lincoln's "Gettysburg Address" and his "new birth of freedom," to envision a democratic and more equal postwar order.

The third watershed period occurred with MISSION 66. With new funding from the federal government, Gettysburg finally enjoyed a new visitor center and established a viable presence on the battlefield. Civil War Centennial celebrations regenerated America's interest in the Civil War. For the first time in its history, Gettysburg National Military Park recorded over 2 million visitors. MISSION 66, the surge of patriotism engendered by the Cold War, and the Civil War Centennial all served to recast the image and significance of the Battle of Gettysburg and Gettysburg National Military Park. The celebrations at Gettysburg in July 1963 represented the climax of the Civil War Centennial. In the early 1960s, while the nation celebrated the centennial, some used the battlefield to articulate support for a "new birth of freedom" for millions of Americans who remained confined to antiquated notions of race. At the same time, Gettysburg's staff used the Civil War Centennial and regenerated interest in the battlefield to expand interpretive program. Reminiscent of the campfire programs offered during the World

War II era on East Cemetery Hill, park rangers offered interpretive programs, complete with weapon demonstrations and sing-alongs, in the park amphitheater in Pitzer's Woods.

Finally, the period beginning in 1995 marked the establishment of a clear, consistent management philosophy. Arriving in the wake of the unpopular Memorial Landscape Philosophy, John Latschar fought to implement a battlefield rehabilitation program that would restore the battlefield's terrain to its 1863 condition. Under his careful yet controversial stewardship, the battlefield rehabilitation program implemented by the Park Service over the last nine years provides visitors with an accurate understanding of the terrain visualized by the Union and Confederate soldiers. Visitors to Gettysburg no longer have to imagine how the land influenced tactical decisions. Through John Latschar's efforts, Gettysburg proudly displays the nation's preeminent museum on the American Civil War and a beautifully restored cyclorama. Currently, Gettysburg's permanent and seasonal rangers offer more interpretive programs than any other Civil War park.

The history of the management of the Gettysburg battlefield between 1933 and 2009 proved to be as controversial as the historical accounts of the battle itself, if not more so. While Civil War scholars debate the tactical merits of Pickett's Charge, the public explores the meaning of Gettysburg. More than any other battlefield, Gettysburg symbolizes the Civil War. Gettysburg National Military Park is a memorial landscape to war. It is a place where Americans can embrace a comfortable memory of the horrific sacrifices made in July 1863. In its simplest form Gettysburg is a field of battle, but to many Gettysburg is more than a battlefield; it is a place of patriotic expression, of public display, a even a place of veneration. To some it is a holy shrine, but to all it is a place that "shall not perish from the earth."

Bibliography

Unpublished Primary Sources:

Gettysburg National Military Park Archives

Annual Reports, 1893-1921, (GETT 41148), Records of the National Park Commission.

Cyclorama Building Records, Series I and II, (GETT 41097), Records of the National Park Service at Gettysburg National Military Park.

Daily Journals, 1893-1921, (GETT 41144), Records of the National Park Commission.

General Management Plan Records, 1968-1983, (GETT 41105), Records of the National Park Service at Gettysburg National Military Park.

General Management Plan, Environmental Impact Assessment, 1996-1998. Records of the National Park Service at Gettysburg National Military Park.

General Records, 1922-1933, (GETT 41155), U.S. War Department, Office of the Quartermaster General.

Engineer's Annual Reports, 1893-1921, (GETT 41121), Records of the National Park Commission.

Historians' Files, 1933-1965, (GETT 41151), Records of the National Park Service at Gettysburg National Military Park.

Interpretive Program Files, 1930-present, (GETT 43970), Records of the National Park Service at Gettysburg National Military Park.

Newspaper Clippings, Unbound, (GETT 43663), Records of the National Park Service at Gettysburg National Military Park.

Park Main (Central) Files, 1933-1954, (GETT 41113), Records of the National Park Service at Gettysburg National Military Park.

Park Main (Central) Files, 1954-1987, (GETT 41160), Records of the National Park Service at Gettysburg National Military Park.

Park Main (Central) Files, 1987-present (Unprocessed), Records of the National Park Service at Gettysburg National Military Park.

Park Maps and Drawings, 1933-1960, (GETT 41107), Records of the National Park Service at Gettysburg National Military Park.

Record Books of Legislation, 1873-1921, (GETT 41122), Records of the National Park Commission.

Record Books of Testimony and Proceedings, 1893-1905, (GETT 41123), Records of the National Park Commission.

Thomas Harrison Files, Records of the National Park Service at Gettysburg National Military Park.

Unprocessed Collection, (GETT 41161), Records of the National Park Service at Gettysburg National Military Park.

Gettysburg National Military Park, Contemporary Files

Cultural Resource Management Files
Friends of the National Parks at Gettysburg Newsletters
Gettysburg Foundation Newsletters
Public Comments on the Fee Proposal
Superintendent John Latschar's Annual Reports

Gettysburg National Military Park Library

Vertical Files
Gettysburg National Tower Boxes

National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland

Record Group 79, Records of the National Park Service, Central Classified File, 1933-1949.

Record Group 79, Records of the National Park Service, Administrative Files, 1949-1971.

National Archives and Records Administration, Northeast Region, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Record Group 79, Records of the National Park Service, Northeast Regional Office, Historic Shrines, Sites, Monuments, and Parks, General Correspondence, 1952-1966.

Record Group 79, Records of the National Park Service, Northeast Regional Office, Historic Shrines, Sites, Monuments, and Parks, Historical Studies Files, 1952-1967.

Record Group 79, Records of the National Park Service, Northeast Regional Office,
Historic Shrines, Sites, Monuments, and Parks, Subject Files, 1937-1957.

Documents in Author's Possession, Auburn, Alabama

"About the Conservation of the Gettysburg Cyclorama Painting." Gettysburg
Foundation.

"David Olin." Biography. Gettysburg Foundation.

"General Agreement Between Gettysburg National Military Park, National Park Service,
and the Gettysburg National Battlefield Museum Foundation." Revised
September 30, 2002.

"Grand Opening Celebration Event Schedule." September 26-28, 2008.

"Report for the Organization of American Historians (OAH) and the National Park
Service (NPS) on Gettysburg National Military Park. August 1998.

Published Primary Sources:

Bachelder, John. *Gettysburg: What To See, And How To See It*. Boston: John B. Bachelder,
1873.

Beach, Warren. "Record of Decision on the White-Tailed Deer Management Plan Final
Environmental Impact Statement for Gettysburg National Military Park/Eisenhower National
Historic Site, Pennsylvania." July 5, 1995. [www.epa.gov/EPA-IMPACT/1995/July/Day-
13/pr-1083.html](http://www.epa.gov/EPA-IMPACT/1995/July/Day-13/pr-1083.html).

Fiftieth Anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg, Report of the Pennsylvania Commission
Harrisburg: W. M. Stanley Ray, 1914.

Gettysburg Cyclorama Building, Historic American Buildings Survey, HABS-PA-6709.
www.memory.loc.gov/habshaer/pa/pa3900/pa3988/data/pa3988.pdf.

Gettysburg National Military Park Commission, *Annual Reports to the Secretary of War,
1893-1901*. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1902.

Gettysburg National Military Park National Register Documentation, Adams County, PA, (NRIS
66000642), National Register of Historic Places, Washington, DC, 1/23/2004.

Minnigh, Luther W. *Gettysburg: What They Did Here*. Tipton and Blocher, 1924.

Roy, Paul L. *Last Reunion of the Blue and Gray*. Gettysburg: Paul Roy, 1950.

- U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Government Operations. *Land Exchange Between National Park Service/Gettysburg National Military Park and Gettysburg College*. 103rd Cong., 2nd sess., 9 May 1994.
- U.S. Congress. House. Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands of the Committee on Resources. *Oversight Hearing on Gettysburg National Military Park General Management Plan and Proposed Visitors Center*. 106th Cong., 1st sess., 11 February 1999.
- U.S. Congress. House. Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands. *The Future Visitor's Center at Gettysburg National Military Park and the Associated Fundraising Efforts*. 107th Cong., 2nd sess., 21 March 2002.
- United States Department of the Interior. *Boundary Study, Gettysburg National Military Park: Draft Report to Congress, Environmental Assessment*. United States Department of the Interior: National Park Service, August 1988.
- United States Department of the Interior. *Draft Development Concept Plan, Environmental Assessment: Collections Storage, Visitor and Museum Facilities*. Gettysburg: National Park Service, Gettysburg National Military Park, April 1996.
- United States Department of the Interior. *Draft Development Concept Plan, Environmental Assessment: Gettysburg Museum of the Civil War*. Gettysburg: National Park Service, Gettysburg National Military Park, April 1995.
- United States Department of the Interior. *Development Concept Plan, Little Round Top/Devil's Den, Gettysburg National Military Park, Pennsylvania*. United States Department of the Interior: National Park Service, 1986.
- United States Department of the Interior. *Draft Development Concept Plan/Environmental Assessment, Little Round Top/Devil's Den, Gettysburg National Military Park, Pennsylvania*. United States Department of the Interior: National Park Service, May 1985.
- United States Department of the Interior. *Draft Development Concept Plan/Environmental Assessment Supplement, Little Round Top/Devil's Den, Gettysburg National Military Park, Pennsylvania*. United States Department of the Interior: National Park Service, May 1986.
- United States Department of the Interior. *Draft Environmental Impact Statement, White-Tailed Deer Management Plan*. Gettysburg: National Park Service, Gettysburg National Military Park, November 1994.
- United States Department of the Interior. *Draft General Management Plan, Gettysburg National Military Park and National Cemetery*. United States Department of the Interior: National Park Service, May 1977.
- United States Department of the Interior. *Draft General Management Plan and Environmental*

Impact Statement, Gettysburg National Military Park and National Cemetery. United States Department of the Interior: National Park Service, August 1998.

United States Department of the Interior. *Final Environmental Impact Statement, White-Tailed Deer Management Plan.* Gettysburg: National Park Service, Gettysburg National Military Park, May 1995.

United States Department of the Interior. *Final General Management Plan and Environmental Statement, Gettysburg National Military Park,* 2 vols. United States Department of the Interior: National Park Service, June 1999.

United States Department of the Interior. *Final Report: Gettysburg College-National Park Service Land Exchange, Study of Alternatives/Environmental Assessment.* Gettysburg: National Park Service, Gettysburg National Military Park, May 1995.

United States Department of the Interior. *General Management Plan, Gettysburg National Military Park and National Cemetery.* United States Department of the Interior: Mid-Atlantic Regional Office, December 1982.

United States Department of the Interior. *Land Protection Plan.* Gettysburg: National Park Service, Gettysburg National Military Park, October 1993.

United States Department of the Interior. *National Tower Demolition and Removal Environmental Assessment, Draft.* Gettysburg: National Park Service, Gettysburg National Military Park, May 2000.

United States Department of the Interior. *Request for Proposals: Visitor Center & Museum Facilities, Gettysburg National Military Park.* Gettysburg: National Park Service, Gettysburg National Military Park, December 1996.

Vanderslice, John. *Gettysburg: A History of the Gettysburg Battle-Field Memorial Association With An Account of the Battle.* Philadelphia: The Association, 1897.

_____. *Gettysburg Then and Now: The Field of American Valor, Where and How The Regiments Fought, And The Troops They Encountered, An Account of the Battle, Giving Movements, Positions, and Losses of the Commands Engaged.* New York: G.W. Dillingham, 1899.

Newspapers and Magazines:

Chattanooga Daily Times, Chattanooga, Tennessee

Civil War Courier

Civil War News

Civil War Times Illustrated

Detroit Free Press, Detroit, Michigan

Gettysburg Compiler, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania

Gettysburg Times, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania

Hanover Evening Sun, Hanover, Pennsylvania

Harrisburg Patriot News, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

New York Times

Philadelphia Inquirer, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Reading Eagle, Reading, Pennsylvania

Record Harold, Waynesboro, Pennsylvania

Rochester Democrat, Rochester, New York

Saturday Evening Post

Sunday News, Lancaster, Pennsylvania

Star Magazine

Star & Sentinel, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania

Patriot, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

Plain Dealer, Cleveland, Ohio

USA Today

Washington Post, Washington, D.C.

York Daily Record, York, Pennsylvania

York Dispatch, York, Pennsylvania

York Sunday News, York, Pennsylvania

Interview By Author

Latschar, John. Interview By Author, January 4, 2010.

Harrison, Kathy. Interview By Author, February 15, 2009.

Marks, Jeff. Interview By Author, February 16, 2010.

Nyeste, John. Interview By Author, February 16, 2010.

Unpublished Secondary:

Engle, Reed. *Cultural Landscape Report: The Soldiers' National Cemetery Gettysburg, Pennsylvania*, 1994. Uncataloged Report, Gettysburg National Military Park, GNMP Archives.

LaFantasie, Glenn W. "Terrain and the Battlefield as Artifacts: History and Preservation at Gettysburg National Battlefield Park." Presented at AHA.

Lee, Ronald F. "The Origin and Evolution of the National Military Park Idea." Office of Historic Preservation, Washington, D.C.: Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1973, Gettysburg National Military Park Library.

Published Secondary:

Books:

Allaback, Sara. "Mission 66 Visitor Centers: The History of a Building Type," 2000.
www.nps.gov/history/history/online_books/allaback.

Badger, Anthony. *The New Deal: The Depression Years, 1933-1940*. Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 1980.

Belasco, Warren James. *Americans on the Road: From Autocamp to Motel, 1910-1945*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1979.

Billinger, Robert. *Hitler's Soldiers in the Sunshine State*. Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 2000.

- _____. *Nazi Prisoners of War in the Tar Heel State*. Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 2008.
- Blight, David. *Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory*. Cambridge: Belknap Press, 2001.
- Boardman, Sue and Kathryn Porch. *The Battle of Gettysburg Cyclorama: A History and Guide*. Gettysburg, Thomas Publications, 2008.
- Bodnar, John. *Remaking America: Public Memory, Commemoration, and Patriotism in the Twentieth Century*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992.
- Boge Georgie and Margie Holder Boge. *Paving Over the Past: A History and Guide to Civil War Battlefield Preservation*. Washington, D.C.: Island Press, 1993.
- Boritt, Gabor. *The Gettysburg Gospel: The Lincoln Speech That Nobody Knows*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2006.
- Brach, Taylor. *Parting The Waters: America in the King Years, 1954-1963*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1988.
- _____. *Pillar of Fire: America in the King Years, 1963-1965*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1998.
- Brewer, Susan. *Why America Fights: Patriotism and Propaganda from the Philippines to Iraq*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Broadwater, Jeff. *Adlai Stevenson and American Politics: The Odyssey of a Cold War Liberal*. New York: Twayne, 1994.
- Carr, Ethan. *Mission 66: Modernism and the National Park Dilemma*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2007.
- Carter, Dan T. *From George Wallace to Newt Gingrich: Race and the Conservative Counterrevolution, 1963-1994*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1996.
- _____. *Politics of Rage: George Wallace, the Origins of the New Conservatism, and the Transformation of American Politics*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2000.
- Coco, Gregory A. *A Strange and Blighted Land: Gettysburg, the Aftermath of the Battle*. Gettysburg: Thomas Publications, 1998.
- Connally, Eugenia Horstman, ed. *National Parks in Crisis*. Washington, D.C.: National Parks & Conservation Association, 1982.

- Cook, Robert. *Troubled Commemoration: The American Civil War Centennial, 1961-1965*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2007.
- Davies, Richard. *Defender of the Old Guard: John Bricker and American Politics*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1993.
- Desjardin, Thomas A. *These Honored Dead: How The Story of Gettysburg Shaped American Memory*. Cambridge: Da Capo Press, 2003.
- Drexler, Arthur and Thomas S. Hines. *The Architecture of Richard Neutra: From International Style to California Modern*. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1982.
- Everhart, William C. *The National Park Service*. Boulder: Westview Press, 1983.
- Fiedler, David. *The Enemy Among Us: POWs in Missouri During World War II*. St. Louis: University of Missouri Press, 2003.
- Finfrock, Barbara J. *Twenty Years On Six Thousand Acres: The History of the Friends of the National Parks at Gettysburg*. Harrisburg: Huggins Printing, 2009.
- Foote, Kenneth E. *Shadowed Ground: America's Landscapes of Violence and Tragedy*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2003.
- Foresta, Ronald A. *America's National Parks and Their Keepers*. Washington, D.C.: Resources For The Future, 1984.
- Foster, Gaines. *Ghosts of the Confederacy: Defeat, the Lost Cause, and the Emergence of the New South, 1865-1913*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Fried, John. *The Russians Are Coming! The Russians Are Coming! Pageantry and Patriotism In Cold-War America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Freeman, Douglas Southall. *Lee's Lieutenants: A Study in Command*, 3 vol. New York: Scribner Sons, 1942-1944.
- _____. *R. E. Lee: A Biography*, 4 vol. New York: Scribner Sons, 1934.
- Fussell, Paul. *The Great War and Modern Memory*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1975.
- Grant, Susan Mary and Peter J. Parish, ed. *Legacy of Disunion: The Enduring Significance of the American Civil War*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2003.
- Grover, Kathryn. *Hard at Play: Leisure in America, 1840-1940*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1992.
- Handler, Richard and Eric Gable. *The New History in an Old Museum: Creating the Past at*

- Colonial Williamsburg*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1997.
- Harrison, Blake. *The View From Vermont: Tourism and the Making of an American Rural Landscape*. Burlington: University of Vermont Press, 2006.
- Hattaway, Herman. *Gettysburg to Vicksburg: The Five Original Civil War Battlefield Parks*. Kansas City: University of Missouri Press, 2001.
- Hines, Thomas S. *Richard Neutra and the Search for Modern Architecture*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1982.
- Horton, James Oliver and Lois E. Horton, eds. *Slavery and Public History: The Tough Stuff of American Memory*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006.
- Hosmer, Charles, Jr. *Preservation Comes of Age: From Williamsburg to the National Trust, 1926-1949*. Vol I. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1981.
- Ise, John. *Our National Park Policy: A Critical History*. Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1961.
- Jakle, John A. *The Tourist: Travel in the Twentieth-Century*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1985.
- Kammen, Michael. *Mystic Chords of Memory: The Transformation of Tradition in American Culture*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1991.
- Kennedy, David M. *Freedom From Fear: The American People in the Depression and War, 1929-1945*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Kirk, Russell. *The Political Principles of Robert A. Taft*. New York: Fleet Press Corp, 1967.
- Krammer, Arnold. *Nazi Prisoners of War in America*. New York: Stein and Day, 1979.
- Lamme, Ary J. III. *America's Historic Landscapes: Community Power and the Preservation of Four Historic Sites*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee, 1990.
- Leuchtenburg, William E. *Franklin D. Roosevelt and the New Deal*. New York: Harper & Row 1963.
- Leshner, Stephan. *George Wallace: American Populist*. New York: DeCapo Press, 1995.
- Linenthal, Edward Tabor. *Preserving Memory: The Struggle to Create America's Holocaust Museum*. New York: Viking Press, 1995.
- _____. *Sacred Ground: Americans and Their Battlefields*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1991.

- _____. *The Unfinished Bombing: Oklahoma City in American Memory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Linenthal, Edward and Tom Engelhardt. *Enola Gay and Other Battles for the American Past*. New York: Metropolitan Books, 1996.
- MACTEC Engineering and Consulting. *Vicksburg National Military Park, Environmental Assessment for Landscape Rehabilitation, Statement of Findings for Executive Order 119900 (Protection of Wetlands)*. August 3, 2009. www.nps.gov/vick/parkmgmt/upload/CRL-EA%20Wetlands%20Statement-of-Findings%20-%20Final.pdf.
- MacCannell, Dean. *The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class*. Berkley: University of Carolina Press, 1999.
- Mackintosh, Barry. "Interpretation in the National Park Service: A Historical Perspective." Washington, D.C.: National Park Service, Department of the Interior, 1986. www.nps.gov/history/history/online_books/mackintosh3/index.htm.
- McKeever, Porter. *Adlai Stevenson: His Life and Legacy*. New York: Morrow, 1989.
- Martin, Edward. *Always Be On Time: An Autobiography*. Harrisburg: Telegraph Press, 1959.
- Mayo, James M. *War Memorials as Political Landscape: The American Experience and Beyond*. New York: Praeger Press, 1988.
- Miles, John C. *Guardians of the Parks: A History of the National Parks and Conservation Association*. Washington D.C.: Taylor and Francis, 1995.
- Milner, John Associates. *Chickamauga Battlefield: Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park, Cultural Landscape Report*. September 2004. www.nps.gov/history/history/online_books/chch1/clr.pdf.
- Moore, John Hammond. *The Faustall Tunnel: German POWs in America and Their Great Escape*. New York: Random House, 1978.
- Moyer, Teresa S. and Paul A. Shackel. *The Making of Harper's Ferry National Historical Park: A Devil, Two Rivers, and a Dream*. Lanham: AltaMira Press, 2008.
- Neutra, Richard. *Life and Shape*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1962.
- Paige, John C. *The Civilian Conservation Corps and the National Park Service, 1933-1942: An Administrative History*. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1985. www.nps.gov/history/history/online_books/ccr.index.htm
- Paige, John C. and Jermone A. Greene. *Administrative History of Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park*. Denver: Denver Service Center, National Park Service.

February 1983. www.nps.gov/archive/chch/adhi/adhi.htm.

- Patterson, James T. *Mr. Republican: A Biography of Robert Taft*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1972.
- Patterson, John S. "From Battle Ground to Pleasure Ground: Gettysburg as a Historic Site" in *History Museums in the United States: A Critical Assessment*, ed. Warren Leon and Roy Rosenzweig, Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1989.
- Peterson, Merrill. *Lincoln in American Memory*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Pfanz, Harry W. *Gettysburg: The First Day*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001.
- Piehler, G. Kurt. *Remembering War the American Way*. Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1995.
- Piston, William Garrett. *Lee's Tarnished Lieutenant: James Longstreet and His Place In Southern History*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1987.
- Platt, Barbara L. *"This is Holy Ground": A History of the Gettysburg Battlefield*. Harrisburg: Huggins Printing, 2001.
- Purcell, Sarah J. *Sealed With Blood: War, Sacrifice, and Memory in Revolutionary America*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002.
- Reardon, Carol. *Pickett's Charge in History and Memory*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997.
- Richard King Mellon. *National Parks For A New Generation: Visions, Realities, Prospects*. Washington, D.C.: The Conservation Fund, 1985.
- Rothman, Hal. *Devil's Bargains: Tourism and the Twentieth-Century American West*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1998.
- _____. *Preserving Different Pasts: The American National Monuments*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1989.
- Rugh, Susan Sessions. *Are We There Yet? The Golden Age of Family Vacations*. Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 2008.
- Runte, Alfred. *National Parks: The American Experience*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1979.
- Savage, Kirk. *Standing Soldiers, Kneeling Slaves: Race, War, and Monument in Nineteenth Century America*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997.

- Schmid, Walter. *A German POW in New Mexico*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2005.
- Shackle, Paul A. *Memory and Black in White: Race, Commemoration, and the Post-Bellum Landscape*. Landam: AltaMira Press, 2003.
- Silber, Nina. *The Romance of Reunion: Northerners and the South, 1865- 1900*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993.
- Smith, Timothy. *The Untold Story of Shiloh: The Battle and the Battlefield*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2006.
- _____. *The Golden Age of Battlefield Preservation: The Decade of the 1890s and the Establishment of America's First Five Military Parks*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2008.
- _____. *This Great Battlefield of Shiloh: History, Memory, and the Establishment of a Civil War National Military Park*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2006.
- Snell, Charles W. and Sharon A. Brown. *Antietam National Battlefield and National Cemetery: An Administrative History*. Washington, D.C. : U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1986.
- Sutton, Robert K., ed. *Rally on the High Ground: The National Park Service Symposium on the Civil War*. Washington: Eastern National, 2001).
- Tilden, Freedman. *Interpreting Our Heritage*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1957.
- _____. *The National Parks*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1976.
- Trudeau, Noah Andre. *Gettysburg: A Testing of Courage*. New York: Harper Collins, 2002.
- Toplin, Robert Brent, ed. *Ken Burns's The Civil War: Historians Respond*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Tyler, Norman. *Historic Preservation: An Introduction to Its History, Principles, and Practice*. New York: W.W. Norton, 2000.
- Unrau, Harlan D. *Administrative History: Gettysburg National Military Park and Gettysburg National Cemetery*. United States Department of Interior: National Park Service, 1991.
- Waldrep, Christopher. *Vicksburg's Long Shadow: The Civil War Legacy of Race and Remembrance*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2005.

- Warren, Robert Penn. *The Legacy of the Civil War: Meditations on the Centennial*. New York: Random House, 1961.
- Waters, Michael. *Lone Star Stalag: German Prisoners of War at Camp Hearne*. College Station: Texas A&M Press, 2004.
- Wefing, John. *The Life and Times of Richard H. Hughes*. New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 2009.
- Weeks, Jim. *Gettysburg: Memory, Market, and an American Shrine*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003.
- Westbrook, Robert B. *Why We Fought: Forgoing American Obligations in World War II*. Washington: Smithsonian Books, 2004.
- Wert, Jeffery. *General James Longstreet: The Confederacy's Most Controversial Soldier*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1993.
- Whitfield, Stephen J. *The Culture of the Cold War*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991.
- Wills, Garry. *Lincoln at Gettysburg: The Words That Remade America*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1992.
- Wilson, Charles Reagan. *Baptized in Blood: The Religion of the Lost Cause, 1865-1920*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1983.
- Winter, Jay. *Remembering War: The Great War Between Memory and History in the Twentieth Century*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006.
- _____. *Sites of Memory, Sites of Mourning: The Great War in European Cultural History*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998.
- _____. *The Experience of World War I*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- _____. *The Great War and the British People*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1986.
- Winter, Jay and Antoine Prost. *The Great War in History: Debates and Controversies, 1914 To the Present*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Wirth, Conrad. *Parks, Politics, and the People*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1980.
- Zenzen, Joan. *Battling for Manassas: The Fifty Year Preservation Struggle at Manassas National Battlefield Park*. State College: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1998.

Articles and Essays:

Andrews, John and D. Scott Hartwig. "Cultural Landscape Management and Interpretation: A Dilemma." *Ranger: The Journal of the Association of National Park Rangers* 10 (Spring 1994): 14-16.

Bearss, Edwin C. "The National Park Service and Its History Program: 1864-1986 An Overview." *The Public Historian* 9 (Spring 1987): 10-18.

Cook, Robert. "Unfinished Business: African Americans and the Civil War Centennial." In *Legacy of Disunion: The Enduring Significance of the American Civil War*, ed. Susan Mary Grant and Peter J. Parish. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2003.

_____. "(Un)Furl That Banner: The Response of White Southerners to the Civil War Centennial of 1961-1965." In *Journal of Southern History*, 68 (Nov. 2002): 879-912.

Franklin, John Hope. "A Century of Civil War Observance." *Journal of Negro History* 47 (April 1962): 97-107.

Gondos, Victor, Jr. "Karl Betts and the Civil War Centennial Commission." *Military Affairs* 27 (1963): 49-70.

Kinsel, Amy J. "From Turning Point to Peace Memorial: A Cultural Legacy." In *The Gettysburg Nobody Knows*, ed. Gabor S. Boritt, New York: Oxford University Press, 1997: 203-222.

Latschar, John. "Gettysburg: The Next 100 Years." *The Fourth Annual Seminar, Gettysburg 1895-1995: The Making of an American Shrine*. Gettysburg: Eastern National, 1995: 112-123.

_____. "The Taking of the Gettysburg Tower." *George Wright Society* 18 (2001): 24-33.

Makintosh, Barry. "The National Park Service Moves into Historical Interpretation." *The Public Historian* 9 (Spring 1987): 51-63.

Murray, Jennifer. "'Far Above Our Poor Power to Add or Detract': National Park Service Administration of Gettysburg Battlefield, 1933-1938." *Civil War History* 55, (March 2009): 56-81.

Patterson, John S. "A Patriotic Landscape: Gettysburg, 1863-1913." *Prospects: The Annals of American Culture Studies* 7 (1982): 315-333.

Pitcaithley, Dwight T. "'A Cosmic Threat': The National Park Service Addresses the Causes of the American Civil War." In *Slavery and Public History: The Tough Stuff of American Memory*, ed. James Oliver Horton and Lois E. Horton. Chapel Hill: University of North

- Carolina Press, 2006: 169-186.
- Pound, Edward T. "Battle Ground!" *National Journal* 21 (February 2009): 26-33.
- Roe, Charles R. "The Second Battle of Gettysburg: Conflict of Public and Private Interests In Land Use Policies." *Environmental Affairs* 2 (Spring 1972): 16-64.
- Rogers, Jerry R. "Fulfilling Its Mandate: The National Park Service and Historic Preservation" *The Public Historian* 9 (Spring 1987): 143-146.
- Roth, Jeffery B. "Gettysburg National Military—Deer—Park." *Pennsylvania Wildlife* XI: 27-29.
- Schaefer, Thomas. "If You Seek His Monument- Look Around: E.B. Cope and the Gettysburg National Military Park." *Unsung Heroes of Gettysburg: Programs of the Fifth Annual Gettysburg Seminar*. The National Park Service: Gettysburg National Military Park, 1996: 107-33.
- Smith, Karlton. "The Changing Faces of Gettysburg: The National Park Service at Gettysburg," *Gettysburg 1895-1995: The Shaping of an American Shrine, The Fourth Annual Gettysburg Seminar*. Gettysburg National Military Park, 1995: 124 -34.
- Smith, Timothy B. "Black Soldiers and the CCC at Shiloh National Military Park." *CRM: The Journal of Heritage Stewardship* 3 (Summer 2006): 73-84.
- _____. "Civil War Battlefield Preservation in Tennessee: A Nashville National Military Park Case Study." *Tennessee Historical Quarterly* 63 (2005): 236- 247.
- Stokes, Melvyn. "The Civil War in Movies." In *Legacy of Disunion: The Enduring Significance of the American Civil War*, ed. Susan Mary Grant and Peter J. Parish. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2003.
- Summers, John. "Gettysburg Regress: How the Government is Ruining America's Most Famous Battlefield." *The New Republic* (March 18, 2009): 22-24.
- Unrau, Harlan D. and G. Frank Williss. "To Preserve the Nation's Past: The Growth of Historic Preservation in the National Park Service during the 1930s." *The Public Historian* 9 (Spring 1987): 19-49.
- Weeks, Jim. "Gettysburg: Display Window for Popular Memory." *Journal of American Culture* 21 (Winter 1998): 41-56.

Theses and Dissertations:

- Abroe, Mary Munsell. "All the Profound Scenes: Federal Preservation of Civil War Battlefields,

- 1861-1990.” Ph.D. diss., Loyola University, 1992.
- Dixon, Benjamin Y. “Gettysburg, a Living Battlefield.” Ph.D. diss, Oklahoma University, 2000.
- Kinsel, Amy J. “‘From These Honored Dead’: Gettysburg in American Culture, 1863-1938.” Ph.D. diss., Cornell University, 1992.
- Oyler, John. “Pickett Charges; Everyone Else Pays: The Story of the Gettysburg Tower Controversy.” Undergraduate Thesis, Princeton University, 1972.
- Roe, Charles. “Second Battle of Gettysburg: Conflict and Public and Private Interests in Land Use Policies.” M.A. Thesis, Indiana University, 1971.
- Spielvogel, John Christian. “Interpreting Sacred Ground: the rhetoric of National Park Service Civil War historical battlefields and parks.” Ph.D. diss., The Pennsylvania State University, 2003.
- Trail, Susan W. “Remembering Antietam: Commemoration and Preservation of a Civil War Battlefield.” Ph.D. diss., University of Maryland, 2005.