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Name of Property

Title: Virginia State Historic Preservation Office

In my opinion, the property meets does not meet the National Register criteria.

Julie V. Langan 1.30.2014

4. National Park Service Certification

I hereby certify that this property is:

✓ entered in the National Register

☐ determined eligible for the National Register

☐ determined not eligible for the National Register

☐ removed from the National Register

☐ other (explain) Accept Additional Documentation

Patrick Andrews 3/19/2014

5. Classification

Ownership of Property

(Check as many boxes as apply.)

Private: ☐

Public – Local ☐

Public – State ☐

Public – Federal ☑ U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service

☐ U.S. Department of Defense, U.S. Army

Category of Property

(Check only one box.)

Building(s) ☐

District ☑
Arlington House Historic District (2013 Boundary Increase & Additional Documentation)

Number of Resources within Property
(Do not include previously listed resources in the count)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Contributing</th>
<th>Noncontributing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structures</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objects</td>
<td>4(^1)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of contributing resources previously listed in the National Register (1980 Listing):

3 contributing buildings

\(^1\) The objects consist of individual monuments located in the immediate vicinity of Arlington House. Two memorialize two highly esteemed Union generals and one a U.S. Admiral. These stand at the east front of the house on cemetery-owned land, along with a monument marking the grave of esteemed city planner Pierre L'Enfant.
6. Function or Use

Historic Functions
(Enter categories from instructions.)

INDUSTRY/EXTRACTION/Extractive Facility – Quarry
DOMESTIC/Single dwelling
DOMESTIC/Multiple Dwelling/Slave Quarters
DOMESTIC/Secondary Structure/Smokehouse, Summer kitchen, Storehouse
LANDSCAPE/Garden, Forest
DEFENSE/Military Post
DOMESTIC/Institutional Housing – Military/Staff Housing
FUNERARY/Cemetery - Graves/Burials
GOVERNMENT/Government Office – Administration Building
AGRICULTURE/Horticultural Facility – Potting Shed
RECREATION & CULTURE/Museum, Monument/Marker

Current Functions
(Enter categories from instructions.)

RECREATION & CULTURE/Museum
LANDSCAPE/Park
FUNERARY/Cemetery
LANDSCAPE/Garden, Forest
7. Description

Architectural Classification
(Enter categories from instructions.)
EARLY REPUBLIC/ Classical Revival - Greek Revival
LATE VICTORIAN/ Italianate
LATE 19th & 20th CENTURY REVIVALS/ Classical/Colonial Revival

Materials: (enter categories from instructions.)
Principal exterior materials of the property: Brick, Stucco, Stone, Slate, Wood, Marble & Granite (grave markers)

Narrative Description
(Describe the historic and current physical appearance and condition of the property. Describe contributing and noncontributing resources if applicable. Begin with a summary paragraph that briefly describes the general characteristics of the property, such as its location, type, style, method of construction, setting, size, and significant features. Indicate whether the property has historic integrity.)

INTRODUCTION

First established as a historic site dedicated to the memory of General Robert E. Lee in 1925 by Congress, control of Arlington House passed from the War Department to the Department of the Interior's National Park Service (NPS) in 1933. Since taking over management of the Arlington House property, the NPS has acquired additional land surrounding the mansion and has completed several restoration efforts. In 1955, Congress officially designated the property a permanent memorial dedicated to Civil War general Robert E. Lee. Administratively listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1966 when Congress enacted the National Historic Preservation Act, the first nomination form for Arlington House was submitted and accepted by the Keeper of the National Register in 1980. Since that time, registration requirements have changed; the park boundary of “Arlington House, The Robert E. Lee Memorial” has changed; and voluminous additional research and documentation has been completed.

2 Senate Joint Resolution 62, Public Law 107, Chapter 223 (June 29, 1955). The language included in the 1955 resolution recognized Lee's military prowess (both as a U.S. Army officer and as commander of the Confederate forces), and his post-Civil War devotion to peace, national reconciliation, and education. It also praises his personal traits which are described as “high character,” “grandeur of soul,” and “strength of heart.” The resolution also named the property the “Custis-Lee Mansion,” which was, at the time, popularly known as the Lee Mansion. A 1972 act of Congress assigned the current name: “Arlington House, The Robert E. Lee Memorial” in recognition of the historic name assigned to the estate by George Washington Parke Custis.
This National Register Nomination update expands the historic district boundary to incorporate significant non-NPS-owned federal property that has important historical associations with the house and domestic core of the historic Arlington estate. In addition, the nomination updates the information provided in the 1980 nomination by introducing expanded periods and areas of significance, defining and justifying the new boundary, and providing additional description of the resources and landscape features that contribute to the historic and architectural significance of the place. Context is provided for the areas and periods of significance identified in Section 8.

The 1980 nomination established the property as the 27.9 acres that, at that time, the National Park Service managed. The present nomination retains the original boundary and adds to it. The boundary increase adds approximately 3.1 acres to the existing National Register boundary for a total acreage of 31 acres. The 1980 listing defined three contributing and two non-contributing resources within the boundary. Subsequent research and determinations of eligibility defined other resources that contribute to the property’s eligibility, including the Arlington Woodlands that stands to the north and west of the Arlington House residence. The new boundary encompasses 18 contributing and 3 non-contributing resources within the district. Of the five resources described in the 1980 nomination, three remain contributing, one has been demolished, and one has changed status from non-contributing to contributing.

**NOTE ON REDACTED INFORMATION:** Portions of the text that appears in *bold italics* is descriptive information for sensitive archeological sites, and under the authority of Section 304 of the National Historic Preservation Act, should be **redacted before the document is released to the public.**

**Summary Description**

The Arlington House Historic District is the 31-acre domestic core of the estate that George Washington Parke Custis and Mary Fitzhugh Custis built in the early 19th century, and that Robert E. Lee, and his wife Mary (Custis) Lee called home until the outbreak of the Civil War in 1861. The district encompasses the Custis’ imposing, Greek-temple-like dwelling house, two dependencies that housed slaves along with various domestic service functions, and the historic setting, which includes both designed and vernacular landscapes. These landscapes consist of gardens, a wooded ravine to the west, and important distant views and vistas stretching to the east. The district also encompasses elements that illustrate the creation and early 20th century development of Arlington National Cemetery, as it transformed from a Civil War Union cemetery into a national place of honor for military veterans. Located in east-central Arlington County, Virginia across the Potomac River from the District of Columbia, the district sits astride a high hill overlooking Arlington National Cemetery and the monumental core of Washington to the east. The district is entirely surrounded by the cemetery, which sprawls across approximately 600 acres of rolling hills planted with groves of trees and crisscrossed by curvilinear drives.

The Arlington House Historic District contains resources related to both prehistoric and historic occupation and development of the property. The site’s prehistoric occupation is represented by a Late Archaic Period lithic procurement site...
The historic district centers on the remaining nineteenth century features developed by the Custis and Lee families as the domestic core of their formerly 1,100 acre estate, and includes a layer of resources connected to the early development of Arlington National Cemetery. Between 1864 and 1931, the Arlington mansion, the adjacent dependencies, and the grounds immediately surrounding them functioned as the administrative and operational core of the growing cemetery. Additionally, the district incorporates designed and natural landscapes that are important remnants of the Custis-Lee period.

The district contains 18 contributing buildings, structures, sites, and objects. The main house and two dependencies that incorporated slave quarters form the core of the district. Set on a level open terrace, the house is an imposing, temple-form Greek-Revival-style building that stands two-and-one-half-stories tall and features stuccoed brick walls, a front-gable roof, and a full-height Doric portico that stretches across the east front. One-story, stuccoed brick hipped-roofed wings pierced with arched windows extend to the north and south sides of the central section. A pair of one-story, stuccoed brick outbuildings that once housed the Custis-Lee household slaves along with a kitchen and other service and storage spaces stand behind the main house; each building displays Classical Revival details designed to link them architecturally to the main house. The landscape is considered one contributing site, though it encompasses contributing features that reflect different eras of the property’s development.

In order to capture significant features and sites that relate directly to the history and development of Arlington House, the district’s boundary extends beyond the boundaries of National Park Service land to encompass approximately three acres of land owned by the Department of Defense (DOD) and managed as Arlington National Cemetery (ANC). The district also includes a small discontiguous site -- the Custis family burial plot -- which contains the graves of the early-19th-century master and mistress of Arlington: George Washington Parke Custis and Mary Fitzhugh Custis. The two were buried and marked in a small, fenced, rectangular plot located approximately 1,100 feet southwest of the main dwelling house.

Narrative Description
Brief Overview of Historical Development
The district was historically part of a 1,100-acre estate on the banks of the Potomac River George Washington Parke Custis (G.W.P. Custis), step-grandson of George Washington, inherited in 1802. Custis was the grandson of George Washington’s wife Martha Washington.

3 The 49 grave markers that rim the south and east edges of the Flower Garden stand on ANC land. Because they are all headstones that mark Civil War officers’ graves, they are counted as a group as one (1) contributing site. The structures include a sizable monument that marks the location of a crypt containing the remains of over 2,000 unknown soldiers killed in the Civil War. The burial plot containing the two Custis graves is counted as a discontiguous site; the two grave markers on the site are not counted individually. Mary Randolph’s tomb is classified as a structure because it combines a grave marker with a functional structural wall that encloses the table-top style marker. Individual headstones and monuments that mark single burials are counted as objects. See Resource Inventory Table included at the end of the narrative description section.
through her first marriage. After his natural father, John Parke Custis, died in 1781, G.W.P. Custis lived at Mount Vernon where the Washingtons raised him. The Arlington property was one of several estates owned by G.W.P. Custis and worked by the slaves that he inherited along with several family plantations in central Virginia.

Custis developed Arlington mainly as a family seat where he pursued his myriad interests, including agricultural improvements, painting, and writing. He was a passionate patriot who, throughout his life, sought to glorify and honor the patrimony of his step-grandfather, George Washington. He acquired and displayed many George Washington relics, including his Revolutionary War tents and his deathbed; over time, his house became a memorial to Washington where many visited to hear Custis’ stories and view the artifacts. Custis, like Washington, was interested in advancing American agriculture and manufacturing, but he was also a painter, a playwright, a lover of music, and a storyteller. He was active politically, but never held an elected public office. Thousands visited Custis’ Arlington estate every year to enjoy social events and outings at Arlington Spring, a public meeting place that Custis established in the southwest section of his estate on the banks of the Potomac River.

The Arlington estate is most notably associated with Robert E. Lee, a seminal figure in American history. In 1831, Lee married G.W.P. and Mary Custis’ daughter Mary Anna Randolph Custis. The couple called Arlington home and raised their seven children there until 1861. Lee’s military career frequently kept him away from Arlington, but following the death of G.W.P. Custis in 1857, Lee returned to execute Custis’ will and to manage the estate for his wife who inherited the property from her father. At Arlington House in April 1861, on the eve of the American Civil War, Lee made the pivotal decision to resign his commission in the United States Army and to support Virginia’s secession from the Union. Lee would go on to lead the Confederate Army of Northern Virginia (ANV) through four years of bloody civil war.

Lee’s decision changed the fate of his beloved home at Arlington. In May 1861, federal forces occupied the property, and from that day forward, Arlington has been under federal control. From 1861 to 1933 Arlington House and the surrounding property was used for military purposes and under the control of the War Department (now the Department of Defense). In 1864, 200 acres surrounding the house were officially set aside as a national cemetery where fallen soldiers were buried.

In 1925, the United States Congress recognized Arlington House for its association with Lee, directing the War Department (which then ran the cemetery) to restore the building to reflect the period just prior to the Civil War, when Lee and his family occupied the property. The restoration that took place at Arlington House under the auspices of the War Department’s Office of the Quartermaster General was an important early federal foray into accurate, full-scale restoration work and an important landmark in the history of American preservation and conservation practice.

---

4 The U.S. Department of War, commonly referred to as the War Department, was the predecessor of the modern Department of Defense (established in 1949). Established in 1789, the War Department was the cabinet-level department responsible for the U.S. Army.
Setting and Landscape Features
(Arlington House Cultural Landscape CLI# 600049)

1 Contributing Site

The landscape and its associated features are a critical part of the Arlington House Historic District. The location, setting, and designed landscape retains features related to both the initial domestic development on Custis’ Arlington estate, along with reminders of the military and cemetery development of the property after its seizure by the federal government in 1861. The remaining 19th century elements reveal that the Custis family carefully planned and constructed a designed landscape setting in the Picturesque tradition of English Romantic Landscape design, while organizing the house and its practical dependencies in a manner typical of the prosperous 18th and 19th century Virginia gentry. Perhaps not surprisingly, connections can be made between George Washington’s Mount Vernon landscape and the spatial organization and elements employed at Arlington. Records suggest that Custis employed Washington’s gardener, William Spence. In 2001 and 2009, the NPS completed comprehensive historical studies and evaluation of the historic landscape. The following is a discussion of the primary landscape features that contribute to the historical significance of the historic district. The narrative is largely taken from the 2009 Cultural Landscape Inventory and the 2001 Cultural Landscape Report, both prepared by NPS staff.5

Key Components of the Historic Landscape

The Custis-Lee Landscape: Land Use and Spatial Organization

G.W.P. Custis built Arlington to be a status-conveying family seat surrounded by a decorative and practical landscape, rather than as a profitable agricultural venture. Custis’ intention drove both the placement and design of the estate which was sited on a prominent hill which could be seen from and overlooked Washington, D.C., the nascent capital city of the young American nation. Arlington House was built on a gradual north-to-south sloping hill at approximately 200 feet above sea level. It is likely that the topography of the site was modified during construction when grading created a large flat terrace for the house and garden areas to the north and south.

At the time Custis began development of his family seat at Arlington, the property was largely wooded. Nineteenth century accounts describe a large, dense woodland to the west of the house that was preserved during the development of the estate. The woods provided a dense forested background to the house and the cultivated areas around it. The aesthetic and practical decision to preserve the “primeval” woodland reflects trends seen in the English Romantic Landscape movement of the late-18th and early-19th century. In contrast to the open, park-like area in the front of the mansion and the formalized landscape of terraced gardens on either side of the house, Custis managed the Arlington woods with minimal intrusion, removing only select mature trees when it was necessary to improve the health of the forest.

Custis created a hierarchical landscape at the core of his estate. He chose to organize the areas immediately surrounding his dwelling into distinct functional and aesthetic zones. The house itself faced a partially open, park-like slope covered in grass and scattered with trees and clumps of trees where Custis grazed his sheep. The park-like slope, sometime referred to as “the park” in family correspondence, again recalled the Romantic landscapes of the English aristocracy. By the 1860s, “the park” was described as a “highly cultivated meadow.” A portion of the park retains some of its original character today along the eastern slope directly in front and to the east of the mansion.

Arrayed on either side of Custis’ mansion, upon the leveled terraces, was a kitchen garden to the north and a flower garden on the south. Behind and to the west of the residence, two symmetrically placed dependencies that contained housing and work spaces for the household slaves framed a central work yard. The two dependencies and the central work yard remain today. Another utilitarian space, the stable, was built several hundred feet to the west and behind the mansion; although Custis had it designed to complement the architecture of the house, the stable was likely screened from view of the house. The Custis-built stable burned down in 1904 and was replaced in 1907 by a War Department-built stable with a different form. During the War Department’s 1928-1935 restoration campaign, the decision was made to remodel the 1907 stable so that it now resembles Custis’ original 19th century building.

The formal public gardens that were designed and used by the Custis and Lee families during their tenancy included the south flower garden and an area just west of the flower garden, referred to by the family as “the grove.” While the flower garden reflected formal garden design that may have incorporated geometric planting beds and carefully trimmed boxwood hedges, records suggest that the grove is what contemporary literature labeled “modern” garden design. It contained a less formal, more naturalistic flower garden that incorporated a canopy of mature oak and elm trees and an understory composed of a wide variety of native and non-native vegetation. The flower garden remains in its original location and largely in its 19th century configuration. Restoration efforts in recent years have partially restored period plant materials and pathways.

Currently, the spatial organization of the house, dependencies (commonly referred to as the slave quarters), work yard, and garden terraces (formerly the kitchen and flower gardens), along with a small portion of the historic woodland to the west of the house, retain much of their Custis-Lee-era character. In addition, although altered by the introduction of graves and other cemetery elements, a remnant of the grassy east slope of “the park” remains to evoke this picturesque element of the Custis-Lee designed landscape. The location of each element is still recognizable although the extent and details of each has changed to varying degrees.

Remnants of the Custis-Lee-era circulation pattern also remain. These include Lee Avenue that forms the southern boundary of the historic district. Lee Avenue began as the terminus of the original approach road to Arlington House. It retains the same alignment although its dimension and paving material have changed; it is currently paved with exposed aggregate concrete, and now serves primarily as a footpath in the cemetery.
Historically, the woods west of the residence encompassed a thick stand of forest composed mainly of oak (*Quercus* sp.), chestnut (*Castanea* sp.) and elm (*Ulmus* sp.). Commonly referred to as Arlington Woods, the forest provided a dark background to the house, a design feature that was often commented on with admiration in recollections of the estate during the historic period. This setting was based on the picturesque ideal of a naturalistic landscape popularized by Andrew Jackson Downing, Humphrey Repton and other landscape designers who were influential during this time period. The woods provided a place for hunting, pleasure walks, and family burials. During the historic period, five forest types comprised Arlington Woods: mixed hardwood forest, red oak forest, chestnut oak forest, white oak forest and disturbed hardwood forest.

Although dramatically reduced in size, currently Arlington Woods retains much of its historic character. In 2008, 12 acres of the 24-acre Section 29 plot was transferred back to Arlington Cemetery. With this transfer, the National Park Service retained about half of the remaining woods adjacent to the central core of the property. Many of the oldest trees in Arlington Woods were identified in a 1998 cultural resource study. The report indicated that the mixed hardwood forest of the ravine between the house and administration building was the location of the oldest trees in the surrounding area. A fallen hickory tree was dated to approximately 1775. Some of the oldest specimens are considered "witness trees" (trees which were standing and "witnessed" the historic time period), and still stand today.

With the exception of the mature trees in Arlington Woods and a deodar cedar planted in 1874 immediately west of Arlington House in the former work yard, there is almost no vegetative matter on the site today that was growing during the period of significance. However, the vegetation in the yard, flower, and vegetable gardens is generally compatible with the Custis-Lee era landscape.

The dramatic power of Arlington House derives largely from its impressive position and the views and vistas provided by its location. A primary view established during the Custis era was from the front of the house looking east towards the expanse of Washington, D.C. It was also important to Custis that his home be seen from Washington. This is illustrated in the creation of park-like land to the east of the house. The park was a planned pasture area planted with single tree specimens, and groves of trees strategically preserved or planted to frame views and present a picturesque setting for the house behind it. The retention and preservation of Arlington Woods to the west of the house provided a scenic and mysterious backdrop in the tradition of the English Landscape-style of design.

---

6 The Custis burial plot where George Washington Parke Custis and his wife Mary Custis are buried, originally stood within the forested portion of the Arlington estate known as Arlington Woods. Today, it stands within the developed burial ground of Arlington National Cemetery.


Arlington House’s primary views to and from Washington, D.C. remain largely intact today and allow the house to retain its historic character of conspicuousness and prominence upon the landscape. Internal views between the flower and vegetable gardens remain from the historic period and retain integrity.

The Military-Cemetery Landscape

When the federal government took over the property in 1861, it was largely converted for military uses. Drill grounds, encampments, fortifications, and storage or service buildings dotted the landscape. Although the larger estate landscape was extensively damaged and altered by these military activities, the immediate house setting was left largely intact. The U.S. Army introduced new landscape elements which today allow us to visualize the important period when Arlington House and the surrounding land hosted the growing national military burial ground.

With federal occupation, new elements were introduced, including modifications and additions to the circulation system. The army built new roads to provide access to the four forts erected on the property and to provide an additional road access out of the area in case of attack. Present-day Sherman Avenue follows part of the route of the main new access road built during the Civil War. In the early 1870s, the access road was altered north of the house to lessen its grade. A trace of the original route can be found today in the north section of Arlington Woods.

Few remnants of the military activities of 1861 to 1864 remain today, thus the landscape does not retain enough integrity to convey its historical significance as part of the Civil War Defenses of Washington. The potential for archeological remains related to encampments during the war exists but has not been explored. Despite changes to the setting since the war, the house retains Civil War military significance as the site of the Union Army command and as the headquarters of the defenses of Washington between May 1861 and October 1862.

While this post-1861 layer altered some primary features of the Custis-Lee property, the spatial organization of the domestic landscape largely was retained. For example, the two dependencies continued as housing and service buildings; the mansion remained partially residential; the flower garden was retained; and although the kitchen garden was built over, its essential outline remained. Lee Avenue that extends along the historic Custis-era carriage approach road continued in use and retains its route today. Construction of the Memorial Amphitheater, Tomb of the Unknowns, and grave markers placed along Lee Avenue are prominent reminders that the land was seized from a Union enemy and the property would forever be used as a military burial ground.

The Restoration Landscape

Since 1925, when Congress directed the War Department to remove administrative functions and restore the house as a museum, several restoration campaigns have focused on removing some of the layers added by the cemetery administration, while at the same time accommodating a growing number of tourists. Most of the removals related to paving and plantings, but also
included the removal of the greenhouse from the kitchen garden. The War Department’s re-creation of the early-19th century Custis stable for use as administrative office for the cemetery administration reflects the holistic objectives of the restoration.

While little exists today of the Civil War landscape of barracks, entrenchments, and drill grounds, the conversion of the estate into a military burial ground after 1864 transformed the large estate into a highly designed and managed cemetery landscape. The landscape elements and features encompassed in the Arlington House Historic District reflect the early period of the cemetery’s development, a period when Arlington House and its immediate surroundings served as the administrative and maintenance headquarters of the cemetery. The most eloquent element of the cemetery conversion is the row of 45 headstones that line the east and south edges of the flower garden and extends west along the north side of Lee Avenue. The headstones mark the burials of Union officers felled in the Civil War. The Tomb of the Unknown Civil War Soldiers is another prominent cemetery feature. It stands at the center of the area known to the Custis-Lee family as the Grove. Completed in 1866, the monument was erected above a crypt containing the remains of 2,111 unidentified soldiers who perished at the battles of First and Second Manassas and in battles along the U.S. Army’s route to the Rappahannock River.

Custis Walk, a paved walkway and stair that extends northeast from the northeast corner of Arlington House, was built by the War Department in 1893. It was built to connect the house, which then served as the cemetery headquarters, to a newly established electric trolley stop along the Washington, Alexandria and Mt. Vernon Railway. The southernmost segment of this concrete-paved path is within the historic district boundary. It relates to the late-19th century development of the cemetery as a tourist and commemorative destination and to the significance of Arlington House as the headquarters of the growing cemetery.
Arlington House Historic District 2013
Boundary Increase & Additional Documentation
Name of Property

Contributing Resources - Buildings

Arlington House, 1802-1818; Major restoration, 1928-1932
(List of Classified Structures – LCS # 000059; VDHR #000-0001)
1 Contributing Building

Exterior

Arlington House is a Greek Revival style building composed of a large two-story, front-gable central section flanked by two one-story, hipped-roofed wings. The long axis of the house runs north-south, and the main façade faces east toward Washington, DC across the Potomac River. Constructed in phases between 1802 and 1818, the walls were built with locally manufactured brick and clad with a hard stucco surface scored to simulate ashlar stonework. The building’s most prominent feature is the large (16-foot by 52-foot) full-height Doric portico that stretches across the east façade and is visible from across the river in Washington.

Designed by British-born architect George Hadfield, the house was constructed in phases, with the north and south wings completed between 1802 and 1804. The central section and portico were built later, probably between 1817 and 1818. The three-part form of the house consists of the central main block covered by a front-gable roof and flanking wings extending to the north and south. All together, the three sections stretch 140 feet north to south with a maximum depth of 64 feet. The main block measures approximately 59 feet wide (measured north to south), 42 feet deep, and 31 feet to the eaves. The front portico extends approximately 23 feet toward the east; the peak of its pediment reaches 47.5 feet. The house features six chimneys; four of these are interior stacks set in pairs on either side of the central main block. Each wing also encompasses a single chimney stack. The interior north chimney serves four fire boxes in the basement and first floor on the north wing. The south wing chimney is also an interior stack smaller in dimension than the north chimney. It occupies the rear (west) slope of the south wing’s hipped roof. All of the chimneys are constructed of brick and covered with smooth stucco.

The wings each consist of one-story hipped-roof blocks measuring approximately 24 feet deep by 40 feet wide (north to south dimension). The low-sloped roofs are covered with a gravel roof that approximates the surface applied in 1858 during Robert E. Lee’s management of the property (1857-1861). Each wing has a one-story frame extension off its west elevation. Covered by hipped roofs, these extensions may have originated as open porches (loggias), but subsequently were enclosed. The extensions extend the full width of each wing and are

---

9 Measurements were taken from NPS-prepared existing conditions drawings prepared for the 1985 (Phase II) Historic Structure Report. The drawings are dated 03/09/1982.
approximately 11 feet in depth, bringing the overall depth of each wing to approximately 35 feet. The north wing's west extension contains the outer hall pantry where slaves worked and served the family in the main house. The south wing's extension contains a conservatory; the floor level in the conservatory is near ground level, several steps down from that of the main house. The outer hall pantry and conservatory extensions connect to the main house via small one-story, frame enclosures covered by hipped roofs that are set below the eaves of each extension. These connections were likely constructed when the wing extensions/former porches were enclosed.

Except for portions of the foundations of the rear wing extensions, all sections of the building stand atop continuous brick foundations. The portico columns rest on 8-foot-square, brick foundation piers. The perimeter foundation rises approximately 3 feet above the surrounding grade. Along the north, south, and east elevations of the two wings, the raised foundation is clad with a rough-textured stucco that contrasts with the smooth surface of the faux-ashlar upper walls. The raised foundation is irregularly pierced by small, rectangular windows along the exposed elevations of the north and south wings and along the rear or west elevation of the central block. These windows mainly consist of 6-light wood windows; some are screened by wide-spaced horizontal bars, others are covered by screens made of tightly spaced vertical louvers. The central section’s rear basement-level windows are shielded by solid shutters hung on metal strap hinges.

The upper walls of the main block, its wings, and the portico columns are built of soft-fired brick clad with smooth-surfaced hard stucco scored to simulate ashlar stone blocks. The north, south, and east elevations of the two wings along with the east elevation and the columns and entablature of the portico are faux-grained to simulate the veining and coloration of Aquia sandstone. The current reproduction finish was applied circa 2000; the surface treatment is based on evidence from historic, Civil War-period photographs. The north and south elevations of the main block, which are exposed above the wing roofs, and the west elevation of the main block and the wing extensions are finished with the same scored stucco, but these areas are painted a cream color rather than being faux-grained.

The east façade of the house is dominated by the giant prostyle portico with eight un-fluted, stuccoed brick Greek Doric columns surmounted by a full Doric entablature, paneled soffit, and an enclosed pediment. The massive columns rise approximately 16 feet and are 5 feet in diameter at the base. The columns taper as they rise upward to the wooden Doric capitals. Six columns extend across the front with two additional freestanding columns set behind each corner column. The entablature is adorned with simplified Doric triglyphs and metopes. The pediment field is clad in flush horizontal wood weatherboard.

Partially hidden behind the monumental portico, the main (east) façade of the main block is five bays wide. The symmetrical arrangement of bays centers on a wide, double-leaf, paneled and painted, wood door. Large, 9-over-6, double-hung wood sash windows flank the door, two on either side. Each window is protected by a pair of 3-panel wood shutters and the top of the first story windows aligns with the top of the central entry door. A temporary multi-light and paneled wood vestibule structure protects the entry; it is topped by a multi-light transom. The door and

---

windows have no external trim; instead, the incised stucco coating forms a frame of faux stone blocks around each opening. The window sills consist of square-edged wood blocks below each window.

The wide expanse that separates the tops of the first story windows from the bottom of the second story windows is relieved by a single, rectangular inset panel aligned with each window or door bay. The five second story windows align with the bays below; each contains a single 6-over-6, double-hung, wood sash window.

Except for the number and placement of the basement windows, the east elevations of the flanking wings are identical. Each features a low raised basement level covered in rough-textured stucco and pierced by small basement-level windows and a main level dominated by a row of three arched, double-hung wood sash windows. Each arched window occupies a larger inset arched frame that extends above and below the window opening. A single recessed, plain panel rests below each window sill. The window sash consists of large upper sash with eight lights topped by a radial pattern of lights. The lower sash has an eight-light pattern and delicate muntin divides. The eaves of both wings feature shallow modillion blocks and a simple bed molding.

The north and south end walls of each wing display the same detailing and finishes. Each elevation contains a single arched window that matches those on their east elevations. The only difference is that the north wing end wall contains a single basement window centered below the first story window.

The rear or west elevation of the house is finished differently from the main, public façade. Built as the service-yard elevation, it incorporates less architectural detailing. Its organization is also more complex, reflecting the more practical functions that took place at the rear of the house, out of sight from the more formal, public areas.

The west elevation of the central block is two and a half stories in height and three bays wide. The elevation is divided into three vertical bays by a slightly recessed center bay. The central first story entrance and a second-story tri-partite window occupy the recessed bay. A paneled, double-leaf wood door occupies the main rear entrance; it is framed by vertical 6-over-4-light, double-hung sidelights that surmount single-panel bulkheads. Fluted trim frames either side of the door.

To either side of the central entrance bay, the outer first-story bays contain single, rectangular windows set into shallow arched niches. Each window contains a 9-over-6, double-hung, wood sash window protected by louvered wood shutters. The second story west elevation features three window bays. The outer bays hold single, 6-over-6, double-hung wood sash windows. The central bay contains a tripartite window. The elongated window opening contains an 8-over-8 central sash flanked by 4-over-4 sash on either side. The lower one-third of the opening consists of bulkhead panels that are operable. It is believed that this door-sized window was

12 Civil War photographs suggest that, at one time, the panels contained decorative paintings, though physical investigation has not confirmed this.
designed not as an upper level entrance, but to provide access for moving furniture in and out of the upper floor.

The west elevations of both the north and south wing feature arched, shallow recesses that contain windows. Two of the three arched recesses on the north wing’s west elevation hold 6-over-6, double-hung, wood sash windows, while the third and southernmost bay contains a single-leaf paneled door topped by a 3-light transom. This door provides access to the outer hall pantry. The basement level at this elevation includes two below-grade entrances and two basement windows. The winter kitchen was located in the basement of the north wing, so these doors provided exterior access to those work spaces.

The south wing’s west extension contains the conservatory, which is enclosed by large, arched openings filled with multi-light windows. The west and south elevations of the conservatory extension are dominated by glazing. Along the west wall, there are three arched bays; each contains a pair of 8-over-8 double-hung wood sash windows divided by a mullion and capped by a large, two-part, half-round transom that contains multi-light windows. The low wall below the windows contains plain, recessed panels. The conservatory is accessed through an arched bay that fills the south elevation of the conservatory extension. The entrance bay holds a double-leaf, multi-light door topped by a half-round, multi-light transom. Each door panel contains fifteen lights above a paneled base.

The exterior of Arlington House retains nearly all of the architectural features that were present during its occupation by the Custis-Lee family (1818 – 1861). The primary exceptions are the rooftop parapets that once wrapped the perimeters of the north and south wings. The parapets appear in 19th century renderings of the house; however, they were removed prior to the Civil War by the Lees. During the 1929-1933 restoration of the house, the War Department reinstalled the parapets. The National Park Service removed them again in 1959 because they were not in existence during 1861, the primary interpretive period for the house.

While significant portions of the original exterior materials of the house have been repaired or replaced during various restoration periods, the design and workmanship are essentially intact.

**Arlington House – Interior**

The interior of Arlington House has been restored and furnished to reflect the occupation of Robert E. and Mary Lee and their family (1831-1861). Although several successive restoration projects have been completed since 1929, most of the interior architectural features are either original or copied to replicate original elements in the house. In 2012-2013, the NPS completed

---
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an interior rehabilitation that included the installation of a climate control system, repairs to the plasterwork and frescoes, selected flooring replacement, and repainting.

Arlington House’s interior is organized around a center-hall plan with a transverse rear stair hall divided by a wide transverse arch. The two spaces are known respectively as the front hall and the “Hunting Hall.” The house displays finishes and architectural details typical of early 19th century houses of Virginia’s gentry class. The main block contains two full floors above a basement, while each wing is a single story above a full basement. Service and storage areas, including a winter kitchen and wine cellar beneath the north wing and a dairy below the south wing, occupied the basement level. The main level contained the formal entertaining rooms and the main living areas of the Custis and Lee families. More private areas and service spaces were located near the rear or west side of the first floor. The second story of the main block contained sleeping rooms and dressing rooms.

During the army’s occupation of the house (1861-1933), the first floor variously served as office space and living quarters for soldiers or staff of the cemetery. Portions of the ground floor remained open to the public during the cemetery administration’s occupation of the house (ca. 1864 – 1933). During the cemetery occupancy, the second floor housed the cemetery’s head gardener, David H. Rhodes and his family. Alterations were made to provide a kitchen for the Rhodes family; a 1906 floor plan of the second floor shows that the northwest bed chamber (known as the Girls’ Chamber) contained a kitchen. The War Department removed all vestiges of the army and cemetery occupation of the house in the 1929-1935 restoration.

The main block of the house is characterized by lofty ceilings, deeply carved moldings, and a liberal use of archways. The floors throughout are random-width pine; the first floor boards were all replaced in the 1929-1935 restoration. Original flooring remains in the bedrooms on the second floor of the main block. Due to severe deterioration and life-safety concerns, the flooring in the upper center hall was replaced in the 2012 rehabilitation project.

The walls throughout the interior are plastered and many feature molded trims, including deep cornices, door frames, decorative window lintels, picture rails and chair railing. The current (2012) rehabilitation project employed paint analysis conducted in 1987 to reproduce the wall colors from circa 1860. The moldings differ slightly from room to room, with the most elaborate elements found in the public rooms, including the White Parlor (Main block room south of the center hall), the Dining Room – Family Parlor (Main block room north of the center hall). A unique decorative feature in the Hunting Hall is a series of three frescoes painted high on the walls above the archways. The frescoes create a wide frieze below the cornice. Likely painted by G.W.P. Custis and executed in the secco fresco technique (painted on dry plaster), the three murals depict hunting scenes that feature dogs chasing a rabbit, a lion and a tiger fighting, and a stag hunt. The hunting hall frescoes were stabilized in 2013.

15 During the rehabilitation work, all interior furnishings and fixtures were removed from the house.
Among the most distinctive architectural features of the house is the variety of arches that relieve large wall expanses and serve to divide spaces. The architect and builder incorporated both blind arches and open archways to provide variety and elegance to the interior. Upon entering the center hall, the viewer observes a wide transverse arch at the back of the hall; it divides the reception hall from the rear stair hall or hunting hall. During the Federal period (ca. 1780 - ca. 1830), transverse arches were commonly used in high-style houses of the wealthy. Typically they separated the entry or reception area from an elaborate center staircase.

At Arlington, the main stair is “hidden” in the rear stair hall that runs perpendicular to the center hall. Located in the southern half of the rear hall, the main stair itself is fairly narrow and not as elaborate as many of the period. It features a simple molded railing; thin, squared-off balusters; and an attenuated, Federal-style newel post. The open-stringer stair is adorned with shallow paneling and bullnose treads. A second, winder stair that likely served as a servants’ stair, occupies the northeast corner of the rear stair hall. While the side paneling and bullnose treads match the main stair, the newel post and rail are more modest in design.

Archways also play a prominent role in the primary entertaining spaces of Arlington House. The large room to the north of the center hall and within the main block is divided into two rooms by a “screen” wall composed of three arches. The room to the east of the screen wall served the Lees as the family parlor; on the west was a dining room. The latter space also features a prominent blind arch centered on the west wall. The blind arch features a trimmed shallow recess with a door at the center. Above the door is a fanlight transom with leaded muntins formed in a foliate pattern.

The house retains many of its original interior doors. Some are painted and others are faux wood grained to simulate exotic woods. A variety of door styles exists throughout the house. Most are four- or six-panel painted or faux wood-grained doors. The main front and rear doors are tall, double-leaf units that feature multiple, small, square panels that align vertically. The front door retains its original brass box lock and knocker.

The main block of the house incorporates four fireplaces on the first floor and four on the second floor. On the first floor, the family parlor and dining room each contain one fireplace and the White Parlor (to the south on the center hall) has two placed symmetrically along the south wall. Mantelpieces in a variety of designs, styles, and materials adorn the fireplaces. Except for the two Victorian marble mantelpieces in the White Parlor, which were installed by the Lees in 1855, and a wood mantel located in the Lee Chamber upstairs —which is a Federal-style reproduction that the War Department installed during the 1929 restoration— the remaining mantels in the main block date to Custis’ initial construction of the central two-story section in 1817-1818. The original mantels are Federal in style, with delicate, hand-carved medallions, foliate motifs, and reeding.

In 1855, Robert E. Lee ordered three marble mantelpieces from a company in New York City. Two were installed in the White Parlor which G.W.P. Custis had left unfinished until that year. The third was installed in the adjacent “Morning Room” in the south wing of the house. In 1932 the War Department removed the Victorian-style mantels and had reproduction Federal-style
mantels installed in their place. The intent was to return the house to an appropriate style for when it was occupied by Custis in the early 19th century. In 1953, the National Park Service reinstalled the original Victorian-era mantels in the White Parlor.17

Arlington House - North Wing Interior

The north wing is the earliest portion of Arlington House. Built in 1802-1803, it initially served as Custis’ residence. When built, it was a free-standing, two-story, brick building with a hipped roof. The interior underwent significant changes as the other sections of the mansion were built, including the removal of the second story and raising the ceiling heights. Thus, its floor plan is the least regularized of the three main sections of the house and it contains the smallest rooms. Five rooms occupy the north wing, two used as bed chambers in the latter years of Custis’ occupancy. A third room was used as a sewing and school room. The western or rear room was occupied by a servant’s hall and pantry. This outer hall pantry space incorporates a stair to the basement kitchen below the north wing along with a small bathroom/water closet installed by the Lees in the 1850s.

In the north wing, an inner hall runs north-south and connects the main block to the sewing/school room at the north end of the wing. Evidence of the first construction phase of the north wing remains along the west wall of the inner hall. Consisting of a chimney flue, remnants of early finishes, and a wall ledger and pockets for the second-floor joists, the evidence has been revealed and preserved in place. A sliding screen wall and directed lighting allows guides to reveal this building archeology during interpretive tours.

The north wing’s interior finishes are very similar to those within the main block. The larger chamber (probably occupied by Mr. and Mrs. Custis in their later years) and the sewing/school room contain Federal-style wood mantels. A unique feature found only in the north wing are rectangular windows set above some of the interior doors; they are similar to transoms, but are unconnected to the door frame and are trimmed differently from the door openings.

The north wing’s west extension contains the outer hall pantry service area. The walls are painted, but paint analysis suggests that in the mid-19th century they were finished with faux-wood graining. The space is plainly finished; a straight-run stair descends to the basement along the room’s east wall. An original exterior west-facing window with 6-over-6-light, double-hung wood sash opens between the main section of the north wing and the outer hall.

Arlington House - South Wing Interior

The south wing is divided into two rooms: one large – the Morning Room or parlor – and one small. The smaller room served as an office for both G.W.P. Custis and his son-in-law, Robert E. Lee. The Morning Room features deeply recessed and paneled window frames on its two east-facing, arched-sash windows and a 1932 reproduction Federal mantelpiece on its west wall.

17 The 1929 reproduction mantel still exists in the Morning Room of the South Wing. Records indicate that it is a copy of the mantel in the room used by Mr. & Mrs. G.W.P. Custis on the first floor of the north wing. The 1855 Morning Room mantel removed by the War Department in 1929 has not been located. The same is true for the Federal-style reproduction mantel still in place in the Lees’ Chamber on the second floor.
A large blind arch stretches the full width of the north wall. An arched doorway provides access to the office to the south of the Morning Room; the door is surmounted by a fanlight transom containing a light pattern that matches the leaded, petal-shaped lights in the back wall of the dining room. A plaster foliate-patterned medallion adorns the center of the ceiling.

The north extension contains a conservatory. Set five steps below the main floor level, the conservatory features a brick floor laid in a herringbone pattern and arched windows along its west wall. The outside entrance is at the south end of the room.

**Dependencies**

**North Slave Quarter and Kitchen, 1803-1818**
**South Slave Quarter, Storehouse, and Smokehouse, circa 1810**
(LCS#s 000060 and 011956)

2 Contributing Buildings

A major element of Custis' domestic core at Arlington was the construction of a pair of symmetrically placed dependencies set at the rear and slightly north and south of the main house. Facing each other across a service yard, these rectilinear, one-story buildings were designed to provide convenient quarters and work/storage spaces used by the house slaves that were essential to running the Custis household. Measuring approximately 40 feet long and 20 feet wide, the buildings also accommodated multiple service spaces that included a summer kitchen (basement of the North Slave Quarter) and a locked storage room. From his father's and grandmother's estates, Custis inherited nearly 200 slaves; while many of the slaves worked and lived at his plantation properties in central Virginia, approximately 60 slaves lived and worked on the Arlington estate. Most of these enslaved people worked to maintain Custis' agricultural and industrial pursuits; a few, who were viewed as the elite of slave society, worked in and around the main house. It was these household slaves who lived and worked in the two back buildings and the intervening service yard.

Custis had the buildings designed to complement the mansion. Situated perpendicular to the north and south wings of the main house in a formal alignment, they incorporate architectural details that link them to the house design. The north and south sides of the buildings that face the formal garden spaces and the west facing sides of the building are highly ornamental, echoing design elements found on the main house. The facades of the buildings that face the yard and the back of Arlington House are plain in comparison. Shallow blind arches and engaged classical columns set into a niche and topped by a lintel and architrave element adorn the outer (south and north facing) elevations that face outward toward the kitchen garden on the north and the flower garden to the south. Likewise, the gable ends are similarly adorned. Along with the west elevation of the main house, the north and south walls of the north and south dependencies form a court partially enclosed on three sides. The court served as a work yard for the domestic slaves; here they performed most of the household chores. The presence of the two flanking

18 Slave narratives documented in John Michael Vlach's *Back of the Big House* record that typical chores performed by slaves in the work yard included making soap, candles, syrup, and sausage, and doing laundry. Vlach, *Back of the Big House*, 33-42.
dependencies shielded these practical activities from view from the front or sides of the mansion. The level of architectural elaboration is uncommon in other southern plantations of the era.

The placement, architectural elaboration, and function of the north and south dependencies express and reinforce the hierarchy inherent in the slave system. The Arlington House grouping is a rare and highly expressive example of plantation architecture and landscapes in antebellum Virginia.

The exact construction date of the two slave quarters is not known. It is likely that they were built during the house construction period of 1803 to 1818. The 2009 Historic Structure Report investigation of the two buildings revealed that the north quarters was built several years before the south building.

Both the north and south slave quarters buildings are constructed of solid-brick masonry walls that rest on 18-inch-thick stone foundations. The foundations are exposed above grade, forming random rubble stone water tables on each building. Measuring approximately 20 feet wide by 40 feet long, each building is one story in height. However, due to the slope of the site to the rear (north), the North slave quarter has an exposed basement level along its north elevation. Both buildings contain three first-floor rooms; the north dependency originally also incorporated two additional rooms in the partially exposed basement.

The exterior walls are finished with rough-cast and smooth stucco and incorporate classical detailing. A series of blind arches with inset windows extends across the outward-facing elevations of both quarters. The central bay of each of these elevations contains a set of engaged columns that support an engaged wood entablature surmounted by a series of ornamental and louvered vents. A single blind arch adorns the east-facing gable ends, while the west gable ends contain another set of engaged columns and a lunette-shaped ornamental vent in the pediments.

Both buildings feature low-pitched, side-gable roofs covered with clay-tile shingles manufactured to simulate wood (installed circa 1960). The wide eaves and soffits of the roof contain exposed rafter tails. The gable ends are pedimented with ornamental vents centered on each end. Both buildings feature small, rectangular, framed and recessed panels set one above each of the three doors that pierce the inward-facing facades. Each of these panels contained a small painted image applied to a slate substrate; the slave quarters paintings have been heavily restored over time. They depict eagles and a horse; the horse that occupies the central panel on the south building is said to be George Washington’s war horse.

Historically, the north quarters housed a summer kitchen and four rooms that housed the household slaves. This historic configuration was recently restored on the east end of the building; the west end currently contains the Arlington House gift shop. The primary historic
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19 While the two dependencies located west of the main house were designed to be multi-purpose residential and domestic service buildings, the NPS commonly refers to them as the north and south slave quarters. This nomination will refer to them as such.

20 Evidence shows that the buildings initially had wood-shingle roofs that the War Department replaced with slate shingles circa 1890. (HSR).
function of the south quarters was as a storehouse; it also contained a smokehouse in the center first floor room, and living quarters for the enslaved Gray family in the western room. During the Department of the Army’s management, the two slave quarters buildings were used as quarters for cemetery employees and for storage of tools and other equipment.

The interiors of both quarters reflect several restoration efforts, starting with the War Department’s 1930 restoration. The employees of the War Department in charge of planning the restoration of the outbuildings were directed to carefully plan and execute the restoration “to avoid irreparable injury to work which must be preserved in its historic character.” The south slave quarter essentially retains its original three-room layout; each space is separated by a frame wall partition and there are no doors between rooms. Each room is accessed by a single door opening in the building’s north façade. Currently, the east room (originally the storehouse) contains a display on the slaves of the Arlington Estate; the center room (formerly the smokehouse) is closed to the public and used for storage; and the west room is furnished as the room of Selina Gray, the matriarch of the most prominent of the slave families at Arlington.

The rooms are simply finished with plaster or whitewash and the floors are brick. While some original plaster remains (especially in the center room), most of the finishes and the roof structure were extensively repaired or replaced in the 20th century. The spaces retain their original dimensions and their essential character remains intact.

The north quarters has undergone extensive interior reconstructions and several campaigns of exterior changes as well. The War Department’s 1930 restoration attempted to return the original floor plan and interior division of the upper and lower rooms. In 1964, the NPS, believing most of the War Department’s reconstruction to be inaccurate, removed and rebuilt the floor and ceiling levels. Recent research has shown that the interior layout devised by the War Department, while not exactly correct, was closer to the original than the NPS version. A gift shop currently occupies the western room of the north slave quarter. In the fall of 2012, the other two rooms re-opened restored to the early-19th century when George Clark, a cook, was living and working there.

**Potting Shed (historic)/ Museum Building (current), 1888**
(LCS# 011957)
1 Contributing Building

Built in 1888 as part of a larger greenhouse complex, the potting shed stands at the northeastern edge of the vegetable garden north of the mansion. The War Department built the small potting house with a large attached greenhouse to propagate plant materials for the cemetery. The potting shed, as it stands today, is a finely articulated late-Victorian brick building. Two stories in height, the building stands on a rectangular stone foundation which measures approximately 22 feet by 25 feet. Covered by a hipped roof clad with slate shingles, brick buttresses divide three of four elevations into two or three bays. The building faces north with its main entrance occupying the central bay of that elevation. The entrance contains a double-leaf wood paneled

entry door, a segmental arched lintel, and an arched roof portico supported by attenuated chamfered wood posts. Single 6-over-6 double-hung wood windows occupy the first-story facade bays flanking the centered entrance. Three single windows are arrayed above them at the second story.

The south elevation which faces the main house is largely blank brick without the dividing buttresses; this is where the original associated brick and glass greenhouse was attached. The NPS removed the greenhouse extension in 1934. The openings along this side are irregularly placed; they consist of a single-leaf, four-panel door located near the center of the first story and two single windows, one per story.

Decorative features include a brick, modillion-like cornice and four louvered and gabled roof dormers, one per side. Each dormer features scroll-sawn woodwork. Copper gutters and downspouts extend around the full perimeter of the building.

The interior of the building has been substantially remodeled from its original state; it presently contains exhibition, office, and storage spaces. The potting shed stands in its original location and is used as a walk-through museum exhibiting collections from the families of G.W.P. Custis and Robert E. Lee.

**NPS Administration Building, 1931**
(LCS# none)
1 Contributing Building

Located approximately 480 feet directly west of the rear of Arlington House, what is currently known as the Administration Building is a 1931 reproduction of G.W.P. Custis’ original early-19th century stable. The War Department built the Administration Building as part of its new administrative complex that was developed between 1930 and 1935. The complex, comprised of the Administration Building (1931), greenhouses, a lavatory building, and the Cemetery Superintendent’s residence (a.k.a. Lodge, 1931), replaced the facilities formerly located in and immediately around Arlington House.

The Administration Building stands on the site of the Custis stable which burned down in 1904. Custis’ stable was highly architectural; it featured a Doric portico that recalled the main house’s front portico. In 1907, the War Department replaced the Custis stable with a new stable in a more utilitarian form. After Congress directed that the mansion be restored, the War Department developed plans to replace the office space and living quarters located within the Arlington House since the 1860s. Presumably using historic photographs, the War Department’s restoration architects designed the new Administration Building to replicate Custis’ porticoed stable. Completed by early 1934, the work was described as a remodeling of the 1907 stable, so portions of that structure likely remain beneath the later sections that recreated the Custis-Lee-era stable.

As it stands today, the Administration Building is a one-story, brick, front-gable, temple-like building with flanking hipped-roof wings. The main roof’s ridgeline runs north-south and the
building extends back from the flanking wings to form a T-shaped footprint. The rear extension departs from the footprint of the original Custis-era stable which had no rear extension.

The exterior walls are finished in smooth stucco with rough-cast stucco defining the foundation. The front facing pediment is clad with flush, horizontal board siding. The wings exhibit a narrow, molded wood cornice and projecting eaves. The central front-gable portion which extends at the rear has a wide frieze under the eaves; narrow louvered vents pierce the frieze along the rear length.

The south-facing facade is divided into three sections that are pierced by seven bays. The central, three-bay section is recessed slightly. It falls under the main, front-gable roof which extends to form a pedimented, temple-front portico supported on four un-fluted Doric columns. While significantly smaller in dimension, the Administration Building's portico displays proportions much like those of the main house's portico. Differences include the wider spacing between the two central columns and the inclusion of a lunette shaped vent in the pediment.

The main entrance occupies the central bay and is located within an arched opening. It contains a paneled, single-leaf wood door that is flanked by sidelights and surmounted by a decorative fanlight. Single, 4-over-4, double-hung sash replacement windows flank the front entrance. Each hipped-roof, one story wing features two arched window openings set within recessed arches that extend below the windows. The replacement windows in each arched opening consist of multi-light, arched upper sashes and 6-light lower sashes.

A secondary entrance opens at the rear or north-facing elevation. The remainder of the exterior walls possess a variety of rectangular windows set within shallow recessed niches. The sides of each wing contain a pair of rectangular windows set within large, arched niches that approximate those seen on the Arlington House.

In 1998, the NPS acquired the building and approximately two tenths of an acre that it occupies from the army. It currently serves as the administrative headquarters of Arlington House, The Robert E. Lee Memorial. The Administration Building parcel is completely surrounded by land controlled by the army and used as part of Arlington National Cemetery.

After fire damaged the roof and interior in 1991, the building was repaired and substantially remodeled on the interior; thus no interior finishes date to the period of significance. However, the exterior of the building continues to represent the War Department's pioneering efforts to complete a comprehensive restoration of the historic Arlington House property. Although the remodeling of the 1907 stable building was completed to provide offices for the cemetery administration, the War Department made a conscious decision to remodel to replicate the Custis stable, thus adding to the sense of authenticity of the setting.
Contributing Resources - Sites

Mary Randolph’s Tomb, 1828, brick enclosure; 20th century
(Owned and maintained by Army National Cemetery Program.)

1 Contributing Site

Mary Randolph, a cousin of Mary Lee Fitzhugh Custis, wife of G.W.P. Custis, died in 1828 and was buried at Arlington. She gained wide acclaim for the cookbook, *The Virginia Housewife*, which she had published in 1824. She was the daughter of an elite Virginia family. Her father was Thomas Mann Randolph; her brother married Thomas Jefferson’s daughter. Mary Randolph married her cousin, David Meade Randolph in 1780. Randolph was an acclaimed farmer, inventor, and businessman. In their later years, the Randolphs moved from Richmond to Washington, D.C. where they lived with their son.

Located approximately 200 feet northeast of the Arlington House mansion, the grave of Mary Randolph is accessed by a short, slate-paved path that extends off Custis Walk. The grave consists of a chest-type tomb with an inscribed slab top. The base of the chest is brick and the slab appears to be marble. The grave stone inscription reads:

> In the memory of Mrs. Mary Randolph,
> Her intrinsic worth needs no eulogium.
> The deceased was born
> The 9th of August, 1762
> at Amphill near Richmond, Virginia
> And died the 23rd of January 1828
> In Washington City a victim to maternal love and duty.

Set into a steep hillside, the tomb sits within a brick walled enclosure that is approximately 5 feet tall at the bottom of the slope. The wall features corner and mid-point posts with square stone caps set atop each one. Although the date of the walled enclosure has not yet been determined, a brick walled enclosure appears in an 1862 watercolor of the property. A metal pipe railing separates a small slate viewing platform from the brick-walled enclosure. The inscribed stone slab rests on its base approximately four feet below the grade of the top of the brick enclosure wall.

The tomb and brick wall are in good condition.

22 Maps show that, in the 1860s, the burial plot had much the same dimensions as it does today. Union soldier Robert Know Sneden’s 1862 watercolor of Arlington House shows a low brick wall enclosing the site of Mary Randolph’s grave downslope from the house [Robert Knox Sneden diary, 1861–1865 (Mss5:1 Sn237:1), Virginia Historical Society, Richmond, Va., Volume 3, p. 755] Image link: http://vhs4.vahistorical.org/vhsimages/manuscripts/Mss5/SnedenDiary/Vol3/Mss5.1.Sn237.1.Vol3_0755.jpg There is some evidence that, sometime after the cemetery took over management of the property, the slope at this location was graded, possibly to allow for burials or to accommodate construction of Custis Walk in the 1890s.
Custis Burial Plot, 1853; 1857
(Owned and maintained by U.S. Army, National Cemetery Program.)

1 Contributing Site

The Custis burial plot is a discontiguous site in the Arlington House Historic District. Located approximately 1,100 feet southwest of Arlington House, the Custis Burial Plot contains the graves of Mary and George Washington Parke Custis, the original owners and developers of the Arlington estate. Buried there in 1853 and 1857, respectively, the Custis gravesite encompasses a small fenced enclosure containing two marble grave markers separated by a mature oak tree. The burial plot is surrounded by mainly Civil War era burials associated with the early establishment of Arlington National Cemetery.

The rectangular enclosure measures approximately 15 feet by 30 feet and features an iron picket fence on its perimeter. The fence was installed after 1864 and features a decorated gate at the center of the north side and decorative finials atop support posts.

The larger of the two marble grave markers marks the grave of G.W.P. Custis. Standing approximately eight feet tall, the monument consists of a marble obelisk set atop a base with a block-like plinth. The corners of the plinth block are chamfered and a shield-shaped, raised plaque with incised lettering adorns the north face. The plaque is carved with the following words:

George Washington
Parke Custis
Born April 30, 1781
Died October 10, 1857

On the reverse, carved directly into the plinth, is the Biblical verse:

"Blessed are the merciful for they shall obtain mercy."
Matt, chap V. verse [illegible]

The smaller, pylon-shaped monument marks Mary L. Custis' (Mary "Molly" Lee Fitzhugh Custis) grave. Standing approximately five feet tall, the monument is a tapered pylon set atop a block-like plinth and capped by a flared capital carved with a foliate pattern. A bas relief wreath adorns the south side of the shaft. The same side of the base plinth block is carved with lettering:

Mary L. Custis
Born April 22, 1788
Died April 23, 1853

The reverse or south side of the plinth is carved with

"Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God."
The only other carving is at the base of the plinth on the south face which is inscribed with the monument carver's name:

R.E. Lauintz, N.Y.

Both monuments are in fair condition. They show moderate weathering and both lean outward from the tree that separates them. The slab base of Mary Custis' marker has been replaced by a granite block. G.W.P. Custis' marker displays small repairs to the stone, while Mary's displays major cracks.

**Civil War-era Officers' Graves and Grave Markers Site along Lee Avenue and the Eastern Edge of the Flower Garden, 1864**

*(Owned and maintained by Army National Cemetery program)*

1 Contributing Site

Starting in 1864 and at the direction of Quartermaster General Meigs, Federal Army officers were buried along the outer edge of the rectangular flower garden plot south of the Arlington mansion. In all 45 officers' graves are located along what was built as the carriage road to the front of Custis' mansion, and is now designated Lee Avenue, starting immediately east of the Old Amphitheater.\(^ {23} \) The first officer buried along the flower garden's perimeter was Captain Albert Packard, in May 1864. As are most of the 45 graves that line Lee Avenue and border the flower garden, his grave is marked by a standard marble, segmental-top grave marker used at all National Cemeteries after 1873.\(^ {24} \) When first buried, the marker would have been a wooden headboard; they were replaced soon after Congress appropriated money to provide stone markers in 1873. The headstones face east and south away from the garden and the interments extend outside the garden boundary toward Lee Avenue.

Along the segment of Lee Avenue that extends east from Sherman and Sheridan drives, the line of grave markers stands approximately 15 feet north of the paved path. Placed at irregular intervals, the markers are inscribed with a shield within which is carved the name, rank, and outfit the officer belonged to; below the shield is carved the date of death. Several of the markers have been replaced with markers of similar design; the replacement reflects the army's policy of replacing severely damaged or deteriorated gravestones. A few private grave monuments have

\(^ {23} \) An 1869 map enumerates 52 officers' burials in this location. *U.S. National Cemetery Arlington Virginia, 1869,* Scale 100 feet to 1 inch (NARA 1 Copy in map files at ARHO Archive).

\(^ {24} \) Therese T. Sammartino, "Civil War Era National Cemeteries" *National Register of Historic Places Multiple Property Documentation Form* (National Park Service, 1994), Section E, p. 16; Section F, pp. 2-3. In 1867, Congress passed an act aimed at improving and making permanent the national cemeteries. Among its provisions was that every grave be marked by a permanent marker. Prior to that date, wooden headboards were used to mark most graves. Permanent headstones were not installed in national cemeteries until Congress appropriated money for them in 1873. After the money was made available, the Secretary of War specified that all headstones in national cemeteries be made of white marble or granite slabs, 4 inches thick and 10 inches wide with a curved top. The headstone face was carved with a recessed shield and raised lettering on its face. By 1881, all soldiers' graves were so marked. Since then, replacement headstones have differed slightly in design. Some have an incised (instead of a recessed) shield on their face with incised lettering.
replaced the original standard markers. These are larger and have individual designs; some incorporate the graves of additional family members.

The officers’ graves continue along the south and east edges of the flower garden. At the flower garden, they occupy the edge of the flat terrace and are fronted by a short slope that extends down and meets the pavement of Lee Avenue. Where Lee Avenue turns north at the southeast corner of the garden, the pavement turns to light-colored pea gravel. The row of officers’ graves continues at the top of the slope that leads to the terrace and extends to the northeast corner of the flower garden.

**Archeological Sites**

While archeological surveys have indicated that archeological resources exist within the district, only two sites have been identified and determined eligible for listing on the National Register. Investigations have uncovered individual artifacts from the period of significance, and have shed light on patterns of development within the district which were not previously evident on the surface. As they are investigated, newly identified archeological resources have the potential to offer further information about the history of the site and its past users.

**Arlington Ravine Archeological Site**

(VDHR #44AR0032; Archeological Sites Management Information System - ASMIS #GWMP00086.000)

1 Contributing Site

Identified through a Phase II investigation conducted in 1997, the Arlington Ravine Archeological Site is a multi-component Native American and European American site that includes intact surface and subsurface features and artifacts that date from the historic and prehistoric periods. The NPS-owned portion of the identified archeological site encompasses approximately 12 acres of a ravine system characterized by mostly wooded hilltops, hillsides, terraces, and ravine bottoms.

The historic component of this site dates from the early 19th century Custis-Lee occupation to the present. Although various amounts of historic artifacts are scattered across Arlington Woods, an area of particularly dense deposits and intact features associated with the Custis and Lee families is located at the head of a ravine. Subsurface remains of the former Custis-Lee icehouse were located here, along with a trash dumping area, and a brick feature that dates to the first half of the 19th century. Some scattered evidence of the late-19th century through the 20th century War Department activities also exists. To date, no artifacts dating to the Civil War period occupation of the site have been recovered in Arlington Woods.

The prehistoric component of the Arlington House Ravine site is represented by scattered lithic tools and debris. Evidence of prehistoric quarrying for quartzite and quartz is extensive, but not
intensive across much of the ravine system, although areas of artifact concentration are present. Prehistoric material was recovered from the range of landforms represented in the project area, including low and high terraces, side slopes, ridge noses, and hilltops. The majority of artifacts, such as hammerstones, tested cobbles, cores, and cortical flakes, are associated with lithic extraction, suggesting that limited secondary reduction was performed at the site, possibly in now disturbed areas on higher ground surrounding the ravines.

Although no temporally diagnostic prehistoric artifacts were found in direct association with the lithic extraction areas, the recovery of a steatite sherd in colluvial deposits, as well as evidence from other quartzite quarries in the region, suggests that the prehistoric component likely dates to the Late/Terminal Archaic period.

Arlington House Archeological Site
(VDHR #44AR0017; ASMIS #GWMP00019.000)
1 Contributing Site

Two major archeological investigations and some minor testing have taken place within and around the main house and the two slave quarters at Arlington House. Past investigations identified the Arlington House archeological site which is approximately 3.4 acres (13,827 square meters). The site consists of historic features in and around the main house, north and south slave quarters, and the gardens. The site is essentially level and is characterized by gravel-paved paths, buildings, and decorative plantings. To date, over 60 features have been identified within the site; the features and artifacts identified and recovered date from the early-19th-century Custis occupation through the present. Historic features and artifacts identified to date include historic builder’s trenches, hearths, brick paving, a brick-and-gravel drain, a dry well, historic fence post holes, possible remnants of historic walks and French drains. In the 1950s, fragments of fine china were recovered these are thought to be pieces of two sets of china that Martha Washington bequeathed in her will to G.W.P. Custis. In addition, some recovered ceramics may be part of a set ordered by the Lees in 1855.

Although limited in scope, more recent investigations in 2003-2004 concluded that the archeological record of the Custis-Lee occupation has been altered by multiple reconstruction and restoration campaigns from the 1860s through the present. These campaigns are expressed in the archeological record by widespread truncation of the natural soil stratigraphy and ground-disturbing activities such as the placement of soils and fill deposits from unknown sources, installation of utilities, application of various pavements or surface treatments, restoration (raising or lowering) of floors, and excavation of exploratory trenches.
**Contributing Resources - Structures**

**Well, circa 1805, superstructure, early 1930s**  
(LCS # none)  
1 Contributing Structure

A hand-dug, stone-lined well approximately 45 feet deep exists in the service yard area just northwest of the main house. The well appears in a drawing from the 1850s when it appeared to possess a simple wooden sweep which was converted to a pulley and bucket system by 1864 (CLR Part II, 76). In the early 1930s, the War Department introduced the current superstructure which consists of a rubble-clad wall that encircles the well opening and supports a wooden well cover with hinged access doors.

The below grade portions of the well are believed to retain integrity to the Custis-Lee occupation; while the superstructure relates to the late 1920s and early 1930s War Department restoration of the property.

**Civil War Unknown Soldiers Monument, 1866**  
(structure and site modified in early 20th century)  
(Owned & maintained by Army National Cemetery program)  
1 Contributing Structure

Set atop a slight rise to the west of the flower garden, this granite monument marks the location of an underground vault that holds the remains of 2,111 unknown Civil War soldiers who lost their lives on the battlefields of Bull Run (Manassas) and the Rappahannock River. Erected in 1866, the tomb is surmounted by a rectangular granite sarcophagus set atop a rusticated stone base. The monument is capped by a Greek Doric entablature and crowned by a row of carved stone stars and corners adorned by Greek acroteria. The west elevation is carved with the words:

Beneath this stone  
Repose the bones of two thousand one hundred and eleven unknown soldiers  
Gathered after the war  
From the fields of Bull Run, and the route to the Rappahannock.  
Recorded in the Archives of their country, and its grateful citizens  
Honor them as of their noble Army of martyrs. May they rest in peace!  
September, A.D. 1866.

The monument stands at the center of a grotto encircled by a mature boxwood hedge. The monument sits within an oval flower bed defined by an ovoidal pebble-concrete paved path with feeder paths extending to the north, south, east, and west.

When initially built, the monument had a simpler design and had a more militaristic look. The sarcophagus originally was capped by a plain molded cornice with four Rodman guns mounted...
on the top, one at each corner. A pyramid of round shot set on a raised platform occupied the center top of the monument. By circa 1910, the monument had been modified to incorporate the Greek Doric style elements, the guns and shot were removed, and the monument was raised on the rusticated stone base. For a time, the removed Rodman guns were part of the surrounding landscape. Photos show them partially planted in the ground creating bollards around the monument’s base. Pyramidal piles of round shot were also placed near the base. These symbols of the violence that killed the soldiers buried there have been removed and the area around the base is ornamentally planted. Maps from the 1930s show that the monument site, including the surrounding walks, was substantially altered after 1930 and before 1935. At that time a new configuration and new sandstone slab walkways were introduced. The site has pathways and plantings that have been altered since; the walks are now pebbled concrete.

This monument was the first memorial at Arlington Cemetery to be dedicated to soldiers who had died in battle. The monument is in very good condition.

**Arlington National Cemetery Old Amphitheater, 1873**
(Owned and maintained by Army National Cemetery program)

1 Contributing Structure

Arlington House was the site of the first official Memorial Day or Decoration Day ceremony on May 30, 1868. By the 1870s, Arlington National Cemetery required a permanent venue to host Memorial Day and other public events. The War Department constructed what they called the Memorial Amphitheater in 1873. Built at the direction of Quartermaster General Montgomery C. Meigs, the structure stands just east of the flower garden, in what the Custis-Lee family termed “the Grove,” a short distance west of the 1866 Tomb of the Unknown Civil War Soldiers.

Located at the intersection of Lee Avenue and Sherman Drive, the amphitheater remains much as it appeared when it opened in 1873. It is an open, brick, iron, and wood structure composed of an elliptical-shaped pergola encircling a shallow, grassy bowl-shaped lawn. A rectangular stage or rostrum occupies the north end of the structure. Sheltered by a pergola roof set atop three rows of tall, stuccoed-brick, Ionic columns, the rostrum is constructed of brick with a slate-paver floor and sandstone steps along its sides. The stuccoed columns incorporate cast iron bases and capitals in the Ionic style. In 1880, a marble altar designed by prominent DC architect John L. Smithmeyer and inscribed with the phrase “E Pluribus Unum,” was installed along the inner edge of the rostrum, facing the viewing lawn.

The encircling pergola consists of three concentric circles of square brick piers supporting a wood trellis. Wisteria vines grow from the base of the brick piers and spread across the wooden trellis roof, providing shade to the interior. A slate-paved path extends between the outer two

---


26 HABS VA 7-ARL. The 30 May 1873 *Washington Evening Star* reported that construction of the amphitheater began on May 2, 1873 and was completed before the May 30th Memorial Day ceremony that year.
rows of piers and small bushes and ground plantings adorn either side of the path. Roses grow at the base of the rostrum on the interior of the amphitheater.

Through the last quarter of the 19th century, the Old Memorial Amphitheater hosted ever-growing Memorial Day ceremonies. By the early 1900s, the 1873 amphitheater could no longer accommodate the growing Memorial Day crowds. In 1920, a new larger memorial amphitheater assumed the Memorial Day functions. The 1873 structure is now used for various smaller public events.

The Old Amphitheater is in good condition.

**Contributing Resources - Objects**

**General Sheridan, Admiral Porter, and General Wright Monuments, 1888-1891**
*(Owned and maintained by Army National Cemetery program)*

3 Contributing Objects

The burial of honored Union generals at Arlington and their placement in a highly visible spot in front of the Arlington mansion overlooking the city of Washington reflects the cemetery’s growing prestige as a military burial ground, as well as the symbolic power of burying federal military leaders in close proximity to the former home of their enemy. General Philip H. Sheridan, USA Commanding General, U.S. Army, Civil War who died in 1888 was the first Union general to be buried on the east slope immediately in front of Arlington House. Before the practice of burying highly esteemed Union officers on the east slope in front of the mansion was discontinued circa 1900, two Union generals and an admiral were interred there and sizable stone monuments placed atop their graves.27

**Sheridan**

General Philip Henry Sheridan (1831–1888) was a career U.S. Army officer and a Union general in the American Civil War. His career was noted for his rapid rise to major general and his close association with Lt. Gen. Ulysses S. Grant. In 1864, Sheridan defeated Confederate forces in the Shenandoah Valley and his destruction of the economic infrastructure of the valley, called "The Burning" by residents, was one of the first uses of scorched earth tactics in the war. In 1865, his cavalry pursued Gen. Robert E. Lee and was instrumental in forcing his surrender at Appomattox. By the end of the Civil War, Sheridan was a hero to most Northerners. His post-war career in the American West included violent efforts to subdue Native Americans. Sheridan is also considered to be largely responsible for the establishment of Yellowstone National Park – saving it from being sold to developers.28

---


28 Sheridan biography adapted from Wikipedia page “Philip Sheridan” ([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Philip_Sheridan](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Philip_Sheridan) [ACCESSSED 08/31/2012]) and from the website of The Civil War Trust ([http://www.civilwar.org/education/history/biographies/phillip-sheridan.html](http://www.civilwar.org/education/history/biographies/phillip-sheridan.html) [ACCESSSED 08/31/2012]).
Sheridan’s grave monument takes the form of a squat granite obelisk set atop a two-stage granite base. The lowest stage of the base is rusticated. The obelisk is unadorned except for a large bronze, high-relief plaque attached to its east face and bronze lettering that reads “SHERIDAN.” The plaque features a profile portrait head of Sheridan set atop a large flag.

The monument is in good condition.

**Porter**

Admiral David Dixon Porter (1813-1891) died in 1891 and was interred at Arlington National Cemetery that year. Porter was a member of one of the most distinguished families in the history of the United States Navy. As the second man to be promoted to the rank of admiral, he helped improve the navy as the Superintendent of the US Naval Academy after significant service in the American Civil War. After his promotion to rear admiral during the Civil War, Porter led many significant naval actions, including leading the Mississippi River Squadron during the Vicksburg campaign and the Red River campaign in Louisiana. 29

Located north of the Sheridan grave and north of the flagstaff that is centered on the front of the mansion, Porter’s grave monument is largely obscured from view of the house and public walks by a mature, evergreen tree. It sits downslope and roughly in alignment with the northeast corner of the mansion’s north wing. Smaller than Sheridan’s or Wright’s markers, the stone monument features a two-step rusticated stone base, atop which stands a rectangular slab engraved on its east face.

The slab is capped by a hipped-roof-shaped cap carved with decorative motifs. The uppermost of the two base blocks is carved with an inscription on its east face.

The monument is in good condition.

**Wright**

Horatio Gouverneur Wright (1820-1899) was an engineer and general in the Union Army during the American Civil War. After the war, he was involved in a number of engineering projects, including the Brooklyn Bridge and the completion of the Washington Monument, and served as Chief of Engineers for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. He died in 1899 and was buried at Arlington that year. The obelisk marking his grave was erected by survivors of the VI Army Corps, Army of the Potomac, which he commanded from the Battle of Spotsylvania in May 1864 to the end of the war. 30

Located between the Porter Monument and the flagstaff, the Wright grave monument consists of a stone obelisk set on a two-stage, beveled stone base. On the obelisk’s east is mounted a
rectangular bronze plaque containing a bas relief profile portrait of Wright. Another bronze plaque hangs on the west face of the obelisk.

The west-facing top bevel on the base bears raised carved letters reading “WRIGHT.” The monument is largely screened from the house side (west) by a mature tree; it remains in good condition.

**Pierre Charles L’Enfant Grave and Monument, 1909-1911**

(Owned and maintained by Army National Cemetery program)

*1 Contributing Object*

Pierre Charles L’Enfant was a captain, U.S. Engineers, and a brevet major in the U.S. Army during the American Revolutionary War. Under the direction of President George Washington, he planned the Federal City of Washington, DC. Pierre Charles L’Enfant was born in Paris, France, Aug. 2, 1754. He died June 14, 1825, and was interred on the Digges family property, also known as Green Hill, in Prince George’s County, Maryland.32

In 1908, the Board of Commissioners of the City of Washington requested the Secretary of War to make available a suitable burial site in Arlington Cemetery. A special act of Congress which was approved May 27, 1908 provided for the reburial of L’Enfant’s remains at Arlington and the erection of a monument. A sum of $1,000 was appropriated to accomplish the tasks. On Dec. 17, 1908, Secretary of War Luke E. Wright advised the D.C. Board of Commissioners of his approval for a site in Arlington Cemetery for the reinterment. The selected site was between the Gen. Sheridan Monument and the flagstaff fronting the mansion at Arlington House.

On April 28, 1909, a military escort conveyed L’Enfant’s remains to the U.S. Capitol where they lay in state from 9 a.m. until noon. They were then taken by military escort to Arlington National Cemetery where they were reinterred at 4 p.m. in the site on the slope in front of the Mansion. Three years later, the monument was dedicated on May 22, 1911. The service was conducted on the portico of the Arlington House, where chairs had been arranged to make a miniature open-air theater facing the city. The monument was draped with the American flag. President William Howard Taft made the dedication address. He was followed by Ambassador Jules Jusserand of France. The concluding address was made by Senator Elihu Root. More than 350 people attended the ceremony. Many notables attended including the chief justice and justices of the Supreme Court, many senators and members of Congress, high-ranking military, city officials, diplomatic corps and Washington socialites.

The monument marking the grave of Pierre Charles L’Enfant was erected under the direction of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia who chose the design in addition to selecting the

---

31 The text describing the L’Enfant monument was adapted from the history found on the website of Arlington National Cemetery. See [http://www.arlingtoncemetery.mil/History/Science/HF_LEnfant.aspx](http://www.arlingtoncemetery.mil/History/Science/HF_LEnfant.aspx) [ACCESSSED 08/31/2012].

site in Arlington National Cemetery. It is a table-top marker made of white marble. The monument consists of three stacked slabs that form the base; the bottom slab measures approximately 7 feet by 11 feet. The table-top slab measures approximately 7.5 feet by 3.5 feet and is 6 inches thick. Six carved marble posts support the top slab.

Shallow *bas relief* oak leaf carvings adorn the corners of the beveled base slab. In bold relief on the top of the base, below the table top, the slab is carved a 4-foot-long broadsword with a floral piece entwined at the hilt. There is an oak leaf at each corner and a 4-inch scallop design enframes the top.

On the east end (the design facing the Arlington House) is a circle, 2 feet 7 inches in diameter, enclosing the plan of the City of Washington laid out by L'Enfant. Below the circle is the inscription:

Pierre Charles L'Enfant engineer - artist - soldier under the direction of George Washington designed the plan for the federal city * Major U.S. Engineer Corps 1789 Charter member of the Society of the Cincinnati designed its certificate & insignia * Born in Paris, France August 2, 1755 Died June 14, 1825 while residing at Chillum Castle Manor Prince George's Co Maryland and was interred there * Reinterred at Arlington April 28, 1909[33]

On April 23, 1931, a bronze marker was placed on the top of the base (east end) by the Daughters of the American Revolution. The inscription on the marker reads:

Revolutionary Soldier 1775 [Daughters of the American Revolution insignia] 1783 Placed By the National Society Daughters of the American Revolution

The marble surfaces of the monument are very rough due to heavy weathering of the stone.

---

[33] The inscription on the monument shows the rank of major, U.S. Engineer Corps. However, records show that L'Enfant was a captain in the U.S. Engineers, and held the temporary rank of brevet major, U.S. Army during the Revolutionary War. L'Enfant was born in 1754, not 1755. The inscription also states that L'Enfant died at Chillum Castle Manor which was the 4,443-acre land patent established in 1763 by William Dudley Digges. One of the previous patents encompassed in the 1763 Chillum patent was the Henrietta Maria parcel; on this parcel the Digges family erected a manor house and named it Green Hill. The Digges family seat was at Warburton Manor near Fort Washington on the Potomac. L'Enfant lived at Warburton Manor during and after his years working on the reconstruction of Fort Warburton (now Fort Washington) after its destruction in the War of 1812. Warburton Manor became dilapidated, and in 1824, L'Enfant moved to the Digges' Green Hill property where he died and was buried one year later. See "Green Hill, (PG:65-8)" Maryland Historical Trust, Maryland Inventory of Historic Properties Form (1990), and National Park Service, *Fort Washington Park Cultural Landscape Inventory* (NPS, 2006), pp. 35-36.
Collections

Arlington House Collections
The Arlington House Museum collections include decorative arts, archives, music, manuscript, and archeological collections, 18th- and 19th-century furnishings, furnishings and memorabilia of the Robert E. Lee and G.W.P. Custis families, and items owned by the individuals and families enslaved at Arlington House. In addition, the collection incorporates historic objects related to Robert E. Lee’s life. The overall collection includes approximately 40,000, including historical objects, archeological artifacts, and archival materials. An estimated 40 percent of the collection is original to the property. Portions of the collection can be found in the house itself, the potting shed/museum building, and in the south slave quarter, while others are housed in NPS facilities both on- and off-site that are located outside the National Register Historic District boundary. The total number of objects on exhibit in the house, the south slave quarters, and in the potting shed/museum building is 1,674; some of these are owned by the NPS, while others are on long-term loan.

The objects, documents, and other items in the collection that are owned by the National Park Service and that are original to the house or are historically associated with the property during the Custis and Lee ownership contribute to the authenticity of the Arlington House Historic District. Significant in American and regional decorative arts traditions of the early- to mid-19th century, the original house furnishings and objects provide important information about how the Custis and Lee families lived. They are integral to interpreting the history of Arlington House, including the life and contributions of Robert E. Lee and George Washington Parke Custis.

There are several significant objects in the collections that are original to the time the Custis and Lee families occupied Arlington House. This includes the Lee cornflower china, George Washington’s Revolutionary War-era tent bags, silverware, family letters, furniture, and household furnishings. However, with the exception of an 1820s globe, all of these possessions either were removed from the mansion by the family when they vacated in 1861, were stolen, or were packed and removed in 1862 by the army, which stored what it could at the Patent Office in Washington to protect them from further theft or harm. The material in the collection is very comprehensive covering all interpretive themes that are identified in the site’s Statement for Interpretation (NPS, 1992).

In 1925 when Congress directed the War Department to restore Arlington House to its condition prior to Robert E. Lee’s departure at the beginning of the American Civil War, Quartermaster General officials began to acquire furnishings and other items (some original, most period items) from various sources, including local donors. Over the years, original objects have been donated to the National Park Service, sometimes from the families of soldiers who had taken these objects during the army occupation of the house and grounds during the Civil War. Some items were returned to the house by those formerly enslaved on the estate. Most of the original objects in the collection were purchased or donated by Lee family descendents.
The first museum object added to the collection, the desk used by Robert E. Lee while serving in Baltimore (1848-1852) with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, was returned to the house in 1913. It was not until 1925, when the War Department was mandated to restore Arlington House to Lee’s era that the government began to actively acquire items for the collection. In 1933, at the behest of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, the National Park Service took over administration of the site and its mandate remained the same. The museum collection was acquired gradually over the years by both entities from numerous sources through gifts, loans, purchases, transfers and project field collecting, as provided in guidance from the Scope of Collections Statement. These objects, artifacts, and collection documents support the site’s interpretive themes, resource management programs, and the mission of the site. All items accessioned into the museum collection must relate to the interpretive themes, comprehensively reflect the scope of collection, and support the resource management goals and objectives of the site.

Non-Contributing Resources - Buildings

Comfort Station, 2012
Between 2010 and 2012, the NPS completed a rehabilitation of Arlington House, outbuildings, and grounds. As part of the three-phase rehabilitation, a circa 1925 comfort station that stood immediately north of the North Slave Quarter was demolished and replaced in a new location farther away from the historic house core. Completed in 2011, the new comfort station building stands at the north end of the kitchen garden, approximately 40 feet northwest of the Potting Shed/Museum Building. Designed by the Washington, DC architecture firm of HTNB Architecture, the comfort station is a one-story, hipped-roof, frame building clad in smooth stucco-like panel cladding and four bays that contain three doors and a square wall vent. Each door is surmounted by a large,
loveled metal vent. Sloped retaining walls extend out at an obtuse angle from the west façade. The building is approached by a short driveway paved with permeable pavers. Otherwise, the area surrounding the building is planted informally. A series of electrical vaults and mechanical equipment stand on concrete pads between the bunker building and Sherman Avenue. These are mainly screened by the heavy vegetation. Recently erected, the building is in excellent condition.

**Non-Contributing Resources – Structures**

**Generator House (Section 29), circa 1935 with alterations, circa 1960**

A small electrical generation structure stands within the Arlington Woods (formerly section 29 of Arlington National Cemetery) across Sherman Avenue from Arlington House. Set amongst a dense stand of trees growing on a small terrace within the Arlington Woods ravine, the building is not visible from any part of the district. Erected circa 1935 (based on historic maps), the structure is one-story tall, clad in stucco, and roofed with a concrete, shed roof. Set on a poured concrete pad, the structure features a single-leaf, metal pedestrian access door with two integral louvered vents. Although maps indicate that the generator house was built as part of the cemetery’s early-1930s development of their new administrative area, the building has been altered since its original construction. In its current condition, it appears to date to the 1950s or 1960s with few distinguishing architectural features. The building is in fair physical condition. Because of later alterations and because of its isolated location, the building has lost integrity and does not contribute to the significance of the historic district.

**Missing Resources**

Additional buildings and structures that are known or are reported to have existed on the estate during the period of significance include:

**Arlington Stables** (ca. 1818-1904) stood at the present site of the 1931-32 Administration Building. Built circa 1818, it was a large and architecturally elaborate stable built for G.W.P. Custis, probably around the time the central main block of his house was completed. The current NPS Administration Building stands upon the site of this earlier building and portions of its form attempts to recreate the early 19th century stable design. The War Department built the present building in 1931-32 as a new cemetery administration building; the designers based its design on Civil War-era and later photographs of the original building, which burned down in 1904. Although the existing building recalls the basic location and look of the 19th century stable, its origins in the 1920s-1930s restoration efforts by the War Department tells us more about that era and restoration ideas of the period than it does about 19th century stables.

An **ice house** stood west of the northern slave quarter until circa 1890. The archeological remains of this building have been located and are part of the Arlington Ravine Archeological Site (ASMIS #GWMP00086.000).
A **flower garden arbor** was removed from the center of the flower garden in 1883 or 1884, prior to construction of the Temple of Fame on the same spot. Period photographs and a sketch done from memory by the cemetery landscape designer, shows the structure was an octagonal gazebo with a steeply flared roof that came to a central point and was crowned by a teardrop shaped finial. The structure was covered in lattice and incorporated benches on its interior perimeter.  

**Temporary structures** including tents, barracks and stables were built on various parts of the estate by the army to house and supply soldiers during the Civil War (1861-1865).

A small, frame, gable-roofed **greenhouse** stood in the northeast corner of the flower garden between circa 1870 and circa 1888. A circa 1875 photograph shows a portion of the building from the southwest.

A larger brick, steel, and glass **greenhouse** was erected on the eastern half of the kitchen garden in 1888. The NPS removed it in 1934.

Prior to 1894, the War Department erected a **lavatory building**, a small building with a square footprint located directly north of the North Slave Quarter. The building was replaced circa 1921 with a slightly larger one-story, stuccoed-brick public restroom building that featured a low-pitched, slate-shingled, gable roof and small windows placed near the eaves. In 1929, a boiler room to house a new heating plant for the mansion and outbuildings was installed in the basement of the 1921 lavatory building. In 2011, NPS removed the building as part of the phased rehabilitation of Arlington House and its grounds. The present comfort station, completed in 2011 at the north end of the kitchen garden, replaced the function of the circa-1921 comfort station.

In 1881, the War Department built a **brick water tower** in the service yard to the west of the house. Removed by 1916, the water tower appears in a few period photographs which show its circular structure and conical roof. The tower provided water throughout the cemetery; using steam power water was pumped up to the tower and then distributed through a series of buried water lines.

In the 1880s, the War Department constructed a **frame well-cover structure** over the Custis era well set just east of the North Slave Quarter. A 1904 photograph shows it as a four-sided gazebo capped with a flared pyramidal roof supported by chamfered wood corner posts and chamfered down braces.

A memorial structure known as the **Temple of Fame** was erected at the center of the Flower Garden in 1884. Designed by Quartermaster General Montgomery C. Meigs, the structure replaced the Custis-Lee-era frame arbor that stood in the same location until circa 1885 when it was removed as part of a Rhodes' redesign of the Flower Garden. In 1884, the Temple of Fame was constructed using portions of the stone columns salvaged from the U.S. Patent Office.

---

34 D.H. Rhodes to Major F.E. Matteson, June 19, 1930 (ARHO Archives).
35 Hanna, CLR, p. 118.
building in the Washington, D.C. which had burned in 1877. The building took the form of an octagonal temple surmounted by a dome-like roof. The temple sheltered several benches and was surrounded by formal planting and flower beds. The names of Civil War Union heroes were engraved in the columns and the entablature.\(^{36}\)

**Integrity of the Historic District**

Despite the loss of historic features and limited non-historic alterations to historic features, since the end of the period of significance in 1935, within the bounds of the Arlington House Historic District, the buildings, structures, and contributing sites and landscape features have changed in mainly minor ways. The collection of buildings, structures and objects still reflects the property’s layered functional history; first, as the domestic core of a wealthy gentleman farmer’s 1,100-acre estate, and later as the administrative core of a military burial ground destined to become the nation’s premier national cemetery. Other than a remnant road trace of a Civil War era road located in Arlington Woods, little remains of the strategic military landscape developed during federal military occupation between 1861 and 1865.

Some segments of the district and individual features reflect conditions during the Custis-Lee occupation from 1804-1861. Most notable of these are the main residence which retains its original footprint, most of its structural materials, and its essential interior and exterior design elements. In addition, the two slave quarters buildings clustered around a functional work yard at the rear of the mansion are important features in the district; despite several historic and non-historic interventions, both buildings retain their original dimensions and visual features on the exteriors. The terraced setting with the kitchen and flower gardens flanking the mansion on the north and south are also significant features reflective of the Custis-Lee legacy. The views and vistas to the east are emblematic of Custis’ original dramatic intent in constructing his mansion at the site. The mainly open, sloping east lawn, while altered by changes in vegetation and the introduction of burials and cemetery drives on its periphery, is an important feature for understanding Custis’ reliance on the romantic vocabulary of English garden design of the late-18\(^{th}\) and early-19\(^{th}\) century. Finally, the presence of a portion of the much larger Arlington Woods as the backdrop to the Greek mansion house reflects the original largely forested nature of the Arlington estate and Custis’ effective use of juxtaposition of the natural and the designed in his domestic landscape.

The discontiguous burial site of the original patron and patroness of the Arlington Estate provides a direct connection to the individuals most influential in the establishment and early development of the property.

Smaller, individual features contribute to understanding the Custis landscape. These include Lee Avenue which retains the alignment of the original approach road to the mansion when it was occupied by the Custis and Lee families. The Old Administration Building to the west, across

\(^{36}\) Hanna, CLR, p. 122.
Sherman Avenue from the mansion, recalls the location and original design of the Custis-Lee stable, though its materials, detailing, and design reflect the 1930s when it was constructed.

The commemorative and funerary landscape related to the early development of Arlington National Cemetery is illustrated by a layer of resources that spreads across the district. Among the most prominent features that relate to the funerary significance are the burial markers and gravestones installed around the mansion and its flower garden between 1864 and the early 20th century, the Civil War Unknown Soldiers Monument, the Old Amphitheater, the potting shed at the north end of the kitchen garden, and by the Old Administration Building. Sherman Avenue and other circulation elements reflect the evolution of the district into the administrative core of a highly designed rural cemetery landscape.

More difficult to discern is the layer created by the early restoration and commemoration efforts of the 1920s and early 1930s. Although some of the work has been undone since 1935, the comprehensive restoration conceived and implemented mainly by the War Department and its Construction Division of the Quartermaster Corps between 1928 and 1935 left a lasting legacy in the district, one that reflects the site's significance in early federal full-scale preservation and conservation efforts at historic sites. The processes and decisions made by experts and officials over the ten-year period between the site's de facto memorial designation in 1925 and completion of the restoration are significant in the context of the American historic preservation and conservation movement. Many of the finishes, features and elements of the landscape reflect the work done in this first restoration period.
**ARLINGTON HOUSE**

**INVENTORY OF RESOURCES TABLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NPS ID# (LCS# or ASMIS #)</th>
<th>Name of Resource</th>
<th>Dates of Construction/Use + Major Alterations</th>
<th>C/NC Contributing?</th>
<th>Resource classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LCS #000059</td>
<td>Arlington House</td>
<td>1802-1818</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1 Bldg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCS #000060</td>
<td>North Slave Quarter &amp; Kitchen</td>
<td>ca. 1803-1818</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1 Bldg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCS #011956</td>
<td>South Slave Quarter, Storehouse, &amp; Smokehouse</td>
<td>ca. 1803-1818</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1 Bldg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following resources were included in the original 1980 listing:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LCS# / ASMIS#</th>
<th>Name of Resource</th>
<th>Dates of Construction/Use + Major Alterations</th>
<th>Contributing?</th>
<th>Resource classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LCS #000059</td>
<td>Arlington House</td>
<td>1802-1818</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1 Bldg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCS #000060</td>
<td>North Slave Quarter &amp; Kitchen</td>
<td>ca. 1803-1818</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1 Bldg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCS #011956</td>
<td>South Slave Quarter, Storehouse, &amp; Smokehouse</td>
<td>ca. 1803-1818</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1 Bldg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following resources were mentioned in the 1980 nomination, but were not designated as contributing. Their status has been reexamined and they have been determined to be Contributing:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Resource</th>
<th>Dates of Construction/Use + Major Alterations</th>
<th>Contributing?</th>
<th>Resource classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Well</td>
<td>ca. 1802 1930s superstructure</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1 Str.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCS# 011957 Potting Shed (historic name) Museum Building (current name)</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>C (NC in 1980)</td>
<td>1 Bldg.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following resources are included in the boundary increase area OR were identified after the 1980 nomination:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASMIS# GWMP000-86.000</th>
<th>Arlington Ravine Archeological Site 44AR0032</th>
<th>Late/Terminal Archaic period 1802-1861</th>
<th>Contributing?</th>
<th>Resource classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

37 The 1980 National Register listing for Arlington House encompassed the house, outbuildings, and all NPS-controlled land at that time. This amounted to 27.9 acres. Since 1980, the NPS land has contracted in size to the present 16.08 acres. The present nomination encompasses approximately 31 acres of land that includes the originally nominated acreage plus approximately three (3) additional acres of Army land that contains resources that were importantly associated with the historic Arlington estate between 1802 and 1935. The previously listed resources shown in the "Inventory of Resources" table represent those resources that are located within the 1980 district boundary and were mentioned in the nomination. Since 1980, one resource (the 1888 Potting Shed) has changed status from non-contributing to contributing (indicated in the C/NC column), and one resource has been demolished (the circa-1921 lavatory building; see "Missing Resources").

38 The boundary increase area is limited to the 3 acres located adjacent to the North, east, south and southwest boundaries of the Arlington House NPS boundary and includes the discontiguous Custis Burial Plot. The remaining portions of the nominated district fall within the original 1980 boundary.
### Arlington House Historic District (2013 Boundary Increase & Additional Documentation)

#### Name of Property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NPS ID# (LCS# CLI# or ASMIS #)</th>
<th>Name of Resource</th>
<th>Dates of Construction/Use + Major Alterations</th>
<th>C/NC Contributing?</th>
<th>Resource classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASMIS# GWMP000-19.000</td>
<td>Arlington House Archeological Site 44AR0017</td>
<td>1802-1935</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1 Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL1 #600049</td>
<td>Arlington House Cultural Landscape</td>
<td>1802-1935</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1 Site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Historic Associated Features:**
- Arlington Woods
- Flower and Vegetable Gardens
- Work Yard
- East lawn
- Road trace in Arlington Woods
- Flower & Vegetable Garden central paths
- East/west oriented road connecting Lee Drive and Sherman Avenue between work yard and flower garden
- Potting shed access road
- Custis Walk
- Stone & brick stair in Arl. Woods (ca. 1930)
- Deodar cedar (planted 1874)
- Views & vistas
- Flag pole

**None**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arlington National Cemetery Administration Building (historic name/function)</th>
<th>1931</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>1 Bldg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NPS Administration Building <a href="9">current/preferred name</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None (Not owned by NPS)</td>
<td>1855 &amp; 1857</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1 Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custis Burial Plot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None (Not owned by NPS)</td>
<td>1824</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1 Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Randolph’s Tomb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

39 In accordance with National Register of Historic Place’s “National Register Eligibility of National Cemeteries – A Clarification of Policy” (NPS, 09/08/2011), all National Cemeteries are considered exceptionally significant, thus their periods of significance extend to the present and their level of significance is considered to be “national.” The policy states that “component resources contribute to the cemetery’s significance regardless of their age, function, or administrative role.” Thus, all substantial resources within a National Cemetery are considered contributing and the period of significance extends to the present.
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## Arlington House Historic District [2013]

**Boundary Increase & Additional Documentation**

### Name of Property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NPS ID# (LCS# CLI# or ASMIS #)</th>
<th>Name of Resource</th>
<th>Dates of Construction/Use + Major Alterations</th>
<th>C/NC Contributing?</th>
<th>Resource classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None (Not owned by NPS)</td>
<td>Civil War-era Graves &amp; Grave Markers along Lee Avenue &amp; East of Mansion</td>
<td>1864-1870s</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1 Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None (Not owned by NPS)</td>
<td>Arlington National Cemetery Old Amphitheater</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1 Str.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None (Not owned by NPS)</td>
<td>Civil War Unknown Soldiers Monument</td>
<td>1866; modified ca. 1905</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1 Str.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None (Not owned by NPS)</td>
<td>Graves &amp; Monuments to famous Civil War federal commanders Sheridan, Porter &amp; Wright Monuments</td>
<td>1888-1891</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3 Objs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None (Not owned by NPS)</td>
<td>Pierre Charles L’Enfant Grave &amp; Monument</td>
<td>1909-1911</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1 Obj.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None (Not owned by NPS)</td>
<td>Comfort Station</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>1 Bldg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None (Not owned by NPS)</td>
<td>Mechanical Bunker</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>1 Bldg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None (Not owned by NPS)</td>
<td>Generator House (in Section 29)</td>
<td>ca. 1960</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>1 Str.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Statement of Significance

Applicable National Register Criteria
(Mark "x" in one or more boxes for the criteria qualifying the property for National Register listing.)

- Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.

- Property is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.

- Property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction.

- Property has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Criteria Considerations
(Mark “x” in all the boxes that apply.)

- Owned by a religious institution or used for religious purposes

- Removed from its original location

- A birthplace or grave

- A cemetery

- A reconstructed building, object, or structure

- A commemorative property

- Less than 50 years old or achieving significance within the past 50 years

Areas of Significance
(Enter categories from instructions.)

- Architecture

- Landscape Architecture
Arlington House Historic District [2013]

**Boundary Increase & Additional Documentation**

Name of Property

Military
Politics/Government
Other: Commemoration
Conservation/Historic Preservation
Ethnic Heritage: Black
Archeology: Prehistoric
Archeology: Historic Non-Aboriginal

**Period of Significance**

3000 – 1200 B.C.
1802 – 1935

**Significant Dates**

1802 – 1818 (initial construction, Custis)
1831 – 1861 (Lee family residency)
April 20, 1861 (Robert E. Lee’s decision to resign from the U.S. Army)
1861 (property taken over by U.S. Army)
1864 (National Cemetery established)
1928-1935 (completion of first full restoration)

**Significant Person**

(Complete only if Criterion B is marked above.)

Custis, George Washington Parke (1781 - 1857)
Lee, General Robert Edward (1807 - 1870)

**Cultural Affiliation**

Ethnic/Black
Late Archaic

**Architect/Builder**

Hadfield, George, architect (1763-1826)
McLean, Cornelius, builder (unknown)
Spence, William, gardener (unknown)
Rhodes, David H., gardener (circa 1850-1932)
Randolph, David Meade (1758-1830, Richmond inventor of exterior stucco coating)
Leisenring, Luther Morris, restoration architect (1875-1965)
Statement of Significance Summary Paragraph (Provide a summary paragraph that includes level of significance, applicable criteria, justification for the period of significance, and any applicable criteria considerations.)

Summary Statement of Significance

Arlington House derives its primary historical significance from its association with two nationally significant historical figures and from its link to an important event in the nation’s history. George Washington Parke Custis, George Washington’s step grandson whom Washington raised at Mt. Vernon, and General Robert Edward Lee, a world-renowned military leader and a seminal figure in the American Civil War, both called Arlington home and are intimately linked to its history and evolution (Criterion B: Politics/Government - National; Military - National). In addition, the house has national importance as the setting of a critical Civil War event that took place on April 20, 1861, the date that Robert E. Lee made the pivotal decision to resign his commission in the United States Army and join the Southern secessionists (Criterion A: Military event - National).

In addition, Arlington’s distinctive and influential architecture and landscape design endow it with national significance in the areas of architecture and landscape architecture (Criterion C: Architecture - National; Landscape Architecture - National). Designed by British-born, American architect George Hadfield and erected between 1803 and 1818, Arlington House is recognized as the first full-fledged Greek-temple form residence built in the United States. Hadfield’s Arlington House presaged a popular American domestic form—the temple-and-wing house—that came to characterize the purest form of the Greek Revival mode in American architecture. The landscape setting of Arlington House plays an important role in the perception and understanding of the house and its builder and occupants. The remaining 19th century features are expressive of 19th century, high-style, Romantic-era landscape design.

The property also retains important features that reflect the ethnic heritage of the enslaved African Americans who worked and lived within its boundaries (Criterion A: Ethnic Heritage-Black - Statewide). The district has statewide significance for how it reflects the lives of household slaves in antebellum Virginia. The core buildings and landscape illustrate the domestic and work environment of house and skilled slaves (coachman, cook, gardener) on a prosperous 19th century gentleman’s farm.

After the Civil War, the Arlington House Historic District transformed from a domestic landscape to the center of a funerary landscape. As the headquarters and operational core of Arlington National Cemetery (ANC) during its formative years, the district is nationally important for its association with the establishment and development of the National Cemetery System (Criterion A: Military, Commemoration - National). Established in 1864, ANC was
among the first national cemeteries authorized by the U.S. Secretary of War, and by the turn of the 20th century it had become the nation’s premier military burial ground.

In 1925, in recognition of Arlington House’s connection to Robert E. Lee, Congress authorized the restoration of Arlington House. The War Department’s restoration (1928-1935) of Arlington House represents one of the federal government’s first forays into full-scale historic house preservation and a pioneering project in historic preservation practice. As such, the property possesses national significance under National Register Criterion A as a pivotal episode in the history of historic preservation (Criterion A: Conservation – National).

Finally, the district incorporates locally significant, intact archeological sites that have yielded or have the potential to reveal important information about prehistoric and historic occupation and use of the site and surrounding area (Criterion D: Prehistoric, Historic: Non-Aboriginal - Local). One identified prehistoric site has the potential to provide important information about the native populations that occupied the region during the Late Archaic Period (3000 - 1200 B.C.) and their methods of lithic extraction and procurement. In addition, sites associated with the 19th-century occupation of the property by the Custis and Lee families also have been located. These include trash middens, the location of the original icehouse, and sites adjacent to or within the footprints of the main house and slave quarters. All have provided or could provide important information related to the cultural and domestic life of both Anglo- and African-American residents of the property in the 19th and 20th centuries.40

**Period of Significance:**
Arlington House’s complex and multi-faceted history reflects several periods of significance. The prehistoric significance period coincides with the Late Archaic Period when the area was used extensively as a lithic procurement site for native populations that occupied seasonal villages along the Potomac River. The historic occupation of the property and its layers of historical significance span the years between 1802 when George Washington Parke Custis first occupied and began to develop his home plantation there, and 1935 when the first professional restoration of the house, its immediate outbuildings and grounds was completed (1802-1935). Within each period, the property’s history relates to distinct areas of historical and architectural significance.

40 **Criteria Consideration F – Commemorative Property:** While “Arlington House, The Robert E. Lee Memorial” has effectively functioned as a memorial to Robert E. Lee since 1925 and officially as a national memorial since 1955 when the United States Congress designated it as such, it was not initially or primarily built as a memorial. While its owner and builder, George Washington Parke Custis, is believed to have built his house partly to contain and display relics associated with his step-grandfather George Washington, the building was conceived and used primarily as a dwelling for Custis and his family. The Arlington House Historic District’s primary function and National Register significance is not commemorative and thus, it does not need to meet Criteria Consideration F in order to be eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places. **Criteria Consideration D: Cemeteries:** Similarly, because the cemetery portions of the nominated district are not the primary focal point of the property being nominated, the district does not need to meet Criteria Consideration D.
Arlington House Historic District [2013]
Boundary Increase & Additional Documentation
Name of Property

Arlington County, VA

Narrative Statement of Significance (Provide at least one paragraph for each area of significance.)

The Arlington Estate – The Custis-Lee Period, 1802-1861

Between 1802 and 1861, the Arlington House Historic District was the domestic core of a sprawling estate. Developed and occupied by a member of Virginia’s landed gentry who came from a wealthy and well-connected family, Arlington reflects the domestic traditions of the nation’s elite in the first half of the 19th century. It also provides powerful cues about the lives of the enslaved African Americans who made this way of life possible. Its architecture illustrates the importance of formal design to advertising status. Beyond its visual and physical traits, during its domestic tenure, Arlington was the home of important people and the site of a pivotal event in American history.

The tract of land on which the Arlington estate was built became part of the Custis-Lee legacy in 1778. That year, John Parke Custis, son of Martha Dandridge Washington and her first husband Daniel Custis, and stepson of George Washington, purchased from Gerrard and Robert Alexander a large tract of land along the Potomac River with the hope of building his family seat. The property was convenient, being close to his stepfather’s estate at Mount Vernon and not far from his wife’s childhood home at Mount Airy in Prince George’s County, Maryland. The hilltop setting offered spectacular views along the Potomac River, and the prospect of cultivating the site’s rich alluvial soil near the river and turning it into a profitable working estate was appealing.

In 1779, John, his wife, Eleanor, and two children moved into the former Alexander house located near the mouth of Fourmile Creek, renaming the house and estate Abingdon. In September 1781, John traveled to Williamsburg to serve as a volunteer aide to George Washington, caught camp fever and died later that year. George Washington informally adopted the two youngest of their four children, George Washington Parke Custis (G.W.P. Custis) and Eleanor Parke Custis, and took them in to live with him and their grandmother, Martha at Mount Vernon.

As a young boy, G.W.P. Custis followed his guardian, George Washington, around the Mount Vernon estate, listening to him talk with prominent visitors about issues pertinent to both the estate and the country. Washington frequently discussed the importance of good transportation routes to free the young nation from its dependence on Europe. He also believed that breeding hardier agricultural stock would promote the economic and political freedom of the country. As a

---

41 The deeds were recorded in the Land Records of Fairfax County, Virginia, Liber N, 223, 226.
43 Custis, Recollections, 254f.
grown man, G.W.P. Custis adopted these principles, experimenting with farming techniques and animal breeding.44

George Washington Parke Custis (1781-1857) – Biography and Significance

Born in 1781 at his mother’s family home in Prince George’s County, Maryland, George Washington Parke Custis (G.W.P. Custis) was the fourth and youngest child of John Parke and Eleanor Calvert Custis. The Custis and Calvert families both were well-established, wealthy and influential families in 18th century Tidewater society. John Parke Custis died shortly after the birth of his fourth child in 1781. After his father’s death, G.W.P. Custis and his older sister – the youngest two children of John and Eleanor Custis – went to live with their paternal grandmother, Martha Dandridge (Custis) Washington. After the death of her first husband, Martha had remarried George Washington and moved to Mount Vernon south of the town of Alexandria along the Potomac River.

G.W.P. Custis was close to his adoptive grandfather George Washington who guided his education. Privately tutored early in life, Washington sent G.W.P. Custis to the College of New Jersey (now Princeton University) in 1796 where he studied until he was expelled in 1797. He also briefly enrolled at St. Johns College in Annapolis, but he never graduated.45 Except for periods away at school and when he accompanied the first family to Philadelphia and New York during Washington’s two terms as President, G.W.P. Custis lived at Mount Vernon from infancy until he was 21 years old in 1802, the year his grandmother died.

After his step grandfather’s death in 1799 and his grandmother’s death in 1802, Custis attended the public sales of their estates held in 1801 and 1802 respectively. Many of the purchases he made at the sales were practical, for he intended to establish himself independently on one of the properties inherited from his father. Located north of Alexandria along the western shore of the Potomac River, the 1,100-acre property was characterized by steep slopes, flat land near the river that had previously been farmed by tenants of the Alexander family, and extensive forests. Custis needed supplies to develop the relatively raw land of what he would initially name “Mount Washington.” What he needed as a newly independent, landed farmer were the tools with which to work the soil and harvest the crops. Custis wanted to play the role of gentlemen farmer like his late guardian, attempting to emulate both Washington’s aesthetic design sensibilities and his agricultural improvement proclivities. From his grandmother and guardian’s estates he acquired animals from Mount Vernon, including horses, mules, cows, and a ram.46 He also purchased many farm implements and tools, such as a corn drilling machine, a flax break, a potato tiddle,

44 Hanna, CLR, 16-21, 41-44.
w wool and flax spinning wheels, a boat, an ox cart, six harrows and a set of blacksmith’s tools.\textsuperscript{47}

In total he spent approximately 4,500 dollars on his purchases.\textsuperscript{48}

With Martha Washington’s death in 1802, G.W.P. Custis inherited all of his father’s properties, including the White House plantation, Romancock (later renamed Romancoke), and the ancestral Custis home at Arlington on Virginia’s Eastern Shore.\textsuperscript{49} Altogether, Custis inherited approximately 18,000 acres of land in Virginia along with nearly 200 slaves. Through her will, Martha Custis Washington also left household valuables to her grandson, including all her silver, a set of \textit{Society of the Cincinnati} china (late 18\textsuperscript{th} century), all her books save the family bible, an elaborate master bed and bedclothes, and other assorted furnishings. At the sale of her estate, G.W.P. also purchased a large number of household goods from side boards to soap jars—perhaps already thinking about the establishment of his own home at Mount Washington (by 1804, known as Arlington).\textsuperscript{50}

In 1804, two years after moving to what would become his Arlington estate, Custis married Mary Lee Fitzhugh of Chatham near Fredericksburg, Virginia. During his adult life, Custis pursued many interests, including painting and playwriting. As a gentleman farmer, Custis’ duties were running his sizable estates in Virginia. Between 1802 and 1818, as his finances allowed, he slowly erected his family seat at Arlington, an architectural showplace where he and his wife, Mary Fitzhugh Custis, entertained prominent citizens and travelers. Among these were important domestic and foreign dignitaries, including presidents Andrew Jackson and Martin Van Buren, along with the Revolutionary War hero, Marquis de Lafayette who visited in 1824 and 1825.\textsuperscript{51}

By virtue of his close association with the revered first president, George Washington, Custis became famous and was highly sought after as a speaker. He gave numerous patriotic speeches and wrote articles and editorials urging the young nation to follow the Federalist principles of George Washington. His personal connection to the nation’s first president also drew visitors by the thousands to Arlington. Custis cultivated this interest in his step-grandfather by hosting visitors, and by staging festivals at Arlington Spring along the Potomac River where he set up Washington’s Revolutionary-era tents and entertained crowds with stories and speeches. In addition, he spent hours responding to requests for Washington memorabilia and autographs.\textsuperscript{52}
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\textsuperscript{49} W. W. Abbott, Editor. \textit{The Papers of George Washington, Colonial Series}, Vol. 6, 202-209. The other children did not inherit because the common law canon of descent gave preference to males over females. This law remained active until 1785, so that G.W.P. became sole owner at his mother’s death. The name of the Romancoke estate was changed to Romancoke sometime in the mid-nineteenth century.
\textsuperscript{50} From the will and estate accounts of Martha Washington as related in Joseph Field’s, \textit{Worthy Partner: The Papers of Martha Washington} (Westport, CN: Greenwood Press 1994), 406-417.
\textsuperscript{51} Nelligan, \textit{Old Arlington}, pp. 165-168; 189.
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Custis’ most lasting accomplishments relate to several activities that focused attention on stimulating an independent national character and economy for the new American nation. He sponsored one of the earliest agricultural improvement fairs at Arlington in the hopes of spurring on economic independence from Europe; he wrote and produced early nationalist plays that brought patriotic and native themes to popular audiences, and he published and spoke extensively about George Washington, contributing greatly to the development of the veneration of George Washington.

In 1803, Custis advertised a plan to encourage agricultural improvements in America by sponsoring a competition for a hardy, native breed of sheep. His first sheep shearing fair was held in 1805 at Arlington Spring, a natural spring located on Custis’ 1,100-acre estate along the banks of the Potomac River. At these annual events which continued through 1812, Custis erected George Washington’s canvas Revolutionary war tents and entertained his guests with stories and speeches. Prizes were awarded for the best ram and for the best wool products, including cloth, blankets, and yarn. An essay published in an 1809 issue of the Boston Patriot newspaper placed Custis alongside George Washington, Robert R. Livingston, and David Humphreys among the nation’s “most distinguished patrons of American agriculture.” Custis’ aim was not purely agricultural, but rooted in a firm belief that America must develop native agriculture and manufacturing so as to free itself from economic dependence on Europe. His annual festivals were a venue to promote this belief and an opportunity to convince other planters that America must establish agricultural and thus economic independence from Europe.

Despite his zealous efforts, the “Arlington Improved” sheep never caught on, and in 1812, the last sheep shearing was held. Arlington Spring continued to be a gathering place where city dwellers came to recreate and Custis continued to entertain thousands of guests there.

Custis’ agricultural improvement efforts followed a national trend begun after the nation obtained independence. In his final message to Congress as president, George Washington recommended the establishment of a national board of agriculture tasked with collecting and disseminating agricultural information. Many at that time felt that the United States was lagging behind England in agricultural improvements and allowing its fertile lands to become exhausted. As the backbone of the national economy, this was a dangerous situation.

Although there was Congressional interest, Washington’s proposal failed; instead, the task of encouraging innovation in agriculture fell to local agricultural societies. By 1800, several such local societies existed, including two in Frederick and Culpeper counties in Virginia. These societies and some local governments sponsored agricultural fairs where prizes were given to the best crops and livestock. In the early 19th century, sheep were often the focus of these agricultural groups; merino sheep from Spain became extremely popular in America and were widely promoted.

Custis’ sheep shearings followed the lead of the merino societies. Instead of promoting the imported breeds, however, Custis actively fought the trend by advocating for establishing hearty native breeds that could compete with the merinos. He provided prizes to encourage farmers to strive for improvements and innovations that would eliminate American dependence on foreign imports. Custis’ efforts likely sparked local interest, and that same year, a group of prominent area landowners and intellectuals, including Custis, formed the Columbian Agricultural Society in Georgetown, D.C. The Society published an agricultural newspaper aimed at disseminating new methods and farming advice. It also sponsored agricultural exhibitions modeled on Custis’ and others’ earlier agricultural fairs. The Columbian Agricultural Society flourished and drew many prominent citizens and government officials to its five biannual fairs held in May and November from 1810 to 1812.55 By 1860, over 940 agricultural societies existed throughout the United States; two years later, Congress established the U.S. Department of Agriculture.56 Indeed, Custis and his compatriots were early advocates for the establishment of a national agricultural institution that would promote American agricultural development and research.57

In the 1820s, Custis’ turned to writing and cultural pursuits, while remaining an active orator. In the early 1820s, he published several historical and patriotic articles, including “Conversations with Lafayette” printed in the Alexandria Gazette and a series beginning in 1826 called “Recollections and Private Memoirs of Washington” that appeared in The National Intelligencer newspaper and other national publications. Two of his earlier speeches, one an extemporaneous speech given in 1812 in honor of a revolutionary war soldier, James McCubbin Lingnan, who was murdered by a mob in Baltimore, and another given at a celebration marking the Russian victories over Napoleon in 1812, were published and widely read.58 Custis’ written works, although never considered polished by literary or historical scholars, were part of a distinctly American literary movement led by Washington Irving, James Fenimore Cooper, and William Cullen Bryant, a movement aimed at creating a national school of writing that focused on American themes. According to historian Murray Nelligan, Custis’ “Recollections” series was not only a popular success, even many contemporary historians of the period used Custis' assertions and stories in their own writings.59

Among Custis’ cultural pursuits were painting and writing plays. The products of both these activities illustrate how Custis remained fervently interested in promoting national patriotism and a unique American character founded on the principles and character of George Washington. Custis’ first play, The Indian Prophecy, which was staged in Philadelphia in 1827, is credited with beginning a two-decades long fashion for Indian-themed plays in the American theater.

59 Nelligan, Old Arlington, pp. 177-179.
These Indian plays reflect the same nationalistic movement found in literature. Though short-lived, Custis contributed to this Americanist trend through the production of at least eight of his plays in theaters in Washington, Baltimore, and New York City between 1827 and 1836. 60

As the owner of important relics of General Washington’s life, Custis was sought out by collectors and tourists who came to Arlington to see the relics and to hear firsthand stories of the great man from his former ward. Throughout his life, G.W. P. Custis sought to protect and glorify the memory of his guardian. He displayed and used George and Martha Washington’s belongings that he had acquired either through inheritance or purchase at auctions following their deaths. Throughout his life Custis acted as the custodian and curator of the Washington relics and, in effect, at Arlington House, he created a museum and memorial to Washington. Tourists would travel to see the relics like Washington’s death bed and to hear firsthand accounts of the great man from his ward and adopted grandson. In this way, Custis played an important role in the establishment and perpetuation of the patriotic cult of George Washington, a reverence that continues to this day.

Custis Builds Arlington, 1802-1818

Shortly after his inheritance, G.W.P. Custis moved into a small four-room house located on the muddy flats of the Potomac River, on the land that was to become the Arlington estate. The house, once the home of a tenant of Gerrard Alexander, was primitive by Mount Vernon standards. There Custis stored the belongings of his grandmother Martha Washington and his adoptive grandfather, George Washington, items which he had purchased at the Washington’s estate auctions. On the damp ground of the flood plain, the material of the tents and flags used by the General during the Revolutionary War quickly began to mold. 61 Custis realized that in order to protect the relics, he would need to move into a more substantial residence soon. In 1802, high on the brow of the most prominent hill of the 1,100-acre property, he began construction of what became the north wing of Arlington House. 62 In honor of the first president and to reinforce his own claim as the “Child of Mount Vernon,” Custis named his new estate, “Mount Washington.”

Custis, like many large landowners in Virginia during the early nineteenth century, was rich in land and slaves but cash poor. Inheritances from his father John Custis, his grandmother Martha Custis Washington, and his guardian George Washington, provided G.W.P. Custis with over 18,000 acres of land and approximately two hundred slaves. 63 This put the young man in the top

63 This 18,000 acres included, approximately, Mount Washington/Arlington House (1,100 acres), Washington Forest Tract (1,200 acres), Mockin and Smith’s Islands (6,000 acres), Romancock (4,656 acres), White House (5,000 acres)
five percent of all slave holding individuals in the south, for most who owned slaves held fewer than twenty. Yet Custis was not without debt or financial obligations. As part of the settlement of his mother’s dower rights to his father’s property, Custis made an annual payment of $1,750 to his mother, Eleanor Calvert Custis Stewart. In addition, his expensive purchases from the estates of George and Martha Washington had diminished his cash supply.

Despite his uncertain finances, Custis forged ahead with establishing his residence and farm at Mount Washington. His prospects for successful farming appeared good both because of his proximity to Alexandria—an important port for exports to Europe—and because of the ease of transporting his farm products to nearby population centers. The growing markets in the newly established District of Columbia also improved his prospects. The Napoleonic Wars then raging in Europe raised demand for American grains.

Early in his tenancy at Mount Washington, Custis hired a farm manager, John Ball. Ball and Custis initiated many improvements aimed at establishing the property as a working farm and a gentleman’s family seat. Custis’ first concerns were practical. Existing correspondence suggests that in 1802 and 1803, Custis primarily focused on organizing his many properties into a profitable enterprise. His letters mainly deal with establishing crops, constructing agricultural structures, and the work of his slaves. Custis’ early agricultural pursuits at Mount Washington (later Arlington) included market gardening, wheat and corn cultivation, and raising livestock, including cattle and sheep. The location of Mount Washington especially lent itself to market gardening, which involved the cultivation of large plots of land on which crops were grown to provide fresh vegetables and fruits to nearby urban centers. Though such gardens required intensive cultivation, Custis had inexpensive labor available in his slaves. In addition, Mount


63 John Michael Vlach. Back of the Big House. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press 1993): 8. In 1860 there were only about 2,300 plantations at which 100 or more slaves were owned in the slave holding states. Though these slaves were not located all at one plantation, the mere fact that he owned outright so many individuals is a clear indication of his position in Southern aristocracy.

64 Nelligan, 58. This agreement was recorded April 4, 1803 in Records of Alexandria County, D.C. Deed Book E, pp. 127-132, 133-135.


66 During the French Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars, which lasted from 1792 to 1815, much of Europe was in a state of war and upheaval. At the time in which Custis first began to farm at Arlington, the British Royal Navy had placed an extensive commercial blockade around France, and France was preparing to attack England. As such, the demand for American grain products increased. For more information see James Burbank, “The French Revolt and Empire” in The War Times Journal (March 2000) online at http://www.wtj.com/articles/. See also, Nelligan, Old Arlington, 63.

67 On July 20, 1803 Custis placed an advertisement in the Alexandria Gazette, for an overseer to “take charge of the Mount Washington Estate.” In November of the same year, John Ball was listed as manager of Mount Washington and placed an advertisement for a gardener or “person qualified to undertake the management of a large market garden.” Alexandria Gazette, November 16, 1803.
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Washington’s proximity to Georgetown and Alexandria kept transportation costs low, and thus promised a greater return on his investment in their cultivation. Despite these advantages, Mount Washington’s hilly topography meant that Custis had a limited supply of tillable soil. In contrast, the sloping, largely wooded property provided good pasture land for grazing cows and sheep.

At the same time Custis was planning his farm, he selected a site for his dwelling house at the crest of a high hill in the northeast quadrant of his estate. Sometime between 1802 and 1803, he had constructed a two-story, brick dwelling on the site. The original dwelling is now incorporated into the north wing of Arlington House. Physical evidence shows that this first house was substantially altered when the south wing was built a year or so later; the changes decreased its height to a single story and altered the main floor level. An 1804 family letter indicates that by the spring of that year, the plan for the larger mansion was set. Later in life, Custis’ daughter recorded that both the north and south wings were complete by the summer of 1804.  

Custis hired English-born architect George Hadfield (1763-1826) to design his residence. Hadfield had recently come to America to oversee the construction of the U.S. Capitol building. Considered to be only the second formally trained architect to practice in America (after the former Capitol supervising architect, Stephen Hallet), Hadfield was well-connected and highly respected as an architect. Following a series of disputes with the city commissioners, Hadfield left his post as supervising architect of the Capitol and established his own practice. Hadfield had known George Washington prior to the latter’s death in 1799, and thus was acquainted with G.W.P. Custis prior to Custis’ inheritance. Although no original drawings exist, Hadfield’s designs for Custis’ house were groundbreaking. The house is considered the first temple-form residential building in the United States. The form became increasingly popular through the 1820s and 1830s, and became one of the predominant house forms for the upper middle-class during the antebellum period.
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George Hadfield was born in Florence, Italy, the third of five gifted children of Charles Hadfield (d. 1776) and Isabella Pocock (d. 1809). The scion of a well-known Manchester (England) family of textile manufacturers, Charles Hadfield, an art collector and dealer, owned and managed three hotels in Tuscany, where his children were brought up in the Roman Catholic faith, with Italian their first language. After Charles Hadfield’s death in 1826, the family moved to London. Maria Hadfield, the eldest daughter, married the artist Richard Cosway in 1781, the same year that George Hadfield was admitted as an architectural student to the Royal Academy, where he had an outstanding career, winning accolades that included the academy’s silver medal (1781) and the gold medal in 1784.

After completing his training at the Royal Academy, Hadfield worked for celebrated British architect James Wyatt as an architectural assistant from 1784 to 1790, while also executing a number of engravings. During a visit to Paris in 1789, Hadfield was introduced to his elder sister’s friend Thomas Jefferson. In 1790, he won the Royal Academy’s three-year traveling scholarship which he used to travel to Rome to study ancient buildings. During 1792, Sir James Wright, a well-known patron of the arts, commissioned Hadfield to complete measured drawings and reconstructions of the temple at Palestrina, near Rome; these were exhibited in 1795 at the Royal Academy. Hadfield stayed on in Rome for a year and worked as an architect, including designing chimneypieces for the Prince of Wales and others. After his return to England in 1794, he designed a house in Ireland. In September 1794, Hadfield was asked by the American painter John Trumbull if he would consider superintending work at the Capitol in Washington, D.C., and in March 1795 Hadfield formally agreed to a trial year. Despite brilliant prospects at home, Hadfield agreed to travel to America. The war with France and resultant difficult economic situation, family difficulties, and what was perhaps an unhappy love affair were all possible reasons for his departure.

Arguably the second professionally trained architect to work in America (after Stephen Hallet), Hadfield arrived with enthusiastic letters of introduction, his portfolio of drawings, his books, and the latest architectural and technological knowledge. After three troubled years, in May 1798 he left his Capitol post in protest after the city commissioners used his designs for the four

---

executive office buildings without paying him. The executive buildings had fifteen bays, two stories with basement, and giant porticos with Ionic columns—one of the earliest uses of a Greek order in America. Several of Hadfield’s designs for the Capitol were later adopted by other architects.

In 1800, Hadfield patented the first brick-and tile-making machine in the United States and established a manufacturing company. One year later, he advertised for students at his architectural academy; his one known pupil was William P. Elliot. Best remembered for his winning design with Ithiel Town for the U.S. Patent Office, Elliot trained for five years with Hadfield. In 1802, Hadfield was the first person to become a naturalized citizen in Washington, D.C., and the following year he was elected a city councilor as a Jeffersonian Republican.

Over the next few years, recommended by Jefferson and by the city commissioners, Hadfield successfully designed a number of public buildings in Washington, including the arsenal in 1803; the marine barracks and commandant’s house (1801-1803), which survives with later alterations; and the city jail, completed in 1801 (it was later converted into a hospital and burned to the ground in 1861). Hadfield corresponded with Jefferson about dry docks and worked on several other projects as well. Hadfield was long a prominent member of the Columbian Institute for the Promotion of Arts and Sciences (subsequently absorbed by the Smithsonian Institution), whose objectives included the establishment of a national museum and the U.S. Botanic Garden.

Also at this time Hadfield worked on several private commissions, including the Washington Theatre, which opened in 1804, and Commodore David Porter’s elaborate house on Meridian Hill. Designed in 1798 and completed in 1819, Porter’s mansion incorporated a distinctive geometrical staircase. In addition, Hadfield completed designs for the Tayloe row houses (later transmogrified into the Willard Hotel); the Way brothers’ row houses; and Weightman’s Row (1816). In 1802, Hadfield designed Arlington House for G.W.P. Custis. After the Washington Theatre burned in 1820, its owners, the Carusi brothers, asked Hadfield to design a replacement; a number of inaugural balls were held in this famous building, which contained a theater, assembly rooms, and a convention hall. 72

In later years, Hadfield designed his own house in Washington; several other private residences; building alterations, including the second roof of the Octagon; and, in 1824, the Washington Branch Bank of the Second Bank of the United States. At the end of his life, in 1825-1826, he designed the Van Ness Mausoleum, a small tempioetto now located within Washington’s Oak Hill Cemetery. Hadfield, who died in Washington, is buried in Congressional Cemetery. William P. Elliot entered Hadfield’s designs for the Washington National Monument competition posthumously.
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Washington City Hall, Hadfield's most important public commission, was not completed until 1849, although the cornerstone was laid in August 1820, and the intended rotunda was never built. The central section surmounts a stepped terrace; the well-proportioned Ionic hexastyle portico was derived from the Erechtheum in Athens; and the hyphens that extend to either side feature recessed round-headed windows, a Hadfield signature. The two wings end with distyle in antis Greek-style porticos. The originality of the exterior is matched by the distinctive interior use of space.

Several architects were strongly influenced by Hadfield's architecture, particularly Alexander Jackson Davis, who drew and engraved Hadfield's buildings in considerable detail. Davis's partner Ithiel Town was also greatly influenced by Hadfield's architecture; Town had partnered with Hadfield's student William P. Elliot in their design for the U.S. Patent Office design competition. Disseminated through the designs of these architects and those of the next generation, the influence of Hadfield's work was considerable and is reflected throughout the Midwest and the Northwest, in both private and public buildings. Contemporary accounts describe Hadfield as a modest, reserved, and sensitive man who according to Jefferson and others, did not promote himself sufficiently, and some of his achievements have gone almost unrecognized. Hadfield's work helped introduce the Greek Revival to America, as exemplified by Washington City Hall, which is "a noble and durable monument of his correct conceptions in the art to which his life was devoted [and] will hand down to posterity the name, the genius, and the talents of George Hadfield." 73

Hadfield's Design for Arlington House

Hadfield designed Custis a classical temple for his house. Set atop a prominent hill overlooking the Potomac River and the new national capital to the east, the mansion was a conspicuous architectural landmark. In their selection of the site and in their choice of a building type drawn from classical antiquity, Custis and Hadfield responded to both local traditions and international trends. The house was pioneering among residential buildings in North America; it and a handful of other temple-form buildings are the predecessors to a "national craze" for Greek Revival design that started in the 1820s and lasted until the American Civil War (1861-1865).

Constructed of hand-made bricks and covered in stucco scored to look like stone blocks, Hadfield's Arlington House design was a classically symmetrical, three-part house centered on a two-story tall, front-gable block fronted by a full-height, Doric portico. The portico dominated the facade with its hefty columns supporting a prominent pediment. 74 Much lower, hipped-roof,

73 Records of the Columbian Institute, Minutes, II Feb. 1826
74 Civil War-era photographs of Arlington House show that, by the mid-19th century, the main portions of the building, including the columns, were faux grained to mimic Aquia sandstone, the material then in use for the construction of many government buildings across the Potomac River in Washington, DC. Aquia Creek sandstone came from a quarry opened in 1694 on Aquia Creek in Stafford County, Virginia. The stone was a valuable source
one-story wings flanked the central block; the wings originally incorporated balustraded parapets that screened the low-pitched hipped roofs from view. The wings featured a series of arched windows, large in size and set within larger recessed, blind arches. The effect of this neoclassical Grecian composition is of a grand and imposing building set off by a heavily wooded backdrop, making it a highly visible landmark from across the river in Washington, DC.

In placing his home on the most prominent and highest point of his Mount Washington property, Custis was following an established American custom. From the beginning of the American colonies, primary structures were often built on high points, both for aesthetic and defensive reasons. As the century progressed, as technology and settlement advanced, and the ideas of the English landscape school filtered to the newly formed United States, the aesthetic drama of a high elevation became even more valuable to the elite. Often in Virginia, the largest land owners carefully selected their elevated positions, siting their plantations to assure maximum prominence in the landscape. Custis’ own family homes demonstrated this: both at Woodlawn plantation, the Georgian-Federal style mansion (1800-1805) that sits high on a hill overlooking Mount Vernon and the Potomac River and was the home of his sister, Nelly Custis Lewis and her husband Lawrence Lewis, and at Chatham (1768-1771), the home of Custis’ future wife, Mary Lee Fitzhugh, which also stood high on a bluff overlooking the Rappahannock River.

As a young man, Custis had accompanied his knowledgeable guardian around the grounds of Mount Vernon as Washington planned and managed the landscape. This experience may have imbued Custis with the naturalistic and classical design principles that influenced the layout at Arlington. The Mount Vernon mansion featured a monumental, full-height portico (piazza) that extends across the entire length of the river-side façade. The view from this porch was of the gently sloping hillside, covered with long grass and dotted with specimen and massed trees, carefully placed to frame vistas of the river and the distant Maryland shore. Such pastoral design elements—irregular spatial organization, serpentine lines, gentle slopes and rough lawns extending to the foundations of buildings—were popular devices in the late-18th-century English Landscape School of design. This attraction to picturesque features and naturalistic settings has been interpreted as an aesthetic reaction to the rapid mechanization of the industrial revolution, and as an outgrowth of the “enclosure movement” in England during the mid-eighteenth century.

of building material throughout the 18th century and into the 19th century in the region. It can be found at Gunston Hall (George Mason’s house in Fairfax County, Virginia), at Christ Church in Alexandria, Virginia, and even at Mount Vernon in the steps and walkways. Because of its ease of shaping and its location close to the new national capital, George Washington selected Aquia sandstone as the primary material for the government buildings in D.C. It was used in the construction of the Capitol, the White House, and the Treasury Building among other public buildings. Wikipedia.com: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Aquia_Creek_sandstone


Prime examples of the style include the gardens of such prominent individuals as Andre Parmentier and Thomas Jefferson. 77

Other landscape design elements found at Mount Vernon can be seen at Arlington. Among these are features related to a series of improvements initiated by Washington between the 1780s and his death in 1799. During that period Washington remodeled the driveway into a curvilinear alignment and established “groves” of trees on either side of the drive. Emulating the English Garden landscapes popular in England, Washington attempted to cloak the working elements of the farm in a picturesque veil—moving the rectangular walls and houses that enclosed the upper and lower flower and vegetable gardens, so they hid the pragmatic necessities. 78 In the landscape of Arlington, such control of access and views also played a prominent role.

Like Washington, Custis had professional help from William Spence who had served as head gardener at Mount Vernon starting in 1797. 79 A Scottish indentured servant, little is known of Spence’s specific training, but Scottish gardeners were common in early nineteenth-century America. 80 At Mount Vernon, Spence was responsible for the addition of boxwood to the gardens, and he participated in the implementation of Washington’s design improvements. 81

77 The enclosure movement in England during the middle of the 18th century revolved around the practice of wealthy landowners enclosing common fields for their own use, usually for the purpose of raising sheep. In England, Humphry Repton, a horticulturist during the eighteenth-century, promoted the ideals of the less formal gardening style, in his book *Sketches and Hints on Landscape Gardening* published in 1795. According to Repton the landscape should display natural form and hide natural defects; should be open; should be designed in a naturalistic style; and all aspects of the landscape should be pleasing and if not they should be concealed—characteristics which correspond to the design at Arlington. Thomas Jefferson created a garden at his estate, Monticello, which had characteristics of the English Landscape style of gardening. By the 1820s, the style was firmly established in America. In 1828, Andre Parmentier published essays about this “modern” style of gardening in his catalogue for his nursery and botanic garden in what is now Brooklyn, New York. For more information about the development of the English School of landscape gardening in America see Brenda Bullion, *The Science and Art of Plants and Gardens in the Development of an American Landscape Aesthetic (1620-1850)*. (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University 1990): 9-20.


79 *Alexandria Gazette*, Nov 4, 1802. This is an announcement stating that a dog was lost from Mount Washington. William Spence is listed as the contact. Spence was an indentured servant from Scotland with a term of three to four years. James Anderson to George Washington August 1797 and George Washington to James Anderson (of Scotland) November 4, 1797 in Dorothy Twohig, Ed. *The Papers of George Washington: Retirement Series. March-December 1797* (Charlottesville and London: University Press of Virginia: 1998).

80 This would hold true throughout the first half of the nineteenth century. According to A. J. Downing, author of the famous mid-nineteenth century landscape design book, *A Treatise on the Theory and Practice of Landscape Gardening, Adapted to North America*, only 3% of working gardeners were native born Americans in 1852. A.J. Downing, *The Horticulturist* (June 1852). The countries most known for their gardening skills were Ireland, Scotland, England and Germany. See Patricia M. Tice, *Gardening in America 1830-1910* (Rochester, New York: The Strong Museum 1984): 57.

Exactly what role Spence played in the layout of the grounds of Arlington is unknown; however it is likely he was involved.

Because of financial constraints, Custis was forced to build his mansion and develop his decorative landscape in stages. While the exact evolution is unclear from available documents, the existing house was constructed in fits and starts between 1802 and 1818. The north wing was the first section erected, initially built in 1802-1803 as a stand-alone, two-story house. By 1804, Hadfield had completed plans for a much larger and more architecturally ambitious mansion for Custis. Some scholars believe that, from the beginning, Custis designed his house to serve, in part, as a memorial to his departed step-grandfather, George Washington and that the design reflects this monumental intention. Certainly, Custis’ devotion to his grandfather’s legacy and eagerness to collect and show artifacts connected with the esteemed Washington may have driven some of his design decisions. 82

Construction began on the three-part Greek Revival design with the south wing, which was completed by the summer of 1804 when Custis married. It is not known when the north wing was remodeled so that it would match the design of the south wing, but alterations were extensive and included the reduction of the structure from two to one story, the relocation of the first floor and ceiling levels, altered window placements, and changes to the interior floor plan. After many years of residing in the two wings which may have been connected by a covered walkway of some sort, the center section of Hadfield’s temple-with-wings design was largely complete by the fall of 1818. 83

Again, there is a lack of evidence that would exactly date G.W.P. Custis’ outbuildings at Arlington, but it is likely that the two slave quarters, the nearby icehouse, and the stable were all erected during the same span of years, 1802-1818, as the main house.

Because of its prominence in the landscape and its well-known occupant, travelers and other local observers frequently commented on Arlington House. One of the first to observe the construction of the main house in May 1818 called it "Custis' Folly." 84 A. Levasseur, who

82 The origins of the idea that Custis designed his house to serve as a memorial to George Washington appear to derive from statements made by early Arlington scholar Murray H. Nelligan in his in depth research report “Old Arlington” (1953). Roger Kennedy extended the theory in an uncited article “Arlington House, A Mansion That Was a Monument.” Smithsonian 16, no. 7 (October 1985) 156-165. Although no primary source declares Custis’ intent, circumstantial evidence supports the idea that he built the house, in part, to act as a repository for Washington relics.
83 In an undated letter to a friend, G.W.P. Custis’ adult daughter, Mary Lee recollected that her father had built the north and south wings prior to marrying in July 1804. Mary Lee was born there in 1808, and she remembered the center section being completed (though she did not recall the date or her age). Letter quoted in Laura C. Holloway, The Ladies of the White House, Vol. II (New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1886), pp. 58-59.
Arlington County, VA

Arlington House Historic District [2013]

Boundary Increase & Additional Documentation

Name of Property

visited Arlington House with Lafayette in December 1824, reported, "His [Custis'] house, [was] built according to reduced plans of the temple of Thesus..." 85

In his *Historical Sketches of the Ten Mile Square*, published in 1830, Jonathan Elliot described Arlington House. He noted:

The mansion house consists of the centre building of 60 feet front and two wings of 40 each, making a prescriptive front of 140 feet. The centre has a portico of 60 feet by 25, a pediment supported by eight massive columns, six in front. This noble portico was designed from a drawing of the Temple of Poaestun [sic], near Naples, the columns are five feet in diameter at their base, gradually declining to the capitals, which are of the ancient Doric order; the columns, 26 feet in height, are built of brick, covered with stucco resembling freestone and like the pediment marked off in blocks. This stucco resists the frost and forms impenetrable cement. 86

Mrs. Francis M. Trollope, an English woman generally critical of all things American, apparently saw Arlington House from a distance in 1830-31. In 1832 she wrote, "It is a noble looking place, having a portico of stately white columns, which as the mansion stands high, with a background of dark woods, forms a beautiful object in the landscape." 87

The London barrister, Godfrey T. Vigne, who visited about 1830 and published a book in 1832, was also impressed by Arlington House until he examined it closely. Of this experience he wrote:

Arlington, the seat of George Washington P. Custis, Esq., occupied the most conspicuous and commanding situate, on the south bank of the Potomac. It is visible for many miles, and in the distance has the appearance of a superior English country residence, beyond any I had seen in the States; but as I came close to it, as usual, I was woefully [sic] disappointed... 88

Custis' many economies in constructing Arlington House were apparently quite visible when viewed from close at hand. Indeed, Custis appears to have been limited by his finances. Instead of employing stone or hard-fired brick purchased from a brickyard, he used soft-fired brick for the foundation and walls of his residence. Hadfield's design also eliminated common architectural details, including fluting on the Doric columns and trims and moldings were kept relatively simple. Custis also saved money by choosing not to finish off the interior of what is today known as the White Parlor in the south wing.

87 Francis M. Trollope, *Domestic Manners of the Americans* (New York, 1904), p. 204.
Despite these economies, Custis and Hadfield attempted to innovate. The material used to clad the exterior of Arlington House was the invention of David Meade Randolph of Richmond and husband of Mary Custis’ cousin, Mary Randolph. While the use of stucco to imitate stone had a long tradition in America, Hadfield, who was familiar with new methods for making hard mortars and cements in Europe, may have urged Custis to find a material that would seal and harden the soft brick walls. Randolph may also have convinced Custis to use his new “hydraulic cement” by using the experiment at Arlington House to promote his product. In August 1818, Randolph reported the success in a newspaper advertisement, "... One other experiment was made on the northwest [exterior] corner of Arlington House, the seat of G. W. P. Custis, Esq., in the District of Columbia, just before sunset on Saturday, 19th day of December 1817." Cement stucco was successfully applied to the exterior at the northwest corner. 89

Although Arlington House has been identified as the first Greek temple-form house erected in America, it was not the first to emulate ancient temple forms. What Charles E. Brownell calls the American Temple Revival began along the east coast of America in the 1780s and 1790s with the appearance of temple-form porticoes, mainly attached to conventional church and public building forms. Thomas Jefferson’s Virginia State Capitol (1785-1789) at Richmond was one of the grandest examples. Benjamin Henry Latrobe’s Bank of Pennsylvania (1799-1801, demolished) was the second major temple-form building erected in America. Both these examples owed more to Roman buildings than to Greek precedents. 90

The Greek Revival fashion in America is more accurately seen as a late evolution of the interest in classicism that dominated architecture and the decorative arts throughout the 18th century. Born of European Hellenism and the proliferation of classical studies, the Greek Revival followed the discovery and intensive study of ancient artifacts and buildings in southern Europe starting in the early 18th century. Publications such as Isaac Ware’s The Four Books of Andrea Palladio’s Architecture (London, 1738) and James Stuart’s and Nicholas Revett’s Antiquities of Athens (1762) allowed artists and architects to widely study original examples of ancient Greek architecture. These studies resulted in highly detailed classifications of the orders and proportions used in Greek architecture and the proliferation of classical elements used in new buildings throughout Europe and America.

In the United States, as elsewhere, the Greek Revival is associated with nationalistic trends. It is seen by most scholars as the first truly national American style, a style that reflected the nation’s new concept of itself as an independent Republican democracy. Historian David P. Handlin concludes that with the dawning of the new American republic, buildings were “not only frameworks in which to live and work; they were also provocative projections of what Americans wanted to be.”91 Americans, like G.W.P. Custis, and after 1802, George Hadfield, were searching for appropriate cultural expressions that would represent the new nation.

Classical Roman and Greek architecture lent itself easily to the desire to create an American cultural image. The Greek Revival’s symbolic power lay in its connection to the republican form of government largely adopted by the American state from Roman and Greek precedents. In addition, Classical temples were seen as being free from the ecclesiastical and aristocratic associations that the new Americans associated with England and monarchies across Europe. Finally, in the 1820s, Americans sympathetically followed the Greek war for independence then taking place; this contemporary event was seen as a direct reflection of American experiences and helped to popularize all things Greek.  

The architectural legacy of Arlington House was widespread. Hadfield’s temple design at Arlington and his use of a robust temple-front at Washington City Hall that he designed in 1820 were influential early examples of the Temple Revival that was perfected in the 1820s and 1830s by architects such as William Strickland, Ithiel Town and A.J. Davis. Hadfield’s ideas were disseminated by a group of architects who admired his work, including his pupil, William Parker Elliot. Arlington House was influential in residential design as it illustrated the possibilities for adapting the temple-front to domestic buildings. The temple-and-wing house form flourished throughout Virginia and the nation in the 1830s through the 1850s. Examples can be found from Massachusetts to New York and beyond as the nation expanded westward. Berry Hill, the 1840s plantation of the Bruce family in Halifax County, Virginia and Westend, completed in 1849 and located in the Green Springs National Historic Landmark district in Louisa County, Virginia are both prime example of a temple-and-wings form house in the state. Important national examples include Town and Davis’s Russell House (1828-30, now Honors College, Wesleyan University) in Middletown, Connecticut and the Thomas U. Walter-designed Andalusia residence of Nicholas Biddle constructed as a Doric temple north of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania in 1836. 

While Custis and Hadfield adopted the Greek Temple form as the newest fashion from Europe, it also fit Custis’ desire to help define a new national identity for America, one that did not wholly rely on English precedents and that reflected the values of the newly independent nation. 

---


93 Premier examples include William Strickland’s Second Bank of the United States in Philadelphia (1818-1824) and Ithiel & Davis’ U.S. Custom House in New York City (1833-1842).
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Slavery & Freedom at Arlington, 1802 - 1861

In addition to Arlington’s importance as an architectural landmark, the property retains important features that reflect the ethnic heritage of the enslaved African Americans who worked and lived within its boundaries. From the time Custis established his estate at Mount Washington in 1802, the enslaved residents of his estate played a pivotal role building, maintaining, and operating the family seat that he envisioned. The story of the slaves at Arlington reflects both a unique set of circumstances and a situation typical of Virginia’s elite slaveholding families. The experiences of the Custis and Lee family and their slaves are representative of the antebellum period; a period during which the slavery system was being threatened both by its abolitionist opponents and by its own internal collapse as a non-viable economic system. Although members of the Custis-Lee family expressed their disapproval or frustration with slavery as a system, their lifestyle was dependent on the labor rendered by their human property. Despite personal reservations among the family members, the Arlington estate was part of the same repressive economic system that characterized all the slaveholding states.

Arlington is also notable as the site of resistance to enslavement. Recognized as a site affiliated with the national Underground Railroad Network to Freedom, persons and events associated with Arlington reflect established patterns and activities associated with slave resistance during the antebellum period.95

When he came of age and after Martha Washington’s death in 1802, Custis acquired through inheritance or purchase approximately 200 slaves from both his father’s and from his grandmother Martha (Custis) Washington’s estates. This number placed Custis in the top five percent of slave owners in the United States.96 Much like the other great planters of the Chesapeake region, Custis operated the 18,000 acres of Virginia land that he inherited as a single discontinuous plantation. Most of his 200 slaves lived and worked at his two most productive properties along the Pamunkey River near Richmond, Virginia.97

Throughout his 55-year residency at Arlington, between 50 and 60 of his slaves resided and worked at his family seat there. While the majority of these either worked in the agricultural fields distant from the house or were hired out to neighbors, a small group served in the domestic core of the estate, helping to clean and maintain the house and outbuildings; clothe and feed its white occupants; and complete a variety of domestic chores, including caring for the horses and carriages, cultivating the garden, and preparing food for storage. The enslaved people who

97 The White House Plantation in New Kent County, Virginia contained approximately 5,100 acres and Romancoke encompassed 4,656 acres in King William County, Virginia. The two properties stood on either side of the Pamunkey River, east of the state capital at Richmond.
worked in the main house at Arlington made possible the lifestyle of gracious hospitality for which Arlington was famous. Charles Syphax oversaw the dining room at Arlington and is frequently mentioned in the Custis family correspondence. Eleanor Harris was the housekeeper. Since Custis planned to emancipate his slaves some day, bondspeople received a rudimentary education. 98

In early 19th century America, slaves were not citizens, they were property. As such they possessed no legal rights; they could not legally marry, and in Virginia after 1849, teaching slaves to read and write was prohibited. The invention of the cotton gin in 1793 caused major changes in the institution of slavery. The new machine allowed planters to quickly and efficiently process cotton, sparking a boom in cotton cultivation. Grown mainly in the south, cotton plantations flourished and along with them, the need for slave labor. Between 1790 and 1810, the slave population in America increased 70 percent. The burgeoning cotton culture in the south also spurred Northern industrialization through the establishment of cotton mills in New England where water power was plentiful. 99

In the context of a growing slave population, domestic and international slave revolts, and growing hostility to free blacks in Northern cities, many whites urged their government to more tightly control slaves and the slave trade. This manifested itself in several forms, including the abolition of the international slave trade by Congress in 1808, passage of a series of increasingly restrictive and punitive state laws related to slaves and their owners, and in the development of alternative schemes to rid the nation of its free black population. The most prominent national effort to solve what whites saw as the problems associated with a large slave and free black population was the American Colonization Society (ACS). Founded in 1817 by the Reverend Robert Finley and supported by many illustrious Americans, the goal of the society was to help free black people and slaves manumitted by their owners to emigrate to Africa. Over the course of its existence from 1817 to the Civil War, the ACS helped approximately 12,000 free blacks emigrate to the newly formed Liberia colony in West Africa. 100

100 “Africans in America”: “White intolerance of free blacks manifested itself at the national level with the formation of The American Colonization Society, founded in 1817 by the Reverend Robert Finley to help free black people emigrate to Africa. In keeping with the popular thought of the day, Finley saw the presence of blacks in America as a threat to the national well-being and the quality of life for whites. He said that free blacks were "unfavorable to our industry and morals" and that removing them would save Americans from difficulties such as interracial marriage and having to provide for poor blacks. With the assistance in Washington, D.C. of his brother-in-law Elias B. Caldwell, Clerk of the Supreme Court, and Francis Scott Key, author of "The Star Spangled Banner," Finley raised the support of prominent white men, who agreed that sending freed Africans back to Africa would be best for all concerned. The society gained government support with its 1820 petition to Congress.” “The motives of the ACS members varied considerably. Some were genuine allies of free blacks, and were concerned for their welfare. Some hoped that colonization would eradicate slavery. Others wanted to maintain the institution of slavery but to rid the country of free blacks, who they believed posed a serious threat as potential fomenters of slave rebellion.”
G.W.P. Custis’ attitude toward slavery and his slaves “differed little from the common views of his contemporaries.” He viewed slavery as a burden from the past that caused many economic ills and personally limited his ability to flourish financially. He opposed the international slave trade and once even offered his James River property as a refuge for a ship of illegally seized Africans. Like his step-grandfather George Washington did in his retirement, Custis refused to buy slaves, although he did sell and give his slaves away as gifts. While he professed a paternalistic concern for the well-being of his slaves, he was not a good manager and on several occasions his overseers were accused of badly mistreating his slaves. Again like his former guardian, he was unable to determine a route to freeing his slaves and himself from the self-perpetuating system. Custis’ wife, who objected to slavery on moral (not economic) grounds, finally persuaded her husband to free his slaves in his will.

Although Custis grew cotton on his Pamunkey River plantations, corn and wheat remained important crops. Like most planters in the Upper South where soil depletion had degraded the land, he had diversified his agrarian base by raising significant numbers of sheep, cattle and hogs, and by running grist mills and distilleries. No evidence indicates that Custis increased the number of slaves he owned through purchase, and he only rarely sold his slaves. His letters show that he regarded his numerous slaves a financial burden and the institution of slavery culpable for Virginia’s economic ills. Historian Elizabeth Brown Pryor argues that, though Custis attempted to provide for his slaves, he was a lax administrator and manager, and thus, his slaves were able to develop some autonomy and to passively resist their master by being unproductive and recalcitrant.

A combination of factors led G.W.P. Custis and his wife Molly to grasp at options for solving what they viewed as the slavery problem. The economic instability of the period combined with a general fear of black insurrection and his wife’s religious convictions led the Custis family to support the colonization movement that began in the second decade of the 19th century. In the early years of the Colonization Society, G.W.P. Custis believed strongly in its doctrines.

The ACS continued its work until after the Civil War. The organization worked with the United States government to establish the African colony of Liberia, where it transported approximately 12,000 blacks over the course of its existence. Although the ACS controlled the bulk of emigration, other groups formed their own schemes. The total number of black people to emigrate from the United States to other countries was approximately 15,000.”

---


103 Pryor, *Reading the Man*, 125-126.


105 Historian Elizabeth Brown Pryor located records of at least two slave sales in 1811 and 1812 in the accounts and day books among the Custis-Lee Family Papers in the Library of Congress. Pryor, *Reading the Man*, n.15, p.520.

106 For Brown’s evidence and conclusions, see *Reading the Man*, 125-138.

However, by the 1840s and 1850s he had become disillusioned with its methods for solving the problem of slavery in Southern society—though these were, in fact, the years of the Colonization Society’s greatest influence.

The Custises and some of their bondspeople, led by Molly Custis and her daughter Mar, raised money for the ACS through the sale of flowers and vegetables grown in the garden that still occupies the terraces just north and south of Arlington House. In addition, in a small room in the north wing of the house, they taught many of the Arlington slaves to read and write in the hopes that this would prepare them for freedom. They also provided religious instruction to slaves, foreseeing the spread of Christianity to Africa through the Liberian émigrés.

Despite their convictions, the Custis-Lee family funded the passage to Liberia of only one family of Arlington slaves, William and Rosabella Burke and their four young children. Shortly after the family’s arrival in Liberia, Rosabella Burke wrote to Mary Custis Lee of their happiness and success in Liberia. Mary Lee so firmly supported the society that, at her death, she left her inheritance from her uncle, William Fitzhugh of Ravensworth, not to her children but to the American Colonization Fund. The ACS was not without its critics: abolitionists often referred to colonization as “assisted deportation,” and many newly freed slaves refused to go to Africa.

The members of the Burke family were not the only Arlington slaves to be manumitted. George Washington Parke Custis released a number of slave women and their young children in the early nineteenth century. In addition, after emancipating Maria Syphax in 1826, Custis gave

---


109 According to a list of slaves emancipated in the will of G.W.P. Custis made on December 29, 1862, they included Catherine Burke and child and Marianne and Agnes Burke. Copy in ARHO. William and Rosabella Burke emigrated with their four children Granderson, Cornelia, Alexander and Martha. An 1855 letter between Rosabella Burke and Mary Lee was published in African Repository and Colonial Journal. Volume 35, No. 7 (February 20, 1859): 216.


112 The paternity of these children and Custis’ relationship with their mothers is debated. While no definitive evidence exists to prove miscegenation on Custis’ part, historian Elizabeth Brown Pryor lays out the circumstantial evidence and contextual evidence that makes it likely. See Pryor, Reading the Man, 137-138. At Custis’ death in 1857, Northern newspapers published articles pertaining to the subject of the possible paternity of his “mulatto slaves.” For an interesting study of the American Colonization Society in the southern United States highlighting additional rationale for the Custis and Lee women’s interest in colonization see chapter five of Marie Tyler McGraw’s, An African Republic: Black and White Virginians in the Making of Liberia (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2007). For more information on the identity of the manumitted women and children of Arlington see, Douglas Eugene Pielmeier, “Arlington House: The Evolution of a Nineteenth Century Virginia Plantation” Unpublished study, Arlington House: The Robert E. Lee Memorial, 1996 (ARHO Archive). Pielmeier asserts that, prior to 1830, Custis emancipated or sold nearly 20 slaves. Many of the sales were predicated on the understanding that the purchaser would free the slave after purchase. Pielmeier, 116-120.
her and her husband, freeman Charles Syphax, the use of a 17-acre parcel of land on the southern boundary of his Arlington estate. In 1818, four slave children between the ages of eight and fourteen received their freedom. Two slaves, Cassy and Louis, moved to New York after Custis emancipated them.113

Not all of Custis' enslaved people were content to wait for freedom. Some escaped from the Arlington plantation, while others may have assisted runaways from other properties. In 1813, Catherine Brown, of Chestnut hill [sic], Virginia, placed an advertisement in the Alexandria Gazette offering a reward for the capture of her runaway slave, Hannah. This represented Hannah's second attempt to escape from slavery; earlier she had been caught in Georgetown where she had passed as a free woman. Brown conjectured that Hannah was "harbored by Mr. Custis' negroes at Arlington, or is about the City or Navy Yard." It is uncertain whether Hannah was actually harbored by the Arlington slaves.114

While some of the Arlington slaves may have assisted runaways, others decided to seek the end of enslavement themselves. Custis offered a $50 reward for the capture of his slave Eleanor, who ran away in October, 1829. In a letter to his wife in 1831, Custis mentions several runaways who had thus far eluded capture. In 1836, one runaway was accused of possessing false free man's papers. Although his exact identity is uncertain, it is possible that he was attempting to use the documents to escape the plantation and the condition of slavery. That same year, a Jane Steiner, "spinster," was accused of providing money and advice to assist one of Custis' female slaves in her escape from the plantation. Court records do not indicate that this slave was ever captured.115

Despite these isolated incidences early in Custis' residency at Arlington, he retained most of his slaves until his death in 1857. In his last will and testament he divided up his real estate among his male grandchildren and directed that several tracts be sold to pay $10,000 to each of his three granddaughters. Finally, he directed that:

... upon the legacies to my four granddaughters being paid, and my estates that are required to pay the said legacies, being clear of debts, then I give freedom to my slaves, the said slaves to be emancipated by my executors in such manner as to my executors may seem most expedient and proper, the said emancipation to be accomplished in not exceeding five years from the time of my decease.

114 Daniel Meaders, Advertisements for Runaway Slaves in Va 1801-1820, p. 94.
Custis’ son-in-law, Lieut. Col. Robert Edward Lee, was among the executors named to fulfill the directives in his will.

An inventory of Custis’ property taken shortly after his death listed 63 slaves. Some of the enslaved had expected to receive their freedom immediately upon Custis’ death. Several ran away from Arlington, and others refused to work. After Custis’ death, his son-in-law, Robert E. Lee took over management of the estate both as its executor and as the husband of Custis’ daughter and heir. Under Lee’s tenure at Arlington, life changed radically for those in bondage.

In order to raise the required capital to settle the estate’s debts, Lee hired out some slaves, separating families. The enslaved found Lee to be a more stringent taskmaster than Custis had been. In 1859, three slaves ran away. Mary and Wesley Norris were brother and sister and had grown up on the Arlington estate. They and a cousin left behind a host of relatives when they escaped. The trio made their way to Westminster, Maryland, before they were captured. After an alleged whipping, the two men were incarcerated in the jail at Hanover Court House for approximately a week. All three slaves were then hired out.116

This event received much attention in the press. A letter to the editor printed in the New York Tribune accused Lee of violating Custis’ wish of emancipating his enslaved people. The author of the letter, who wrote under the anonymous appellation of “A CITIZEN,” also called attention to the plight of the three runaway slaves. In a rebuttal letter, “JUSTICE” referred to the five-year deadline established by Mr. Custis and accused “A CITIZEN” of being “one of the meddling scoundrels who, immediately after Mr. Custis’ death, went over from Washington City and tried to induce the negroes upon the Arlington estate to run away, falsely telling them that they were all free.” Lee informed his eldest son of the controversy; he noted that he had chosen not to reply to the letters and referred to the slaves as “an unpleasant legacy” from Custis.117

The incident involving the three runaways resurfaced after the Civil War. In 1866, Wesley Norris gave his version of the escape which was published in the Anti-Slavery Standard. According to Norris, it was “the general impression among the slaves of Mr. Custis that on his death they should be forever free.” Norris stated that Custis had made this pledge to his slaves years before. After learning from Lee that the enslaved must endure their bondage for an additional five years, Norris, his sister, and their cousin decided to run away in the summer of 1859. Upon their return to Arlington, Lee asked the slaves why they had run away. The three replied “we frankly told him that we considered ourselves free.” According to Norris, County Constable Dick Williams administered fifty lashes to each of the men, and twenty lashes to Mary Norris. After a week in jail, the men were hired out to the Orange and Alexander Railroad, and Mary Norris was hired out in Richmond, Virginia. Finally, in 1863, Norris escaped from Richmond, made his way through the Union lines, and returned to Arlington. His passage...
through the Union lines was confirmed by Major General George G. Meade. Eventually, Norris became a laborer at the National Cemetery established at Arlington, and his sister was “employed by the French Minister at Washington, and will confirm my statement.”

In 1866, the same year that Wesley Norris gave his account, Lee denied any mistreatment of the slaves under his charge. In a letter to E. J. Quirk, Lee thanked the man for his “bold defense of me in the New York papers, at a time when many were willing to believe any enormity charged against me.” Lee further stated, “No servant, soldier, or citizen that was ever employed by me, can with truth charge me with bad treatment.” Although the treatment and punishment of Wesley and Mary Norris and their cousin remains subject to debate, the surviving accounts clearly indicate that the three made their escape from slavery in 1859 and were captured a short distance from the Pennsylvania border. This escape continued the documented pattern of slave flight that began at Arlington in the 1830s.

While written evidence of Arlington slaves and their daily lives is relatively limited in comparison to records relating to its white master and mistress, the buildings and landscape within the domestic core retain important evidence of how slaves and their masters lived, worked, and interacted. The two highly designed slave quarters combined practical work spaces with sleeping quarters for those who toiled in and around the main house. The way the domestic core was organized directly reflected the social status of those living “back of the big house” and those who controlled the estate. The work yard, the gardens, and the service spaces within the house expressed the integral role that slaves and the slave system played in antebellum Virginia society.

Robert E. Lee at Arlington, 1831 – 1861

Perhaps more than any event or association, Arlington’s link to Robert E. Lee and the pivotal decision he made to leave the U.S. Army and join with the secessionist forces in his native Virginia, has cemented its national significance and defined its current role as a memorial. Recognized as a brilliant military leader, Robert E. Lee is a historical figure of surpassing historical importance. Biographer Elizabeth Brown Pryor argued that Lee’s significance extends well beyond his military brilliance or his status as a hero to the defeated southern states after the Civil War. She concluded that:

Since his [Lee’s] decision to withdraw from the Union in 1861, his actions have provoked controversy. Yet, Lee remains a significant historical figure, whose importance lies as much in the questions he prods Americans to ask about patriotism and loyalty as it does in his battle prowess.

119 R.E. Lee to E.J. Quirk, March 1, 1866, Letterbook #3, Debutts-Ely Collection, Library of Congress, Manuscripts Division.
Historians agree that Lee’s decision to fight on the side of the Southern secessionist states was pivotal in the course of the American Civil War. Lee made that decision on the evening of April 19-20, 1861 at Arlington House. Thus, Arlington is the site most directly linked to Lee and this pivotal decision.

Molly Custis was an elder cousin to Robert E. Lee and Lee visited Arlington House frequently as a child.¹²⁰ He expressed affection and gratitude to both G.W.P. and Molly Custis who treated him like family. After his 1831 marriage to the Custis’ daughter at Arlington House, he and Mary Anna Randolph (Custis) Lee made their family home there. While Lee’s illustrious career in the U.S. Army took him away from Arlington for long periods between 1831 and 1857, his letters reveal that he saw Arlington as his family home. In 1852, he wrote that Arlington was the place where his “affections and attachments are more strongly placed than at any other place in the World.”¹²¹ Furthermore, after his father-in-law’s death in 1857, as one of the estate’s executors, Lee took a leave of absence of two years to return to Arlington to take charge of the Custis properties. Thus, though Lee never legally owned the Arlington estate, he was closely associated with the place.

Robert E. Lee Biography and Significance¹²²

Robert E. Lee was a Confederate general during the American Civil War (1861–1865) who led the Army of Northern Virginia from June 1862 until its surrender at Appomattox Court House on April 9, 1865. Descended from several of Virginia’s early families, in 1825 Lee entered the U.S. Military Academy at West Point and graduated second in his class in 1829. He took a position with the U.S. Corps of Engineers and began a distinguished 32-year career in the U.S. Army. In 1831, he married the only daughter of Arlington’s Custis family, Mary Anna Randolph Custis. The couple bore seven children. Lee served in the Mexican American War with the celebrated General Winfield Scott and later became superintendent of West Point. In 1855, Lee accepted a commission as lieutenant colonel in the 2nd U.S. Cavalry.

By the time of the Civil War, Lee was a well-regarded officer of the U.S. Army. Just as Virginia voted to secede from the Union with the other southern states, President Lincoln offered Lee command of the Union forces amassing to defend the nation. His decision to fight for the Confederacy was emblematic of the wrenching choices faced by Americans as the nation divided.

¹²⁰ Molly was born Mary Lee Fitzhugh.
¹²¹ Quoted in Pryor, Reading the Man, 54.

Section 8 page 74
On April 12, 1861, South Carolina shore batteries opened fire on Fort Sumter in Charleston harbor signaling the beginning of the Civil War. The North, or Union, had 22 million citizens, with a strong economy supported by an established industrial base and an extensive transportation system. In contrast, the South or Confederacy, which eventually included eleven states with nine million people, was based on an agricultural economy defined by a loose infrastructure and a relatively weak transportation network.

Nevertheless, on April 17, 1861 Virginia seceded from the Union, following the examples of South Carolina and sixth other southern states. Surrounded by friends and family anxiously waiting at Arlington, Robert E. Lee was faced with a choice—whether to join forces with the south or the north—his state or his country. Earlier in the year he had expressed his feelings on the matter to his son, now master of Arlington:

The South in my opinion, has been aggrieved by the acts of the North, as you say. I feel the aggression and am willing to take every proper step for redress ... As an American citizen I take great pride in my country, her property and institutions, and would defend any State, if her rights were invaded. But I can anticipate no greater calamity for the country than the dissolution of the Union. 123

Now, on April 19, after being offered command of the U.S. troops, Lee paced under the trees that grew in the Park at the east edge of Arlington’s carefully kept flower garden—back and forth—and then he went to his room where he remained until after midnight. On April 20, 1861 Robert E. Lee, a United States Army officer for over thirty years, wrote a letter resigning his federal post. Two days later he accepted the command of the Virginia forces, never again to return to Arlington.

After an early defeat in western Virginia, Lee repulsed George B. McClellan’s army from the Confederate capital during the Seven Days’ Battles (1862) and won stunning victories at Manassas (1862), Fredericksburg (1862), and Chancellorsville (1863). The Maryland and Pennsylvania campaigns he led resulted in major contests at Antietam (1862) and Gettysburg (1863), respectively, with severe consequences for the Confederacy. Lee offered a spirited defense during the Overland Campaign (1864) against Ulysses S. Grant, but was ultimately outmaneuvered and forced into a prolonged siege at Petersburg (1864–1865). On April 9, 1865, the Civil War ended when Lee surrendered at Appomattox Court House.

Lee’s generalship was characterized by bold tactical maneuvers and inspirational leadership; however, critics have questioned his strategic judgment, his waste of lives in needless battles, and an unwillingness to fight in the Western Theater. At the end of the war in 1865, his beloved home at Arlington having been turned into a national cemetery, Lee moved to Lexington, Virginia where he became president of Washington College (now Washington and Lee

123 Robert E. Lee to George Washington Custis Lee, January 23, 1861. ARHO
University). There he promoted educational innovation and presented a constructive face to the devastated Southern public. Privately Lee remained bitter and worked to obstruct societal changes brought about by the war, including the enfranchisement of African Americans. By the end of his life he had become a potent symbol of regional pride and dignity in defeat, and has remained an icon of the *Lost Cause*. He died on October 12, 1870.

**Lee’s Legacy & the Lost Cause**

Following the war, Southern whites, including former Confederate generals, historians and journalists, developed a Confederate interpretation of the Civil War that came to be known as the *Lost Cause*. Proponents of the *Lost Cause* used a combination of myths and facts to paint a positive picture of the Southern secessionist movement and the events of the Civil War. Historians have concluded that "in a postwar climate of economic, racial, and gender uncertainty, the Lost Cause created and romanticized the "Old South" and the Confederate war effort, often distorting history in the process."  

The *Lost Cause* proved a useful tool to pacify and comfort the defeated and uncertain Southern population and even to promote reconciliation between the north and the south. Among the common tenets espoused by supporters of the Lost Cause was that Robert E. Lee was the most heroic and saintly of all Confederates, perhaps of all Americans. One historian explains Lee’s place in the movement this way:

> The *Lost Cause* characterizes almost all Confederate military leaders as saintly, but Lee ranks first among heroes. Appearing almost Christ-like in subsequent Southern iconography, he found near-instant admiration among many Northern Democratic Party members following the surrender at Appomattox. Only four days after Lee accepted Ulysses S. Grant’s terms, the *New York Herald* admitted that Lee was "generally well spoken of" in the North. His status in the South, meanwhile, only increased after his death in 1870, especially through the efforts of former Confederate general Jubal A. Early and the publication of the Southern Historical Society Papers. Early in the twentieth century, Douglas Southall Freeman, his sympathetic, Pulitzer Prize–winning biographer, further enhanced this image.  

**The Military – Cemetery Era, 1861 – 1933**

**Occupation**

At the outset of the American Civil War, the Arlington estate and its domestic core that surrounds Arlington House transformed from a private agrarian seat of the Custis-Lee family to a

---

military encampment and headquarters set upon a strategic military landscape. Viewed by military leaders—both north and south—as a critical strategic location, the Arlington property and many of its neighbors were quickly occupied by Union troops following Virginia's secession from the Union. The legacy of the Union occupation of Arlington in 1861 is seen now in the vast military burial ground that some recognize as "...perhaps the nation's greatest symbol of military honor and sacrifice."[126]

While extensive military use of the Arlington estate took place over the course of the war, including officers occupying the house, construction of encampments near the house, and the digging of trenches and erecting fortifications, little of these military functions remain visible on the landscape today. The house itself remains much as it was at the time it was occupied by the military. As the site of the headquarters for the defenses of Washington and for the Army of the Potomac between May 1861 and December 1862, Arlington House has historic military significance for its Civil War associations. Evidence exists that indicates that President Abraham Lincoln visited Arlington House on a number of occasions to visit with General Whipple, then in charge of the defense of Washington.[127] Soldiers quartered in the house left record of their occupation in the form of graffiti and one union soldier sketched one of the upstairs rooms.[128] In addition, soldiers stationed at Arlington entered the house and removed items from the house; several were later returned following the war.[129]

In the landscape, what physically remains of the military's 72-year tenure at the Arlington estate mainly reflects the 1864 decision to establish a military burial ground on the 200 acres surrounding the house. Since then Arlington National Cemetery (ANC) has greatly expanded to cover approximately 600 acres. Established to address the pressing need to bury the thousands of Union soldiers dying in hospitals across Washington, DC and its surrounding jurisdictions, ANC has grown to be the nation's premier military cemetery.

---


[127] John Michael, Images of America: Fort Myer, Virginia (Charleston, SC: Arcadia Publishing, 2011), p. 14. In a September 1, 2011 blog post at [http://www.historic-fortmyer.com/2011/09/01/a-note-worthy-find/], the author John Michael indicated that Lincoln's visits are confirmed in correspondence that he unearthed while researching for the book. He states that "According to other accounts located during the research of the book, President Lincoln would drive over to have lunch with General Whipple [at Arlington House] and afterward wrap his arms around Whipple's two sons as he got the briefing. This note combined with the research established that Lincoln did visit Arlington House during the Civil War and a friendship developed between him and General Whipple.

[128] Nelligan, Old Arlington, pp. 463-486. The sketch of the interior of Arlington House was likely drawn by a Union officer late in the Civil War; it resides in the records of the Arlington House Archive and is reproduced on page 78 of Hanna, CLR (2001).

[129] A number of veterans and veteran's families returned items removed from Arlington House during the war. Among the items returned was an oil painting portrait of Mildred Childe Lee, General Robert E. Lee's daughter that was returned by the daughter of the Union soldier who had taken it. "Painting of Lee's Daughter, Taken in War, Is Returned," Washington Post (5 March 1932) p. 1.
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The “heights of Arlington”, as the estate was described in local papers in 1861, promised strategic advantages for both the Northern and Southern forces, so high above the city of Washington. Yet to the Union, occupation of Arlington was crucial, for without it the defense of the capital was jeopardized. The Lees knew this and expected the Union forces to take possession very soon. The carpets were rolled up; the curtains taken down. The most valuable belongings—including some of the Washington relics—were sent to Richmond and Ravensworth, where the family was to stay. Other items were boxed, stored in closets or locked in the attic, while most items were left in their places. With Robert in Richmond, her youngest children safe at Ravensworth, and preparations for departure made, Mary Lee waited. She wrote in disbelief to her husband:

I never saw the country more beautiful, perfectly radiant. The yellow jasmine in full bloom and perfuming the air, but a death like stillness prevails everywhere. You hear no sounds from Washington, not a soul moving about.  

A few days later, on May 19, 1861, acceding to the pleas of her husband who was afraid for her safety, Mary Lee departed Arlington with a few of her slaves, leaving others behind to tend and possibly protect the estate. 131

In the early morning, before sunrise on May 24, 1861, a column of eight thousand men marched across the Potomac on Long Bridge and spread out over the low land of Arlington and on towards Alexandria. 132 The Seventh Regiment of New York was among the thousands of soldiers ordered forward from the southern end of Long Bridge to the slopes of Arlington. Near Arlington Spring, as part of the first major military action of the Civil War, the soldiers of the Seventh constructed tents with branches cut from the many varieties of native trees that shaded the smooth, sodded lawn of Custis’ old resort. With picks and spades they joined the other regiments the next morning, following the engineers’ lines of entrenchment, cutting into the hills. 133 Such earthworks were crucial to the defense of the Union capital, for “a single hostile battery could have fired the city with its shells” from the command of Arlington House. 134 In order to boost protection, by May 29th the Eighth New York regiment set up camp amid the enormous oak and elm trees to the south of the flower garden south of Arlington House. 135

But on that first morning, while the federal forces constructed earthen defenses down near the Potomac River, only a few individuals climbed the heights to Arlington. Among them was Major General Charles W. Sandford, in charge of all New York regiments in the District of

130 Mary Lee to Robert E. Lee, May 9, 1861, Ely-DeButts Collection. Library of Congress. ARHO.
131 Pryor, Reading the Man, 302. Other sources place Mrs. Lee’s departure date earlier on May 15th.
132 At the same time as this group of soldiers crossed, another smaller group crossed the Aqueduct Bridge from Georgetown, while a third regiment came ashore in Alexandria. Nelligan, Old Arlington, 463. ARHO Interpretive Ranger and historian Matthew Penrod established the early morning of May 24th as the time of the river crossing.
134 Ibid, 199-201.
Columbia. He established his divisional headquarters at Arlington House. Instead of moving into the mansion, he had three large tents erected between the house and the flower garden. The next day he issued a proclamation stating that all property taken for use by the federal forces in Alexandria County, in which Arlington was then located, would be protected and used only for suppressing unlawful acts against the Union. This proved difficult to enforce and several items in the house and on the grounds were vandalized or stolen during the wartime occupation.

Both the slaves whose primary work was located in the house, yard and gardens—including Selina Gray, George Clarke, Eleanor Harris, Perry Parks, Daniel and Ephriam—and most of the slaves whose quarters were down on the farm, remained on the Arlington Estate. Some assisted the federal soldiers with tasks such as washing and cooking, while others continued with agricultural work. Though they were “left with a month’s provisions” according to a journalist, most stayed on the estate for at least another year which required the production of food.

At the end of May 1861, Brigadier General Irvin McDowell, in charge of the newly-named Army of the Potomac, took over the tent headquarters set up by General Sandford south of the mansion at Arlington. Prior to the war, McDowell had been good friends with the Lee family and now he wrote to assure Mary Lee that her property would be protected. Improvements to the military post continued. Within weeks a telegraph line, connecting Arlington with Washington, was set up on wooden poles that descended down the east-facing slope through the Park.

Fresh from the Union Army’s repulsed attack on the Confederates at Bull Run (known as the First Battle of Manassas by Confederate forces) on July 21, McDowell recognized the need for a better defense system adequate to protect Arlington, thereby preventing at least one way of attacking the capital city. He decided to connect Fort Corcoran to the north and Forts Albany and Runyon to the south. To accomplish this, McDowell had constructed a chain of lunettes that included Fort Tillinghast, Fort Cass and Fort Woodbury all located on the Arlington property and west of Arlington House. Fort DeKalb to the northwest of the estate property line and Fort Craig to the southwest were also built as part of this continuous defensive line in advance of the

---

139 McDowell to Mary Lee, May 30, 1861. McDowell took over the command of General Sandford before Sandford had the opportunity to answer the letter written by Mary Lee. McDowell, therefore, addressed the issues she raised. Local and Northern newspapers commented on the odd location of the headquarters, outside of the mansion instead of in it. Most gave the rationale that by living in a tent and not in the mansion, the General endeared himself to the soldiers, who were living in tents on the heights. New York Daily News July 9, 1861. Washington Republican July 12, 1861: 3. William Howard Russell. My Diary North and South (Boston: T.O.H.P. Burnham 1863): 395.
140 Samuel P. Heintzelman, MS Diary, Thursday June 20, 1861; June 8, 1861 Frank Leslie’s Illustrated Newspaper NY.
141 A lunette is a military fortification with two projecting faces and two parallel flanks.
heights of Arlington.\textsuperscript{142} To link the new forts, many roads were cut through the woods and a belt of trees—both large and small—was felled through the forest in front of Arlington to allow for passage and communication.\textsuperscript{143}

Another primary purpose of the new road construction was to ensure that the headquarters, Arlington House, had more than one path of entry or egress in case of invasion by enemy forces. During the life of G.W.P. Custis, and later under the management of Robert E. Lee, the Arlington estate had only one carriage drive which connected it to the main roads and the Potomac—that which extended west from Arlington Spring, through the farm and up the slope through the Park to the mansion, stables and yard. This situation of limited egress and entry was dangerous, for if the Confederate forces advanced, there was only one route of retreat for the Union Army. To solve this problem, the drive to the estate was extended to the west through the woods, immediately west of the yard, down into the ravine behind the house and back up again before turning east and continuing down the slope to meet the turnpike at the northeastern corner of the property. The path of the war-era military road partially remains as Sheridan Drive behind the house.

Throughout the former estate to the north, south and east of the mansion thousands of soldiers bivouacked in the forest and fields.\textsuperscript{144} In early July of 1861, a young soldier described the scene,

...through the green forest leaves gleams the white canvas of the tents and on the highest ridge westward rises an imposing structure with a portico and colonnade in front, facing the river, which is called Arlington House. . . a large United States flag floats from the roof which shames even the ample proportions of the many stars and stripes rising up from the camps in the trees.\textsuperscript{145}

For the first time in its history, the American flag flew from the pediment of Arlington House. Later the pediment flag was replaced by a freestanding flag pole set at the edge of the plateau and directly in front of the house’s east façade; a flagpole has remained in this position to this day.\textsuperscript{146}


\textsuperscript{143} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{144} Frank Leslie’s Illustrated Newspaper. “Our Camps and Strongholds.” (New York) June 15, 1861.

\textsuperscript{145} Diary entry July 8, 1861 in William Howard Russell’s My Diary North and South. (Boston: T.O.H.P. Burnham 1863): 394.

\textsuperscript{146} Based on historic photographs, the freestanding flag staff was in place by 1864. See “Broad view of Arlington House from the ‘park’ to its east” ca.1864 (ARHO, ARHO and grounds, 1860_1960 box 6, II cat #237). In 1928, an attempt by the quartermaster general and the Commission of Fine Arts to move the flagstaff to a less visible location failed when the U.S. Army veterans grounds demanded that the flag remain in front of the mansion house. “Veterans Demand Flag for Arlington,” Washington Post 12 December 1928, p. 24.
Yet even with the needs and deprivations of war, the house and the gardens near it remained unmolested. A New York Times reporter wrote in the fall of 1861 that, though the home was that of the “rebel leader,” it was also “hallowed grounds—as once being the estate of the Custis family from whence sprang the wife of Washington.” The garden he described as a “mass of flowers.” Another visitor commented that “after the vandalism I have witnessed in the destruction of property in and about the houses of rebels and elsewhere, it was a pleasurable relief to find here ... enforced respect for the property and furniture ... the garden, with its fences is preserved ... the garden is fine ...”

147 Though General McClellan had replaced General McDowell as the Commander of the Army of the Potomac soon after the First Battle of Manassas, McClellan lived in Washington D.C., so McDowell remained at Arlington trying to preserve the estate from damage.

Another reason the estate remained in relatively good condition that first year—at least in the vicinity of the main house—was the care given by the Lee slaves. Selina Gray, identified by Mary Lee in the letter to General Sandford as “the woman in the yard,” had lived in the western third of the southern slave quarter with her husband and children during the residency of the Custis and Lee families. During the federal occupation, she played an important role in the protection of the Washington relics, some of which were, out of necessity, left behind in the departure of the Lees. Though a few relics were eventually stolen from the house, she ensured for at least the first year of occupation they were locked and secure.

148 By 1863, the war occupation of Arlington had taken its toll. Both the house and the grounds suffered both from lack of care and from the demands of an army encampment. Trees were cut, fences removed, roads and trails crisscrossed the property; and the garden was trampled and muddy. Despite this abuse, many of the old trees were spared.

Ownership of Arlington

Up until 1863, Arlington had been occupied by the federal government without legal title to the property as was often the case in wartime. Mary Lee, as direct inheritor of the estate of her father George Washington Parke Custis, still owned the land. Shortly after McClellan’s departure south in March of 1862, Congress passed a law authorizing “the collection of direct taxes in the insurrectionary districts within the United States.” Under this legislation, property...
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owned by individuals loyal to the Confederacy within the boundary of the United States, such as
the Lees, could be assessed federal taxes. If these taxes went unpaid, then the property would be
forfeited to the government and put up at auction to be sold to the highest bidder. This law was
amended in 1863, to wit "any such sale of any tracts, parcels or lots of land which might be
selected under the direction of the President for government use for war, military, naval, revenue,
charitable, educational or police purposes might be at said sale, be bid on under directions of
President and struck off to the United States." It was under the authority of this law that the
United States government attained ownership of the Arlington estate.150

On September 16, 1863, Mary Ann Randolph Lee, as holder of the title to Arlington, was
assessed $92.07 in taxes on property worth, according to the 1860 census, approximately
$34,100. She was given sixty days to pay. Mary, suffering from acute rheumatism and behind
enemy lines, was unable to make the journey to Washington herself and so sent someone else to
make the payment. The law, which required the owner of the property to make the tax payment,
was held strictly in this case, perhaps because the wife of the leader of the Confederate Army
held the deed. In any case, the individual sent by Mrs. Lee was turned away. With the taxes
unpaid Arlington was forfeited to the United States. The property was to be sold at public
auction on January 11, 1864. On the sixth of January, under the 1863 amended tax act,
President Lincoln made an order directing that the Arlington estate be bid on and acquired by the
United States for war, charitable and educational purposes.151 Therefore the property was
purchased by the federal government at an auction for $26,800.00.152

The Cemetery & Other Federal Uses

The federal government would put the 1,100 acres of the former Custis-Lee estate to good use
over the next several decades. In 1863, the army had already established a village to house
escaped slaves, known as contrabands, who were displaced from their former owners' planta-
tions in southern states. Known as Freedmen's Village,153 it occupied a tract at the
southern end of the Arlington estate, and would remain occupied until the turn of the 20th
century despite government efforts to relocate residents. In 1864, the secretary of war set aside
200 acres surrounding the Arlington mansion as a military cemetery. By 1902, the easternmost flats along
the Potomac River became the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Experimental Farm. Today, the
Pentagon stands on a portion of the old Arlington estate.

The only one of these functions to directly impact the Arlington home site was the establishment
of the national cemetery. Arlington House and its immediate setting became the headquarters of

150 Libel of Information filed in United States v. All the Rights, Titles of Robert E. Lee etc., February, 1864.
ARHO.
151 President Abraham Lincoln. 6 January 1864 as cited in 43d Congress 1st Session. Senate Mis. Doc. No. 96.
Memorial of G.W. Custis Lee of Virginia Setting Forth his Claim to “Arlington” &c. April 6, 1874.
153 While Freedman’s Village often appears spelled with an “a” in Man, the official spelling of the bureau that
established and ran the community was Bureau of Refugees, Freedmen, and Abandoned Lands (the Freedmen’s
Bureau), thus, the “e” spelling is also correct.
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a national cemetery; one destined to become the nation’s premier military burial ground where America’s military heroes are honored today.

Even as early in the war as 1862, questions began to arise as to the proper burial of Union soldiers. Articles and editorials in the papers in the Northern cities commented on the irreverent burials and inadequate sites of interment experienced by the fallen men. In response to a clear need, on July 17, 1862 Congress enacted legislation authorizing the President to purchase “cemetery grounds” to be used as national cemeteries for “soldiers who shall have died in the service of the country” and gave authority of their oversight to the Quartermaster General of the United States. Following the enormous loss of life in the Battle of the Wilderness in early May of 1864, Major Daniel H. Rucker and Captain James Monroe of the Quartermaster General’s Office were ordered to make a careful examination of all sites eligible for burial use near the District.

They reported in favor of Arlington. Since January, the site had been owned by the United States due to the purchase ordered by President Lincoln. In addition to being convenient to the hospitals in Washington and Alexandria, the high elevation of the site provided both pragmatic security from floods and the aesthetic beauty of the picturesque view to and from the capital. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, it was the former home of the leader of the Confederate Army—Robert E. Lee.

Montgomery Meigs, a prominent Washington, D.C. engineer and the Quartermaster General of the United States, assumed responsibility for ordering the first interments. In response to Rucker’s recommendation, General Meigs wrote on June 15, 1864:

The Arlington mansion and the grounds immediately surrounding it are by the direction of the Secretary of War appropriated for a Military Cemetery. The bodies of all soldiers dying in the hospitals in the vicinity of Washington and Alexandria after the grounds now at Alexandria are full will be interred in this cemetery. You will cause the grounds not exceeding 200 acres to be immediately surveyed, laid out and enclosed for this purpose not interfering with the grounds occupied by the freedman’s camp—I enclose a sketch showing the form and location . . . Mr. Edward Clark will act as Architect and Engineer of the Cemetery having accompanied me this morning on an inspection of the grounds he

154 In an omnibus act approved by President Lincoln on July 17, 1862, Section 18 provided: “That the President of the US shall have power, whenever in his opinion it shall be expedient, to purchase cemetery grounds and cause them to be securely enclosed to be used as a national cemetery for the soldiers who shall die in the service of the country.” Monro MacCloskey, Hallowed Ground: Our National Cemeteries. (New York, R. Rosen Press 1968).

155 The Old Soldiers Home, which held approximately 6,000 graves, was officially closed the same day that Arlington Cemetery opened. Congressional Serial No 1230-38 36th Congress, 2nd Session. House Executive Document for Quarter Master General.; M.C. Meig’s Report to Secretary of War dated November 8, 1864 by Capt. James M. Moore. NARA I RG 92.

156 The Battle of the Wilderness was a tactical Confederate victory. General Grant lost more than twice as many soldiers (about 18,000 to 8,000) as did Lee.”
In fact, the first burial already had occurred one month earlier on May 13, 1864 when Private William Henry Christman, a farmer from Pennsylvania, was interred at Arlington. He was buried near the cemetery that had been established to inter local contrabands, at the northeast corner of the old Arlington estate near the Alexandria and Georgetown Turnpike (now designated Section 27 of ANC). Meigs had apparently directed Clark to establish the burials “encircling” the mansion and when he made a subsequent visit, he discovered the graves of more soldiers in the northeast corner near the “contraband cemetery.” He was angry and personally paced off the graves and had laborers remove several coffins and have them reburied along the edge of the Lee flower garden.

Federal army officers, in contrast to enlisted men, were buried in a line along the flower garden. In all, forty-five officers were interred around the outside of the rectangular flower garden to the south of the mansion. The first, Captain Albert Packard, was buried four days after Private Christman. By the end of the month, over 2,600 individuals had been buried in the new cemetery.

In 1865, with the Civil War over, the primary objective of the Quartermaster General’s department, and therefore the principal duty of the cemetery staff, was to bury the dead. An ambitious federal program was initiated to locate, recover and re-inter thousands of deceased soldiers from battlefields and temporary burial sites associated with the military hospitals and posts. Within three years over fourteen thousand deceased soldiers, from many different battles and many different backgrounds, lay at Arlington—over three times as many as at any of the other thirty-three national cemeteries. In the early development of the national cemetery system, the desire for an organized design of grave plots and an efficient and aesthetic road system gave way to the need to accomplish interments quickly. But even such pragmatic

---

157 General Meigs to Secretary of War Edwin Stanton, June 15, 1864. NARA I RG 92 Consolidated Correspondence File, Old Military and Civilian Records. Meigs to Brig General D. H. Rucker Chief Quarter Master General, June 15, 1864. NARA I RG 92, Consolidated Correspondence File, Old Military and Civilian Records.  
158 A member of Company G of the 67 Penn Infantry became the first soldier to be buried at Arlington. Private William Christman died on May 11, 1864. L. Reinhart, Rebel, N.C. is listed as Running No 1. in a later register. He died on May 17, 1864.  
159 Meigs to Secretary of War Edwin Stanton, August 5, 1871; M.C. Meigs to Edwin Stanton, Secretary of War. April 14, 1873. NARA I. RG 92, Consolidated Correspondence File, Old Military and Civilian Records. Also Pryor, Reading the Man, p. 313.  
160 Pryor, Reading the Man, 313.  
161 According to the Report of the Secretary of War for the year 1866, the dead were disinterred from all parts of Maryland and Virginia within a circuit of thirty-five miles from Washington and “removed to the national cemetery at Arlington to the number” of approximately 2000. See Congressional Serial No. 1285 — 39th Congress, Second Session House Executive Documents 1866-1867. This was over three times as many as the next largest of the nine national cemeteries within the District of Washington in 1869. This included 15, 585 Union soldiers and 347 Confederate soldiers. Congressional Serial No 1412, 41st Congress. Second Session. House Executive Documents 1869-70. October 1869. NARA I. ARHO.
development was expensive. By 1867, the expenditure for Arlington, at over one hundred and seventy thousand dollars, was over three times as much as the next largest expenditure reported in the accounts of the Secretary of War.162

In February of 1867, the “Act to Establish and to Protect National Cemeteries” was passed by Congress, committing the nation to maintain a long-range fiscal policy regarding cemetery expenditures. Despite this the enormous outlay of funds required to erect permanent markers at hundreds of thousands of veterans’ graves around the country called for a special appropriation that finally came in 1873 when Congress set aside one million dollars for the erection of permanent headstones at national cemeteries.163 Until at least 1873, each soldier’s grave at Arlington was marked by a rounded headboard of oak or chestnut, whitewashed and printed with black lettering spelling out the names and regiments of each of the deceased. Another provision of the 1867 act was the construction of lodges to house a superintendent at each cemetery. Because Arlington’s superintendent lived in Arlington House, the construction of “suitable quarters” was not needed.

In 1866, at the order of Quartermaster General Montgomery Meigs, a large granite sarcophagus was placed just north of the flower garden in what had been the grove or woodland garden of Mary Custis and Mary Lee.164 By then evidence of the grove, adjacent to and west of the more formal flower garden, had almost disappeared. Its naturalistic design was hidden in luxuriant weeds and its once distinct paths lost among the beaten tracks of Union soldiers. A whitewashed fence, erected by the newly commissioned army staff, surrounded only the eastern half of the flower garden.165 If the war had not destroyed the woodland grove, this solemn monument, through its sheer size, most certainly did. A local newspaper described its creation in vivid detail:

---


163 The replacement of all wooden headboards with the specified headstones was completed nationwide in 1877 at a total cost of $786,360. A balance of $192,000 remained and it was then recommended to Congress that this money be used to mark those graves in national cemeteries not included by the Act of March 3, 1873, and for the erection of permanent markers at all known soldiers’ graves outside the national cemeteries. An act, approved February 3, 1879, authorized these expenditures and the second gravestone program was undertaken. Though Arlington was included under the 1873 cemetery appropriation, replacement had not yet begun by November of 1874. Monthly Report of the Condition of National Cemetery Arlington Virginia. November 1874. NARA I. ARHO. For further information about 1873 and 1879 Acts see website for Department of Veterans Affairs. Office of Facility Management at http://www.va.gov/


A more terrible spectacle can hardly be conceived than is to be seen within a
dozen rods of the Arlington mansion. A circular pit, twenty feet deep and the
same in diameter, has been sunk by the side of the flower garden, cemented and
divided into compartments and down into this gloomy receptacle are cast the
bones of such soldiers as perished on the field and either were not buried at all or
were so covered up as to have their bones mingle indiscriminately together. At
the time we looked into this gloomy cavern, a literal Golgotha, there were piled
together, skulls in one division, legs in another, arms in another, and ribs in
another, what were estimated as the bones of two thousand human beings.\textsuperscript{166}

The vault was sealed in September of 1866 with the remains of 2,111 unknown soldiers from the
battlefields of Bull Run and the Rappahannock River inside.\textsuperscript{167} As the first unknown soldiers’
memorial in Arlington cemetery, this monument came to symbolize the sacrifices of tens of
thousands of men, for almost half of all the soldiers who died in the Civil War were unknown.\textsuperscript{168}

In May of 1868, on the first official Memorial Day held in this country, under the portico of
Arlington the following address was given by Brigadier General James Garfield, future President
of the United States. In honoring the deceased soldiers he read,

What other spot so fitting for their last resting place as this, under the shadow of
the Capitol saved by their valor; Here where the grim edge of battle joined; Here
where all the hope and fear and agony of their country centered; here let them
rest, asleep in the nation’s heart.

Seven years ago, this was home of one who lifted his sword against that of his
country and who became the Emperor of the rebellion. The soil beneath our feet
once watered by the tears of slaves, in whose hearts the sight of yonder proud
capital awakened no pride and inspired no hope. The face of the goddess that
crowns it, was turned toward the sea and not toward them. But thanks be to God,
this arena of rebellion and slavery is a scene of violence and crime no longer!

This will be forever the sacred mountain of our Capital. Here is our temple, its
sacrament is the sarcophagus of the heroic hearts; its dome the bending of

\textsuperscript{166} National Intelligencer (1866) as quoted in In Honored Glory: Arlington National Cemetery the Final Post. by
\textsuperscript{167} “Decoration Day.” Washington Chronicle. May 30, 1874; “Notes on Research for South Garden,” ARHO. Also
in this report are listed the numbers of individuals buried at Arlington as follows: “8191 White Soldiers, 3720
Colored Soldiers and Contrabands” Thompson R. East, Superintendent, Arlington Cemetery, VA. “A Report and
Conditions and Requirements of the Cemetery under his Charge. Aug. 24, 1867.” NARA I. RG 92. Series
NM81E225. Title: Consolidated Correspondence File, Old Military and Civilian Records.
\textsuperscript{168} According to the “Secretary of War’s Report for November 20, 1868” in Congressional Serial No. 1367 40th
Congress, 3\textsuperscript{rd} Session 1868-69, House Executive Documents the total number of graves of Civil War soldiers
reported was 316, 233. Only the occupants of 175, 764 were identified. Seventy-two national cemeteries were
reported. NARA I.
heavens; its altar candles the watching stars. Hither our children’s children shall come to pay their tribute of grateful homage.\(^{169}\)

Over the next three decades, the War Department’s Quartermaster General’s office expanded and developed Arlington Cemetery. In response to the popularity and growing numbers attending Decoration Day (now Memorial Day) events at the cemetery, in 1873, Meigs had the Memorial Amphitheater erected just west of the Unknown Civil War Soldiers monument. In 1888, General Philip Sheridan became the first Union general to be buried on the east slope immediately in front of the house. Before this practice was discontinued around 1900, three esteemed Union generals were interred there under sizeable stone monuments.

In addition to the pragmatic elements of a burial ground—access roads, enclosure to prevent theft and to establish permanency, and thousands of wooden grave markers—elements were added to the landscape immediately surrounding Arlington House to support its use as a center of mourning and memorialization. The American flag, first attached to a staff on the peak of the pediment of Arlington’s portico in 1861 by Union soldiers, now flew from a pole directly in front of the portico stairs.\(^{170}\) The house, including the west façade which had been covered in stucco for the first time after the war, was repainted a light yellow in 1867.\(^{171}\) A white sign with black lettering reading “Superintendent” was hung above the central door on the west façade.

In the early 1870s, when the landscape gardener was hired, he too would have his home and office inside the Arlington mansion.\(^{172}\) Behind the main house, the old summer kitchen and slave quarters were decaying rapidly.\(^{173}\) These structures were used for storage and to house cemetery

\(^{169}\) This speech, delivered by General Garfield, later the president of the United States, was quoted in a letter written by Benjamin Austin, County Clerk, Alexandria (VA) to General Whitaker, 10 December 1882, National Archives, RG 92, Records of the Quartermaster General. Memorial Day was first proclaimed an official holiday on May 5, 1868 by General John Logan. Report of the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater Commission (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office 1923), 8.

\(^{170}\) The exact location of the flag pole during the subsequent restorations of Arlington House and grounds has been a subject of interest and contention for the past eighty years. No flag pole is illustrated in any documentation prior to the Civil War. The flag pole is first mentioned by William Howard Russell in his diary entry for July 8, 1861, printed in My Diary North and South (Boston : T.O.H.P. Burnham, 1863): 394. The collection of photographs taken by Andrews Russell 1864, however, does not show a flag pole. Yet, the map created to inventory the site prior to the formal formation of the cemetery (1864) does show a flag staff located to the immediate east of the portico, approximately twenty feet from the portico steps. See endnote 26. The first official mention of the flagpole is in the Monthly Report of the Cemetery Superintendent August 1874. NARA I RG 92. Copy Date files, ARHO. See Memorandum, Report on Flagpole at Lee Mansion National Memorial, by Murray H. Nelligan. Randle B. Truett, Chief National Memorials and Historic Sites Division to the Superintendent. February 16, 1951. ARHO.

\(^{171}\) Monthly Report for the Arlington National Cemetery, August 1867. NARA I. RG 92. Box 132. Copy in date files, ARHO.

\(^{172}\) Ibid. See also Benjamin Marchus, Ed. Washington during War Time; a series of papers showing the military, political, and social phases during 1861 to 1865. Official souvenir of the Thirty-sixth annual encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic; collected and ed. by Marcus Benjamin under the direction of the Committee on literature for the encampment, (Washington, D.C.: The National Tribune co. 1902): 83.

\(^{173}\) Monthly Report of on the Condition of the National Cemetery at Arlington for the month of April 1869; Monthly report for March 1871, NARA I, RG 92, Entry No. 576, Box No. 132.
workers, some of whom were former slaves of Custis. Around the flower garden and on the slopes to the east and south of the house, the lawn had been resodded.

In 1873, David H. Rhodes, a trained landscape gardener, was hired by the Quartermaster Generals Office to oversee the development of Arlington. Rhodes quickly took charge. By 1874, the monthly report of the cemetery superintendent listed all the buildings in good condition. 174 “Neat houses” were erected over the well and a glass roof was installed on the conservatory of the main house to provide better growing conditions. 175 The neat house consisted of a simple hipped-roof, four post structure that prevented leaves and other debris from contaminating the well water. Pumps replaced the rope and buckets. 176 In the spring of 1874 benches with curving cast iron frames and simple wooden slat seats were purchased. 177 Iron urns painted white and filled with annuals were placed in various locations around the building. Behind the house in a circular bed Rhodes planted two Cedrus deodara, or Deodar Cedars. 178 In addition, he believed that the house, standing starkly on the crest of the hill, needed foundation plantings to blend the architecture gracefully with its surroundings. Therefore in 1878 he planted magnolia trees in front of each wing of the main house with plantings of specimen evergreens at the foundation, including “boxwood, yews and arbor vitae.” Quartermaster General Montgomery Meigs continued to make suggestions for increasing the beauty of the landscape at Arlington. “Please give orders that clumps of caladium esculentum and of canna [annual flowers] be planted next season in front of the mansion at Arlington,” he wrote. The planting beds were created next to the base of the flag pole along the drive immediately east of Arlington House. 179

As decades passed, aging veterans of the Civil War passed away in greater and greater numbers and an increasing number of visitors trekked to the cemetery. Organizations of widows and elderly soldiers around the country gathered to raise money to erect monuments to past military glories. Even those that did not mourn at the graves visited the cemetery to view the memorials. Through the late nineteenth-century the use of cemeteries as public parks, for picnicking and contemplating nature, gained social acceptance and heightened their popularity as recreational destinations. Moreover, construction of the electric rail lines during the early 1890s coupled with cessation of tolls on the bridge from Georgetown across the Potomac, made travel to Arlington more economical. Visitors came to Arlington every month out of sadness, pride,

174 During this time, the eastern room of the southern slave quarters was occupied by building materials, the center section tools and the far room by the watchman and laborer. (1873 and for 7-8 years after.) From 1885 until 1930 this building was home of J. H Marcey and family in order that he might oversee the greenhouse and stock of plants in the absence of the Landscape Gardener, who for many years, had extensive detached duties at other points to perform. D. H. Rhodes, “Historic Memories of Arlington . . . “, 1.
177 Major Myers to Quarter Master General, May 25, 1874. NARA I RG 92.
178 These trees were purchased from trees purchased, in six inch pots, from the John Saul Nursery at 7th Street Washington, D.C. Rhodes, “Memories”: 10. ARHO.
179 Montgomery Meigs to Captain A. F. Rockwell, Assistant Quartermaster General, Washington, D.C., October 3, 1874. NARA I RG 92. Consolidated Correspondence of the Quartermaster General. ARHO.
nationalism, and curiosity. By the end of the 19th century, their numbers would increase tenfold. Expanded facilities were required not only to maintain the cemetery grounds, but to provide for the needs of these new visitors.

Water was needed for irrigation and drinking. During the early 1880s when new water lines were being installed at Fort Myer and Arlington Cemetery, a brick water tower was built to the west of Arlington House, within what had been the work yard. By the late 1880s, a powered pump set within a wooden encasement had been installed in the Custis-Lee era well to provide drinking water. The simple hipped-roof pavilion that sheltered the well was replaced with a more ornate version in the 1880s. Public lavatories were built immediately north of the northern slave quarter. The vine-covered, former slave quarters were used for storage and for housing.

The addition of land to the cemetery grounds was accompanied by changes to the structures as well. New slate roofs were added to the slave quarters, stable and to the wings of the mansion. In order to supply the demand for vegetation to plant throughout the growing cemetery grounds, in 1888 the War Department constructed a large, new greenhouse and a potting shed building in the eastern half of what had been the kitchen garden. The greenhouse was one hundred feet long and thirty feet wide, with a brick foundation and glass walls set within an iron frame. The two-story potting building attached to the immediate north of the greenhouse remains on site today; it serves as the National Park Service museum building.

An access road between the yard area to the west of the mansion and the potting house was built along the western edge of what had been the kitchen garden area. Between the access road and greenhouse were a series of plats for plant propagation.

In 1885 the flower garden of Arlington House was completely redesigned, at the direction of Colonel R. N. Batchelder, the officer then in charge of the cemetery and with the approval of the Quartermaster General. The plan, designed by Rhodes, called for the removal of the Custis-Lee era arbor that stood at the center of the flower garden. The entire site was plowed up and regraded. New entrances to the garden, one each on the east, west and south sides, augmented the original entrance on the north. New walks, crossing the garden from north to south and east

---

180 The pump was removed shortly thereafter, however, due to the accumulation of a disagreeable odor when the top of the well platform was closed. Hanna, CLR, 118.
to west, connected to the existing walks around the Tomb of the Unknown Civil War Soldier to the west. These gravel walks met under the dome of the new Temple of Fame. The paling fence that the War Department had erected early on was removed leaving the officers graves in clear view of the Temple. Built at the direction of Montgomery Meigs, the Temple of Fame was an eight-sided, temple-form pavilion that incorporated stone columns, entablature and frieze elements salvaged from the U.S. Patent Office building after a large fire destroyed portions of the structure in 1877. About a year after construction of the Temple of Fame, the names of Civil War heroes of the Union Army were engraved into the frieze around the domed roof and onto the columns. For the next seventy years, the Temple of Fame served as a focal point within the Arlington House grounds; in 1967 in preparation for the flower garden restoration, the NPS removed the Temple of Fame.

Transportation links and circulation were improved as well. In the 1890s, two electric railways provided access to the cemetery. The Arlington and Falls Church Electric Railway ran to the northwest of Arlington House and provided a stop at the Fort Myer Gate into Arlington National Cemetery. To the east of Arlington House, the Washington, Alexandria and Mount Vernon Electric Railway ran along what had once been the Alexandria and Georgetown Turnpike, by then renamed the Alexandria and Georgetown Road. The rail stop was located at the Sheridan Gate. By 1893, a paved walk, later named the “Custis Walk,” extended from the Sheridan Gate entrance up the slope to Arlington House, the central administration building and the focal point for visitation. The southernmost segment of Custis walk lies within the historic district. Other site improvements aimed at easing visitor access was the introduction of granite pavers and scored concrete paving surrounding Arlington House.

By the last years of the 19th century, Arlington National Cemetery had grown into a national landscape of mourning; a place to honor all who fought for the defense of their land and honor. The sinking of the U.S.S. Maine in Havana Harbor in 1898 and the removal of the drowned
sailors’ bodies for interment at Arlington, signaled the national significance that this particular national cemetery held in the minds of most Americans. It was the fitting and logical place to mourn a national tragedy and to honor American ideals.

By extension, Arlington House played a similar role. As the operations center of the cemetery and as a known historic site linked not only to the “adopted son” of George Washington, but of the defender of the south and hero of the Lost Cause, Robert E. Lee, the house was a relic, but also a link to a nation struggling to reunite. One observer, whose brother had just died in the Spanish-American War, summed up Arlington House’s symbolic power this way:

Indeed not even hallowed Mount Vernon is so rich in historic associations, for Arlington is at once the old home of the adopted son of George Washington . . . the former home of the principal actor in the drama of the ‘Lost Cause’ and as such endeared to all Southerners; the last resting-place of thousands of heroic defenders of the Union and therefore cherished at countless firesides in every Northern State; and, finally, the eternal bivouac of hundreds of gallant martyrs of our recent war for suffering humanity, by whose solemn advent Arlington has been consecrated anew as truly a National Cemetery.190

By 1904 the total number of individuals buried in the cemetery reached 19,734.191 Though the burial of Union officers in the vicinity of Arlington House no longer occurred, a few interments were made near the house. Captain John Williams, who had been killed almost one hundred years previously in the East Florida campaign of 1812, was reinterred at Arlington at the southern end of the flower garden. The stone slab which lay upon his grave in his original burial spot in the cemetery in St. Mary’s, Georgia was placed over the new grave. In 1911 Pierre Charles L’Enfant, U.S. Engineer and brevet major in the army during the Revolutionary War who had been commissioned to design the original plan for the City of Washington, was reinterred just east of the front of Arlington House, regardless of the regulations to cease burial on the slope.192 The classically-styled monument of white marble was placed to overlook

---

191 Ibid, April 28, 1904.
192 L’Enfant was born in Paris, France August 2, 1754 and died June 14, 1825. He was buried at Green Hill in Prince George County, Maryland. See “Green Hill, (PG:65-8)” Maryland Historical Trust, Maryland Inventory of Historic Properties Form (1990), and National Park Service, Fort Washington Park Cultural Landscape Inventory (NPS, 1998; Revised 2006), pp. 35-36. L’Enfant’s reburial site at ANC was selected by the City’s Board of Commissioners with the assistance of U.S. Army Captain A. B. Shattuck who was then in charge of National Cemeteries. See Arlington national Cemetery website:
Washington, DC with its gridded and radial streets laid out by L'Enfant over two hundred years prior.\footnote{L’Enfant, \textit{Plan of the City Intended for the Permanent Seat of the Government of the United States}, Facsimile of a manuscript by Peter Charles L’Enfant in the Library of Congress. Published in Washington by the U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey, 1887.}

\textbf{Restoration, Museum, and Memorial, 1925 - 1935}

Although initially not acquired for its historic or symbolic significance, Arlington House eventually became one of the federal government’s earliest comprehensive forays into historic preservation and house museums. Undertaken by the War Department at the direction of the United States Congress, the restoration of Arlington House and its adjacent buildings and landscapes represents an early national response to the federal acquisition and preservation of historic sites under the aegis of the War Department and prior to the National Park Service’s consolidation of historic monuments in the 1930s. Arlington House is important in the early development of historic preservation techniques. It illustrates the efforts of early-20\textsuperscript{th}-century architects and connoisseurs to restore sites of national importance. Much of the restored fabric remains in place today and provides a physical link to the decisions and ideology of those that led the restoration efforts between 1920 and 1935.

Although public interest in the fate and symbolism of the Arlington estate began shortly after the United States government seized the property in 1861, its meaning to the American people differed widely based on varying sectional perspectives. During the early 1920s, a behind-the-scenes struggle over what Arlington House and the surrounding cemetery landscape would represent ensued. The struggle reflects both the slow healing of the sectional divide that the Civil War rendered, as well as a resurgence in patriotism and national identity. The mechanism and details of the restoration effort reflects trends in historic preservation that would resolve into the professionalization of the profession in the mid-20\textsuperscript{th} century.

\textit{The Veneration of Robert E. Lee}

Even prior to Robert E. Lee’s death in 1870, many recognized Arlington House as a potent American symbol and some thought of it as a national shrine. Much like his father-in-law’s association with the founder of the nation, Lee’s link to the pivotal events of the Civil War and the drama of the military and later funerary seizure of the land, imbued the property with importance recognized by many visitors.

Shortly after Lee’s death in 1870, Southern poet Sidney Lanier proposed that a memorial hall be erected to the iconic military hero of the Confederacy. During the decade of Reconstruction that
followed the Civil War, in an attempt to reconcile their defeat, Southern journalists and former Confederate leaders developed and promoted an alternative history of the Civil War that sought to present the war in the most positive terms possible. Known as “the Lost Cause,” this version of events romanticized the antebellum “Old South” and focused on nostalgia. Proponents of the Lost Cause asserted that states’ rights, not slavery had caused the Civil War; that African Americans were willing, loyal servants and that former slaves could not function in society without their masters. In addition, supporters of the Lost Cause argued that the military defeat of the Confederacy was solely due to the overwhelming numbers and resources of the North, and that Southern soldiers were heroic and saintly.

Robert E. Lee became the central figure in the quest to deify the Confederacy’s military leaders. After his death in 1870, two organizations formed to eulogize Lee: the Lee Memorial Association was established in Lexington, Virginia where Lee died and former Confederate General Jubal Early founded the Lee Monument Association in Richmond. While neither association was immediately successful in erecting a monument, interest in Lee and his connection to the Lost Cause grew as the century progressed. In 1883, Washington and Lee College (renamed from Washington College in 1870 following Robert E. Lee’s death) opened a mausoleum addition to the campus chapel with a marble statue of Lee, and by 1890, an equestrian statue to Lee stood on Monument Avenue in Richmond, Virginia.

By 1907 when Washington and Lee University celebrated the centennial of Lee’s birth, veneration of Lee was no longer confined to former Confederates. That year, President Theodore Roosevelt wrote to the committee that organized the centennial celebration expressing his esteem for Lee. The president’s words reflected a growing acceptance throughout the South and the North of the tenets of the Lost Cause. In 1909, Woodrow Wilson (U.S. President, 1913-1921), while still a professor at Princeton University, delivered a highly flattering lecture on Robert E. Lee. In 1915, historian Douglas Southall Freeman published Lee’s Dispatches, a compilation of Lee’s long-lost wartime letters and orders. Four years later, the Lee Highway

194 Spanning the years 1865 to 1877, the Reconstruction Era refers to the period following the American Civil War when the federal government addressed how states that had seceded in 1861 would be readmitted to the Union and regain self-governance. The government imposed military rule and civil reform in the southern United States and starting in 1866, Radical Republicans in Congress passed a series of laws aimed at removing former Confederates from power, enfranchising the Freedmen, and establishing a free-labor economic system. Reconstruction eventually failed. By 1877, Southern Democrats had regained power in all the former Confederate states, and by the turn of the 20th century, they had re instituted white supremacy.

195 http://www.encyclopediavirginia.org/Lost_Cause_The#start_entry The term “Lost Cause” comes from the book published in 1866 by the influential wartime editor of the Richmond Examiner, Edward A. Pollard. Pollard’s book titled The Lost Cause: A New Southern History of the War of the Confederates (1866), began the fascination with rewriting history in terms more complimentary and palatable to defeated Southerners.
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Association formed in Roanoke, Virginia with the goal of establishing a cross-country roadway as a memorial to Lee. 197

**Early Federal Historic Preservation Efforts and Preservation in Washington, D.C.**

Interest in Lee and places related to him combined with a patriotic trend in American culture spurred the acquisition and preservation of historic sites. While veneration of Washington and other heroes and sites related to the American Revolution date back to the early years of the nation, projects were sporadic and generally were led by private groups, or in limited cases, by state or city officials. Federal government involvement in the protection and interpretation of historic sites did not arise until the last decades of the 19th century. Between 1881 and 1884, the federal government erected the Yorktown Victory Monument on the Revolutionary War battlefield in Virginia; in 1890, Congress established the nation’s first national military park at Chickamauga and Chattanooga battlefield; and in 1892, the nation’s first prehistoric and cultural preserve was established to protect the Native American ruins at Casa Grande Arizona.

At the same time local interest in marking and preserving important historic sites was blossoming in the nation’s capital. In 1892, by a joint resolution, Congress established the Memorial Association of the District of Columbia. The association’s members were appointed by the U.S. president, vice president, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Their group’s stated goals were:

- to preserve the “most noteworthy houses”... “that have been made historic by the residence of the greatest men of the nation”;
- to mark, “by tablets the houses and places thru-out the city of chief interest”; and,
- to cultivate “that historic spirit and reverence for the memories of the founders and leaders of the Republic upon which an intelligent and abiding patriotism so largely depends.” 198

The association’s charter stated that any historic sites that the group acquired would be owned by the United States, and controlled by the association with Congressional oversight. In order to promote its work, the association published several booklets highlighting important houses and places in the District, including Suter’s Tavern, the Capitol, Octagon House, Kalorama, Tudor Place, the Washington Monument, and Arlington House. 199 In 1896, the Memorial Association achieved a primary goal when Congress authorized the federal purchase of the Peterson House

---
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where President Lincoln died in Washington, DC. This was the first historic property purposefully acquired by the federal government for purposes of its preservation and public access.200

In 1903, Congress authorized the “restoration” of the White House. The final project report prepared by project architects McKim, Meade and White, noted that one of the restoration directions given by President Theodore Roosevelt was that “none of the essential features of the White House should be sacrificed in the restoration; that the nation’s historic house should be left intact....” The final report presented to the president included a five-page history of the White House with 14 illustrations. The historical section was prepared by Charles Moore, possibly while he served as secretary of the Senate Park Commission that produced the influential City Beautiful McMillan Plan of 1901.201 The reliance on historical background data and the desire to preserve the historic parts of the building were hallmarks of a new age in historic preservation, one that placed growing importance on authenticity and research.

The War Department’s Role

Prior to the 1930s, the War Department was directly or indirectly involved in most federal historic sites, many of which were battlefields. The first four National Military Parks established between 1890 and 1899 were overseen by local commissions made up of veterans and avocational military historians. During the late 19th century, American historians began to follow the lead of German scholars who were placing greater emphasis on scientific accuracy in historical work; thus, careful research, documentation, and mapping of troop movements became a critical part of preserving and marking historic battlefields. The legacy of the early military parks is important in the development of the modern historic preservation movement and in the formulation of federal preservation policy. Among the legacies of the early War Department Military Park efforts was a broad-based landscape preservation approach based on thorough research and documentation, continued traditional land use through use-and-occupancy agreements, and the administration of the parks by three-man commissions that reported to the War Department. Perhaps the most concrete and important legacy of the military parks was the landmark 1896 U.S. Supreme Court decision (U.S. v. Gettysburg Electric Railway Co.) that affirmed the federal government’s constitutional authority to acquire and preserve historic sites and places.202

As the keeper of significant battlefield sites, the War Department eventually became the default caretaker for a variety of historic properties, not all related to military history. One of these was Lincoln’s Birthplace in Springfield, Illinois, which the United States acquired by Congressional authority in 1916. Arlington House was another unique example of a non-military historic property maintained by the War Department. As part of a National Cemetery, the management of Arlington House fell under the Quartermaster Department whose construction division had responsibility for development and maintenance of the National Cemeteries.203

Historic House Museums

The American historic preservation movement unfolded against the backdrop of the Colonial Revival movement, a cultural trend that gained adherents after the Civil War. As America’s growing fascination with its Colonial and Federal period history gained steam, scholars expanded their study of architecture and artifacts associated with America’s past. The 1876 International Centennial Exposition in Philadelphia popularized all things “colonial” and revived interest in what was seen as the nation’s glorious history of patriotism and self-determination.

An outgrowth of this cultural patriotism was the historic house movement which initially focused attention on sites and buildings associated with the origins of the nation, including George Washington as the father of our country, and the American Revolution.204 The first Washington site to be acquired specifically for the purpose of preservation was the Hasbrouck House in Newburgh; the state of New York purchased it in 1850. Mount Vernon was acquired in 1853 by a group of wealthy women led by Ann Pamela Cunningham. By 1895 there were about twenty house museums operating in the United States; by 1910 there were nearly 100 and in 1933, the American Association of Museums reported 400 house museums operating in the United States.205 The astonishing popularity of the automobile fueled huge increases in travel and demand for destinations; house museums and historic sites became popular destinations.

203 NARA Guide to Federal records (online): Records of the Office of the Quartermaster General, Record Group 92: “Records of the Construction Division, 1819-1941; also Records of the Memorial Division; also Records of War Department Commissions Concerned with Military Cemeteries and Battlefield Parks. The Quartermaster Department (QMD) established its first centralized construction service in 1864 as part of its Sixth Division. Pursuant to an 1867 law, the Sixth Division was also responsible for burials and establishment and maintenance of national cemeteries. After several reorganizations, name changes, and expansion and divisions of duties, by 1918 these two functions became the responsibility of the Construction Division and the Cemeterial Division (later the Graves Registration Service and later the Memorial Division) of the QMD. The Construction Division was abolished in 1941 and the Office of the Chief of Engineers (later the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers) took over responsibility for all Army construction projects.


Arlington House: Public and Private Preservation Efforts, 1919 - 1925

Interest in the “Lee Mansion” appeared during the Civil War. General McDowell, who occupied the house and grounds as a military headquarters between May 1861 and December 1862, noted “the crowd of curiosity-seekers constantly coming here.” By 1906 when Congress authorized renovations to the property, the Quartermaster already recognized the house as historic. That year, a quartermaster inspector stated in a report that “This is an historic building and should be safeguarded in every possible way.”

From 1864 until at least 1914, the quartermaster corps maintained, repaired, and made improvements to Arlington House and the surrounding cemetery with no external input. Unlike most national cemeteries, Arlington had no purpose-built superintendent’s lodge. Instead, the historic house and its immediate grounds served as the administrative core of the cemetery as well as housing its primary employees. Between 1864 and 1929, Arlington House contained the cemetery’s administrative offices along with living quarters for the superintendent and the head gardener and their families. The grounds surrounding the house contained various maintenance buildings, greenhouses, and propagation gardens for the cemetery. Ceremonial and funerary spaces existed alongside the utilitarian buildings and spaces. The memorial amphitheater, the Temple of Fame, the flower garden and the surrounding officers’ graves lent gravity to the place. During the War Department’s occupancy of the house, the quartermaster corps completed improvements and repairs including construction of partitions to create private living areas and public offices, repairs and upgrades to the heating system, installation of electric lighting, replacement of the roofing and some of the floors.

By 1920, interest in Lee, the growing popularity of house museums, and a blossoming national urge to preserve historic sites converged. Nearly simultaneous interest in restoration of the Custis-Lee home arose from two directions: one public and one private. Before 1920, the U.S. Commission of Fine Arts (CFA)—a quasi-governmental design oversight board—began actively advising the cemetery on its landscape design. Formed in 1910 by an act of Congress, CFA was an advisory board charged with overseeing the implementation of the ground-breaking 1901 McMillan Plan for Washington, D.C. The commission’s secretary was Charles Moore,

---


209 For detailed construction history, see Snell, HSR, vol. 1, Section III.C. Arlington House Under the Administration of the War Department, 1861-1933 (NPS, December 1985).

210 Established in 1901 through the efforts of Michigan Senator James McMillan (served 1889-1902), the Senate Park Commission (popularly known as the McMillan Commission) was tasked with developing a design plan that would guide the development of monumental Washington and its park system. The commission members were
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Senator McMillan’s former political secretary. Moore later served as one of the first chairmen of the CFA (1915-1937). During his 22-year tenure as chairman (1915-1937), he exerted enormous influence on many pivotal monumental works in Washington D.C. Moore was also a presidential scholar, and according to Washington, D.C. historian Pamela Scott, Moore maintained a lifelong interest in George Washington and Washington’s legacy in the capital city. In 1926, he published a book titled Family Life of George Washington; in it, he included a chapter on “George Washington Parkie Custis of Arlington” that related the history of the estate and its occupants prior to the Civil War. Moore emphasized the house’s Custis connections and revealed his preference for the architecture of the “first half-century of the Republic, the best period of American architecture.”

After the CFA was established in 1910, one of its first major duties was advising on the location and design of the Lincoln Memorial (dedicated in 1922). In the process of working on the Lincoln Memorial and other monuments and memorials in the District, the commission began to consider the design of the planned Arlington Memorial Bridge and the former Arlington estate across the Potomac River. Moore and the other commissioners viewed the cemetery and

distinguished architects, landscape architects, and artists who worked to reestablish the preeminence of Pierre L’Enfant’s 1791 design for Washington D.C. through a series of recommendations based both on primary research of L’Enfant’s work and on information gathered on the commission’s sojourns to various European capitals. The McMillan commission members included Daniel Burnham, a well-known architect who had overseen the creation of the “White City” for the Chicago World’s Fair in 1893; Charles McKim of the architectural firm McKim, Mead and White known for their classically styled works; Augustus St. Gaudens, a highly respected sculptor; and Frederick Law Olmsted Jr., a well-known landscape architect. For a detailed history of the commission and the plan, see Sue Kohler and Pamela Scott, eds. Designing the Nation’s Capital: The 1901 Plan for Washington, D.C. (Washington, DC: U.S. Commission of Fine Arts, 2006).


212 Born in Ypsilanti, Michigan in 1855, Charles Moore (1855-1942) graduated from Harvard University in 1878. His early career in journalism in Detroit shifted after about 1889 when he was sent as a correspondent to Washington, D.C. There he met Michigan Senator James McMillan. In 1890, McMillan hired Moore as his political secretary, and in 1901 appointed him to the Senate Park Commission. Moore played an important role in the commission’s report that would guide the development of monumental Washington as we know it today. After Senator McMillan’s death in 1902, Moore returned to Detroit, but he remained active with design and historical research in Washington.


214 Congress had authorized the Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission (AMBC) in 1913, but the commission remained unfunded until 1922, at which time, it requested the advice of the CFA. In its 1924 report the AMBC acknowledged the cemetery grounds and the Arlington House mansion as one of the seven essential parts of the memorial bridge project. Their recommendations suggested leaving the “portion of the Cemetery grounds intervening directly between the [proposed] main entrance … and the Lee Mansion in practically its present informal condition, eliminating but two or three trees to enable the visitor to see the Lee mansion from below…..”

Section 8 page 98
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Arlington House as crucial elements in the overall plan for the monumental setting of Washington.

The McMillan Commission's recommendations, popularly referred to as the McMillan Plan of 1901, adopted the position that the Arlington estate and the national cemetery thereon would play an important role in the development of the city's park system and in the vision for a monumental core for the city. The planners envisioned a "close link" between the Washington and Arlington shores of the Potomac via a memorial bridge. The relationship was seen in terms of its symbolic importance as a physical link between the North -- represented by the proposed Lincoln Memorial on the D.C. side -- and the South -- represented by Arlington House. The plan also emphasized the need to impose "simplicity and uniformity" in the cemetery landscape in order to improve its aesthetics and to promote a dignified and noble atmosphere for soldiers' burials. 215

Sometime prior to 1919, Moore began advising the superintendent of the Arlington Cemetery on landscape improvements that would fit with the CFA's vision for the Memorial Bridge and the cemetery. CFA minutes reveal that prior to March 1919 the commission had written to the cemetery superintendent suggesting landscape changes around the mansion that he felt were needed to improve the setting of the "dignified old mansion." With the superintendent's cooperation, the commission members visited the mansion and placed the commission's landscape architect, James Greenleaf, in charge of preparing recommendations for improvements that would conform to the simplicity and dignity called for in the 1901 McMillan Commission Plan. 216

On November 27, 1920, Col. H. C. Bonnycastle, quartermaster commanding the Washington Depot, prepared the following comments on a November 1st "Report Pertaining to Arlington Cemetery for the Commission of Fine Arts":

So far as the mansion is concerned and views, as the Committee of Fine Arts does, this office does not feel that the mansion is properly presented to the public.

It has been suggested that the south wing might be restored and given a finish in keeping with the north wing, the building furnished throughout with furniture of the proper period and the whole building throughout open to the public. 217

The proposed new main entrance to the cemetery was located at the terminus of an avenue that would extend the bridge to the base of the hill upon which the mansion stands. 214


216 Commission of Fine Arts, Meeting Minutes: March 10, 1919; March 21, 1919. On file at the Commission of Fine Arts, Washington, D.C.

217 RG 92, Entry 1891, Box 75, File 687.
Although the exact origin of these restoration proposals is unclear, it is clear from later accounts that the CFA and the War Department discussed the state of the house and its interiors. Restoration plans were underway as early as 1921.

Moore and the members of the CFA were not the only parties interested in the development of Arlington. For years, visitors had commented on the disappointing appearance of the house, especially the interior. In 1905, celebrated English novelist Iza Duffus Hardy lamented after a visit to Arlington House:

> It is empty and ungarnished. Its bare floors echo mournfully to our footfalls. The lofty rooms are spotless and utterly forlorn, the desolate silence only broken by our own steps. .... More mournful a memorial than granite slab... the forsaken mansion stands, a silent monument to the Lost Cause.\(^\text{218}\)

A prominent member of the United Daughters of the Confederacy (UDC) likewise described her reaction to the barren interior, exclaiming “I was astonished and appalled at the barrenness of the whole building. Its life, its soul had been taken from it.”\(^\text{219}\)

In addition, views concerning the historical value of the house varied, reflecting the many opinions about the rights and wrongs, causes and effects of the Civil War. In Moore’s case, his viewpoint was shaped also by his aesthetic connection to early American architecture and the lives of the heroes of the early Republic.

From at least as early as the late 1860s, Arlington National Cemetery had been revered by those sympathetic to the Union cause. The sectionalism that had divided the country and prevented Arlington National Cemetery from attaining complete national acceptance had been assuaged first by the Spanish-American War and then fully diffused by the tremendous cost of World War I. For instance, southwest of Arlington House, a Confederate Monument first proposed by Congress in 1900 had been dedicated in 1914.

By the 1920s, the public and government officials generally recognized Arlington House’s significance as a setting of the early history of the Republic—as the property of the adopted grandson of George Washington. Homage was also paid to the structure and grounds as the home of Robert E. Lee. For these two reasons, according to contemporary commentators, Arlington House deserved better than to be left to slow deterioration.

According to some, the proper action was to restore the house and grounds to the moment of Lee’s departure in 1861, as a revered monument to the primary hero of the Southern


\(^{219}\) Quoted in Karen Byrne Kinzey, “Battling For Arlington House: To Lee or Not to Lee?” *Arlington Historical Magazine* (October 2003), 21.
Confederacy. Others proposed that a museum be created within its walls—a museum to honor the Union forces. Still others believed that restoration of the house and grounds should reflect the days of Custis. Although the interpretation of the building and grounds as a memorial to Robert E. Lee would eventually prevail, the first complete restoration of the house (1925-1935) actually reflected the period of the early Republic.

One disappointed young visitor to Arlington House around the turn of the 20th century went on to spearhead a public campaign to restore the house as a memorial to Robert E. Lee. Frances Parkinson Keyes (nee Wheeler, 1885-1970) visited when she was thirteen; five years later she married Republican Senator Henry Wilder Keyes of New Hampshire. After moving to Washington, D.C., she became active in the social and political life surrounding Congress. In addition to her role as political wife, Frances Parkinson Keyes made a name for herself by becoming a noted author and magazine editor and contributor.

During her husband’s tenure in the Senate (1919 to 1937), Frances Parkinson Keyes worked as a contributing editor for Good Housekeeping Magazine. In the 1920s, she began writing a column titled “Letters from a Senator’s Wife,” that recounted her activities in Washington along with commenting on the political and social life in the nation’s capital.

In 1921, Keyes began promoting a plan to restore Arlington House as a memorial to Robert E. Lee. On July 31, 1921, the Washington Post reported that Keyes had met with a local chapter of the United Daughters of the Confederacy in Upperville, Virginia to discuss the project. The chapter agreed to lead an effort to persuade the national UDC to undertake the restoration. A week later the Post reported on their plan:

The southern colony in Washington has become greatly interested in the proposition made by Mrs. Frances Parkinson Keyes, wife of the Senator from New Hampshire, and a group of friends to form an association of women similar to the regents of Mount Vernon whose purpose will be to restore the Lee mansion at Arlington National Cemetery to its original appearance.

220 For instance, in February 1926 a bill was proposed outlining the use of Arlington House as a museum for trophies and emblems of the Union Army and Navy of the United States during the Civil War. Feb 17, 1926. (69th Congress, 1st Session. S3180).
The same article noted that Chairman Charles Moore supported the restoration and that the CFA would review and approve all donations of furniture or other artifacts offered to furnish the house.

Keyes took her cause nationwide in August of 1921, using her *Good Housekeeping* column as a platform to persuade its readership, mainly women, that the restoration in honor of Lee was a moral duty. In her August 1921 installment of “Letters from a Senator’s Wife” she made an impassioned appeal to her readers:

> Whatever our opinions and traditions may be, [...] we all realize now that Robert E. Lee was one of the greatest generals and one of the noblest men who ever lived. To every American woman the abuse of his home must seem a disgrace; to every Southern woman it must seem a sacrilege.  

In her article, Keyes used the example of the Lee Mansion as a case against the proposition then being considered of the government taking over Mount Vernon. Later columns included further appeals that described various meetings with women’s groups, including a speech she gave to a committee of the UDC’s annual national convention in Richmond in 1922.

After reading about Keyes’ plans in the newspaper, Charles Moore wrote to Keyes in the late summer of 1921, informing her that:

> This commission [CFA] has made plans for the treatment of the grounds around the mansion, with a view of restoring to them the character of a house of that period. These plans are now before the Secretary of War for adoption and we have no reason to think that they will not be adopted since they have been approved by the Quartermaster General and those in charge of the cemetery.

> The matter of getting furniture and pictures for the house is one that has had the attention of the Commission for several years past, and the obstacles are better explained verbally than written about.

In his letter, Moore invited Keyes to meet with him at Arlington to “show you some of the large projects that are now under way.” The visit was delayed however, because Keyes already had left Washington on vacation; their meeting would not take place until the following summer.

---

224 Frances Parkinson Keyes, “Letters from a Senator’s Wife,” *Good Housekeeping Magazine* v. 73, no. 3 (August 1921) 131.
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In September of 1921, the CFA discussed the restoration of the mansion and the acceptance of donated furnishings. The minutes record that the commission had developed a plan “to restore the Mansion” and that citizens had begun to offer furnishings. They stated that “now that the landscape plan of the Commission for the grounds surrounding the Mansion has been adopted it would be desirable to equip the interior so that the Mansion would be of historical interest, as Mount Vernon.” The report goes on to describe how portraits and other paintings could be acquired and recommend how the interiors be treated:

The rooms on the north side of the building, occupied by the Superintendent of Arlington Cemetery, are being kept as they were at the time General Lee lived there. The office now in the Mansion should be removed to the [new] Arlington Amphitheater, as the flag pole.227

In the late summer and fall of 1922, Keyes’ efforts began to bear fruit. Late that summer, she visited Arlington with Chairman Moore who showed her the “plans of improvement” that the CFA had developed with the cemetery superintendent, who she reported was “also deeply interested” in the restoration of the house.228 Just a week prior to her visit, Representative Bill G. Lowrey of Mississippi had made a speech in the House of Representatives urging Congress to pass a bill in support of the restoration of Arlington as a monument to Lee. This speech repeated an appeal he had first made in June 1921 at a gathering of the Washington chapter of the United Confederate Veterans organization at Arlington Cemetery. In his original address, Lowrey argued:

Let the home of Lee, as the home of Washington, be held sacred in the hearts of the people. Let it be kept in its original form and beauty, the peculiar care and treasure of the Daughters of the Confederacy, as Mount Vernon is kept by a band of noble women.229

In his 1922 reprisal on the floor of the House of Representatives, Lowrey acknowledged the work of Frances Parkinson Keyes as the leader of the movement and he urged the House to support the restoration of Arlington House as the Lee Mansion.230

In August 1922, the secretary of war weighed in on the restoration plan in a letter to a senator who had questioned the idea. The secretary asserted that he would not support the transfer of the mansion to any outside organization because of its sensitive location within a national cemetery.

227 Commission of Fine Arts, Minutes of the meetings held 22-23 September 1921, On file at CFA, Washington, D.C.
He was supportive of making it a receptacle for Lee family items, but he did not want it made into a "general memorial hall." The quartermaster general interpreted this to mean that no donated furnishings should be accepted except those related to the Lees.231

Meanwhile, Moore and the CFA continued their efforts to have the Victorian-era plantings and site furniture removed. To them, they marred the grounds and the cemetery as a whole. Moore made repeated requests to the cemetery administration to have the flower beds and the decorative urns around the mansion removed. The War Department complied in the spring of 1922. However, by then it was clear that although some War Department and Quartermaster Corps staff appeared genuinely interested in restoring the house, both a lack of funds and a lack of official authorization from either Congress or the secretary of war would stymie progress. Also, in order to accomplish a complete restoration, the cemetery would have to find alternative quarters for both its administrative offices and living quarters for its superintendent and head gardener.232

In addition, by 1923, the question of what period to restore the house to remained unresolved and Moore was actively attempting to persuade the War Department and quartermaster staff, along with interested congressmen, that his plan to restore the house and grounds to the more classical Custis period was the best. In a March 1923 letter to the Quartermaster General, Moore recommended that the War Department accept a bequest of furniture from the late Mrs. Julian James of Washington, D.C., and that the items be arranged in the vacant first-floor rooms of Arlington House. He went on to complain about the forces arrayed against his plan:

There is a movement on foot to have the Mansion furnished [to the Lee period], in which movement Representative R. Walton Moore of Virginia, Representative Louis C. Cramton of Michigan and others are much interested.233

233 Charles Moore, Chairman CFA to Quartermaster General, March 12, 1923 (ARHO archives). Republican Senator Louis C. Cramton of Michigan (1875-1966), was an advocate for the national parks and for the preservation of historic and natural sites. Elected to the U.S. House of Representatives from Michigan in 1913, Cramton served for 18 years in Congress. As a long-time member of the powerful House Committee on Appropriations and as chairman of the subcommittee that oversaw funding for the Department of the Interior, during the 1910s and twenties, Cramton was active in establishing and developing National Parks nationwide. Director of the National Park Service Horace Albright who worked closely with Cramton during the period, recalled Cramton as “an avid reader in history, politics, and government” and an “ardent traveler.” Later chroniclers of Cramton’s career have called him “a pioneering preservationist,” and have noted how he “exemplified the growing enthusiasm for history and a genuine commitment to its support” during the 1920s. Among Cramton’s major accomplishments in Congress was the passage of the Capper-Cramton Act of 1930 and the enabling legislation for the Colonial National Monument in Tidewater, Virginia in the same year. The former authorized the establishment of the George Washington Memorial Parkway, extended Rock Creek and Anacostia parks, and provided for appropriations to acquire new park lands in Maryland, Virginia and the District of Columbia. The latter law created the Colonial National Monument and Colonial Parkway. National Park Service, Great Falls Park, Virginia Final GMP/EIS,
Moore explained that R. Walton Moore and Cramton supported enlisting the UDC to restore and furnish the house as a monument to Lee. In opposition, the CFA chairman argued that “no one organization should be permitted to monopolize the work in which there is widespread interest.” The letter also laid out the house’s history, emphasizing its connection to George Washington and the length of time that Custis remained master of the property. Moore argued that the Custis name for the house, “Arlington,” should be used and that the house “should be refitted ..., as a home representative of the first fifty years of the Republic of the United States.”

Frances Parkinson Keyes’ dream came to fruition in 1924, when Representative Cramton introduced in Congress a bill to restore Arlington House “as nearly as practicable to the condition in which it existed immediately prior to the Civil War.” In May CFA Chairman Moore was called to testify at the hearing on H.J Resolution 264, “authorizing the restoration of the Lee Mansion in the Arlington National Cemetery, Virginia” before the Joint Committee on the Library of Congress. In his statement, he proposed a compromise restoration plan-- one he claimed to have discussed and worked out with the UDC and Keyes. His compromise plan proposed that the house as a whole be restored as the “Custis Mansion or Arlington Mansion” and that the room in which Robert E. and Mary Custis Lee were married be restored to its condition at the time of their marriage. He also pointed out that Lee never occupied the house for any length of time.

Evidence from the hearing reveals that, in cooperation with the War Department, the CFA had prepared a plan for restoring the mansion and its grounds. Both Moore and the War Department’s representative at the hearing, Colonel Benjamin F. Cheatham, who would be appointed Quartermaster General in 1926, informed the committee of their past collaboration. Moore explained that "this matter has been up several times between the Commission of Fine Arts and the various officials at Arlington and of the War Department, and the plans have been made for the complete restoration of the mansion so far as the externals are concerned..." While Cheatham took no position on the proposed resolution, he did mention that "Mr. Moore, of the..."
The Fine Arts Commission, has given the War Department a study of the entire [landscaping] project. This is now being worked on in the Quartermaster's office with a view to requesting the secretary of war to ask for an appropriation at the proper time. 237

After Moore explained his compromise restoration plan, Rep. Cramton offered to amend the resolution to omit the word “immediately” from the phrase requiring that the house be restored “to the condition in which it existed immediately prior to the Civil War.” 238 He explained that with that edit, the resolution would be broad enough to encompass what Moore and the CFA envisioned.

Despite Cramton’s suggested change to the wording, on March 4, 1925, Congress passed the resolution with its original wording. With regard to the restoration of the Custis-Lee Mansion, the resolution read:

...that the secretary of war be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed, as nearly as may be practicable, to restore the Lee Mansion in the Arlington National Cemetery, Virginia, to the condition in which it existed immediately prior to the Civil War and to procure, if possible, articles of furniture and equipment which were then in the mansion and in use by the occupants thereof. He is also authorized, in his discretion, to procure replicas of the furniture and other articles in use in the mansion during period mentioned, with a view to restoring, as far as may be practicable, the appearance of the interior of the mansion to the condition of its occupancy by the Lee family. 239

The preamble to the resolution laid out the purpose of the restoration to honor and recognize the contributions of Robert E. Lee:

Whereas the era of internecine strife among the States having yielded to one of better understanding...; and Whereas, now honor is accorded Robert E. Lee as one of the great military leaders of history, whose exalted character, noble life, and eminent services are recognized and esteemed, and whose manly attributes of precept and example were compelling factors in cementing the American people in bonds of patriotic devotion and action..., thus consummating the hope of a reunited country.... 240

At the congressional hearing, there was no discussion of the merits of honoring Lee by restoring his house at Arlington. Moore’s arguments were calculated to allow for a broader interpretation that would acknowledge what he believed was the superior aesthetics and architecture of the

---

238 Public Resolution—No. 74—68th Congress (H.J. Res. 264).
239 Public Resolution—No. 74—68th Congress (H.J. Res. 264).
240 Public Resolution—No. 74—68th Congress (H.J. Res. 264).
early Republican period versus the Victorian era. He apparently had no political or personal animus for Lee.

However, others did object to honoring Lee in this way. Following Rep. Lowrey’s and Frances Parkinson Keyes’s initial proposals for the restoration of Arlington House in 1921, a lively series of editorial letters appeared in the Washington Herald. Conflicting views came to light after the paper published an editorial endorsement of the idea, arguing that:

...it should be a beautiful example of the old home of the Southern gentleman and a memorial of the then owner, who came from the civil war [sic], with honor, dignity and as an American of Americans.241

Four days later, a subscriber describing himself as a Union veteran from a southern state, discontinued his subscription to the Herald in protest of the paper’s support for honoring Lee. His letter prompted three response letters supporting the restoration and condemning the protester. Two of these were submitted by Confederate veterans who insisted that they admired both Lee and Union heroes such as General Grant and President Lincoln.242

Following the passage of the act in 1925, resistance to the idea remained. Dissatisfied with the resolution, Charles Moore continued his efforts to dampen or remove the requirement to restore the house to the period of Lee’s occupancy. Through his long connection with the War Department and Quartermaster corps staff, Moore apparently convinced the War Department to assign the CFA an advisory role on the project. In August 1925, acting secretary of war Dwight F. Davis wrote to Moore about furnishing Arlington House. He stated in part, "It occurred to me that the Fine Arts Commission could best decide the articles that blend properly with the project as a whole and I am, therefore, writing to ask you if you will be kind enough to pass upon any articles that may be offered."243 Moore provided the secretary with the proper language that established the CFA as the approval authority to the selection and acceptance of the mansion’s furnishings.

Moore went further. In October 1925, he visited President Calvin Coolidge to discuss plans for Arlington House. The Washington Times reported soon after that the plan of “creating a shrine to the memory of Robert E. Lee in the restoration of the Lee Mansion in Arlington National Cemetery probably will be dropped.”

Following a visit of Charles C. Moore, Chairman of the Fine Arts Commission, paid to President Coolidge today, it became known that an entire change of base with regard to the project virtually has been determined upon. The mansion will

be restored, not in the decorative style it had as occupied by General Lee, but in the period style of the earlier years in which it was occupied by members of the Custis Family. There is no real demand from the South that a Lee shrine be established in Arlington Cemetery, Mr. Moore declared.\textsuperscript{244}

Moore went on to claim that Lee’s burial site in Lexington was the only “real memorial” to Lee. He further declared that “extreme care must be exercised in preserving [Arlington cemetery’s] art values,” especially as plans were underway to extend the cemetery down to the Potomac River as part of the Arlington Memorial Bridge construction. Moore emphasized that the cemetery must restrict burials on slopes facing east to the city and that the “wooded charms of Arlington” must be preserved by planting trees.\textsuperscript{245}

Moore was not alone in his opposition to the Lee era restoration. Virginia author, Marietta Minnigerode Andrews, whose grandmother had been a bridesmaid in the Lee wedding at Arlington House in 1831, also objected to creating a shrine to Lee. In her book \textit{George Washington Country}, published in 1930, Andrews argued that “Arlington is not a Lee mansion, it was only through his marriage with the heiress of Mr. Custis that General Lee occupied the house.”\textsuperscript{246}

Despite extensive support for the Lee restoration among Northerners and Southerners, universal respect for Lee was not a reality. After passage of the bill authorizing the restoration of Arlington House in March 1925, several organizations protested. Shortly after its passage, the Grand Army of the Republic (GAR, the national Union veterans association) sent a petition to Congress calling Robert E. Lee a traitor and protesting the official recognition of any organizations with Confederacy in its name. In response, Rep. John N. Tillman of Arkansas, issued a rebuttal on the floor of the House of Representatives, stating that “General Lee led a revolution like Washington did, and was no less a patriot than was Washington.”\textsuperscript{247} In February 1926, at the urging of the GAR, Senator Porter H. Dale of Vermont introduced a bill that would require that “the Custis Mansion” serve as “a museum in which shall be kept trophies and emblems of the Union Army and Navy of the United States during the Civil War.”\textsuperscript{248}

Although Dale’s bill never gained traction, opposition to the Lee restoration continued. In April 1926, \textit{The Washington Post} reported that at their annual convention, the National Society of Dames of the Loyal Legion began a “vigorous protest” against giving the UDC control of the Lee Mansion and allowing that group to make it a “shrine to the memory of Robert E. Lee.” The

\textsuperscript{244} “Lee Memorial Plans to be Dropped,” \textit{The Washington Times-Herald}, 26 October 1925.
\textsuperscript{245} “Lee Memorial Plans to be Dropped,” \textit{The Washington Times-Herald}, 26 October 1925.
\textsuperscript{247} Congressional Record, vol. 67, Part 6, 22 March 1926: 6033.
\textsuperscript{248} 69\textsuperscript{th} Congress 1\textsuperscript{st} Session. Senate Bill 3180, February 17, 1926, “‘Break Seen Between G.A.R. and Old Enemy: Union Army Veterans Move to Oppose Restoration of Lee Mansion,” \textit{The Washington Post} 18 February 1926, p. 1.
group argued that it was “un-American” to establish a shrine to the Confederacy within Arlington National Cemetery.\footnote{249 “Dames Protesting Turning Over Lee Mansion to U.D.C.,” \textit{The Washington Post} 16 April 1926, p. 22. Established in 1899, the Dames of the Loyal Legion of the United States (DOLLUS) is the auxiliary to the Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States (MOLLUS). The Dames’ purpose is to “foster the spirit of patriotism and to cherish the memory of those men and women whose distinguished services during the Civil War so largely aided in preserving the integrity of the government of the United States of America, to maintain the historical truths of that period; to protect the rights and liberties of American citizenship and to maintain national honor, union, and independence.” Dames of the Loyal Legion webpage: http://suvcw.org/mollus/dollus/home.htm; accessed 6 November 2012.}

**Planning the House Restoration**

Shortly after the March 1925 passage of the resolution authorizing the War Department to restore Arlington House, the quartermaster staff conducted a survey to estimate the cost of the restoration, including the price associated with constructing new buildings to house the employees then living in the former slave quarters and the mansion. The findings were published in the \textit{Evening Star}:

> It will cost about $225,000 to restore the ancestral home of the Custis family in the Arlington National Cemetery to the condition it was in when Gen Robert E. Lee and his wife, formerly Miss Mary Ann Randolph Custis, lived there at the outbreak of the Civil War, in accordance with the legislation enacted by Congress in March ...\footnote{250 “225,000 To Restore Lee Home Asked by Army After Survey,” \textit{Evening Star}, Washington, D.C. August 15, 1925. The total costs were $160,000 for restoration and furnishing of buildings, $160,000 and $92,000 for new buildings to house workers and office space. according to those listed in the official Quartermaster Generals Office report. NARA I RG 92, Entry 1891, Box 67, File 600.13.}

The quartermaster general’s report was quick to point out that “no allowance has been made in the above estimates for roads, walks, special grading or planting, as these items have been covered by previous estimates for the sections surrounding the Mansion as part of a general scheme for progressive improvements to the National Cemetery submitted in October 1923.”\footnote{251 Cost estimates for Restoration July 9, 1925. ARHO}

The quartermaster’s estimates included “structural changes and repairs” to the mansion house and the two associated slave quarters, along with refurnishing all buildings, and construction of a new lodging and office. By the time the secretary of war had approved the estimate and submitted an appropriation request to Congress, the amount had been reduced to $177,000, which included $50,000 for restoring the mansion and two outbuildings, $75,000 for furnishing them, and $52,000 for erecting a new superintendent's office-lodge, a gardener’s lodge, and a foreman’s lodge. Congress declined to appropriate money for this project.

Without money to implement the restoration, the War Department and Quartermaster remained in a holding pattern. While awaiting congressional approval for the funds, small steps were...
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taken to prepare for the project. On August 17, 1925, acting Secretary of War Dwight F. Davis wrote to Moore about furnishing Arlington House. He asked Moore and the CFA to review and approve all potential donations of furnishings. Moore accepted. Because of the delay in funding, between 1925 and 1928, the quartermaster general refused to approve expenditures for the routine maintenance of the exterior or interior of Arlington House on the assumption that money would be provided for the restoration. Only money for emergency repairs was authorized during this period.

Upon the suggestion of Chairman Moore an estimate was submitted for fiscal year 1927, asking for $10,000 to make "a thorough investigation and survey to determine the condition of Arlington Mansion and outbuildings." This request twice failed to pass, but finally, on March 28, 1928, Congress approved the desired appropriation. The engineering division then provided the quartermaster general with a detailed five-page estimate on how the $10,000 could be spent. On August 1, 1928, the quartermaster general authorized the quartermaster supply officer of the Washington Depot to expend up to $5,400 on exterior restoration of the mansion and the two outbuildings. Of this sum, $3,800 was for Arlington House. No expenditures for interior work were approved. This work was, in many aspects, deferred maintenance for the years 1925-1928. The supply officer was also notified that:

Mr. L. M. Leisenring, Architect of this office, has been placed in charge of the work of research in connection with this restoration, and the work now to be done is to be under his direct supervision. He has been directed to make frequent inspections of the work as it progresses and will co-operate with your office in the matter of giving detailed information as the work progresses...

Luther M. Leisenring (1875-1965), along with Charles Moore of the CFA and several War Department officials, spent the next five years researching, planning and implementing the restoration of Arlington House. Leisenring was a University of Pennsylvania-trained architect who spent most of his career as a designer with the War Department and later with the Army Corps of Engineers. His military work involved designing Army housing, chapels, hospitals, and laying out new national cemeteries. He was involved in a number of historic sites controlled by the War Department, including Fort McHenry and Arlington. (For extended biographical information on Leisenring, see Appendix A at the end of Section 8).
Plans for the Landscape Restoration

In the mid-1920s, while CFA Chairman Charles Moore was working to influence legislation pursuant to the restoration of Arlington House, other members of the Commission of Fine Arts were serving as design consultants to the cemetery staff, recommending modifications to the landscape. As early as 1919, CFA member and landscape architect James Greenleaf reviewed the development ideas of Major Lemly, then in charge of Arlington Cemetery. Intent on simplifying the cemetery grounds, Greenleaf recommended that all flower beds and cast iron planting urns be removed immediately, believing their showiness ill-suited to the solemnity of the cemetery. He proposed planting low-growing boxwood instead, as the dark green, delicate foliage of boxwood would be more subdued than the brightly colored annual plantings remaining from the 1880s design of Rhodes. 256

After reading Greenleaf’s comments on his proposal, Major Lemly requested from the commission a full and “frank” report on the grounds. 257 The CFA agreed and quickly offered further suggestions regarding proposed planting schemes for the Memorial Amphitheater, to the west of the flower garden, in addition to the landscape immediately around Arlington House. Nevertheless, much to the commission members’ frustration, few if any of their suggestions were taken by the Quartermaster Generals Office. Ever determined, ten years later Chairman Moore was still pushing for the demolition of the Temple of Fame and the removal of the flower beds south of Arlington House:

... cannot means be taken to remove the tin top arrangement, known as the Temple of Fame? I told Abraham Garfield that he must be prepared to see the name of his father [General Garfield] disappear. He said that he did not know it was there, so he would not feel badly ... 258

In 1921 the Quartermaster General’s Office presented a plan to the Commission of Fine Arts addressing the “Remodeling of the Grounds about the Lee Mansion.” There were two primary objectives guiding their plan. The first was to improve the safety of visitors through the redesign of roads and paths. The second was to create a setting that properly represented the solemn and patriotic essence of the National Cemetery and of Arlington House. The CFA agreed with the proposition that the visitor parking area be moved from the yard between the two slave quarters. Though the commission approved the landscape plan, there was no congressional appropriation to fund the project. The 1921 plan, however, formed a basis for future development proposals and the eventual alterations of the landscape.

256 James Greenleaf (1857-1933) was a member of the Commission of Fine Arts from 1918 to 1927. Though well-known for the design of private estate grounds in New Jersey, Connecticut and Long Island, through the 1920s he increasingly became involved in high profile, public projects such as the Arlington House restoration. As he did at Arlington, Greenleaf emphasized clarity of line and simplicity in vegetative palette in many of his landscape designs. Hanna, CLR, p. 142.
258 Moore to Bash, Chief Construction Division, Office of the Quartermaster General. July 17, 1930. ARHO.
As part of the General Scheme for the Progressive Improvements to the National Cemetery, submitted in October 1923 by the Quartermaster Generals Office, plans were drawn up detailing the work to be done to the grounds immediately west of the mansion.\textsuperscript{259} Greenleaf conducted the CFA’s review of the cemetery development plan. The proposal for the area immediately west of Arlington House called for the removal of all the Victorian iron vases and the existing concrete paving which encircled the house. New concrete walks were constructed by the army to provide access between the slave quarters and mansion, and a new comfort station (demolished in 2011) was erected just north of the north slave quarter.\textsuperscript{260} In the 1923 plan, as in the 1921 plan upon which it was based, visitor access and landscape aesthetics formed the two central components. For instance, according to the plan, thick plantings were to be arranged to screen the recently rebuilt comfort station and the pedestrian paths.

In addition to the attention devoted to the landscape by Greenleaf and other designers, the structures of Arlington House were also receiving the notice of professionals. Only a year after the landscape development plans were created for Arlington National Cemetery, Washington, D.C. architect Gilbert L. Rodier wrote an article for \textit{Architectural Forum Magazine}, detailing the architectural evolution of Arlington House and including the first known measured drawings of the building.\textsuperscript{261}

Shortly thereafter changes in the administrative personnel of Arlington occurred that impacted the future of the grounds. In January of 1926, almost one year after passage of the legislation calling for the restoration of Arlington House, General Benjamin F. Cheatham was appointed Quartermaster General. General Cheatham, whose father had served on General Lee’s staff during the Civil War, had a great personal interest in General Lee and his home. After General Cheatham’s retirement in 1930, he signed on as the resident superintendent at Stratford Hall, General Lee’s birthplace in Westmoreland County, Virginia. In contrast, General William E. Horton, who joined the Quartermaster Corps (QMC) shortly after General Cheatham as chief of the construction division, was known for his interest in, and fine collection of, colonial era artifacts.\textsuperscript{262}

Colonel L. H. Bash came to the quartermaster general’s office in September 1928, and later succeeded Horton as chief of the construction division. He eventually became quartermaster general. Oversight of the finances and contracts was given to Charles G. Mortimer. Mortimer was described by Major Leisenring, the army architect supervising the historical research

\textsuperscript{259} Draft of Report on Restoration of Lee Mansion. July 9, 1925. ARHO Archives.
\textsuperscript{260} “Arlington National Cemetery, VA Plan for Work to be Done at Lee Mansion” War Department, Quartermaster Corps. Construction Service. Aug 16, 1923. ARHO Map files. No plans for the landscape east of Arlington House from this period have yet been found. \textit{General Scheme for the Progressive Improvements to the National Cemetery} (1923) recorded the proposed 1921 changes to the circulation around Arlington House, though the changes had not yet been made. The plan also emphasized the view line between the proposed memorial bridge and the “Lee Mansion.”
\textsuperscript{261} Gilbert L. Rodier, “Arlington House” \textit{Architectural Forum}, March 1924.
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preceding the restoration project, as a “Virginian with a flare [sic] for old furniture and houses.”263 Each of these men, with the members of the CFA, would become involved in the restoration of the house and grounds, shaping the results through their personal expertise and agendas.

Despite ongoing controversy and congressional wrangling, the money to start the full restoration was finally made available in March 1929 when Congress passed and the president approved a deficiency bill that included $90,000 for the restoration of Arlington House.264 Under the jurisdiction of the Quartermaster General of the War Department, plans were laid out for the professional preservation of the house and grounds. The War Department employed a familiar setup to ensure the involvement of qualified persons in designing the restoration and selecting the historic furnishings. Like it had done for years with its battlefield parks, the Department established a committee to determine the best route to restoration. This form was also used in the ongoing, large-scale restoration work funded by John D. Rockefeller, Jr. at Colonial Williamsburg. There, in the late 1920s, Rockefeller solicited the professional expertise of archeologists, architects, and landscape architects to research and design accurate 18th century restorations.

By April 1929, Quartermaster Cheatham had formed a committee to advise him “as to the plans for reproducing and refurnishing of the Arlington Mansion.”265 In order to head off criticism, Cheatham appointed the committee consisting of retired Brigadier General William E. Horton (1868-1935), architect Edward W. Donn, Jr. (1868-1953), and Leisenring of the QMC’s construction division. Horton was the former chief of the construction division and an antique collector with a strong interest in and knowledge of early American furnishings. Edward Wilton Donn, Jr. was a respected Washington, DC architect in private practice who had experience working on historic buildings.266 (For additional biographical information on Donn and Horton, see Appendix A at the end of Section 8.) The chairman of the committee was then Colonel (later Major General and Quartermaster General, 1934-1936) Louis H. Bash (1872-1952). Bash was a decorated veteran of the Spanish American War and World War I. In the 1930s, Bash headed the QMC Construction Division where he initiated a huge army building program funded

263 Leisenring, “The Restoration,” 2. Even after the house passed to NPS in July of 1933, Mortimer remained in charge.
264 War Department Bulletin No 6, March 18, 1929, and an act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30 1929, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1929, and June 30, 1930 and for other purposes. As cited in Historic Structure Report, Data Section Volume I: 165.
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through the Public Works Administration, a program aimed at reducing unemployment during the Great Depression.\(^{267}\)

Quartermaster General Cheatham directed the committee to review existing historic documentation on Arlington House, collect additional research, interview witnesses with firsthand knowledge of the house, and “to make detailed recommendations concerning each room in the building, the exterior architectural features and the parking and layout of the grounds immediately surrounding.”\(^{268}\) The commanding officer of the Washington General Depot of the QMC was placed in charge of the restoration work.

The committee met for the first time on April 17\(^{th}\) at Arlington House. Charles Moore, Chairman, Arno Caemmerer, Secretary, and architect Walter Peter all of the CFA attended at the request of Col. Bash. Lt. Colonel Charles G. Mortimer of the Washington General Depot, who was in charge of all work at Arlington National Cemetery also attended; according to Bash, to share his “intimate knowledge of what has already been accomplished.”\(^{269}\) Following the two-hour meeting, the committee issued a report generally outlining the work to be recommended. After review and comment by Mortimer, Quartermaster General (QMG) Cheatham approved parts of the committee’s recommendations on May 3, 1929.

The approved recommendations included the removal of the paving around the mansion and the construction of a heating plant outside the walls of the house to reduce the risk of fire. The QMG also agreed that the slave quarters would be restored to illustrate their original uses, that the roof parapets on each wing be restored to their early 19\(^{th}\) century appearance, that all modern flooring be removed inside the mansion, and that the Victorian-era mantels on the first floor (south wing) and on the second floor be replaced with “mantels of the Colonial period.”\(^{270}\)

The report and subsequent correspondence reveal that Moore succeeded in convincing the QMC to restore the house not to the Lee period, but to the pre-1830 era. Approval to reinstall the wing roof parapets, which research indicated were removed in 1858, and the replacement of the Victorian (nee Lee)-era mantels, shows the distinct change of course. It is clear that the QMC accepted and understood Moore’s plan, for at the conclusion of the restoration on August 9, 1932, Brigadier General Bash wrote regarding Arlington House, that “By authority of Congress,


\(^{268}\) NARA RG 92, Records of the Quartermaster General; Entry 1891, Box 67, File 293, Bash to Horton, April 13, 1929.

\(^{269}\) NARA RG 92, Records of the Quartermaster General; Entry 1891, Box 67, File 293, Bash to Horton, April 13, 1929.

\(^{270}\) May 3, 1929 memo from the quartermaster general in response to the April 17 recommendations of the committee appointed to make recommendations on the restoration plans for Arlington House, RG 92, Entry 1891, Box 67.
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this Office has restored the old mansion to the condition in which it was during Mr. Custis lifetime."

Since 1921, Rep. Cramton, Keyes, Moore, and the QMC had been collecting historic data regarding the Arlington House and its grounds. After the restoration committee’s April 1929 meeting, the QMC conducted extensive research to guide the accurate restoration of the Arlington mansion and its outbuildings. In an undated (ca. 1931) report to the quartermaster general summarizing the restoration work at Arlington, Architect Leisenring described the preparatory research done in 1929 and 1930:

Nearly sixty-five years had passed since the Lees left. How did the Mansion look at that time? What was in the house and how was it arranged?

For what was the ground surrounding the house used? These major questions and many minor questions in detail must be answered.

All available old pictures, artists’ sketches, magazine articles and old maps were carefully studied, folklore and first hand recollections of former slaves and their descendants was gathered and the information thus obtained was collected into a visionary replica of what had once been the beautiful and imposing Mansion.

NPS historian, Charles Snell’s examination of the extensive restoration files for the 1929-31 period revealed that the quartermaster general, or his agents, wrote numerous letters to scholars and members of the Lee family requesting information on the history of the mansion and its furnishings. In response to one such letter, Douglas Southall Freeman, editor of the Richmond [Virginia] News Leader and noted biographer of Robert E. Lee and George Washington, responded on April 22, 1929:

Answering your [Col. Bash’s] letter of April 18, I beg to say that there is a singular dearth of material regarding Arlington. My own opinion is that the glories of the place have been greatly exaggerated, and that Arlington was never anything more than a fairly comfortable country house, except, of course, for Washington Relics.

The incoming letters, however, provided the QMC with the names of various authors and titles of articles or books that contained some mention or information on Arlington House. Armed with this information, Architect Leisenring, or his assistants, proceeded to the Library of Congress to collect the data from these published sources. Unfortunately, they found little or no

272 From a typed copy (original) found in the park research files (ARHO Archive), undated report probably written in March or April of 1931.
273 RG 92, Entry 1891, Box 67, File 600.3, Freeman to Col. L. H. Bash, April 22, 1928.
information on the architectural evolution and furnishings of the house. Leisenring did make a valuable contribution to the understanding of the house by interviewing several former Lee slaves that were still alive in 1929 and 1930. Later research has revealed that important sources were not available to the QMC, thus resulting in only partial knowledge of the building’s evolution. Most importantly, the Custis-Lee family letters (in the de Lutta-Ely Collection and the George Bolling Lee Collections), at that time, were privately owned and not available for examination, hence the alterations and improvements made by Custis and Lee from 1802 to 1861 remained undocumented, known only from limited sources or physical investigations.

The QMC used several important sources in piecing together its understanding of the building’s history. This included historian and artist Benson J. Lossing’s 1853 article published in *Harper’s New Monthly Magazine* (September 1853) in which he recalls in detail his visit to Arlington and includes sketches he made of a number of artifacts and pictures in the mansion.

In addition to culling through books and records from local repositories, oral history played a considerable role in the analysis of the buildings and landscape of the Custis and Lee era. Leisenring interviewed former slaves of Mary Lee and G.W.P. Custis, including the daughters of Thorton and Selina Gray, Mrs. Annie Baker and Mrs. Ada Thompson, who would have been seven years old and three years old respectively at the time the Federal army occupied the property in 1861.274 James Parks, born on the Arlington estate and an employee at the cemetery for his entire life, also offered insight into the arrangement of farms, fields and gardens, as did D. H. Rhodes, who retired from the position of cemetery landscape gardener in 1930.

A newspaper article in the *Washington Star*, July 5, 1931, written by Will P. Kennedy and based on an extended interview with Lieutenant Colonel Charles G. Mortimer, who was in charge of the work at Arlington, shows some of the QMC’s conclusions about the house’s periods of construction:

The Lee Mansion itself was started in 1803. Custis first built the north wing and here his wife moved in while the rest of the house was being built. This wing was a complete house with a hipped roof. When the work of restoring the mansion was in progress the framing of this hipped roof was found in the attic.

Custis lived in the North Wing while the main part of the Mansion and the South Wing were being built. The South Wing is a duplicate of the North Wing, except interior partition. . .

The partitioning in the North Wing is an interesting feature. It was originally intended to be one large room as in the South Wing, and Custis had put in the chimney breast, but divided it into two rooms, for temporary occupancy. But the

274 Interview, by L. M. Leisenring of Mrs. Annie Baker and Mrs. Ada Thompson daughters of Thornton and Selina Grey, March 3, 1930. Transcript ARHO.
fireplace was never finished and the partition still stands so these two rooms are being preserved and furnished as nearly as possible as they were when occupied by the Custis couple.\textsuperscript{275}

While subsequent research and investigation has proven much of this information to be only partially accurate, in general, the QMC proceeded cautiously.\textsuperscript{276} Indeed the 1929-31 restoration work at Arlington was a pioneering project. In view of the limited sources available to them the restoration was conservative in its approach to the physical fabric of the buildings. If already in place, a physical feature was generally retained unless proven to be post 1861 (with the exception of the Lee era mantels). If stability required replacement, it was done in material and technique to resemble the original.

Leisenring’s reading of the physical evidence and efforts to locate and apply documentation was well in advance of the state of the art. Where fabric was removed due to the commission’s demands, (e.g., mantel removal in the White Parlor), the fabric was retained on site and fully documented. Without documentation available to later researchers, Leisenring found and restored the old door to the boys’ chamber from the small chamber, with only a four-year error in dating physical material with which Mrs. Lee had closed off this opening in 1857.

\textbf{Completing the Restoration}

Following the May 1929 approval from the Quartermaster General, the house restoration proceeded quickly. Drawings were provided by Leisenring and his staff at the QMC Construction Division (also referred to as the Construction Service). By November, two contracts had been let, one for the new heating system and another for the fire alarm system, and over $40,000 of the $90,000 appropriated by Congress in March 1929 had been expended or obligated.\textsuperscript{277} At the request of the QMC, on January 6, 1930, Congress approved an additional $10,000 for furnishing the mansion once its restoration was complete.\textsuperscript{278}

On March 6, 1930, Brigadier General Bash wrote to Charles Moore, stating:

\begin{quote}
The reconditioning of Arlington Mansion with its adjacent buildings in Arlington National Cemetery, Virginia, is practically completed. A small amount of furniture has been installed as a beginning but more will be obtained from time to time, as it becomes available.
\end{quote}


\textsuperscript{276} The Quartermaster Corps and the Commission of Fine Arts did not know when the main house was built, but dated it at some undetermined time after 1804 and prior to 1826. The exact years, 1817-18, were not to be established until research by Murray Nelligan was completed, 1948-53.


\textsuperscript{278} “$10,000 Lee Mansion Fund Given Approval” \textit{The Washington Post}, 7 January 1930, p. 20.
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In view of the provisions of Act of Congress, approved March 4, 1925, it is thought that the Commission at its convenience might wish to view the work already accomplished. There will be no formal opening of the premises, the public being permitted access thereto as at all times heretofore.279

The Commission of Fine Arts inspected the Arlington House restoration project on March 20, 1929, and on the following day, Chairman Moore reported to General Bash on their findings. He wrote:

The Committee of Fine Arts, at their meeting yesterday, inspected the Arlington Mansion, in accordance with your request of March 6th. The Committee were satisfied with all the work except putting back of the [Victorian 1855 Lee] mantels in the east [south] room [room 112]. These mantels are bad in themselves, were not part of the original house, and are a conspicuous blot on the otherwise excellent work of restoration. The Commission advise[s] an immediate change in the mantels, however simple, that will preserve the old lines of the fireplaces.280

The war department considered the restoration work on the house and outbuildings to be complete by April 1931.

By the fall of 1931, however, the QMC had not yet managed to have "Colonial" mantels (reproductions of mantels in place in the family parlor and dining room) made to replace the two Victorian marble mantels that Col. Robert E. Lee had installed on the south wing fireplaces in 1855. This occasioned further criticism from Chairman Moore on October 1, 1931. He wrote:

Every time the Committee of Fine Arts inspects the Arlington Mansion they have been disturbed by the retention of the mantels in the room to the southeast. I understood you to say you had taken up the question of having the old mantels in the western room duplicated but that the expense was prohibitive. There are two mantels of the period in the Y.M.C.A. house on B Street. Will you look at these mantels and see if they will answer your purpose.281

The Quartermaster Corps, however, managed to obtain a contractor to carve two marble mantels in London, and in early 1932 the two old Lee mantels were removed and replaced by the reproduction Colonial period mantels. The restoration of Arlington House had finally been completed in accordance with Chairman Moore's plan. Between 1928 and 1931, Congress

279 RG 92, Records of the Quartermaster General, Entry 1891, Box 68, File 600.3.
280 RG 92, Records of the Quartermaster General, Entry 1891, Box 68, File 600.3.
281 NARA RG 92, Records of the Quartermaster General, Entry 1891, File 600.3, (Contract No. W. 950-QM-941.) The contract for the two marble mantels at 100 pounds each, dated July 10, 1931, was approved by the quartermaster general on October 3, 1931.
appropriated a total of $110,000 to restore Arlington House: $71,500 for work on the mansion and two outbuildings and $38,500 to furnish the three structures.

While progress on the house repairs and furnishings proceeded fairly rapidly, work on the landscape lapsed behind. In 1930 the Quartermaster General’s Office prepared plans for the treatment of the grounds at Arlington House and submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts for review. The commission brought the plans to the attention of Ferruchio Vitale, a landscape architect out of New York City and a member of the CFA.282 A letter from Quartermaster General J. L. DeWitt accompanied the plans. In his letter, DeWitt explained that “though the present appropriations were not sufficient to cover the entire cost of the proposed restorations of the surrounding gardens it was desired to have a definite plan upon which to base any work now possible.” He outlined the proposed restoration of the flower and vegetable gardens, assuring the commission that careful research had been made as to the location and general plan of the gardens. Ever conscious of the limited budget, he suggested that the presence of the lattice summer house, “a central feature of the old fashioned garden” during the period of Lee’s departure from the estate, might be suggested through the planting of vines around the existing Temple of Fame.

As did all the prior restoration plans, DeWitt proposed replacing the concrete drives and walks adjacent to the buildings, this time with gravel or brick walks. He was concerned as well that the outbuilding immediately north of the north slave quarter, “used for a guard house and toilet room,” be screened more completely from public view. In addition, he pointed out that in the proposed plan the vehicular traffic was rerouted from the rear of the mansion to a parking area near the Memorial Amphitheater. He assured the commission that, regardless of what was accomplished, the intention of the Quartermaster General’s Office was not to remove any of the “old forest trees,” for their “preservation was of great importance.”283

The commission, with the comments of Vitale, approved the 1930 landscape plan for Arlington with the following stipulations. Eager to reinforce the importance of the nineteenth-century landscape, the CFA recommended that the walk currently leading to the Sheridan monument be removed, and that vegetation be used to screen the monument from the mansion. The commission, returning to the plans of 1923, proposed that, if possible, the drive on the east front should be eliminated and a study made for a simple brick terrace in front of the mansion so as to accommodate sightseers gathering to enjoy the view over the city. They concurred in the ultimate removal of both the L’Enfant and Wright monuments to another part of the cemetery. They approved the creation of a screened parking area to the east of the memorial amphitheater with the provision that this parking area not be brought too near the old amphitheater.

Again members of the CFA reiterated their belief that the landscape would be more pleasing without the Temple of Fame. In fact they suggested that, if possible, the Monument to the

282 CFA meeting minutes, March 20, 1930 (CFA Archives). Vitale
283 J.L. DeWitt Maj General, Quarter Master General to Charles Moore, Committee of Fine Arts, March 19, 1930 (CFA Archives).
Unknown Civil War Soldier be re-erected in place of the temple, for they felt that the significance of the monument had been inappropriately minimized. This sentiment would inform the future design of the flower garden, which was left for further study. Once the commission approved the plan, the QMG submitted an estimate of $17,500 to “raze [the] greenhouse, remove concrete paving, put in gravel roads and walks, and brick walks.”

This proposed landscape design, with its symmetry, brick sidewalks, boxwood hedges, and limited floral ornamentation was typical of the Colonial Revival-style—a design style whose escalating nationwide popularity was bolstered by the 1932 bicentennial celebration of George Washington’s birth. The emphasis, as illustrated in such contemporaneous garden restorations as Colonial Williamsburg and Mount Vernon, was on emulating the values and ideals thought to have been integral to the genesis of America. As Arthur Shurcliff, a landscape architect wrote in an essay in* The History of the George Washington Bicentennial Celebration,* “pleasure lay in a garden which showed man’s control of that wilderness ...straight paths, hedges straight.” At Arlington, the paths proposed in the 1930s were straight, as were the tightly trimmed boxwood hedges that lined the walks. A second essay in the same volume, authored by another Colonial Revival landscape architect, Fletcher Steele, noted how the gardens of Mount Vernon were undergoing “exemplary restorations,” at the time with intricate beds of boxwood crossed with brick paths.

Changes were progressing slowly, however, according to the approved 1930 grounds plan, which did include the circular drive. Plantings of evergreen shrubs were installed around the Porter and Sherman graves to hide the memorials from visitors at Arlington House. The old drinking fountain was removed and a new field stone well head was built over the well west of the mansion. By 1931, most of the concrete paving surrounding the mansion and outbuildings had been replaced with gravel. Following the plan of 1930, brick walks were installed to connect the kitchen garden with the main house, slave quarters and comfort station. The use of brick not only conformed to the theories of Colonial Revival design, it created a hierarchy of circulation on the grounds, helping to guide the one million visitors who passed through the site each summer. Lilac, yew and boxwood lined the walk to the greenhouse and screened the comfort station. An iron dinner bell was erected near the comfort station. Nevertheless, the restoration of the historic Arlington kitchen garden had not begun due, in part, to the need to tear down the cemetery greenhouse first.

---

284 Bash to Leisenring, April 9 1930 (CFA Archives).
289* Washington Star,* 5 July 1931.
Yet it was not only the comprehensive restoration of Arlington House and its grounds that captured the attention of the public, the improvement of the surrounding memorials—particularly the Tomb of the Unknown Civil War Soldiers—also warranted attention. Beginning with the construction of the Tomb to the Unknown Soldier in 1921 and continuing up until the Second World War, Civil War veterans and their descendants, as well as patriotic societies and the secretary of war himself, expressed concern that the Civil War monument, located behind the flat terrace of the former flower garden, was not given enough prominence. They wrote letters to Congress and local newspapers, and voiced their opinions to employees of the War Department and to members of the Commission of Fine Arts. In light of their concerns, and with a desire to create momentum for funding the flower garden restoration, ornate plans were drawn up by designers in the Quartermaster Generals Office. The beautifully rendered drawings, illustrating the “restoration” of the flower garden with many different renditions of intricately woven boxwood beds and a monumental stairway leading from the flower garden to the Tomb of the Unknown Civil War Soldier, were reviewed by the Commission of Fine Arts.

After General Bash assured the CFA that every effort had been made in the designs to provide the Civil War monument proper stature in the landscape, Chairman Moore informed him that the “Civil War people would be satisfied if there could be a view over the city from the tomb, the same as from the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier of the World War.” He added that, after the Temple of Fame was removed, the placement of any structure within the flower garden—namely the proposed summer house—would block this significant view and he strongly advised against its construction. Regardless of the grand recommendations and plans, the Temple of Fame remained. No arbor was built, but the annual flower beds, long disparaged by the commission, finally were removed.

The QMC continued the restoration by requesting money to build a new administrative building on the site of the former Custis stable. The QMC decided to use historic photographs to model the new office building after the original stable that had burned down in 1904 and had been replaced with a utilitarian stable in 1906. The designers presumably retained and remodeled the 1906 stable building so that, from the front (faces south), it resembles the form of the Custis-Lee-era stable. The stuccoed brick building was completed in 1931.

Conclusions

While the restoration did destroy or remove some important original fabric and introduced some somewhat conjectural design elements (i.e. the roof parapets on the north and south wings), for the most part large-scale removal of original fabric was avoided. The War Department’s restoration, directed by the QMC’s construction division and implemented by the Washington Depot in charge of Arlington National Cemetery construction was an early and interesting foray by the federal government in the field of historic preservation and full-scale house restoration.

290 Charles Moore to General Bash, January 25, 1932. CFA files.
The research undertaken and employment of experts reflected current trends used in private sector preservation projects of the same period.

The quartermaster general's own instructions issued at the commencement of the work after securing the first $10,000 appropriation in 1928, reflect the development of a modern theory and practice of historic preservation. In his instructions the quartermaster general wrote:

> While the work to be done under this appropriation consists largely of repair, it is necessary that this should be carried out strictly in accordance with old methods, and every detail should be carefully supervised to avoid irreparable injury to work which must be preserved in its historic character. This work is only a part of that which will be eventually accomplished to restore this old building to its condition immediately prior to the Civil War, when it was in every respect in furniture as well as in construction a typical example of a Colonial mansion of the later period.  

During the 1920s and 1930s as they reported on the progress of Arlington House's restoration, Washington newspapers acknowledged the innovation, noting that it was the first project of its kind ever undertaken by the federal government.  

National Park Service historian Charles Snell concluded in the Historic Structure Report prepared for Arlington House in the mid-1980s, that the War Department's restoration was one of the early major restoration projects of the 20th century. Charles B. Hosmer, the preeminent historian of the American historic preservation movement, called Arlington "[t]he first important post-Mount Vernon preservation in the South."  

Arlington House Under National Park Service Administration, 1933-present

On June 10, 1933, the building designated as the "Lee Mansion" and the two slave quarters at Arlington House were transferred from the War Department to the Department of the Interior, when President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed Executive Order 6166. The order reorganized the administration of public parks by combining all federal public buildings, national monuments, and national cemeteries under a renamed National Park Service. While the new name (Office of National Parks, Buildings, and Reservations) was destined to disappear within a year, Roosevelt's action was far reaching, transforming the National Park Service. For years, NPS

---

291 NARA RG 92, Records of the Quartermaster General, Entry 1891, Box 67, File 600.3, August 1, 1928.
292 Hanna, CLR, p. 135.
officials and some advocates for conservation and preservation had argued for consolidation of federal parks and monuments under a single authority. 294

Among the public lands and buildings transferred to the park service in 1933 were most of the War Department’s historic sites, including the military parks and Arlington House. Because Arlington National Cemetery was used for active burial, it remained under the jurisdiction of the War Department. 295 The Executive Order did not specify the boundaries of the area pertinent to the administration and protection of the buildings. While the buildings were now under the administration of the National Park Service, the land surrounding them remained under the jurisdiction of the Department of War, Quartermaster General’s Office.

In 1933, after the consolidation that transferred 48 historical properties to the National Park Service, the agency employed few historians and no historical architects. Its few landscape architects, naturalists, and archeologists had little training or interest in historical research or preservation. The National Park Service had hired its first historians in 1931 and the first "chief historian" ran a one-man office until 1933. Thus, the addition of 48 historical properties to the National Park System caused a crisis. NPS Chief Historian Verne E. Chatelain, and his hastily formed staff, were confronted with the problem of quickly formulating and implementing policies for the preservation, maintenance, and interpretation of a large number of historical properties. At Arlington House the NPS turned for advice to Lt. Col. Charles G. Mortimer, the Depot Quartermaster Supply Officer, who had been in charge of the $110,000 restoration program that had been carried out between 1928 and 1931. 296

Thus on August 17, 1933, A.E. Demaray, Associate Director, Office of National Parks, Buildings and Reservations (nee the NPS), wrote to Maj. Gen. J.L. DeWitt, Quartermaster General, U.S. Army, confirming and spelling out the terms of an agreement that had been reached with the War Department. The arrangement provided that Colonel Mortimer would continue to advise and oversee the ongoing work at Arlington House. DeMaray wrote:

In connection with a recent conference between yourself, Colonel Laubach and Mr. Chatelain in regard to the policy for the handling of Lee Mansion at Arlington, I am glad to indicate the compliance of the office of National Parks, Buildings and Reservations (NPS) in the details of the plan worked out. I assume that the War Department through Colonel Mortimer, the officer in charge of Arlington Cemetery, will cooperate in the maintenance of the Lee Mansion in the

295 Executive Order No. 6166 of June 10, 1933 as interpreted by Executive Order No 6228 of July 23, 1933. (HSR, 120 and 134-135). This executive order consolidated all federally-administered parks, monuments and reservations under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service, abolishing the Office of Public Buildings and Parks of the National Capital.
same way in which this problem has been handled heretofore until the Interior
Department is able to set up estimates and get an adequate appropriation for this
work from Congress.

You will be interested to know that the Lee Mansion has been assigned to Mr. J.T.
Gill, Assistant Director, in charge of public buildings. In connection with his
general supervision of public buildings in the Capital City, Mr. Gill may later
want to talk with Colonel Laubach again with reference to details of
administration.

However, as it was decided at the conference, our Accounting Division wishes to
work with Colonel Mortimer in arriving at definite estimate figures which can be
submitted to the Bureau of the Budget. We will expect to receive from the War
Department such things as heat, light, water and comfort station accommodations
in the same way as these matters have been handled in the past in order that there
will be no necessity for creating new expenses on account of double operation.297

In an article that appeared in the Washington Post on August 8, 1933, the policies of the National
Park Service in regard to the Lee Mansion were explained:

Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, announced yesterday that little change
will be made in the direction of Arlington House. The work of restoration and
refurnishing, which has progressed under the War Department supervision, will
be continued.

Additional furniture perhaps will be acquired, original pieces to make even more
authentic the atmosphere of the house. Although the interior is charming and the
mahogany and china and silver are exquisite examples of the taste of the period,
very few pieces there now ever belonged to Arlington.

Secretary Ickes is enthusiastic about the historical value of his department's new
acquisition. He hopes patriotic societies and individuals throughout the country
will assist him in continuing work of restoration.

As far as possible . . . the mansion and garden will be returned to its old
appearance.

One of the immediate improvements to be made at Arlington will be the
introduction there of guides recruited from the National Park Service. The history

297 Demaray to DeWitt, August 17, 1933, copy in ARHO, Park Master Data File Notebook for 1933 (henceforth
referred to as PMDF).
of Arlington will be explained . . . Verne E. Chatelain, chief historian of the National Park Service, will undertake to compile its historic story. . . .

Although the QMG, the Commission of Fine Arts, and the General Organization of the Sons of Confederate Veterans protested the transfer of Arlington House to the National Park Service, Harold Ickes, then Secretary of the Interior, convinced President Roosevelt to let matters stand.

Shortly after the transfer Col. Mortimer collaborated with the NPS to develop a series of estimates for what were seen as critical final stages of the War Department restoration program. These included paving with brick the basement floors in the mansion, painting the exterior of the mansion and two slave quarters, partial restoration of the kitchen garden, and replacement of the wooden steps on the east portico of the mansion with limestone steps.

As part of President Roosevelt’s Great Depression economic recovery programs, in 1933, the Public Works Administration awarded the NPS $12,470 to complete the work. The NPS agreed to have Col. Mortimer direct the proposed work and submitted bills to the NPS. NPS’s budding historical section began to research “what historical basis there might be for the items submitted by Colonel Mortimer.” Chief NPS Historian Verne Chatelain and his assistant historian, Elbert Cox, reviewed the proposed work along with NPS architect Charles E. Peterson, now recognized as a notable historical architect who was instrumental in establishing the Historic American Buildings Survey. Based on Cox’s preliminary research, Peterson objected especially to the installation of stone steps where evidence indicated there had never been stone steps at the east portico. In a memorandum to the NPS director in December 1933, he stated that “This office is opposed to ‘improving’ antique structures to make them look as modern people think they should have, instead of trying to make them look as they really did.”

The stone steps envisioned by the War Department at the outset of the restoration were never built. Through the 1930s, NPS continued to use public works funding to undertake minor repairs and upgrades to the mansion, the outbuildings, and their heating and fire protection systems. Colonel Mortimer remained involved, making suggestions for protecting the historic house that he had spent years restoring.

As the park service’s historic sites staff, programs and policies matured, the philosophy behind the management and restoration of Arlington House evolved. In the late 1940s and 1950s, the

298 The Washington Post, 8 August 1933, in ARHO, Park Master Data File Notebook, 1933.
299 Harold I. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior to Charles Moore, February 2, 1934., ARHO Archives, CFA Archives.
NPS redoubled research efforts in order to more fully document the house and its grounds and to guide accurate period restoration, rather than relying on the aesthetically popular Colonial and Classical Revival modes advocated by the CFA and other early restoration architects. Likewise, NPS rethought the restoration period for the house. By the late 1940s, NPS had returned to the original intent of the 1925 law, and that commitment would strengthen, culminating in the 1960s and 1970s, when the NPS finally completed an exterior restoration to the house’s 1861 appearance. Likewise, the NPS’ commitment to the Lee interpretation is reflected in the first complete furnishing plan approved by the NPS in 1979 and the first allocation of funds to begin acquisition of Lee-era original furnishings and artifacts.

Although, after 1933, NPS controlled Arlington House and two of its outbuildings, it was not until 1947 that the War Department (the Department of the Army) approved a survey plat delineating the 2.73 acres controlled by the NPS. Since then, a number of land transfers have enlarged and later decreased the land area held by the NPS. In 1956, the Arlington House property was assigned a federal reservation number (Res. No. 697). In 1959, the property was expanded to include the former flower garden to the south of the mansion. In 1964, the secretary of the army ordered that the woodland to the west and north of Arlington House be preserved as park land in perpetuity with the purpose of enhancing the beauty of the cemetery and to preserve and protect the setting of the Arlington House historic site.

In 1975, the army determined the area to be excess property and transferred 24.44 acres to the National Park Service. This transfer was initiated as part of the Legacy of Parks Program which was started in 1971 as a federal program aimed at excessing federal lands to be used by cities, counties and states for park purposes. The last transfer to enlarge the land holdings associated with Arlington House was executed in 1998. The land exchange was calculated to give the cemetery land upon which to build its new administration building and visitor center (off Memorial Avenue near the cemetery entrance). In the exchange, NPS acquired the 1931 Cemetery Administration Building along with the 0.17-acres upon which it stands. After a building fire and subsequent remodeling, the NPS now occupies the building as the park headquarters. After six years of consultation and controversy, in 2002, the NPS transferred 12 acres of the Arlington Woodlands back to the army, for use by the cemetery for burials. Today, the national park comprises 16.08 acres.

Name changes and park designation changes have reflected Arlington House’s place in history and in public notions of commemoration. In 1955, the Lee Mansion was officially renamed the

---

301 In 1947, the War Department became the Department of the Army & the Department of the Air Force. Two years later, in 1949, the army, navy, and air force were consolidated under the U.S. Department of Defense. National Archives & Records Administration, Online Guides to Federal Records: “Records of the Office of the Secretary of War, Record Group 107, 1791-1947,” http://www.archives.gov/research/guide-fed-records/groups/107.html#107.1
303 For details on land transactions, see the George Washington Memorial Parkway Administrative History (NPS, Mackintosh, 1996) and the update to it, prepared by Robinson & Associates, August 2011.
Custis-Lee Mansion. According to the statement of Virginia Congressman Joel Broyhill, who introduced the legislation, the change was requested to avoid confusion with Robert E. Lee’s birthplace, Stratford Hall in Westmoreland County, Virginia.

More importantly, the 1955 legislation established the Custis-Lee Mansion as a permanent national memorial to Robert E. Lee, the same designation given to the Lincoln and Jefferson memorials built across the Potomac River. Thus, the initial intent of Congress was finally codified into law during a period in American history associated with the renewed use of Confederate symbols by Southern conservatives who opposed the civil rights movement. In 1972, the park’s name was changed again to its present designation as “Arlington House, The Robert E. Lee Memorial.” This change reflected the National Park Service’s desire to apply the historic name given to the estate by its original builder.

The following is a brief summary by decade of important developments in the management of Arlington House since 1940:

1940s and 1950s

The Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) completed measured drawings of Arlington House in 1941 and, on December 10, Chief of Planning Thomas Vint transmitted the Vandyke negatives of HABS Survey VA-443 (18 sheets), Arlington House, Arlington County, Virginia, to the superintendent of National Capital Parks (Drawing 2.3-66).

The Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, and the United States entered World War II. Wartime hours of operation and defense precautions were instituted at Arlington House and other National Capital Park sites on December 8, 1941. National Park Service appropriations and personnel were cut to the bone during the national emergency, and operations were reduced to caretaking activities. With the end of the war, however, appropriations for the National Park Service did not increase greatly. With the nation’s economy booming and the rising leisure time and discretionary funds of its growing middle class, visitation at National Parks, including Arlington House, increased in the late 1940s and early 1950s. Despite the boom, funding did not keep pace. In June 1950, just as there seemed to be some progress in

306 Vint to Superintendent, National Capital Parks, December 10, 1941, ARHO Archive, in PMDF 1940-49.
307 Superintendent, National Capital Parks, to the Director (NPS), December 8, 1941, in ARHO Archive, PMDF 1940-49. Also see Radio and Press Release, December 8, 1941, ibid.
funding, the United States entered the Korean conflict and once again funds were drastically reduced.  

Still, planning continued at Arlington House. In 1945, with the ultimate intent of restoring the 19th century gardens to the north and south of the house, Irving Payne, Chief Landscape Architect for the Buildings and Grounds Division of National Capital Parks within the National Park Service, created a plan for the redesign of the grounds to the east and west of Arlington House. Implementation started in 1948, and his design was in place by 1954. Payne’s plan included the use of over 40 kinds of shrubs, heavy foundation planting for the east side of the house, the use of prickly plants to discourage trespassing, a planting of roses in the northeast corner of the kitchen garden, and an American Holly hedge surrounding the kitchen garden. In addition, a fruit garden was installed in the western half of the kitchen garden. Boxwoods were moved from the edge of the kitchen garden to screen the Monument of the Unknown Civil War Soldier from the flower garden area, and to the edge of the woods on the north and east end of the kitchen garden to provide a transition between the woods and the turf area near the potting house.

Research and Museum Development

In the late 1940s and early 1950s, visitation at Arlington House increased. In order to improve interpretation of the property, Murray Nelligan, one of the first historians employed at Arlington House, wrote a comprehensive social history of the Custis and Lee families at Arlington from the eighteenth century to their departure from the estate at the beginning of the Civil War. Nelligan’s manuscript history helped clarify the construction dates and repairs and renovations made by Lee after Custis’ death.

The Arlington House research project, 1948-1953, is recognized as one of the National Park Service’s major pioneering efforts toward a comprehensive study of a historical site using original sources. Despite many statements to the contrary, between 1941 and 1955, the National Park Service engaged in little original historical or architectural research. There were two major reasons for this. First, many officials in the regional and Washington offices believed that


Section 8 page 128
research had no practical use and hence was a waste of the taxpayers money; and second, many Congressmen agreed. 311

The Arlington House research project, 1948-53, provided an immense amount of previously unknown data about the history of the house and the Custis and Lee families from 1800 to 1865. The result of Nelligan’s work was both a thorough research collection that today forms the core of the Arlington House Archives and a 703-page typewritten manuscript covering the history of the estate and the house from 1800 – 1865, which was not published until 2002.

To more fully express the significance of the Custis and Lee families, in the early 1950s, a museum was created to display artifacts associated with their lives at Arlington. 312 The museum was placed in the 1880s potting shed building located in the north east corner of the old kitchen garden. With the new research being conducted on the life of Robert E. Lee and his family, a small restoration project took place and additional elements were added to the landscape of Arlington House, most likely to assist in the interpretation of the site. For instance, in 1954, a large bed of camellias was planted near the north wing of the house (where there was room) because oral history had revealed that Mary Lee sometimes referred to the conservatory, on the southern wing of the house, as the camellia house. 313

Nelligan’s research and recommendations also initiated changes within the mansion. In 1953, based on primary source documentation, the two marble mantels that had been removed from the White Parlor were reinstalled in their original locations. Nelligan’s research showed that Lee ordered and had the mantels installed in 1855 and that the War Department had replaced them with earlier period reproductions upon the advice of Charles Moore of the CFA. Nelligan also worked closely with Architect Haussmann to conduct early paint studies to determine historic interior paint colors. Between 1954 and 1957, three rooms were repainted based on their work.

1960s

During the 1960s, the National Park Service developed its first master plan for Arlington House and conducted extensive research and restoration work aimed at returning the house and its grounds to their appearance in 1861. Increased visitation and outside development of the cemetery impacted the house and grounds.

312 “Museum Planned as Adjunct to Lee Mansion.” Washington Evening Star April 18, 1950.
313 Interview, by L. M. Leisenring of Mrs. Annie Baker and Mrs. Ada Thompson daughters of Thornton and Selina Grey. March 3, 1930. Transcript ARHO.
1963-1967 – John F. Kennedy Gravesite—Through the NPS’s management of Arlington House, a delicate balance has existed between the cemetery function and the treatment of the historic house and grounds. Some cemetery activities have altered the landscape and visitation at Arlington House. On November 25, 1963—three days after his assassination—President John F. Kennedy was buried on the eastern slope below Arlington House. The original burial site, chosen for its proximity to the historic Lee Mansion that Kennedy had visited only seven months before his death, and because of its prominence in the landscape, was small and initially surrounded by a white picket fence. Over sixteen million people visited Kennedy’s grave during the three years following his death.314 Due to the overwhelming crowds, cemetery officials and members of the Kennedy family decided a more permanent site should be constructed. In addition to the grave area designed by John Warnecke and Associates on the east slope, the cemetery constructed a small viewing terrace slightly north and east of Arlington House, and connected to the grounds by a short concrete stairway. Following the dedication of the gravesite, the entire hillside below Arlington House, about 3.2 acres, was set aside to honor the memory of President Kennedy by the secretary of the army, assuring that it remains open forever.315

1964-1967 – Master Planning and Garden Development—With the increased visitation generated by the introduction of the tour bus system to Arlington National Cemetery in the early 1960s, something needed to be done to address issues of resource protection and interpretation. In 1966 the National Park Service created a master plan for the Custis-Lee Mansion. There were four major factors which contributed to the specific objectives of the plan. The first was the increasing understanding and regulation of historic resources with the passage of the National Historic Preservation Act in 1966. The act, which was spurred by the destruction in the wake of national urban renewal and highway construction policies of the postwar era, formulated standards of preservation and called upon the National Park Service to create the National Register of Historic Places.

The passage of the 1966 act encouraged the NPS to focus on historically significant properties through the allotment of additional funding towards their preservation. The second factor was embedded in the National Park Service’s nationwide response to increasing visitation and limited funding during the war years—Mission 66. Initiated in 1956, this ten year program was funded to upgrade park facilities and improve resource management. Thirdly, across the country at both the national and local levels, the theories of living history interpretation and their basis in the rise of material culture studies generated an increased focus on re-creating settings appropriate to telling specific stories. Tours of house museums and other sites, led by costumed guides became increasingly common, in parks both within the National Park Service and without. Finally, a master plan was produced following the 1957 legislation that created the Custis-Lee Mansion as a permanent memorial to Robert E. Lee. As the mission statement of the 1966 Master Plan read:

The interpretation and restoration programs at Custis-Lee National Memorial will provide the visitor with a moving personal experience leading to a clear understanding of R. E. Lee and his place in American history.316

In order to achieve this mission of “understanding the life and worth of Robert E. Lee,” the “historic scene as it appeared in April of 1861” needed to be recreated.317 This re-emphasis on the place of Robert E. Lee in the interpretation of Arlington House was characteristic of the 1950s and 1960s—a time associated with a rebirth of Southern patriotism in light of concurrent re-evaluations of the causes of the Civil War. Post World War II nationalism along with the social unrest associated with the American Civil Rights Movement of the period prompted many to re-embrace the post-Civil War Lee as a symbol of national unity.318

A major portion of recapturing the scene was the re-creation of the flower garden. In 1964, the National Capital Office of Design and Construction of the NPS created a plan to restore the flower garden based on the recorded history of 1930. By 1967, the NPS had established a rectangular flower garden on the terrace south of the house. It had gravel paths and curvilinear beds. The removal in 1967 of the Temple of Fame from the center of the flower garden made possible the restoration.

1970s

In 1972, the name of the Custis-Lee Mansion was legally changed to “Arlington House, The Robert E. Lee Memorial” through legislation introduced by Representative Broyhill.319 In May of 1975, the National Park Service acquired 24.44 acres of land that had been set aside in perpetuity in 1964 by the secretary of the army to provide an appropriate setting for Arlington House.320 The National Park Service agreed to assume the preservation and management of the forested area known as Arlington Woods or Section 29 of Arlington National Cemetery. With the flower garden restored, the kitchen garden was replanted with vegetables. Fruit trees and shrubs were also planted including raspberries, gooseberries, currants, pears, cherries, and plums.321

During the years 1972-1979 more than $100,000 was to be expended for the repair and restoration of Arlington House; among the work completed was interior and exterior painting, remarbelization of the front columns, window repairs and the addition of light filtering window film; correction of structural weaknesses, and restoration of the 1861 roof appearance (simulated gravel applied to wing roofs, copper gutters and downspouts replaced in 1861 configuration, etc., main roof slates repaired).

1972-1979 – Furnishings Plan – A preliminary report for the furnishing study for Arlington House was completed by Harpers Ferry Center Museum Curator Agnes Mullins and submitted for review to the Division of Museums at Harpers Ferry Center on June 1, 1972. Work on the study for the plan was continued by Mullins during 1973 and 1974. In her annual report for 1974, Site Supervisor Fuqua commented on the project:

Work continued on the furnishings study. Most of the time was spent in continuing study of the Lee family papers at the Virginia Historical Society in Richmond and the Custis-Lee portraits owned by Washington and Lee University.

In 1975 she noted that "a complete and comprehensive inventory of furnishings was taken. This inventory included notations on the condition of the furnishings and provides a basis for future restoration needs."

The plan was approved in 1979 and Site Supervisor Fuqua noted:

The furnishing plan for Arlington House was approved this year. Division of Museum Services allotted $20,000 to get implementation underway. This marked the first time since the 1920s that major budgeted funds have been available for acquisition of furnishings for Arlington House. By the end of the year research and final specifications for ordering reproduction carpeting for the center hall, south stairway, and second floor hallway were completed. During the year, 204 furnishings for the house were received as gifts or purchases.

1980s

During the 1980s the varied jurisdiction of the site continued to affect its development. In 1981 the lavatory building, or comfort station, north of the northern slave quarter was transferred to the National Park Service. The land upon which the comfort station building was located, however, was retained by the Department of Army and leased to the NPS under a renewable 5-year permit. The administration building, the early twentieth-century reproduction of the

---

original stables building, had been transferred to the NPS; the parking lot and the nearby structures remained under the ownership of the Department of Army. Around Arlington House, the graveled area continued to be extended as the brick walks surrounding the slave quarters were removed. National Park Service signs were added. The historic elm tree, once located at the center of the northern edge of the flower garden, having succumbed to Dutch elm disease, was replaced. Based on analysis of the 1864 photograph collection by Andrew J. Russell, a Kentucky coffee tree was planted immediately south of the southern wing of the house.

During fiscal year 1979, $100,000 was received for the emergency stabilization and repair of the mansion. Some of this money was used to begin extensive historical and physical investigations that would culminate in a multi-volume historic structure report completed between 1979 and 1985.

1990s-present

By the 1990s, the flower garden again needed rehabilitation and the house required numerous fixes. The garden was rehabilitated based on existing and new research into the specific Custis and Lee-era flower garden and on flower gardens of the early nineteenth century. The NPS undertook mostly minor repairs to the house aimed at preserving the historic fabric and improving visitor safety. In 1999-2000, a new exterior coating and re-marbelization based on a 1994 paint study was completed.

In the mid-1990s cemetery officials, realized that within ten years the current land of Arlington National Cemetery would be at burial capacity; thus they approached officials of the National Park Service with a proposal to allow burials in such portions of the wooded area as could be determined not to have historical significance or archeological resources. On February 22, 1995, the Department of the Interior and the Department of the Army signed an interagency agreement to transfer portions of Arlington Woods (designated Section 29 of Arlington National Cemetery) back to the army for cemetery use. In 1998, a cultural resources investigation report was completed in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act and in satisfaction of the requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. The report detailed the existing cultural resources within the primarily wooded 24.44 acre parcel. A draft environmental assessment was developed based on the cultural resource investigation report and the environmental issues regarding the site.

The 1998 investigations revealed significant historic resources across much of the project area. The investigation revealed that the Arlington Woods contained an archeological site of high integrity, with significant prehistoric and historic deposits. Furthermore, it determined that the forest retained high integrity as it contained vegetation dating to the Custis-Lee occupation. The study advised that “only limited portions of the study area can be utilized for interments without adversely affecting cultural resources,” and further recommended that the entire preservation zone be preserved intact.\(^{329}\)

Despite opposition to the cemetery expansion from members of Congress, the NPS, Arlington County officials, the NAACP, and the Sierra Club, the National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2002 authorized the transfer of 12 acres of land designated as the interment zone from Section 29 of Arlington Cemetery from the Department of the Interior to the Department of the Army.\(^{330}\) The bill also charged the secretary of the interior with managing the remainder of the tract “in perpetuity to provide a natural setting and visual buffer for Arlington House, the Robert E. Lee Memorial.”

In 2000, the fire-damaged administrative building re-built in 1930-1931 on the footprint of the Custis-Lee stable, was rehabilitated for use as administrative offices for staff of Arlington House.

The 2011 update to the George Washington Memorial Parkway Administrative History prepared by Robinson and Associates summarized the most recent condition problems and rehabilitation plans:

As the controversy over Section 29 continued into the early twenty-first century, Arlington House, the Robert E. Lee Memorial ... experienced worsening conditions. A leaky basement and the ensuing destructive mold spores circulating throughout the mansion forced the NPS to restrict public access to some of the rooms at Arlington House.\(^{331}\) In 2000, Virginia congressmen successfully secured a $150,000 appropriation under the Save America’s Treasures Fund for renovation planning and staffing. With Arlington County’s bicentennial celebrations generating increased interest in the site, NPS requested $2.15 million from Congress for the 2002 fiscal budget to address the drainage issues plaguing the cellar; however, only $1.562 million was received. Funds would also be used to restore two slave quarters behind the house in addition to upgrading utilities, constructing new restrooms, and improving handicap accessibility. The NPS’

---


defined goals for the restoration project were to provide a safe environment for the visiting public where the history and significance of the site could be interpreted through a more accurate representation of the circa 1861 conditions.\textsuperscript{332}

Although the restoration project was initially proposed in 1998, it was not fully funded until 2003. Several reports were produced in conjunction with the restoration effort, including a 2001 Cultural Landscape Report; a [draft] 2004 Historic Structures Report for the slave quarters; a 2003 archeological compliance investigation; a 2004 Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) documentation of Arlington House, the slave quarters, and grounds; as well as proposed draft revisions for the 1966 Master Plan.\textsuperscript{333}

As of November 2012, the three-phase rehabilitation of Arlington House, the Robert E. Lee Memorial was nearing completion with the furnishing of the rehabilitated house ongoing. Phase I included installation of a fire detection and suppression system throughout the house and ductwork for climate management to protect the house and historic furnishings. During Phase II contractors installed a climate management system that included construction of a below-grade mechanical bunker to the west of and screened from the house, provided a new HVAC system, and replaced underground ductwork. Phase III included repairs on the interior of the house, return of the home’s furnishings, rehabilitation of the slave quarters, partial restoration of the spatial qualities of the original Kitchen Garden, stabilization of the soils and the house foundation, and replacement of the circa-1921 comfort station. The project also focused on improving access to the buildings and grounds pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act.

\textsuperscript{332} The Louis Berger Group, “Environmental Assessment: Rehabilitation of Arlington House, Outbuildings, and Grounds,” prepared for the U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, George Washington Memorial Parkway, 2006, I. The preferred alternative for the Kitchen Garden restoration recognizes that certain features from the post-Civil War era, such as the potting shed, have significance in their own right. The alternative proposes a gravel access road to the west of the north slave quarter to improve site circulation.

CRITERION D – ARCHEOLOGY

Archeology at Arlington House

Arlington House Site

Archeological investigations within and around Arlington House (VDHR #44AR0017; ASMIS #GWMP00019.000) have provided evidence of original landscaping and construction of the house and its immediate grounds.

The first known study was an informal survey conducted in 1954 after the removal of a locust tree which uncovered china, glass, and stoneware. In 1955, a second investigation shed light on a trash deposit and artificial grading in the area. In 1963 an excavation conducted by Bruce Powell, Regional Archeologist in the National Capital Region of the National Park Service, recovered information on the historic composition and appearance of the Custis-Lee era flower garden. In 1982, an investigation to determine if the construction of a proposed waterline in Arlington Woods would have an adverse effect on potentially significant cultural resources led to the recommendation of a new route for the waterline.

The earliest major archeological study undertaken at Arlington House was completed in 1980 by NPS archeologist John Pousson. Pousson’s excavations were completed within and around the main house, with a focus on the winter kitchen in the basement of the north wing and in the lower loggia walkway of the north wing. Pousson’s work was completed in support of the Historic Structure Report and aimed at recovering information on the construction evolution of the house. The study revealed the remains of kitchen features, including a hearth, along with other building features such as a stairway leading from the north side of the loggia, the base of a 1850s heating system, and historical grades outside the north wing. Deposits found along the house perimeter suggested that the area was used for refuse disposal before being formally landscaped after the final construction phase was complete in 1817-1818. Pousson’s north wing investigations informed the reconstruction of the lower level loggia, the winter kitchen, and the wine cellar.

Later investigations revealed that the original yard area between the two slave quarters existed approximately 2 feet lower during the historic period than it did at the time of investigation. In 1991, to fulfill compliance requirements, a study of land which would be impacted during a high voltage electrical system upgrade was undertaken. Removal of an underground fuel tank near the north slave quarters in the 1990s resulted in monitoring. During the monitoring project, NPS archeologist Matt Virta confirmed the absence of evidence for an outside entrance to what is

known as the coachman’s room at the lower level of the north slave quarters. In addition, the existence of a dry-laid brick pavement approximately three feet below ground suggested that considerable grade change had occurred in this location.

A significant study was undertaken by Garrow and Associates in 1998. Along with archeology, it included cultural landscape inventory, and forestry and viewshed analysis. The Garrow study resulted in the identification of the Arlington Ravine Site, but made no further investigations in the Arlington House site.335

Finally, a 2005 report prepared by the Louis Berger Group of Washington, D.C. gathered information about slave life at Arlington and investigated the potential effects of construction of a new comfort station and utility bunker on the site. The study concluded that much of the landscape around the buildings has been greatly altered, “not only during the site’s historic occupation period, but also during subsequent restoration campaigns under periods of ownership by the War Department (1864-1933) and NPS (1933-present).”336

The Arlington House Archeological Site has local and statewide significance under Criterion D for its realized and potential ability to provide substantive information about the form and function of an elite, early-to-mid-19th century Virginia estate.

Arlington Ravine Site

Identified through a Phase II investigation conducted in 1997, the Arlington Ravine Archeological Site (VDHR #44AR0032; ASMIS #GWMP00086.000) is a multi-component Native American and European American site that includes intact surface and subsurface features and artifacts that date from the historic and pre-historic periods. The remains of the 19th century icehouse and trash midden located within the site boundaries offer potential new information on how the Custis-Lee estate operated. The prehistoric remains, while scattered and reflecting non-intensive lithic extraction activities, represent a very rare occurrence of a large-scale quarry site in Arlington County, and thus, provide significant research potential at the local level.

336 Berger Group (June 2005), p. i.
Appendix A: Biographies

Edward W. Donn, Jr., Architect (1868-1953): A native Washingtonian, Edward W. Donn, Jr. trained at M.I.T., graduating with a B.S. in Architecture in 1891. After traveling and practicing on his own, Donn worked for the Office of the Supervising Architect, Department of the Treasury and then joined in partnership with two other D.C. architects to form the firm of Wood, Donn & Deming. This firm was highly successful in D.C., designing a number of high profile buildings, including the Union Trust Building at 15th and H Streets, NW; the Masonic Temple (now the National Museum of Women in the Arts at 801 13th Street, NW), and the Carnegie Geophysical Laboratory on Upton Street, NW. After 1923, Donn practiced on his own, pursuing his antiquarian interests. He specialized in the restoration of nationally significant historic buildings in Virginia and Maryland and was considered a pioneer in preservation. He undertook the reconstruction of George Washington's birthplace, Wakefield in Westmoreland County, Virginia, and he worked on the restoration of the Octagon in D.C., Woodlawn Plantation in Fairfax County, Virginia, Kenmore, the home of Washington's sister, Mary Lewis in Fredericksburg, Virginia; and the apothecary shop and George Washington schoolhouse also in Fredericksburg. In the mid-1920s, the War Department hired Donn to work on plans for a reconstruction of George Washington's birthplace at Wakefield in Westmoreland County, Virginia. The War Department controlled the property and the Commission of Fine Arts reviewed the plans. In 1927, Donn’s design for what is now called the “Memorial House” was approved by the CFA and the War Department. In 1932, as part of the George Washington Bicentennial Celebration, Donn designed entrance markers commissioned by the Garden Club of America for important entrances to the city from Maryland.337

Brig. Gen. William Horton was a highly decorated general who served in three wars: the Spanish-American War (1898), the Philippine Insurrection (1899-1902), and World War I (1914-1918). During World War I, he served in France as the chief quartermaster in charge of supplying troops; for which he earned the Distinguished Service Medal. In addition, Horton received many foreign honors for his European service. Upon returning to Washington, he was active in the city’s social life, and was reportedly friends with three U.S. Presidents. He was a member of a number of military and patriotic societies.338

Luther Morris Leisenring, Architect (1875-1965)339 Born in 1875 in Lutherville, Maryland, Luther Morris Leisenring trained in architecture at the University of Pennsylvania where he graduated with a two-year degree in 1898. Following graduation, he won two fellowships that allowed him to study architecture in Europe. In 1906 Leisenring moved to Washington, D.C. as a designer with the firm Hornblower & Marshall (based in NYC), which was then working on

---

339 Much of the biographical text on Luther M. Leisenring is taken from the entry on him including the D.C. Historic Preservation Office’s D.C. Architects Directory that was prepared by History Matters, LLC in November 2011. The Directory is available by request from the D.C. Office of Planning, Historic Preservation Office, Washington, D.C.
the design of the Smithsonian’s new National Museum building on the Mall (now the Museum of Natural History).

After establishing his own private practice with partner Charles Gregg, in 1918, Leisenring became head of the architectural design group in the Quartermaster General’s Office of the U.S. War Department. At the War Department, he was responsible for the preparation of designs as well as overseeing commissions given to private architectural firms. Among the first category of projects were: the original stages of the restoration of Fort McHenry in Baltimore (1926-1927); the restoration of Arlington House, its dependencies and furnishings (1928-1931); U.S. Army officers’ and enlisted housing, hospitals, and chapels; and the layout and architectural features at several newly established cemeteries throughout the U.S.

During World War II (1941-1945), Leisenring acted as consulting architect on the design and construction of the Pentagon where he established standards of construction and ways to expedite outside architectural and engineering contracts with the army. He also wrote the competition programs for monuments such as the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, the Wright Brothers’ Monument at Kitty Hawk, N.C., and the memorial at Appomattox Court House.

Leisenring was active in promoting the architectural profession; in the early 1920s, he worked with the U.S. Congress to pass an act in 1924 “to provide for the examination and registration of architects and to regulate the practice of architecture in the District of Columbia.” The law established a Board of Examiners and Registrars of Architects; Leisenring was the third architect registered in D.C. and was appointed to the board in 1925; he served as its president from 1938 to 1953. Upon his retirement in 1946, Luther M. Leisenring received a Meritorious Service Award from the War Department in recognition of his years of service.

Leisenring’s interest in historic buildings began with his travels in Europe and his early restoration work on the 1742 house Bellefield in Croom, Maryland before World War I, and then grew during his government tenure. After retirement, Leisenring worked on other historic buildings such as Tulip Hill in Anne Arundel County, Maryland. As chairman of the American Institute of Architect’s (AIA) preservation committee, he worked to save Wheat Row (Washington’s earliest row houses) in southwest D.C. and the historic buildings surrounding Lafayette Park including the Renwick Gallery.

In 1951, Luther Morris Leisenring was elected a Fellow of the AIA. Among the achievements noted at the time of his election were his 28 years of public service in the War Department, his service to the AIA Washington Metropolitan Chapter by serving on a number of committees, his

---

work for the passage of the Architects' Registration Act of 1924, and his interest and work in protecting "architectural monuments of the District." Luther M. Leisenring died October 3, 1965 at the age of 90 and was buried in Prospect Hill Cemetery in northwest Washington, D.C.  

---
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Previous documentation on file (NPS):

____ preliminary determination of individual listing (36 CFR 67) has been requested
X____ previously listed in the National Register (NRIS# 66000040)
X____ previously determined eligible by the National Register
designated a National Historic Landmark
X____ recorded by Historic American Buildings Survey #HABS VA 7-ARL-1 through -26; VA-443
____ recorded by Historic American Engineering Record #
____ recorded by Historic American Landscape Survey #HALS VA-10

Primary location of additional data:
X____ State Historic Preservation Office
____ Other State agency
X____ Federal agency
____ Local government
____ University
X____ Other
Name of repository: National Park Service, National Capital Region and Arlington House, The Robert E. Lee Memorial Archive

Historic Resources Survey Number (if assigned): NRIS #66000040; Virginia Department of Historic Resources #000-0001; NPS List of Classified Structures (LCS) #s 000059; 000060; 011956; 011957; 011958(now demolished); NPS Cultural Landscape Inventory (CLI) #600049; VDHR File No. 000-0001

10. Geographical Data

Acreage of Property ______ approximately 31 acres (16.08 acres owned by NPS; remainder belonging to the U.S. Department of Defense: Army)
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Use either the UTM system or latitude/longitude coordinates

**Latitude/Longitude Coordinates**
Datum if other than WGS84: NAD83
(enter coordinates to 6 decimal places)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Longitude/X (NAD83)</th>
<th>Latitude/Y (NAD83)</th>
<th>X UTM (NAD83)</th>
<th>Y UTM (NAD83)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-77.073041</td>
<td>38.883864</td>
<td>320190.223500</td>
<td>4305931.401000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-77.071821</td>
<td>38.883734</td>
<td>320295.724700</td>
<td>4305914.602600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-77.071345</td>
<td>38.880589</td>
<td>320329.143300</td>
<td>4305564.621900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-77.072458</td>
<td>38.880098</td>
<td>320231.313800</td>
<td>4305512.318500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-77.074435</td>
<td>38.880203</td>
<td>320060.087600</td>
<td>4305527.885100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-77.075550</td>
<td>38.882112</td>
<td>319968.231000</td>
<td>4305741.918300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-77.077223</td>
<td>38.880927</td>
<td>319820.102300</td>
<td>4305613.749300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-77.078193</td>
<td>38.881054</td>
<td>319736.286400</td>
<td>4305629.731400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-77.076388</td>
<td>38.883191</td>
<td>319898.182600</td>
<td>4305863.334400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Or**

**UTM References**
Datum (indicated on USGS map):

- [ ] NAD 1927  or  - [ ] NAD 1983

1. Zone:  Easting:  Northing:
2. Zone:  Easting:  Northing:
3. Zone:  Easting:  Northing:
4. Zone:  Easting:  Northing:
Verbal Boundary Description (Describe the boundaries of the property.)

See attached boundary map.

The 1980 National Register listing for Arlington House encompassed the house, outbuildings, and all NPS-controlled land at that time. This amounted to 27.9 acres. Since 1980, the NPS land has contracted to 16.08 acres. In 2001, when NPS transferred administrative control of approximately 12 acres of woodland to the Department of the army (Public Law 107-107), it was determined that approximately 8.6 acres of the transferred woodland formed an important component of the historic landscape of Arlington House, and thus, it contributes to the National Register listing of Arlington House. The present nomination encompasses approximately 31 acres of land that includes all 27.9 acres nominated in 1980 (whether NPS- or Army-managed) plus approximately three (3.1) acres of Army land that contains resources that are importantly associated with the historic Arlington estate between 1802 and 1935.

The boundary increase area is limited to 3.1 acres located adjacent to the north, south, east, and southwest boundaries of the Arlington House NPS boundary, as well as the small discontiguous Custis Burial Plot (1 site) that stand approximately 1,100 feet southwest of the NPS boundary. The remaining portions of the nominated district fall within the original 1980 boundary.

The Arlington House Historic District boundary encompasses five of the six tracts of NPS controlled property that are associated with United States Reservation 697. The five tracts encompass approximately 16.08 acres:

- Arlington House and Slave Quarters – tract 01-104 – 0.48 ac. – acquired in 1947.
- Flower garden area – tract 01-102 – 0.76 ac. – acquired 1959.
- Administration Building and Land – 0.17 ac. – acquired in 1998.

The one, NPS-owned tract that is excluded from the historic district is the Curatorial Building tract (former comfort station/lavatory building). Acquired by NPS in 1981, the deed included the building with a permit to use the underlying land. It has been excluded because the building does not contribute to the historic or architectural significance of this district.

In addition, the district includes one small discontiguous site: the Custis Burial Plot where Mary and George Washington Parke Custis were buried in 1853 and 1857, respectively. The burial plot stands approximately 1,100 feet southwest of Arlington House and encompasses a fenced enclosure that contains two marble grave markers and a mature white oak tree. The Custis plot is owned and maintained by the U.S. Department of Defense, Army National Cemeteries Program.
Boundary Justification (Explain why the boundaries were selected.)

The proposed boundary is drawn to include those resources and landscape features located within and outside the NPS park boundary that are historically linked to the Custis-Lee development of the property, to its use as the military and cemetery administrative core between 1864 and 1933, and to the early twentieth-century restoration of the Custis-Lee-era domestic core. The included resources and landscapes relate to the various areas of significance identified in the nomination.

This approach acknowledges that lands and features outside the NPS’s jurisdiction have historical significance that contributes to the historical setting and development of the core. It also recognizes the Arlington House cluster served as the administrative center of Arlington National Cemetery for nearly seventy years, between 1864 and 1933. All of the adjacent property included within the proposed NR boundary is federally owned (Department of the Army) and contains features and resources that are historically associated with the evolution of the property from an early-19th century gentleman’s estate to a National Cemetery.

11. Form Prepared By

name/title: Kathryn Gettings Smith, Cultural Resource Specialist/Historian
organization: National Park Service, National Capital Region, History Program Office
street & number: 1100 Ohio Drive, SW
city or town: Washington state: DC zip code: 20242
e-mail: kathryn_smith@nps.gov
telephone: 202-619-7180
date: 31 December 2013

Additional Documentation

Submit the following items with the completed form:

- **Maps:** A USGS map or equivalent (7.5 or 15 minute series) indicating the property’s location.

- **Sketch map** of historic districts and properties having large acreage or numerous resources. Key all photographs to this map.

- **Additional items:** (Check with the SHPO, TPO, or FPO for any additional items.)
Photographs
Submit clear and descriptive photographs. The size of each image must be 1600x1200 pixels (minimum), 3000x2000 preferred, at 300 ppi (pixels per inch) or larger. Key all photographs to the sketch map. Each photograph must be numbered and that number must correspond to the photograph number on the photo log. For simplicity, the name of the photographer, photo date, etc. may be listed once on the photograph log and doesn’t need to be labeled on every photograph.

Photo Log
All photographs are common to:

Name of Property: Arlington House Historic District
Location: Arlington County, Virginia
DHR File Number: 000-0001
Photographer: Kathryn Gettings Smith, NPS, NCR Historian
Date Photographed: May - October 2012; May 2013
Location of digital images: Virginia Department of Historic Resources, Richmond, Virginia; National Register of Historic Places, Washington, DC

The following is a description of photograph(s) with numbers and descriptions of the view indicating direction of camera. “[In boundary increase area.]” after an entry indicates that the resource is located within the boundary increase area.

Photo 1 of 33: (VA_Arlington County_Arlington House Historic District_0001)
   Distant view of district looking west up the grassy east lawn from near gravesite of John F. Kennedy.

Photo 2 of 33: (VA_Arlington County_Arlington House Historic District_0002)
   Arlington House, east façade, detail of monumental Doric portico.

Photo 3 of 33: (VA_Arlington County_Arlington House Historic District_0003)
   Arlington House, southeast corner, looking NW at south wing and central portico.

Photo 4 of 33: (VA_Arlington County_Arlington House Historic District_0004)
   Arlington House, northeast corner, looking SW at north wing of house.

Photo 5 of 33: (VA_Arlington County_Arlington House Historic District_0005)
   Arlington House, East façade of central pavilion under portico. Looking SW.

Photo 6 of 33: (VA_Arlington County_Arlington House Historic District_0006)
   Arlington House, Rear (west) elevation, looking SE. Stone well in foreground.
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- **Photo 7 of 33**: (VA_Arlington County_Arlington House Historic District_0007)
  View looking northeast from the front of Arlington House. Arlington Memorial Bridge, Lincoln Memorial, and Washington Monument in middle distance.

- **Photo 8 of 33**: (VA_Arlington County_Arlington House Historic District_0008)
  Kitchen Garden looking NW from north end of Arlington House.

- **Photo 9 of 33**: (VA_Arlington County_Arlington House Historic District_0009)
  Flower Garden (left), Civil War Officers’ graves (center, edge of garden), and Lee Avenue (right), looking north toward Arlington House.

- **Photo 10 of 33**: (VA_Arlington County_Arlington House Historic District_0010)
  Flower Garden south of Arlington House mansion. View looking SE from near the northern entrance to the garden.

- **Photo 11 of 33**: (VA_Arlington County_Arlington House Historic District_0011)
  North Slave Quarters and Summer Kitchen. South elevation.

- **Photo 12 of 33**: (VA_Arlington County_Arlington House Historic District_0012)
  North Slave Quarters, North elevation. Two lower windows at left open into the former Summer Kitchen. Arlington House in background.

- **Photo 13 of 33**: (VA_Arlington County_Arlington House Historic District_0013)
  South Slave Quarters, smokehouse & storeroom. North and west elevations. View looking SE from service yard behind Arlington House mansion.

- **Photo 14 of 33**: (VA_Arlington County_Arlington House Historic District_0014)
  Interior of Old Amphitheater with marble altar set on raised stage to the right. Looking west. [In boundary increase area.]

- **Photo 15 of 33**: (VA_Arlington County_Arlington House Historic District_0015)
  Row of Civil War officers’ graves on the north side of Lee Avenue. View looking east from near east end of the Old Amphitheater. Path to Civil War Unknown Soldiers Monument visible in center distance. [In boundary increase area.]

- **Photo 16 of 33**: (VA_Arlington County_Arlington House Historic District_0016)
  Civil War Unknown soldiers Monument. View looking NW at the south and east elevations. [In boundary increase area.]

- **Photo 17 of 33**: (VA_Arlington County_Arlington House Historic District_0017)
  Grave monument of Lt. General Philip Henry Sheridan. Looking northeast from near the terminus of Lee Avenue. View of Washington, DC in background. [In boundary increase area.]

- **Photo 18 of 33**: (VA_Arlington County_Arlington House Historic District_0018)
  Grave monument of Pierre Charles L’Enfant, looking NE from east front of Arlington House. [In boundary increase area.]
Arlington House Historic District [2013]
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Photo 19 of 33: (VA_Arlington County_Arlington House Historic District_0019)
Mary Randolph’s Tomb, looking NE from the Kennedy gravesite overlook path. Custis Walk passes Tomb on the left. Graves downslope are outside the historic district. [In boundary increase area.]

Photo 20 of 33: (VA_Arlington County_Arlington House Historic District_0020)
Custis Burial Plot (discontiguous element of the historic district). Looking NW. Mary Custis’ monument on the left; G.W.P. Custis’ grave monument on the right. [In boundary increase area.]

Photo 21 of 33: (VA_Arlington County_Arlington House Historic District_0021)
NPS Administration Building (formerly the Arlington National Cemetery Admin. Building). View looking NE at south façade and west elevation. [In boundary increase area.]

Photo 22 of 33: (VA_Arlington County_Arlington House Historic District_0022)
Potting Shed (now the NPS Museum Building). View looking SE from new Comfort Station building.

Photo 23 of 33: (VA_Arlington County_Arlington House Historic District_0023)
New NPS Comfort Station (completed 2011). Southeast façade.

Photo 24 of 33: (VA_Arlington County_Arlington House Historic District_0024)
Arlington House interior: center hall looking west from main entrance. Photo taken Oct. 2012 at end of rehabilitation project & prior to refurnishing.

Photo 25 of 33: (VA_Arlington County_Arlington House Historic District_0025)
Arlington House interior: Dining Room looking NW. Photo taken May 2013 after refurnishing.

Photo 26 of 33: (VA_Arlington County_Arlington House Historic District_0026)
Arlington House interior: Morning Room looking northwest; 1929 Adams-style replica mantel on west wall. Photo taken Oct. 2012 at end of rehabilitation project & prior to refurnishing.

Photo 27 of 33: (VA_Arlington County_Arlington House Historic District_0027)
Arlington House interior: Rear transverse stair hall; view of main stair, looking southwest. Photo taken Oct. 2012 at end of rehabilitation project & prior to refurnishing.

Photo 28 of 33: (VA_Arlington County_Arlington House Historic District_0028)
Arlington House interior: Looking NW from the Family Parlor into the Dining Room; Custis-era marble mantels on north wall. Photo taken Oct. 2012 at end of rehabilitation project & prior to refurnishing.

Photo 29 of 33: (VA_Arlington County_Arlington House Historic District_0029)
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**Photo 30 of 33:** (VA_Arlington County_Arlington House Historic District_0030)

Arlington House interior: White Parlor looking southeast; Lee-era marble mantel on south wall. Photo taken May 2013 after refurnishing.

**Photo 31 of 33:** (VA_Arlington County_Arlington House Historic District_0031)

Arlington House interior: Family Parlor looking north from Center Hall. Photo taken May 2013 after refurnishing.

**Photo 32 of 33:** (VA_Arlington County_Arlington House Historic District_0032)

Arlington House interior: Detail of Custis-era mantel in the Custis Chamber on the first floor of the North Wing. Photo taken Oct. 2012 at end of rehabilitation project & prior to refurnishing.

**Photo 33 of 33:** (VA_Arlington County_Arlington House Historic District_0033)


**Paperwork Reduction Act Statement:** This information is being collected for applications to the National Register of Historic Places to nominate properties for listing or determine eligibility for listing, to list properties, and to amend existing listings. Response to this request is required to obtain a benefit in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended (16 U.S.C.460 et seq.).

**Estimated Burden Statement:** Public reporting burden for this form is estimated to average 100 hours per response including time for reviewing instructions, gathering and maintaining data, and completing and reviewing the form. Direct comments regarding this burden estimate or any aspect of this form to the Office of Planning and Performance Management, U.S. Dept. of the Interior, 1849 C. Street, NW, Washington, DC.
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