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ABSTRACT

Secondary narratives are most easily defined as narratives deemed non-essential to the primary interpretation goals of a historic site. Given the established significance criteria in the United States, secondary narratives are currently undervalued and are challenging to address. James Madison’s Montpelier in Orange County, Virginia serves as an ideal lens through which to explore this challenge, given that the estate clearly embodies more than one period of significance.

In 1901 William duPont Sr. of the illustrious Delaware duPont family purchased a large area of land just outside of the small rural town of Orange, Virginia. Located over two hundred miles from the family’s seat in Wilmington, Delaware, this swath of land was no other than the remnants of the estate our nation’s fourth president: James Madison’s Montpelier. Following their acquisition of the property, duPont and his successors transformed the long lost country estate into a thriving agricultural mecca centered on the duPont’s love of horses. Despite the vast impact of the duPonts on Montpelier’s modern cultural landscape, little attention has been given to preserving the duPont legacy.

To guide the revaluation of the secondary duPont narrative at Montpelier, as well as at other historic sites, this thesis proposes an alternative value-based approach to supplement the current federally recognized significance criteria in the United States. An adoption and expansion of English Heritage’s “heritage values,” this approach calls for the consideration of both heritage and latent values at historic sites. Such an approach provides for a more holistic consideration of a place, allowing for the valuation of all aspects of a site. The implementation of this heritage-latent value system allows for the reconsideration of secondary narratives, such as in the case of the duPont narrative at Montpelier.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Situated in the foothills of the Blue Ridge Mountains in rural Orange County, Virginia just six miles outside the limits of the sleepy town of Orange, lies a country estate whose rich history is the very personification of the American Dream. Over the course of its nearly three-hundred year history, Montpelier has served as home to hundreds of people, each generation leaving their own distinct mark on the landscape. While calling Montpelier his home, our nation’s fourth president James Madison penned our country’s most defining document, the United States Constitution. During the nineteenth century, numerous other owners worked to attain their American Dream at Montpelier, but to varying degrees of success. Throughout the twentieth century, the duPonds, a self-made American family, endeavored to achieve their own dream of returning the Montpelier landscape to a successful working estate. In 1984, Montpelier was entrusted to the National Trust for Historic Preservation so the property might be opened to the general public, serving as an educational vehicle for Madisonian and Constitutional history. While the Trust remains the legal owners of the property, the estate currently operates under the management of The Montpelier Foundation, as result of a co-stewardship agreement formed in 2000.1

Despite the property’s rich and multi-layered history, the Trust has made the active decision to focus its attention on Montpelier’s earlier years, presenting the property as “James Madison’s Montpelier.” While this interpretative goal may be set, the landscape

---

1Further details regarding both the co-stewardship agreement as well as a more detailed history of the Montpelier estate will follow in Chapter Two.
presented to visitors by the Trust is anything but a Madison era landscape. In truth, it is a landscape composed of a conglomeration of nineteenth, twentieth, and twenty-first century buildings. Well over seventy buildings constructed during the duPont era remain extant on the estate. Despite this overwhelming presence at the estate today, the incorporation of the duPont narrative into Montpelier’s interpretation is virtually non-existent. The Foundation and Trust have chosen to interpret the property to the period of Madison’s retirement years, primarily through the carefully restored Madison era mansion. In making this determination, the Foundation and the Trust grappled with the property’s complex history, choosing to direct their focus toward one period of significance: that of the late Madison years, at the exclusion of other periods in the property’s history.

Figure 1.1: Current view of mansion looking east. (Photograph by author)

An investigation into Montpelier’s interpretative history will take place in Chapter Four.

---

2 An investigation into Montpelier’s interpretative history will take place in Chapter Four.
Utilizing Montpelier as a primary case study, this thesis explores two large problems faced by many preservation organizations: realizing the full value of historic resources and identifying an appropriate means of preserving and interpreting the secondary narratives at a site. In the case of Montpelier, the Madison narrative has been widely accepted as the primary narrative of focus, or the most “significant period” in the estate’s history. This is due in part to the estate’s association with James Madison, a man of extreme national importance in our country’s history. While the significance of Madison cannot and should not be refuted, Madison’s influence is not the only segment of Montpelier’s expansive history worthy of note. Beyond the significance the estate garners from this link with Madison, the current acknowledgment of multiple historical perspectives, or secondary narratives, demands that the both the Trust and Foundation recognize and pay heed to all narratives present at the site. Doing so will allow the organizations to continue on as responsible stewards of the estate.

While the term secondary narrative is not an academically recognized term by the Secretary of Interior Standards, or any other official preservation authority, it is employed in this thesis as it best describes the case at hand. The term “secondary” in this particular sense is intended to refer to a narrative, or history of a site currently not granted equal recognition given the story driving the mission of a particular institution. This latter term is known as a site’s primary narrative. The term secondary narrative is intended to encompass all varieties of secondary stories- anything deemed at first pass “non-essential” to a site’s primary interpretation goals. The presently recognized term amongst scholars in reference to narratives of a similar nature to secondary narratives is
that of minority narrative. The term minority narrative is understood to describe a non-dominant historical view based upon race or gender, or an alternative version of history differing from the most prevalent telling. While the term minority narrative falls under the classification of a secondary narrative, not all secondary narratives may be considered a minority narrative. The duPont narrative is an example of this mutual exclusivity. It is for this reason that the term secondary narrative will be utilized throughout the course of this study.

While the challenge of incorporating secondary narratives into site interpretation and overall site value is faced at many historic sites throughout the United States, the case of Montpelier reveals itself to be a premier example of this challenge. Well known for its association with President James Madison, the property is more recently recognized for its modern twentieth-century tenants, the William duPont family. Despite the wide range of knowledge and understanding of the estate’s history during both of these periods, the Foundation faces a continuous daily struggle to interpret the estate to the public. Given Madison’s significant contributions to American history, this earlier period earns recognition as the prominent narrative at the estate. While may be the case, the ghosts of the duPont legacy are clearly visible on the estate’s landscape, manifesting in dozens of twentieth-century agricultural buildings. Montpelier is distinctly unique in this aspect. No other prominent historic site captures the juxtaposition of time and place within its built environment in the same manner as Montpelier. While other institutions face the dilemma of how to incorporate secondary narratives, the prominence of Montpelier within both American history and present day preservation circles allows Montpelier to
manifest as the perfect lens through which to investigate the current way in which the field of historic preservation values secondary narratives.

**A Look at Literature**

In addition to its lack of recognition in academic circles, the concept of the secondary narrative has yet to truly find its place in both the physical world of preservation interpretation and the canon of preservation literature. Although literature specifically addressing the interpretation of the secondary narrative is not a defined body of discourse, the topic has of late been loosely broached in scholarly work. Similarly, preservation literature includes consideration of multiple forms of significance, although the discussion is still in its early form. With regard to the traditional understanding of the term significance, there exists a substantial amount of literature. The discussion of this term is a frequently contended central concept in the field of historic preservation. Much of the published literature on significance argues for the re-evaluation of the

---

3 Although scant literature exists addressing the specific notion of secondary narratives within the context of broader, more significant primary histories, preservation literature has begun to touch on this subject through its increasing attention toward the subject of minority histories. Over the course of the past two decades much attention has been turned toward both the interpretation and incorporation of African American and Native American histories into the national dialogue. Such efforts can be seen at Montpelier through the reconstruction and interpretation of the Black Heritage on the property, ranging from slave history to the Civil Rights Era. Recent notable literature addressing the subject of minority interpretation include Jennifer B. Goodman’s *Restoring Women’s History through Historic Preservation* (2003); Deborah L. Rotman and Ellen-Rose Savulis’s *Shared Spaces and Divided Spaces: Material Dimensions of Gender Relations and the American Historical Landscape* (2003); Thomas King’s *Places that Count: Traditional Cultural Properties in Cultural Resource Management* (2003); “Blackness and Blood: Interpreting African American Identity” by Lionel K. McPherson and Tommie Shelby (2004); Max van Balgooy’s *Interpreting African American History and Culture at Museums and Historic Sites* (upcoming Dec. 2014); Raymond D’Angelo’s *The American Civil Rights Movement: Readings and Interpretations*; Samuel N. Stokes and A. Elizabeth Watson’s *Saving America’s Countryside: A Guide to Rural Conservation*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989.
current standards for determining significance to allow for the incorporation of broader histories. The case for the inclusion of secondary narratives in significance evaluation is made by Richard Longstreth in his article “Architectural History and the Practice of Historic Preservation in the United States.” In this publication, Longstreth identifies preservationist’s “reluctance to venture much beyond [the] well-established boundaries” to address more appropriately the vernacular, modern, minority, history etc. Longstreth approaches the growing need of the preservation field to more fully recognize the multifaceted and diverse layers of history currently ignored and forgotten at historic sites throughout the United States.

A review of the literature on the case study of this thesis revealed little formally published work about the Montpelier property, despite the prominence of its former owners. Even less is available about the estate's most recent occupants, the duPonts. This exposes a sizable gap in literature surrounding the property. The limited published material addressing the duPonts at Montpelier was published primarily by the Montpelier Foundation in the two years surrounding the completion of the mansion restoration project in 2008. The two in-house publications by the Foundation include *James Madison's Montpelier: Home of the Father of the Constitution* (2008), which depicts the basic history

---


6 Numerous institutional publications exist regarding the history and development of Montpelier as an estate, in addition to numerous reports on its cultural heritage. Few of these reports have been formally published, and therefore will not be discussed in this review, but rather will serve as critical source material for later analytical discussion research.
of the property on a level accessible to the average visitor, and Building a President's House: The Construction of James Madison's Montpelier (2008) which discusses the evolution of the Mansion from its original ground breaking to the completion of the restoration. Concurrent with the property's timely rise in popularity (due to the prominence of the mansion's restoration) Matthew Hyland published Montpelier and the Madison's: House, Home and American Heritage, which focuses solely on the Madisons and the estate during their occupation, proving no significant new source of study.

An interesting precursor to these publications is a 1998 article published in The Sociological Quarterly by James L. Nolan Jr. and Ty F. Buckman. The article stands as an outlier in the literature surrounding Montpelier in that it was written before the decision was made to carry out the Mansion restoration. The article presents an interesting ideological standpoint of the Foundation vocalized by the director at that point in time. At the time of publication, the article suggests that Montpelier would approach its future with a preservation outlook as opposed to that of restoration. Evidence of such public positioning encourages further investigation into the ideologies and governing opinions of both The Montpelier Foundation and the National Trust. Further investigation into

---


8The Secretary of the interior defines preservation as "applying measures necessary to sustain existing form, integrity, and materials of an historic property" whereas restoration is defined as "accurately depicting the form, features, and character of a property as it appeared at a particular period of time by means of the removal of features from other periods in its history and reconstruction of missing features from the restoration period." National Park Service, "Preservation Technology," accessed April 12, 2015, http://cr.nps.gov/local-law/arch_stnds_10.htm.

the decision making processes and goals of these organizations during Montpelier’s early years as a Trust property will be further discussed in Chapter Four.

While multiple books exist surrounding the property’s history during the Madison era, only one published work relates directly to the estate at the time of the duPont ownership. This work is Gerald Strine’s *The Recollections of Marion duPont Scott* (1976). Published less than ten years prior to her death, the work focuses primarily on Mrs. Scott’s career as an equestrian, but also briefly touches on her time spent living at Montpelier. The work provides brief insight into the more recent history of the property and helps to facilitate the larger discussion of the development of the estate’s twentieth century landscape.\(^{10}\) The singularity of this work directly relating to the duPont tenure at Montpelier reveals a significant gap in the literature on the subject. The present day interpretation efforts at the estate echo this trend. The vast majority of writing on the subject of Montpelier during the duPont era lies in unpublished reports and other materials contained within the archives of both the Trust and the Foundation. Due to their unpublished nature, these sources will not be evaluated as part of this discussion of existing literature, but rather will play a role in the body of this thesis.

While scant literature exists in relationship to either the duPonts or the idea of the secondary narrative (it goes without saying that no literature combines the two subjects)

---

the concept of significance has been central to historic preservation for decades. Despite the age of the idea, the conversation of historic significance is very much alive in today's scholarship. The discussion of significance began with the Historic Sites Act of 1935. It was in this act that the verbiage of “historical significance” was first used. It was not until the passage of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 that the four criteria for significance were devised. These criteria continue to reign unaltered over the field of historic preservation today, almost fifty years later. These criteria serve as qualifications for the National Register of Historic Places.¹¹

In the years following the passage of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, the National Park Service issued a number of National Register Bulletins, created with the intention of assisting individuals with the National Register nomination process, including shedding light on “significance.” Through their use, these bulletins have helped to frame and guide the way in which historic significance has been discussed over the course of the past forty-six years.¹² The most useful bulletin defining significance is Bulletin 15, or “How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation.” First published in 1990, this bulletin explores how to properly assess whether or not a specific historic property is considered significant under the four criteria set forth by the National


¹² Due to the recent conversion of the original bulletins to digital formats, many of the original bulletins are no longer referred to by their number, but rather merely referenced by their topic of focus. At present, twenty-eight different digital bulletins are currently posted to the National Register website relating to the application of the National Register Criteria to varying types of historic resources.
Register.\textsuperscript{13} Given the fact that the federal government publishes this bulletin, the same entity responsible for the National Register, it quite strict in its discussion of significance. As no revisions or further interpretations of the criteria have been made since their initial establishment, the definition of significance remains narrow and stagnant. Although revised editions of the bulletins have periodically been published, the bulletins continue to support the original definition of significance. This static nature serves as a focal point for criticism of the currently accepted process of attributing significance. As more sites begin to reach the fifty-year mark, which by definition of the federal criteria makes them eligible for Register consideration, the criteria are receiving critical attention with regard to their parameters. Some argue the criteria should be periodically reviewed in order to remain current. The narrow original definitions prescribed by the Register eliminate the possibility to incorporate new ideas and viewpoints on significance that have developed in the fifty years since the Register’s creation.

While the topic of significance has been widely discussed since the passing of the Historic Sites Act in 1935, the conversation remained relatively homogeneous until the early 1990s. At this point in time, a drastic spike occurred in the literary canon.

Publications surfacing during this time served as the starting point for arguments that would arise in the two decades that followed, and continue in some circles today. Unlike previous arguments, which were somewhat passive in their nature, these recent discussions strongly advocate for the re-examination of the current definition of significance. This popularity in recent academic discussion on the topic can most likely be attributed to the larger social movement of the 1990s and 2000s regarding the acknowledgment and incorporation of minority histories into the broader national narrative. In historic preservation this movement is characterized as a need to further explore our country’s cultural past, and begin to reexamine and realize the value of more non-traditional properties, and histories (ranging from traditional cultural sites, to vernacular, and even Modern structures).

Long before the advent of this discussion in the United States, the Austrian art historian Alois Riegl began an influential conversation with the publication of his essay “The Modern Cult of Monuments: Its Essence and Its Development.” In this short essay, Riegl builds upon some of the earlier discussions presented by John Ruskin pertaining to the growing appreciation for buildings as time passes. Riegl in turn takes the outlook that buildings gain value as they age and uses this idea to address his view of both the concept of age value and newness value. Riegl suggests there are multiple types of value (age, newness, and art) that lead to significance. His essay serves as the groundwork for many of the recent publications concerning the reevaluation of significance.14 Riegl’s theories

---

additionally serve to support the mission to find further value and significance in the duPont legacy at Montpelier. The application of his arguments will be further discussed in Chapter Four as part of an effort to facilitate a greater understanding for the lasting impact of the duPonds on the Montpelier landscape.

Published in 1998, as one of the landmark publications in the conversation of significance with regard to historic properties, is Michael Tomlan's *Preservation of What, for Whom?* This work is a compilation of essays compiled as result of a 1997 symposium of the same name at Goucher College. The publication reveals the topic of historic significance to be a “critical issue” for discussion. 15 Although all of the articles contained within the book advocate addressing the prevailing conundrum of the significance definition, three essays are particularly relevant to this thesis. These three articles encourage reforming the concept of significance to encompass a broader spectrum of place. The articles are: W. Brown Morton's “Determining Significance: Mind Over Matter?” Kendrick Ian Grandison’s “Beyond Buildings: Landscape as Cultural History in Constructing the Historical Significance of Place” and Barbara Anderson’s “The Importance of Cultural Meaning in Defining and Preserving Sense of Place.” All three of these essays push for, in one way or another, a closer examination of how the preservation field considers and values both cultural landscapes and traditions previously unconsidered, or difficult to rationalize under the current significance criteria. 16 It is through their push toward a new understanding of the term significance, and a cultural


16 Tomlan, 127-136, 143-150, 159-168.
landscapes perspective, that these articles assist in conveying the importance of realizing the secondary narratives at Montpelier, including that of the duPonts. While the Montpelier estate is the work of an upper-class white businessman, thus not a minority narrative by definition, the duPonts greatly shaped the landscape visible at Montpelier. Tomlan’s publication was the first of many advocating revisiting the significance question, however, his edited collection stands as the only book publication specifically addressing the topic. The remainder of the literature is composed primarily of scholarly articles.17

Published in 2003, Randall Mason’s “Fixing Historic Preservation: A Constructive Critique of Significance” addresses the problems that exist with the current significance criteria and classification. In this argument Mason brings attention to the point that much of the current perception of historic significance is fixed, discussing the predefined views of architectural historians and scholars of what is deemed historically significant. Paul Bentel’s “Where Do We Draw the Line? Historic Preservation’s Expanding Boundaries” (2004) further pushes this discussion, drawing attention to the fact that historic preservation has no “single voice.”18 Melinda J. Milligan’s “Buildings as History: The Place

17 More recent book publications addressing the concept of assessing significance include Donald L. Hardesty and Barbara J. Little, Assessing Site Significance: A Guide for Archaeologists and Historians 2ed. (Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press, 2009) and Ned Kaufman, Place, Race, and Story: Essays on the Past and Future of Historic Preservation, (New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, 2009). Although both publications deal primarily with assessing significance within the realms of cultural resource management (the latter delving slightly more into advocacy for attention to vernacular spaces) both present valid arguments within their respective area of focus that add to the greater discussion of re-evaluating significance.

of Collective Memory in the Study of Historic Preservation” (2007) takes an interesting approach to the discussion of significance. An article cited frequently by later publications on this topic, Milligan investigates the concept of significance from a sociological perspective, effectively presenting an outsider’s view into the study. Utilizing New Orleans as a case study, Milligan furthers the argument for revisiting the definition of significance, arguing that more must be saved and interpreted in order to present an accurate depiction of the development of the built environment.19

Chapter Five of Theodore Pruden’s Preservation of Modern Architecture (2008) works to build upon Milligan’s claims in that it advocates for a more critical look at the way the field currently views the preservation of Modern architecture. In this chapter, Pruden urges that the definition of significance move away from valuation solely on a building’s age and uniqueness, and look instead to a collective significance, specifically addressing Modern buildings. Trevor Blank further builds on both Pruden’s and Milligan’s discussion with the publishing of his article “Contesting the Contested: Preservation Politics, Collective Memory, and the First Institution for the Criminally Insane in America” (2009). Although focused around a now demolished insane asylum in Maryland, Blank uses this case study to further bring attention to the need to preserve all aspects of history. He argues that selective preservation of only the grand and elite histories and buildings traditionally significant under the current criteria should be

---

abandoned, as it is a misrepresentation of our cultural heritage.²⁰

Serving as testament to the frequent discussion of significance within preservation literature over the past twenty years, John Sprinkle’s Crafting Preservation Criteria: The National Register of Historic Places and American Historic Preservation (2014) is the most recent addition to the conversation.²¹ A compilation of eight articles, Sprinkle explores the development of the National Register criteria. Focusing primarily on the history and creation of the criteria, the majority of the essays endeavor to broaden the preservation field’s understanding of the criteria’s application and meaning. The second chapter of Sprinkle's book, an essay titled “An Orderly Balanced and Comprehensive Panorama” directly investigates the question of “how many sites are historically significant?”²² This chapter serves as a continuation of, and a connection to, the reoccurring argument made throughout preservation literature over the course of the past twenty years, questioning what is worthy of being considered significant. Although not a vehicle for any new interpretation or resolutions concerning the argument, the inclusion of this essay in Sprinkle's book, furthers the argument that the topic of revising the criteria is indeed worthy of receiving future attention by preservationists. The book assists the further understanding of the criteria history, which serves as an excellent guide for future discussion of criteria revision.

While some books exist pertaining to the topic of significance, the literature is


²² Sprinkle, 3, 26-44.
primarily comprised of articles, which reveals the lack of extensive discussion on the subject. Although existing literatures does present argument for the need to revisit the current criteria governing historic significance, little literature has suggested a new angle or alternative approach to this subject. The investigation of the secondary duPont narrative at Montpelier will serve not only as a guide for this specific institution, but will also help to refuel the discussion of significance, which has quieted considerably over the course of the past five years.

Methodology

Following the completion of the initial investigation phase carried out during the summer of 2014 as part of a summer internship, the focus of the thesis shifted toward an in depth study of both the historical and physical impact of the duPont legacy at Montpelier. In order to gain a complete understanding of the duPont influence, a visit to the National Trust for Historic Preservation’s headquarters in Washington D.C. took place the second to last week of October 2014. The primary focus of this visit laid in examining numerous documents pertaining to the Trust’s oversight at Montpelier. Within the Trust’s archival collection exists numerous planning documents relating to the early organization of the Montpelier estate under the Trust’s ownership, annual organizational reports, and interpretative reports. The examination of documents of this nature assisted in providing insight into the early management and organization of Montpelier. This including insight into the discussions that led to the manifestation of the estate’s present day interpretation, which is discussed in Chapter Four. In addition to general management documents,
the examination of reports relating to the interpretation of the Gilmore Cabin provided insight into how Montpelier is already addressing other secondary narratives on the property. Other document types, relating directly to the historical interpretation of the estate, were also examined.

In addition to examining archival material from the Trust, the Montpelier archives furnished a significant amount of primary and unpublished secondary source materials. As result of research conducted during a summer internship at the estate, numerous resources were collected prior to the start of this thesis process, and determined critical in understanding the significance of the duPont legacy at Montpelier. Included within these materials were legal documents pertaining to the acquisition of the property, existing building surveys, and the compiled recollections of Marion duPont Scott. Directly

Figure 1.2: The Gilmore Cabin, located across State Route 20 from the main estate serves to assist the Foundation’s current efforts of interpreting African American history at Montpelier. (Photograph by author)
following the archival visit to the Trust was a two-day site visit to Montpelier. The first of these two days served as a continuation of archival research, which involved the examination of interpretative and master plans, archaeological reports, and institutional records. These institutional records provided insight into the management and decision-making processes currently in place at Montpelier. In gaining a thorough understanding of this institutional hierarchy, a better understanding of the decision-making processes with regard to interpretation of the site was gained.

The second portion of this fieldwork included the documentation, evaluation, and survey of the existing buildings presently extant at Montpelier. Each building was photographed. Utilizing a survey sheet created prior to the site visit, each building was briefly assessed. The assessment included the following components: building name, Foundation identification number, denotation of building campaign (Phase I: Madison, Phase II: 19th Century, Phase III: William duPont Sr., Phase IV: Marion duPont Scott, and Phase V: Montpelier Foundation/National Trust), condition (Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor), and current and historic use. While fairly cursory in nature, this evaluation assisted in providing the visual context and understanding for the property as it currently stands. This survey can be found in Appendix A. Maps were created utilizing GIS in order to graphically depict the building distribution throughout the estate. These maps serve as useful tools in illustrating both the development of the built environment on the Montpelier estate, and as result the significant duPont legacy.

In addition to exploring the attention given to both the subject of significance as well as that of the secondary narrative, this introductory chapter introduces the
framework for the remainder of the thesis. Chapter Two in turn examines the historical development of the Montpelier estate. The chapter begins with a thorough introduction to the property’s early history, discussing the property’s beginnings under Madison ownership, and then tracing the property’s various nineteenth century owners. Following the property’s early history, the chapter transitions into an in-depth discussion of the property’s two different duPont phases: William duPont and then later that of Marion duPont Scott. Given the focus of this thesis, this chapter provides special attention to both of these phases, closely tracing the transformation and evolution of the estate’s cultural landscape during these two periods. The chapter closes with an investigation into the National Trust’s acquisition of the property and the formation of The Montpelier Foundation, discussing the changes to the property as result.

The third chapter functions as the first platform for the argument of the alternative values that the estate hosts, including interpretation of the duPont legacy. This chapter investigates more closely the Montpelier duPonts, illustrating their expansive impact on the estate’s landscape. The chapter further explores the various building phases at Montpelier through the utilization of GIS maps. The chapter presents the results of the building survey, analyzing landscape evolution, building conditions, and building use.

Chapter Four explores the interpretative evolution of the property, examining the factors influencing the interpretative decisions during early years of the Trust’s ownership. The chapter specifically examines the interpretative specifications set forth by both the will of Marion duPont Scott as well as her heirs in the legal battle surrounding the Trust’s acquisition of the property. As part of the discussion of the property’s interpretative
traditions, this chapter builds upon the survey introduced in Chapter Three, this time examining more closely the current functions of the extant buildings on the property. As part of this interpretation discussion, this chapter additionally discusses the secondary narratives already interpreted at Montpelier, including slave histories, the Civil War, and the Civil Rights movement. The chapter concludes with a summarizing dialogue on the importance of a holistic approach to interpretation, driven by the theory of Alois Regal.

Given the shortfalls with the present day definition of significance, Chapter Five of this thesis presents an alternative value-based approach which serves as an appropriate method to evaluate secondary narratives. The “Conservation Principles Policies and Guidelines for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment” devised by English Heritage, provide the basis to discuss the unrealized potential “heritage values" of the estate. The four different values discussed include evidential value, historic value, aesthetic value, and communal value. This chapter additionally takes a broader approach to the evaluation of historic sites through the implementation of a devised latent-value system. The latent-value system partners with English Heritage's heritage values to provide a more holistic way in which to consider historic sites. These latent values include economic value, development value, recreational value, and educational value. In addition to defining and applying each of these values at Montpelier, this chapter presents a broader view by exploring the application of these values at other historic sites in the United States. The examination of English Heritage values serves as framework for the discussion of alternative ways through which to interpret the duPont and other secondary narratives at Montpelier. The sixth and final chapter of this thesis serves as a conclusion, bringing
to the forefront the duPont legacy at Montpelier, and discusses how a reconsideration of the estate through the lenses of the proposed heritage-latent value system provides for a broader and more holistic approach to the property’s use and interpretation.
CHAPTER 2: A BRIEF HISTORY OF MONTPELIER

Although the primary focus of Montpelier’s interpretation lies with the period of Madison’s ownership of the property, the estate’s complete history is complex and multi-layered. Despite the fact that no formal comprehensive publications exist with regard to detailing the history of Montpelier, internal research within the Foundation archives provides a fairly clear chronology of the players in the estate’s historical lineage. While previous research has largely focused on the Madison period of ownership, efforts have been made on behalf of the staff and contracted historians to discover more about nineteenth century owners of the property. This being said, the research of the property’s history is nowhere near complete, but is in fact an ongoing endeavor. Given the narrow parameters of this thesis, this chapter serves primarily as a broad overview of the estate’s history in an effort to provide the framework for later discussions pertaining to the property’s historic significance.¹

Phase I: The Madison Era

As result of the estate’s contemporary labeling as “James Madison’s Montpelier,” there is a common misconception about the estate’s original creation. While President Madison certainly played an integral role in the development of Montpelier, credit for the estate’s initial construction in fact belongs to the president’s grandfather.

¹It should be noted that new research with regard to Montpelier’s estate history was not a focus of this thesis. While a significant amount of information remains to be uncovered concerning the estate’s expansive history, this research lies outside the narrow scope and time frame of this graduate thesis. Historic information utilized in this chapter is secondary in nature, and was ascertained from various other sources which are attributed with proper citations as necessary.
In the year 1723, Ambrose Madison and his brother-in-law patented almost 5,000 acres in rural Orange County, Virginia. Included within this parcel of land was today’s Montpelier estate. During this early period, the estate was known as Mt. Pleasant. The property was not christened Montpelier until much later in the eighteenth century.\(^2\)

Archaeological excavations completed in the early 2000s revealed the ruins of a modest wooden farmhouse and associated outbuildings near the current location of the Madison family cemetery. This archaeological evidence is all that remains of this original plantation complex. An analysis of this evidence suggests that the farmhouse was intentionally burned around 1770, roughly five years after the completion of the first variation of the present day Madison mansion.\(^3\)

After coming of age in 1744, Ambrose’s son James became head of his family following the early death of his father in 1732. Managing the property with the assistance of his widowed mother, James Sr. married Nelly Conway in September of 1749. Two years later on March 16, 1751 the two welcomed the first of their twelve children, a boy named James after his father. \(^4\) At the time of his birth, young James’ parents had little idea that in just over thirty years their son would continue on to become Father of the Constitution, and eventually the fourth president of the United States of America.

\(^2\) According to the Montpelier Foundation, the name Montpelier did not first surface in documentation until after the year 1781. The Montpelier Foundation, *James Madison’s Montpelier: Home of the Father of the Constitution* (Orange County, Virginia: The Montpelier Foundation, 2008), 42.

\(^3\) Ibid., 40; For more detailed information concerning the archaeological finds of the Mt. Pleasant archaeological investigations, please see Matthew Reeves and Kevin Fogle’s “Excavations at the Madison’s First Home, Mount Pleasant (1723-1800) Summary of Archaeological Investigations 1997-2004,” Montpelier Foundation.

Historical record reveals that construction of the present day Montpelier mansion began around 1763, and was completed approximately two years later. By this point in time, James Sr. had established himself as one of the wealthiest men in southern Virginia, and endeavored to design and build a house that lived up to this superlative.\(^5\) A much smaller and simpler version of the mansion that currently stands on the estate today, James Sr. called for the construction of a modest two-story brick Georgian structure situated approximately one quarter of a mile to the east of the original Mt Pleasant homestead. This simple building serves as the core of the mansion visible today. Although minor alterations were made to the building in 1791, the primary footprint of the mansion remained until 1797 when James Jr. arranged for the first enlargement of the building, including the construction of the iconic front portico. Though the mansion appeared to be a singular structure from the exterior, this renovation resulted in an interior duplex building layout. This allowed two separate households to be run within the mansion. The first household was kept by the aging James Sr. and his wife. The second was occupied by the newly wed James Jr., his wife Dolley Payne Todd, and his stepson.\(^6\) Following the younger Madison’s election to the presidency in 1809, the mansion underwent yet another significant building campaign. This period of construction removed the mansion’s interior duplex configuration and additionally called for the construction of two one-story wings attaches to the north and south sides of the mansion. A rear colonnade was additionally


\(^{6}\) Ibid., 8; For an in-depth analysis and investigation into the evolution of the mansion, including the mansion restoration process, see *Building A President’s House The Construction of James Madison’s Montpelier* by Bryan Clark Green, Ann. L. Miller, and Conover Hunt.
added to the east side of the building. This was the last major building campaign undertaken on the property during the Madison ownership.  

In addition to the extensive mansion modifications, this final Madison building period saw a shift in the appearance of the landscape directly surrounding the mansion. “Mr. Madison’s Temple,” the only surviving Madison era structure on the property today besides the restored mansion, was constructed in 1810 to serve as an ice house. Terraces were added to the formal gardens, and the primary drive to the house was reconfigured, creating the “Willow Gate” approach present on the property today. Numerous additional ancillary structures populated the landscape during this period, adding to those constructed in the preceding years. Due to the absence of a comprehensive written record documenting the estate’s landscape history, the exact location, purpose, function, etc. of these earlier buildings is still relatively unknown. Archaeological efforts continue to uncover more of this early landscape history. The focus of these investigations has been primarily on the region directly surrounding the mansion. Analysis of these archaeological finds has led to the launch of a reconstruction of the mansion’s south yard. A multi-year construction plan, these efforts are the first in a series of efforts to recreate the nineteenth century appearance of the estate’s historic core. Included in this campaign will be the reconstruction of a detached kitchen, two smokehouses, and three duplex slave quarters. Evidence surrounding the footprint, materiality, and use of these structures has been obtained through archaeological excavations. These buildings are intended to assist

---

in further telling the secondary African American narrative at Montpelier. Although not original structures, their added presence on the Montpelier estate will further assist the Foundation's mission to understand and interpret the Madison story.

**Phase II: Montpelier During the 19th Century**

Despite the death of President Madison in 1836, Dolley maintained possession of the property until 1844. Although extensive literature exists discussing Montpelier during the Madison ownership, fewer details exist with regard to Montpelier during the second half of the nineteenth century. In the fifty-six year period between the Madison and duPont periods of occupation, Montpelier changed ownership a total of seven times. Eight years following the president’s death, Dolley sold the property in two transactions.
to a Richmond merchant by the name of Henry Moncure. The first transaction, taking place in 1842, included the sale of only 750 acres of the estate, and included a rental agreement for the mansion. In 1844, Moncure purchased the property in its entirety. Legal documentation reveals that in addition to the land and buildings, many slaves and items of furniture were included with the 1844 sale. Four years later, in 1848, the property transferred from the hands of Moncure into those of Benjamin Thornton of Leeds, England. Archaeological investigations and archival research completed by the Foundation revealed significant changes occurred to the estate’s landscape during the Thornton period of ownership. These alterations included the demolition of buildings in the mansion's south yard, and the reconfiguration of the front drive. Visible changes took place with regard to the mansion, including the re-roofing of the building's wings, alterations to the portico, and the stuccoing of the building's exterior.⁹

After a brief six-year ownership, the property passed in 1854 to William Macfarland of Richmond for a short one-year span. Due to the brief period of his ownership, little is known about Macfarland’s influence on estate’s landscape. Following this brief occupation, the estate passed on to Alfred Scott in 1855. Scott, a previous resident of Alabama, owned the property for two years. Again, little is known about this portion of the estate’s history. In 1855, the property passed into the hands of the Carson brothers, Thomas and Frank. Although the brothers owned the property for almost twenty-five years, few recorded improvements were made to the estate during this period.

Numerous accounts from both Union and Confederate troops occupying Montpelier during this time period point to this era as the start of the property’s decline. These Civil War era documents additionally greater insight into the estate during the Carson ownership, providing a clearer lens than any era of ownership since the Madison’s.\footnote{Montpelier Foundation “Owners of Montpelier.” For more information regarding the Carson era of ownership, please see archival records held in the Montpelier archives located at James Madison’s Montpelier in Orange, Virginia. A great need exists for the compilation and publishing of a comprehensive landscape history of the Montpelier estate. Given the limited time frame and parameters of this thesis, this need is not filled here.}

In 1881, the property was jointly purchased by Louis Detrick of Baltimore and William Bradley of Boston. Business partners in the fertilizer business, the two men owned the estate for almost twenty years and utilized Montpelier as a country retreat for their families, owning primary residences elsewhere. In addition to the property’s use as a retreat, Detrick and Bradley oversaw farming practices on the estate. Records exist of extensive interior changes occurring to the mansion during this period of ownership. An 1894 insurance policy was completed during this period that provides the clearest picture of the Montpelier landscape at the turn of the twentieth century, just before the duPont purchase of the property. Although the insurance policy did not include a physical map of the estate, the listing and description of buildings in relation to one another provides enough information to create a basic outline of the estate's built environment during this period. Further discussion of this insurance policy will occur in Chapter Three of this thesis.\footnote{Ibid. The contents of the 1894 Detrich and Bradley insurance policy will be further discussed in Chapter Three.}
Phase III: The Delaware duPonts

After almost a quarter of a century, Montpelier was sold by Detrick and Bradley to Charles Lenning, secretary and agent of William duPont Sr. Due to duPont’s residence in England at the time of the sale, Lenning served as agent until duPont was able to purchase the property himself the following year in 1901. During his ownership, duPont took it upon himself to cultivate and shape the estate’s landscape, transforming it from a derelict plantation into a thriving country estate.

The grandson of the wealthy French immigrant Eleuthère I. du Pont, patriarch of the Delaware duPonts, William Sr. was born in 1855. In 1892 William married Annie Rogers Zinn causing much controversy amongst the Delaware elite, as both William and Annie were recent divorcées. Divorce alone was considered nothing short of a scandal amongst the social elite during this time period, let alone a new union between two recently divorced individuals. In an attempt to escape the gossip and social strife, William and Annie were married in England and continued to reside abroad for the majority of their first seven years of marriage. In 1894, Annie made a brief return to the United States for the birth of the couple’s first child, a daughter named Marion. Returning to England following the birth, a second child, a son called William Jr., was born in 1896.12

In 1901, William duPont Sr. formally acquired the Montpelier property from his agent Charles Lenning. At the time of duPont’s purchase, the estate encompassed 1,235.5 acres on which were located the mansion house and approximately twenty-one structures.

12 Ann L. Miller, Montpelier During the duPont Ownership (Orange County, Virginia: Montpelier Foundation, 2008), 21-22.
William continued to purchase additional land, eventually acquiring an additional 1,100 acres of historic Madison property, in addition to 850 acres of surrounding non-Madison land. Due to the duPont's residence in England at the time of the transaction, many of the original alterations made to the mansion were overseen by Lenning. These changes included the addition of second stories above the mansion's wings and the addition of rooms to the building's rear, or eastern side. The iconic exterior pink-stuccoed façade was also introduced during this period.\(^{13}\) Although the duPonts owned numerous other properties throughout Delaware and Georgia, Montpelier served as the primary home the couple and their two children.

In addition to making numerous changes to the interior and exterior of the mansion building, William duPont was responsible for the transformation of Montpelier from a derelict country estate into a successful and thriving farm complex. Under duPont's ownership, a large majority of the agricultural structures previously constructed by Detrick and Bradley were enlarged, and numerous other barns and outbuildings were built. These buildings included, but are not limited to: the train depot, the power plant, carriage house, pony barn, schooling barn, additions to the Farm Barn complex, greenhouses, and multiple residential structures to accommodate the estate's workers.\(^{14}\) A more thorough analysis of these building campaigns can be found in Chapter Three.

Although responsible for dozens of new structures on the property, the duPonts

---

\(^{13}\) Miller, *Montpelier During the DuPont Ownership*, 23. For more information regarding the alterations made to the mansion during the duPont period, see the aforementioned publication or Clark, Miller, and Hunt's *Building a President's House*.

\(^{14}\) Refer to Appendix A for photographs and information regarding the construction period of these and other buildings extant on the Montpelier property.
were also responsible for extensive gardening and landscaping in the region surrounding the mansion. Many of these improvements are still visible today at the estate and contribute to the overall visitor experience. One of the most significant aspects of this landscaping influence was the development of the formal garden, known today as the Annie Rogers duPont Garden. It is believed that this garden was constructed on the remains of the original Madison era garden. The garden is preserved and interpreted today in its twentieth century appearance. Numerous improvements were also made to the property’s infrastructure including internal roads and paths connecting the estate’s complex arrangement of subsidiary structures.¹⁵

![Figure 2.2: View of mansion’s primary facade following the 20th century additions by William duPont. Note the doubling in height of the north and south wings and the reconfiguration of the front portico. (Photo courtesy of the Historic American Buildings Survey, Library of Congress)](image)

¹⁵ Miller, *Montpelier During the duPont Ownership*, 46.
Phase IV: The Mrs. Scott Years

In 1928, a thirty-four year old Marion duPont became steward of Montpelier following the death of her father. Although her younger brother William Jr. still lived at this point in time, it was stipulated in the will of her father that the property should pass to her should he die before Marion married and settled on land of her own. Providing that she had no heirs, the property would then eventually pass back into the hands of her brother, or to her brother’s presumed heirs. Although married and divorced twice, Marion produced no heirs. She was known in her later years as Marion duPont Scott, deriving her second surname from her second husband, the well-known actor Randolph Scott.

Figure 2.3: View of the entrance to the Annie Rogers duPont Garden as it appears today at Montpelier. (Photograph by author)  
Figure 2.4: View of the vista to end of formal garden from inside front gate. (Photograph by author)

16 Further discussion of the legal battle surrounding Scott’s will and the Trust’s acquisition of the estate can be found in Chapter Four.
Like her father before her, Marion was an avid equestrian and at the age of twenty-one became the first female to win a riding class at the National Horse Show at Madison Square Garden. Her passion for horse breeding and racing greatly guided her influence on the Montpelier property during her fifty-five year ownership of the estate. During this time, she oversaw the final improvements to the property in its last years as a privately operated estate. The two greatest additions to Montpelier during Marion's ownership was the creation of the flat track and steeplechase race courses. Located to the front, or west, of the mansion, the construction of these two landscape features greatly altered the view approaching the mansion.

![Observation stand constructed as part of the flat track race course building campaign oversaw by Marion in the 1930s. (Photography by author)](image)

**Figure 2.5:** Observation stand constructed as part of the flat track race course building campaign oversaw by Marion in the 1930s. (Photography by author)

In addition to these courses, Marion oversaw the construction of numerous barns and outbuildings, allowing her to pursue her passion for breeding racehorses. Dozens of prizewinning horses, specifically thoroughbreds, were both bred and trained on the
Montpelier grounds during Marion’s ownership. Most notable of these was Battleship, who won the 1938 English Grand National, in addition to numerous races in the United States. In 1934, Montpelier hosted the first Montpelier Hunt Races. These race events continue at Montpelier today, and are held annually on the first Saturday in November. While Marion oversaw the extensive development and growth of her father’s agricultural estate, unlike her father, she made few changes to the mansion.\textsuperscript{17}

\textbf{The National Trust for Historic Preservation}

At the time of Marion’s death in 1983, the Montpelier estate passed into the hands of the National Trust for Historic Preservation at her bequest. Recognizing the estate’s significant historical ties to our nation’s fourth president, it was her wish that the mansion be preserved and opened to the public as a shrine to James Madison. Operating as a nonprofit organization, the Trust first opened the property for public visitation in 1987. At this point in time, few alterations were made to the estate, only minor maintenance tasks being accomplished. Given the estate’s duPont-era appearance, during the early years Montpelier operated as a house museum, interpretation was split between the Madison and duPont periods. The interior of the mansion at this time was contemporary with the duPonts, making a clear interpretation of the Madison period difficult. A closer look into the property’s interpretative history will be discussed in Chapter Four of this thesis.

The year 2000 saw a significant change in the organization of the estate’s administrative hierarchy. Up until this point, the estate’s ownership and operations fell

\textsuperscript{17} Miller, \textit{Montpelier During the DuPont Ownership}, 15, 59.
solely under the Trust’s oversight. The Trust relied on financial and staffing assistance from the Montpelier Foundation, which was founded in 1987, as a supporting nonprofit to the estate’s goals. In 2000, a shift in management occurred when the National Trust and the Montpelier Foundation entered into a co-stewardship agreement, which is still in place today. While the Trust still maintains legal ownership of the property, the partnership allows for a more localized management of the estate through the Montpelier Foundation. A further discussion of this partnership will be explored in Chapter Four.

Just three years following the institution of this co-stewardship agreement, the Foundation, with the permission of the Trust, received a $25 million dollar grant from the Mellon Foundation for the purposes of undertaking a complete mansion restoration. This five-year endeavor restored the mansion to the last period of Madison occupation. This extensive undertaking involved the complete removal of all duPont and 19th century additions and alterations to the mansion. The primary goal behind this restoration was to allow for a clearer and more thorough interpretation of the Madison narrative at the estate. In conjunction with this restoration process, the Foundation oversaw the construction of a new visitor’s center located to the south of the mansion. This structure now serves as the base for visitor interpretation at the estate. Completed and reopened to the public in September of 2008, the Foundation has spent the past seven years working to accurately decorate and furnish the interior of the building with Madison or period pieces. This endeavor is just the first in a larger effort to restore the property’s historic core as the Foundation attempts to further achieve its Madison-centric mission. A recent gift of $10 million has allowed the Foundation to continue with their restoration and reconstruction
efforts with the reconstruction of the mansion’s South Yard. As of the completion of this thesis, this South Yard project is in the early planning stages.

Figure 2.6: View from parking lot of new visitor’s center which was constructed as part of the 2008 mansion restoration campaign. The structure presently serves as the first point of visitor contact at the estate, housing ticketing and gift shop services. The right wing of the building serves as home to the William duPont Gallery. (Photograph by author)
CHAPTER 3: UNDERSTANDING THE DUPONT VALUE

Since its incorporation as a 501(c) (3) nonprofit organization in 1986, the mission of The Montpelier Foundation has focused primarily on one centralized goal: preserving the legacy of James and Dolley Madison.\footnote{Madison-Montpelier Foundation, “Articles of Incorporation of The Madison-Montpelier Foundation,” Montpelier Foundation, (Orange County, Virginia, 1986).} Situated on either side of Route 20 and equidistantly located between the city of Charlottesville to the south and Fredericksburg to the north, Montpelier is a piece of Virginia’s presidential legacy. In order to achieve its mission, the Foundation has oriented the visitor experience around the restored mansion. The house tour serves as the focal point of the typical visitor experience.

During a mansion tour, visitors gain insight into Madison’s life at Montpelier, with stories spanning from his youth through his final days. The stories and experiences are carefully selected to focus primarily on Madison’s later life—his presidential and post-presidential years. With the purchase of their admission to the estate, visitors are provided with this house museum tour, and access to prescribed areas of the grounds (the expanse of which will be discussed in greater depth later in this chapter.) While the Foundation is still in the process of decorating and furnishing the mansion, their current collection provides visitors with a satisfactory glimpse to the building as it was during Madison’s ownership. Like many house museums, the presence of these physical artifacts assist in immersing guests in a Madison-centric visitor experience.

Over the course of the past two decades, the Foundation has expanded its outreach through the creation of the Robert H. Smith Center for the Constitution. Operating
from its base in Montpelier’s Constitutional Village, the Center provides educational opportunities for students, teachers, and professionals on both national and international levels. The Center strives to be the “nation’s leading resource in high-quality constitutional education.” Due to the Center’s focus on Madison’s written legacy through his authorship of the United States Constitution, the Center functions as an essentially separate entity from the rest of the estate. Given its specialized nature, Montpelier’s average visitor interfaces very little, if at all, with the Center. This is due primarily to the direction of the Center’s programming toward the academic study of Madison’s written contributions. The academic focus is in contrast to the Foundation’s goals of introducing visitors to Madison’s built legacy through the mansion. Despite the divisions between these two co-hosted programs, the Foundation considers Constitutional education integral to their mission. The integration of these two parts is made clearer with a closer examination of the Foundation’s mission statement. This statement promotes the opportunity to experience both the cultural and scholarly sides of Montpelier as it endeavors to “inspire continuing public engagement with American constitutional self-government by bringing to life the home and contributions of James and Dolley Madison.”

While visitors receive many opportunities to interact with the estate’s main structure (Madison’s restored mansion), and select visitors partake of the programming

---

2 Montpelier Foundation “Center for the Constitution: About,” accessed February 3, 2015, http://www.montpelier.org/center/about. Established in 2002, the Center for the Constitution provides programming for all ages, and is internationally known for its educational programs on the American Constitution. More information about this educational asset of the estate at the Center’s website.

provided by the Center, one critical aspect missing from the visitor experience is interaction with the cultural landscape. Following the completion of mansion tours, guides encourage visitors to explore the grounds immediately surrounding the mansion. The grounds made available include the north and south yards, the formal garden, and both Madison and slave cemeteries. Visitors are also encouraged to venture across State Route 20 to the Gilmore Cabin and the Train Depot sites. In total, visitors are encouraged to access to approximately 120 of the property’s 2700 acres (see Figure 3.1) this equates to approximately four percent of the estate’s current property holdings. Interaction with such a small portion of the estate is detrimental to overall visitor experience for two reasons. First is the missed opportunity through an environmental and economics lens; the land is not being experienced or utilized to its full potential. The second reason this limited scope of visitor interaction with the cultural landscape is negative is that it does not present a holistic view of the site’s history and historic values. The inability for the visitor to experience a larger portion of the estate results in an incomplete presentation of the property’s history, and an unvaried experience of the multiple assets the site is able to offer.

As was briefly discussed in the previous chapter, the lasting impact on Montpelier’s cultural landscape as result of the duPont tenure is immense. Based solely on existing fabric (built and landscape) at the estate, the sheer magnitude of the duPont impact

---

4 Bartzen and Ball, *Montpelier Master Plan Fall 2008 Planning Recommendations*, (Charlottesville, VA: 2008), 30. Excluded from these calculations are the Landmark National Forest and Freedman Trials, each of which span approximately two miles in their entirety. It should also be noted that the Gilmore Cabin’s visitor availability is typically restricted to the weekends, at which point in time there is a staff member present to facilitate interpretation as minimal signage exists.
Figure 3.1: Featured above is a Land Use Map created by the Montpelier Foundation. The map depicts the present day Montpelier estate divided into zones based upon land usage. Note the small area denoted for visitor use. (Map courtesy of The Montpelier Foundation)
is clearly legible. The history and built fabric associated with the duPonds is treated as a secondary narrative. This secondary narrative is currently uncaptured in the visitor experience at Montpelier. Due to the importance of horse culture in the lives of both William duPont Sr. and his daughter Marion, their legacy on the property is exposed largely through agricultural buildings and features. Extensive thought and expense went into the creation of the large agricultural center that was the Montpelier estate during most of the twentieth century. Numerous barns and stables, as well as dozens of residences for workers, were integrated into the landscape during this period in an effort to transform Montpelier from a long forgotten working presidential and agricultural seat to a gentleman's country estate.

The duPont mission to transform Montpelier back into a large and prosperous estate was not unique. Many wealthy early twentieth century families endeavored to carry out such tasks. In nearby Westmoreland County, Virginia, for example, the prosperous Eustis family sponsored a similar redevelopment at Oatlands Plantation as did the Davis family at Morvan Park. The duPont impact on Montpelier can thus be seen as part of a larger elite cultural pattern. The duPont era Montpelier can therefore be understood within a regional network of similar agricultural and recreational estates. The degree of duPont impact still visible at Montpelier today serves as an excellent example of this twentieth century trend. Though appropriately secondary to Madison's narrative, it is an aspect of American history worthy of acknowledgment.

---

On a broad scale, the efforts of the duPonts at Montpelier can clearly be classified as falling within this wider twentieth century trend of country estate revivals. However, upon examining the duPont’s specific impact on Montpelier, a distinction is visible which separates the duPont efforts from those of their elite colleagues. Most of the duPont’s contemporaries during this period renovated their historic estates to serve as large and elegant country retreats. The duPont’s, however, transformed the landscape of Montpelier in such a way as to not only create their own private country home, but also created a thriving agricultural center that actively employed hundreds of workers over the years. The successful formation of this agricultural center is what sets the duPonts apart from others in their social group. The economy of Montpelier during the early duPont ownership could be described as “diversified agriculture, one balanced between crop farming, livestock farming, and dairy farming.” The productivity of this land use resulted in the construction of almost all of the buildings extant on the property today- nearly all buildings hidden from visitor eyes. This expansive agricultural operation greatly justified the massive duPont building campaign, and effectively transformed the landscape. The culmination of the landscape transformation occurring under the duPonts during the first part of the twenty-first century, in conjunction with the larger national trends of country estate revivals, affirms the significance of the duPont legacy at Montpelier.

Due to a gap in the archaeological record, the estate layout during Madison ownership is not known in its entirety. The earliest complete map of the estate dates to

---

1903, and was commissioned by William duPont Sr. shortly after his purchase of the property. At the time of the map's completion, the only clearly discernable Madison features present on the property were the mansion and the temple, both of which remain standing today. Although the temple was left untouched by the duPonts, the mansion underwent substantial changes. Desiring to complete his vision of a country estate, William duPont was responsible for a massive expansion of the mansion, noticeably the addition of second stories to the original Madison wings, in addition to northeast and southeast wings on the building's rear. Although they implemented extensive changes to the building, both internally and externally, the duPonts recognized the important history of the building they had inherited. This recognition was made particularly apparent during the Trust's mansion restoration process- the duPonts were meticulous about saving and storing the historic fabric they removed during their upgrades to the house. Although the duPonts greatly altered the building, they demonstrated an excellent sense of stewardship through these efforts. The duPonts foresight enabled the Trust to portray the mansion in the period of Madison occupation.

In 1960, despite is alterations, Montpelier earned distinction of being designated a National Historic Landmark. The significance of the place, largely attributed to its
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7 Robert H. Blain, "Montpelier," Montpelier Foundation Archives, surveyed February, 1903. It is worthy of that as of the completion of this thesis, no map has yet been discovered that depicts the complete Montpelier landscape prior to the duPont purchase. Given this fact, it is not discernable what, if any, Madison structures still existed at the time of duPont's purchase, nor where they may have been located, or when they were torn down. The 1894 Detrich and Bradley insurance policy suggests that a Madison era sawmill may have been extant at the time of the duPont purchase. This building was thought to have been located in the region west of the present day Madison cemetery. It is believe that duPont built a dairy on the site of this sawmill complex in 1909. The dairy later burned in the 1930s. It is not documented as to whether or not the sawmill was in working condition at the time of duPont's purchase.

8 Chambers, 32-34
association with a former United States president, convinced the National Historic Landmarks Commission of Montpelier's national importance despite the loss of original fabric. At present, the federally recognized criteria for which significance is determined are those utilized by the National Register for Historic Places. As discussed in Chapter One, under this dated system, Montpelier garners significance through the architectural style of the mansion and the estate's association with James Madison. Under these current guidelines for significance, evaluation of the estate in its entirety as a holistic cultural landscape is impossible. While it is irrefutable that the property is indeed “significant” due to its previous ownership by Madison, unrealized value abounds at Montpelier. The National Register criteria do not capture the values of the complete landscape. As is the case of many historic sites, the broader landscape at Montpelier plays a critical role in defining the property as a historic site worthy of interpretation.

Illustrating the myopic nature of significance recognized in the United State's system, the word landscape does not appear once in the wording of any of the Register criteria. When taking a step back from the current federally recognized criteria for significance, and examining the Montpelier estate in a broader context to include the property’s landscape evolution, the “significant” impact of the duPonts is unmistakably clear. Consistent with the basic preservation ethic called “anti-scrape,” that undermines the idea of “one period of significance,” Montpelier should be considered in its larger context as an estate through multiple eras of ownership. Recognizing broader values and holistic histories within the landscape is critical in the responsible stewardship of a historic site. In the case of Montpelier, it is a central aim of this research to recognize the
pivotal role played by the duPont’s in the transformation of the estate’s cultural landscape. As no complete rendition of Montpelier’s landscape at the time of the Madison ownership has yet been found, or fully derived from archaeological excavations, it is virtually impossible to understand how large a transformation the property has undergone since the Madison period. When William duPont Sr. purchased the property in 1901, written records suggest that much of the Madison built environment had been erased from the property save the mansion, temple, and remnants of a mill complex. The 1903 Blain survey of the Montpelier estate shows that few changes occurred on the property during the first two years of duPont ownership (see Appendix B). In addition to the extant mansion and temple, the map reveals a cluster of structures in the location now occupied by the remnants of the duPont’s dairy. This feature on the map may represent the remnants of the Madison mill. The 1894 insurance policy compiled during the final years of the Detrich and Bradley ownership of the property inventories the buildings on the estate at that point in time. This document indicates that the dairy house may have been present at the time the duPont’s purchased the property, making it unclear what buildings were actually present on this cluster of land. While the exact date for the appearance of this mill complex on the Montpelier estate may be disputed, it should be noted that by the beginning of the duPont ownership the vast majority of the Madison buildings and landscape features had disappeared. The virtually extinct nature of the president’s footprint on the property effectively presented duPont with a blank canvas from which to

9 Miller, Montpelier During the DuPont Ownership, 53.
start over in his efforts to create his idealized gentleman’s estate.

The evolution of Montpelier from a forgotten historical remnant to a thriving agricultural estate came about relatively quickly in relation to the estate’s rather noble age. In comparing the 1903 Blain map with a second map created just five years later, the sheer number of buildings on the property nearly doubles in size. Forty years later (by 1948 Marion had been managing the property for twenty years) the number of buildings virtually doubles again. Although no inventory of the property’s buildings was discovered during research, numerous sources suggest that the building count was approximately 125 at the time of the Trust’s acquisition of the property.11 To an unfamiliar eye, when examining a map of extant structures at Montpelier during the peak its 1948, the buildings appear somewhat widespread in their distribution, if not disorganized. The type of structures erected on the property during the duPont ownership were constructed for two primary purposes: agricultural use and worker housing (see Figure 3.2 for distribution of original building functions.) The buildings’ distribution throughout the property reflects these two programs. It is worthy of note that with the exception of the additions made to the mansion, construction on the property was undertaken in a manner so as to not impede on the views or experience of the mansion. While this was likely due to duPont’s personal desire to maintain an unobstructed view to and from the mansion, his decision to avoid further construction in this historic core of the property enabled the long-term

---

11 National Trust for Historic Preservation, “Cooperative Agreement,” National Trust for Historic Preservation (Washington, D.C.: 2000), 1. The number 125 is an arbitrary number found in the co-agreement. A list of the specific buildings present at the acquisition of the Trust was not uncovered during the course of this research.
Figure 3.2: Original building functions at Montpelier (Overlay by author. Basemap courtesy of Drew Chritton and the Montpelier Foundation)
preservation of the Madison legacy at Montpelier. By not disturbing the soil in the area with building foundations, information about the Madison era historic core can be rediscovered through archaeological excavations such as those being undertaken today.

The evolution of the estate as a whole is understood through observation of a mapped chronology as can be viewed in Figures 3.3-3.7. As complete knowledge concerning the estate’s historic landscape features has yet to be ascertained, the property evolution depicted in the map series is limited to the built environment. Serving as the base of each map are the estate’s current landscape features. Each map in turn features a separate layer of buildings, one map for each building phases. Through the analysis of the property’s history and various building campaigns, five phases of significance were determined to appropriately illustrate the estate’s evolution. The five phases are as follows: Phase I- Madison (1732-1844), Phase II- 19th Century (1844-1901), Phase III- William duPont Sr. (1901-1928), Phase IV- Marion duPont Scott (1928-1984), and Phase V-National Trust (1984-present). Based upon known and speculated construction dates, each extant or once extant building is easily classified into the appropriate phase.\(^\text{12}\) Maps showing demolition of buildings help to convey the story of buildings that have come and gone on the property, presenting insight into both original building functions as well the property’s building hierarchy.

The first map in the series (Figure 3.3) depicts the two Phase I buildings that are presently extant on the property, in addition to the footprints of six ghost frame

\(^{12}\) These maps were created through the assistance of the Meacham report, the 2006 "Montpelier Master Plan Building Inventory" the 1903 Blain Map, 1908 Nichols Map, 1948 Randolph, and a building inventory survey conducted in October, 2014 as part of initial research for this thesis.
Montpelier Phase I: Madison (1732-1844)

Figure 3.3: Montpelier Phase I Map (Overlay by author. Basemap courtesy of Drew Christon and the Montpelier Foundation)
Figure 3.4: Montpelier Phase II Map (Overlay by author. Basemap courtesy of Drew Chritleton and the Montpelier Foundation)
Montpelier Phase III:
William duPont Sr. (1900-1928)

Figure 3.5: Montpelier Phase III Map (Overlay by author. Basemap courtesy of Drew Chritton and the Montpelier Foundation)
Montpelier Phase IV: Marion duPont Scott (1928-1984)

Figure 3.6: Montpelier Phase IV Map (Overlay by author. Basemap courtesy of Drew Chritton and the Montpelier Foundation)
Montpelier Phase V: National Trust (2015)

Figure 3.7: Montpelier Phase V Map (Overlay by author. Basemap courtesy of Drew Chritton and the Montpelier Foundation)
reconstructions which were built by the Foundation during the past decade. All of these known structures are centered around the mansion as this has been the focus of archaeological excavations in recent years. The potential exists for the discovery for dozens of other Phase I buildings, prompts ongoing archaeological excavations, as Montpelier was a working plantation during the Madison occupancy. The possibility of these future discoveries is heightened by the lack of overall disturbance of the soils by the duPonts during their tenure on the property. This is largely accredited to the large role played by horse breeding and racing at Montpelier during both the first and second phase of duPont tenure- pasture and racetracks are much less invasive to the soils than plow zones, which are the result of large scale crop farming. Although perhaps not intentional, the act of relative land preservation is yet another way in which the duPonts have aided in the preservation of Montpelier.

Changes made to the property during the 19th century as denoted by the second map in the series (see Figure 3.4) are relatively few in number. Buildings constructed during this period lie far from the estate center, near the present day property boundaries. This is largely the case as many of these buildings are located on parcels of land that were not part of the original Montpelier land holdings. These structures tend to appear on the map in small clusters, as they were smaller independent homesteads added to the Montpelier property holdings by William duPont Sr. Unlike those constructed during the 19th century, the Phase III (see Figure 3.5) additions to the property are concentrated

---

13 Ball, “Master Plan,” 15. Archival evidence shows that William duPont purchased an additional 850 acres of surrounding land not originally part of the Montpelier estate, potentially to serve as a buffer against any future outside development.
much nearer the mansion center of the property. As can be observed from the maps, the estate’s built environment greatly expanded during this third phase William duPont completely transforming the landscape of the property during the first ten years of his ownership. Construction varied between agricultural as well as residential buildings as many of duPont’s employees lived on the property. One of the primary complexes that developed during this phase was the Farm Barn complex. Developing to the southeast of the mansion, this complex served as the estate’s agricultural center. To the west of this farm complex a number of residential buildings were built, in addition to more public spaces such as a schoolhouse for the children of the workers. An additional small cluster of agricultural buildings developed to the southwest of the mansion, in the region of the estate historically known as Coney Island. These buildings were utilized primarily for play as opposed to work. It was here that the pony barn and riding arena were constructed for young Marion and her brother (see Figure 3.8).

Under the supervision of Marion, Montpelier’s Phase IV (see Figure 3.6). development was characterized by a much greater and more widespread building campaign. Like her father, Marion’s additions to the property were primarily in the form of agricultural buildings. However, unlike her father, whose commissioned buildings related to crop development and farming practices on the property, Marion’s contributions related largely to her passion for horse-racing. Unlike any of Montpelier’s preceding owners, Marion transformed the estate’s landscape through the creation of both the steeplechase course and the flat track. To the north of her father’s Farm Barn complex she oversaw the construction of three Sears barns to house her horses. Adjacent to the flat
Figure 3.8: Montpelier map depicting estate complexes (Overlay by author. Basemap courtesy of Drew Chritton and the Montpelier Foundation)
Montpelier: Building Conditions

Figure 3.9: Building Conditions (Overlay by author. Basemap courtesy of Drew Chritton and the Montpelier Foundation)
Figure 3.10: Montpelier General Building Use Trends (Overlay by author. Basemap courtesy of Drew Chritton and the Montpelier Foundation)
track, she continued to build upon a small number of agricultural buildings previously constructed by her father, creating what is known today as the Race Barn complex.

With the exception of the mansion additions, power plant, pony barn, and carriage house almost all of the buildings constructed at Montpelier during duPont ownership were built primarily of wood. Despite much deferred maintenance and the relative vulnerability of wood structures to environmental induced deterioration, the majority of buildings from phases III and IV stand in good condition. Figure 3.9 depicts a conditions map of the current buildings on the property. As might be expected, the buildings currently in use remain in better condition than those that sit vacant. Figure 3.10 depicts the buildings currently being used by the Foundation.

During the general building survey undertaken as part of for this thesis, the extant buildings on the estate were evaluated on their current condition. Before the study revealed patterns, the initial hypothesis was that buildings within the closest proximity to the mansion would be the best-maintained structures on the property. This is not the case; however, there exists a small degree of correlation between proximity to the mansion and building condition. The cluster of buildings located directly to the south of the mansion (utilized today primarily as office space for Montpelier staff) are among the best-kept facilities. Directly to the east however, the large Farm Barn complex continuing down to the Sears Barns, and including the houses along East Gate Road, are in various degrees of disrepair. The evidence suggests that the poor condition of some structures is

---

14 As previously discussed in the Methodology section of Chapter One, buildings were given the value of Excellent, Good, Fair, or Poor based upon evaluation of exterior observations. Further discussion of these observations/determinations with regard to interpretative potential will occur in Chapter Six.
related directly to their current vacancy, and the associated deferred maintenance/neglect more than proximity to the property’s historic core. Likewise, on the western side of the property two distinct clusters of residential structures fall into fair and poor categories with regard to their condition. With their position relative to the mansion similarly remote, the variety of conditions again appear to be as result of their abandonment.

These building condition evaluations show a significant under-utilization of land and buildings on the estate’s edges. The best kept, and most actively used buildings are situated within the estate’s internal road network. Observation of both these condition and usage patterns presents the opportunity for further analysis as to how Montpelier might better capitalize upon its wide ranging assets. A further discussion of building use/disuse with regard to visitor accessibility will occur in Chapter Four as part of a deeper investigation into the Foundation’s current as well as potential interpretative trends. While much more will be discussed about the landscape analysis in the chapters to follow, what is easily perceived from preliminary landscape evaluation is the current disuse of a significant number of duPont era buildings.

Although not currently recognized in the property’s organization and interpretation, the impact of the duPonts on the landscape of Montpelier is clearly lasting. As the Foundation strives to remain good stewards of the estate, they currently fall short of acknowledging the full and complete history of the property. Although it is clear that the greatest impact to the landscape was at the hands of the duPonts, it should be fully realized that the property underwent five significant phases of development, which in turn, under the current federally recognized significance criteria, easily equivocate to five
periods of significance. Not all equally weighted in terms of national historic significance, the periods do present a framework for considering unrealized value. Dissecting the estate's built environment based upon the criteria of significance as set forth by the National Register results in a singular narrative about an important historic figure and an architecturally impressive work. This leads to the loss of potential value that can never be fully realized given the singular interpretation. Chapter Five will serve as a vehicle to more closely examine a value based system, and why a more inclusive approach may better serve Montpelier.
CHAPTER 4: SKewed VIEWS: CURRENT INTERPRETATION

Over the course of the three decades since Marion duPont Scott bequeathed Montpelier to the National Trust, the estate has experienced many changes with regard to its interpretation to the public. The most obvious of these adaptations involves the mansion restoration project discussed in Chapter Two. Completed in 2008 this interior and exterior building transformation provided the opportunity for substantial changes in the property's interpretation. Prior to the restoration's completion, the temple reigned as the singular Madison era building in appearance on property. Although the mansion in fact predates the temple by almost fifty years, the layers of alterations to the mansion at the time of the Trust's acquisition concealed this fact.

After passing through the hands of seven different owners over the course of almost sixty years, by 1984 almost all original traces of the Madison-era building had been concealed, save the mansion's general footprint.¹ The paradox of presenting a twenty-first century building as the home of James and Dolley Madison resulted in an interpretative challenge for both the Trust and the Foundation staff. With the completion of the restoration a more pure, singular interpretation was possible and assisted the Foundation's Madison centered mission. While the restoration has greatly assisted in furthering the Madison visitor experience, it has continued to push to the background the duPont narrative. Prior to the restoration, visitors experienced buildings and landscape

consistent with the twenty-first century duPont occupation. This reality demanded a more thorough explanation of the family's impact on the property. Following the restoration, visitor focus is drawn to the mansion and the grounds directly surrounding the mansion. In recent months it has been revealed that the mansion restoration proves just the beginning of a larger effort to return the land surrounding the mansion to the period of Madison's retirement. While it appears that no duPont structures will be directly effected in this proposed landscape restoration, as the duPont buildings lie further away from the mansion, this plan suggests a trend on behalf of the Montpelier Foundation for restoration over preservation. This treatment priority continues to minimize the presence of the duPont legacy. In order for the duPons to obtain a permanent place in the interpretative narrative at Montpelier, it is critical to first understand the place held by the 20th century narrative in Montpelier's interpretation since the Trust's acquisition.

As discussed in previous chapters, credit for the preservation and interpretation of the Montpelier estate belongs to the duPont family. Although responsible for much of the estate's modern transformation the duPons, specifically Marion duPont Scott, also recognized the property’s historic value and guaranteed its accessibility for public visitation. Outliving both of her parents and having no children of her own, Marion inherited Montpelier from her father upon his death. As the property executor, Marion made critical decisions concerning the estate’s future. Prior to her death in 1983, Marion exercised the foresight to provide for the future of Montpelier in her will. In this final testament she expressed her desire for the property to pass into the hands of the National Trust so that it might “be made available to the general public as a historic shrine.” In
her bequest, she clarified the Trust’s need to acquire at minimum the property’s “historic core.”

Although never having children herself, Marion was not without blood relations at the time of her death; her brother William had five children. Despite Marion’s desire to bequeath Montpelier to the Trust, the property was bound by law to pass into the hands of her surviving nieces and nephews, due to the rules of inheritance set forth by her

---

Figure 4.1: Outlined above in red is the current Montpelier estate property lines, comprising of approximately 2650 acres. The entirety of this land mass was purchased by the National Trust from the duPont heirs. Outlined in green is Marion’s “historic core” which constitutes less than half of the land actually purchased by the Trust. (Map by author)

Although never having children herself, Marion was not without blood relations at the time of her death; her brother William had five children. Despite Marion’s desire to bequeath Montpelier to the Trust, the property was bound by law to pass into the hands of her surviving nieces and nephews, due to the rules of inheritance set forth by her

---

2 Marion duPont Scott, Will dated February 6, 1975, with codicils and list of heirs, Chancery Order Book 42, Orange County Courthouse, Orange County, Virginia, 3. In review, the National Trust chose to acquire the property in its entirety as opposed to solely the historic core. Records pertaining to the rationale behind this process were unavailable for study at the time of this thesis.
father William duPont Sr. before his death. In an attempt to circumvent these restrictions, Marion gifted ten million dollars to the National Trust for the purposes of buying out the shares of any niece of nephew who chose not to donate their portion of their Montpelier inheritance to the Trust. Any or all money remaining from this purchase could then be used for the care of the property. In an attempt to discourage her heirs from ignoring her request, Marion’s will stated that any niece or nephew who refused to comply with her wishes toward Montpelier’s future as a Trust property would forfeit all of their inheritance from her estate, which was a substantial sum. Dissatisfied with the parameters set forth by Marion’s will, specifically those outlining their potential disinheriting, the will was contested by her heirs. After extensive litigation, a settlement was finally reached in October of 1984. The settlement honored Marion’s request, and the Trust obtained the estate in its entirety—approximately 2,650 acres of land. Although triumphant in its efforts to acquire the property, the legal battle was not without cost. Following the settlement, only two million of the original ten gifted by Marion remained in the hands of the Trust; eight was used to buy out the male heirs and pay fees relating to the litigation.3

Although critical in determining the future of Montpelier’s legal ownership, the litigation surrounding the will of Marion served a critical role with regard to forming the framework for the estate’s interpretation. Though a settlement for the lawsuit was reached in 1984, the final settlement decree did not come about until August 18, 2003. The late timing of this final decree corresponds directly with the mansion restoration efforts. Serving in essence as an update to the original settlement, the agreement takes into
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3 Will of Marion duPont Scott, 4.
account the mansion restoration plans including the removal of the duPont alterations. In addition to granting both the Trust and Foundation permission to restore the mansion to the Madison era, a number of stipulations were made on the part of the duPont heirs in an effort to guarantee the continuation of their family legacy on the Montpelier estate. The stipulations of the decree are as follows:

(a) the establishment of a “new facility named the ‘William duPont Gallery,’ honoring the life and legacy of William duPont, Senior at Montpelier…the Gallery shall consist of three public spaces…a great room…inspired by the formal rooms created by William duPont…equivalent or greater in size to the Drawing and Morning Rooms. A second public room will be an interpretive space devoted to telling the story of the William duPont Family…a third public room…will be a re-creation of the ‘Red Room’ in the current Mansion…

(b) …. ex-officio positions of the Board of The Montpelier Foundation for two members of the William duPont family…

(c) …Name Montpelier’s garden for Annie Rogers duPont…

(d) …Carry on the equestrian legacy of the William duPont family at Montpelier by hosting a weekend each year of equestrian activities of the type conducted during the residency of the duPont family.”

---

4 Final Decree on Settlement, Montpelier Foundation v. Martha Anne Verge duPont, et al. 18 August, 2003, Orange County Circuit Court, Orange Virginia, 5. Note: A copy of the original settlement was unable to be obtained during the course of this research. It is in essence, however, ineffective due to establishment of the settlement amendment.
The stipulations described in the settlement decree accurately depict the attention given to the duPont legacy presently at Montpelier. Built as a second wing to the Visitor Center, which was constructed in conjunction with the mansion restoration process, the William duPont Gallery ensures the continuation of the duPont name on the property. As required by the settlement agreement, this wing of the Visitor Center complex is comprised of three primary spaces. This wing is located adjacent to a café and dining space, on the opposite side of the building from which mansion tours commence.

The first space encountered upon entering this wing is the duPont Gallery, an L-shaped hallway. Arranged upon the walls of this hall is a collection of various historic photographs and interpretative panels relating to the William duPont Sr. family and their time at Montpelier. Located directly off the hall on the right hand side is an exact recreation of Marion duPont Scott’s Red Room. Prior to the removal of the duPont alterations to the mansion, the interiors of this room were removed and saved for re-installation in the new duPont Gallery. A unique art deco space, complete with black and white checkered linoleum flooring, a zebra rug, and red vinyl seating fashioned from a material bolt straight from Henry Ford’s assembly line, this room showcases Marion’s career as an equestrian. Dozens of photographs and other memorabilia commemorating Marion’s various horses and races fill the walls of the room. Like the hall space, visitors are welcome to explore this room at their leisure. The second and last room contained within this gallery space, located at the end of the L-shaped hall, is the Grand Salon, or a hybrid rendition of the Morning and Drawing Rooms. A large and grand room with high ceilings and architectural details from the corresponding rooms in the duPont mansion, such as
a mantle and chandeliers, this space serves less as an interpretative room and more as a meeting and event rental space.

The arrangement of the three aforementioned spaces as the William duPont Gallery as part of the Visitor Center complex serves to fulfill the first stipulation of the settlement decree. It also functions as the singular way in which the duPont history is presented within the current interpretation at Montpelier. These efforts, while complying with the legal requirements are minimal at best. They are divorced from the extant landscape in which they occurred. In addition to their relative disassociation from the built environment, the gallery’s remote location with regard to the start and end of mansion tours serves to further distance the interpretative efforts from the mainline visitor experience. Additionally, unlike the mansion where visitors are accompanied by a guide throughout the entirety of their visit, the staffing of the duPont Gallery is on a volunteer basis. The gallery is not staffed the entire time that it is open to the public.

The third and fourth stipulations of the settlement decree are the only portions of the legal document to address the built environment of the estate. The most influential of these final two requirements is the christening of the duPont garden for Annie Rodgers duPont- a second way in which to guarantee the duPont name remains associated with the estate in perpetuity. Despite the permanence of the duPont name, like the duPont Gallery, the interpretation of this outdoor space is not included within the mansion tour.5 The final
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5 The interpretation of this garden space is included as a stop on the Gardens and Grounds Tour. This tour, however, is only offered on the first Saturday of each month. The limited nature of this tour prevents this information from being readily available to visitors. Visitors in fact are in essence only privy to this interpretative information if they visit the estate on a specific day of the month.
stipulation of the decree relates less to interpretation of the property, but speaks rather to its use in the decades to come. Although not specifically mandating the type of equestrian activity to be held at Montpelier each year, the Foundation has made the conscious effort to fulfill this requirement with the annual Montpelier Hunt Races, which are held the first weekend in November. Additionally, the presence of horses on the property and the use of the flat track for horse training exercises proves a further fulfillment of this request. While the stipulations of the final settlement decree serve to guarantee the presence of the duPont name at Montpelier Visitor Center, they have little impact on the interpretation of the estate at large. Despite the due diligence on behalf of the Foundation and the Trust in their design of the duPont Gallery, there exists a significant disconnect between the story told through the gallery’s walls and the remaining built duPont landscape. The discussion of ways in which to further address this disconnect will occur in Chapter Six of this thesis.

Interpretation Through the Years

Prior to the completion mansion restoration, Montpelier differed not only in its physical appearance, but in its interpretative presentation as well. A 1998 comparative piece of Monticello and Montpelier published in *The Sociological Quarterly* provides an interesting outlook into the not so distant past of the Montpelier mindset. In this article Larry Dermody, director of preservation at Montpelier at the time of publication, states the philosophy of Montpelier at that point in time to be to “preserve the structure [the mansion] itself, the property, and its cultural context, according to the time at which it was given to the National Trust.” In addressing the question of interpreting the duPont legacy,
Dermody stated “that to focus only on Madison not only represents an undemocratic disregard for the others who occupied the home, but violates the growth and development inherent in an historic structure.” From this article alone the ideology and mindset of both the Trust and Foundation is clear. This quote reveals that a preservation treatment ideal was held by major decision makers just ten years following their acquisition of the property. The goal during this first decade was in essence to preserve the property as it was when acquired by the Trust, although focusing the discussion on Madison. A restoration treatment approach has since been executed on the site. Due to the inaccessibility of some Foundation and Trust documents, specifically meeting minutes from Board of Directors meetings, the pivotal point at which the treatment direction of preservation changed to restoration is unclear. It is important to recognize that the Trust does not maintain specific guidelines or preservation plans that spell out the ideological approach. The decision-making processes guiding the management and organization of Montpelier during its foundational years is inaccessible, and not governed by a strict set of guidelines.

Further examination of the site’s interpretative history is found in early planning and educational documents. One of the earliest planning documents created regarding the Trust’s newly acquired Montpelier was the 1985-1987 property management proposal. As suggested by the document’s title, the primary focus of this document is the initial setup and management of the property. The document is vague in its discussion of interpretative plans for the property, as visitor engagement did not begin until 1987. Even with this
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6 Nolan and Buckman, “Preserving the Postmodern,” 258, 260.
7 As part of the initial research for this thesis, an attempt was made to access these documents. Upon further investigation, it was revealed that these records are sealed/inaccessible to the general public.
projected timeline, reference to visitor experience was limited to minimally refurbished public spaces within the mansion, including a designed duPont exhibition space. The document does not elaborate on the details of this exhibition. In 1986, included as a short memorandum to his graduate report investigating the estate hierarchy of Montpelier during the duPont ownership, Douglas Chamber presents a discussion of interpretative possibilities in relation to the stipulations of the duPont settlement agreement. In this discussion he suggests that the duPont narrative be interpreted through the “eyes of the ‘new’ social history.” He proposes the focus of the duPont narrative is best expressed with their changes to the landscape. His proposed focus centered upon evaluating the duPont legacy from the perspective of a working farm, utilizing the idea of the social hierarchy of a modern working estate to provide a new way through which to explore the duPont narrative. Additionally he suggests the utilization of the three duPont rooms to be preserved as part of the revised settlement agreement, as a demonstration of evolving southern architectural style during the twentieth century. Despite Chambers extensive research into the hierarchical organization of the estate during the duPont era, his recommendations appear to have had little effect on the interpretative programming at the
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9 Douglas B. Chambers, Preliminary Research Report, ca. 1987, folder Chambers, Douglas B., Montpelier Report Files, Montpelier Foundation, Orange, Orange County, Virginia. Note that the purpose of Chambers report was not for the sake of devising an alternative interpretation plan for the duPont legacy, but rather to garner a better understanding of how the property operated on a day to day basis during this period. Chambers research utilizes estate records, in addition to relying heavily on interviews with various former employees of the duPont estate. Although never formally published, Chambers research serves as an integral key to understanding the workings of Montpelier during the duPont era. The significance of his research garners further importance in the fact that many of his informants, in addition to a large number of other former duPont employees have passed away since the compilation of his report.
estate. While the impact of this report may appear insignificant, its relevance lies in the
early acknowledgment of the duPont story at Montpelier, in a time when research on the
property was substantially Madison-centric.

The text for the first estate tour reveals a slightly different approach than currently
encountered by visitors. Unlike today where visitors begin their tours within walking
distance of the mansion at the newly completed Visitor Center, the first tours at the estate
were arranged much differently. Beginning across State Route 20 near the old Montpelier
Supply Company Building, visitors were shuttled across the road and up to the mansion
by bus. This route to the mansion was not direct in nature, but instead provided visitors
with an opportunity to tour a larger portion of the grounds. The driver of the bus
served as a guide for this portion of the visitor experience, speaking primarily to duPont
landscape and buildings. Structures encountered during this initial tour included: the flat
track and steeplechase race courses, the power house and greenhouses, the Farm Barn
omplex, the residential houses now comprising Constitutional Village, the Sears Barns,
the bowling alley, and finally the formal garden. Visitors would then be dropped off for
their tour of the mansion and encouraged to further explore the grounds on their own
following the completion of their tour. Following the examination of multiple tour scripts,
this early version of the Montpelier estate tour actively provided visitors with the most
information concerning the duPont story at Montpelier, and also provided the greatest
interaction with the landscape.  

In 1989, the Trust received a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities to pursue Montpelier’s “interpretative potential.” As result of this grant, a colloquium was held in order to further explore the mission, programming, and interpretative potential for the estate. During this meeting, a mission statement was proposed that stated the Trust’s investment in Montpelier as “discovering and interpreting the values and legacy of James Madison within the overall context of Montpelier and the evolving American political, economic and cultural experience.” Although devising a Madison focused mission, the colloquium recommended that the “landscape should be maintained in its present duPont form...[as] it is an outstanding example of early 20th century country estate planning.” It was additionally noted that it would be impractical to remove it from the landscape. The findings of this report serve as an implicit acknowledgment of the value of the duPont narrative, not only to the landscape of Montpelier, but as part of the larger history of twentieth century American country estates. A year following this discussion, meeting minutes from an interpretative meeting present an opposite stance. These minutes state that the outbuildings are not to be interpreted, despite the acknowledgment of their significance during the previous year.
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10 Maguire and Reeder, “Montpelier Estate Tour,” National Trust for Historic Preservation Archives, (Washington, D.C.: 1987), 1-11. While this version of the estate tour appears to be the most comprehensive tour with regard to providing visitors with information on the duPont legacy. It should be noted that the goal of both the Trust and the Foundation at this point in time was still Madison driven, however, the lack of knowledge at this point in time of the Madison story resulted in an interpretative gap that was filled by the duPont story. As more information was discovered concerning the Madison period duPont story faded into the background.

This meeting also recommended the changing of the bus tour, prescribing a more direct route to the mansion with less focus on the duPont structures.\textsuperscript{12}

In 1992, the Trust organized an interim interpretative planning meeting. The fruits of this meeting were six interpretative themes on which to focus until the completion of a formalized plan could be arranged. This report supports the gradual shift of the Trust toward its Madison-centric views, as four of the six themes developed pertain directly to the Madison story. The first of the non-Madison themes relates to the acknowledgment and presentation of Montpelier as a “sophisticated complex…shaped by many people” specifically referencing the property’s African-American history. The second in turn references the Trust’s ongoing efforts to serve as good stewards of the property’s complete history, which included the recognition that the “DuPonsts and other owners have played import roles in preserving Montpelier.”\textsuperscript{13} This is the only significant statement with regard to the duPont impact included within the document.

A significant gap exists within the available documentation surrounding interpretative measures in the late 1990s. By 2000 the interpretation standards at the estate had virtually reached their current appearance with regard to influence of the duPont narrative. Examination of the 2000 Acoustiguide tour reveals limited discussion of the general landscape, touching mainly on the buildings and features within view of the mansion. Predating the mansion restoration by eight years, this tour includes


interpretation of the Dining, Morning, and Red Rooms of the duPont era mansion as now seen reconstructed in the Visitor Center. The remainder of the tour, discussing both interior and exterior rooms and features, pertained to Madison.\textsuperscript{14}

Since the Trust’s acquisition of the property in 1984, various efforts were made to investigate the original Madison mansion. In 2001, through the assistance of grants from the estate of Paul Mellon and the Save America’s Treasures Program, the Foundation was able to complete a full and comprehensive architectural study of the mansion. This paired with the original mansion drawings, discovered two years prior, and a generous $20 million grant from the Paul Mellon Estate, enabled the mansion restoration process to begin in December of 2003.\textsuperscript{15} Although the ideology behind the decision to restore the mansion is unknown, this serves without question as the turning point in the Montpelier interpretative history. As part of the mansion restoration efforts, a new interpretative plan was devised in 2008 outlining the Foundation’s new goals following the mansion overhaul. Much like the 1992 Interpretative Plan, six themes were developed. Unlike the 1992 plan, however, none of the themes pertain to the duPont narrative. Instead, separate from the Foundation’s six new primary themes, a secondary list of themes was developed specifically for the duPont Gallery. None of the themes included within this new interpretative plan pertain to the duPont landscape visible throughout the estate.\textsuperscript{16}

\textsuperscript{15} Building a President’s House, 34.
**Current Interpretation**

While the duPont buildings have historically been excluded from the estate’s mission and interpretative goals, the exception being the train depot, many of the buildings have remained in active use. Although most of the buildings extant on the property today were originally constructed for agricultural or residential purposes, the Foundation has been able to utilize many of these structures in alternative ways. Figure 4.2 illustrates the buildings on the property which have either maintained their original function or have been adaptively reused for other purposes. As visible from the illustration, a large number of structures currently in use today have changed in function since their original construction. Buildings such as the Pony Barn and the Carriage House are successful examples of the Foundation’s reuse- morphing them from agricultural buildings into office space for the Foundation’s staff. The current archaeology lab continues this trend, taking over what originally served as a kitchen building for Montpelier’s African-American workers. The estate’s original schoolhouse now serves as home to the Gupton Library. As can be observed in Figure 4.2 almost all of the buildings in Constitutional Village maintain their original residential functions, although they now serve as guest accommodations as opposed to full-time residential buildings.

Although a large number of buildings maintain an active use in the current day-to-day functions of Montpelier, over forty percent of the structures on the property are currently without use. As depicted in Figure 4.2 the majority of these unused structures fall well outside the presently designed visitor route through the property. Unless alterations are made to the current interpretative plan to incorporate some or all of these
Figure 4.2: Montpelier General Building Use Trends (Overlay by author. Basemap courtesy of Drew Chritton and the Montpelier Foundation)
resources, or they are reused, these buildings will most likely continue to remain vacant and unused until they are eventually demolished due to neglect. Chapter Six will further discuss potential mitigation, reuse, and interpretative efforts designed to help preserve the legacy of these under-valued duPont structures.

While the completion of the mansion restoration punctuates the prominence
of the Madison story at Montpelier, it should not go without recognition that the Foundation has made effort to pursue the discussion of some secondary narratives. The most prominent of these secondary narratives currently interpreted is that of the African American experience at Montpelier, specifically with regard to slavery during the Madison years. Archaeological excavations over recent years have revealed the location of numerous slave dwellings in the region of the mansion’s south yard. Archaeological digs have provided enough information to allow the recreation of ghost structures of six of these buildings.\(^{17}\) Due to their close proximity to the mansion, these structures and their stories fall within the average visitor path, and have become an integral part of Montpelier’s present day interpretation. Located along the main route linking the mansion and the Visitor Center, visitors are encouraged to interact with these spaces. Although not part of the guided tour, interpretative signage provides information regarding the buildings and the people who once occupied them.

The African-American story is continued on a parcel of land a large distance from the mansion, located opposite the main estate across State Route 20. Here the secondary narrative continues through the interpretation of the Gilmore Cabin. The Gilmore Cabin is credited as the “first preserved and interpreted freedman’s home in the United States.”\(^{18}\) Entirely separate from the mansion with regard to its interpretation,

\(^{17}\) Note that these are the structures that will be rebuilt as a part of the South Yard reconstruction project, made possible through the Rubenstein Grant.

the cabin underwent a thorough restoration following the Trust’s acquisition of the Montpelier property. The interpretation of the building’s interior is contemporary with the decorations and furnishings of a freedman’s family in the years following the American Civil War. On the grounds surrounding the cabin are various agricultural features including a working garden and a pig-pen. As the cabin is staffed the entire time that it is open for public visitation, visitors are able to interact with the staff members and gain insight into the agricultural practices of freedmen. Although a significant cultural resource to the greater region of Virginia, the site is only open for visitation on weekends from the months of April to October. This limited access provides a narrow window in which visitors are able to experience the Gilmore story. The limited time frame clearly

Figure 4.5: View of the current ghost structures standing in the south yard of the mansion, constructed to assist with the interpretation of slave life at Montpelier. These structures are currently in the process of being removed in order to make way for more complete interpretations as part of the South Yard Reconstruction Plan. This effort was announced in the fall of 2014 follow a gift from David Rubenstein. (Photography by author)
defines the secondary role of the Gilmore Cabin in the greater narrative at Montpelier. The final portion of the African American experience at Montpelier interpreted to visitors is the duPont era train depot, also located across Route 20 from the main estate. Although constructed by William duPont Sr. in 1910, the Foundation utilizes the train depot as a vehicle through which to tell the story of Civil Rights on both the local and national levels. Utilizing various interpretative panels, the Foundation discusses the experience of African American Montpelier employees during this critical time in history. One of the primary reasons this building is relevant in telling this story is due to the inclusion of segregated waiting rooms in its original architectural plans. Interpretative panels providing a brief overview of the broader Civil Rights movement in the United States are also included to provide supporting information.\textsuperscript{19} Although not explicitly mentioned in the overall mission statement of Montpelier, the discussion of the African-American legacy is clearly a key secondary narrative interpreted at the estate.

Considerably smaller in its presentation, the Foundation presents interpretation of a second secondary narrative at Montpelier. In the early 2000s, archaeological surveys conducted in the woods to north of the mansion uncovered the location of numerous Civil War encampments. Historical research revealed these encampments were occupied by Robert E. Lee’s Army of Northern Virginia during the winters of 1863 and 1864. As result of this discovery, some of the camp huts were recreated and interpretative signage was designed to convey the story. The Civil War encampments were then placed on a trail route linking the camp to the Gilmore Cabin. Visitors are encouraged to explore this

\textsuperscript{19} Montpelier Foundation, Train Depot Exhibit, James Madison’s Montpelier, Orange County, Virginia, 2015.
interpretative trail (located across Route 20 from the main estate) following the conclusion of their visit to the main estate. Unlike the Gilmore Cabin, access to this interpretative trail is not limited to the weekends.

As can be seen through the Foundation’s efforts with regard to the treatment of the African-American heritage at Montpelier and the William duPont Gallery, the idea of preserving the secondary narratives at Montpelier is not entirely lost. The potential to convey additional secondary narratives is not fully recognized. In his influential paper “The Modern Cult of Monuments” Alois Riegl discusses the concept of historical value

---

within the confines of preservation. He states that “everything that has been constitutes an irreplaceable and irremovable link in a chain of development...[that] each successful step implies its predecessor could not have happened as it did without that earlier step.” 21 The complex developmental nature of Montpelier’s environment serves as a prime example for Reigl’s definition. The recognition that each aspect of the estate’s history matters, regardless how seemingly insignificant it might seem at first glance, and play an integral part in the development of the property as it stands today. Without recognition of each of these different puzzle pieces, a historic institution can never truly achieve its goal of being a faithful steward of the property, and Montpelier is no exception to this reality.

21 Riegl, 1.
CHAPTER 5: A VALUE BASED APPROACH

Although the case has been made for the critical impact of the duPont legacy on the physical landscape of Montpelier, the question remains as how to appropriately address this secondary narrative, given the preservation field’s current standards. The answer to this question is simple. Based upon the currently recognized federal standards for significance, the duPont legacy cannot rise in prominence. As alluded to in previous chapters, the key to more clearly understanding the impact of the duPont legacy at Montpelier can only be realized through an alternative approach to the property’s current evaluation.

Due to the estate’s designation as a National Historic Landmark, its national significance currently derives from the criteria set forth by the Landmark’s program. Much like designation on the National Register, a property must meet one or more of the determined criteria in order to earn recognition as a landmark.¹

The six criteria are:

1. association with events that have made a significant contribution to...broad national patterns
2. association with the lives of persons nationally significant
3. representation of some great...ideal of the American people

¹ The estate additionally falls within the criteria set forth by the National Register of Historic Places, as before a property may become a National Historic Landmark, it must first be designated a National Register Site. This results in the applicability of both criteria to both classifications of buildings. Additionally the wordings of these criteria are similar in nature. The primary difference between the National Register and the National Historic Landmark Programs is that Register listings garner significance on a more local level whereas NHLs are nationally significant.
4. embodiment of distinguishing characteristics of an architectural type
5. characterizing a certain way of life
6. yielding or likely to yield information of major scientific importance

At Montpelier’s designation as a National Historic Landmark (NHL), during the program’s inaugural year in 1960, the property reflected the duPont influence. This influence was particularly evident in the alterations that had occurred to the mansion, and the extensive landscape evolution by this point in time. Despite the overwhelming 20th century influence on the estate, Montpelier was designated a NHL, falling under the second criterion based upon the site’s relationship to a significant American figure. Given the mansion’s numerous modifications, and thus its compromised integrity with respect to the Madison era, Montpelier was recognized for its significance under this second criterion, as opposed to the fourth with relates to architectural style.

Under the Secretary of Interior’s Standards, integrity is defined as the “authenticity of a property’s historic identity, evidenced by the survival of physical characteristics that existed during the property’s historic or prehistoric period.” With regard to Montpelier, this integrity is determined based up the amount of original fabric and evidence that exists from the Madison period of occupation, given that the Madison period has been determined to be the property’s period of significance. Integrity can refer to either the built environment or landscape features. The Secretary of the Interior recognizes seven

---

aspects with regard to integrity in the United States. These seven aspects are: feeling, materials, workmanship, location, design, association, and setting. The presence of the duPont era buildings from decades following Madison’s inhabitation of the estate detract from the property’s original design, feeling, and setting integrity according to the Madison-centric view of Montpelier’s interpretation.\(^3\)

In focusing solely on the property’s Madison association, the opportunity to recognize the contributions of the duPonts is subdued. Due to the narrow scope of the current standards for determining significance in the United States, the only way in which the duPont narrative can attain significance is through the evaluation of the property through a new lens. One such system, which may serve as an appropriate alternative to the current standards utilized in the United States, is a “value” based system employed by the leading British historic preservation nonprofit, English Heritage. Because listing on the Register serves as a precursor to designation as an NHL, and it is the National Register which in turn serves as the basis for determining the significance in the United States, the National Register for Historic Places criteria are the foundational criteria for significance. Due to this fact, this study will continue to utilize the National Register for Historic Places as the current significance standard as opposed to the NHL criteria.

Despite specificity from the four criteria for significance set forth by the National Register, a clear definition of the term “significance” within the purview of the Secretary of Interior’s Standards does not exist. Although the term “significance” is employed

throughout various federal preservation briefs and publications by the National Park Service, the verbiage surrounding the definition of this term is vague and inconsistent. Through the examination of a number of these documents, the closest approach of any document to providing a clearly articulated definition of the term “significance” involves the mere listing of the four National Register criteria in question form.

Like the United States, English Heritage utilizes the same term “significance” as the standard for considering historic sites. Unlike the United States, however, English Heritage provides a concise and clearly articulated definition of the word in relation to their valuation process. English Heritage defines significance of place as “the sum of cultural and natural heritage values of a place, often set out in a statement of significance.”

While the English Heritage term of significance is utilized for the same purpose, effectively determining how important a historic site is, the definition offered by English Heritage hinges on the “cultural or natural heritage value” of a particular site. Cultural heritage refers to the cultural or man-made aspects of a population’s history whereas natural heritage serves to represent the geological and physical natural environment. The view of historic sites through these broader lenses serves as an integral part of determining significance within the English Heritage system.

In a 2008 publication titled “Conservation Principles: Policies and Guidelines for
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5 Cultural Heritage as defined by English Heritage is the “inherited assets which people identify and value as a reflection and expression of their evolving knowledge, beliefs and traditions and their understanding of the beliefs and traditions of others.” Natural Heritage in turn is defined as “inherited habitats, species, ecosystems, geology and landforms, including those in and under water to which people attach value.” English Heritage, 71.
the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment” English Heritages discusses the concept of cultural heritage values and their implementation in the process of evaluating significance. Unlike the Secretary of Interior’s Standards, the process set forth by the English Heritage is twofold in its nature. The first step discussed by English Heritage is the presentation of six principles to consider in defining a property’s significance. These principles serve as the framework for appropriate management of resources and serve to guide the discussion for what aspects of a property hold significance. These principles are as follows:

Principle 1: the historic environment is a shared resource
Principle 2: everyone should be able to participate in sustaining the historic environment
Principle 3: understanding the significance of a place is vital
Principle 4: significant places should be managed to sustain their values
Principle 5: decisions about change must be reasonable, transparent and consistent
Principle 6: documenting and learning from decisions is essential

Although included within a document centered on the discussion of responsible management of historic properties, the “Conservation Principles” serve to encourage a broader discussion of a property’s potential. This in turn provides for a more comprehensive consideration of resources. It additionally places less emphasis on a singular period of significance, as is the case with the Register criteria. In the case of

---

6 Ibid., 7.
Montpelier, this provides for the greater exploration of the Madison, duPont, and other secondary narratives. Principle 3 specifically denotes the importance of understanding the significance of place in its entirety including “how and why it has changed over time.” It also calls for the embrace of “all the diverse cultural and natural heritage values that people associate with it.” In essence, all spectrums of significance are worthy of consideration under this approach.

**Heritage Values**

Tying into this idea of understanding significance is the fourth principle, which states “places should be managed to sustain their values.” In its “Conservation Principles” English Heritage presents a set of four heritage values utilized in further quantifying the significance of a place. The combined application of both principles and the recognition of value provides for a broader and more holistic approach to assessing the significance of a place. Unlike the strict criteria used for consideration in the United States, which largely implies that a site must comply with the set standards, the concept of value hinges largely on a site’s “potential.” Without a system of recognized values, the true potential of a site can never be fully realized. English Heritage’s fourth principle discusses the importance of a place to recognize, manage, and sustain its heritage values in order for an organization to maintain proper stewardship of a site. This multi-phase approach allows for a broader and more thorough consideration of a site than the criteria set forth by the National
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7 English Heritage, 21.
8 Ibid., 22.
Register. Through the implementation of English Heritage's value system, which calls for the evaluation for a place as a whole, the secondary duPont narrative is able to effectively garner significance in the valuation of the site.

The first of these English Heritage values is the evidential value, defined by English Heritage as “value deriving from the potential of a place to yield evidence about past human activity.” This is the most narrowly defined of the four heritage values. Similar to the National Register’s Criterion D, this heritage value focuses on the amount of potential information a particular site may provide about the past, such as through archaeological excavations. The examination of Montpelier through the lens of this evidential value reveals a significant potential. Evidential value points to the Madison influence on the property, in addition to other minority experiences during, and predating the Madison period. This value has less application to the duPont narrative. The evidential value of the estate is currently being explored through extensive archaeological investigations. Given the fairly comprehensive records left by the duPons following their ownership of the property, little if anything, exists to be discovered through archaeological excavations with regard to this later period of ownership. Evidential value exudes the potential to reveal more about other secondary narratives in Montpelier’s history though, as the Civil War encampments and African-American histories have demonstrated. Evidential value can further a more complete understanding and interpretation as a comprehensive site.

Historical value is the second value presented by English Heritage. Defined as “value deriving from the ways in which past people, events and aspects of life can be
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9 English Heritage, 28.
connected through a place to the present,” this value is analogous to a combination of the National Register’s Criteria A and B in that it discusses a site’s relationship to both people and events of the past. In its task to serve as a connection to the past, this value additionally encompasses interpretative value, as interpretation typically serves as the link between a site’s history and its visitors. The value differs from the Register criteria in the fact that it continues on to discuss the “illustrative or associative” nature of a site, or the way in which a property is able to serve as a physical illustration of the historic past. The associative portion of this definition relates to the way in which a visitor is able to mentally and emotionally connect with the past through interaction with the historic property. The incorporation of the illustrative and associative nature of a property into the historic value places emphasis on visitor interaction with the physical manifestation of the landscape of a site over time.

Due to its similar wording to the National Register’s criteria, English Heritage’s historical value and the Register’s criteria A and B appear almost identical. Upon further analysis of the English Heritage value, historical value is revealed to include a site’s entire history as opposed to the National Register which acknowledges only a singular period of significance. Historical value in turn recognizes the evolution of a place over time stating “the authenticity of a place indeed often lies in visible evidence of changes as a result of people responding to changing circumstances.” In the case of Montpelier, these changing circumstances are most clearly observable through the passage of time, and as result of

10 English Heritage, 72.
11 Ibid., 29.
the progression of the property’s ownership. The impact on the landscape as result of the
duPont era serves as a clear example of this visible change. Further differentiation between
the historical value and the Register criteria can be observed. The heritage value definition
states that “aspects of life can be connected through a place to the present” which harkens
to the illustrative and associative aspects of historic value previously discussed. Unlike the
Register criteria, which focuses statically on the historic nature of a place, English Heritage
presents an active approach to experiencing the history of a place. This is achieved
through the implication that a place can be utilized as the link through which to tell a
larger, and more comprehensive story. In this sense, the landscape serves to connect many
generations of inhabitants and influence, all of which must be recognized and understood.

Unlike the evidential value, which is modest at Montpelier, the estate harbors a
substantial amount of historical value. The property’s expansive built environment serves
to meet the illustrative definition set forth by the historical value. The large number
of duPont structures on the landscape paired with the remaining two Madisonian
buildings, as well as the reconstructed slave quarters, serve to support the importance
of site authenticity, demonstrating substantial changes to the property over time. These
property changes are further reinforced by the presence of the other secondary narratives
currently interpreted at the estate (i.e. the Civil War encampments and the train depot).
The substantial amount of intact fabric on the property, or the property’s “integrity”
进一步支持了该遗址的历史价值。现存的建筑环境和景观特征提供了一条可触知的路径，通过该路径，游客可以体验该财产。建筑物和考古特征可以服务到
represent almost all periods in the property’s history. These discrete features are linked together by the landscape, presenting a comprehensive history of the property. The presence of the Madison era built features and the many duPont era structures results in a unique historic agricultural environment, one quite unlike any other historic estate in the United States. Despite this unique asset, the collection continues unrecognized. Due to this exclusion of the duPont buildings from Montpelier’s interpretative plan, this historical value is currently under realized.

Linking closely with historical value is the third value presented by English Heritage, or aesthetic value. Unlike the historical value, which focuses primarily on the physical experience, aesthetic value centers its focus on the “sensory and intellectual stimulation” of a site. In further defining this value, English Heritage presents the subcategories of “conscious design” and “fortuitous” design of a place. The former relates to a deliberate layout or design of a building or landscape, whereas the latter refers to the unplanned evolution of a place over time. English Heritage brings attention to responsible stewardship of sites both planned and unplanned in their sense of design. The way in which the public is stimulated by a place is greatly impacted by the way in which a historic site evolved.

While seemingly a simple value, aesthetic value calls for the recognition of a site’s evolutionary process, which in turn aides in the interpretation and understanding of its comprehensive history. Aesthetic value relates to Riegl’s idea of age value. In his “Cult of Monuments” Riegl suggests age value to be the objective appreciation of the past at face value, or in essence, appreciating old things for being old. He states that “age value is
revealed in imperfection, a lack of completeness, a tendency to dissolve shape and color, characteristics that are in complete contrast with those of modern” which personifies the visible development of Montpelier. Through this definition, it is clear that Riegl suggests a certain degree of importance comes from a site's ability to communicate its age to viewers. This view is articulated through intuitive, aesthetic aspects of historic structures. One aspect of seeing and understanding the age of a site is through the clear observation and interpretation of the site's evolution over time. At Montpelier this age value is seen through the appearance of the duPont and other 19th century structures throughout the course of the estate's history. Developing over time in an organic and unplanned fashion, these buildings speak to the site's complex history and serve to illustrate a change over time found at few other historic sites. The recognition of this unique collection of buildings as it has developed over the course of the past century correlates directly with the acknowledgment of aesthetic value. As Riegl suggests, there exists a natural emotional appeal in discerning old and aged structures on a landscape. This emotional connection between visitors and buildings assists to foster an appreciation for a site that is lost with the removal of structures from the landscape. In summary, recognition of a site's aesthetic value is critical to discerning the full value of a historic site.

Two characteristics of Montpelier’s full estate have proven problematic in interpreting the one singular, dominant narrative of Madison on the site that may be addressed using the aesthetic value. These two characteristics are the presence of vernacular in contrast to high style buildings around the estate's historic core, and the
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12 English Heritage, 30; Reigl, 72-73.
informally planned placement of these buildings and landscape structures that convey a notion of change over time, or “fortuitous” design. By American criteria, these vernacular and organically placed buildings undermine the integrity of the site with respect to the Madison narrative.

While the presence of these two characteristics at the estate (its vernacular building forms, and its organic method of growth and development) hinder its value of integrity under the United States’ definition, they actually serve to enhance the recognition of the English Heritage aesthetic value at Montpelier. Through its organic growth and design over the course of its history, Montpelier’s landscape plays straight into the hand of “fortuitous design.” The appearance and disappearance of buildings over the course of time, both Madison and duPont alike, demonstrates an evolution of place. A thorough understanding and appreciation of this progression calls for the acknowledgment of all of the known structures on the property, both extant and demolished. In fitting with aesthetic value, the extant buildings should be recognized for their emotive sensory appeal. While an appreciation of this value may be clear to some of those working with the property on a daily basis, in order to provide visitors with the opportunity to fully realize the potential of this value, a conscious effort must be made to portray it within the estate’s interpretation. This includes addressing all periods of development within visitor interpretation. The definition of the aesthetic value calls for recognition of a landscape’s evolution through the responsible stewardship of a site. As suggested by the lack of attention directed toward the duPont buildings, at present, this value is not fully recognized at Montpelier. Further discussion as to how these elements
can be incorporated within the Montpelier visitor experience will follow in Chapter Six.

The fourth and final value presented within the English Heritage’s discussion of principles and guidelines is that of communal value. Greatly differing from any of the federally recognized criteria in the United States, this value pertains solely to the meaning of a place, whether it be symbolic, commemorative, social, or spiritual. As defined by English Heritage, this value relates less to the tangible built environment, but rather appeals more to the ongoing emotional and practical uses of a place outside of those prescribed under a historic value. ¹³ Differing from the three values previously discussed, the communal value is fairly well captured at Montpelier. Open to visitors and scholars alike, the property serves as an outlet for social interaction on a daily basis, mirroring the extensive social atmosphere of the property in decades past. Additionally, the estate has earned a recognized place within the local community and frequently serves as host to public events, including the annual Montpelier Hunt Races as well as other festivals and fairs. The shortcoming with regard to the value being fully realized is in the symbolic and commemorative meanings. While the air of commemoration of Madison and the Constitution are clear and easily identifiable, the commemoration of other secondary narratives are in need of bolstering and definition.

As can be observed through closer examination, the utilization of the “heritage values” provides for a much broader consideration of historic sites than is currently derived from use of the criteria in the United States. Due to the broad range of their definition, the application of these heritage values at a historic site allows for the

¹³ English Heritage, 30-32.
recognition of a site's complete history and present usefulness to a wider range of people. Having no strict call for a singular period of “greatest significance” the English Heritage Guidelines and Principles allow for the consideration of historic sites as comprehensive wholes, as promoted by Ruskin. The use of such a value system in determining the significance of a site with such a complex history as Montpelier proves an effective and holistic way in which to properly evaluate all elements of a property and address current resources that fall outside of consideration.

Latent Values

Although some systems, such as English Heritage, recognize significance in secondary narratives, frequently these secondary narratives do not support the primary mission of a given historic site. This disconnect leads to a simplified, less diversified interpretation and preservation prospective on significance. Given their finite resources, the stewards of historic properties often cannot afford to divert funding from their primary mission to that of a secondary story. To accommodate this reality, and be as inclusive of alternative histories as possible, it is necessary to consider more than just the traditional heritage values during the evaluation of a site. Through the further exploration of this broader nontraditional approach, several additional values, or latent values, are suggested here. Latent values are most easily defined as hidden, or unrealized potential at historic sites. These values are designed to be less traditional in their nature, as opposed to heritage values, which in contrast relate directly to the physical interpretation of a property’s story. These latent values were derived after the careful consideration of
Montpelier’s wide reaching ability to combine multiple historic narratives and the estate's potential to be an activated landscape. Following the careful examination of the property, four latent values were identified. These values are economic value, development value, recreational value, and educational value.

It is important to note that in order for all aspects of these latent values to be fully realized a comprehensive evaluation of the estate is necessary. In order for this investigation to be considered comprehensive in nature, all qualities of a landscape must be evaluated equally. Although less traditional than the four heritage values, latent values are just as important. Like English Heritage’s heritage values, latent values are broad in their application. Numerous other historic sites capitalize on their latent values, though they do not employ this term. Further discussion of these values at Montpelier, in addition to other historic sites will help to illustrate their versatility.

Within a historic site, the latent economic value is defined as a site’s ability to capitalize on its various assets in order to maintain financial viability. In essence, how can the property work for an organization in order to provide economic stability? Montpelier’s economic value from this perspective involves a holistic outlook on the property with regard to ways in which to utilize both the land and buildings for potential income, while still remaining faithful to its historic values. Considering the economic latent value must support or partner with previously identified heritage values at the estate. The recognition of the economic value of a historic site is critical for the success of the property as a not only an effective interpretative center, but also as a successful business. Regardless of a historic property’s relative significance or heritage value, if it is unable to utilize its
resources to support itself economically its heritage value is seriously threatened. In
the case of Montpelier, given the estate’s expansive land holdings and well-developed
infrastructure, a solid base exists on which to further capitalize upon its currently
under-realized economic value. Extracting additional economic gain from the property
sympathetically, without undermining the heritage value, would substantially assist the
estate in meeting its current organizational goals.

Presently, this economic value is realized at Montpelier through the Foundation’s
leasing of a small number of sheds, barns, and fields for private agricultural practices.
These buildings are utilized by independent contractors for equestrian and livestock
raising purposes. Additionally, the estate utilizes retail opportunities within the capacity of
its visitor’s center. Capitalizing on economic potential additionally provides ways through
which the Foundation may better itself in its stewardship endeavors through identifying
affordable means by which to support the estate’s interpretation. This will be further
discussed in Chapter Six.

Relating closely with economic value is that of development value. This value calls
for the consideration of the property’s potential capacity for development, which can be
quantified in a number of different ways. Development value may refer to a site’s ability
to grow and expand programmatically, and/or physically with regard to infrastructure.
The value of development should be treated with caution as this value has the potential
to undermine other identified latent and heritage values. Development value must first
carefully assess a site’s assets and consider where there is opportunity versus friction with
the other latent and heritage values. Development value may manifest in a number of
different ways. In the case of Montpelier, this value is only partially realized. Since the beginning of the mansion restoration project in the early 2000s, the estate has undergone a significant change through the development of new programming. The new programming addressing the restored mansion and reconstructed ghost structures within the south yard, as well as the African American story discussed in Chapter Four.

The Foundation has overseen the construction of several buildings in recent years, including a new visitor’s center, and a new operations and maintenance building to support the new interpretive programming. Although this construction demonstrates some acknowledgment of the development value at the property, the extensive amount of land composing the estate leaves room for additional development of the estate’s infrastructure. This may be through agricultural pursuits, more effective use of existing buildings, or other currently untapped possibilities. The financial benefits potentially realized through development value overlaps with the economic value previously discussed. This demonstrates the cohesive way in which this value system is intended to function. On the programmatic side, previous analysis of landscape history within this thesis has revealed complex and multi-layered history of the property, which is currently understated at the estate. Extensive room exists for the further development of these currently under-realized eras of the estate’s occupation.

Linked closely with the development value is the third derived latent value at Montpelier, educational value. As may be implied by its name, this value relates to a historic sites potential to convey and interpret information to the general public and scholars through visitation. This information may relate to those themes and facts
realized through the consideration of a property’s historic heritage value, or it may
relate to more modern practices such as environmental conservation, or sustainability
practices. It is through this broad definition that educational value distinguishes itself
from the interpretative value (which manifests as part of the historical heritage value).
The two terms are mutually exclusive with one another with regard to their ability to
convey information to visitors. The primary difference between the two lies with the fact
that educational value is a much broader and all-encompassing definition, including the
dissemination of historic as well as current information. In the case of Montpelier an
example of the latter may be a presentation on modern day horse training or farming
practices. This reaches outside the realm of the strict confines of the estate’s primary
Madison focused interpretative goals to provide additional education to visitors. The
interpretative, or historic value, in turn, would focus only on those historic practices.

With these differences in mind, the observation of the way in which Montpelier,
as with most historic sites, currently realizes its educational value lies primarily with its
interpretative efforts. At present, this value is partially realized through the education of
visitors through the interpretation of the estate’s history. In addition to mansion tours,
visitors receive the opportunity to engage in additional special educational programming
on select weekends throughout the year. The majority of this programming relates to life
at the estate during the Madison era. Tying into its mission of Madison interpretation,
educational value is also recognized at Montpelier through the programming and
outreach of the Center for the Constitution. Given the emphasis placed upon the Madison
history at the estate, educational value is at its broadest under-realized at Montpelier. The
Foundation currently falls short of providing an inclusive interpretation of the estate's full history. A significant amount of potential exists with regard to more fully realizing the educational value at the estate. These educational opportunities may lie well outside the current historic interpretative goals, and may instead lie in agricultural and equestrian education, land management education, etc. These possibilities will be further discussed in Chapter Six.

The final latent value at Montpelier is that of recreational value. Hinging largely on visitor interaction, this value is defined as a site’s ability to actively engage visitors in ways outside of the typical historic and interpretative schemes. At large estates such as Montpelier, this potential can be realized through the estate’s natural resources such large swaths of open space, forested areas, rivers and streams, vistas, etc. Recreational activities may exist solely to enhance overall visitor experience and engage a different segment of the population at a particular site, but also frequently interfaces with a site’s economic value. Recreational experiences often serve as a source for additional income for a site. While recreational value often relates to the naturally occurring features within a site’s landscape, this value may also manifest in ways which pertain to a site’s mission, allowing it to interface with the its educational and historic values such as through walking tours. Presently at Montpelier, this value is currently significantly under-realized. Despite the estate’s expansive land holdings, only a small number of recreational opportunities exist at Montpelier. A small trail system of approximately two miles runs through the James Madison Landmark Forest. Three trails currently comprise this system are the Landmark
Forest Trail, the Demonstration Forest Trail, and the Civil War Trail. In addition to these trails a number of short walking paths exist near the mansion, connecting the estate’s historic core to the visitor’s center. Given the estate’s size of approximately 2700 acres, the amount of recreational potential is much greater than what is currently realized by the Foundation.

As revealed through a closer examination of Montpelier, the implementation of this value system during the consideration of historic sites is multi-fold in its benefits. Firstly, as earlier discussed, the utilization of this system provides for a broader and more comprehensive valuation of a site’s history. Unlike the National Register criteria, which are narrow in their definition, heritage latent values allow for the consideration of a site in its entirety, providing for consideration of landscape features, which are currently unrepresented. In the case of Montpelier, this allows for the inclusion of the duPont narrative with regard to the property’s significance. Instead of focusing in on one specific period of significance, a more thorough valuation is allowed. This in essence provides for a more holistic representation of the estate’s past. In addition to this more holistic view, the value approach allows for the evaluation of the estate with regard to its numerous untapped potentials, something completely unrealized through the implementation of the National Register criteria. The recognition of these values not only aid in the interpretation and incorporation of secondary narratives within the site, but additionally recognizes the estate as a larger entity- not just the Madison core. This provides a clear

**Figures 5.1: Realized vs. Potential Value Charts**

The top chart in each pair featured below (Figure 5.1) serves to visually represent the current perceived level of recognition at Montpelier of each of the previously discussed Heritage and Latent Values. Each value was judged on a scale from one to four. Dark green represents a number one score, which implies the value is well recognized. The lightest green represents a number four score, indicating that the value is at present substantially under recognized at the estate. In classifying their current land holdings, the Montpelier Foundation categorizes the estate into thirteen different zones based upon land usage. For the purposes of this analysis, each zone was evaluated with regard to its current recognition of each heritage and latent values. The second chart in each pair serves in turn to visually represent each value's potential amount of recognition at Montpelier. This chart serves as an idealized standard to which Montpelier should strive to meet in order to fully recognize the potential of its heritage and latent values. Further discussion with regard to ways in which Montpelier might reach these goals can be found in the following chapter.

### Heritage Values

#### REALIZED:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone 1: Historic Core</th>
<th>Evidential Value</th>
<th>Historic/Interp. Value</th>
<th>Aesthetic</th>
<th>Communal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zone 2: Cemeteries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 3: Other visitor areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 4: Landmark Forest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 5: Equestrian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 6: Special Events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 7: Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 8: Center for the Constitution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 9: Pasture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 10: Confederate Encampments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 11: Freedman's Farm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 12: Forest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 13: Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### POTENTIAL FOR:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone 1: Historic Core</th>
<th>Evidential Value</th>
<th>Historic/Interp. Value</th>
<th>Aesthetic</th>
<th>Communal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zone 2: Cemeteries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 3: Other visitor areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 4: Landmark Forest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 5: Equestrian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 6: Special Events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 7: Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 8: Center for the Constitution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 9: Pasture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 10: Confederate Encampments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 11: Freedman’s Farm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 12: Forest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 13: Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Latent Values

#### REALIZED:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone 1: Historic Core</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Educational</th>
<th>Recreational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zone 2: Cemeteries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 3: Other visitor areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 4: Landmark Forest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 5: Equestrian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 6: Special Events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 7: Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 8: Center for the Constitution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 9: Pasture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 10: Confederate Encampments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 11: Freedman’s Farm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 12: Forest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 13: Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### POTENTIAL FOR:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone 1: Historic Core</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Educational</th>
<th>Recreational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zone 2: Cemeteries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 3: Other visitor areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 4: Landmark Forest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 5: Equestrian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 6: Special Events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 7: Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 8: Center for the Constitution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 9: Pasture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 10: Confederate Encampments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 11: Freedman’s Farm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 12: Forest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 13: Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 5.2: Featured above is a Land Use Map created by the Montpelier Foundation. The map depicts the present day Montpelier estate divided into zones based upon land usage. (Map courtesy of The Montpelier Foundation)
lens through which to look as the Foundation endeavors to continue forward to a sustainable and successful future. These values serve to provide clear guidance with regard to preservation planning and management.

**Case Studies**

Although not intentionally designed or managed based upon the heritage-latent value system proposed in this chapter, numerous historic properties in the United States have successfully capitalized upon their heritage and latent values. Two such places include The Biltmore (Asheville, NC) and Middleton Place (Charleston, SC). While maintaining significance with regard to the Register criteria these sites additionally demonstrate the successful realization of both heritage and latent values.

**The Biltmore**

The Vanderbilt’s Biltmore, located in Asheville, North Carolina, serves as an excellent example of a site which successfully recognizes its heritage-latent values. Although constructed just a decade before the duPont ownership of Montpelier began, and roughly three times the size of Montpelier, the Biltmore and Montpelier share a common theme in that they were both designed to serve as a gentleman’s country estates. One of the greatest difference between the two estates, however, exists in their pattern of development. Unlike Montpelier, the house at the Biltmore was new construction by George Washington Vanderbilt, following his purchase of the estate in the late-1880s. With construction of the house beginning in 1889, over the course of the next
two decades, the estate developed into a thriving estate, featuring hundreds of ancillary structures, both agricultural and residential in nature. Many of these structures were part of a subsidiary development to the mansion known as Biltmore Village. While development of the Biltmore estate occurred on a much larger scale than the duPont development at Montpelier, the two estates are similar in their initial development and agricultural goals.¹⁵

![The Biltmore Mansion](Image courtesy of flickr.com)

**Figure 5.3:** The Biltmore Mansion (Image courtesy of flickr.com)

Despite the parallels between the two estates during their twentieth century development, Montpelier and the Biltmore have manifested quiet differently in the twenty-first century with regard to their success as historic sites. Although both were designated as National Historic Landmarks while privately owned in the 1960s, the

development of the Biltmore serves as a greater success story with regard to the realization and capitalization of its heritage and latent values.

Known first and foremost as a successful house museum, like Montpelier, the Biltmore has successfully realized its heritage values through its interpretation of its architecturally significant Chateauesque mansion. Unlike Montpelier, however, the Biltmore successfully recognizes the estate's interpretative and aesthetic values in the emphasis placed upon the estate's landscape. Despite having a larger abundance of both buildings and land, the Biltmore has successfully incorporated its expansive landscape into the visitor experience through landscape tours. Additionally, visitors are encouraged to explore a vast portion of the grounds and surrounding supporting buildings during their visit to the site. A greater effort is made toward the incorporation of the many secondary structures into the estate's interpretation, unlike Montpelier. The heritage communal value is also more fully recognized at the Biltmore through the estate's role in hosting a substantial number of events throughout the year, serving as a gathering place for numerous concerts and festivals. The recognition of these values allows for a variety of experiences and engagement, providing reasons for visitors to spend a day, or more, exploring the estate.

The variety of visitor engagement as result of realized heritage values leads to the successful recognition of latent values at the Biltmore. Tying in specifically with these heritage values are those economic, development, and recreational values. While acknowledging its heritage values through its house and landscape tours, unlike Montpelier, the Biltmore has economically capitalized upon its substantial land holdings
through the development of numerous outdoor recreational activities. Examples of these activities include hiking, biking, horseback riding, carriage tours, and shooting sports. In addition to these various activities numerous dining and shopping options exist within the confines of the property. The range of activities encourage exclusive visitor interaction for an entire day, if not longer.\textsuperscript{16} The recognition of these heritage and latent values has allowed the Biltmore to become a successful and well-interpreted site that seeks to maximize all of its potentials.

\textbf{Middleton Place}

On a slightly smaller scale from the Biltmore, yet still serving as a prime example of the successful realization of both heritage and latent values is Middleton Place, located along the Ashley River in Charleston, South Carolina. Originally home of Henry Middleton, second president of the first Continental Congress and signer of the Declaration of Independence, the plantation remained within the Middleton family for over three centuries. In the 1970s the plantation was named a National Historic Landmark. Today, approximately one hundred of the plantation’s original 7,000 acres is owned and operated as a historic site by the Middleton Place Foundation.\textsuperscript{17}

Operated first and foremost as a historic site, Middleton Place has made a conscious effort to recognize its historic and evidential heritage values through its


interpretation of the estate’s long history. Touching briefly on every generation of Middleton owners through its house tour, the plantation continues to interpret the secondary slave story through a reconstructed slave cabin. Significant research, in addition to archaeological excavations have revealed information with regard to slave life at the plantation. The aesthetic heritage value is additionally well recognized at the plantation through the expansive interpretation and recreation of the plantation’s formal gardens. The interpretation of this area allows for an extensive and engaging visitor experience that allows visitors to interact with the landscape in an active manner. The estate recognizes its communal heritage value through its hosting of a variety of community events, in addition to its service as a venue for weddings and other privately planned events.

In addition to heritage values, Middleton Place successfully realizes multiple latent values which has led to its success as both a historic site, but also a profitable business. As previously mentioned, the plantation does well in recognizing its latent educational value through its numerous interpretative measures. The plantation has additionally built upon its educational value through the creation of a farmyard, exhibiting animals and farming techniques of the appropriate historic period. In contrast to these more historic based values, latent, economic, and development values are present and work hand in hand. Economic, development, and latent values manifest through the plantation’s integration of both lodging and dining amenities into the landscape. These programmed buildings provide visitors with multiple ways in which to engage with the landscape, and are disguised such a manner so as to still keep true to the historic appearance of the property. Although not as well recognized as the previously two discussed latent values, the
plantation has begun to realize its recreational value through the offering of kayak tours and walking trails. These recreational opportunities not only work to utilize the land to its fullest potential, but additionally provide visitors with a diversified and engaging visitor experience. Through the reconsideration of the property as a whole, Montpelier exhibits the potential to relay to the public a much more comprehensive story than currently exhibited, and to provide for engagement that will create new experiences and associations for individuals with the place. Previous chapters have demonstrated the significant impact of the duPont family on the estate’s landscape encouraging the revaluation of the property through a new and broader lens. As seen in the cases of both the Biltmore and Middleton Place, the potential exists for a successful incorporation of both heritage and latent values, providing not only for a greater stewardship of the properties historic resources, but additionally for the realization of a greater economic potential. The following chapter will further discuss a more thorough recognition of heritage and latent values at Montpelier.

Figure 5.4: The inn at Middleton Place. (Photograph by author)
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSIONS

Although exploring a wide range of facets of Montpelier’s rich history, the initial focus of this thesis was centered on rediscovering the secondary duPont narrative at the estate. Through the exploration of the property’s history, a more complete view into the duPont influence on the property is revealed. A careful discussion and physical examination of the landscape’s evolution over time serves as a critical tool in illustrating the expansive impact of the duPonds on the physical appearance of the property. Recognizing the primacy of Madison’s significance within Montpelier’s history, yet diagnosing a disconnect between the scale of the duPont impact and their minimal role in interpretation raises questions about the way significance is attributed. In addition to the landscape analysis, a closer examination of the definition of significance within the United States reveals an opportunity for an alternative, more inclusive approach. The current United States standards for significance rely on a fairly narrow application of the term. The current criteria for significance as put forth by the National Register for Historic Places preferences the establishment of a singular period of significance. This is in contrast to considering the site in its entirety. In the case of Montpelier, as with many other historic properties, this view of significance provides a narrow and skewed interpretative lens for the property. The narrow scope of the current criteria serves to advocate a need for their reconsideration and revision.

As part of this significance investigation, an alternative value based system is proposed. Serving as an alternative approach to the current federally recognized significance criteria, this system provides for a more comprehensive consideration of
Montpelier in its entirety. As discussed in the Chapter Five, this heritage-latent value approach presents two sets of values for evaluating a property's significance. The first of these, the heritage value, calls for the estate's evaluation in a more traditional sense. Included within these values are evidential, historic, aesthetic, and communal values, all of which pertain primarily to the property's historic characteristics. In an effort to examine Montpelier through a broader and less traditional lens, a second system of latent values was devised in order to capture elements of a property left out by the more traditional values. These values include economic, development, educational, and recreational values. While both heritage and latent values encompass a wide variety of potentials at a site, they are intended to work together in a mutually inclusive fashion.

During the evaluation of Montpelier through the lens of the proposed heritage-latent value system, a number of opportunities were discovered. The careful evaluation of the Montpelier estate has allowed for a more comprehensive look into the estate's current practices. This not only reveals the present shortcomings with regard to fully realizing its heritage and latent values, but also provides insight as to how these values might be better met.

**Heritage Values**

As previously discussed in Chapter Five, a conscious effort is already being made at Montpelier to capitalize upon its evidential value. For over a decade, archaeological excavations have been underway at the property, revealing significant amounts of information with regard to the estate's historic appearance. Information from these
archaeological digs assists the estate with its interpretation of the Madison era. Archaeology has provided information for the extensive restoration and reconstruction projects. Examples of these projects include the mansion restoration in the early 2000s and the recreation of the south yard, which is just beginning. While these efforts have been significantly fruitful, limiting the scope of study to solely the Madison era of occupations results in the skewed development of the estate's interpretative opportunities. Archaeological excavations surrounding the Confederate Civil War encampments provide a small alternative appreciation of evidential value. Further exploration of currently less understood portions of the estate's history, such as the nineteenth century, or the time pre-dating the start of the Madison ownership in the early eighteenth century, would allow the estate for showcase a more comprehensive and fuller understanding of this evidential value.

As more information is uncovered through a greater appreciation of the estate's evidential value, a more thorough recognition of the property's historic value can be realized. As was explored in previous chapters, the current shortfall in Montpelier fully recognizing its historic/interpretative value is the substantial interpretative focus on the Madison era, despite the number of secondary narratives present at the site. Efforts to better realize this value are currently underway at the estate through an attempt to better understand and interpret slave culture through the recreation of the mansion's south yard. This, however, is only a sliver in the estate's expansive and complex history. In relation to the estate's large land holdings, the visitor experience is relatively restricted, visitors only receiving the experience to engage with two of the dozens of historic structures on the site.
The dismissal of the majority of the buildings on the estate results in an under recognition of the property’s historic value. In an effort to correct this oversight, the estate needs to better realize the significant amount of existing historical knowledge of this period and not let it sit wasted. Although the primary mission of the estate lies with the Madison interpretation, and it is not realistic to suggest a re-evaluation of the Foundation’s entire mission, the organization is easily able to recognize this and other secondary narratives through providing additional visitor experiences.

One way in which this historic/interpretative value might be better realized is through the development of an additional self-guided walking tour, or driving tours. Given the substantial number of twentieth structures extant on the property, such tours would allow for the interpretation of the estate as a whole, providing visitors with a greater understanding of the estate’s substantial twentieth century farming activities. The use of these buildings in such a manner would require only exterior interaction, allowing the buildings to continue with their current adapted functions, or continuing as vacant structures. As a solid internal road system already exists within the estate, such an effort would be of relative little cost to the Foundation, and would provide visitors with additional ways in which to interact with the estate’s historic value. The implementation of such a tour could also help to better realize the estate’s economic and recreational values as it would assist in lengthening the amount of time visitors spend at the estate. Accompanying this tour, or in lieu of, appropriate interpretative signage should be included on the exterior of all buildings within the visitor path at Montpelier. Currently, visitors encounter many twentieth century buildings during their drive to and from the
mansion, and no information is presented with regard to their historic development and use. The under-recognition of the historic value of these buildings provides a disservice to both the visitor as well as the property.

Given the estate’s nonprofit status, it must be recognized that funding plays a significant role in governing the interpretative abilities of the estate. This being said, the retention of the duPont structures has not been a front line for funding over the past decade and many of these structures have disappeared from the landscape. Due to neglect or their remote locations on the property, many of these buildings continue to be threatened. While this value-based approach assists in the fight for their significance to Montpelier’s cultural landscape, without the procurement of appropriate funding, the fight is for naught. Documentation efforts are currently in place at the estate to architecturally record buildings that have disappeared from the landscape. Once completed, however, this documentation is placed into an archive and the building is in essence forgotten. The dismissal of these structures in such a manner significantly under-values the property’s historic and interpretative value. Setting them aside pushes them further from mind, and diminishes any future potential for active interpretation. In keeping with the current technological trends within visitor interpretation, these drawings might be developed into three-dimensional renderings and utilized in a virtual reconstruction of the estate. This recreation could be developed to includes the entire estate, showing Montpelier’s multiple different periods of occupation. Such a virtual recreation would allow for the continued preservation of buildings unable to be physically maintained. More importantly, it would help to facilitate a more comprehensive understanding of the estate’s entire historic
value. Providing for a more visitor-interactive experience with the property, whether it be physical or virtual, will additionally help to support a better recognition of the estate's aesthetic value.

As has been previously discussed, the recognition of Montpelier's communal value has already begun, although it still harbors room to grow and further develop. Given the expansive land holdings, the Montpelier estate presents itself as the prime location for hosting community events. The further development of an event system will not only serve to encourage a positive relationship with the surrounding community, but also has the potential to support the estate's economic value and encourage a greater understanding of the estate's historic, aesthetic, and recreational values through visitor interaction.

**Latent Values**

The successful realization of Montpelier’s economic value is by and large integrally connected with the successful acknowledgment of the estate’s other values, both heritage and latent. Through a development of more inclusive programming that allows for a widened visitor experience, Montpelier serves to attract a broader range of visitors who in turn will be encouraged to spend more time at the estate, thus increasing its economic capital. An internal evaluation of the estate's resources reveals multiple ways through which to more fully realize the estate's economic potential. First is the more effective utilization of the existing infrastructure. While a number of agricultural buildings are presently utilized for private rental, a substantial number of residential buildings remain
empty on the property. Historically these structures were utilized for rental housing, largely for the estate’s workers. Up until the early 2000s, many of these buildings were still operated as independent rental units. The reconsideration of the use of these buildings in such a manner should be explored. Reusing these buildings would not only provide the estate with additional income, but it would also breathe new life into these currently abandoned structures, saving them from demolition. In addition to the discussed internal opportunities for the estate to better realize it’s economic value, Montpelier should further explore the ways in which it can realize this value through interfacing with the broader current trend of heritage tourism.

The National Trust defines the trend of heritage tourism as “traveling to experience the places, artifacts and activities that authentically represent the stories and people of the past.”¹ Montpelier’s complex, multi-faceted history presents the estate as a prime candidate to harness this trend of heritage tourism, and utilize it as a lens through which to acknowledge the estate’s economic value. Essentially commercializing the idea of tourism, recognizing Montpelier as a heritage tourism site provides a framework to guide the understanding of its economic potential. Such recognition would allow the estate to continue to thrive in its educational missions, but also provides opportunity for the site to sync with current tourism trends, and more fully recognizing the associated economic potentials. Within their discussion of heritage tourism, the Trust discusses five principles that guide the practice of heritage tourism, the first of which calls for collaboration

between organizations. While Montpelier has been established as an estate for over two hundred years, it is has been less than thirty years since the it has opened its doors for public visitation- and less than ten years since the completion of the mansion restoration. In relation to neighboring presidential homes, which happen to be the “great” presidential homes of Mt. Vernon and Monticello, this less than thirty-year period is virtually inconsequential. Over the course of the past century, the homes of both Washington and Jefferson have seen millions of visitors walk through their doors. This extensive visitorship has resulted in their development into the preservation standard; they embody the success that every historic site hopes to achieve. Montpelier, like many other sites, looks to them as a model. This being said, this idolization by other historic estates is somewhat unrealistic. Given the extensive span of time that both Mt. Vernon and Monticello have been open to the public, which has allowed for the development of extensive funding and program development, they have set and unspoken standard that is unrealistic for most organizations. At present, Montpelier finds itself in an uphill battle in effort to try and compete with these long developed programs. While non-profits currently face a struggling economy, Montpelier and these other historic institutions should work together in an effort to collaborate and work with one another in an effort to further support this idea of heritage tourism.

Tying in closely with the latent economic value is the development value. Much

---

2 The National Trust discusses five principles that are key in guiding heritage tourism. These principles include: collaborate, or “bring[ing] together partners who may not have worked together in the past; find the fit, or “balancing the needs of residents and visitors;” make the site come alive, or insure that “the destination is worth the drive;” focus on quality and authenticity; and preserve and protect.
like economic value, development value directly interfaces with the idea of heritage tourism. This value encourages further exploration of the ways in which Montpelier can further realize its development potential in order to achieve economic and interpretative goals encouraged by heritage tourism. One such way that Montpelier might better realize this development goal is through a reconsideration of its current infrastructure, and what visitor interaction it encourages.

In the previously discussed case studies of Biltmore and Middleton place, the development of guest accommodations, such as an inn and a full service restaurant, seeks to provide visitors with additional ways in which to interact with the estate. Given the Montpelier’s rural location, the development of such accommodations would provide guests with a new way through which to experience the estate. Such development would encourage and allow for an overall extended visit by guests, supporting the estate’s attempts to foster greater visitor interaction and appreciation of heritage and latent values alike. Additionally the incorporation of a full-service restaurant into the estate would encourage a wider audience, perhaps luring visitors to the estate that would otherwise be deterred by Montpelier’s remote location. Recognition of the development value need not be limited solely to commercial development on the property. Valuation of the estate’s development potential encourages a further examination of Montpelier’s current infrastructure—how the estate effectively utilizes its buildings, its road network, etc. Through a closer evaluation of the estate’s development value, the potential exists to further recognize the current benefits of such a complex and developed infrastructure and how it can be better understood and utilized to enhance visitor interaction with the estate.
The opportunity for recognition of the estate’s educational value links closely with the recognition of the previously explored heritage historic/interpretative value. While the exploration of the estate’s historic value involves the research and discovery of information that should be disbursed to the public, the educational value relates directly to this act of disbursement. As previously discussed, a significant educational value exists at Montpelier through the interpretation of the multiple periods of the estate’s occupation. This provides an educational lens for visitors to better understand not only the transformation of the landscape over time, but the way in which it was worked and managed. This educational value may be better realized through the development of additional programming for visitors relating to these different periods of the estate’s history. This value is currently well recognized through the efforts of the Center for the Constitution, but possesses the potential to be more fully explored.

In addition to tying into the current Madison-centric interpretative mission, the opportunity to provide additional educational opportunities at Montpelier is vast. Given the estate’s extensive agricultural history, this value may be further recognized through the pursuit of agricultural, equestrian or horticultural educational opportunities. Although lying outside of the Madison-era scope, all three of these practices have been alive at Montpelier for the vast majority of the estate’s existence. The infrastructure developed on the property during the duPont ownership, and still standing on the estate today, provides an excellent outlet for the exploration of many of these educational opportunities. Such educational programming might explore historic practices, as well as modern day practices. Given the general urban and suburban upbringing of most American citizens.
today, the importance of conveying these practices is more important than ever before.

Acknowledgment of the estate's recreational value provides a significant potential for increased visitor experience at the Montpelier, in addition to potential economic benefits. As discussed with the historic value, the incorporation of additional trails and walking paths throughout the estate would result in increased visitor interaction with the landscape. It would additionally provide an outlet for visitors to better experience the estate’s historic and evidential values. In addition to trails within the main core of the estate, the development and expansion of a trail system through the estate's expansive wooded land holdings would result in the attraction of additional visitor clientele who may otherwise be indifferent to the historic nature of the property. Through the opening of these currently restricted areas, the estate is able to be more fully utilized and valued for its natural value.

The continued development of trails and paths throughout the estate additionally presents the opportunity for Montpelier to connect with outside programs and historic sites through the possibility of a regionalized trail network. The feasibility of such a network is currently being explored within the state of Virginia. Focusing on the state's numerous Civil War battlefields, this trail system would serve as a physical connection between the state's many battlefields. Due to the visible presence of Montpelier’s Civil War history, and the relative proximity of the estate to the Wilderness Battlefield, the potential for the estate to connect into a larger regional trail base is substantial. In addition to connection to other nearby Civil War sites, the estate is additionally located within close proximity to two other presidential homes, Thomas Jefferson's Monticello and James
Monroe's Ash Lawn Highland. The development of such a presidential home network would allow for increased visitor experience, both educationally and recreationally. Such a trail system would most likely manifest as a bike network, as the distance between Montpelier and the neighboring sites is numerous miles. Such a network would serve to better connect the estate to the outside world, and provide an attractive recreational outlet that would draw visitors to the estate. In a similar manner, given Montpelier's historic relationship with horse culture, the estate could internally further the recognition of its recreational value through the development of a trail riding program. This program would provide not only a recreational outlet, but would additionally provide use for currently vacant agricultural buildings as well as providing another way to realize economic value.

Moving Forward

Through a closer examination of the treatment of the secondary duPont narrative at the Montpelier estate, the need for an alternative approach to the consideration of historic sites is made evident. Serving as the premier example of a multi-layered history, Montpelier exemplifies the substantial flaws in the United States currently recognized system for evaluating significance. Under the National Register criteria, the estate is in essence forced to choose a singular period of significance to drive its interpretative mission. As previously discussed, in the case of Montpelier, this period is that of the Madisons. While intended to bring attention to the most “important” aspect of the estate's history, this significance determination serves as a discredit to the site as a whole, in the fact that it calls for the virtual dismissal of all other periods of the estate's history. In
doing so a critical element of the site’s interpretation is lost- the ability to understand and appreciate the estate as a cohesive whole, understanding its development over time. While Montpelier serves as an excellent lens through which to explore this flaw in the United States’ system for determining significance, this oversight can be seen at historic sites all over the country. Forgotten secondary narratives manifest at each site in a different manner, however, they are frequently undervalued.

The proposed heritage-latent value system provides an alternative approach for the current criteria for significance within the United States. Given the Register criteria’s narrow scope, the proposed value system provides for a much broader consideration of historic properties. At present, valuation solely based upon the Register criteria, results in a severe disregard of a site’s many values. The implementation of this new value based system provides for a more comprehensive approach to the significance of place, providing for the inclusion of all aspects of a site. This allows for a more comprehensive understanding and appreciation of a site in its entirety, as opposed to honing in on one singular period of significance. In the case of Montpelier, this provides an effective way of rediscovering the duPont narrative within the property’s interpretation.
APPENDICES
APPENDIX A: BUILDING INVENTORY

The following survey was conducted as part of the initial research portion of the thesis process. All primary buildings were photographed, their current and historic use noted, as well as their current condition. Condition was determined to be Excellent, Good, Fair, or Poor. These determinations were made based upon the exterior appearance of each building. The Mansion was utilized as the base variable for the condition’s survey, given its “Excellent” condition. Conditions of the remaining buildings on the estate were judged in relation.

**Building Name:** Mansion
**Building Number:** #1
**Construction Phase:** Phase I
**Historic Use:** Residential
**Current Use:** Interpretative
**Condition:** Excellent

**Building Name:** Temple
**Building Number:** #1a
**Construction Phase:** Phase I
**Historic Use:** Ice House
**Current Use:** Interpretative
**Condition:** Excellent

**Building Name:** Bowling Alley
**Building Number:** #2
**Construction Phase:** Phase II
**Historic Use:** Agricultural
**Current Use:** No Active Use
**Condition:** Fair
Building Name: Main Office
Building Number: #11
Construction Phase: Phase II
Historic Use: Residential
Current Use: Offices
Condition: Good

Building Name: Building 7
Building Number: #7
Construction Phase: Phase II
Historic Use: Residential
Current Use: Part-time Residential
Condition: Good

Building Name: Wellhouse
Building Number: #31
Construction Phase: Phase II
Historic Use: Landscape Feature
Current Use: Interpretative
Condition: Good
**Building Name:** Dairy House
**Building Number:** #34
**Construction Phase:** Phase II
**Historic Use:** Residential
**Current Use:** Residential
**Condition:** Good

**Building Name:** Depot
**Building Number:** #39a
**Construction Phase:** Phase II
**Historic Use:** Depot Storage
**Current Use:** No Active Use
**Condition:** Poor

**Building Name:** Houseworth Barn
**Building Number:** #42
**Construction Phase:** Phase II
**Historic Use:** Agricultural
**Current Use:** Agricultural
**Condition:** Poor
Building Name: Johnson House
Building Number: #46
Construction Phase: Phase II
Historic Use: Residential
Current Use: No Active Use
Condition: Poor

Building Name: Gilmore Cabin
Building Number: #49
Construction Phase: Phase II
Historic Use: Residential
Current Use: Interpretative
Condition: Good

Building Name: Tagg’s Island 1
Building Number: #53
Construction Phase: Phase II
Historic Use: Residential
Current Use: No Active Use
Condition: Poor
**Building Name:** Dr. Madison House

**Building Number:** #56

**Construction Phase:** Phase II

**Historic Use:** Residential

**Current Use:** Part-time Residential

**Condition:** Fair

---

**Building Name:** Arlington House

**Building Number:** #57

**Construction Phase:** Phase II

**Historic Use:** Residential

**Current Use:** Part-time Residential

**Condition:** Fair

---

**Building Name:** “Pony Barn”

**Building Number:** #3

**Construction Phase:** Phase III

**Historic Use:** Agricultural

**Current Use:** Educational Offices

**Condition:** Good
**Building Name:** Power Plant  
**Building Number:** #4  
**Construction Phase:** Phase III  
**Historic Use:** Power Plant  
**Current Use:** No Active Use  
**Condition:** Poor

**Building Name:** Lewis Hall  
**Building Number:** #5  
**Construction Phase:** Phase III  
**Historic Use:** Agricultural  
**Current Use:** Offices  
**Condition:** Excellent

**Building Name:** Building 8  
**Building Number:** #8  
**Construction Phase:** Phase III  
**Historic Use:** Residential  
**Current Use:** Part-time Residential  
**Condition:** Good
Building Name: Building 9
Building Number: #9
Construction Phase: Phase III
Historic Use: Residential
Current Use: Part-time Residential
Condition: Good

Building Name: Building 10
Building Number: #10
Construction Phase: Phase III
Historic Use: Residential
Current Use: Part-time Residential
Condition: Good

Building Name: Spring House
Building Number: #12
Construction Phase: Phase III
Historic Use: Spring House
Current Use: No Active Use
Condition: Poor
Building Name:  Schooling Barn  
Building Number:  #20  
Construction Phase:  Phase III  
Historic Use:  Agricultural  
Current Use:  No Active Use  
Condition:  Fair

Building Name:  Secretary’s Stable  
Building Number:  #19  
Construction Phase:  Phase III  
Historic Use:  Agricultural  
Current Use:  No Active Use  
Condition:  Poor

Building Name:  Loafing Shed  
Building Number:  #16  
Construction Phase:  Phase III  
Historic Use:  Agricultural  
Current Use:  Demolished  
Condition:  Demolished
**Building Name:** Blacksmith’s Shop  
**Building Number:** #21  
**Construction Phase:** Phase III  
**Historic Use:** Agricultural  
**Current Use:** No Active Use  
**Condition:** Poor

**Building Name:** Old Archaeology Lab  
**Building Number:** #23  
**Construction Phase:** Phase III  
**Historic Use:** Employee Kitchen  
**Current Use:** No Active Use  
**Condition:** Fair

**Building Name:** Laundry House  
**Building Number:** #24  
**Construction Phase:** Phase III  
**Historic Use:** Laundry House  
**Current Use:** No Active Use  
**Condition:** Poor
Building Name: Three-Stall Barn
Building Number: #25a
Construction Phase: Phase III
Historic Use: Agricultural
Current Use: Agricultural
Condition: Fair

Building Name: Hunt Race Office
Building Number: #36
Construction Phase: Phase III
Historic Use: Residential
Current Use: Hunt Race Offices
Condition: Good

Building Name: Esso Station
Building Number: #37
Construction Phase: Phase III
Historic Use: Commercial
Current Use: No Active Use
Condition: Good
Building Name: Woodard House
Building Number: #38
Construction Phase: Phase III
Historic Use: Residential
Current Use: Residential
Condition: Good

Building Name: Train Depot
Building Number: #39
Construction Phase: Phase III
Historic Use: Commercial
Current Use: Interpretative
Condition: Excellent

Building Name: Carpenter House
Building Number: #43
Construction Phase: Phase III
Historic Use: Residential
Current Use: Residential
Condition: Good
**Building Name:** Bassett House  
**Building Number:** #45  
**Construction Phase:** Phase IV  
**Historic Use:** Residential  
**Current Use:** Residential  
**Condition:** Good

**Building Name:** Lamb House  
**Building Number:** #47  
**Construction Phase:** Phase III  
**Historic Use:** Residential  
**Current Use:** No Active Use  
**Condition:** Poor

**Building Name:** Corbin House  
**Building Number:** #48  
**Construction Phase:** Phase III  
**Historic Use:** Residential  
**Current Use:** No Active Use  
**Condition:** Poor
Building Name: Tagg’s Island 4
Building Number: #52
Construction Phase: Phase III
Historic Use: Residential
Current Use: No Active Use
Condition: Poor

Building Name: Tagg’s Island 2
Building Number: #54
Construction Phase: Phase III
Historic Use: Residential
Current Use: Residential
Condition: Poor

Building Name: Tagg’s Island 3
Building Number: #55
Construction Phase: Phase III
Historic Use: Residential
Current Use: Residential
Condition: Poor
Building Name: Library
Building Number: #66
Construction Phase: Phase III
Historic Use: Schoolhouse
Current Use: Library
Condition: Good

Building Name: Archaeology Office
Building Number: #67
Construction Phase: Phase III
Historic Use: Agricultural
Current Use: Office
Condition: Good

Building Name: Clatterbuck House
Building Number: #69
Construction Phase: Phase III
Historic Use: Residential
Current Use: Part-time Residential
Condition: Fair
Building Name: Yearling Barn
Building Number: #71
Construction Phase: Phase III
Historic Use: Agriculture
Current Use: Agriculture
Condition: Good

Building Name: Triple Stable
Building Number: #73
Construction Phase: Phase III
Historic Use: Agricultural
Current Use: No Active Use
Condition: Fair

Building Name: Chicken House
Building Number: #74
Construction Phase: Phase III
Historic Use: Agricultural
Current Use: No Active Use
Condition: Fair
**Building Name:** Shed Stall 1  
**Building Number:** #n.a.  
**Construction Phase:** Phase III  
**Historic Use:** Agricultural  
**Current Use:** Demolished  
**Condition:** Demolished

**Building Name:** Shed Stall 2  
**Building Number:** #n.a.  
**Construction Phase:** Phase III  
**Historic Use:** Agricultural  
**Current Use:** Demolished  
**Condition:** Demolished

**Building Name:** Loafing Shed  
**Building Number:** #75  
**Construction Phase:** Phase III  
**Historic Use:** Agricultural  
**Current Use:** No Active Use  
**Condition:** Poor
Building Name: Granary
Building Number: #17
Construction Phase: Phase IV
Historic Use: Agricultural
Current Use: No Active Use
Condition: Fair

Building Name: Stud Barn
Building Number: #18
Construction Phase: Phase IV
Historic Use: Agricultural
Current Use: No Active Use
Condition: Fair

Building Name: Upper Sears Barn
Building Number: #25
Construction Phase: Phase IV
Historic Use: Agricultural
Current Use: Agricultural
Condition: Fair
Building Name: Loafing Shed
Building Number: #25b
Construction Phase: Phase IV
Historic Use: Agricultural
Current Use: Demolished
Condition: Demolished

Building Name: Loafing Shed
Building Number: #25c
Construction Phase: Phase IV
Historic Use: Agricultural
Current Use: Demolished
Condition: Demolished

Building Name: Middle Sears Barn
Building Number: #26
Construction Phase: Phase IV
Historic Use: Agricultural
Current Use: Agricultural
Condition: Fair
Building Name: Shed
Building Number: #26c
Construction Phase: Phase IV
Historic Use: Agricultural
Current Use: Agricultural
Condition: Fair

Building Name: Loafing Shed
Building Number: #26d
Construction Phase: Phase IV
Historic Use: Agricultural
Current Use: Demolished
Condition: Demolished

Building Name: Lower Sears Barn
Building Number: #27
Construction Phase: Phase IV
Historic Use: Agricultural
Current Use: Agricultural
Condition: Fair
Building Name: Upper Race Barn
Building Number: #28
Construction Phase: Phase IV
Historic Use: Agricultural
Current Use: Agricultural
Condition: Fair

Building Name: Trainer’s Cottage
Building Number: #29
Construction Phase: Phase IV
Historic Use: Residential
Current Use: Residential
Condition: Good

Building Name: Bunk House
Building Number: #30
Construction Phase: Phase IV
Historic Use: Residential
Current Use: Demolished
Condition: Demolished
Building Name: Yellow Barn
Building Number: #32
Construction Phase: Phase IV
Historic Use: Agricultural
Current Use: Agricultural
Condition: Fair

Building Name: Lower Race Barn
Building Number: #33
Construction Phase: Phase IV
Historic Use: Agricultural
Current Use: Agricultural
Condition: Fair

Building Name: Theatre
Building Number: #37a
Construction Phase: Phase IV
Historic Use: Commercial
Current Use: No Active Use
Condition: Fair
Building Name: Clatterbuck House
Building Number: #40
Construction Phase: Phase IV
Historic Use: Residential
Current Use: Residential
Condition: Good

Building Name: Black Barn
Building Number: #68
Construction Phase: Phase IV
Historic Use: Agriculture
Current Use: Agriculture
Condition: Good

Building Name: Broodmare Barn
Building Number: #70
Construction Phase: Phase IV
Historic Use: Agriculture
Current Use: No Active Use
Condition: Fair
Building Name: Jockey Hut
Building Number: #n.a
Construction Phase: Phase IV
Historic Use: Agricultural
Current Use: No Active Use
Condition: Poor

Building Name: Observation Deck
Building Number: #n.a
Construction Phase: Phase IV
Historic Use: Agricultural
Current Use: Agricultural
Condition: Good

Building Name: Race Barn
Building Number: #n.a.
Construction Phase: Phase V
Historic Use: Agricultural
Current Use: Agricultural
Condition: Good
Building Name: Visitor Center

Building Number: #n.a.

Construction Phase: Phase V

Historic Use: n/a

Current Use: Interpretative

Condition: Excellent
Figure B.1: 1903 Blain Survey of the Montpelier estate. (Courtesy of The Montpelier Foundation)
Figure B.2: 1908 Nichols Survey of the Montpelier estate. (Courtesy of The Montpelier Foundation)
APPENDIX B: PROPERTY MAPS

1948 RANDOLPH SURVEY MAP

Figure B.3: 1948 Randolph Survey of the Montpelier estate. (Courtesy of The Montpelier Foundation)
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