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The term “memory” is often paired with places, monuments and other physical objects, but the term is usually used as a metaphor to identify such sites and structures as memory markers or stores of information. The purpose of this study is to explore the properties of structure as memory by first, redefining the relationship between structure and memory, and second, by analyzing the history and current condition of the Mount Vernon Estate to identify guidelines for future study. In addition to the guidelines identified, there are two principle findings of this study, with regards to the Mount Vernon Estate as memory: structures are malleable both in meaning and in its (re)construction, and preserved historic sites are temporally static.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

Monuments have been long associated with national identity. Monuments are constructed to reinforce the primacy of the regime in power, and constructed as a means to cope with tragedy or with a difficult of regretful past (see, e.g., Jezernik 1998, Couch 2001, Wagner-Pacifici & Schwartz 1991). Additionally, sites and structures\(^1\) are designated for their historic significance to protect the land and architecture from “change,” as was the initial goal of the U.S. preservation movement. Indeed, historic site preservation persists as essential to American heritage-building. Unfortunately, with the nearly instant historicization of American life and architecture as an act to remember, a few social scientists such as Diane Barthel (1996) have expressed their concern with the preservation of “bogus history,” and the subsequent danger of ‘commodifying history’ for profit. Nevertheless, profit and any other motive for remembering seem secondary to “memory,” the primary outcome of experience and remembering.

The term “memory” is often paired with places, monuments and other physical objects, but the term is usually used as a metaphor to identify such sites and structures as memory markers or stores of information. Physical records and structures to memory either prompt memory recall or are used to “mediate” memory reconstruction (see, Wertsch 2002). Hence, as a marker, every national monument and memorial erected, 

\(^1\) The term “structures” refers to physical or tangible artifacts, buildings and other monuments.
every building and district preserved as a historic site, every document officially archived (either as legislation, a judicial precedent or a public statement), every one carries an invitation (less by destruction or erasure they are forgotten) to the respective nation’s discussion of its past and the information stored can be ‘remembered’ when needed.

As opposed to being identified as a construct in which memory is stored, structure can be also identified as memory. As a memory, monuments and other physical structures not only mediate memory, but also have the attributes of memory and are socially constructed and reconstructed. Degnen (2005) proposed that “much, although by no means all, of the literature on social memory in the West has tended to focus on active, intentional forms of commemorative practice” (p. 730). To focus on intentional forms of commemorative practices not only creates a biased image of collective memory and monuments as static “vessels of knowledge,” but also disallows a direct association to be theoretically represented between memory and monument (p. 730, 729). Therefore, to better observe the properties of structure as memory, the focus of this study will be non-commemorative or common structures.

The purpose of this study is to explore the properties of structure as memory by first, redefining the relationship between structure and memory, and second, by analyzing the history and current condition of the Mount Vernon Estate to generate hypotheses for future study.
Collective Memory

The term “collective memory” is most often traced to the works of Maurice Halbwachs – particularly *La Mémoire Collective* (1950, translated *The Collective Memory* in 1980), the first book to theorize memory as collective or a social construction. According to Halbwachs (1980), collective memory is the sum of all information shared by the members of a particular group that, by definition, resembles “a current of continuous thought … [that] does not exceed the boundaries of the group” (p.80). Likewise, each group is defined by the information shared and the memory socially constructed by its members. As a result, familiarity with this constructed memory is used to identify an individual as legitimately ‘belonging’ to a group, whereby to ‘belong’ is to remember. To remember, then, is to “member” and “re-member” oneself with past experiences and their reconstructions, and with the groups that share them.²

There are two limitations of this initial conceptualization of collective memory. The first limitation of Halbwachs’ theory of collective memory is that memory, after being first constructed and susceptible to social reconstruction, is perceived as personal cognitive property. Since Halbwachs posits that only individuals remember, a group can

² Note that first-hand or personal experience with the group and the event (when necessary) is a prerequisite for collective memory. Secondary knowledge of the experience is not included. One must experience or interact with the group to have the memories of the group.
remember only to the extent that the information shared is “stored” in the personal memory of each group member as cognitive property. As cognitive property, collective memory survives only as long as the members of the group survive.

The second limitation of Halbwachs’ collective memory is that the intended “collective,” often indecisive and intentionally ambiguous, remains undefined. With the target group undefined, the term collective memory does not distinguish enduring groups from intimate groups, for example, in the discussion of memory as the treatment or organization of information. An enduring group is a group of increasingly unfamiliar individuals, who are either new or distant (geographically and/or temporally) members. Due to the looming ambiguity of the supposed “collective,” scholars seem to be divided as to the contribution of the term collective memory to images of the past. As a result, the term collective memory tends to be either replaced with more specific terms (i.e., official memory, public memory, cultural memory, historical memory) or ignored to conform to older terms (i.e. myth, tradition, customs, and historical consciousness) (Olick & Robbins 1998, p. 112).

As a result of the two presented limitations, Halbwachs’ collective memory does not theoretically account for acquired information, of which members have little to no prior experience or knowledge but is necessary to maintain group membership. The memory or information that must be acquired does not necessarily “belong” to its members by personal experience, but may be learned from recorded information or physical memory constructs identified as worth remembering and significant to the legacy of the group. Although unexplored by Halbwachs, collective memory has the potential to survive in the form of an external or tangible memory that is both a construct
to store memory (memory as a metaphor), and a platform or system of meaningful information to define the group (memory as collective identity). Nevertheless, the distinct advantage of Halbwachs’ collective memory is the emphasis on theorizing a socially constructed memory that is both malleable and group specific, properties that can be used to evaluate non-commemorative monuments as memory in terms of the treatment of information – the selection, preservation, restoration and construction. The objective of this study is to redefine the relationship between structure and memory for national historic sites, such that structure is memory. As a socially constructed memory, a structure can be understood as both an object and meaning that can be constructed and reconstructed.

Collective Memory and Issues in the New Structural Memory

Michael Schudson (1992), as an introduction to his discussion of public memory and the “myth” of Watergate journalism, identifies three constructs in which collective memory is stored: the individual mind, institutions, and monuments and markers. Consistent with Halbwachs’ perception of collective memory, Schudson (1992) identifies the individual mind as the first construct in which collective memory is located. He states that the individual mind contains information that is “collective” both in content, and “idiosyncratically” through language and learned behavior (p. 51). The second construct in which collective memory is located, is institutions. According to Schudson, memory located in institutions takes the form of laws, regulations, standardized procedures, and other records or “biblical documents” used to maintain the culture and tradition of the
group (Boulding 2000, p. 47). Tradition, as an enduring complex of socially acquired values held stable over time, acts as a vehicle for cross-generational collective identity through institutions and shared narratives that carry normative authority over the beliefs and memories of the individual group members (see, Knapp 1998).

The third and less theoretically developed construct is that of “collectively created monuments and markers” (Schudson 1992, p. 51), a concept referred to by Kerwin Lee Klein (2000) as the new structural memory. According to the new structural memory, physical artifacts and social practices – holidays, documents, and memorials (statues, museums, and other historic sites) – are each perceived “not as a mnemonic device to help individual memory but as memory itself” (Klein 2000, p. 131). Surprisingly, although written to summarize Schudson’s treatment of collective memory, Klein’s definition unintentionally contradicts Schudson’s argument, and in turn, uncovers two weaknesses of Schudson’s conceptualization of the relationship between constructs and collective memory.

The first weakness is that the recognition of external memory constructs, namely institutions and monuments (and markers), is used primarily to substantiate the utility of recorded information in unraveling inconsistent and conflicting narratives in the public’s collective memory, or public memory. Memory does not rationalize, justify or reconstruct “itself” or information, the individual or group does. It is a transfigured depiction of the past that does not require accuracy but instead relevance in its depiction (see, Knapp 1989). As a result, discussing the utility of monuments and markers to remembering, serves only to marginalize the conceptualization of external memory constructs and to narrowly include monuments and markers as a storage unit for memory. Structure as
memory, therefore, is defined by its capacity to store information as a marker or mnemonic device without consideration of any other memory attributes.

In sum, the constructs are not wholly memory, but store memory. Consequently, the second weakness is the disjoined conceptualization of memory as “construct” from memory as “content,” whereby the memory and construct are distinct entities. “Cultural continuity,” according to Assman (1992; quoted in Olick & Robbins 1998), is not so much a product of a culture’s ability to physically record and preserve information (construct), but instead a product of the meaning and values developed to support the information (content). Memory as content refers to relatable information that directly impresses on the identity of the individual and encourages personal reflection to connect with the group. To explore the importance of reuniting memory as construct and content under a unified concept, one must also consider the role of memory and memory construction to “member” with an enduring group or “imagined community.”

**The Imagined Community and “Othering” Collective Memory**

Benedict Anderson’s (1991) “imagined community,” mentioned most often in discussions of nationalism, refers to a constructed fraternal bond that transcends both time and person to create a sense of cultural continuity or metaphysical stability of a desired community. Nations and religious groups are both examples of imagined communities that are not only governed by a common set of laws but are also united under those same laws. Imagined communities precede membership, and therefore must be constructed and grounded in a common past or concept of “self” that can be acquired
and internalized by the members of the group or community. The concept of “self,” as defined by George Herbert Mead (1934),

… is something which has a development; it is not initially there, at birth, but arises in the process of social experience and activity, that is, develops in the given individual as a result of his relations to that process as a whole and to other individuals within that process” (135).

The self arise when the individual takes the attitude of the “generalized other,” societal norms and expectations of what is appropriate and acceptable for both individual behavior and ideals that are learned through social interaction.

Self-awareness presumes memory of self. Similarly, “[c]ollective awareness presumes collective memory. Without it there are no laws and no justice, no political structures, and no collective purposes” (Funkenstein 1993, p. 3). Similar to Halbwachs' conceptualization of the relationship between collective memory and collective awareness, a group is a group when identified by its shared memory. Thus, remembering by external memory, or systems of information located outside the individual mind, can be perceived as the charitable “duty” of the members to maintain (record and teach) the legacy and identity of the imagined community.

The preference for an “othered” history as the common past used to represent and ground an imagined community results in both a selective and removed memory. John Bodnar (1992), in his discussion of the life of Watergate as an “American memory,” illustrates the two attributes of an “othered” memory: selective and removed. He identifies public memory as the selection of official culture in place of local vernacular culture. As the product of official culture, public memory is not representative of the memory of the “public,” but of the controlling elite of “professionals” who determine
what is important or significant to shaping the heritage and culture of the group. As a memory that is no longer constructed by the community, but electively by a subgroup on behalf of the community, individuals must acquire and relate to the information, norms and values associated with the “othered” memory. Remembering, then, is a means of defining who “we” are as well as the standard for group membership. This objective of preemptive remembrance formation allows for a sense of permanence when accomplished, and subsequently a safeguard against amnesia of significant information shared and group culture. Nevertheless, as previously stated, collective memories must be not only fixed to protect collective memories from extinction, but they must also be malleable. By pairing collective memory with “shared cross-generational narratives,” the intrinsic meaning established both regulates changes in collective memory, and allows space to also construct and reconstruct collective memory within the limits set (Spillman 2003).

Memory, Meaning and the Treatment of Information

The literature reviewed in the previous section addressed the meaning and consequences of “collective” to the term collective memory. Subsequently, the focus of this section is to better characterize “memory” as an active part of the term collective memory. Generally defined, memory proper \(^3\) is a collection of cognitive information – language and other learned skills, emotions, images and physical details – that includes

---

\(^3\) James V. Wertsch (2002) uses the term “memory proper” to refer to memory that “is grounded in direct, immediate experience of events” (5).
information gathered from sensory experiences, perceptions, actions and from overall interactions with one’s environment (Thompson & Madgin, 2005). Memory is uniquely characterized not only in the diversity and complexity of information included, but also for its malleability.

John Dewey (1939) states that in order to effectively communicate or remember an event, the event first must be named, and as a result the named information leads an ‘independent life’ of the original event. The named event and the associated narrative or “meanings” are subject to experimentation and “may be indefinitely combined and re-arranged in imagination” (386). Thus, each experience is transformed into a malleable system of meaningful information or beliefs⁴ – desires and purposes, wants and impulses – that can be organized and reorganized to fit the intent of recall. Consequently, the retrieval of meaningful information depends on both the individual and the social context or community with which the individual is expected to communicate⁵. Therefore, naming an event involves both the selection and recognition of significant information, and the construction and reconstruction (or malleability) of the named information.

In the context of ‘structure as memory,’ monuments⁶ should have the same or similar forms of information as required to communicate information: 1) the original

---

⁴ ‘System of beliefs’ is a Rokeachian (1968) concept that refers to information or ideas in terms of attitudes, beliefs and values. Information, thus, varies by 1) importance to the individual and/or community, 2) resistance to change, and 3) centrality (to a sense of personhood).

⁵ According to Halbwachs (1992[1925]), the necessary connection between name and meaning is lost to the aphasiac patient. The patient has the memories of the social group but is disassociated from the group because of an inability to communicate using the “verbal conventions” of the group.

⁶ As used by the National Park Service, the term ‘monument’ is generalized to include both natural and constructed (both common and commemorative structures are assumed for constructed sites) buildings, structures, sites, objects or districts. The term ‘common monument’ or “common historic site” is used to refer to building or structure (a house, post office, store front, etc) that is not intentionally to commemorate
structure or event, from which to construct a memory; and 2) the reconstruction, to name and order information. An additional form of information should also be included, 3) the self or common character (the construction), to associate the memory with the group by judging the relevance of the named information. One of the primary guardians of “self” for historic sites and monuments is the National Park Service, which is responsible for designating historic sites as having either local, national or international significance.

**Historic Site Preservation in the United States**

The American (U.S.) preservation movement “is nearly as old as the country itself,” dating as far back as 1796 with the impending destruction of “Green Spring” in James City County, Virginia (Hosmer 1965, p. 29). Two hundred years later, private and public interest in site preservation persists for both heritage-building and protection from urbanization and “change.” Presently, there are three historic preservation programs administered by the U.S. National Park Service (a bureau of the Department of the Interior), which are informally referred to as the ‘pyramid of Federal historic recognition.’

The earliest instituted program is the National Parks conservation program, established with the founding of the National Park Service (NPS) under the NPS Organic Act of 1916. The NPS, then, was charged to manage the already 40 national parks and natural monuments recognized for their national significance as natural wonders -

---

a particular place, person or event of either national or international importance, but instead is a local property and structure that can be later named as historically significant.
including Pelican Island (1903) and Yellowstone Timberland Reserve (1891), the nation’s first wildlife refuge and forest reserve respectively. Later in 1933, by Executive Order, 63 national monuments and military sites previously administered by the Forest Service and the War Department were also placed under the direction of the NPS. The second historic preservation program is the National Historic Landmarks Program, established by the Historic Sites Act of 1935. The National Historic Landmarks Program was established both to acknowledge specific sites for their importance to all Americans, and to “preserve for public use historic sites, buildings and objects of national significance for the inspiration and benefit of the people of the United States” (preamble, see Appendix 1). To be listed as a national historic landmark, the property must be nominated by the Secretary of the Interior nomi- nates potential properties, and designation as a historic landmark is awarded by the Secretary of the Interior.

The latest instituted program is the National Register of Historic Places, established under National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. The establishment of the National Register allowed for the designation of sites nominated by not only by the Secretary of the Interior but also by other interest groups, organizations and individuals. The National Register is, thus, the official federal list of all approved historic properties, buildings and objects, including national parks and national historic landmarks. To date\(^7\), there are almost 390 natural wonders, more than 2,400 national historic landmarks, and more than 84,000 other historic properties listed on the National Register as important to the American Story.

\(^7\) As of February 2008.
For the purpose of this research study, a national historic landmark that is a common historic site will be selected for its higher order significance to the American story and collective memory of the nation. Monuments, particularly common historic sites, are designated as such because they are perceived as having some national significance worth recognizing or naming and preserving. As a means to remember and/or commemorate past events, persons and places; these sites have the invaluable role of preserving an “experience,” a constructed and reconstructed structural memory in which individuals can interact and connect with the memory preserved.
Chapter 3
Methodology

Case Study

As previously stated, the purpose of this study is to reconceptualize the relationship between monuments and memory, from defining monuments as markers used to facilitate remembering or memory recall to defining monuments as collective memory in its construction and reconstruction. As a preliminary analysis designed to move toward reconceptualizing the relationship between the two, this study combines information about 1) the physical property description, 2) the content preserved and/or changed, and 3) the associated narrative, to better understand the properties of structure as memory. To address the properties of structure as collective memory, this research project relies on the results of an exploratory case study analysis. With exploratory case study analysis as the guiding methodology, qualitative data were gathered and analyzed for the purpose of identifying guidelines for future study in monuments and memory.

Research Site

The research site selected to examine the memory attributes of a common historic site is George Washington’s Mount Vernon Estate. There are three primary motives for the selection of the Mount Vernon Estate as the research site for this project. The first motive for the selection of the Mount Vernon Estate was its nearly 150 years of operation
as a national historic site. With preservation as the primary goal of the owners of this historic site for the past 150 years, it was assumed that the site would provide more information as the product of several cycles of renovation or reconstruction that can be identified and analyzed\(^8\). The second motive for the selection of this site was the significance of the previous owner, George Washington (interred at the site), to the American story. Ideally, more development and variation of site structures would be preserved to protect the tradition of the site, and greater funding would be provided for the development and preservation of the site structures. The third motive for the selection of the Mount Vernon Estate was the breadth of information available on both George Washington and the estate.

The Mount Vernon plantation is located in Alexandria, Virginia about seventeen miles south of the U.S. Capitol, and sits on the east bank of the Potomac River. The Mount Vernon Estate, a 500-acre plantation, is a private-owned national historic landmark, of which about 45 acres are open to the public for tours. The public property includes several buildings, structures and farming exhibits, as well as research facilities accessible upon request. The focal property features for this study are the mansion house and subsidiary buildings, the Tomb, the Ford Orientation Center, and the Donald W. Reynolds Museum and Educational Center.

\(^8\) The assumption was later substantiated by the data gathered concerning the renovation of original buildings and the construction of new buildings.
Primary Data Sources and Data Collection

Two forms of qualitative data were used to capture the current function and condition of the selected buildings and structures: field observations and non-technical literature, both according to the procedures below. Non-technical literature was also utilized to illustrate the renovations and general change in both the function and condition of the selected property features. The primary and supplemental literature collected was retrieved from the Library of George Washington at Mount Vernon, the Donald W. Reynolds Museum and Educational Center, the Library of Congress’ digitized special collection archive, and the Pennsylvania State University library.

Field Observation. Field observations were conducted at George Washington’s Mount Vernon Estate. Entrée was gained after two months of contact, by phone and electronic mail, with a student archivist at the Mount Vernon library. This student archivist later served as a key informant for on-site data collection.

After gaining entrée, a total of two field visits were completed. The first field visit was conducted in May 2007 with two primary objectives: to meet the informant, and to achieve familiarity with the research site and the available resources. The informant reviewed the new security procedures, the procedures for acquiring and handling original documents, and other trust concerns to ensure a scholarly representation of the estate and its keepers. To achieve familiarity with the research site, the researcher toured the estate, with specific attention to the buildings and structures of interest selected before entering the field. The tour included a guided tour of the Mansion House; a simulated tour of the estate circa 1778 (video); and a walking tour of the subsidiary buildings, Tomb, and the
new facilities. The second field visit, completed in July 2007, included the full use of the library and a repeat tour of the estate.

The method of data collection in the field was a combination of two distinct methodological procedures. The first methodological procedure utilized was that of direct or reactive observation. Direct observation was the procedure of choice to collect data the research facilities where it was necessary to gain entrée, access to the on-site library and permission to use the original documents and other needed resources. The second methodological procedure utilized, as the procedure of choice to collect data while touring the site, was that of unobtrusive observation. All field observations were recorded in the form of field notes for future analysis.

Non-technical Literature. The primary non-technical literature used was the collection of more than thirty printed, sequential versions of the Mount Vernon Visitor’s Guide. The guidebooks include a description and history of the estate and all showcased relics, a chronology of estate ownership, photographs, and reports of recent renovation projects and other Mount Vernon events (e.g., a report of the bicentennial ceremony or a summary of donated furniture). There were more than thirty editions of the Mont Vernon Visitor’s Guide published in print between 1876 and 2005, and copies of the guidebook are shelved in the estate library. With the exception of the first visitor’s guide, all of the guidebooks were written and published by the Mount Vernon Ladies’ Association (MVLA).

To supplement the data gathered from the visitor’s guides and field observations, additional non-technical literature was collected, including 1) free information brochures and estate maps available in the Orientation Center primarily for guest use; 2) letters and
diaries written by the ladies of the MVLA, obtainable in their original form or reprinted in books; 3) newspaper articles written to campaign for the preservation of the estate and located with the use of web resources, LexisNexis and the New York Times Historical (1851-2004) Digital Archive; and 4) other random personal and official documents including wills, itemized reports and receipts, Congressional appeals, and MVLA Meeting Minutes. All literature collected from the estate library were acquired with the assistance of the resident archivist on the Mount Vernon Estate. Additionally, all photographs were provided by either the owners of the estate, the Mount Vernon Ladies’ Association of the Union, or by GWWO, Inc./Architects, the architectural design and construction firm responsible for building the new facilities.

9 It is assumed that the company name includes an acronym, but no further information was provided by either the MVLA or the official company website.
The Mount Vernon Estate: A Survey of the Land

Limited Background of the Mount Vernon Estate

The Mount Vernon Estate underwent several changes and property developments before and while owned by George Washington, and now today more than 200 years after his death, renovations continue in an effort to restore and maintain the property. This section offers an abbreviated background of the land transformations that occurred prior to being named “The Home of Washington” and the current appearance of the Mount Vernon Estate, with a particular focus on property ownership - beginning with the Washington family and ending with the purchase of the estate by the Mount Vernon Ladies’ Association. The background information provided in this section will be referred to indirectly later in the analysis to support the generated hypotheses for historic sites as memory.

Prior to the ownership of the estate by George Washington, three generations of Washingtons owned the property: his great-grandfather, John Washington (1674); his grandfather, Lawrence Washington (1677); his father Augustine Washington, (1726); and his half-brother, Lawrence Washington (1752). George Washington first acquired the Mount Vernon plantation in 1754, which then included a seventeen room farmhouse on a
little more than 2,000-acres of land. At the time of his death, the Mount Vernon plantation included more than 8,000-acres of land and the extensively renovated mansion house, which included an additional four rooms, a piazza and a two-story balcony.

Washington divided the more than 8,000-acre Mount Vernon plantation into five farms: the Mansion House Farm; Muddy Hole Farm, the lowland to the north of the Mansion House Farm; River Farm to the east; Union Farm to the west, along the Potomac river and Dogue Creek; and Dogue Run Farm. Washington governed each farm as an independent establishment. Each farm was equipped with an overseer and field hands, farm buildings, slave quarters, and farm animals. The Mount Vernon Estate now identified as a national historic landmark, consists of land and structures from the original Mansion House Farm.

The Mansion House Farm, originally a 500-acre property, most notably includes the renovated farm house or mansion house and the Tomb, in which the remains of both George and Martha Washington now reside. After George Washington’s death, the Mount Vernon plantation was identified instantly as a tourist attraction and increasingly as a “national shrine.” The estate attracted so many national and international visitors that the burden of upkeep exceeded the resources and vivacity of the Washington family. As a result, the property “has been offered in turn to the Government of the United States and the Commonwealth of Virginia, but that purchase has been refused by each.” Official, both state and national, disinterest did not stop guests from visiting the estate. In fact, it was a letter from a steamboat traveler, Mrs. Robert Cunningham, in 1853 that prompted both the founding of the Mount Vernon Ladies’ Association of the Union (MVLA) in
1856 by Ann Pamela Cunningham, and the subsequent purchase and restoration of the property by the ladies of the newly founded organization.

Ann Pamela Cunningham accepted the responsibility of restoring the Mount Vernon estate after reading a stirring letter from her mother, Mrs. Robert Cunningham. In this letter, Mrs. Cunningham expressed her disappointment with the progressed deterioration of the Washington house. She wrote that she “was painfully distressed by the ruin and desolation of the home of Washington…. Why was it that the women of his country did not try to keep it in repair, if the men could not do it? It does seem such a blot on our country” (quoted in Thane 1966). On December 9, 1859, after receiving a donation of $68,294.59 contribution by Hon. Edward Everett, the MVLA purchased the mansion and 202 surrounding acres of the Mansion House Farm for $200,000 from George Washington’s great grandnephew and the last private owner of the Washington mansion, John A. Washington, Jr. The U.S. Department of the Interior later designated the Mount Vernon Estate as a national historic landmark on December 19, 1960 and the property is currently listed on the National Register. Thus, the estate was named by a select subgroup of the nation and publically accepted as significant to the vernacular culture before designated as such by the official culture.

Despite the many residents of the Mount Vernon Estate, they are little if ever represented in the property, save George and Martha Washington. There is a “Brief Chronology” printed both in the visitor map (free pamphlet) and the Visitor’s Guide (available for purchase in the gift shop), in which previous owners are mentioned in the bulleted history of the estate. Even in the bulleted history, the residence of the MVLA at the Mount Vernon Estate during the pre- and post-Civil War eras is not included. It is
well noted that the absence of the MVLA in the residential history of the estate is
consequently the result of their insistence to remain anonymous or unacknowledged in
the history of the estate. Their insistence to remain unacknowledged is a response to the
mission and duty charged to the ladies of the Association, to preserve only the “sacred
memory of George Washington.”

_The Duty and Campaign: Mount Vernon Ladies’ Association of the Union (MVLA)_

The Mount Vernon Ladies’ Association of the Union (MVLA) is, and has been
for nearly 150 years, the private owner and the primary decision-making body for the
restoration and property development projects on the Mount Vernon Estate. In an article
written to encourage public support in Delaware for the preservation of the Mount
Vernon Estate, the Southern Matron\(^\text{10}\) declared that “Delaware – now under the auspices
of her daughters – has but to do as she has always done and should ever do – “her
duty\(^\text{11}\).” As her duty, the MVLA tended to the property in accordance with their mission
to restore, preserve and to accurately depict the estate as it was during the final years of
Washington’s life, and as now printed in the visitor’s guide for more than 50 years. The
mission of the Association reads,

\begin{quote}
The object of The Mount Vernon Ladies’ Association shall be: “To
perpetuate the sacred memory of ‘The Father of his Country’ and, with
loving hands, to guard and protect the hallowed spot where rest his mortal
remains. To forever hold, manage and preserve the estate, properties and
relics at Mount Vernon, belonging to the Association, and, under proper

\end{quote}

\(^{10}\) As Miss Cunningham often signed in place of her name.

\(^{11}\) Printed in the _Delaware Gazette_ November 20, 1855.
regulations, to open the same to the inspection of all who love the cause of liberty and revere the name of Washington.”

The MVLA identified the memory of the George Washington as sacred. The land on which his corpse rests, the house in which he lived and died, and the property to which he tended were all identified as sacred and worth preserving because the memory of George Washington was identified as sacred. Although this ‘sacred by association’ method of identifying the buildings as equally as significant as his interred remains to the memory of George Washington, the memory of George Washington was and is deeply embedded in the broader value, liberty. As a result, the memory of George Washington is further embedded in a sacred common character that is central to the American identity, including 1) his body, the remembrance of his death; 2) his life and estate, the remembrance of his personal character and service; 3) his service to the country, a military general who fought for American independence; and at the deepest level, 4) the founding of the country, to “secure the Blessings of liberty for ourselves and our posterity.”

After the purchase of the Mount Vernon Estate, the MVLA worked diligently to tend to the responsibilities outlined in the mission statement of the Association. The ladies promptly moved from their homes to Alexandria to prepare the property for guests and supervise the restoration project. Sara C. Tracey, Cunningham’s secretary, wrote in a letter to Miss Cunningham on March 13, 1861:

[Mr. Herbert] wants permission to put General Washington’s room in perfect order, that is plaster, paper, and paint…. One of the Lewises is about breaking up housekeeping…. I am on the track of a dressing table used by General Washington…. Mr. Herbert says the sills will last three of four years longer, but the roof cannot be longer delayed, it leaks badly and will injure the house. [Muir 1946, p.19]
The mission and duty of the organization, ingrained in both the association and legacy of this historic landmark, persists. The ladies are reminded of their oath and duty to the estate and their duty to their country as well through the recitation of Miss Cunningham’s Farewell Address.\(^{12}\)

See to it that you keep it the home of Washington. Let no irreverent hand change it; no vandal hand desecrate it with the fingers of – progress! Those who go to see the Home in which he lived and died wish to see in what he lived and died. Let one spot in this grand country of ours be saved from ‘change!’ Upon you rests this duty.

As briefly outlined in the previous section, the site had a life before being named for its historic significance. When named, the life of George Washington at the Mount Vernon Estate was extracted from the life of the estate as the new living memory. When Ann Pamela Cunningham founded the Mount Vernon Ladies’ Association of the Union, she initiated an aggressive campaign to enlist public and government support, to accept funding and artifacts, and to recruit more women with a similar fervor for restoration to the organization. The objects of national importance, used to draw both congressional support for the incorporation of the MVLA and monetary support for the purchase and restoration of the estate, were the house and the Tomb, respectively in which Washington died and now remains (see Burke 1857). Likewise, although the estate is more than 300 years old, the information named as worth communicating and remembering with the preservation of the estate is representative of Mount Vernon as the home and final resting place of George Washington.

---

\(^{12}\) Miss Cunningham’s Farewell Address is printed in every Annual Report, in the Meeting Minutes, and “since 1916 it has been read aloud at the opening of Council” (Thane 1967, p. 19).
The boundaries set to define the acceptable content for the desired memory and its reconstruction, exclusively limit the available information to include only the information that is relevant and significant to the life of George Washington as it is preserved by the remaining relics and property features. As a result, the desired memory to be reconstructed is selective, not necessarily by the individual pieces of information included, but by the boundaries set to limit the system of information to purpose and specify the significance or remembering.

The governing boundaries set by the MVLA, in the case of the Mount Vernon Estate, are the temporal location of the desired memory and the historical significance of the named person(s). As previously mentioned, Mount Vernon during the life of George Washington is the extracted temporal location to be represented in the reconstruction of the survived structures. As a result of this temporal stasis (memory limited to a fixed time period), the mansion house and other common structures are static in that they are a representation of the site at a specific temporal point in the progressing history of the estate.

The Memory Captured: Current Site Features of Interest

The objective of this section is to both describe the current buildings and structures of interest, and to discuss their construction and/or reconstruction in order to generate hypotheses relating structures with the memory attribute: malleability.

13 Photographs of the property features are included in Appendix 2.
George Washington’s interred corpse remains one of the main attractions of the estate. As early as the 1860s, when the buildings were not suitable for visitors, steamboats would salute Washington’s tomb with a bell toll to honor the general and president, as they passed the Mount Vernon plantation on the Potomac. Today, there are daily readings and wreathlaying at the tomb to salute Washington’s presence on the estate. The Tomb has not been altered to preserve the legacy of Washington’s last will and testament concerning his interment.

George Washington left detailed instructions for his burial and the construction of a new family vault.

The family Vault at Mount Vernon requiring repairs, and being improperly situated besides, I desire that a new one of Brick, and upon a larger Scale, may be built at the foot of what is commonly called the Vineyard Inclosure, -on the ground which is marked out. –In which my remains with those of my deceased relatives (now in the old Vault) and such others of my family as may chuse to be entombed there, may be deposited. –And it is my express desire that my Corpse may be Interred in a private manner, without –parade, or funeral Oration. [Washington 1982, p. 27]

Washington’s instructions expressed both his desire to quietly remain in Virginia near his home, and to be placed in a brick tomb with his family only. The caretakers of his estate have protected his wishes diligently, despite pressure from Congress on two separate occasions to have his corpse removed from the Mount Vernon family vault. Congress first petitioned Martha Washington, shortly after George Washington’s death in 1799, to move her husband’s remains to Washington, D.C., a location suitable for a U.S. President. Congress, in a second attempt to claim the former president’s body, asked
Bushrod Washington in 1816 to move his uncle’s remains. Congress petitioned to move George Washington’s remains twice after his death, and both requests were denied.

After his death in 1799, Washington’s corpse was placed in the old family vault. Lawrence Lewis and George Washington Parke Custis built the new vault in 1830-1 and moved the family remains stored in the old vault to the new vault, their current resting place, according to the instructions outlined in Washington’s will. The new vault is east of the Mansion House, in which a white marble sarcophagus for each George and Martha Washington sit symmetrically centered on the chamber floor. Although the repeated interment theme echoes Washington’s resounding wish to construct a new family vault, the main attraction the construction and preservation of the Tomb. The family vault is now named “Washington’s Tomb,” as it is identified on the visitor’s map. Additionally, inscribed on a stone tablet over the entrance of the family vault are the words: “WITHIN THE ENCLOSURE REST THE REMAINS OF “GENERAL GEORGE WASHINGTON”.” Although the physical remains of other family members are located in the vault with Washington, the desired memory does not include a remembrance of the other interred family members, but are mentioned in later editions of the visitor’s guide.

Unacknowledged physical structures may eventually be recognized as relevant to the desired memory. Adjacent to the Washington family vault, further east on a wooded hill, are the unmarked graves of slaves and freed slaves who worked on the Washington plantation during the 18th and 19th centuries. Although many of the descendants of blacks who worked for Washington on the Mount Vernon plantation “were enlisted as gardeners, spinners, weavers, and guards,” their history and memory of their ancestors was not identified and represented as part of Mount Vernon memory (Rees 2001, p. 160).
Three student architects from Howard University later designed a memorial in memory of the black slaves buried there. In 1983, the Slave Memorial was erected on the wooded hill to mark the burial site. Previously, in 1929, the MVLA erected a monument to mark the burial site of the slaves and free blacks who worked on the plantation. Engraved on the monument are the words:

IN MEMORY OF THE MANY FAITHFUL COLORED SERVANTS OF THE WASHINGTON FAMILY BURIED AT MOUNT VERNON FROM 1760 TO 1860 -- THE UNIDENTIFIED SLAVES SURROUND THIS SPOT -- 1929

Not only were the previously unacknowledged remains recognized, but the range of years noted exceeds the previously set boundaries of the temporal location of the desired memory.

The “Reconstructed” Mansion House and Subsidiary Buildings

As opposed to the Tomb, a memorial to recognize the deceased, the house represented life.

But while the resting place of a great man’s mortal remains is infinitely to be cherished and revered, the Tomb is not what Mount Vernon means today, or should not be. We visit tombs because usually that is all we have left – the last abode. But Mount Vernon is the life, as well as the death, and the Mansion and its surroundings are therefore the triumphant, touching thing, the immortality made visible – because in the house, or on the piazza with its still splendid outlook towards the green Maryland shore, he lives. [Thane 1967, p. 224]

The Mansion House, restored to its appearance in 1799 during the last year of Washington’s life, required great attention to architectural and decorative details to capture the memory of the Washington home. After purchasing the property, the ladies
immediately attended to the restoration of the Mansion House to restore the life of Mount Vernon. The attending vice-reagent of each of the original thirteen states had “the privilege of selecting a room and placing in it whatever mementos or furniture may be contributed from the State, as having historic association” (Johnston 1876, p. 20). The furniture was either purchased on credit or donated. Furniture having historic association are items that were not used or previously owned by Washington, but instead exhibit the appropriate furnishings for the time period. Today, about 30 percent of the furniture on display in the Mansion House belonged to or were used by George Washington.

There were originally fifteen individual dependencies or subsidiary buildings on the property, all in need of repair. Due to the need of extensive repair, although most of the subsidiary buildings were used to house the resident employees and their children, some contributors and guests were in favor of removing the subsidiary buildings.

“Early in its administration the Association was advised … to remove all subsidiary buildings entirely, even those belonging to the Mansion life, as unworthy of preservation…. But once again the Mount Vernon foresight and respect for tradition prevailed, and they were made use of for storage and housing, while retaining their original names. [Thane 1967, p.123]

In the 1930’s, with public interest, financial contributions and attendance increasing, a subcommittee was created within the Association “to direct the restoration and furnishing of all the Mansion’s dependencies to complete the picture of Mount Vernon as Washington knew it” (p.123).

Although all site structures were preserved, some of the structures remained “nameless” until the Association could locate information about the name and function of the structures. In 1910, after reviewing some of Washington’s hand-written notes and property diagrams, four building names were added to the list of subsidiary buildings
presented in the visitor’s guide: The Spinning Room, Servant’s Quarters, The Summer House and Pohick Church. More recently, at the beginning of the 2008 calendar year, the Association funded the restoration of a slave cabin located in the southwest corner of the estate, near the 16-Sided Barn. The cabin is not listed in the latest visitor’s guide because the guidebook was published in 2005. It is unknown to the researcher whether or not there are other absent structures that have not been rebuilt.

Some of the preserved structures that were named were later renamed following a national shift of social ideals. Following the 1960’s U.S. civil rights movement, there was a shift to reform the treatment of slave history on the estate, to associate the memory of the Mount Vernon plantation with slave labor. In addition to the erection and inauguration of the Slave Memorial in 1983, one method used to acknowledge the legacy of slavery at the estate was to rename buildings and retell the story of service on the estate to include the previously omitted slaves. The term “Service Lane,” renamed in 1936 and to refer to the north and south service lanes, was replaced later with the term “Plantation Life” in 1988. The 1988 edition of the visitor’s guide was the first guide to use the term “slave,” with the name change of the Greenhouse and Quarters to the Greenhouse and Slave Quarters.

Consequently, to rename the buildings and the activities of the estate also required that George Washington be renamed as a slave owner. This title is not directly associated with the memory of George Washington, but instead, he is referred to as a “visionary” for emancipating the majority of his slaves after his death, by request as detailed in his will.
The New “Constructed” Facilities: The Orientation Center

The two constructed or new public facilities on the Mount Vernon Estate are the Ford Orientation Center and the Donald W. Reynolds Museum and Education Center. The two facilities are the result of a $110 million development project intended to enhance, not detract from, the property features. Mount Vernon opened the two facilities to the public in October 2006. To architecturally embody both the stately and common presence of the former president, the two buildings feature white marble floors and hardwood accent walls, as well as immaculate windows to capture the outside property features and natural sunlight. Together, the facilities display more than 500 collected artifacts in glass showcases, more than 30 statues and busts of George Washington.

The Ford Orientation Center

The Ford Orientation Center, a 30,200 square-foot building, is the first building guests visit after purchasing a ticket and is the passageway used to ‘enter the property.’ The orientation center is an open lobby complete with a brochure station of local attractions, and an information desk to collect printed materials about the estate and to ask questions about the many property features. Guests who enter the doors of the orientation center first see life-sized bronze statues of each member of the Washington family – George, Martha, with Nelly and Washy (two grandchildren) – and a curved wall of floor-to-ceiling windows that extends from the right entrance-door to the opposite end of the building. There are also two adjacent theaters with maximum seating capacity of 450 viewers. In the theaters, guests watch a 20-minute reenactment of the American
Revolution\textsuperscript{14} to “reintroduce visitors to the charismatic American hero and the events that
defined his legendary leadership and character” before touring the historic property.

The Donald W. Reynolds Museum and Education Center

The first museum was built on the Mount Vernon estate in 1928 by the
Association to house the growing collection of donated Washington memorabilia. As the
first and only building constructed on the estate property since the new tomb, the
Association did not want the building to distract from the traditional architecture of the
estate. As a result the old museum was built “in outward harmony with the original
buildings” (Mount Vernon 1965, p. 78). Still growing, the collection of Washington
memorabilia outgrew to museum and the Association prepared for a larger facility.

The Donald W. Reynolds Museum and Education Center is a 41,000 square-foot
complex, built to encourage visitors to “discover the “real” George Washington.” The
glassed entrance immediately leads to a descending marble-tiled staircase with extra-wide
steps, and metal and glass railing. Counter-clockwise from the foot of the staircase is a
dark wood-paneled security desk, a glass door that leads to the Museum, the open
entrance of the Education Center, and the exit.

The Museum features six permanent exhibits that showcase relics owned or used
by Washington that are arranged by theme. The six permanent exhibits are “The Houdon
Bust,” a domed gallery designed exclusively to showcase to terra cotta bust of George
Washington sculpted by Jean-Antoine Houdon; “The World of George Washington,” to

\textsuperscript{14} A movie entitled Why We Fight (a History Channel production).
showcase international items purchased; “From Soldier to Statesman,” to showcase military regalia and a chair from the first Congress; “At Home with the Washingtons,” to showcase random artifacts including a sundial, early paintings of Mount Vernon, weapons and musical instruments; “Washington Style,” to showcase clothing and accessories worn by the Washington family; and “Books and Manuscripts,” to showcase Washington’s Last Will and Testament, slave roster, country’s founding documents.

There is also an exhibition that changes biannually. Although artifacts collected from the original buildings and returned to the estate as the property of Washington were present in the building, they were showcased as independent relics without an accompanying temporal context. As a result, simulated memories were created in which the artifacts were presented with a verbal narrative (written and oral) as the primary method used to place the event by constructing a context to name the artifacts as significant.

In addition to the new museum the Association also approved the construction of the Education Center. The Education Center is a facility in which guests can learn about the “real” George Washington and about the importance of preserving history. The center includes three hands-on learning centers for computer-based distant learning, for accessing the virtual presidency library, and for learning with assisted by “hands-on history.” There are also seventeen learning stations, each with a different story and wax exhibit to illustrate attributes about George Washington, his life, his duties, his ideals, and his legacy. The seventeen learning station are, in order of appearance from the opening of the center (both the entrance and exit) around the exhibit hall: Reconstructing George Washington Young Virginian, Upstart Colonial Officer, Gentleman Planter/Revolutionary, A 40-Year Romance, First in War, George Washington,
Commander-in-Chief (open theater), Citizen Soldier, Visionary Entrepreneur, The Dilemma of Slavery, A Leader’s Smile, Indispensable American, The People’s President, Private Citizen, The Grand Finale (open theater), and Saving Mount Vernon the birth of preservation in the nation. To exit the complex, visitors pass through a free-standing hall with a full length wall of floor-to-ceiling windows to the right and a painted and illustrated timeline to the left of national landmark events and landmark events associated with the preservation of the estate. The hall forks to the food court and two gift shops.

Initially, the goal of the Association was to protect and preserve the Mount Vernon Estate as the Home of George Washington and as “sacred to the memory of Washington forever” (Johnston 1876, p. 22). As a result, all buildings were restored to match the specifications of their original architecture (e.g., the Mansion House), and the new buildings were built in semblance with the original buildings (e.g., the old museum). The new facilities do not follow this model. The two new “constructed” facilities were built specifically to commemorate the life of George Washington as the “Father of Our Country” and to “discover the real George Washington.” Before visitors can experience the home and life of the estate, they first learn about the “charismatic American hero” (the Orientation Center); and as they leave the estate, they learn about “real George Washington” (the Museum and Education Center). Now sandwiched between Washington-centered information provided by the exhibits in the new facilities, the memory of the home is surrounded by a new narrative. As a memorial to the life of Washington, the new narrative delineates from the established meaning of the property as ‘the living and the dead,’ to ‘the dead and the restored.’
Chapter 5

Conclusion

The primary objective of this study was to explore the properties of structure as memory by both redefining the relationship between structure and memory, and by exploring the characteristics of various structure types. There was one principle guideline leading the collection and organization of the presented data: to explore the property features of the Mount Vernon Estate as having multiple forms of preserved information (the unaltered, the reconstructed and the constructed). After analyzing the data, there are two additional guidelines that should also be considered in the future when investigating the characteristics of structure as memory. The two additional guidelines are to explore the breadth and limits proposed by the goal or purpose statement of the founding and all invested organizations; and to explore not only the remaining structures but also both unnamed or unmarked structures, and absent structures.

There are two supplementary findings of this study. The first finding is that structure as memory and its reconstructions are not all imagined (meaning and values), but there are physical elements present to anchor the image and architectural renovations required to restore and maintain the structures as memory. These physical or structural elements, as well as their assigned meaning, are malleable and subject to physical construction and reconstruction over time.

The second result is that the Mount Vernon Estate as a memory, although malleable in its construction and reconstruction, can be characterized as also static. With
Reference to Halbwachs’ conceptualization of memory as a “current of continuous thought,” the estate as memory accommodates only a specific event or experience along the life of the property, such that the named event is a living memory of a single lived memory. Memory, then, is constructed and reconstructed to maintain the common character or generalized memory of the Mount Vernon Estate, as it was in 1799. This concept, the act of socially constructing and reconstructing a memory to maintain an “othered” memory, is termed by the researcher “doing memory.”

Memory is continuous and progressive just as it is malleable. With time, information is lost, transformed, and added, as this is the nature of memory. Conversely, one is taxed with the responsibility of “doing memory” when it is no longer acceptable or desired to allow ‘memory loss.’ Hence, reconstruction occurs to maintain the structure as it was, and as it would not have been without reconstruction or restoration.

One limitation of this study is that all property features were not observed and analyzed as part of the site memory. The property features that were not included are the livestock, gardens, and farming exhibits. The “Heritage Breed” livestock includes rare breed hogs, sheep, cattle, turkeys and chickens, many of which were traditionally raised at the Mount Vernon Estate during the eighteenth century. Additionally, as an accomplished agriculturalist, Washington also had an extensive horticultural collection that included multiple gardens, a lumber trail, and farming exhibits. The exhibits are open daily with hands-on activities, and include a video presentation about the reconstruction of the adjacent barn. These natural features were excluded because the memory observed was limited to the “preserved” 1799 Mount Vernon Estate and did not include organic memory. “Organic memory” is an interesting concept that deserves further investigation.
The Mount Vernon Estate as the memory of the home of George Washington includes several structures that are each representative of one of three memory forms: the original structure or event (unaltered), the reconstruction, and the construction. The Mount Vernon Estate includes both common and commemorative buildings and structures that each contribute to the description of the site (memory). As an advantage, the results from this study present a general overview of the field of possible structure types that can be analyzed as memory, of the treatment of structure as memory, and of the complexity of common historic sites that include multiple buildings and structures as memory. Although the majority of the common sites listed on the National Register of Historic Sites are single buildings or structures, the results can be generalized to analyze the treatment of an individual monument as a complex memory with attention to specific structural features.

Although the structure as memory is relatable, the information represented concerning the memory preserved and its assumed importance is unfamiliar. As unfamiliar, the memory is not shared as a recollection of a personal experience by the majority of the group members, and must be either experienced or learned. In the case of the Mount Vernon Estate, there is a clear distinction between experienced and learned memories. Although maintaining a ‘common character,’ memory that is shared by personal experience with the memory (or historic site) does not require that all individuals remember learn specific facts or verified pieces of information, but to understand at a deeper level and connect with the memory of the group. One’s self-reflection and interaction with group-designated historic sites as “othered” memories, then, can be discussed as a means of establishing group-consciousness, and identifying
with one’s place in the group. Historic sites are often characterized as merely a “trip to
the past,” but when defined as memory, they share an active role as referents for
establishing group-consciousness.
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Appendix A

Historic Preservation Legislation

National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (as amended through 1992)

Public Law 102-575


*Italic* indicates new text.

*Strikeout* indicates text removed.

Section 1 (*16 U.S.C. 470*)

(a) This Act may be cited as the "National Historic Preservation Act."

(b) The Congress finds and declares that-

(1) the spirit and direction of the Nation are founded upon and reflected in its historic heritage;

(2) the historical and cultural foundations of the Nation should be preserved as a living part of our community life and development in order to give a sense of orientation to the American people;
(3) historic properties significant to the Nation's heritage are being lost or substantially altered, often inadvertently, with increasing frequency;

(4) the preservation of this irreplaceable heritage is in the public interest so that its vital legacy of cultural, educational, aesthetic, inspirational, economic, and energy benefits will be maintained and enriched for future generations of Americans;

(5) in the face of ever-increasing extensions of urban centers, highways, and residential, commercial, and industrial developments, the present governmental and nongovernmental historic preservation programs and activities are inadequate to insure future generations a genuine opportunity to appreciate and enjoy the rich heritage of our Nation;

(6) the increased knowledge of our historic resources, the establishment of better means of identifying and administering them, and the encouragement of their preservation will improve the planning and execution of federal and federally assisted projects and will assist economic growth and development; and

(7) although the major burdens of historic preservation have been borne and major efforts initiated by private agencies and individuals, and both should continue to play a vital role, it is nevertheless necessary and appropriate for the Federal Government to accelerate its historic preservation programs and activities, to give maximum encouragement to agencies and individuals undertaking preservation by private means, and to assist State and local governments and the National Trust for Historic Preservation in the United States to expand and accelerate their historic preservation programs and activities.
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Photographs of the Mount Vernon Estate

The Ford Orientation Center – Guest Entrance

The Mansion

Mount Vernon – Exterior
Photo © Mount Vernon Ladies' Association

Mount Vernon from the Potomac River
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Main Entrance – Exterior
Photo © GWWO, Inc./Architects

Main Entrance – Wall of Windows from Inside
Photo © GWWO, Inc./Architects
The Tomb

George Washington's Tomb – Exterior
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George Washington's Tomb – Interior
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Donald W Reynolds Museum and Education Center

Main Entrance – Exterior
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Museum (right) and Education Center (left)
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