PUTTING HISTORIC PRESERVATION INTO PRACTICE: THE FRIENDS OF THE CALEB PUSEY HOUSE, INC. AND THE TWENTIETH-CENTURY RESTORATION OF A SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY PENNSYLVANIA HOME.

By

Melissa Elaine Engimann

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of the University of Delaware in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Early American Culture

Spring 2006

Copyright 2006 Melissa E. Engimann
All Rights Reserved

UMI Number: 1435841

UMI

UMI Microform 1435841

Copyright 2006 by ProQuest Information and Learning Company.
All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

**PUTTING HISTORIC PRESERVATION INTO PRACTICE:
THE FRIENDS OF THE CALEB PUSEY HOUSE, INC.
AND THE TWENTIETH-CENTURY RESTORATION OF A SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY PENNSYLVANIA HOME.**

by

Melissa Elaine Engimann

Approved: _____
Pauline Eversmann, M.Phil.
Professor in charge of thesis on behalf of the Advisory Committee

Approved: _____
J. Ritchie Garrison, Ph.D.
Director of the Winterthur Program in Early American Material Culture

Approved: _____
Thomas M. Apple, Ph.D.
Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences

Approved: _____
Conrado M. Gempesaw II, Ph.D.
Vice-Provost for Academic and International Programs

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

In researching and writing this thesis, I am indebted to a number of very generous people. My first thank you is to Jana Maxwell, archivist at the Caleb Pusey House in Upland, Pennsylvania, and the members of the Friends of the Caleb Pusey House, Inc. Mrs. Maxwell and the Friends of the Caleb Pusey House kindly provided me with the use of their time and resources, as well as unfettered access to the Caleb Pusey House archives. Initially, I came to the Caleb Pusey House in search of an architectural history story that I might share with my classmates, but quickly I found myself immersed in the amazing social history of the house and the organization supporting it. Without the assistance, patience, and enthusiasm of Mrs. Maxwell and the board of the Friends of the Caleb Pusey House, Inc., this project would not have been possible. I sincerely thank you.

My advisor, Pauline Eversmann, M.Phil., provided me with support and understanding as I grappled first with the topic of women in historic preservation, and then the topics of cookbooks, cooking schools and immigrants, before finally coming full circle to pursue this topic in historic preservation. I thank her for helping me to tease out my thoughts and ideas, and for keeping my research and writing on track for the past year.

In addition to Pauline Eversmann's advisement, I thank Bernard Herman, Ph.D., for his advice, assistance, and encouragement in developing this topic. This thesis grew

out of a paper I first wrote for one of his architectural history classes. I am grateful for his insights and expertise, as well as for his time in reading and reacting to this work in its various drafts and forms.

I am very appreciative of the many opportunities and experiences I received as a Lois F. McNeil fellow in the Winterthur Program in Early American Culture (WPEAC). I am beholden to J. Ritchie Garrison, Ph.D., the staff of the Winterthur Museum and Library, Sandy Manno, Kay Collins, and my colleagues in the WPEAC classes of 2005, 2006, and 2007, for providing me with such unwavering support during my two years in the program. Thank you for answering my questions, calming my nerves, and working through this process with me. Special thanks go to my classmates Jane Marion, Katy Beckham, and Eliza Stoner for keeping me fed, reading my drafts, listening to me sort out my ideas, and helping me keep my car in working order while I researched and wrote.

To my family – Mom, Dad, and Jennifer – thank you! You have made sure I wanted for nothing while I devoted myself to the process of researching and writing. Thank you for your emotional and technological support! Thank you for the letters, care packages, and phone calls. Your support and love means the world to me.

Finally, I thank Daniel K. Ackermann, who has been with me through every step of this thesis, all while writing a thesis of his own. My writing partner, my sounding board, my friend – to you I dedicate this work with love.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES vi

ABSTRACT vii

Text

Introduction 1

The Caleb Pusey House - A history and description 6

The F.C.P.H. and twentieth-century historic preservation 13

Conclusion 38

APPENDIX 42

BIBLIOGRAPHY 43

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: The Caleb Pusey House as it appears in 2006. 42

ABSTRACT

Americans have long had a fascination with ideas of memory, history, and preservation. Following World War II, the United States experienced a surge in the formation of organizations committed to preserving historic sites for patriotic, memory-creating, and educational purposes. National foundations, like the National Trust for Historic Preservation, and federal, state, and local legislation, like the Historic Preservation Act of 1966, greatly affected the historic preservation movement and the organizations that conducted preservation work in America. Small, local historic preservation groups, created and run primarily by women, worked diligently to save sites with connections to local, state, and national history. In preserving historic sites, these groups often established new research methods, restoration practices, and fundraising techniques. One such organization, which came of age during the post-World War II historic preservation era, is the Friends of the Caleb Pusey House, Inc. This paper uses the Friends of the Caleb Pusey House, Inc. as a case study, exemplifying the sort of small, local organization dedicated to preservation that was typical of this period.

Introduction

Americans have long had a fascination with ideas of memory, history, and preservation. As early as the period following the Revolutionary War, they have worked to save material objects and set aside landscapes devoted to the memory of fallen heroes, founding fathers, and nation-building events. Following the destruction caused by the Civil War, the nation attempted to rebuild itself, creating a national identity and cultural memory using relics from both the Revolutionary War and the antebellum period as their touchstones. Speaking to the exponential growth of historic preservation in Western countries, David Lowenthal writes, "At the heart of historic preservation lies the view that the tangible past is attractive or desirable."[1] He also writes that, "dawning public awareness of the faster pace of change, coupled with loss of earlier faith in progress, has intensified attachments to tangible relics in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries."[2] Today, the historical things we preserve – be they buildings, objects, or documents – are saved not only because they are often "elegant," "unique," or "rare," but also because they represent a symbolic connection with the past.[3]

The wanton destruction of Native American sites, pre-historic remains, and the pristine American landscape during Westward expansion give rise to a sense of loss and

---

[1] David Lowenthal, "Introduction," in *Our Past Before Us: Why Do We Save It?* eds. David Lowenthal and Marcus Binney (London: Maurice Temple Smith Ltd.), 1981: 10.

[2] Lowenthal, 1981: 11.

[3] Lowenthal, 1981: 11.

an appreciation of importance of these sites for connecting with at national past. These feelings and the outcry against the destruction of ancient and natural sites brought about the first United States legislation for national historic preservation efforts. These pieces of legislation were the acts of Congress creating the first national park – Yellowstone National Park – in 1872, the first national monument – Casa Grande, Arizona – in 1886, and the Antiquities Act of 1906. The Antiquities Act of 1906 in particular, allowed the President to set aside additional public sites as national monuments, and it called for federal protection of these sites, threatened with destruction by pothunters, looters, and traffickers of antiquities.[4] Following this precedent-setting legislation, the National Park Service (a part of the Department of the Interior) was created in 1916 to administer the federal protection provided to historic sites created under the Antiquities Act of 1906. In 1933, and again in 1935, the National Park Service's protective authority over historic sites was broadened to include historic battlefields and forts of the Revolutionary and Civil War periods.[5]

But it was not until the years following World War II, that average Americans truly began to take great interest in preserving for all time those monuments, landscapes, and buildings, which related to people, events, and themes in American history. The

---

[4] William J. Murtagh, *Keeping Time: The History and Theory of Preservation in America* (Pittstown, NJ: The Main Street Press), 1988: 53.

[5] James A. Glass, *The Beginnings of A New National Historic Preservation Program, 1957-1969* (Nashville: American Association for State and Local History), 1990: xiii.; Elizabeth D. Mulloy, *The History of the National Trust for Historic Preservation, 1963-1973* (Washington, D.C.: The Preservation Press – National Trust for Historic Preservation in the United States), 1976: 3-8.; Frederick L. Rath, Jr. and Merrilyn Rogers O'Connell, *Guide to Historic Preservation, Historical Agencies, and Museum Practices: A Selective Bibliography* (Cooperstown: New York State Historical Association), 1970: 8.

post-World War II era was one of 'progress.' It was a time in which many Americans witnessed the destruction of historic sites, landscapes, and communities, all to make way for the baby-boomer generation and the path of industrialism and consumerism. As urban and suburban growth quickly encroached on historic buildings, parks, and open areas – often first targeting sites previously damaged by the fighting during the Civil War, by natural disasters, or by human neglect – a few people remembered and understood the importance of rescuing and preserving these sites for teaching heritage, identity, and history to future generations. These champions of the historic preservation movement, many of them well-respected, community-leading women, banded together in small groups under the banner of preserving patriotism, battling modernity, and promoting positive urban renewal in their hometowns, states, and across the nation.[6]

The small community historical societies and clubs frequently chose to focus their efforts on endangered buildings and parklands with historic and patriotic connections to either local or national "Founding Fathers." They raised the funding necessary to purchase imperiled properties, as well as money for protecting and restoring them. Sometimes, an organization fighting to preserve a site would push for the preservation or adaptive reuse of other historic properties surrounding the initial site, thus creating historical parks, much like those created by Colonial Williamsburg or Sturbridge Village. Working diligently to research the history of the site they were working to save, many of these organizations created or used new methods of archival research, archaeological excavation, and architectural study to gather information. These groups also promoted tourism in their area, and aspired to teach their visitors about early American life, historic

[6] Mulloy, 1976: 3, 33-35.

events, and the men and women who played important roles in the development and history of the United States.

Help for these smaller organizations came in 1940, with the birth of the American Association for State and Local History (AASLH). The AASLH was created as a "nonprofit, educational organization dedicated to advancing knowledge, understanding, and appreciation of localized history in the United States and Canada," and designed to serve historical societies be they small, large, public, private, amateur, or professional.[7] More help for small historic preservation groups arrived in 1949, when a Congressional charter made it feasible for some of the grassroots preservationists to join forces with professionals in the architectural, archaeological, and museum fields, and to create a private foundation with the goal of supporting preservation efforts throughout the United States. This foundation was the National Trust for Historic Preservation. Since then, the National Trust has helped to legitimize the historic preservation movement, and has assisted hundreds of small historic foundations to preserve and conserve America's historic resources. It encouraged federal legislation supporting historic preservation, such as the Historic Preservation Act of 1966. It also provided standards for restoration, much literature on methods appropriate for preservation, conservation, restoration, and re-creation of historic sites, and assistance to small groups through conferences and seminars.[8]

Yet, while national organizations, like the National Trust, attempted to rescue many of the most threatened landmarks of nation-wide importance, much of the historic

[7] Rath, 1970: 4-5.

[8] Mulloy, 1976: 10-12, 40-45.; Rath, 1970: 6.

preservation work that went on post-World War II was still conducted by small, private institutions striving to preserve and maintain houses, landscapes, and objects of local importance. One such small, private organization dedicated to the rescue and restoration of a local historic site is the Friends of the Caleb Pusey House, Inc. (F.C.P.H.).[9] The F.C.P.H. was created in 1960 for the purpose of rescuing and restoring a seventeenth-century home – the Caleb Pusey House – along the Chester Creek in Delaware County, Pennsylvania. The organization came of age during the boom of the historic preservation movement, and is still actively promoting the preservation of historic sites in the Delaware County area. The Caleb Pusey House itself, as it stands today, is not only a conveyor of early Pennsylvania and Quaker history, but also a testament to the twentieth-century American historic preservation movement.

In reading about the historic preservation movement and studying the organizations created to facilitate preservation post-World War II, one begins to see commonality among them. There appear to be five major qualities characteristic of many of the small, private preservation organizations formed during the rapid expansion of the historic preservation movement in the mid-twentieth century. These common qualities are:

- a group founded and supported primarily by women.
- a group dedicated to preserving a site associated with an important event or figure in American history, and promoting attitudes of memory, patriotism, and nationalism.

[9] I have chosen to use the abbreviation, "F.C.P.H." to refer to the organization, the Friends of the Caleb Pusey House, Inc., rather than "the Friends" or other possible notations, to avoid both wordiness and confusion. ("Friends" often refers to Quakers, but the F.C.P.H. was not a Quaker-affiliated organization and I do not wish to imply it was.) The Friends of the Caleb Pusey House first began to use the abbreviation, "F.C.P.H.," to refer to themselves in the minutes of their 1964 meetings.

- a group committed to the conservation of historic resources and the promotion of urban renewal.
- a group seeking out new and progressive methods of funding both on the local and state level.
- a group enthusiastic about learning new methods for conducing research and restoration.

The Friends of the Caleb Pusey House, Inc. is an organization that in the 1960s (the period in which they restored the Caleb Pusey House) exhibited these five characteristics. Documents in the F.C.P.H. archives, which range from minutes of board meetings and annual reports, to publications and board correspondence, open a window onto the types of decisions, struggles, compromises, and triumphs encountered by this one institution while attempting to recreate and preserve a slice of history for posterity. The following discussion looks back on the Friends of the Caleb Pusey House, Inc. as they undertook the tremendous task of saving America's only remaining house with an accepted association to William Penn, and will examine more closely what makes them an exemplary case study for historic preservation.

The Caleb Pusey House – A history and description

Since 1960, when preservation and restoration work first began at the Caleb Pusey House, faithful volunteers have been conducting archival research in order to uncover the story behind the location, building, and habitation of the home. By 1970, members of the F.C.P.H., including Mary S. Patterson and Josephine Albrecht, had

produced a number of publications outlining the following history of the house and outbuildings.[10]

The story of how Caleb Pusey (an Englishman from Upper Lamborne, in the Berks region) became a miller and prominent Quaker leader on the banks of the Chester Creek in Pennsylvania appears to have begun in the late seventeenth century. Caleb Pusey was born in 1651. In 1681, while living in England and working as a lastmaker creating shoes, he married Ann Stone Worley, a widow and mother of two boys – Henry and Francis. About the same time, the Society of Free Traders granted Pusey a share in a saw- and grist-mill owned by William Penn. Penn, himself, appointed Pusey to serve as manager and agent for the mill. Why this lastmaker went into the milling trade is presently unknown, but Pusey, nevertheless, temporarily left his new family shortly after his marriage and sailed to Pennsylvania in order to prepare for the construction of the mill. Once in Pennsylvania, he chose the land at what is now 15 Race Street, in Upland, Pennsylvania, situated in Delaware County along the Chester Creek, as the site for Penn's Mill, and named it "Landingford Plantation." In late October of 1682, William Penn and Richard Townsend (another miller designated to be co-operator of the mill) arrived at Landingford, bringing a "ready framed mill," millstones, and Pusey's family with them.[11]

According to the F.C.P.H., Pusey, and his wife, Ann (then eight months pregnant with a child who would not survive infancy), along with Henry and Francis, most likely

---

[10] The following section is a brief history of the Caleb Pusey and Landingford Plantation area drawn from a compilation of these F.C.P.H. publications.

[11] Josephine F. Albrecht, "Penn's Mill and its 'Keeper' at Landing Ford Plantation in Upland, Pennsylvania," in the *Bulletin of the Archaeological Society of Delaware, No. 7* (Wilmington: The Archaeological Society of Delaware), Fall 1969: 3, 12-13.

spent the winter of 1682 in an underground room along the Chester Creek on the site dubbed "Landingford." In 1683, Pusey apparently built an aboveground room with a large fireplace onto the original underground room. The aboveground room became the primary living quarters for the family, while the underground room may have changed into a "Chymical" laboratory, where someone (perhaps Pusey, himself, or his sons) practiced metallurgy and chemical experiments. Many years later, another workroom built onto the house enclosed the chimneystack and bake oven for the aboveground room, in addition to a well in the yard west of the structure.[12] The 1683 aboveground room and the added workroom constitute the present house, which the F.C.P.H. found in poor condition, rescued, and preserved in the 1960s.

In addition to being a prolific and somewhat prosperous miller, Caleb Pusey seems also to have been a well-respected figure in the Quaker community. Concerning Pusey's prominence in the Quaker meeting, Josephine Albrecht writes,

> [Pusey] was a member of the Provincial Assembly for eleven years, of the Governor's Council, on the Grand Inquest (Jury), Foreman and Jury member frequently, one of two Justices of the Peace for Chester County, appraiser of estates… "Peacemaker", collector of taxes, sheriff…, trustee of estates, school supervisor for Penn Charter Academy, Treasurer and Overseer of Chester Monthly Meeting, Signer of Penn's Charter and Code of Laws (1701), and on Penn's departure for England, he was appointed to the Council of State which was to govern in the absence of the Proprietor.[13]

Due to the location of the house on the "King's Highway" between Philadelphia and cities to the South, as well as Pusey's standing in the Quaker community, the F.C.P.H. believes the house became a stopping over and gathering place for many Quakers and

[12] Albrecht, 1969: 4.

[13] Albrecht, 1969: 7.

other travelers journeying up and down the East Coast. One such traveler, a Quaker missionary named Thomas Storey, wrote in his 1698-1714 journals of resting for the night during his pilgrimages at the Pusey house.[14] The F.C.P.H. believes William Penn was also a guest at the house, and it is upon this belief that the F.C.P.H. fought for the preservation for the site.

By 1705, Caleb Pusey owned the mill, his house, and over one hundred and fifty acres of land. He also entered into agreements with his neighbors to provide water access for the mill. However, around 1712, documents found by the F.C.P.H. at local historical societies and in Quaker archives show that Pusey began parceling off his land and asked to be relieved of his duties as keeper of the mill. In 1717, he moved to land he owned in East Marlborough, Pennsylvania, and lived in the home of a daughter, also named Ann, and son-in-law, John Smith, until his death in July of 1726.[15]

A number of families have occupied the house since Caleb Pusey and his family departed it in 1717. A succession of Quaker families owned the house until 1749. Shortly thereafter, in 1752, two millers named Samuel and Thomas Shaw acquired the property. To avoid confiscation of the millstones by the British in 1776, the mill was closed and the millstones hidden. After the Revolution, the mills operated with only sporadic success. In 1845, John P. Crozer purchased the house and adjoining 60 acres in

---

[14] Josephine F. Albrecht, *A Visit to the Pusey House,* no date. (Friends of the Caleb Pusey House Archives); Mary S. Patterson, "Escaping Pitfalls in Early Pennsylvania Restoration," reprint from the *Daughters of the American Revolution Magazine,* March 1964. (Friends of the Caleb Pusey House Archives)

[15] Albrecht, 1969: 8.

order to build cotton mills along the Chester Creek. Workers at the Crozer Cotton Mills used the house as a tenant property, continually occupying the house until the 1950s.

Unfortunately, by 1960, the house was in serious disrepair, had no interior plumbing or electricity, and was nearly condemned. The little derelict cottage sat beside a landfill, and it was in this sad condition the rescuers of the Caleb Pusey House first laid eyes on the building. In one of her many articles on the house, Albrecht gives the following account of the birth of the Friends of the Caleb Pusey House:

> Some of Upland's residents, led by the Mayor, Ray Ruditys, were less resigned, and in 1960, with the aid of a borrowed bull-dozer, the ground was leveled off, filling the old Race and covering the junk. The final step [towards a rescue] was taken when, on an historical tour, Architect Edwin Brumbaugh told his visitors that if something were not done immediately to save the old house, it would be too late, and Pennsylvania's last remaining house with documented association with Penn would be nothing but a heap of rubble. Two of the visitors, Mrs. Henry [Mary] Patterson and Mrs. Lynmar [Sarah] Brock, spurred by Quaker background and historical interest, took a mutual resolve that this should not happen.
>
> Thus the "Friends of the Caleb Pusey House" organization came into being and the tottering Cottage was shown to interested visitors.[16]

In April 1961, the last residents were asked to leave the house, and the newly established Friends of the Caleb Pusey House, Inc., brought in a team of architects and archaeologists to begin the tasks of stabilizing the building and conducting a comprehensive study of the historic site.[17]

The history of the house does not end with the departure of the house's last residents. Rather, it continues through the F.C.P.H.'s restoration of the house up to the

---

[16] Albrecht, 1969: 11.

[17] Albrecht, 1969: 9.; Mary S. Patterson, "Saving a Seventeenth Century Pennsylvania Home," reprint from *The Germantowne Crier* (Germantown Historical Society), Sept. 1962. (Friends of the Caleb Pusey House Archives)

present. Currently, the Caleb Pusey House is interpreted as the early Pennsylvania home of Caleb Pusey and his family. The house also serves as an interpretive tool for teaching children, families, and other visitors to the Delaware Valley about early Pennsylvania and Quaker life. Following the intensive restoration period, the F.C.P.H. opened the Caleb Pusey House to the public in the mid-1960s, and has held special events, tours, and living history demonstrations there ever since.

The house was restored to a two-room, single-story, brick and stone structure with attic space above each room, a central fireplace, and a partially excavated cellar (Figure 1). One may enter either room from the outside, as there is an exterior door for each room on the south-facing wall. An interior doorway located on the dividing (fireplace) wall near the north side of the building connects the two rooms internally. There is no interior access to the attic space, and the cellar is only accessible through a small stairwell in the east room.[18] Over the east room is a gambrel roof, while over the west room is a gable-ended roof. The east room is interpreted by the F.C.P.H. as the primary living space for the Pusey family. A large fireplace and bake oven, both opening into the east room, fill most of the wall shared by both the east and west rooms. Two windows, one to either side of the exterior door, light this space, which was presumed to be used for cooking, eating, gathering as a family, and perhaps (for some members of the family) for sleeping. The room is furnished with a large round table in front of the fireplace, a number of wooden chairs, a large dresser and a chest of drawers, a trunk (or chest), a

[18] For safety reasons, I was not given physical access to the attic and cellar spaces. Therefore, I cannot elaborate on the interior of these spaces, other than to say I understand they now contain the HVAC and other operating systems for the house.

spice cabinet, a hanging cupboard, a bible box, and various other accoutrements for cooking, lighting the space, and storage.

The west room is interpreted by the F.C.P.H. as a workspace. The room has been furnished with items for spinning, processing foodstuffs, and storing goods. A corner cupboard with a Pusey family provenance stands in the northwest corner of the room. The room also contains a reconstructed stand-kettle built into the fireplace wall, and – in the southwest corner of the room – sits a well, which was uncovered and restored during renovations in the 1960s and 70s. This well may have provided an indoor water source for early inhabitants of the house. With the exception of radiant heat emanating from the stand-kettle, rear of the bake-oven, and the chimneystack, the room is otherwise unheated. One window to the east of the exterior door and another window in the west wall provide light and ventilation for the room.

At present, the interpretation of the house indicates that the Pusey family used the attic spaces as the primary sleeping quarters, and for storage. The attic area is accessible only from the outside of the house, through a doorway in the gambrel-end of the roof over the east room. The F.C.P.H. posits that the family used a ladder to access this exterior attic doorway. The family may have pulled the ladder into the room after they had ascended for the night, thus providing some sort of security while they slept.

On the east side of the house, a low wall made of stone has been built up around a garden. The F.C.P.H. interpreters indicate to visitors touring the house that the wall and garden are built upon the foundations of an underground room built on the property prior to the construction of the two-room home. On the west side of the house, a bulkhead

door (now bricked up), is interpreted as a one-time access to an early cellar under the west room.

In recent years, volunteers and members of the F.C.P.H. have held hearth-cooking demonstrations and other presentations of day-to-day, early Quaker activities. The house is furnished with a mixture of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century objects (some with provenances linking the items to the Pusey family), and reproduction pieces to be used in interpretation. This interpretation of the house grew out of research in area historical society archives, as well as archaeological and architectural studies, completed by the F.C.P.H. in the 1960s and 1970s. The body of information on the Caleb Pusey House has been continually increased as recent research yields new information. The F.C.P.H. has adjusted their interpretation of the house as needed to incorporate this new evidence, as well as to address the needs of the ever-changing community in which the house is located.

The F.C.P.H. and twentieth-century historic preservation

How did the F.C.P.H. create the Caleb Pusey House that we can visit today? Why should we use this house and this organization as a case study for understanding mid-twentieth century historic preservation? What characteristics of the organization – and the restoration project it undertook from 1960 to approximately 1970 – make it a good candidate for study? As outlined in the introduction, five characteristics make the Caleb Pusey House and the F.C.P.H. ideal examples of the trends surfacing in the historic preservation movement of the twentieth century. The first characteristic has to do with the women involved in the project. The second characteristic concerns the reasons

behind saving and restoring the house – namely patriotism, nationalism, memory, and the desire to recognize a Quaker founding father of Pennsylvania. The third relates to the plans the F.C.P.H. had to create a large historic park, much like Colonial Williamsburg or Sturbridge Village, and the incentives to promote urban renewal in the area. The fourth characteristic is the way in which the F.C.P.H. sought to fund the restoration project. Finally, the fifth characteristic entails the research methods – archival, architectural, and archaeological – used in restoring, preserving, and furnishing the house. These five characteristics of the F.C.P.H. and the preservation project on which they embarked in 1960 are emblematic of many mid- to late-twentieth century American historic preservation projects.

Considering the period and the precedents in historic preservation, it is not at all surprising that two women would elect to create a "Friends of…" organization for the purpose of preserving and restoring the Caleb Pusey House. The fact that it took *women* to intervene in the fate of a historic structure speaks to the long legacy of ladies' organizations created to steward historic homes and properties that preceded the foundation of the F.C.P.H. This legacy of ladies' organizations began in earnest during the nineteenth-century, when the concept of propriety and a woman's duty encouraged women to assume a "role as a preserver of American culture."[19] Women found a way to express this role through their participation in historic preservation groups. The white, middle- and upper-middle class women of the nineteenth-century felt a societal push to

[19] Edith Mayo, "Introduction to 'Historical Perspective: Images of Women in Museums," in *Women's Changing Roles in Museums: Conference Proceedings, March 16-19, 1986, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC,* ed. Ellen Cochran Hicks (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution), 1986: 10.

be the guardians of culture and morals, to promote temperance and progressivism. In addition to building settlement homes, promoting the temperance moment, and fighting for suffrage, these women found an outlet for their mission in the form of historic preservation groups.[20] These ladies' organizations and women's associations first forays into museum and preservation work centered on nineteenth-century "sanitary fairs," expositions, and the Centennial celebrations. At these events, women's associations were able to try their hand at recreating colonial cultural displays.[21]

However, the first true preservation organization in the United States to be organized by women and dedicated to saving a landmark important to the history of the nation was the Mount Vernon Ladies' Association of the Union. Chartered by Ann Pamela Cunningham in 1856, the goal of the Association was to save George Washington's home, Mount Vernon, for posterity. The Association's efforts to save Mount Vernon created three trends in historic preservation: the privatization of support for preservation activities, the prominent role of women in preservation, and the goal of saving individual landmark buildings.[22] The wave of preservation kicked off by the Association, and similar groups formed for the preservation of other historic buildings of national importance in the nineteenth-century, set the precedents by which preservation

---

[20] Barbara J. Howe, "Women in the Nineteenth-Century Preservation Movement," in *Restoring Women's History through Historic Preservation,* eds. Gail Lea Dubrow and Jennifer B. Goodman (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press), 2003: 17-18.

[21] Melinda Young Frye, "Women Pioneers in the Public Museum Movement," in *Women's Changing Roles in Museums: Conference Proceedings, March 16-19, 1986, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC,* ed. Ellen Cochran Hicks (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution), 1986: 11-12.

[22] Norman Tyler, *Historic Preservation: An Introduction to its History, Principles, and Practice* (New York: W.W. Norton and Co.), 2000: 34.

groups in the mid-twentieth century would follow.[23] Even though it was formed more than one-hundred years later, The Friends of the Caleb Pusey House, Inc., in its early stages was primarily an organization of women, working through networks of women's clubs and associations for the purpose of saving an individual landmark building.

The impetus for restoring this particular house stemmed from the emotional response of Mrs. Mary Patterson and Mrs. Sarah Brock, when, on a Chester County Historical Society tour led by architect, Edwin Brumbaugh, they encountered a dilapidated cottage in a neglected neighborhood. Patterson, a self-proclaimed genealogist specializing in Quakers and southeastern Pennsylvania families, as well as a member of the Friends Historical Association, the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, the Genealogical society of Pennsylvania, and both the Chester County and Delaware County Historical Societies, was keenly interested in historic preservation – especially preservation of items related to Quaker families. Patterson and Brock understood the property to be important both as a memento of William Penn's association with the area and as a place where people could come to learn about the larger picture of Quaker and Pennsylvania life, and so resolved to save this small remnant of Pennsylvania's colonial history. [24]

Consequently, on August 15, 1960, Patterson and Brock organized a group of ten people (including one of the four court-appointed trustees of the house, two directors of

---

[23] Howe, 2003: 35-36.

[24] The papers of Mrs. Mary Sullivan Patterson are located in the Friends Historical Library of Swarthmore College and under copyright restrictions. The information I have gathered on Mrs. Patterson was collected from items in the public domain and the F.C.P.H. archives. I have not located an archive of information on Mrs. Sarah Brock.

the Delaware County Historical Society, and a descendent of Caleb Pusey) to undertake the task of raising money, researching, and preserving the building. Of the ten people present at this first meeting of the group soon to be known as the "Friends of the Caleb Pusey House," six were female.[25] The organization begun on that August day quickly grew. On September 21, 1960, a meeting of forty people was held at the home of Sarah, and her husband, Lynmar Brock.[26] One year later, on September 29, 1961, the Friends of the Caleb Pusey House received their charter of incorporation as a non-profit corporation, and began the process of becoming a tax-deductible entity.[27]

A sheet of letterhead belonging to the Friends of the Caleb Pusey House and dated to 1965 – just four short years later – lists five officers for the organization and twenty-four members of the "Directors." Of the twenty-nine total members of the F.C.P.H. board in 1965, fifteen are female. Patterson served as president, historian, and "co-chairman of project," with Brock serving as the other co-chair.[28] The men listed as members of the board appear to be husbands (or otherwise related to the women on the board), and some of them seem to have been chosen for their professional expertise as archaeologists or historians. Evidenced by much of the correspondence and reports held in the Pusey House archives, as well as the authorship of many of the F.C.P.H.

---

[25] Sarah P. Brock and Mary S. Patterson, "Progress Report – October 26, 1960." In folder marked "Reports – 1960." (Friends of the Caleb Pusey House Archives)

[26] Brock and Patterson, "Progress Report – October 26, 1960."

[27] Common Pleas of Delaware County, Pennsylvania, "Re: Incorporation of the Friends of the Caleb Pusey House." Sept. 1961. Copy in folder "Board Meetings – 1961." (Friends of the Caleb Pusey House Archives)

[28] Correspondence from Mary Patterson to John M. Dickey, Dec. 8, 1965. In folder marked "Caleb Pusey House, Architect 1963-66." (Friends of the Caleb Pusey House Archives)

publications, the women of the board played a vital and enduring role in the decision-making during the restoration. They also spearheaded much of the research required for the restoration of the building, as well as various fundraising efforts and the public relations-marketing aspects of the project.

Other women's organizations in the Philadelphia – northern Delaware area supported the Friends of the Caleb Pusey House through their donations of time and money. Three of these groups were the Delaware County Federation of Women's Clubs, the Delaware County Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution, and the Wissahickon Chapter of the Daughters of the American Colonists. To raise awareness of the Caleb Pusey House preservation project and to solicit funding, the F.C.P.H. sent out numerous letters, many of them personally written by Patterson. According to a December 1961 report addressed to "Our Sponsors and Contributors," over 250 letters were sent to the women's clubs of Delaware County, in addition to the traditional all-male Rotary, Kiwanis, and Lions Clubs. Another 1200 personalized letters were sent specifically to "women, many of them with a long-time Pennsylvania background, and traditional interest in old homes."[29] In the report, it also was noted that the Delaware County Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution petitioned 130 of its chapters in the state of Pennsylvania to consider financially assisting the project.[30] While the women of the greater Philadelphia area were canvassed heavily for financial

[29] Sarah Brock and Mary Patterson, "Progress Report #4 – The Friends of the Caleb Pusey House," Dec. 11, 1961. In folder marked "Reports – 1961." (Friends of the Caleb Pusey House Archives)

[30] Brock and Patterson, "Progress Report #4," Dec. 11, 1961.

assistance, the F.C.P.H. appears to have never considered a mailing project specifically targeting men.

Reinforcement of just how active the women of greater Philadelphia were in supporting and funding the restoration of the Caleb Pusey house can be observed in the ephemera left from an event held in 1964. During the afternoon of Wednesday, April 29, a "Caleb Pusey House Benefit" was held in the auditorium of the Strawbridge & Clothier department store in Springfield, Pennsylvania. The benefit was organized entirely by women and featured only women in the program. The ladies held two shows of fashions (one featuring clothing styles from 1699, and another featuring clothing selected from the then current 1964 fashions), performed in a "Concert of Colonial Songs," and were entertained by the puppet show, "Penn at Landingford," staged by the Panther Patrol of the Swarthmore Girl Scout Troop 744. The last page of a program saved from benefit lists 142 "patronesses for the Caleb Pusey House Benefit."[31] The benefit at the Strawbridge & Clothier department store was a great success in promoting the restoration efforts and getting the word out about the Caleb Pusey House, and, in the process, raised about $2,700 for the project, one of the largest lump sums of funding brought in by the F.C.P.H. in the early 1960s.[32]

As was true of many of preservation and restoration projects undertaken by small, private organizations in the 1960s, the primary goal of the Caleb Pusey House project was to rescue a home believed to have connections to a prominent, white,

---

[31] "Benefit for Restoration of Caleb Pusey House, Upland," Apr. 29, 1964. Program. In folder marked "Reports – 1964." (Friends of the Caleb Pusey House Archives)

[32] "Annual Report for 1964," Dec. 1964. In folder marked "Reports – 1964." (Friends of the Caleb Pusey House Archives)

"founding father." From the beginning, Patterson, Brock, and the other charter members of the F.C.P.H. believed the house to be one of the last surviving 17th century, English-style homes in Pennsylvania, the home of a man – Caleb Pusey – who was prominent in the Quaker meeting, and "the only house left in Pennsylvania which had important connections with William Penn."[33] In saving the house from ruin and building it into a museum-park open to the public, the F.C.P.H. hoped to create a patriotic, identity-building, tourist attraction.

To this end, early publications on the Pusey House preservation project voiced notions of "a county park to be laid along the creek, hopefully to bear Caleb Pusey's name," and the area "as a key stop for Pennsylvanians and traveling Americans."[34] Their ambition developed into the desire "to create a local Sturbridge Village."[35] In 1964 and again in 1967, the F.C.P.H. published landscape schematics showing the Caleb Pusey House as the centerpiece of a park-like setting. In addition to restoring the Caleb Pusey House, the sketches revealed plans to restore an early schoolhouse, the Pennock log house (a home reputedly occupied by a descendent of the Puseys), various barns and outbuildings, and the landscape of Landing Ford Plantation – including fields, gardens, and pastures. To fill out the park, the F.C.P.H. planned for numerous amenities to be offered, including a restaurant, multiple parking areas, camping sites, a Quaker meeting

---

[33] Ralph K. Bennett, "Historical Park is Planned Around Caleb Pusey House," *Philadelphia Inquirer,* Feb. 13, 1964. Reprint found in folder marked "Reports – 1964." (Friends of the Caleb Pusey House Archives)

[34] Patterson, 1962: n.p.

[35] Patterson, 1962: n.p.; Patterson, 1964: n.p.

house, a 'colonial market,' and an administration building/museum housing archives and artifacts.[36]

The idea to create an historical district or park was not a new one. In 1926, the Reverend William A. R. Goodwin persuaded John D. Rockefeller, Jr. to purchase the Virginia city of Williamsburg – "the one remaining colonial village any man could buy."[37] Together, they created one of the most significant historic areas in America. Nor was the idea to cobble together structures from different periods and locations entirely unusual. In 1929, Henry Ford created his own historic park, Greenfield Village in Dearborn, Michigan, out of homes and other structures gathered during his travels across the United States.[38]

Along with the plans to create an historical park, came the discussion of using the Caleb Pusey House preservation project to promote urban renewal in the area surrounding the house. Imbedded in the minutes of various board meetings from 1960-1961 are references to use the project as a means of cleaning up the dilapidated (and at times dangerous) Chester Creek landscape in Upland. To this end, the F.C.P.H. worked with a number of local organizations and government agencies, including the Delaware County Park and Recreation Board, the Commissioners of Delaware County, the Redevelopment Authority of Delaware County, the Delaware County Planning

---

[36] Bennett, "Historical Park…" 1964.; Mary S. Patterson, *The Caleb Pusey House and Landingford Plantation: A Restoration in Progress – 1967,* 1967. (Friends of the Caleb Pusey House Archives)

[37] Tyler, 2000: 37-38.

[38] Tyler, 2000: 38-39.

Commission, and the Salvation Army.[39] The Planning Commission evidently recommended the demolition of nearby houses "so that the Caleb Pusey House will be the main feature of a park along Chester Creek."[40]

On May 28, 1964, the newly formed county park and historic site organization, Historic Delaware County, held its first meeting. The members of the F.C.P.H. first envisioned the creation of this separate organization designed for the support of all of Delaware County's historic sites at a November 1963 board meeting. Their goal was to have a group dedicated to coordinating the efforts of all the local historic sites, and promoting the agendas of these sites to the Delaware County government. Once incorporated, Historic Delaware County would work to acquire the land across the Chester Creek from the Caleb Pusey House in order to facilitate the creation of the historic park desired by the F.C.P.H., as well as to acquire two other historic properties, the Morten Mortenson House in Norwood, Pennsylvania, and the Thomas Leiper House in Wallingford, Pennsylvania. To celebrate its first meeting, Historic Delaware County invited Mrs. Helen Duprey Bullock of the National Trust for Historic Preservation in Washington, D.C. – "a real evangelist on saving good early homes" – to tour the Caleb Pusey House and speak to the F.C.P.H., as well as to the public, at the Springfield Township Auditorium.[41]

---

[39] The Salvation Army apparently owned a large amount of the land in the surrounding area.

[40] Sarah Brock and Mary Patterson, Letter dated May 18, 1961. In folder marked, "Reports – 1961." (Friends of the Caleb Pusey House Archive)

[41] "Quarterly Meeting of the Friends of the Caleb Pusey House, Inc.," Apr. 4, 1964. In folder marked, "Board Meetings – 1964." (Friends of the Caleb Pusey House Archives)

One of the major events in historic preservation that may have encouraged the F.C.P.H. to continue with plans to create a major tourist attraction, historical park, and area of urban renewal was the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. Passed by Congress, the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 encouraged the expansion of historic preservation throughout the United States. The act also encouraged local, state, and federal institutions to cooperate with private individuals in preserving historic properties. Before the passage of the act, many local historical societies and preservation groups were disconnected from state and federal resources. This disconnect often kept the historic sites run by these local groups from receiving wider recognition and promotion in both state and national tourism literature, as well as from receiving grants for the arts and funds for encouraging educational programs. In *Historic Preservation*, Tyler writes, "The 1966 Act changed this perspective. Historic preservation became an integral part of society, expanding interest and involvement at a level never previously imagined."[42]

While the F.C.P.H. was on the cutting edge of working with state and federal historic preservation groups, the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 surely encouraged the organization to continue in its plans and to expand its efforts into growing the property and preservation efforts along the Chester Creek. The National Historic Preservation Act seems to have come at a point in time that truly benefited and encouraged the F.C.P.H. It may have renewed hope for much needed funding to complete the restoration of the house and to expand the interpretation of the area to

[42] Tyler, 2000: 45.

include their detailed landscape plan. Patterson wrote in the same publication that introduced the second (1967) landscaping plan:

> We have indication from the National Trust for Historic Preservation and from historians at Harrisburg that the Caleb Pusey House may qualify for funds to be granted by Congress for the preservation of some of the country's historic sites. We trust they will help us re-erect our early mill on Chester Creek, possibly move here an early Quaker Meeting [house].[43]

More than ever before, after the passage of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, the F.C.P.H. (and other small, privately funded organizations like it) found themselves incorporating state and federal assistance into their finances in order to continue their work.

Where did the money come from to finance the project in the first place? A restoration needs funding, and quickly after Patterson and Brock's initial 1960 push to intervene on behalf of the house, work began in earnest to plan the restoration and raise the necessary funds. Much of the money to save and restore the house came through private donations of cash and shares of stock. As noted previously, the F.C.P.H. sent out many rounds of mailings soliciting funds from social clubs and private individuals who had shown interest in supporting history-related projects in the past, as well as descendents of Caleb Pusey, with some success. To supplement the private donations, in 1960 the first memberships into the F.C.P.H. were made available for the suggested price of three dollars for adults and twenty-five cents for schoolchildren.[44] The F.C.P.H. also held covered dish suppers, weekend events, special lectures, and semi-private group tours

---

[43] Patterson, *The Caleb Pusey House and Landingford Plantation: A Restoration in Progress – 1967,* 1967.

[44] Brock and Patterson, "Progress Report – October 26, 1960."

to increase awareness of the house and its needs. Groups like the Delaware County Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution held rummage sales with all earnings earmarked for the Caleb Pusey House restoration, and historical societies and other area preservation groups, like the Delaware County Historical Society, contributed another large portion of the funds necessary for initially saving and researching the house.[45]

Nevertheless, the F.C.P.H. had a grander plan for acquiring the necessary funds beyond that of nickel-and-diming the community. Urged on by representatives from the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, the F.C.P.H. sought out the assistance of the Pennsylvania State Legislature by creating House Bill #137 and Senate Bill #391. These bills petitioned the Legislature to appropriate $35,000 to the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission for use in covering one-half the cost of the restoration of the Caleb Pusey House. The F.C.P.H. would then have the responsibility of raising a matching $35,000 to reach the proposed total cost for restoration of $70,000. Bill #391 passed in the Pennsylvania Senate by a vote of 50-0 in late May-early June of 1961, and the passage of Bill #137 in the House followed close behind.

At its inception, the legislation behind this funding was recognized as precedent setting by contemporaries of the F.C.P.H. In a report dating to 1962, an unnamed spokesperson for the F.C.P.H. writes,

> Dr. S. K. Stevens, executive director of The Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, watched Governor David L. Lawrence sign the bill for the original appropriation, and then released this statement: "The growing movement to restore and preserve historic shrines of Pennsylvania received an important boost with the precedent-setting

[45] "Minutes: Friends of the Caleb Pusey House," Dec. 4, 1960. In folder marked "Board Meetings – 1960." (Friends of the Caleb Pusey House Archives)

> legislation involving the Caleb Pusey House." The cost would be prohibitive if the State were required to restore a house, provide necessary public facilities and then maintain and staff the property with caretakers in perpetuity. He feels The Friends of the Caleb Pusey House will hold the interest at the local level, but since the State is encouraging the tourism industry, it can justify significant financial assistance. The Historical Commission will mark and advertise the house…
>
> The agreement between The Friends of the Caleb Pusey House and the State is that after the house is restored, furnished and opened to the public, it will be maintained by admission fees, annual dues of members, and various activities fostered locally. The Commonwealth is not to be charged with any maintenance expense following the restoration.[46]

In addition to petitioning funds from the Pennsylvania State Legislature strictly for the restoration of the Caleb Pusey House, the F.C.P.H. also sought funding for the other historic buildings and land they wished to acquire for their historic park. The first references to gathering funds from Project 70 appear in the minutes of the 1964 board meetings. Project 70 was a Pennsylvania state appropriation passed in 1963 for use by historic preservation organizations. Project 70 called for an investment of "$40 million for new regional parks near urban areas, $20 million for grants to local governments, and $10 million to provide wildlife areas and hunting and fishing access rights."[47] The F.C.P.H. appealed to the administrators of Project 70, the Bureau of Community Development and the Department of Community Affairs, to set aside a portion of the $40 million appropriation for the development of the F.C.P.H.'s Caleb Pusey-Landingford

---

[46] Friends of the Caleb Pusey House, "The Friends of the Caleb Pusey House, Inc. Request Assistance in Raising the Final $25,000 to Rescue and Restore this Early Settler's Home in Upland, Delaware County, Pennsylvania," 1961: 3-4. (Friends of the Caleb Pusey House Archives)

[47] Delaware Regional Planning Commission, *A Report on Historic Preservation* (Philadelphia: Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission), 1969: 44.

Plantation historic park. The F.C.P.H. felt their park fit into the requirements of the State for a new regional park near an urban area, and they noted, "The new Project 70 of the State could function in the open space around the house, in creating recreational and historical settings."[48]

The funding for the restoration and the park reflects a very interesting aspect of historic preservation in the 1960s. Until the 1960s, private funding wholly subsidized many "private restorations," including historic houses managed by individual corporations – like the Caleb Pusey House, whereas only larger restorations with a perceived statewide or nationwide importance tended to receive public or government appropriations. The F.C.P.H., as a small organization with what was at the time a limited appeal to a larger audience, appears to have been ahead of its time in procuring additional public support for its projects. Applying for government funds and persuading the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission to enter into a financial agreement to match funds, places the F.C.P.H. in the vanguard of what we today consider to common practice in funding restorations by cooperating with local, State, and Federal governments.

Even so, acquiring funds from local, State, and Federal governments had its drawbacks. Apparently, the F.C.P.H. had difficulty in obtaining the money from the Pennsylvania State Legislature after the Legislature approved the appropriation. In a 1964 article written by Patterson for the *Daughters of the American Revolution Magazine*, she notes,

---

[48] "Minutes: Friends of the Caleb Pusey House," Jan. 18, 1964. In folder marked "Board Meetings – 1964." (Friends of the Caleb Pusey House Archives)

> The Friends of the Caleb Pusey House, Inc., formed in August of 1960 had been working steadily since that time to raise $35,000, plus expenses, to save this house. There was an agreement with the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission that efforts would be made to provide a matching sum from the Legislature. The total cost was estimated at $70,000. The local group had already raised $30,000. The State of Pennsylvania, lagging behind, had paid out $4,000 during the Lawrence administration. Governor Scranton had just signed a bill for $10,000 more [in 1962].[49]

The money promised by the Legislature dripped into the F.C.P.H. coffers, and even then, it only dripped when the F.C.P.H. pushed the issue. Ultimately, the F.C.P.H. was unable to acquire funding from Project 70. Therefore, much of the funding for the restoration and park project came from private sources – many of the pocketbooks opened were those of the F.C.P.H. board.

Over the course of the restoration, the F.C.P.H. consulted with many specialists and professional organizations to assist with architectural and archaeological matters. The first architect retained by the organization was W. Nelson Anderson. In 1963, the F.C.P.H. replaced Anderson with another prominent Pennsylvania architect, John Dickey, of the Media, Pennsylvania firm, Price and Dickey. It was Dickey, and his colleague, John Milner, who carried out much of the architectural research and redesign for the restoration. Also consulting on the project were two architects highly recommended by Williamsburg as experts on the period covered by the restoration. The first was Charles E. Peterson, a Fellow of the American Institute of Architects and architect for the restoration of Independence Hall. The second was H. (Henry) Chandlee Forman, who was also a Fellow of the American Institute of Architects as well as an archaeologist, preservationist, and historian.

[49] Patterson, 1964: n.p.

In late 1961-early 1962, Dr. Allen G. Schiek, a dentist by trade as well as president of the Archaeological Society of Delaware and Chairman of the Board of Archaeology for Delaware, offered to conduct an archeological dig in and around the house on weekends. Schiek and his wife, through their connections in the Archeological Society of Delaware, were able to obtain the opinions of numerous specialists during and after the excavations. These specialists included authorities from Colonial Williamsburg, Jamestown, Harrisburg, and the National Park Service. At about this same time, in 1962, Dr. and Mrs. Herbert O. (Josephine) Albrecht became members of the F.C.P.H. They too became involved with consulting on the archaeological work. Dr. Albrecht was chemist with a love for archaeology, and he and his wife, Josephine, were very active in the archaeological excavations in and around the house.[50]

The records and a few photographs created by the archaeologists working on the Caleb Pusey House in the 1960s illustrate the adaptation of techniques mastered during the reconstruction of Colonial Williamsburg in the 1930s and '40s. In the meeting minutes for April 1, 1962, it was recorded,

> Mr. Nelson Anderson had talked with the Williamsburg authorities concerning excavation and had copied their techniques of digging trenches out at an angle from the old walls, both inside and outside. He had already gottn [sic] 3 bushels of assorted nails, pottery, glass, and so on. On[e] early coin was of especial interest. He had found [the] foundation for what was probably one large fireplace in the earliest construction and soot from its flue. Carbon deposits on the walls of other areas show a fire at some time in the past. Cheyney Smith and Mrs. Bewley moved that the architect be authorized to continue with his excavating until he is satisfied that nothing more of value can be uncovered, this early trenching being done to guide future construction.

[50] Mary S. Pusey, "The Board… will meet at the home…" Oct. 1962. In folder marked, "Board Meetings – 1962." (Friends of the Caleb Pusey House Archives); Mary S. Patterson, "Rescuing the Caleb Pusey House: A 1683 Pennsylvania Gem." Sept. 1962. In folder marked, "Report – 1962." (Friends of the Caleb Pusey House Archives)

> Mr. Jesse Pusey concurred with the desirability of this and wondered if some college students might be interested in helping, young people interested in architecture or archaeology. It was felt by everyone that as much research as possible should be done. [51]

The archaeologists, first led by the architect, W. Nelson Anderson, seemed to have used the now highly controversial (and nearly extinct) trenching method – used by Colonial Williamsburg in their earliest archaeological excavations – to uncover large areas of the surrounding yard in search of brick or stone foundations. This technique involved digging in diagonal strips across an area where foundations presumably might be found. The method was desirable in that it uncovered much ground in a short amount of time, thus saving time, money, and effort. Once a foundation was found, the archaeologists marked off a smaller area using the grid system – a very progressive method of notating an excavation, which is still in practice today. Dirt was removed block by block and sifted, often by local schoolchildren whose assistance on the project was encouraged. Throughout the excavation, a daily record was kept and plot maps, drawings of features, and many photographs were made. All of this information is crucial to reconstructing the excavation on paper, as it appears no comprehensive analysis and report covering the entirety of the excavation was ever made. The records are also vital in that they allow future historians to have the ability to reconsider the evidence the F.C.P.H. used to make many of the decisions in restoring the house.

Even though the F.C.P.H. had grand dreams for a Colonial Williamsburg or Sturbridge Village style setting for the Pusey House, they did seem to have practical ideas about restoring the cottage itself. Early on, it seems the F.C.P.H. agreed the house

---

[51] "Minutes – Friends of the Caleb Pusey House," Apr. 1, 1962. In folder marked, "Board Meetings – 1962." (Friends of the Caleb Pusey House)

would be a *restoration* as opposed to a *reconstruction*. According to Norman Tyler, "*Restoration* refers to the process of returning a building to its condition at a specific time period, often its original condition," while "the term *reconstruction* means the building of a historic structure using replicated design and/or materials."[52] The F.C.P.H. actively chose to restore the parts of the building that were extant and those features of the structure they felt had overwhelming architectural or archaeological evidence for prior existence. As documented in letters between the architects and the F.C.P.H., as well as in reports prepared by the archaeologists, parts of the building missing important structural information and having no period documentation were not reconstructed.[53] The group seems to have been guided by the following principle of good restoration practice preached by many historic preservation groups and which is best summed up by Tyler, who writes:

> an original element, even if in poor condition, is preferable to a replicated element. Historical conjecture is especially discouraged. If documentation does not show an original element, then it is generally better to leave it out… Restoration work should not be based on guesses about what a historical element might have been… but should work from actual evidence, even if limited. …Repair or replacement of missing architectural features should be based on accurate duplications of features, substantiated by historic, physical, or pictorial evidence rather than on conjectural designs or the availability of different architectural elements from other buildings or structures.[54]

[52] Tyler, 24-27.

[53] Letters and reports found in "Box 2: Pusey House Daily Records," and folders titled "Caleb Pusey House, Architect 1963-66," and "Caleb Pusey House – 1967-71." (Friends of the Caleb Pusey House Archives)

[54] Tyler, 2000: 25.

The F.C.P.H. put much thought into every phase of the restoration. The various correspondences between the primary architects for most of the project, John Dickey and John Milner, and the F.C.P.H. reveals the thoroughness with which they approached every decision. When questions arose concerning the accuracy of an interpretation or the appropriateness of restoring a particular feature of the house, it appears the F.C.P.H., Dickey, and Milner tried to find precedents in other restorations or in documentary sources, thus resolving the uncertainty to the best of their ability in the 1960s.

The F.C.P.H. used several documents to substantiate what the architects and archaeologists observed in the remains of the building. One document was a page from a journal dating to 1827. In 1827, John Fanning Watson visited Chester, Pennsylvania, keeping a journal as he traveled. During his journey, he stopped by the Caleb Pusey House, then also known as the Richard Townsend house. In his journal, Watson sketched a version of the structure, which included a dormer window in the gambrel roof and no window to the right of the "East Wing" door. Other documents referenced by the F.C.P.H. included additional sketches similar to Watson's 1827 sketch, as well as land maps showing an oddly shaped, two bay structure in the location of the present day house. In the December 10, 1961, board meeting minutes, Watson's sketch and another earlier 1715 floor plan of the house were brought into play during a discussion of restoring the roof:

> In a discussion of whether the present roof lines should be retained in the restoration of the House Mr. Baker mentioned that the Watkins [Watson?] sketch of 1827 shows the roof as it presently is. A 1715 floor plan of the house shows the floor space as it presently stands. It was felt the roof, therefore, must go back at least 200 years and Mr. Baker suggested that the roof remain as it now appears.

> Mr. Nelson Anderson felt that the State would approve the restoration along these lines sincere there is no evidence to the contrary that the present roof does not date to the days of Caleb Pusey…
>
> … Upon a motion by Mr. Baker, seconded by [illegible], it was decided that the roof remain as it is for the time being at least.[55]

When questions arose about restoring a piece of the building not evidenced by the sketches and other documents already in the F.C.P.H.'s knowledge base, the F.C.P.H. sent out members to do more archival research. For example, in July of 1964, a discussion was held at a board meeting as to whether or not a winding staircase should be built in the house. While architectural and archival evidence for a winding staircase ever having been built in the house had not been found up to the date of the meeting, the possibility of finding evidence, and therefore being able to restore a staircase in the building, was not dismissed immediately. Instead, the F.C.P.H. sent out some of its members to do more research at the Chester County Historical Society and in the Morgan Collection at the New York Public Library.[56]

Documents were used not only as evidence for the reconstruction (or rejection) of particular features of the house. Rather, precedents for features only sketchily recovered through archaeology or architectural study were fleshed out using models from other Delaware Valley historic houses. For example, when trying to decide how best to recreate a missing fireplace and bake oven in the house, the F.C.P.H. looked in other

---

[55] "Minutes – Friends of the Caleb Pusey House," Dec. 10, 1961. In folder marked "Board Meetings – 1961." (Friends of the Caleb Pusey House Archives)

[56] "Minutes – Friends of the Caleb Pusey House," July 14, 1964. In folder marked "Board Meetings – 1964." (Friends of the Caleb Pusey House Archives); Apparently, no precedent for a winding staircase in the house was ever found, for there is currently no restored access to the attic area from the interior of the home.

historic homes for similar extant fireplaces that might fit the footprint of the missing fireplace. Writing about this search, Patterson, in a 1962 report notes,

> It is hoped the boys and girls in the Delaware County Public Schools will contribute to restore the early walk-in fireplace, the bake oven, and the chimney above it. We know there was a bake oven for pieces of a pottery pie dish have been found, blackened at the bottom. When this area is restored it should look something like this [referring to a photograph with the text], the 1695 Gilpin home, know as Lafayette's Headquarters at the Brandywine.[57]

Other homes, such as the Sherman Day house in Philadelphia, were used as examples of early construction and interior architectural features.[58]

Perhaps the most complex decision made by the Friends of the Caleb Pusey House was the decision of how *much* of the house to restore. In 1965, archaeological excavations unearthed two additional wings, one of which predates the extant house. While the wings are present in archaeological excavations, they were absent from all the documentary evidence collected by the researchers up to that point.

One of the unreconstructed wings is an archaeologically uncovered "underground room." The Friends of the Pusey House have interpreted these foundations uncovered during the restoration process as the "underground room," possibly used first by the Pusey family as a temporary shelter during their first winter in Pennsylvania before the main house was built. The F.C.P.H. believes the room was later used as a laboratory for chemical experimentation. Their interpretations of the artifacts uncovered in this room, which included a badly melted still for distilling homemade alcohols and ciders, led them

---

[57] Patterson, "Rescuing the Caleb Pusey House: A 1683 Pennsylvania Gem." Sept. 1962.

[58] The Sherman Day house was no longer standing by 1964, the year in which Dickey pointed to similarities between it and the Caleb Pusey house at an F.C.P.H. board meeting. In this particular case, Dickey used photographs of the Sherman Day house, taken before the house was lost, to draw his conclusions.

to believe that the room was abandoned and filled in following an explosion. While more recent research of similar homes in the Delaware Valley area might allow us to believe these foundations indicate the presence of a one-, or possibly two-, story building with a chimneystack placed directly on the ground, the F.C.P.H. did not have access to this sort of information at the time of restoration. Therefore, they seem to have done their best in interpreting the house based purely on what archaeological and architectural evidence, along with documentary research, they had. It is not unreasonable that the F.C.P.H. would refuse to restore (or in this case reconstruct) a feature of the house for which it was felt there was no contemporary precedent.

There is also an absent "west wing addition." Both the archaeological and architectural reports note the existence of a relatively small, square-ish in plan, foundation uncovered during the archaeological excavations in this location. However, correspondence between the architects and the F.C.P.H. reveals a decision against this wing's reconstruction due to lack of information on the space. There is no precedent for this addition in any of the sketches found during the documentary research for the building. There was also not enough archaeological information to indicate the orientation of doorways into the addition or the true function of the space. In the reports, it was speculated the addition might have functioned as a storage area, but also noted that more research and information was needed to make a positive identification. The "west wing addition" was never reconstructed.

In the instance of the underground room, do we have enough detailed information to be able to take a second look at the F.C.P.H.'s interpretation, and perhaps call for its reconstruction? The answer is both yes and no. Because the F.C.P.H. made a conscious

decision to undertake an archaeological process that adhered to the highest standards of archaeology known in the 1960s, we do have access to a large archive of information documenting the excavation of the underground room. From this information, we could attempt a new interpretation of the building. However, the documentation is far from complete. Over time it is possible photographs detailing key features have been lost, misfiled, or were perhaps never taken.[59] Moreover, descriptions once thought to be very straightforward are now cryptic to researchers unfamiliar with the details of the excavations. While we can attempt to posit new interpretations for the space, the inherently destructive nature of the archaeological and restoration processes forces us to the realization that we may never know how accurate our reinterpretations might be. It also allows us greater understanding of why the F.C.P.H. declined to reconstruct the non-extant wings of the building in the first place. As noted before, the F.C.P.H. was devoted to *restoration*, not reconstruction, and, for that matter, restoration based on clear documented evidence or historic precedent. There simply was not enough clear information on the wings to make reconstruction an option for the F.C.P.H.

Even when it came to furnishing the house, the F.C.P.H. was on the cutting edge of research and attempted to 'restore' versus 'recreate.' Instead of cramming the house full of donated objects that might or might not have fit the restoration, the F.C.P.H. planned to create an interior furnishing plan with the assistance of an inventory of Caleb Pusey's goods. The F.C.P.H. also proposed to have Bart Anderson, then the director of the Chester County Historical Society, supervise the furnishing plan and installation. The

[59] Currently a new archivist for the F.C.P.H. is undertaking the task of organizing, re-locating, and cataloging all of the photographs, reports, documents, and ephemera collected by the organization over the last 45 years. Perhaps more information on the archaeological excavations will become known as the archiving project nears completion.

goal was to create an interior for the home that would best illustrate how seventeenth century Pennsylvania Quaker settlers lived.[60] In 1965, the F.C.P.H. sent out a plea for period appropriate furnishings. According to the plea, written by Patterson, the F.C.P.H. planned to furnish the East Room as it might have looked when Thomas Storey and William Penn visited the house in 1699. A list of desired furnishings was compiled using Caleb Pusey's probate inventory from 1727, and the probate inventories of Pusey's friends and neighbors. Funds for acquiring the furnishings were provided by the Welcome Society, an organization dedicated to the memory and history of the settlers who came to Pennsylvania aboard the *Welcome* in 1682, and by private donations.[61] Over the years, a number of the household items and pieces of furniture requested to meet the furnishing plan, or items with a history of having been owned or used by the Pusey family, have been donated to the F.C.P.H.

The physical restoration of the Caleb Pusey House was considered precedent setting even by contemporaries. In 1965, the minutes of an F.C.P.H. board meeting record that John Dickey's assistant architect for the project, John Milner, was asked by the National Trust and the Historic American Buildings Survey to prepare a comprehensive report on the restoration. The Historic American Buildings Survey desired to use and publish this report on the restoration as a case study for the proper

[60] Friends of the Caleb Pusey House, "Letter to Mr. Foster," Feb. 5, 1962. In folder marked "Board Meetings – 1962." (Friends of the Caleb Pusey House Archives)

[61] "Furniture Sought for 1683 Caleb Pusey House in Pennsylvania," Aug. 21, 1965. In folder marked "Reports – 1965." (Friends of the Caleb Pusey House Archives)

restoration of early colonial American buildings.[62] In addition, in November 1965, the F.C.P.H. was awarded the American Association for State and Local History's citation for outstanding work on the Caleb Pusey House restoration.[63] In 1971, the Caleb Pusey House was accepted for listing on the National Park Service's National Register of Historic Places, and in 1976, the Pusey-Crozer Mill Historic District surrounding the Caleb Pusey House was granted the same honor.

Conclusion

In 1959, Christopher Crittenden, then Director of the North Carolina State Department of Archives and History as well as trustee of the National Trust, said in a speech later reprinted in the National Trust's publication, *Historic Preservation*,

> What is the primary purpose of a historic sites program? You may not agree, but to me the one purpose that should stand far above all others is simply to teach our people their history, to make them cognizant and appreciative of the heritage that is theirs.[64]

From its inception, the Friends of the Caleb Pusey House, Inc. was an organization first and foremost devoted to teaching the people of Delaware County and beyond about their Quaker heritage and to helping them understand and appreciate life in early Pennsylvania. In striving to reach this goal, the F.C.P.H. has amassed a great amount of information teaching us not only about early Pennsylvania, but about the historic

---

[62] "Minutes – The Friends of the Caleb Pusey House," Apr. 9, 1965. In folder marked "Board Meetings – 1965." (Friends of the Caleb Pusey House Archives)

[63] Patterson, *The Caleb Pusey House and Landingford Plantation: A Restoration in Progress – 1967,* 1967.

[64] Christopher Crittenden, "Historic Sites – A Few Problems and Pitfalls," in *Historic Preservation,* Vol. 11, No. 1 (Washington D.C.: National Trust for Historic Preservation), 1959: 25.

preservation movement in the mid-twentieth century as well. The documents from F.C.P.H. meetings, annual reports, letters for donors and members, and publications on the events that occurred during the restoration of the Caleb Pusey House in the 1960s shed light on the trials and triumphs of small historic preservation organizations during the rapid expansion of the historic preservation movement in the United States.

The post-World War II era of historic preservation focused on "nurturing the grass roots and assisting communities with the preservation of physical structures, objects, and settings that tell the story of our collective experience."[65] It was also a time of rapid growth in the heritage tourism industry, as by 1959, more than 60 million people annually took to the roads and visited historic sites in order to commune with the memory of the American past.[66] The Caleb Pusey House and the organization that fought for its preservation and restoration, the Friends of the Caleb Pusey House, Inc., offer an intriguing look back at the process of historic preservation and the state of the movement in the 1960s.

The grand plans ushered in by the era of the 1966 Historic Preservation Act waned for the F.C.P.H. as the realities of funding and decreased visitation set in, as is the case for many of today's historic house museums. Today, the Caleb Pusey House, itself, is fully restored and opened to the public. The first floor of the neighboring Crozer-era schoolhouse serves as a meeting room and gallery space, while the second floor is the repository for various artifacts and the F.C.P.H. archives. However, there is no Colonial

---

[65] Diane Lea, "America's Preservation Ethos: A Tribute to Enduring Ideals," in *A Richer Heritage: Historic Preservation in the Twenty-first Century* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press), 2003: 1.

[66] Crittenden, 1959: 23.

Williamsburg or Old Sturbridge Village-esque museum-park, like the one proposed by the F.C.P.H. in the 1960s. Plans to bring in additional historic buildings to the site have also been placed on the back burner. The Caleb Pusey House is only open to the public on Saturday and Sunday afternoons from May to October, and is also open for school field trips and other special events by appointment. When the house is open, volunteers, all of whom give generously of their time, staff it. While it is not the huge tourist-destination or educational park envisioned by Mary Patterson and the original board members of the F.C.P.H., the Caleb Pusey House is nevertheless an important and educationally active site dedicated to serving the surrounding community. The F.C.P.H. is successful in that it has managed to save a piece of history, which would have been lost without intervention, and to present that piece history within the bigger picture of early Quaker life in Pennsylvania.

What will be the fate of small historic house museums and preservation associations, like the Caleb Pusey House and the F.C.P.H.? As mentioned, decreased visitation and funding is plaguing most, if not all, of the small historic house museums created during the boom of the historic preservation movement in the mid-twentieth century. Is there some way to bring back the visitor? Will there be new ways of finding funding, in addition to local, state, federal, and private grants? As the ongoing professionalization of the historic preservation and museum field continues, will small historic houses have difficulty finding both volunteers and the funding to pay professionals to restore their buildings and staff their projects? Women are increasingly looking outside of the home for work, and the nineteenth and early-twentieth century world of ladies' organizations and clubs is on the decline as women seek new social

outlets in the twenty-first century. Does this mean there will be no more Mary Pattersons, Sarah Brocks, and Josephine Albrechts, who will step up to form organizations for the purpose of saving our local, state and national history? With new revolutions in research and methodology – such as the ability to do archival research, conduct a non-invasive archaeological "excavation," and simulate an architectural restoration, all using computers – will full-blown rescue, research, and restoration efforts, like the Caleb Pusey House project undertaken by the F.C.P.H., become a thing of the past?

Knowing the history of both the historic preservation movement and groups like the F.C.P.H. helps us to understand where we have been and where the preservation movement might be headed in the future. As architects, archaeologists, museum professionals, historians, and the general public enter into the historic preservation movement of the twenty-first century, they would do well to remember the foundation laid by those who came before them. It may seem easy to pass judgment on these groups – saying their methods were uninformed, their reconstructions inaccurate, and their interpretations antiquated. However, we must remember that, for the period, the decisions made by groups like the F.C.P.H. were not uninformed, inaccurate, or antiquated. Instead, they upheld the highest standards known during the mid-twentieth century, and they were on the cutting edge of research, fundraising, and decision-making concerning authenticity and historical accuracy. Without the trial and error, as well as the successes of small historic preservation groups like the F.C.P.H., the historic preservation movement would not be as strong as it is today.

APPENDIX

Figure 1: The Caleb Pusey House as it appears in 2006.
Photograph by the author.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Albrecht, Josephine F. "Penn's Mill and its 'Keeper' at Landing Ford Plantation in Upland, Pennsylvania," in the *Bulletin of the Archaeological Society of Delaware.* Fall, No. 7. Wilmington: The Archaeological Society of Delaware, 1969.

---. *A Visit to the Pusey House*, no date. Friends of the Caleb Pusey House Archives

"Benefit for Restoration of Caleb Pusey House, Upland," Apr. 29, 1964. Program. In folder marked "Reports – 1964." (Friends of the Caleb Pusey House Archives)

Bennett, Ralph K. "Historical Park is Planned Around Caleb Pusey House," *Philadelphia Inquirer*, Feb. 13, 1964. Reprint found in folder marked "Reports – 1964." (Friends of the Caleb Pusey House Archives)

Brock, Sarah P. and Mary S. Patterson, "Progress Report – October 26, 1960." In folder marked "Reports – 1960." (Friends of the Caleb Pusey House Archives)

---. Letter dated May 18, 1961. In folder marked, "Reports – 1961." (Friends of the Caleb Pusey House Archives)

---. "Progress Report #4 – The Friends of the Caleb Pusey House," Dec. 11, 1961. In folder marked "Reports – 1961." (Friends of the Caleb Pusey House Archives)

Common Pleas of Delaware County, Pennsylvania, "Re: Incorporation of the Friends of the Caleb Pusey House." Sept. 1961. Copy in folder "Board Meetings – 1961." (Friends of the Caleb Pusey House Archives)

Crittenden, Christopher. "Historic Sites – A Few Problems and Pitfalls," in *Historic Preservation*, Vol. 11, No. 1. Washington D.C.: National Trust for Historic Preservation, 1959.

Delaware Regional Planning Commission. *A Report on Historic Preservation.* Philadelphia: Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission, 1969.

Dubrow, Gail Lee and Jennifer B. Goodman, eds. *Restoring Women's History through Historic Preservation.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003.

Friends of the Caleb Pusey House, Inc. "Minutes: Friends of the Caleb Pusey House," Dec. 4, 1960. In folder marked "Board Meetings – 1960." (Friends of the Caleb Pusey House Archives)

---. "The Friends of the Caleb Pusey House, Inc. Request Assistance in Raising the Final $25,000 to Rescue and Restore this Early Settler's Home in Upland, Delaware County, Pennsylvania," 1961. (Friends of the Caleb Pusey House Archives)

---. "Minutes – Friends of the Caleb Pusey House," Dec. 10, 1961. In folder marked "Board Meetings – 1961." (Friends of the Caleb Pusey House Archives)

---. "Letter to Mr. Foster," Feb. 5, 1962. In folder marked "Board Meetings – 1962." (Friends of the Caleb Pusey House Archives)

---. "Minutes – Friends of the Caleb Pusey House," Apr. 1, 1962. In folder marked, "Board Meetings – 1962." (Friends of the Caleb Pusey House Archives)

---. "Minutes: Friends of the Caleb Pusey House," Jan. 18, 1964. In folder marked "Board Meetings – 1964." (Friends of the Caleb Pusey House Archives)

---. "Quarterly Meeting of the Friends of the Caleb Pusey House, Inc.," Apr. 4, 1964. In folder marked, "Board Meetings – 1964." (Friends of the Caleb Pusey House Archives)

---. "Minutes – Friends of the Caleb Pusey House," July 14, 1964. In folder marked "Board Meetings – 1964." (Friends of the Caleb Pusey House Archives)

---. "Annual Report for 1964," Dec. 1964. In folder marked "Reports – 1964." (Friends of the Caleb Pusey House Archives)

---. "Minutes – The Friends of the Caleb Pusey House," Apr. 9, 1965. In folder marked "Board Meetings – 1965." (Friends of the Caleb Pusey House Archives)

---. "Furniture Sought for 1683 Caleb Pusey House in Pennsylvania," Aug. 21, 1965. In folder marked "Reports – 1965." (Friends of the Caleb Pusey House Archives)

---. Letters and reports found in "Box 2: Pusey House Daily Records," and folders titled "Caleb Pusey House, Architect 1963-66," and "Caleb Pusey House – 1967-71." (Friends of the Caleb Pusey House Archives)

Glass, James A. *The Beginnings of A New National Historic Preservation Program, 1957-1969.* Nashville: American Association for State and Local History, 1990.

Hicks, Ellen Cochran, ed. *Women's Changing Roles in Museums: Conference Proceedings, March 16-19, 1986, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC.* Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution, 1986.

Lea, Diane. "America's Preservation Ethos: A Tribute to Enduring Ideals," in *A Richer Heritage: Historic Preservation in the Twenty-first Century*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003.

Lowenthal, David, and Marcus Binney, eds. *Our Past Before Us: Why Do We Save It?* London: Maurice Temple Smith Ltd., 1981.

Mulloy, Elizabeth D. *The History of the National Trust for Historic Preservation, 1963-1973*. Washington, D.C.: The Preservation Press – National Trust for Historic Preservation in the United States, 1976.

Murtagh, William J. *Keeping Time: The History and Theory of Preservation in America.* Pittstown, NJ: The Main Street Press, 1988.

Patterson, Mary S. "Saving a Seventeenth Century Pennsylvania Home," reprint from *The Germantowne Crier*. Pennsylvania: Germantown Historical Society, Sept. 1962.

---. "Rescuing the Caleb Pusey House: A 1683 Pennsylvania Gem." Sept. 1962. In folder marked, "Report – 1962." (Friends of the Caleb Pusey House Archives)

---. "Escaping Pitfalls in Early Pennsylvania Restoration," reprint from the *Daughters of the American Revolution Magazine*, March 1964.

---. Correspondence to John M. Dickey, Dec. 8, 1965. In folder marked "Caleb Pusey House, Architect 1963-66." (Friends of the Caleb Pusey House Archives)

---. *The Caleb Pusey House and Landingford Plantation: A Restoration in Progress – 1967,* 1967. (Friends of the Caleb Pusey House Archives)

Pusey, Mary S. "The Board… will meet at the home…" Oct. 1962. In folder marked, "Board Meetings – 1962." (Friends of the Caleb Pusey House Archives)

Rath, Jr., Frederick L. and Merrilyn Rogers O'Connell. *Guide to Historic Preservation, Historical Agencies, and Museum Practices: A Selective Bibliography.* Cooperstown: New York State Historical Association, 1970.

Tyler, Norman. *Historic Preservation: An Introduction to its History, Principles, and Practice.* New York: W.W. Norton and Co., 2000.