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I. Introduction

Lockefield Gardens was a 1936 Public Works Administration (PWA) housing project for Indianapolis African Americans. It was used as a model for other federal housing projects throughout the country. The project met high standards for design, quality of construction and landscaping. A significant feature was the use of open space to suggest a pastoral environment in a large city. Lockefield Gardens’ buildings were arranged about a central grassy mall and the structures shielded noise and activity from the outside. It is this unusual formation that helped render Lockefield Gardens such a special place. Since the arrangement of the structures was so important, it helped frame the historic preservation battles over the property. It was seemingly an all or nothing proposition: Total retention (and rehabilitation) or total destruction of Lockefield Gardens. However, in 1983, nearly 80% of the structures were demolished.

This paper will analyze the Lockefield Gardens historic preservation debate. A review of New Deal architecture and historic preservation will help set the stage. A historic and descriptive overview of Lockefield Gardens will provide a sense of the place. The events of 1975 – 1985, the time period of the Lockefield Gardens preservation debate, will be examined. The paper will also consider the theory of §106 National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) review and the practical politics of preservation. Lastly, the paper will offer the lessons of Lockefield Gardens in an effort to help improve historic preservation efforts in the future.
II. New Deal Architecture and Historic Preservation

The New Deal was a 1932 presidential campaign promise offered by Franklin Delano Roosevelt (FDR). The promise was rooted in the notion that the American people needed a New Deal with their government to respond to the Great Depression. FDR declared:

> Throughout the Nation men and women, forgotten in the political philosophy of government, look to us here for guidance and for more equitable opportunity to share in the distribution of national wealth…. I pledge myself to a new deal for the American people.¹

Following his election, FDR promptly undertook a series of domestic programs between 1933 and 1938, by legislation and executive order. FDR’s New Deal promoted “Relief, Recovery, and Reform.”²

The PWA³ organized and provided funds for government buildings, airports, hospitals, schools, roads, bridges, and dams. From 1933 to 1935, the PWA spent $3.3 billion with private architectural, engineering, and construction firms. The Civilian Conservation Corps. (CCC) built schools, roads, and engaged in reforestation. The Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) transformed much of the central south with hydropower dam construction and collateral community development projects. Later, the Works Progress Administration (WPA) directly employed unemployed Americans to build hospitals, schools, roads, dams, bridges, parks, and playgrounds. By 1940, America’s architectural landscape had been radically improved by the New Deal.

FDR delivered upon his campaign promise and thus provided the foundation for America’s returning World War II servicemen to build the great middle class. That middle class relied on the roads, bridges, schools, hospitals, dams, parks and playgrounds created by the New
Deal’s alphabet governmental agencies. For many post World War II Americans, much of the New Deal work and its legacy were taken for granted.

Federal regulations governing National Register eligibility provide that a structure cannot be considered for the National Register of Historic Places until after a half century. Although the National Register grants eligibility to resources of “exceptional importance”, early on in the preservation movement, New Deal architecture was not appreciated.

Fortunately, many in the historic preservation community ultimately embraced New Deal architecture. Interestingly, most recognition came after the half century mark was passed. In fact, by 1998, a group was organized to promote the identification, documentation, and preservation of New Deal projects. The group is known as the National New Deal Preservation Association and maintains a very vibrant organization. Today, many view the New Deal as more than just buildings, but a new social contract that must be guarded. The New Deal was clearly the result of the combination of intelligent and inspired leadership at the top and public discourse, enormous activism and unparalleled creativity in the grassroots.

For the record, however, some in the architectural community see New Deal architecture as bland. One writer complained that New Deal classical elements had been relegated to only the most important features, such as the entry surround, a light fixture, or a railing. The writer found such features dry and devoid of spark. In his view, New Deal or starved classism was merely the last gasp of classism, before World War II and the acceptance of modernism. In Lockefield Gardens’ circumstance, perhaps this bias against bland buildings may have been a factor. But New Deal architecture was much more than mere bricks and mortar. It involved the blood, sweat, and tears of the New Deal people. Consequently, New Deal preservation and its study may have deeper roots than most historic preservation studies.
Quite necessarily, the review of the historic preservation efforts of this FDR housing project will be conducted in context of the basic fundamental principles underlying the New Deal: A commitment to inclusion and diversity of ideas. However, at that time, FDR’s administration also had to deal with the constitutional reality of the “separate, but equal” law. Of the fifty-two New Deal housing projects, nineteen were specifically designated for African Americans. Today, only ten of the nineteen black projects remain open as public housing. As will be discussed below, much has changed over the last fifty years in public housing and in historic preservation.

III. Historical and Descriptive Overview of Lockefield Gardens

Indianapolis, Indiana, elected a Ku Klux Klansman as Mayor in 1926. Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka,6 wherein the United States Supreme Court finally ruled that segregated public schools were unconstitutional, was still years away. Indianapolis neighborhoods were completely segregated. For fifty years, the African American population of Indianapolis was largely located in the near northwest side, on Indiana Avenue.

In 1925, the Indianapolis School Board was controlled by the Ku Klux Klan and voted to construct a new segregated public high school for African Americans. The NAACP filed suit to block the construction on the grounds that the black students would not receive an equal education as the white students. However, the legal fiction of “separate but equal” prevailed. The School Board7 wanted to name the school Thomas Jefferson High; the black community lobbied for an African American historical figure. The School Board allowed the school to be named for Crispus Attucks, a martyr at the Boston Massacre and a free black man.8 Crispus Attucks High School opened on West Street in 1927. Due to a rising black population,9 the
school immediately had 350 students more than its capacity. This predictable trend of lack of space and sufficient facilities would continue for decades.

Southwest of the new Crispus Attucks High School was an area of urban blight. This African American ghetto was bounded by Indiana Avenue on the north, Blake Street on the east, North Street on the south and Locke Street on the west. Reportedly, there were 363 homes in this area in the early 1930s and only one was habitable. Outhouses and well pumps were still the order of the day in this densely populated area located within one mile of the Monument Circle. This became the site for Lockefield Gardens, an apartment complex that was a PWA project built between 1933 and 1936. For many years, Lockefield Gardens and Crispus Attucks served as the two anchors of the Indianapolis African American community.

Jim Crow was a pejorative expression for blacks that arose in the 1830s. By 1900, Jim Crow Laws referred to de jure (by the law) segregation of blacks. As previously noted, FDR and the New Dealers were forced to accept the Jim Crow status quo as they battled back against perhaps a greater foe, the Great Depression.

While the PWA contractors cleared the Lockefield Gardens area of the existing slums and provided work to the unemployed, the PWA was selecting outstanding architects and contractors to design and build an outstanding public housing project.

Merritt Harrison was a 1906 graduate of Indianapolis Manual High School, and a 1911 graduate of the Cornell University School of Architecture. Harrison designed and built many beautiful homes, schools, churches and community centers. In fact, in 1927, Harrison designed and built Crispus Attucks High School. Later, Harrison teamed with an Ohio architect, William Carl Russ, a graduate of Columbia University. Together, Harrison and Russ were to design many of the great public and private buildings in Indianapolis. Thus, in 1934, they were selected
to design and build Lockefield Gardens. In 1935, they built the State Fair Coliseum, a $1 million project that is still considered an outstanding work of Hoosier architecture. Merritt Harrison was the “Dean of Indiana Architects”\textsuperscript{12} when he died in 1973.

The Lockefield Gardens construction firm was N.P. Severin and Company. That company was founded by Swedish born Nils P. Severin in Chicago in 1890, where he became quite successful in the construction of large structures, including a significant number of substantial churches. By the 1930s, N.P. Severin and Company was constructing federal projects, such as post offices, throughout the Midwest. Thus, the federal government selected an excellent construction team to build Lockefield Gardens.

Construction at Lockefield Gardens began in 1934 and it was estimated that a total of 9,000 jobs were created in the process.\textsuperscript{13} A total of $3 million was devoted for the creation of modern low cost public housing. The PWA started fifty-two such housing projects in twenty states. The Indianapolis goal was to create 748 new housing units on the twenty urban acres that had suffered nearly complete blight.

Both President Franklin D. Roosevelt and Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes, who oversaw the PWA, were committed to proper housing. One of the guiding principles of the New Deal was to improve the physical environment of poor citizens. They firmly believed that if the physical environment improved, it would improve quality of life and increase chances for future success. It was a grand notion that would help develop the great American middle class.

The Lockefield Gardens project took its name from Locke Street. That was the western boundary of the project. (Locke Street has since been relocated through the project and renamed University Boulevard.) The street was originally named for City Councilor Eric Locke, who represented the area in the 1860s and 1870s. “Field” was added to emphasize the openness of
the space and to help promote a serene setting.\(^\text{14}\) “Gardens” was added as a likely tip of the hat to the notions of Ebenezer Howard and his vision of the utopian “Garden Cities of Tomorrow”.\(^\text{15}\) However, tenants did in fact maintain gardens at Lockefield to help families subsist.

Lockefield Gardens’ twenty-four International Style reinforced concrete buildings had brick exterior walls. The brick colors were primarily cream with trim of buff/pink. The buff/pink brick was utilized to emphasize lines and outline features such as doorways. The bricks were laid in an English bond pattern. Fifteen of the buildings were chevron shaped and were three stories with a fourth story section attached. They were sited obliquely to provide sunlight. At the northeast corner of Blake Street and Indiana Avenue was the commercial area. This one and two story wing was composed of the same construction materials, but gives the feel of more Art Deco or Art Moderne.

Both chronologically (1920s – 30s) and stylistically, Art Deco and Art Moderne overlap.\(^\text{16}\) Architectural historians think of Art Moderne as sleek and mechanic, while Art Deco is more chic and organic. Clearly, the sturdy steel windows and doors, the straight functional lines of the Lockefield Gardens apartments give that classic International Style impression of stern mechanical certainty. However, Lockefield Gardens’ commercial wing gives the impression of whimsy as highly decorative pilasters of brick help frame the fourteen window fronts as the wing slowly curves. It is the curve itself that also differentiates the space from the strong rectangular lines of the International Style apartment buildings. The green space currently in front of the commercial wing also helps give the space a less than pure functional European sense.

Architectural historians link Lockefield Gardens to Walter Gropius and the New Objectivity architecture which emerged in German speaking areas of Europe in the 1920s and
This new architecture called for social housing characterized by flat roofs, irregular, asymmetrical plans, with houses arranged in south facing terraces with generous windows. Much of the writings concerning the architectural significance of Lockefield Gardens focus upon these International Style features.

The Harrison and Russ complex was self contained and had a central mall, playgrounds, a grade school and a small shopping arcade. Local landscape architect Lawrence V. Sheridan planted red oaks in the delightful courtyard. The apartments featured plenty of healthful attributes – good ventilation, natural sunlight and pleasant views. The buildings were extremely well made and a strong sense of place emerged within the proud black tenant community.

The Lockefield Gardens project officially opened in February, 1938. Rents ranged from $20.80 to $30.10 per month. Lionel F. Artis was selected to manage the project, a position he held for over thirty years. Artis was born in Paris, Illinois, and came to Indianapolis at an early age. A well educated (University of Chicago) man, Artis ran Lockefield Gardens like he was the family patriarch. Among the shops in Lockefield Gardens was a clothing store operated by Lionel’s mother. Mr. Artis kept Lockefield clean, crime free and fostered a deep sense of pride in the community. It was a village that helped raise many children.

Lionel Artis was a founding member of Flanner House Community, the Indianapolis Urban League, the Alpha Home for the Aging and the Mayor’s Race Relations Committee. Before his passing in 1971, Artis was honored by numerous organizations. Studying Lockefield Gardens, one gets the great sense that one cannot separate the structures’ bricks and mortar, from the blood, sweat and tears of Lionel F. Artis.

Lockefield Gardens functioned as an all black public housing facility until 1976, when it closed. By that time, Lionel Artis had been dead five years and much had changed in the
Indianapolis racial environment. In 1969, the year Artis retired from Lockefield, Indiana Avenue suffered race riots that lasted for three days. Thus, in June, 1969, Indiana Avenue was literally aflame with racial anger. The white-owned businesses of the Lockefield Gardens commercial block were looted and burned.\textsuperscript{21} Indianapolis race relations were at an all time low.

In 1968, the U.S. Department of Justice filed suit against the Indianapolis Public Schools (IPS) to enforce desegregation of public schools. In July, 1971, the federal court found IPS guilty of de jure segregation. The federal court undertook many actions, the most notable being school busing to achieve integration. As part of the controversy, the federal Judge S. Hugh Dillin found that governmental housing also contributed to racial segregation.\textsuperscript{22}

By 1973, Lockefield Gardens was thirty-five years old and in need of substantive repair and significant maintenance. The Department of Housing and Urban Development had funding in place for the repairs. The still segregated black families began moving out. By 1976, Lockefield Gardens was empty and ready for renovation. However, Judge Dillin blocked renovation because Lockefield Gardens had been designed specifically to isolate blacks into this northwest corner of Indianapolis. Dillin reasoned that renovation of Lockefield Gardens could only help continue this unconstitutional pattern of segregation. Thus, from 1976 through 1983, Lockefield Gardens sat abandoned and silent while a whirlwind developed around it.

Interestingly, by 1975, Lockefield Gardens now rested in the path of progress. What had been a black ghetto in the early 1930s was now at the crossroads of future lucrative economic opportunities. The City of Indianapolis, Wishard Memorial Hospital, Indiana University – Purdue University of Indianapolis (“IUPUI”), now had Lockefield Gardens in their development path.
On June 20, 1980, the City and a portion of the community reached an accord for the redevelopment of Indiana Avenue. They agreed to a King Solomon solution, demolishing much of Lockefield Gardens. The interesting accord called for the demolition of the west buildings of Lockefield Gardens and the renovation of a small number of the east buildings. Demolishing the west buildings would destroy the site arrangement that was an all important character defining feature. However, it allowed IUPUI and Wishard Hospital to expand across Locke Street and to run a new north/south street, University Boulevard, on top of where the west Lockefield Gardens buildings had been.

On February 28, 1982, the Indianapolis Historic Preservation Commission adopted a “Historic Area Preservation Plan” for Lockefield Gardens that accepted the destruction of the abandoned buildings. Despite strong opposition from some in the preservation and black communities, the Lockefield Gardens demolition occurred in 1983. In 1985, the few Lockefield Gardens buildings that survived were placed on the National Register of Historic Places. The areas of significance were politics/government; architecture; and social history. The evaluation criteria was A (association with significant events and patterns of history); C (significant architectural design or engineering structure).

The Sexton Companies was selected to redevelop and manage the Lockefield Gardens area. Sexton began in Indianapolis as a developer of apartment communities. Sexton remodeled the surviving Lockefield Gardens apartments and developed eleven new structures during the period of 1985 – 1988. Upon completion, there were a total of 493 units, with 199 of the total being in the original seven structures (of twenty-one original buildings). Lockefield Gardens now primarily serves the IUPUI Campus, although young urban professionals reside there as well.
According to the most recent data, the Lockefield Gardens area is now 65% white and blacks represent a small share of the population behind Asians. The demographics throughout confirm that Lockefield Gardens has become gentrified with University students and young faculty. Thus, Lockefield Gardens has all but lost its African American character. Fortunately, the other anchor in the black community, Attucks High School, still holds tight.

Due to declining enrollment from 1986 to 2006, Crispus Attucks served as a junior high school, then a middle school. However, in 2006, Attucks opened as a medical magnet high school in hopes of capitalizing on its location near Wishard Memorial Hospital and other hospitals in the area.

In 1986, Crispus Attucks High School was placed on the National Register of Historic Places. The Crispus Attucks Museum is housed at the Attucks Medical Magnet High School and it proudly celebrates the history of the first all black high school in Indiana. The Museum is located at 1140 Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Street and exhibits memorabilia of the entire Indianapolis African American Community.

One corner of the Crispus Attucks Museum is devoted to the Lockefield Gardens. The miniature mock up of the proposed PWA building project is preserved here, along with copies of early Lockefield Gardens rental agreements and payment cards. Leaning against the wall is the bronze plaque from the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works and the United States Housing Authority. The marker was no doubt stripped from the demolished Lockefield Gardens buildings.

Thus, while Crispus Attucks High School celebrates its black heritage, Lockefield Gardens has all but lost its African American roots. Some of the fine International Style architecture is still there standing as a silent monument to FDR and his New Dealers. However,
there is no signage or other memorialization of the Jim Crow origins of Lockefield Gardens, or more importantly, the lively black community that once thrived there. These now sterile, but sturdy, surviving International Style monuments recall nothing and thus do not protect us from our past. Therefore, we may be doomed to repeat it.
Lockefield Gardens, Indianapolis, Indiana
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In April, 1975, Christopher Owens of Historic Landmarks Foundation of Indiana (HLFI, now known as Indiana Landmarks) advised the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) that Lockefield Gardens appeared to meet the criteria for inclusion on the National Register. The ACHP contacted the Indianapolis HUD Office, who in turn contacted the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), Joseph Cloud. Mr. Cloud strictly applied the fifty-year rule and on July 14, 1975, determined that Lockefield Gardens was not eligible for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places. As Mr. Cloud would note later:

Although the buildings were well constructed, the architecture of the individual buildings is not outstanding or unique. Its notable feature is the arrangement of the buildings. There is an honest difference of opinion among preservationists and historical architects in the state regarding the significance of Lockefield Gardens. While some would like to see it preserved, others sincerely doubt the exceptional value placed on it by the National Register. In view of such doubts, it is hard for the State Historic Preservation Officer to believe that it is of such outstanding merit to justify ignoring the fifty-year rule.27

Joseph Cloud was a Republican and former member of the Indiana House of Representatives. Cloud served his Richmond, Indiana, House District from 1961 – 1972. When Indiana House Speaker, Otis Bowen, M.D., became Governor, Bowen appointed Cloud to head the Department of Natural Resources (DNR). Joe Cloud was well liked by members of the Indiana General Assembly. That personal fondness by legislators helped increase funding for DNR. The Divisions of State Parks and Reservoirs made great strides under Cloud’s leadership. James Ridenour, who succeeded Cloud as DNR Director, opined that during Cloud’s eight years
as DNR Director, he restored the grandeur of the state park system. Speaking of Cloud, who died in 1987, Ridenour also noted:

He had a keen sense of the political climate and knew what he wanted to accomplish and did it.28

This decision by the SHPO set the tone for the entire lengthy preservation battle that followed. SHPOs were the creation of the NHPA of 1966. One of the prime functions for the SHPO was to identify and nominate eligible properties for the National Register. From a common sense perspective, one would assume that SHPO would be somewhat prone to preserve historic properties. However, Mr. Cloud pointed out the diversity of opinion within the historic preservation community on Lockefield Gardens.

Thus, the ACHP had two conflicting opinions from the historic preservation community. The opinion of HLFI was the property was exceptional and important and thus, the fifty-year rule did not apply. While in the eyes of the politically appointed SHPO, the fifty-year rule provided a complete bar. Thus, was this a clash between historic preservation and politics? Perhaps, but not necessarily.

Under the applicable procedures, the ACHP requested a determination of eligibility from the Keeper of the National Register of the Department of Interior. The Keeper of the National Register is the deciding authority on questions of eligibility. Thus, the Secretary of the Interior, another political appointee, would have final say on the subject. However, final say is somewhat hollow in the §106 review process.

On March 19, 1976, the Department of the Interior’s Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation determined that Lockefield Gardens was eligible for inclusion on the National Register, even though the property was only forty years old. This decision was questioned by
many for its practical effect. While this would not necessarily block Lockefield Gardens’ complete demolition, it could certainly slow things down and help force a compromise.

The City had long determined that demolition of Lockefield Gardens was the only answer to what Mayor William Hudnut perceived as a “cancerous blight” in a critical link between a developing IUPUI Campus and a rebounding Indianapolis downtown area.

IUPUI was established as a partnership between those universities, with Indiana University (IU) acting as the managing partner and Purdue University the more silent partner. The concept arose from a joint venture by IU and Purdue in Fort Wayne, Indiana, in 1958. IU had an undergraduate extension center in Indianapolis since 1916. Purdue opened an extension in Indianapolis in 1946. However, IU Medical School was established in 1911 and its location served as the central focus for IUPUI’s developing campus.

Today, IUPUI totals over 30,000 students and over 2,000 faculty members. The campus spreads over 509 acres. Prior to 1969, IU and Purdue had extension facilities at various locations throughout Indianapolis. Thus, after the IUPUI merger, consolidation of programs and the development of a true college-like campus became a priority. Therefore, IUPUI became a major player in the Lockefield Gardens debate.

By October 7, 1976, despite Lockefield Gardens’ declared historic status, the Indianapolis HUD Office proposed, on the City’s behalf, demolition of Lockefield Gardens and asked for the ACHP’s comments. HUD’s approach was to discuss four alternatives to demolition, but to conclude that none were viable. Letters in support of the demolition were offered on behalf of City agencies, the Department of Metropolitan Development (DMD), the Health Department and the Indianapolis Police Department. Lockefield Gardens was painted as an unhealthy, unsafe burden on the City.
On November 9, 1976, the ACHP requested further information and more discussion of alternatives to demolition. The local HUD Office seemed to reject the suggestions and requests and added additional fire power. It offered the statement by Glenn Irwin, M.D., IUPUI’s Chancellor, that IUPUI endorsed demolition. In his view, Lockefield Gardens was viewed as a health hazard and security problem. Previously, Dr. Irwin had stated that Lockefield Gardens was entirely a City matter.

Many in the preservation community had hoped that IUPUI would be part of a creative solution to spare Lockefield Gardens, but that door was now firmly closed. The hope was that IUPUI would become more than a commuter college, might emerge as the state’s third largest university, and would require ample student housing. Some preservationists thought that student housing was a perfect adaptive reuse for Lockefield Gardens. However, IUPUI firmly rejected that notion.


There is an important bit of correspondence in the HLFI files dated December 22, 1976. The letter is from the Executive Committee of HLFI to Mayor William Hudnut. The signators were H. Roll McLaughlin (Chair); John R. Walsh (President); Richard B. DeMars (Treasurer and President of GIPC)\(^30\); and J. Reid Williamson (Executive Director). In it, the HLFI effectively gave up the battle for the preservation of Lockefield Gardens. The letter states that:

\[
\text{[HLFI] agree[s] with you that it is unfortunate that a feasible reuse cannot be found for Lockefield Gardens Apartments and recognizes that no alternative has been or is expected to be found to demolition.}
\]

Williamson reported that this letter was written to Mayor Hudnut after the Mayor expressed “his displeasure at the efforts of HLFI to preserve Lockefield.”\(^31\) Oddly, the HLFI files contain very little information about Lockefield Gardens that pre-dates this letter.
J. Reid Williamson, Jr., was a pillar of the preservation community and served as HLFI’s Executive Director for thirty-one years. He had been in the position of HLFI’s Executive Director for about one year at that point. Williamson was noted for saying:

> Old buildings are the physical embodiment of our community’s memory. They connect us to previous generations. So the preservation of historic buildings is not only a way to improve the visual character of the City, it also helps us better understand who we are.\(^{32}\)

At the time the letter was sent, Mayor Hudnut would have been Mayor for less than one year. William H. Hudnut, III, was born in Cincinnati, Ohio, in 1932. He graduated from Princeton University in 1954, as a Phi Beta Kappa. Thereafter, he earned a Bachelor’s Degree in Divinity from New York City’s Union Theological Seminary. In 1955, Hudnut was ordained a minister in the Presbyterian Church. Rev. Hudnut served as pastor of the prestigious Indianapolis Second Presbyterian Church on North Meridian Street from 1964 to 1972.


Mayor William Hudnut’s bid to move to statewide office as Secretary of State was rejected in 1990 and he declined to run for a fifth term as Mayor. The next year after leaving office, Hudnut left Indianapolis and moved to Maryland. He has written several books and serves as Chair for Public Policy for the Urban Land Institute. Hudnut is the recipient of many awards for his outstanding public service career.
The force of the City was unified behind Mayor Hudnut and even stretched into the state university system, state government and the federal government. From 1976 forward, Mayor Hudnut steered a strong unified effort to demolish Lockefield Gardens.

HLFI was one of the largest and strongest private statewide preservation organizations in America. The HLFI letter of December 22, 1976, authored so early in what become an extremely long historic preservation review process, is telling. The political pressures facing HLFI from Mayor Hudnut must have been profound. The HLFI letter would be extremely important to the Indiana historic preservation community as the §106 process commenced.

No doubt Mayor Hudnut joyfully received the HFLI letter of December 22, 1976, accepting demolition. Surely, he believed the historic preservation issue was resolved. In fact, Mayor Hudnut wrote a letter dated December 29, 1976, thanking HLFI for not opposing Lockefield Gardens’ demolition. But for the next several years, the preservation/development battle over Lockefield Gardens raged.


By December 1976, with HLFI’s acceptance of Lockefield Gardens’ demise, the demolition die was firmly cast. The ACHP seemed to know it and with such firm unified local commitment to demolition, it simply followed procedure. On January 6, 1977, the ACHP conducted a consultation meeting in Mayor Hudnut’s office with the hopes of it being a basis for a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA). However, the meeting only involved the City, HUD and IUPUI. Those interests advised the ACHP that Lockefield Gardens was a “symbol of segregation and disgrace for the black race.” Apparently, no African Americans or historic preservationists were at the consultation meeting. Not surprisingly, no basis for ACHP’s hoped for MOA emerged.
On March 22, 1977, the ACHP held a public meeting in Indianapolis. 98% of the participants were African American. They made a strong statement in opposition to demolition, noting that they were proud of their black heritage and not ashamed of Lockefield Gardens. Speakers included State Senator Julia Carson (later Congresswoman) and State Representative Bill Crawford, both of whom grew up at Lockefield Gardens.

Thereafter, there ensued much letter writing activity by both sides in anticipation of the ACHP full hearing on the matter on May 4, 1977, in Washington, D.C. At the hearing, the City involved its political ally, U.S. Senator Richard G. Lugar. Senator Lugar, Mayor Hudnut’s predecessor, gave a strong endorsement to demolition and made the point that HFLI supported demolition of Lockefield Gardens. Frank Lloyd, M.D., a noted African American physician, supported Lockefield Gardens’ demolition. In addition, Indiana Governor Otis R. Bowen, M.D., wrote to the ACHP that the State of Indiana supported Lockefield Gardens demolition:

It is also our position that rather than having favorable historical significance, costly preservation would be a reminder of our failure to meet urban housing problems appropriately.

Despite the City’s heavyweight line up, after the May 4, 1977, hearing, the ACHP recommended against demolition. Mindful of the §106 process, the City’s coalition went back to Indianapolis and the drawing board to refuel, reform and refine its demolition mission. A new Lockefield Gardens demolition plan would be developed and IUPUI would help assist to a greater degree.36

On November 22, 1977, there was a meeting of the Task Force for Urban Growth and Revitalization, as an adjunct of the Mayor’s Greater Indianapolis Progress Committee (GIPC).37 GIPC is the Mayor’s “kitchen cabinet” and made up of various business and community leaders. (There was some cross memberships between GIPC and HLFI, such as Richard B. DeMars serving as President of GIPC and as HLFI’s Treasurer.) The Task Force included blacks, such as
State Senator Julia Carson and State Representative Bill Crawford. For the first time, the mention of “MEDIC” occurred. (The “Midtown Economic Development and Industrial Corporation”.)

The City’s grand new plan seemed to be a compromise involving the destruction of most of Lockefield Gardens, but retaining a small corner in the northeast. The whole project was to be tied to the growth of IUPUI and Wishard Memorial Hospital. It proposed a mixture of new buildings, new traffic patterns, new housing and minority participation.

Not surprisingly, having previously acquiesced, HLFI was left out of the whole endeavor. Thus, the City’s compromise sought to enlist a portion of the black community, but to exclude the preservation community. A minority architectural firm was hired from Ohio and evaluated various options. Many studies were considered and many people were involved officially and unofficially. However, at the end of the day, an Action Plan was executed as a result of the GIPC process.

The Action Plan was adopted by MEDIC, the City, IUPUI, and the Health and Hospital Corporation of Marion County, on June 20, 1980. The signators were: Mayor William Hudnut, Dr. Glenn Irwin (IUPUI Chancellor), Thomas Hasbrook (President, Marion County Health and Hospital Corporation) and John White (President of MEDIC).


The Action Plan became somewhat the sacred cow for the next five years. The document itself is fairly brief and not terribly specific. MEDIC was recognized in the planning process and given funding for planning and consultation. The plan called for the demolition of much of Lockefield Gardens, the straightening of Locke Street, a limited rent subsidy program, new units for the elderly and other new housing. Specific historic preservation concerns were not
addressed in the Action Plan, but there were still many hoops that had to be jumped through. Furthermore, another §106 Report would have to be submitted to the ACHP.

By September 27, 1980, HUD acknowledged its support of the Action Plan. A tenants council from the Indianapolis Housing Authority approved the plan, as did Senator Lugar. Joe Cloud, Indiana SHPO, approved the Action Plan, noting that he determined in 1975 that Lockefield Gardens should not be accorded National Register status.

Interestingly, the City, at this late juncture, asked HLFI for support. Mr. Williamson had the apparent temerity to ask for more information. However, DMD’s David Carley noted that it did not need the historic preservationists’ approval.

The stage was set for a showdown at the June 11, 1981, second hearing of the ACHP. Many in the historic preservationist community, as well as the black community, were still up in arms and feeling left out, if not simply dismissed.

5. May 1981: Historic Landmarks Foundation of Indiana’s Tie Vote

J. Reid Williamson and HFLI had been invited to the June 1981, ACHP meeting. Williamson wanted to send a letter about the proposed Lockefield Gardens demolition, but was blocked by HFLI’s Chairman, H. Earl Capehart, a Republican of note and senior partner in the law firm Krieg Devault Alexander & Capehart.38

Capehart required Williamson to seek approval of HFLI’s Executive Board before sending the letter. Capehart was concerned that the letter contradicted HLFI’s commitment of December 1976, to Mayor Hudnut accepting demolition. Furthermore, Capehart appeared skeptical that not demolishing Lockefield Gardens might leave the City and HFLI with a white elephant.
J. Reid Williamson’s proposed June 2, 1981, letter to the ACHP cited the significance of the Lockefield Gardens site and noted that it had been declared eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. Williamson also asserted:

[I]ts location next to an ever-growing medical and university complex provides an opportunity for nearby and convenient housing. Further, its location in the heart of a once vibrant residential neighborhood retains a dominant symbol for the focus of future area wide renewal.

Williamson confirmed that HLFI had tried to attract a “private preservation minded developer to resurrect the complex for modern-day adaptive reuse.” One proposed developer advised that the project was viable so long “as much of the original plan and buildings as possible including those on both sides of the great tree-lined mall are retained.” J. Reid Williamson agreed and suggested that preservation of the Lockefield Gardens’ unique mall effect was key. “The giant yard enclosure attained by buildings standing on three sides of the mall is an essential design element.” Perhaps the fact that this preservation effort was more about space and culture, than outstanding bricks and mortar, was what made this debate so difficult.

Williamson proposed a compromise to nearly complete demolition. He suggested that of the twenty-four extant structures, only ten be destroyed. Williamson offered that the townhouses, numbered 1 – 8 at the southern end, and apartment units 21 and 23 at the northwest corner be demolished. This would allow for the preservation of the central mall, the essence of Lockefield Gardens. Nevertheless, Williamson’s brilliant and most reasonable proposal letter would never be sent.

J. Reid Williamson did not get majority approval to send his letter, as the Executive Board vote was a five – five tie. Capehart did not vote, but ruled that lacking a majority, the letter could not be sent. The individuals who voted to block J. Reid Williamson’s letter were:
• Kathryn Betley (spouse of the Managing Partner of Ice Miller Donadio & Ryan\textsuperscript{39})
• G. Harvey Bradley (Jones & Laughlin Steel Attorney)
• Richard O. Ristine ( Crawfordsville Attorney; former Republican Lt. Gov.)
• George Waller (Butler University History Professor)
• John Walsh (Indiana National Bank\textsuperscript{40} Vice President)

For a second time, on the same issue, HFLI, perhaps the premier historic preservation organization in America, was frozen in place. However, the reluctance of HFLI to take on tough political challenges helped spur Historic Indianapolis, Inc., an organization that prided itself for putting historic preservation first.


While the demolition die was still clearly cast, certain groups refused to give up. Historic Indianapolis could not afford to send representatives to the June 11, 1981, meeting, but strongly opposed demolition in a letter. HLFI did not attend because of the tie vote. The City offered support from MEDIC, IUPUI, Health and Hospital, Governor Robert Orr, Senator Richard Lugar and Senator J. Danforth Quayle. It was suggested HUD Secretary Samuel Pierce was on board. Nevertheless, the ACHP voted to unanimously to recommend retention of all of Lockefield Gardens with the exception of two buildings on the northwest corner.

Historic Indianapolis was absolutely delighted with the recommendation of ACHP. Historic Indianapolis, Inc., was formed to help assist in the preservation of Indiana Theatre.\textsuperscript{41} James M. Rogers, a Vice President of Hook’s Drug Stores, served as its initial President. Historic Indianapolis was incorporated in 1980 “to provide an unencumbered voice and representation for the cause of preservation in Marion County, Indiana.”\textsuperscript{42}
On June 9, 1981, Rogers had written to the ACHP advising the ACHP that Historic Indianapolis was necessary because:

Our two other historic preservation organizations – one a public agency whose commissioners are mayorally appointed and the other a private foundation whose directors frequently have interlocking financial, business, and social ties – are unable to take a public stand on sensitive issues that would conflict with these influencing factors.

Mr. Rogers confided to the ACHP with regard to Lockefield Gardens: “Our most experienced practitioners on preservation are forced to remain mute.” Jim Rogers portrayed Historic Indianapolis as:

[C]omposed of those persons who also have a sincere concern for preservation conservation, and adaptive reuse of our built environment, but further are able to take a public stand.

Jim Rogers provided the ACHP with the history of the Lockefield Gardens controversy starting with the City’s initial plan for total demolition. He acknowledged:

We sincerely feel they [the City] thought demolition was the only answer to the problem at that time.

However, Rogers and Historic Indianapolis:

[S]trongly recommended that the Lockefield complex be sold to a private developer and rehabilitated according to the housing needs of all concerned; further that the money saved from demolition and construction costs for new, replacement housing be spent to bring back to life this unique and perfectly viable project.

Mr. Rogers concluded his letter to the ACHP with this exhortation:

Veto this hollow plan for the few in favor of a plan for a living renovation into an exciting new community that will benefit the whole of Indianapolis.

The City promptly objected to the findings by the ACHP. It directed its response to the Indianapolis HUD office and took the tact of again using GIPC’s Urban Growth and Revitalization Task Force to help counter the ACHP. The group was headed by John Grayson,
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real estate lawyer with Ice Miller Donadio & Ryan, the State’s largest law firm and Bond Counsel to the City. Grayson’s detailed letter to HUD paints a picture of a united local community, highly desirous of moving forward with demolition as the City planned.

Grayson wrote:

The Task Force is unanimous in the opinion that the plan devised by the local community is better able to meet all the essential criteria for revitalization of both Lockefield Gardens and the surrounding area.

The Grayson letter chides the ACHP for its lack of a “sensitive appreciation” for the area’s traffic system and for ignoring “the importance of the University’s Medical Research Complex and Wishard Memorial Hospital”. Grayson complained that the ACHP offered “a single purpose recommendation relating purely to preservation of the original design of the site without being sensitive to all of the other relationships of the surrounding property”.

The ACHP’s §106 recommendation to preserve all but two Lockefield Gardens buildings was forwarded to HUD Secretary Samuel Pierce for consideration. Pierce, a lifelong Republican, was an African American with long governmental service. During his service as President Ronald Reagan’s Secretary for Housing and Urban Development, appropriations for low-income housing were cut in half. Pierce served a full eight years, but after leaving office, was the subject of investigations over mismanagement, abuse and political favoritism. Many of Secretary Pierce’s aides were charged and convicted. However, “Silent Sam” Pierce was not charged. Historic Indianapolis noted that Mayor Hudnut had been lobbying Secretary Pierce for some time. The two met personally in Washington, D.C., to discuss the subject.

On November 6, 1981, Secretary Samuel Pierce sided with Mayor Hudnut and released federal funds for demolition of Lockefield Gardens. The signators to the broad Action Plan began to work together to move forward. MEDIC sought to flex its community muscle. The
DMD designated the area for urban renewal. A Lockefield Gardens Advisory Committee was formed by the City to seek requests for production for development. HLFI still quietly sought developers who might be interested in preserving most of Lockefield Gardens.

Negotiations occurred between the City and IUPUI over the cost of land and the ownership. HUD, the City, the Health and Hospital Corporation and IUPUI worked diligently to sort out the difficult financial particulars. However, Historic Indianapolis was not giving up and was still fighting to somehow block Lockefield Gardens’ demolition.

Meanwhile, in a very unusual development, HLFI, with MEDIC’s support, put together a nomination for seven Lockefield Gardens buildings for the National Register. These were the structures the City was willing to salvage. With the approval of the SHPO, the nomination was forwarded to the National Register on January 6, 1981. Oddly, this was apparently done without the knowledge of the City, IUPUI or the Health and Hospital Corporation, the other signatories to the Action Plan. They were reportedly not happy about this unusual action. There was a lull, but the governmental wheels were still grinding toward demolition.

The City, the University and others continued to press on and worked upon deed restrictions. HLFI tried to help MEDIC with preservation covenants. On the other hand, IUPUI fought the preservation covenants. Two years had passed and much was up in the air about what was really going to happen with the Lockefield Gardens site.

In the spring of 1983, Historic Indianapolis conducted an all out guerilla war to save Lockefield Gardens. A media offensive was unleashed; press releases were issued and press conferences were held. Sermons were preached and flyers were passed. A renovation apartment was developed and displayed to demonstrate that the Lockefield Gardens could be salvaged. HLFI quietly provided some help to Historic Indianapolis.
HLFI also tried to quietly enlist the help of the National Park Service. On March 2, 1983, Douglas Dunn, Director of the Indianapolis Regional Office of HLFI, “For Historic Indianapolis” suggested designating Lockefield Gardens as a national historic landmark. Such landmarks recognize and honor the Nation’s cultural heritage and provide additional protection. Edwin C. Bearss, the Chief Historian, demurred. Bearss was aware that demolition of Lockefield Gardens was imminent and advised that because of fiscal and personnel constraints, the needed assessment could not be performed before demolition. Thus, the humble HLFI/Historic Indianapolis effort quietly failed. However, the City was not pleased with Mr. Dunn’s efforts.45

In April 1983, Mayor William Hudnut put his foot down: The Action Plan of 1980 would be honored and only seven Lockefield Gardens buildings would survive. Demolition finally began in July 1983. By fall of 1983, only six apartment buildings and the administration building survived. Nevertheless, the fight to decide the future of the Lockefield Gardens site continued for three more years. The historic preservation battle had been lost, but the cause lived on.

From July 1983, until groundbreaking on April 22 1986, negotiations continued. The City, HUD, MEDIC and HLFI continued to work on the restrictive covenants. The Lockefield Gardens Preservation Plan was officially adopted on January 16, 1985, by the Indianapolis Historic Preservation Commission.46 In the fall of 1985, a partnership of Sexton Companies and Mansur Development won the development rights. There was a delay in the development when the National Parks Service denied Rehabilitation Investment Tax Credits because a majority of the project had been demolished. However, the decision was ultimately reversed as Mayor Hudnut personally intervened with President Reagan’s Interior Secretary Donald P. Hodel. The
delay prevented the units from being ready for the 1987 Pan Am Games. The Lockefield Gardens units were finally placed upon the housing stock in November of 1988.
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V. The Theory of §106 Review and the Practical Politics of Preservation

Section 106 of the NHPA requires federal agencies to consider the effects of proposed undertakings on historical structures or structures eligible for the National Register. The Section also mandates that the ACHP be given an opportunity to comment upon proposed undertakings. The process is codified in federal regulations as 36 CFR Part 800.

The responsible federal agency in the §106 process must determine whether the proposed activity would affect historic properties. Clearly, demolition could affect Lockefield Gardens. Thus, the fundamental question was whether Lockefield Gardens was historic property. Here, in accord with §106, the SHPO was contacted and Joe Cloud determined Lockefield Gardens was too new to be historic. Again, process was followed and the Department of Interior, National Parks Service, considered the question. The National Parks Service determined that Lockefield Gardens was eligible for the National Register, because of its exceptional characteristic features. The criteria of eligibility was A (association with significant events and patterns of history) and C (significant architectural design or engineering structure).

At that juncture, the onus was upon the federal agency to begin consultations to seek ways to avoid, minimize or mitigate the adverse effect. Consultation should involve the SHPO, local government and members of the public. ACHP participates when there is a substantial impact to important historic properties. The theory is that a collaborative process involving all stakeholders, including the local community and the preservation movement will produce the best result. In the first Lockefield Gardens §106 process, that did not occur; some might question whether it occurred in the second Lockefield Gardens §106 process.
Section 106 provides that the ACHP must provide written comments as part of the process. However, the ACHP recommendation is advisory only. Thus, the federal agency head must only “consider” ACHP’s position when deciding how to proceed. Thus, in this instance, HUD Secretary Pierce could and did disregard ACHP’s comments.47

The ACHP states:

Public involvement is a key ingredient is successful §106 consultation, and views of the public should be solicited and considered throughout the process.

Without question, the second §106 process for with Lockefield Gardens was not completely “successful”. The theory of §106 is that consultation, information and understanding should lead to success in a win-win-win like fashion. That certainly did not happen at Lockefield Gardens. Why not and how could a recurrence be avoided?

It appears that the practical politics of preservation blocked meaningful consultation. Politics is not necessarily a dirty word. Politics is the practice of influencing other people on a civil level. Here, however, the politics of power and division seemed to rule the fray. In Lockefield Gardens, there seemed to be the politics of party, race and preservation involved with the three overlapping.

Partisan Politics: Virtually all of the individuals involved in the controversy at the national, state and local level were Republicans. Mayor William Hudnut served as Republican Mayor of Indianapolis from 1976 – 1990, the only Republican mayor of a large city. During that entire time, a Republican majority served on the City County Council and Republicans served as important city and county agency heads. Otis R. Bowen, M.D., served as Indiana Governor from 1973 – 1981, and his Lt. Governor, Robert Orr, served as Governor from 1982 – 1990, both Republicans. Republican Ronald Reagan served as President from 1981 – 1989, his HUD Secretary, Samuel Pierce and his Interior Secretary, Donald P. Hodel, were Republicans.
On the other side, state legislative officials, Bill Crawford and Julia Carson, both Democrats, opposed demolition. The research does not reflect Democrat Congressman Andy Jacobs’ position. However, early in the process, Democrat U.S. Senator Birch Bayh opposed the demolition team.

One must wonder, at a fundamental partisan political level, whether the unified opposition to Lockefield Gardens might be rooted in the Republican refusal to accept the basic tenets of FDR’s New Deal. The PWA helped America survive the Great Depression and prepare for World War II. Without question, Lockefield Gardens was a success as a slum clearance project, a job creator and a provider of quality housing for the poor. Various changes in the housing laws, coupled with the transfer of Lockefield Gardens from federal to local control, helped bring its downfall. It was truly an eyesore by 1975, but perhaps not the white elephant that the Republicans painted it to be at that time.

Racial Concerns: Early on, it appeared that the African American community was excluded from discussions on the proposed Lockefield Gardens demolition. Its elected representatives were opposed, but were in the political minority and powerless. As the momentum developed, MEDIC was employed to represent the black community. By the end, the development community enlisted the help and assistance of prominent Indianapolis African American physicians, Frank Lloyd, M.D. (a GIPC member), and Frank Johnson, M.D.

MEDIC reportedly tried to rally the black community to save Indiana Avenue. There are reports that MEDIC was key in diverting funds from IUPUI’s purchase of the Lockefield Gardens property for use in the renovation of the Walker Theatre. This led to the development of another group, the Madame Walker Urban Life Center, Inc.\textsuperscript{48}
MEDIC is still listed as a neighborhood group on the official website of the City of Indianapolis. However, according to the Indiana Secretary of State, Midtown Economic Development and Industrial Corporation, which was created on May 28, 1971, was administratively dissolved on April 11, 2002. It appears its last corporate report was filed in 1999. The address for MEDIC was listed as 617 Indiana Avenue, which is the Madame Walker Centre. The entity was listed as a non-for-profit domestic Corporation. Thus, it appears that MEDIC, an entity that purportedly represented the interests of the local black community in the Lockefield Gardens historic preservation negotiations, has completely now disappeared.49

**Historic Preservation:** The historic preservation community was utterly compromised at the threshold of the Lockefield Gardens demolition controversy. The letter from HLFI dated December 1976, accepting the demolition of Lockefield Gardens suggests early and intense political lobbying. The June 1981, HLFI notes on the Executive Committee vote to abstain from the §106 process shows significant continuing political pressure. Given those two developments five years apart, by the nation’s now largest historic preservation organization, it was not surprising to see that Historic Indianapolis, Inc., engaged. This humble effort by a smaller and weaker organization gave the historic preservation community some voice in the second §106 process.

There might be those who would argue that the §106 process did work here. The political forces in the City all but rejected local opposition from the historic preservation community and the African American community. However, the ACHP effectively represented their interests. The ACHP determined that Lockefield Gardens was of such significant importance that it should be involved in the §106 process itself.
Given ACHP’s May 4, 1977, recommendation against complete demolition, the City returned home to try to build a coalition to get the job done. Thus, some might suggest that the fact that seven buildings of Lockefield Gardens survive, this is a testament that the §106 process worked and to a certain extent, that is true.

However, it is also important to note that party politics is why in 1977, the City returned home to reorganize. Mayor Hudnut, at that time the only Republican mayor of a large American city, was facing a Democratic administration in Washington, D.C. The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development was Democrat Patricia Roberts Harris, the first African American female to serve in the United States Cabinet. It is unlikely that Secretary Harris would have rejected the ACHP’s position on Lockefield Gardens.

Regardless, the practical politics of preservation seemed to effectively negatively impact the §106 process and the leadership of Indianapolis seemed to reject the legislative public policy underlying the NHPA. The fundamental question is what lessons does the Lockefield Gardens experience teach us about future historic preservation efforts?
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VI. The Lessons of Lockefield Gardens

Time

The first lesson is the lesson of time. Time is very important to historic preservation, if not its essence. Thus, it is crucial to this retrospective analysis to consider the preservation milieu of 1975. At that juncture, the NHPA was less than ten years old, HLFI was only fifteen years old and J. Reid Williamson was HLFI’s Executive Director about one year. HLFI’s current mission statement, “Indiana Landmarks revitalizes communities, reconnect us to our heritage, and saves meaningful places” has evolved over time.

In 1975, Indianapolis’ concept of historic preservation was still in its infancy. Most people in the Hoosier capitol city had a vague notion of Lockerbie Square. The near east side’s Lockerbie Square Historic District was placed upon the National Register on February 23, 1973. HLFI helped restore the Lockerbie area, basing renovations on the preservation techniques practiced at the German Village, of Columbus, Ohio.\(^5\)

Michael Cannizzo, an architect who worked upon the Lockefield Gardens plan as a member of the Historic Preservation Commission Staff, remembers Lockerbie Square and Lockefield Gardens well. Michael Cannizzo recalls Lockerbie Square as a more traditional historic preservation experience, while Lockefield Gardens was a much more difficult project to grasp. Cannizzo, now an architect for Boston Redevelopment Authority, properly cautions that any review of the facts and circumstances of Lockefield Gardens must keep in mind the stage of the historic preservation movement in Indianapolis at that time.

In truth, historic preservation is still a new movement that has evolved over the last 150 years, starting roughly with Ann Pamela Cunningham and the Mount Vernon Ladies Association
in 1858. That evolution is depicted in how sites are currently interpreted. Today’s Mount Vernon reflects the modern preservation movement as it now takes pains to emphasize the African American contribution to President George Washington’s fine plantation estate.

Thus, in 1974, it is not hard to imagine that there were many in Indianapolis who saw Lockefield Gardens as a modern (less than forty years old), bland, housing failure and marred by its Jim Crow birth. Those same people did not appreciate the historical New Deal success that Lockefield Gardens was for the Indianapolis African American community, nor the beauty in the space and the bricks and mortar. That might not be true today, forty years later, nearly eighty years after construction. However, time and perspective clearly colors all things.

There is another time lesson in the Lockefield Gardens story, the lesson of premature evaluation and early commitment. HLFI’s letter of December 22, 1976, was offered very early in the Lockefield Gardens process. In fact, HLFI’s files do not contain any documentation of any kind of evaluation of Lockefield Gardens’ significance prior to that date. However, there is Christopher Owens’ HLFI letter of April 1976 to the ACHP stating that Lockefield Gardens appeared to meet the criteria for inclusion on the National Register.

If HLFI had slowed down in December of 1976, and performed a thorough and comprehensive independent analysis and feasibility study, more of Lockefield Gardens might have survived and the entire project may have been completed sooner. As the old adage holds: “haste makes waste”.

Another lesson of time may be that time heals all wounds. When Lockefield Gardens was built in the 1930s, racial segregation was the law. By the 1970s, Indianapolis was still struggling with desegregation and integration. Today, Indianapolis is in a much better place with the passage of time. In the 1970s, it was difficult to think that white families might ever live in
the black Indiana Avenue neighborhood. While that might seem silly to some today, that was the racial reality of yesterday.

Money

Money (or the lack of it) may be the root of all evil, but it is also key to proper historic preservation. In many ways, the NHPA of 1966 may have represented the high water mark of historic preservation in America. The NHPA set forth a lofty public policy for preservation of our historic built environment. Although the NHPA lacked meaningful teeth to ensure historic preservation, it clearly made the point that preservation of historic sites was very important to America.

The 89th Congress, 1965 – 1967, which enacted the NHPA, had a House of Representatives and a Senate that both had super Democratic majorities. It was an incredibly productive Congress, enacting such landmark legislation as the Voting Rights Act, the Higher Education Act, the Freedom of Information Act and the creation of Medicaid (healthcare for the poor) and Medicare (healthcare for the elderly). In a real sense, President Lyndon Johnson’s Great Society was the child of FDR’s New Deal.

The 1976 Tax Reform Act provided the first major historic preservation tax incentive systems. This made existing building stock economically attractive. The 1981 Economic Recovery Tax Act altered the system, but allowed a credit of 25% on certified historic structures. Such tax credits were key to Lockefield Gardens’ private development. However, the 1986 Tax Reform Act lessened the attractiveness of the system by lowering the tax rate from 25% to 20%. Additional limitations were inserted to deal with alleged abuses by developers.51

However, money is true public policy and without it, no public policy is successful. “The National Historic Preservation Act and the National Park Service: A History”52 details the
complicated congressional history of the funding of NHPA. The bottom line is that there has never been appropriate funding for historic preservation sufficiently generous to spur significant preservation efforts.

In the Lockefield Gardens situation, the answer to the question may have simply been money. Local governments frequently face unfunded mandates from Congress and state legislatures. Such legislative bodies get to set public policy and also fund it. Sometimes, legislatures embrace causes and enact platitudes, but provide weak funding. Other times, a shift in political winds will result in legislation enacted by one party being ignored, if not repealed, by the other party. Sometimes, the economic realities render the legislative enactment a hollow commitment.

One lesson learned from Lockefield Gardens could be that Congress and the Indiana General Assembly must provide for better historic preservation funding opportunities. Giving Mayor Hudnut and his people the benefit of a doubt, he may have been correct from the very beginning, total Lockefield Gardens retention was not financially feasible. Thus, given the realistic fiscal picture, significant demolition of Lockefield Gardens may have been the only financially feasible recourse.

Much of the correspondence of the period supports this notion. The City officials seemed acutely aware of such fiscal challenges, while the ACHP and Historic Indianapolis appear unconcerned about such a reality. However, HFLI seemed to have better understanding of the financial issues. In fact, H. Earl Capehart warned of this when he blocked J. Reid Williamson’s June 1981 letter to the ACHP:

I am concerned that the City and the University may get turned down by the Council in Washington as a result of our position and if no private party could be located who is willing or able to restore Lockefield Gardens partially or fully, Landmarks could be
criticized. In this event, the City and others may be put to a great inconvenience without any compensating historic restoration.

Perhaps Joseph D. Cloud, Indiana SHPO, who clearly did not think Lockefield Gardens as historic or significant, may have said it best:

If the Advisory Council finds that rehabilitation is feasible and recommends preservation of the structures, the federal government should provide most of the necessary funds.54

In sum, one of the lessons of Lockefield Gardens is there must be better funding of historic preservation efforts.

Of course, there is another way to look at the money issue. Some believe that greed was the motivating factor. There was profit to be made at this valuable site and preservation seemed to be an impediment to profit. There is true irony here, as the current market has shown the developers quite wrong. IUPUI has developed into the State’s third largest university and it is no longer a commuter college. It is now quite evident that the entire Lockefield Gardens complex would have been economically viable. New apartments in the area are rapidly filled. Arguably, this boom is fueled by historic preservation and the civic environment offered by the entire central city. Thus, with patience, profits with preservation were to be made.

Race and Preservation

HLFI was founded in 1960 by Eli Lilly. Today, it stands with nearly 11,000 members and an endowment of $40 million. The organization’s leadership has traditionally had a mixture of businessmen, lawyers, academics and philanthropists. In 1975, the organization’s Executive Board fairly represented this mixture. However, the Board was largely male, white and conservative Republican. What the Board lacked at that time was more women, people of color, individuals with a progressive political perspective, people with disabilities and individuals of limited means. Not surprisingly, it is easy to speculate that had the HLFI executive leadership of
1976 and 1981, been more diverse and inclusive, HLFI’s position in the Lockefield Gardens drama might have been much different.

HLFI’s current mission statement broadly embraces communities, heritage and meaningful places. Today’s HLFI’s Board reflects more inclusion and diversity than it did previously. However, the preservation movement needs to better access and work with minority communities in an effort to coax those who should be natural allies. Issues of gentrification can easily divide preservationists and minorities. However, if the collaborative process envisioned by §106 is to be effective, minority groups must be at the table early and as active players, not tokens.

In the Lockefield Gardens debate, it appeared that the black community was completely excluded from the early process. There seemed to be almost a paternalistic attitude toward African Americans by some. The City suggested to the ACHP that Lockefield Gardens was an ugly reminder of racial segregation. However, the black community that grew up there proudly remember the New Deal success story of dramatically improved housing and the improvement in their everyday lives.

As time went by, there was an outreach to African Americans by the City. MEDIC was engaged by the City, but one might question the true nature of such a corporate entity. As noted previously, it was merely a temporary not-for-profit corporation. The elected black leadership for the Lockefield Gardens, individuals who grew up there, were virtually ignored. Eventually, members of the black professional class, Drs. Frank Johnson and Frank Lloyd, were brought in to bless the demolition. Ultimately, MEDIC signed the Action Plan.

Reaching out to the entire minority community is essential. Cherry picking minority members for a rubber stamp shall not suffice. If there has been a broader coalition involving the
duly elected leadership of the African American, might Lockefield Gardens have remained virtually intact? To test this hypothesis, let’s consider the history of public housing and the black experience elsewhere.

Techwood Homes was the first public housing project in the nation. Located in what was then a white section of Atlanta, it opened in 1936. Thus, Techwood was initially built for whites to eliminate white slums.

Techwood took its name from nearby Georgia Tech. Throughout the 1970s and 1980s, Techwood became a slum itself. It was reportedly synonymous with urban blight in Atlanta. Like Indianapolis (the Pan Am Games), Atlanta seized on athletics to help solve their housing project slum problems. Thus, except for a few buildings, Techwood Homes were demolished before the 1996 Olympic Games.

There is now a Techwood Homes Historic District, not unlike Indianapolis’ Lockefield Gardens Historic District. Techwood Homes was added to the National Register of Historic Places on June 29, 1976. However, a majority of the structures were destroyed less than twenty years later. Today, the area is referred to a Centennial Place in honor of the Centennial Olympic Games in Atlanta of 1996. It is now a mixed income community, with a few former residents removing back with Section 8 vouchers to pay rent.

Techwood was an all white community until 1968. Integration started to occur and by 1974, the complex was 50% black. During the next several years, the project became completely black. Mayor Maynard Jackson, an African American elected in 1973, tried to renovate and save Techwood. However, drug traffic and gang violence overtook Techwood and brought to its knees.
In the early 1990s, Mayor Jackson worked with the black community, the Atlanta Housing Authority, Georgia Tech and the Olympic Committee to turn Techwood around. Ultimately, after demolition, they converted 1,195 low income housing units into 800 new units for mixed income residents. Reportedly, only seventy-eight of Techwood original residents returned.

According to the Brookings Institution, the Atlanta Housing Authority went from an institution that caused neighborhood decline and deterioration to a leader in neighborhood investments. The Techwood area now has economic integration, quality schools, safe streets, social services and recreational opportunities. They changed the entire sociology of the neighborhood by a comprehensive approach and community rebuilding.55

The Techwood experience is different from Lockefield Gardens in terms of time and race. Techwood’s demolition occurred almost twenty years after Lockefield Gardens’ demolition. Furthermore, it occurred with African Americans (and Democrats), not only at the table early, but firmly in political control.

Nevertheless, Atlanta historic preservations sound a familiar lament:

The demolition of the Techwood Homes Complex represents a missed opportunity and is a great loss to the history and character of the City of Atlanta, even if that history was mired in negative race and social issues.56

Thus, Indianapolis walked that same path decades before Atlanta. In 1964, Lockefield Gardens was conveyed by the Public Housing Administration to the Housing Authority of the City of Indianapolis, Indiana. Pursuant to the lease, Lockefield Gardens was to be used for “low-rent” housing for a period of forty years. However, within ten years, the Indianapolis Housing Authority recommended demolition of Lockefield Gardens.
During this time, public housing projects across the nation faced a great deal of negative publicity. It became housing of last resort, housing the worst of the worst and an ugly picture of concentrated poverty and the squalor and violence associated with it. Consequently, in the 1970s, many public housing projects were demolished (as legislation was enacted to exclude many of the working poor from public housing).

The lessons of Lockefield Gardens and Techwood seem to mirror each other. Although separated by 500 miles and more than a decade, the experience was very similar. This suggests that the main lesson is financial feasibility and that factors of time, race and politics are factors of less weight and concern.

This is challenged by Edward G. Goetz, a professor at the Humphrey School of Public Affairs at the University of Minnesota. Goetz, in his text “New Deal Ruins: Race, Economic Justice and Public Housing Policy”\(^5\), asserts that the demolition of New Deal public housing is fueled by mainly racism. This author believes that financial feasibility is the real concern and the principal culprit.

**Political Leadership**

To be an elected official in America is a high privilege. To be the Mayor of one of the largest of American cities must be a tremendous challenge and a great honor. Mayor William Hudnut, III, will always be regarded as a fine Mayor. When Uni-Gov was enacted, there was a two-term limit on Mayor. Mayor Hudnut first had that changed to three terms and then term limits were eliminated in 1986. He was a very popular Mayor. When Mayor Bill Hudnut left office and town in 1991, he left a great positive legacy for Indianapolis. Sixteen years is a great span of time for an American city and those years were crucial to Indianapolis and its future.
Depending upon your perspective, Lockefield Gardens either represented the best or worst of Mayor William Hudnut. Regardless, Mayor Hudnut of Lockefield Gardens did not appear to be the gentle giant leprechaun of the Indianapolis St. Patrick’s Day parade. It appears that very early in his mayoralship, Hudnut concluded that Lockefield Gardens was a cancer on his City and it had to be excised at all costs. Thus, the correspondence files seem to telegraph a sense of what today might be called bullying. Quite simply, there was no political effort at an early, diverse and inclusion collaborative approach to Lockefield Gardens.

On the other hand, Mayor Hudnut was successful in excising what he perceived as a malignancy and this allowed the salvaging of a limb. This small remnant of Lockefield Gardens gives some very limited recognition to the historic nature of what was the New Deal and the African American community of Indiana Avenue. The Lockefield Gardens area is now sandwiched between a booming downtown and a burgeoning mega-university. Walking Indiana Avenue now near the remaining New Deal structures, one’s eyes are firmly on the future and not the past. There is no real hint of the historic preservation struggle and its scars, or the vibrant African American village that once existed there.

In his book, The Hudnut Years, Mayor Hudnut discusses his theory and approach to urban politics. Hudnut’s first theme: “There are not necessarily any right answers of urban governance and leadership”. The Mayor’s second theme: “Stand firm, don’t back down, trust yourself. Do the best thinking you can, make your decision, and stand by it.” Clearly, Hudnut’s declaration of April 1983 on Lockefield Gardens is an example of such leadership theory.

Mayor Bill Hudnut offered his 1995 view of the controversy at Lockefield Gardens with ten plus years of retrospection:

Occasionally, of course, reversing the field and admitting a mistake is prudent. We did that, for example, in our efforts to
rebuild an old downtown public-housing project. In the late 1970s, when we were trying to develop a plan for the renovation of Lockefield Gardens on Indiana Avenue deep in the heart of the African-American community in downtown Indianapolis, one idea I embraced was to raze all the buildings and start fresh with new construction. The place had fallen into acute disrepair since the last tenant had moved out years earlier. When I journeyed to Washington with others to testify in behalf of demolition (federal dollars were involved), I was astounded at the reaction in our African-American community. I realized how wrong I had been. I had tremendously underestimated the affection for this particular space among local residents. It was part of their heritage. We were considering destroying their roots, and they did not like it. Their objections to our plan were cogent, so we changed our minds, backed off, and found a compromise: tear some of the buildings down, rehabilitate others, and build some new ones.

The third theme of Mayor Hudnut’s urban politics philosophy is: Make “positive things happen”. Hudnut asserts that he had a pro-active philosophy of government, not merely a caretaker. Nor was Mr. Hudnut a weather vane politician, with a wet finger in the air. Mayor William Hudnut summed up his positive leadership as follows:

I wanted Indianapolis to become a greater city as a result of my stewardship of the office of mayor. I wanted to develop a public policy that would assist our city in attracting business and creating jobs, holding the downtown core, improving neighborhoods, and sensitizing our citizens to the special problems minorities fact. Such policies would help counteract the forces of deterioration that lurk in the shadows of urban America. I could have watched passively as nature took its course. But in my heart and mind I believed that I was not elected to run an administration adverse to taking risks. It is my hope that a fair assessment of the Hudnut years would conclude that many positive things happened in Indianapolis and that the revitalized city became a better place, with an enhanced national reputation.58

With the benefit of thirty years of hindsight, Mayor Hudnut is still proud of the new Lockefield Gardens. He acknowledges bad advice from Dr. Frank Lloyd and because of “roots and historic preservation” backed off from complete demolition. He advances that “politics is the art of the possible”. Thus, the Lockefield Gardens compromise to “preserve some, tear down
some”. At the end of the day, Mayor Bill Hudnut is still “very pleased that now the weeds, barbed wire fence, and decrepit buildings are gone”. In conclusion, Mayor Hudnut, today still sees the new Lockefield Gardens as a “real inducement to more downtown development”.

Mayor William Hudnut, III, prides himself that Indianapolis is no longer “India No Place” and he should be proud. But future political leaders would do well to practice the politics of inclusion and collaboration, not division and power. Furthermore, they should embrace the underlying public policy provisions of the NHPA. Such an approach would be healthy for the preservation of meaningful places. Inclusive political leadership is another lesson of Lockefield Gardens.

VII. Conclusion

While the bricks and mortar of this historic place have been partially preserved, Lockefield’s spirit and its true significant historical experience has not. The one effort to capture this has largely failed. The artwork, “Jammin on the Avenue,” is located near Lockefield’s new structures. It is a collage of wind instruments welded together and arranged in a square column. It was fabricated in 1989 and was commissioned by the Sexton Companies of the New Lockefield Gardens. The John Spaulding (an African American artist and former Lockefield Gardens resident) sculpture is an attempt to celebrate the jazz heritage of Indiana Avenue. However, it is a lonely call to truly celebrate the rich African American cultural heritage of Lockefield Gardens.

The original Lockefield Gardens storefronts, now vacant, could be designated as the “Lockefield Gardens Annex of the Crispus Attucks Museum”. This would bring life back to these still vacant storefronts and more importantly reconnect the black community to the now gentrified Indiana Avenue. The venue could celebrate the lives of Lockefield Gardens former
residents, such as Janet Langhart Cohen, television journalist, author, and playwright. The Attucks Museum annex could properly connect the dots of Jim Crow which gave birth to Lockefield Gardens and Attucks High School and focus on the tremendous black pride that those two twin anchors provided the African Americans of Indianapolis for all those years. The Attucks Museum could celebrate the distinguishing characteristics of Lockefield Gardens and memorialize the historic preservation struggle that occurred there.

Evansville, Indiana, has a proud community of African Americans. Evansville was the site of Lincoln Gardens, a 191 unit PWA Jim Crow housing project. The project was demolished in 1997, but the Evansville African American Museum convinced the Evansville Housing Authority to save one of the buildings. Building Seven now houses the Museum which housed black families from 1937 – 1997. One of the most popular parts of the Museum is a recreated apartment that offers a glimpse into the lives of African Americans in 1938. The space contains historical artifacts, such as a coal burning stove and icebox. The small apartment consists of a small bathroom, bedroom, living room and kitchen. In its day, Lincoln Gardens was the “elite place to live”. Perhaps the Attucks Museum could do something similar for Lockefield Gardens.

This examination may provide a fresh look at an old wound. However, this study of Lockefield Gardens also validates the goals of the New Dealers. In the first instance, Lockefield Gardens provided employment, blight removal and a sturdy and safe physical space for a segregated, but happy and healthy community. It certainly provided that improved physical environment that upgraded the quality of life and enhanced chances for future success. Thus, the sons and daughters of Lockefield became postal workers and police officers; the grandsons and granddaughters have became doctors and lawyers. Somehow in the Lockefield Gardens
preservation battle, the City lost sight of the wonderful community that lived there during the period of 1938 – 1968. Those thirty years were the glory years for the Lockefield Gardens community.

In conclusion, from a historic preservation standpoint, perhaps Lockefield Gardens will always be remembered as an opportunity lost due to money, timing, lack of inclusion and poor politics. What is now regarded as a New Deal lost opportunity, may hopefully be a catalyst for better historic preservation tomorrow. With finite resources, historic preservation will always be challenging, but at least it should be collegial, rooted in a common sense civility, inclusiveness and a commitment to the commonweal. That may be the true New Deal legacy of Lockefield Gardens and its ultimate lesson: United we stand, divided we fall.

VIII. EPILOGUE

The Lockefield Gardens preservation battle harmed HLFI’s relations with Lilly Endowment and did not resolve the tension within the development community. Thus, the stage was set for the 1985 battle over the Oscar McCullough School No. 5. The White River State Park Commission was determined to raze the building. However, HLFI was finally determined to draw the line in the sand and stand firm for historic preservation. HLFI ultimately obtained a court injunction, but the only thing still standing was the school’s 45’ x 85’ front wall. As part of the court settlement, there was an agreement to incorporate the school façade into the new State Park’s design. The façade, now a part of the State Museum, has elaborate decorations to inspire poor immigrant children and to persuade them that education is the best path to a better future.

Reportedly, the Lilly Endowment still bears hard feelings from the 1980s preservation battles. Lilly Endowment was founded in 1937, by J.K. Lilly, Sr., J.K. Lilly, Jr., and Eli Lilly,
the heirs to Eli Lilly and Company founded by Col. Eli Lilly. Historically, the foundation has focused upon community development, education, and religion, with a major focus on Indianapolis and Indiana. According to the Endowment website, it “continues its interest in and support of efforts to build the quality of life and civic vitality of Indiana communities.”

Lilly Endowment was a shadowy force in the demolition of Lockefield Gardens. Both J. Reid Williamson of HLFI and Jim Rogers of Historic Indianapolis confirmed this in early interviews. The debate over Lockefield Gardens occurred at a time when many in the black community already viewed Lilly Endowment with distrust.

There is great irony in the Lilly Endowment determined effort to see Lockefield Gardens demolished. Eli Lilly was Indiana’s foremost prominent historic preservationist. Conner Prairie was his largest project, but there were many more, such as William Henry Harrison’s home in Vincennes, the Sullivan House in Madison and Shakertown in Kentucky. Oftentimes, Lilly would ensure that the Lilly Endowment would listen sympathetically for requests of historic preservation aid.

In 1960, Lilly and Herman C. Krannert founded HLFI, but Lilly soon emerged as its true leader. Lilly soon partnered with young architect, H. Roll McLaughlin. McLaughlin became a true friend of Lilly and his principal historic preservation advisor. From time to time, Lilly even found HLFI and McLaughlin too slow to act and too conservative for certain historic preservation projects. Nevertheless, in 1969, Lilly provided HLFI with over $3,000,000 in Eli Lilly and Company stock which gave it a firm foundation for statewide growth.

During the 1970s, Lilly’s historic preservation efforts continued to intensify. He restored the Waiting Station at Crown Hill Cemetery, assisted with the restoration of Lockerbie Square, rescued the City Market from the wrecking ball and worked for the preservation of Union
Station. Eli Lilly died in 1977 and no written record has been discovered by this author as to whether he was aware of the battle over Lockefield Gardens or whether he sensed that the Lilly Endowment was becoming adverse to the historic preservation community.

Eli Lilly’s portrait proudly hangs in the hall of Indiana Landmarks beautiful new offices. Hopefully, whatever division that still might exist between the Lilly Endowment and Indiana Landmarks will dissipate and the two will work hand in glove; just as Eli Lilly would have wanted. Once again, united we stand, divided we fall.
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