

THE ARCHITECTURE OF ERASURE: REVISITING THE SITE OF THE MOVE BOMBING
THROUGH A GENRE CRITICISM OF THE NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE THESIS COMMITTEE

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

FOR THE DEGREES

MASTERS OF ART AND MASTERS OF SCIENCE

BY

Huy Pham

ADVISOR: OLON DOTSON

BALL STATE UNIVERSITY

MUNCIE, INDIANA

MAY, 2017

THESIS: The Architecture of Erasure: Revisiting the Site of the MOVE Bombing through a Genre Criticism of the National Register of Historic Places

STUDENT: Huy Pham

DEGREE: Masters of Art in Communication Studies; Masters of Science in Historic Preservation

COLLEGE: Communication, Information, and Media; Architecture and Planning

DATE: May 2017

PAGES: 133

ABSTRACT:

The historic preservation ethic can be understood as two sentiments in support of one ideology. First, history in its traditional iteration of narrating and recounting of past events should be protected from human oblivion. Second, certain histories are referenced by and within certain physical places, objects, and locations – and vice versa. Therefore, to preserve those physical places, objects, and locations is to preserve the histories that they signify or embody. This ethic was established into American law by the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA). This law provided lawful guidelines for the preservation of historic sites, primarily by creating the State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPO) and the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).

Nineteen years after the passing of NHPA, in an incident seemingly unrelated to historic preservation, the City of Philadelphia’s police department dropped two C4 bombs on 6221 Osage Avenue, the home and headquarters of the Philadelphia-based Black liberation group MOVE (which is not an acronym). After the bombing literally ignited the entire Cobbs Creek neighborhood ablaze, Mayor Wilson Good staved off fire department intervention and ordered emergency responder to “let the fire burn.” By the next morning, approximately sixty-one homes were burned to the ground, eleven MOVE members were found dead, including five children, and more than 250 people were left homeless (Assefa and Wahrhaftig, 1988).

Thirty-one years after the bombing, even with the reconstruction of the entire Cobbs Creek neighborhood, there is no formal physical reference to the historic event at the site via of a memorial or plaque. Considering the recent passing of the 50th anniversary of the NHPA and the 30th anniversary of the MOVE bombing, I intend to investigate present-day interaction between the preservation law and the historic event (or lack thereof) as a rhetorical situation. Specifically, I establish “historic places on the National Register” as a rhetorical genre, then I examine the site of the MOVE bombing as an example of this genre, before finally discussing the implications relevant to historic preservation as an ethic and profession and the intersection between race, place, and public memory. In doing so, I intend to answer the following research questions:

RQ1: How does the National Register limit or expand the public’s understanding of racialized violence and marginalized histories?

RQ2: How can the National Register of Historic Places help or hinder understanding of the MOVE site?

In the spirit of reflexivity, I acknowledge that this thesis is itself a rhetorical act. Through this genre criticism, I do not necessarily argue that the site of the MOVE bombing must be recognized by the NRHP. Instead, I assert that the current preservation ethic privileges cultures and histories that have physical references. To ignore this evidence is to be subservient to White dominance in place-making and history-telling.

Dedicated to

Anita, who drove me to Temple University's library to access the MOVE archives and who witnessed the bombing as a little girl on her bike, 31 years ago; and Ramona Africa, who survived a bombing and a fire, and let me march with her 30 years later.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Thank you:

To my neighbors,

Mary, for introducing me to the MOVE story, helping me advocate for them across the country through speech;

John, for pretending to be a MOVE member and warning the pedestrians of the White River of the “crooked-ass system;”

and Lenen, for beginning the lineage of Ball State University MOVE scholars and theses writers.

To my committee members,

Susan Lankford, for letting me push the envelope in historic preservation – but also making sure the message inside that envelope is well received when reaches its destination;

Dr. Beth Messner and Dr. Kristen McCauliff, my matriarchs in rhetoric, for their endless support and guidance – responding to my panicked text messages and emails with the most helpful and professional feedback and encouragement;

and Olon, for taking me to the MOVE site for the first time, for sharing with me both your disheartening and joyful experiences as a faculty and architect of color, for encouraging in me what other professors dismissed as defiance or audacity.

To my friends,

Courtney, who invited me on this communication adventure eight years ago, and pushed me to complete the project as he drove me home from the last conference of my academic career;

and Ashley, who gave me the bare bones of rhetoric criticism and still blushes every time she produces a national finalist.

To my love,

Berkley, who gave me encouragement and support even when I pretended to reject it, for setting the standard of scholarly excellence but never letting me tell her that.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE		
INTRODUCTION		
Introduction.....	7	
Rationale.....	9	
CHAPTER TWO		
REVIEW OF LITERATURE		
Public Spaces as Rhetoric.....	16	
Public Spaces Applied to Public Memory.....	19	
Public Space and Public Memory in Relation in Relation to Race and Identity...	25	
Historic Preservation in Academia.....	30	
CHAPTER THREE		
METHOD		
Genre Criticism.....	33	
CHAPTER FOUR		
ANALYSIS – Establishing the Rhetorical Genre.....	37	
Features of “Historic Sites on the National Register”		
Situational Requirements.....	38	
Substantive Requirements.....	43	
Stylistic Requirements.....	53	
Organizing Principle.....	61	
CHAPTER FIVE		
ANALYSIS – Evaluating the Rhetorical Site		
Features of “the Site of the MOVE Bombing”		
Situational Requirements.....	66	
Substantive Requirements.....	70	
Stylistic Requirements.....	79	
Organizing Principle.....	83	
Discussion.....	89	
CHAPTER SIX		
CONCLUSIONS		
Answers to Research Questions.....	96	
Contributions of the This Study.....	98	
APPENDIX		
A. Historic Preservation in American Law		
Before the National Historic Preservation Act.....	100	
The National Historic Preservation Act.....	106	
B. MOVE		
Origin.....	111	
The Shoot-Out of 1978.....	115	
The Bombing of 1985.....	118	
30 Years Later.....	124	
C. Philadelphia Redevelopment Authority – Request for Proposal.....		Attached
REFERENCES.....	126	

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

I visited Osage Avenue for the first time in October 2014, with Professor Olon Dotson during the National Organization of Minority Architects annual conference held in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania that year. I asked him to take me there because I was writing a speech about the MOVE organization and how their confrontation with the city and police ultimately led to their demise; I wanted to see what remained of their ground. Arriving at the Cobbs Creek neighborhood at sunset, I noticed that residents still filled many of the rowhomes – except the innermost units near 6221 Osage, which were all boarded up and vacant. Walking around the block onto Pine Street, I saw a young woman sitting on her porch. Olon insisted I ask her if she knows “what’s going on with the vacant homes across the street?” She responded, “I don’t know. I think they’re sinking. I heard it’s ‘cause of a fire a while ago.” Her response ignited the origins of this study and my pursuit to understand the built environment’s role in erasure.

The historic preservation ethic can be understood as two sentiments in support of one ideology. First, history in its traditional iteration of narrating and recounting of past events should be protected from human oblivion. Second, certain histories are referenced by and within certain physical places, objects, and locations – and vice versa. Therefore, to preserve those physical places, objects, and locations is to preserve the histories that they signify or embody. This ethic was established into American law by the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA). This law provided lawful guidelines for the preservation of historic sites, primarily by creating the State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPO) and the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).

Nineteen years after the passing of NHPA, in an incident seemingly unrelated to historic preservation, the City of Philadelphia's police department dropped two C4 bombs on 6221 Osage Avenue, the home and headquarters of the Philadelphia-based Black liberation group MOVE (which is not an acronym). After the bombing literally ignited the entire Cobbs Creek neighborhood ablaze, Mayor Wilson Good staved off fire department intervention and ordered emergency responder to "let the fire burn." By the next morning, approximately sixty-one homes were burned to the ground, eleven MOVE members were found dead, including five children, and more than 250 people were left homeless (Assefa and Wahrhaftig, 1988).

Thirty-one years after the bombing, even with the reconstruction of the entire Cobbs Creek neighborhood, there is no formal physical reference to the historic event at the site via of a memorial or plaque. Considering the recent passing of the 50th anniversary of the NHPA and the 30th anniversary of the MOVE bombing, I intend to investigate present-day interaction between the preservation law and the historic event (or lack thereof) as a rhetorical situation. Specifically, I establish "historic places on the National Register" as a rhetorical genre, then I examine the site of the MOVE bombing as an example of this genre, before finally discussing the implications relevant to historic preservation as an ethic and profession and the intersection between race, place, and public memory. In doing so, I intend to answer the following research questions:

RQ1: How does the National Register limit or expand the public's understanding of racialized violence and marginalized histories?

RQ2: How can the National Register of Historic Places help or hinder understanding of the MOVE site?

In the spirit of reflexivity, I acknowledge that this thesis is itself a rhetorical act. Through this genre criticism, I do not necessarily argue that the site of the MOVE bombing must be

recognized by the NRHP. Instead, I assert that the current preservation ethic privileges cultures and histories that have physical references. To ignore this evidence is to be subservient to White dominance in place-making and history-telling.

I begin this thesis by providing a rationale for my study. Next, I review scholarly literature surrounding public spaces, public memory, and their relations to race. Then, I provide a chronological and informational account of the NHPA of 1996, the NRHP, and MOVE as the necessary background for my study. Finally, I will explain the developments and key concepts of genre criticism before previewing the procedures for my analysis.

Rationale

The site of the MOVE bombing in a National Register of Historic Places context warrants rhetorical study for three key reasons. First, the 50th anniversary of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 punctuates a critical point of self-reflection within the profession of historic preservation and its practice at large, specifically regarding issues of diversity. Second and tragically, the narrative of police brutality upon and violent disenfranchisement of African-American peoples is both historic and hyper-contemporary, bridging the gap between the MOVE organization and the Black Lives Matter movement. Third, while this thesis heavily references previous scholarly work on the rhetoric of public memory and place making, the intersection between rhetoric and historic preservation practice and policy is virtually unprecedented.

The 50th anniversary presents a unique opportunity for public and scholarly considerations of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1996. Stephanie Meeks, President of the National Trust for Historic Preservation (NTHP), addresses this in her book *The Past and Future City* (2016) and in an interview with *Curbed Magazine*, where she asserts “The role of historic preservation is evolving, touching not just the buildings that many consider some of the

best parts of their cities, but the cities themselves” (Sisson, 2016). Meeks outlines the accomplishments of a half-century of work in the historic preservation field and the opportunities available to professionals and the public in the next 50 years. While she reviews important conversations regarding the economics and viability of historic preservation in the 21st century, she also calls attention to the lack of diversity: “Of the 86,000 places listed on the National Register, less than 8 percent represent women or people of color... That has to change.” She continues to say, “The National Trust has invested significant resources in this issue, and plans to continue to do so in the future.” Considering that there are more women than men in America and that African-Americans represent more than 13 percent of the total population (US Census, 2015), the National Register reflects an egregious under-representation of non-White, non-male histories in America’s preserved historic landscapes. Meeks adds that “one of the things we need to do as a country is identify the sites that still remain, and even those that don’t.” Meeks reference to unmarked historical sites is an excruciatingly important sentiment considering the current physical state of the site of the MOVE bombing.

However, the National Trust still faces major authoritative limitations despite Meeks admirable reflection and leadership of the historic preservation profession. To clarify, the Trust was first established through an Act of Congress by President Truman in 1949 for the purpose of acquiring and maintaining historic properties and was provided federal funding by the NHPA of 1966. That funding ceased in 1996, at which time the Trust became entirely privately funded. For the past two decades, the Trust has functioned as a nonprofit organization whose goal is to “protect significant places representing our diverse cultural experience by taking direct action and inspiring broad public support” (About, 2016). It operates with a revenue of \$60 million and a membership of over 750,000 individuals while hosting the PastForward National Conference

and spearheading programs like National Treasures, ReUrbanism, and the annual “Most Endangered Historic Places” list (NTHP, 2016).

However, the Trust does not have any official authority over the National Register. In fact, National Register nomination and eligibility is administered solely through the National Park Service and its State Historic Preservation Office constituents. Although the National Park Service has been diligent in addressing a lack of diversity in the employment and visitorship of their National Parks (NPS Fundamentals, 2011), there is little nationwide responses or initiatives from its historic preservation staff regarding issues of under-representation. The lone example from the past five years includes Secretary of Interior Sally Jewel and National Park Service Director Jon Jarvis announcing \$500,000 in matching grants to help fund 13 projects associated with Latinos and other underrepresented communities including African-Americans, Asian-Americans, and LGBT Americans. This agreement followed a meeting with the American Latino Scholar Expert Panel during National Hispanic Heritage Month in 2014 (Warnes, 2014; Salazar, 2014). A better-than-nothing attitude regarding this one-time monetary assistance propagates a capitalistic, tokenistic approach to preservation and under-representation problems. By directly analyzing the National Register of Historic Places nomination and determination of eligibility process, I hope to encourage more discourse among historic preservation professionals surrounding issues of diversity in historic preservation.

Second, this is an opportune time to revisit a site of police brutality given America’s current political climate. Although the MOVE bombing was the result of a longstanding confrontation between the Philadelphia Police Department and MOVE over thirty years ago, the relationship between police officers and Black communities in America remains tumultuous. While some scholars (Kappeler, 2014; Turner, Giacomassi, & Vandiver, 2006) argue that modern

American police departments have identifiable roots in slave patrols and night watches “designed to control the behaviors of minorities,” I punctuate contemporary discourse surrounding the relationship between African-Americans and American police officers as beginning with the acquittal of George Zimmerman in the shooting death of African-American teenager Trayvon Martin in 2012. While Zimmerman was not a police, his position of authority as a self-appointed security guard in his neighborhood expedited the discourse surrounding deadly assumptions about Black presence. Immediately after the announcement of the court decision, the mantra #BlackLivesMatter mobilized on social media platforms like Twitter and Facebook. It then became an organization, a movement, and a rallying cry for street demonstrations following the death of African-Americans Michael Brown and Eric Garner in 2014, both at the hands of city police officers who faced no criminal indictment (Luibrand, 2015). The official #BlackLivesMatter (BLM, About, n.d.) website states that they are “a [38] chapter-based national organization working for the validity of Black life. We are working to (re)build the Black liberation movement.” While #BlackLivesMatter is relevant whenever and wherever Black persons are killed, harmed, or victimized in any way, it is most notable for mobilizing efforts of assembly and protest in cases involving recorded footage of police officers shooting or otherwise brutalizing unarmed African-Americans.

The BlackLivesMatter movement has protested many cases caught on video and disseminated via social media: a McKinney, TX police officer who threw a [unnamed] 14-year old Black girl to the ground before pulling a gun on two [unnamed] Black boys at a pool party (Craven, 2016); 12-year old Black child Tamir Rice who was shot by Cleveland police officers on playground after they mistake his toy gun for actual gun (Flynn, 2016); 28-year old Black woman Sandra Bland who was suspiciously found dead in her jail cell after traffic stop with

Texas state trooper who removed her from her car, forced her to the ground, and arrested her (Nathan, 2016); and 25-year old Black man Freddie Gray who fell into a coma and died while in the custody of Baltimore Police Department (Rector, 2016). One non-police example of BlackLivesMatter discourse involves the spree shooting during which nine Black individuals were killed by a suspected White supremacist in a church in Charleston, South Carolina. President Barack Obama paid tribute at the subsequent eulogy to Black churches for being a place where children were “taught that they matter,” (Day, 2015). Two other distinct examples occurred in June 2016: 1) Philando Castile’s death was recorded and posted by his girlfriend via Facebook Live when a St. Paul, MN officer shot him five times after he told the officer than he had a licensed gun and 2) Alton Sterling was shot and killed by a Louisiana police officer after confronting him outside of a convenient store believing that he had a gun in an open carry state (Donella, 2016).

With these aforementioned incidents comes not only BlackLivesMatter advocacy, but also public responses establishing support, neutrality, or opposition to their cause of demanding change to the “systematically and intentionally targeting [of Black lives],” (BLM, Principles, n.d.). These responses include Twitter hastags #SayHerName, #AllLivesMatter, #BlueLivesMatter and Facebook phenomenon “thin blue line” to name a few (Blay, 2016). Another response involves *The Guardian*’s project that tracks police killings in America updated daily, which cites 266 Black Americans were killed by police in 2016. While 574 White Americans who were killed by the police in the same year, the website also displays the ratio in which these killings occur: Black outnumbers White 6.66 to 2.9 deaths per million. Discourse surrounding police officers and the Black community has also emerged from multiple offline arenas of our society. For example, President Obama addressed these incidents press conferences

(Rhodam, 2016). Presidential candidates responded to it during rallies and debates (Bradner, 2016). Musicians, athletes, and celebrities have created content, protested, and voiced their opinions (Bragg, 2016). Schools and businesses have issued public statements (Wilson, 2015).

Clearly, police brutality and targeted violence upon African Americans is not an antiquated subject matter. The loss of 11 Black lives and 65 homes in a predominantly Black neighborhood by the police's use of incendiary devices frames the MOVE site as an extreme and prime example America is still faced with that very violence today. This thesis benefits from the fifty years of hindsight regarding the National Register and thirty years of retrospection regarding the MOVE bombing rather than solely relying on contemporary speculation.

Finally, this thesis will address the need for more scholarly crossover between rhetoric and historic preservation. Moreover, this thesis has the unique opportunity through rhetorical and critical analysis to interrogate the abilities of historic preservation to generate meaningful discourse between the historic built environment and historic narratives. Rhetorical scholars have contributed seminal works to bodies of knowledge tangential to historic preservation such as Hattenhauer's "The Rhetoric of Architecture" (1984) and Dickinson, Blair, and Ott's "Places of Public Memory: the Rhetoric of Museums and Memorials" (2010). Other rhetoricians have analyzed the rhetoric surrounding architecture, urban planning, housing laws, neighborhood and city programs – or historiography, public memory, oral histories, photojournalism, and other articulations of history. However, neither spatial rhetoricians nor public memory rhetoricians have explicitly examined historic preservation as possible combination of the two perspectives. Regarding historic preservation, the field does produce scholarly work that is self-reflective and critical. Examples include anthropologist Kerri Barile's "Race, the National Register, and Cultural Resource Management: Creating an Historic Context for Postbellum Sites" (2004);

communication scholar Timothy Simpson's auto-ethnography "Communication, Conflict, and Community in an Urban Industrial Ruin" (1995); and Trust President Stephanie Meek's "The Past and Future City: How Historic Preservation is Reviving America's Communities" (2016). However, the field has yet to directly employ rhetorical methodologies nor examine rhetorical implications. To my knowledge, there is no example that links *rhetoric* and *historic preservation* (i.e., ethic, practice, policy, institution, or otherwise) directly in one body of work. I argue that this thesis can use rhetorical criticism to investigate and perhaps improve the meaning-making at play in historic preservation practices and policies. If the historic preservation ethic assumes the preservation of a site preserves the history it embodies or represents, then critical rhetoric can help determine if and why that assumption is true and then challenge the implications that the ethic poses.

CHAPTER TWO

Review of Literature

The intersection between the National Register of Historic Places, the site of the MOVE bombing in 1985, and critical rhetoric provides an ideal position to investigate how racialized groups are further marginalized through the policing of their space and their history. Because the scholarly overlap between rhetoric and historic preservation is unprecedented, I have elected to review the work that has been done in both fields in two separate sections.

First, to most coherently navigate literature relevant to this study from the field of rhetoric, I layer work from: (1) literature that establishes public spaces as rhetoric worthy of analysis, then (2) literature that applies public spaces to public memory, and (3) literature that suggests public memory and public spaces shape discourse surrounding race. Finally, I examine what scholars outside of the field of rhetoric have studied regarding historic preservation. The work reflected in this section is both scarce and fragmentary, hence the need for more scholarly investigation into this now 50-year old, American practice.

My goal for this literature review is to establish a rhetorical foundation to build my analysis upon and to show what gaps in research the analysis can help bridge. Ultimately, the absence of literature linking historic preservation and critical rhetoric makes this analysis of the MOVE bombing site within the National Register of Historic Places genre necessary – for both preservationists' and rhetoricians' understanding of race and space.

Public Spaces as Rhetoric

For rhetoricians, public spaces constitute any space, physical or conceptual, that is provided an audience or participants regardless of intentionality or designation (Birmingham, p.293). Physical spaces, having material properties, can exist as individual buildings or a whole city, enclosed rooms or open landscapes, and can be embodied as schools, parks, shopping

centers, neighborhoods, offices, and museums to name a very few examples. Conceptual spaces are more complicated to identify and mark boundaries like “The Internet” or “The Western World.” Additionally, public spaces do not become rhetorical until there is human intervention with discursive outcomes interjected upon them. For instance, California’s Sierra Nevada mountain range might not necessarily be rhetorical in nature – until the National Park Service names it Yosemite National Park, provides it protected status by U.S. law, places signs and trailheads along a specific path, and identifies it as a site of “national heritage” with the expressed purpose of “preserving the natural resources of America.” This is an important distinction to make to appease the preservationists and the rhetoricians alike when addressing spaces and places. Because public spaces are so broadly studied in rhetoric, I first review literature that specifically addresses physical spaces and their ability to embody, disrupt, or reflect meaning – before later reviewing literature that specifically applies physical spaces to public memory.

In his seminal work “The Rhetoric of Architecture: A Semiotic Approach” (1984), Darryl Hattenhauer straightforwardly argues, “Architecture not only communicates, but also communicates rhetorically” (p. 71). His distinction between communication and rhetoric is that communication is merely the projection of meaning and function, whereas rhetoric has the ability to “influence our behavior” (p. 71). When referencing architecture as public constructed places with rhetorical abilities, Hattenhauer asserts that “symbolic meaning is sometimes more important than the actual use.” He provides the example of the courtroom architecture: the elevated and centered judge’s seat, the partition between the jury and the witness, the symmetrical and parallel seating for the defense and prosecution – none of which are necessary for function, but all of which suggest a role, behavior, or position (p.73).

Elizabeth Birmingham's "Reframing the Ruins: Pruitt-Igoe, Structural Racism, and African American Rhetoric as a Space for Cultural Critique" (1999) adds to Hattenhauer's perspective. Birmingham argues that not only do buildings embody meaning and project messages, but their rhetoric can also reinforce social structures like racism. Birmingham's work is further examined later in the section pertaining to race and public memory; for now it is important to understand that not only is architecture rhetorical, but that it demands critical examination.

Rhetorician Richard Marback (2004a, 2004b) describes how public spaces are subjected to rhetorical intervention. His assertions differ from Hattenhauer and Birmingham in that he does not focus much on public spaces that are rhetorically invented (i.e., an architect has a prerogative that is actuated in a design), but rather he examines places that have been physically/visually modified and therefore rhetorically modified. Marback (2004a) demonstrates the complex and dynamic interactions of spatial experience and rhetorical authority at the notorious South African prison, Robben Island. He argues that conceptually distorting a physical space and vice versa, triggers rhetorical consequences. Marback (2004b) also explores how two plaques placed in different locations in Cape Town, South Africa, which were designed to comment on apartheid, generated different responses from citizens and leaders in both of their efforts to move beyond the injuries of apartheid. The author concludes that spaces are malleable rhetorical resources for political and social change. In both studies, Marback supports the notion that human intervention transitions a space in rhetorical primacy. Robben Island was "just an abandoned prison" until South African leaders decided to reframe it as an artifact of national heritage. Cape Town, consisting of citizens and their built environment, did not function in a rhetorical manner until two plaques bifurcated the town's understanding of apartheid. Perhaps most of all, Marbeck's

studies reminds us that spaces are malleable and not permanent, either physically and therefore rhetorically.

Finally, rhetorician Brent Saindon (2012) uses philosopher Michel Foucault's concept of "heterotopias" to understand the rhetorical power of a building's disposition in the context of culture. Foucault (1986) describes heterotopia as closed or semi-closed spaces that relates to other sides, "but in such a way as to [suspend], neutralize, or invert a set of relations" at work in a culture. Essentially, heterotopias are physical spatial embodiments of a culture, fluidly privileging or emphasizing certain aspects of that culture over another aspect. Saindon argues that the Jewish Museum [of] Berlin contains one heterotopia within another. Ultimately, Saindon argues that the "Shalechet" art installation at the Jewish Museum Berlin functions as one heterotopia enveloped by the much larger heterotopia of architect Daniel Libeskind's original building design in relation to the surrounding city. The city reflects Berlin's post-Holocaust culture: internalized guilt as bystanders, acting as international witnesses. Saindon, through Foucault, calls attention to the intermingling of spaces whether adjacent to each other or within each other. Moreover, when analyzing the rhetoric of spaces, the physical context is not only as important as the conceptual cultural context; they may very well reflect each other as heterotopias – meaning rhetoricians (and architectural critics) should be weary of examining spaces in a vacuum.

Public Spaces Applied to Public Memory

While scholarship on the intersection on memory, place, and rhetoric is abundant, perhaps one of the most notable contributions within the past decade is "Places of Public Memory: The Rhetoric of Museums and Memorials," (2010) a collection of essays organized and edited into a book by rhetoricians Greg Dickinson, Carole Blair, and Brian Ott. The editors assert

that the first time *memory* was recognized as a rhetorical art (or skill perhaps) might have been in classical Roman philosopher Cicero's *De Oratore* in which he recounts the story of Simonides. Simonides identified the maimed victims of a roof collapse by remembering where each one sat at during a banquet before the disaster (p. 1). As this story illustrates, memory is no stranger to the centuries-old tradition of rhetoric as skill to be taught and mastered for oratory.

However, Dickinson et al. points to early twentieth-century French philosophers Maurice Halbwachs and Michel Foucault as the pioneering scholars who conceptualized “memory as an activity of collectivity rather than (or in addition to) individuated, cognitive work” (pp. 5 – 6). This meant that scholars could approach “memory” not from the psychological perspective of an individual's ability to recollect their own individual lived experiences, but instead also analyze and theorize how individuals contribute to a much larger agreed-upon memory belonging to a public. Dickinson et al.'s work has inspired scholars within the recent past century to theorize and study this “shared understanding of the past” providing their own modifiers likes “collective memory, social memory, popular memory, [and] cultural memory” (p.6). In this line of scholarship and interpretation, Dickinson et al. identify six assumptions about “memory” largely shared among contemporary scholars:

- 1) Memory is activated by present concerns, issues, or anxieties;
- 2) Memory narrates shared identities, constructing a sense of communal belonging;
- 3) Memory is animated by affect;
- 4) Memory is partial, partisan, and thus often contested;
- 5) Memory relies on material and/or symbolic supports;
- 6) Memory has a history. (p.6)

Each of these sentiments are important and considered in my analysis, but here I review the three that I believe may not be as apparent in their summation (3, 5, and 6). First, “animated by affect” references public memory's propensity to emphasize and therefore retain only what the group

has deemed worthy based on emotional attachment. This emotional attachment is typically manifested in two ways: “as a simple irreducible and unexplored assumption [i.e., ‘this place makes me feel sad because something tragic happened here’], or as the particularized ground for phenomenological explorations of trauma [i.e., ‘this place makes me feel something because something happened here, but I am uncertain of what that something is’]” (p.7). Secondly, Dickinson et al. explains that “memory has a history” because memory changes over time – and to be thorough in studying public memory is to consider all versions of a memory, not just the one most presently apparent. For instance, how American citizens “remembered” the 9/11 terrorist attacks in the year it happened can be vastly different to how they remember it a decade later. Furthermore, this notion challenges scholars to be distinct in their understanding and usage of *history* versus *memory*.

African-American scholar and novelist, Toni Morrison contributes to the discourse surrounding memory by adding “A rememory differs from a memory, for it presents the opportunity to reconstruct or deconstruct realities in the form of space that can be shared with others” (Carden, 1999). The concept of “rememory” allows for sites to renegotiate their historicity by means of rhetoric intervention – meaning sites are not bound to the first historic event or historic interpretation allotted to them but rather in a constant state of reformation and consolidation.

The third of Dickinson et. al.’s assumptions that is worthy of more explanation is that “[public] memory relies on material and/or symbolic support.” This explains why so much of the scholarship surrounding public memory often involves a physically or visually rhetorical artifact as the centerpiece of the study. Dickinson et al. describes these supports as “language, ritual performances, communication technologies, objects, and places – that work in various ways to

consummate individual's attachment to the group." Dickinson et al. allude to the notion that shared creation, ownership, or recognition of a *thing* that articulates the past also consolidates all of those individual interpretations of that past into a singular collective, public memory (pp. 6-10).

Some scholars go so far as to argue that not only do referential actions, objects, and places support memories, but also that the past "*must* be articulated to become memory" in the first place (Huysen, 2003). Under rhetorician Andreas Huyssen's assertion, not all incidences of the past are worthy of becoming collective memories; if no one talks about it, makes a thing about it, or change their behavior from it – then it is as if it never happened according to the group's shared recollection of what happened. Furthermore, just because an incident was articulated through "material or symbolic support" does not mean it remains as a memory indefinitely either. Huyssen adds if that if the articulation of a past is eradicated – without replacement or repair – then that memory becomes subject to "collective amnesia" (p. 17).

Although the terminology of "collective amnesia" is clever, scholars like James Wertsch (2009) cautions that "sometimes the metaphoric borrowing between theories of individual memory and public memory can be problematic" (p. 35). Primarily, the remembering-forgetting dialectic can oversimplify the reality of certain histories of a public memory – to which critics can blame the lack of discourse surrounding that memory solely on the lack of a physical symbolic articulation. Sociologist Jeffrey Olick in his book "The Politics of Regret: On Collective Memory and Historical Responsibility" explains Germans in postwar Germany did not know or did not remember particular contents of the Nazi past – but because they lacked articulation of that past in their physical and linguistic landscape. Olick explains that instead it was embedded in their cultural proscription, legally and socially, what could and could not be

said about Nazi policies, concluding that the lack of apparent discourse among postwar Germans touched upon an entirely different rhetorical dynamic.

Contemporary scholars look to memorials and monuments as their go-to rhetorical artifact as most of them are already inherent memory places. Rhetorician Barbara Biesecker (2002) asserts that physicalized rhetoric such as memorials and monuments are both “memory texts” and “material culture” in that they evoke discursive memories of events while relying on the materiality as the medium of communication. Specifically, she argues in “Remembering World War II: The Rhetoric of Politics of National Commemoration at the Turn of the 21st Century” that that four memory texts: the *Saving Private Ryan* film, *The Greatest Generation* book, the WWII Memorial, and the Women in Military Service for America Memorial are “reconstructions of the past [that] function rhetorically as civic lessons for a generation beset by fractious disagreements about the viability of the U.S. culture and identity,” (p. 393). Thus, not only do public spaces (and in Biesecker’s study, public objects like the book and the film) embody memories, but they also serve to homogenize memories within cultures that have not yet agreed upon a singular collective memory. Biesecker adds “just as important as recognizing that collective memory is rhetorical is recognizing that the kind of rhetorical work particular memory texts do is not determined in advance” (p. 399). This is perhaps a postmodern warning against dogmatic interpretations of material culture.

In “Oppositional Memory Practices: U.S. Memorial Spaces as Arguments over Public Memory” (2015), rhetoricians Ryan McGeough, Catherine Palczewski, and Randall Lake argue that monuments can present arguments about who and what should be remembered. They assert “monuments’ attempts to stabilize particular histories that can be refuted in diverse ways: “interpretative plaques that access counter histories and punctuate a space with interruptions;

subsequent counter-monuments that ‘answer back’ to the original; and even destruction and/or replacement” (p. 233). Their work supports the notion that public spaces not only embody a history but they can challenge other possible histories.

Not only should scholars consider memorials, monuments, and public spaces in their geographical or cultural context, but in relation to other forms of the history present. For example, McGeough et al. explains that a plaque installed at Fetterman Battlefield that recognizes the native Indians who survived the battle argued for memorialization of the Indian narrative at a site that had already been prescribed as a sacred place memorializing American soldiers. While the plaque argued that the Indian survivor narrative should be remembered *too*, McGeough et al. suggest that not all memorials are created or accepted equally. Hence, the small plaque could not override the dominant history inscribed in signs, pamphlets, and kiosks already established around the rest of Fetterman Battlefield.

This notion that public spaces are grounds for contestation is explored by rhetorician Terasa Donofrio in her article “Ground Zero and Place-Making Authority: The Conservative Metaphors in 9/11 Families’ ‘Take Back the Memorial’ Rhetoric” (2010). Rather than looking at the 9/11 sites themselves, Donofrio focuses on the discourse and dialogue between family members’ who lost someone in 9/11 and those in charge of the potential construction of a memorial site at Ground Zero. Donofrio argues that the rhetoric used by the family members suggests that there is power through representation and memorialization inherent in a memorial site and that to “take the memorial back” from political co-opting is to suggest that it was taken away by political interest groups in the first place. Much like the Indian-Soldier contestation at Fetterman Battlefield, the discourse surrounding the potential memorial at Ground Zero reveals a power struggle between what victims’ family members believe to be the politicization of their

victimhood and what the city believes to be an appropriate commemoration of a tragedy, as if compromise is unwanted or impossible.

Hinting at a postmodern interpretation of public spaces, rhetorician Elizabethada Wright in “Rhetorical Spaces in Memorial Places: The Cemetery as a Rhetorical Memory Place/Space” (2005) argues that spaces are often unstable in their rhetorical abilities and thus the memories evoked by a space are unstable too. Wright explores “how the essential nature of the cemetery makes it both a very usual and unusual memory place” (p.51) meaning that the rituals, traditions, symbols, and gestures physicalized at cemeteries is differently effective depending on who has access to them and when they are accessed. Wright explains, “sometimes people are remembered because someone gets their shoe caught on a stone, or a backhoe uncovers an ancient coffin...then that very real place again becomes a rhetorical memory space even after it has been forgotten for decades, years, or even centuries” (p. 71). The rhetorical power within a physicalized space may not always be activated, but as Wright asserts, it may be dormant and potent once that space becomes public again. Furthermore, Wright also reminds scholars that the reality of rhetoric must consider both space and time, and to consider the physicality of a space alone is to reduce it a one-dimensional rhetorical text.

Public Memory and Public Space in Relation to Race and Identity

I establish in the previous sections that public spaces are rhetorical grounds with dormant and potent socio-cultural power. That kind of power is enacted in the ability to represent, commemorate, or memorialize the history of whoever has the most rhetorical agency over that space, which given the status quo is often dominantly White capitalist patriarchy. This reality warrants rhetorical research to investigate ways in which the dominant culture sustains that dominance through their use of public spaces and subsequent public memory produced by those

public spaces. Research is also needed on the ways marginalized countercultures challenge that dominance by rhetorically reclaiming those public spaces. This section reviews literature addressing how public spaces and/or public memory specifically contributes to the formation of racial identities.

I begin by returning to and expanding upon rhetorical critic Elizabeth Birmingham's article "Reframing the Ruins: Pruitt-Igoe, Structural Racism, and African American Rhetoric as a Space for Cultural Critique" (1999). Birmingham uses social critic Cornell West's "Race and Architecture" (1993) as the springboard for her argument and analysis. While Birmingham agrees with West that architectural critics should be especially able to analyze the "structural and institutional dynamics of power," she points out that he "offers no framework with which critics can take up this project" (p. 294). Hence, she refers to other African American scholars like bell hooks, Michael Eric Dyson, and Marlon Riggs who employ the term *structural racism* to describe "the ways in which racism is so deeply encoded in American society's structure as to seem natural" (p. 295). She applies this concept to the built environment in ways architecture critics have neglected to do. In her study, she rereads the Pruitt-Igoe housing project as a rhetorical text as opposed to a "failed architecture style" where she rejects the "ascendant myth." Established by architecture critic Charles Jencks (1977) in *The Language of Post-Modern Architecture*, the ascendant myth Birmingham refers to is the belief that the death of high modernism architecture style (and evidently the Pruitt-Igoe housing project as a prime example) was caused by "the inability of this architectural style to create livable environments for the poor, in great part because the poor are not the nuanced and sophisticated 'readers' of architectural space the educated architects were" (p. 291). Birmingham exclaims "what is not discussed in this myth are issues of race – the over 10,000 residents of Pruitt-Igoe were 98% African

American” and then adds “the residents of Pruitt-Igoe read and de-coded that housing project perfectly; they recognized it for what it was – an urban reservation which had the effect of containing and segregating its residents from the rest of the city and the cities’ resources.” Her rhetorical method of “re-reading” of Pruitt-Igoe included isolating the different structural and programmatic elements of the housing project, accessing the visual and spatial metaphors embedded in the elements, and comparing those metaphors to the reception of the housing project verbalized by the actual tenants (i.e., impoverished Black people). Birmingham ultimately encourages a startling but necessary paradigm shift to interrogate architecture as an institution not exempt from structural racism.

Rhetorician Casey Schmitt (2015) critically examines the textual, material, and experiential rhetoric of Native American effigy mounds in a modern urban landscape. She finds that “the rhetorical positioning around mound sites [in a modern urban context] reliably promotes either a reverent remove, the association of the Indian with natural world over human world, or a simple lack of acknowledgement” (p. 323) which effectively whitewashes Native American history for a more palpable experience for the site’s visitors. Schmitt concludes by advocating, “Those involved in the maintenance of culturally layered locations can work to promote more reflexive layering” as opposed to further amplifying a “museum-type gaze” (p. 323). Critical attention to cases like these further supports the notion that spaces and places can be interrupted for sociopolitical gain, especially at the detriment to another sociocultural group. Ultimately, a space can be stripped of its rhetorical power when audiences have the means to geosocially distance themselves from it while still in physical contact with it.

Rhetorician Stephen Underhill (2016) uses the rhetorical homology of the “urban jungle” to conduct an intuitional critique of law enforcement in the aftermath of Michael Brown’s death

in Ferguson Missouri. Underhill analyzes how “institutional representatives include some and exclude others as they naturalized violence in the name of public service,” (p. 411). Underhill effectively takes the physical space of Ferguson, Missouri and translates it into the conceptual space of an urban jungle. In Underhill’s analysis, the urban jungle becomes the rhetorical landscape in which institutional representatives can maneuver around criticism while leveling claims of savagery and shifting blame back onto the Black populace for Brown’s death and subsequent riots and destruction. Underhill reminds scholars and critics that how people talk about spaces matter; verbalizing physical spaces in a manner that benefits those already in power is a timeless rhetorical strategy.

Rhetorician Kristan Poirot (2015a) further complicates the hierarchical understanding of rhetorical landscapes. When examining the Birmingham Civil Rights Institute (BCRI), she argues that “memories of the Civil Rights Movement are mapped spatially and rhetorically to depict correlations among Jim Crow contexts and acts of black resistance” (p. 621). Poirot then explains that while depicting Jim Crow era as violent and the acts of Black resistance as masculine might have been a necessary rhetorical maneuver to “animate a relationship between exigency and response” for present-day BCRI visitors, it also produced a “gendered landscapes of memory that limits at the outset the conditions and possibilities for women’s emergence” (p. 621). Therefore, even though BCRI simplified the White narrative of oppression to justify the Black narrative of resistance, it still undermined “women’s role in black freedom struggles” by privileging masculine forms of protest (pp. 639-641). While race and gender are different constructs, Poirot challenges scholars’ diametric assumptions of power when studying place-making and public memory.

While Poirot's study on BCRI focuses on an institutionalized example of a memory place, she, alongside rhetorician Shevaun Watson (2015b) also examine commercialized examples like that of heritage tourism. Poirot and Watson offer "a robust consideration of tourism as a constitutive component of memory environments" by taking "a closer look at the memorials of urban slavery and rebellion that circulate in Charleston, South Carolina's historical tourism industry," (p.91). Ultimately, they find that Charleston's collective tourism initiative "rationalizes the disenfranchisement of black residents within a historical context, allowing visitors to gaze into a palpable past rather than reckon with the fraught realities of the present" (pp. 103-104). Additionally, they assert that Charleston is not unique in its missed or avoided opportunities as a site to challenge White supremacy, nor is it the only place that performs "rhetorical labor" to celebrate the living manifestations of racial hierarchy. Guised as "heritage tourism" of the Antebellum South, tours of historic sites around Charleston highlight the preservation of slave-owner architecture as a present day symbol for longstanding White wealth while historicizing and even assuaging Black narratives of slavery and revolt. Poirot and Watson provide a platform for not only considering how the built environment itself can produce hegemonized public memories but also how institutions that center the built environment (like tourism and historic preservation) can support that hegemonic rhetoric.

Finally, rhetorician Mary Triece (2016) in her book *Urban Renewal and Resistance*: expands the scope of memory places and their relations to race by examining the cities of Detroit and Harlem as two wholes. The premise for her investigation is that "place is intimately related to well-being and inextricably linked to race and class," thus she focuses on the *urban* text such as Detroit's city planning documents and news coverage of Harlem's waste management plant as fragmentary rhetorical elements that make up a place at large. As Triece's work suggests, the

urban texts that she and many other scholars study are not isolated in nature and should not be isolated in study. Collective systems of racial and class inequalities all together normalize the status quo of the “neoliberal city.” Triage explains that the hallmarks of neoliberalism are (1) “a narrative of progress,” (2) “emphasis on the individual,” and (3) a “market logic,” all of which can alleviate a marginalized individual’s sense of well-being without having to do any effective dismantling of the systems that marginalized them in the first place. Ultimately, Triage examines Detroit and Harlem’s urban landscape as a rhetorical landscape to critique neoliberalism physicalized and programmed into two separate cities – both of which have rich racial implications.

Historic Preservation in Academia

Historic preservation publications are often informational and narrative accounts of case studies and successes within the profession, or they catalog grassroots efforts. Similarly, in historic preservation academia most of the writing process is saved for curriculum and program creation, and the occasional think piece reflecting on the nature of historic preservation practices, which admittedly include its issue of diversity. However, to my knowledge, preservationists do not apply methodological analyses or criticisms of their work – nor are they expected to. Therefore, I focus on the few studies I found most relevant to my study.

Kerri Barile (2004), in her article “Race, the National Register, and Cultural Resource Management: Creating an Historic Context for Postbellum Sites” published in the *Society for Historical Archaeology* journal, calls attention to Eric Wolf’s (1982) concept of “the people without history: those that have often fallen through the cracks of written documentation due to their position in society or merely their locality in reference to cultural centers” (p. 90) and their inadequate consideration and representation on the National Register of Historic Places. In

response, Barile conducts a quantitative and qualitative review of the professional archeological reports of 436 postbellum sites from 15 selected counties provided by the Texas Historical Commission, the Council for Texas Archeologists, and local cultural resource management. Barile found that “when sites were examined by factoring race with eligibility, only 6% of the Black sites were determined as eligible versus 77% of the White sites” (p. 95). She also asserts the “the vocabulary used [in the reports] were extremely biased” (p. 96). For instance, domestic sites associated with Black occupants were always listed as “tenant” or “dwelling” whereas sites with a White occupant, whether the occupant owned the property or not, was listed as “farmstead” or “homestead.” Barile believes “the recording archaeologists seem to have naturalized their binaries of White/Black with owner/tenant rather than to first question their own inadvertent racial assumptions” which further privileged household structures that documented White history and undermines the vernacular structure of the lower class which includes the homes of ex-slaves and immigrants (p. 96). For those White sites, such use of language and reporting is then re-documented and re-immortalized a second time when the sites are determined eligible for the NRHP. For the Black sites, Barile concludes “a denial of eligibility not only sends a very particular message to the public on what is considered important; it also negates the sites not included on the register certain privileges associated with NRHP status such as qualification for federal financial assistance and protection” (p. 98). Comparing Barile’s (2004) findings with Meek’s (2016) statistic that less than 8% of the 86,000 listed properties on the National Register represent women or people of color reveals that more than a decade later, cultural resource management (consisting of archeology and historic preservation which are both provided on the NHPA of 1966) is still in dire need of interrogation and subsequent modification.

Mark Nevitt's article (2014) "The National Historic Preservation Act: Preserving History, Impacting Foreign Relations?" published in the *Berkeley Journal of International Law* examines how the NHPA has deviated from its original goals of preserving "the cultural foundations of the nation...in order to give a sense of orientation to the American people" (p. 390). Nevitt uses the U.S Marine Corps Air Station and its relocation as a case study to show that deviation intent has international implications and consequences. Since the National Register is a direct compartment of the NHPA, a similar interrogation into its deviation from "the official list of the Nation's historic places worthy of preservation" can reveal important implications regarding the historic preservation practice and policy.

Through quantitative research, J.F. Coeterier's (2002) study published in *Landscape and Urban Planning* journal found that "lay people's evaluation [of historic sites] are mainly based on form while the main criterion for experts is knowledge, or information value" (p. 111). While Coertier's study focuses on the population and historic preservation practice in The Netherlands, it opens up the conversation for professional preservationists and policy makers to consider any disparities between them and the public they are supposed to serve.

CHAPTER THREE

Method

In this section, I define the key concepts that are important to understand genre criticism, the critical method I employ in this paper. I first explain generic criticism's classical roots then its contemporary developments. Then, I describe the procedures for this specific employment of generic criticism and its corresponding rhetorical artifact for analysis. In the end, I hope to convey that the goal of this project is to apply generic criticism to answer:

Generic Criticism

Rhetorician Sonja Foss asserts "generic criticism is rooted in the assumption that certain types of situations provoke similar needs and expectations in audiences and thus call for particular kinds of rhetoric" (2004, p. 137). This assumption originates from the writings of Aristotle and other classical rhetoricians who contended that rhetoric can be divided into three general types – deliberative or political, forensic or legal, and epideictic or ceremonial. Each type has distinctive strategies and aims. For example, accusation and defense were employed in forensic speaking in pursuit of justice, whereas praise and blame were employed in epideictic speaking in pursuit of honor (p. 138). The main concern for classical rhetoricians was to be able to identify and employ these strategies and developing one's rhetorical repertoire, illustrating the tradition of establishing genres.

Contemporary rhetoricians advanced the generic approach to rhetoric by analyzing the effectiveness and ethicality of those strategies and aims in any given rhetor's attempts to fulfill or subvert any given genre. Black (1965), who was the first use the term *generic criticism* in his critique of neo-Aristotelianism in 1965, proposed as an alternative to the traditional method of criticism a generic frame that included these tenets: (1) "there is a limited number of situations in

which a rhetor can find himself”; (2) “there is a limited number of ways in which a rhetor can and will respond rhetorically to any given situational-type”; and (3) the recurrence of a given situational type through history will provide a critic with information on rhetorical responses available to that situation” (p.133). Black suggests that to understand and analyze contemporary or newly invented rhetorical situations, critics must look to previous or historical examples of the assumed genre to reveal their common features:-

Bitzer’s (1968) notion of the *rhetorical situation* also significantly contributed to the generic criticism. He suggests, “from day to day, year to year, comparable situations occur, prompting comparable responses; hence rhetorical forms are born and a special vocabulary, grammar, and style are established” (p. 13). Framing rhetoric as a *response*, Bitzer asserts that rhetorical situations must have exigence, an audience, and a set of constraints, and to dismiss those three contextual components is to misunderstand or mistake mere utterance for worthwhile rhetoric (p. 3). I define “exigence” as the urgency or prompting of an action and “audience” as the players who witness the action.

Vatz (1973) challenges Bitzer’s foundational work on the rhetorical situation. Vatz asserts that Bitzer overemphasizes the rhetorical act as response to the rhetorical situation, but fails to produce meaningful discourse about the *situation* itself. He states “[Bitzer’s] statements do not, however, tell us about qualities within the situation” (p. 155) which is worthy of investigation on its own. Thus, re-emphasizing the constructs of the situation: exigence, audience, and constraints in this study helps highlight the rhetorical possibilities of the situation before ever considering the response to that situation.

Bakhtin (1986) contributes to generic criticism by suggesting “in the most free, the most unconstrained conversations, we cast our speech in definite generic forms, sometimes rigid and

trite ones, sometimes more flexible, plastic and creative ones.” While Bakhtin refers mainly to speech genres like farewells and congratulations speech, this sentiment regarding genre fluidity challenges the very constraints that perhaps Bitzer asserts in his definition of rhetorical situation.

Campbell and Jamieson’s (1978) notion of *significant form*, or reoccurring patterns in discourse of action, also contributed to the development of generic criticism by expanding on classical rhetorician’s strategies and aims into contemporary iterations. These repeated iterations include “repeated used of images, metaphors, arguments, structural arrangements, configurations of language or a combination of such elements into what critics have termed ‘genre’ or ‘rhetorics’” (p. 18).

Finally, Paré and Smart (1994) focuses on rhetorical genres within organizational settings. They define genre as a distinctive profile of regularities across four dimensions: (1) textual features such as styles of text and modes of argument; (2) regularities in the composing process such as information gathering and analysis of information; (3) regularities in reading practices such as where, when, and why a document is read; and (4) the social roles performed by the writers and readers so that no matter who acts as social worker, judge, or project manager, the genre is enacted in much the same way (pp. 146-154). Their perspective seems to focus more on the rhetorical invention and reception within organizations more than the raw text of any given rhetorical situation or artifact.

With a better understanding of generic criticism’s development in the rhetorical tradition, I review Foss’s (2004) three options for analysis: generic description, generic participation, and generic application. Generic description is the establishment of genre – by observing similarities in rhetorical responses to particular situations, collecting artifacts that occur in similar situations, analyzing those artifacts to discover if they share characteristics, and formulating the organizing

principle of the genre. Generic participation is the deductive process in which a critic tests an instance of rhetoric against the characteristics of a genre. This occurs by describing the perceived situational requirements, substantive and stylistic strategies, and organizing principle of a genre and of an artifact, before comparing the characteristics of the artifact with those of the genre to discover if the artifact belongs in that genre. Generic application is the process of determining whether a particular artifact belongs in a particular genre as a good or poor example of that genre; generic application follows the first three procedures of generic participation but is followed by evaluating the artifact according to its success in fulfilling the required characteristics of the genre.

For this particular study, I employed generic application through the following procedures. First, I established *historic places on the National Register* as a rhetorical genre by deriving its perceived situational requirements, substantive and stylistic strategies, and organizing principles from its pragmatic iteration provided by the application and the NHPA. Then, I will describe the perceived situational requirements, substantive and stylistic strategies, and organizing principles of the site of the MOVE bombing as possible example of the genre. Finally, I will compare the characteristics of the site with those of the National Register to evaluate of the success of the site in fulfilling the required characteristics of a “Historic Place” as prescribed by the National Register genre. In doing so, I intend to answer the following research questions:

RQ1: How does the National Register limit or expand the public’s understanding of racialized violence and marginalized histories?

RQ2: How can the National Register of Historic Places help or hinder understanding of the MOVE site?

CHAPTER FOUR

Analysis – Establishing the Rhetorical Genre

This project seeks to understand what it means to be a listed property on the National Register of Historic Places – and to apply that understanding to the hypothetical inclusion or exclusion of the site of the 1985 MOVE bombing (henceforth “the MOVE site”). Using genre criticism, this project first establishes *historic places on the National Register* as a genre and then accesses the MOVE site as a potential artifact of that genre. This project is not as much concerned with whether the site is eligible or not eligible for National Register, but rather the rhetorical and practical implications regarding the intersection of race, place, and public memory.

When confronting the National Register of Historic Places, this project uses the language directly from the Register’s application, legislation, and official publications regarding the Register from the National Park Service like the Bulletin booklet series. Third-party interpretations like that of the State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPOs) and preservation professionals are considered when discussing the malleability of the Register. When confronting the MOVE site, more typical research methods are applied to find the most truthful and consistent narrative among books, documentaries, archives, court transcripts, investigation reports, and oral histories from city officials, survivors, witnesses, and community members.

As noted in the previous section, Foss (2004) outlines four steps for generic application. In this section, I identify the perceived situational, substantive, and stylistic requirements, and the organizing principle of *historic places on the National Register* as a genre facilitated by the National Register of Historic Places. Second, I do the same for the MOVE site as an isolated artifact. Third, I compare the characteristic findings of the artifact with that of the genre. Finally,

I evaluate and discuss the site's successes and limitations in fulfilling those characteristics from the genre. The results that stemmed from each of these steps are discussed in turn.

Features of “Historic Places on the National Register”

Situational Requirements

Perceived situational requirements are the “perception of conditions in a situation that call forth particular kinds of rhetorical responses” (Foss, p. 137). When establishing the situational requirements, critics are most concerned with what prompts a rhetorical act or artifact to come into existence. For this project, I want to clarify that the situational requirements I establish in this section are in pursuit of understanding when and why a *place* would be nominated and/or listed as a *historic place on the National Register*, which is not to be confused with why the Register was created, why a place was built, or what circumstances make a place “historic” in a broad sense. I am not concerned with isolated places nor the isolated National Register, but rather the transitional rhetorical act of a *place* becoming a *historic place on the National Register*. Therefore, in the following, I investigate the exigence that constitutes the situational requirements that warrant seeking “eligible” or “listed” status on the National Register of Historic Places.

Exigence for nominating and listing a site on the National Register is proffered through both intrinsic sentiments and practical benefits. First, the official NPS web portal, the Bulletin booklet series, and brochures all introduce the National Register using the same language:

The National Register of Historic Places is the official list of the Nation's historic places worthy of preservation. Authorized under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, it is part of a national program to coordinate and support public and private efforts to identify, evaluate, and protect our historic and archeological resources (NPS brochure).

Based on that description, one can perceive that the reason why anyone would want to nominate or list a site on the National Register is because they believe that a site is “worthy of preservation” and is compelled to “identify, evaluate, and protect” that site. The use of “National,” “Nation,” and “our” adds a layer of rhetorical responsibility for the individual to consider the national collective’s desires over their own individual desires regarding the preservation of a place. If the previous sentiment is sound – that places become “historic places on the National Register” because there is a collective agreement that those places are worthy of preservation (i.e., identification, evaluation, and protection) – then it is also important to consider what compels a collective to participate in preservation. This timeless inquiry is pondered by historic preservation professionals and spatial rhetoricians alike. However, in an effort to not offer premature conclusions in this section, I reserve the extended discussion on the rhetorical motivations of historic preservation until after the analysis. For now, socio-economic gain, place-making, and history-telling can function as placeholder exigencies for “historic preservation via National Register,” while historic preservation itself is the overarching exigence for nominating and listing a site on the National Register.

For more concrete examples of exigence, the official webpage and brochure for the National Register of Historic Places explains:

“Listings on the National Register helps preserves listed properties in the following ways:

- Federal preservation grants for planning and rehabilitation
- Federal investment tax credits
- Preservation easements to nonprofits organizations
- International Building Code fire and life safety code alternatives
- Possible State tax benefits and grant opportunities

- Nominations become part of the National Register Archives, a public, searchable database that provides a wealth of research information” (NPS Brochure, n.d.)

These practical benefits reframe the exigence of nominating and listing a site from intrinsic place-making to extrinsic redistribution of monetary and material resources.

One limitation of the webpage and the brochure is that they do not address the bureaucratic nature of public sector historic preservation practices between SHPOs and Federal agencies. In fact, it is evident that the webpage and brochure is aimed at those being introduced to the National Register (with sections like “What We Do” and “How to List a Property”) rather than those who might work with it daily. This is an appropriate limitation considering the National Historic Preservation Act (Public Law 102-575) supplements the public publications with precise legislative language. NHPA provides the last source of exigence: the Section 106 Process.

To reiterate, NHPA not only establishes legal precedent for the citizens to participate in the preservation of historic resources, but it also requires “Federal agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties” mandated by “Section 106” (ACHP, 2013). Essentially, the Section 106 process is triggered whenever a federal undertaking (a project that involves federal funding or permits) has the potential to cause “adverse or indirect” effects onto historic properties. The federal agency involved initiates correspondence with the state or tribal historic preservation office associated with the “area of potential effect (APE).” When the project is brought to the attention of the SHPO in the triage phase, the SHPO has the expertise and resources to quickly determine if the APE definitely has no historic properties within in, potentially has a historic property in it but is not listed on the National Register, or is already listed or eligible. Personal experience at the Pennsylvania SHPO suggests that many projects do

not make it passed the triage phase, but it is gratifying to know that federal agencies are doing their due diligence (and lawful duty) to at least check for potential effects on potentially historic resources. Generally, the SHPO offers one of these conclusions for each project brought to their attention:

- (1) Clearly no historic properties are within the area of potential effect; undertaking can proceed;
- (2) Historic properties (already eligible or listed) are within the area of potential effect, but there are no effects onto those properties; undertaking can proceed;
- (3) Historic properties (already eligible or listed) are within the area of potential effect and those properties will be adversely effected; undertaking should be halted until a memorandum of agreement can be reached between the SHPO, the federal agency, and involved consulting parties and public. If resolution or compromise cannot be met between parties, then the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) is invited for guidance or having the last say; or
- (4) There could be historic properties but they not been reviewed, eligible, or listed yet; undertaking should be halted until SHPO determines eligibility. Once determined, the SHPO then refers to the previous three conclusions.

Since the SHPO utilizes the same guidelines for “determinations of eligibly” as the public does for National Register nominations and listings, the SHPO and the Federal Government treat “eligible” and “listed” as equals in their ability to trigger the Section 106 process, mandating federal agencies to at least *consider* their impact on historic resources. An eligible site becomes a listed site when a person or group formally nominates the site with the National Register

nomination form, which prompts a re-review by the State before it is sent off to the National Park Service for a final review before listing. The National Park Service via the Keeper of the Register can deny nominations that have passed through the SHPOs, but that rejection at that level is a rare occurrence. Reasons why a person or group might want to transition a site from eligible to listed is found with the aforementioned “practical benefits” provided by the National Register publications as well as discursive exigence like historic-homeowner or community pride, any prestige that comes with listings, and marketing or publicity opportunities for the site itself.

With both “listed” and “eligible” status in mind regarding the National Register, the key players of the rhetorical situation are revealed: SHPOs, NPS, other federal agencies; the local, State, or national public; and occasionally the preservation professionals that assist them. In this rhetorical situation, each player can be both *rhetor* and *audience*. Any one of them can nominate a property for the National Register and any one of them can witness or be affected by the nomination result. As a particular audience member, a SHPO is always involved as they facilitate the threshold between the nomination and the listing (by NPS or the Keeper of the Register). A seventeen-hundred participant research study commissioned by the National Trust found that “the composition of ‘preservation leaders’ was 93 percent white, 2 percent black, 1 percent Latino, and 2 percent Asian or Pacific Islander” (Meeks, p.189). Other data supports that the field retains a white, women majority (GuideStar, 2017; Data USA, n.d.). A demographic profile of the “public” is dependent on which city the nominated *place* resides in, which State’s SHPO will review it, or the nation at large.

Myths and misunderstandings about the National Register can also contribute toward the exigence that would compel a nomination or even a request-to-remove from the list. They are

often addressed as concerns in “Listing and Ownership” or “Frequently Asked Questions” sections of National Register publications. The publications state that owners of private property listed on the National register have “no obligation to open their properties to the public, to restore them, or even to maintain them. Owners can do anything they wish with their property provided that no Federal license, permit, or funding is involved.” (NPS Brochure, n.d.). While anyone can nominate any building, owners of the property can object a nomination or request to be unlisted. Regarding historic districts or properties with multiple owners, objections is determined by a majority vote. A National Register listing also does not automatically invoke local historic district zoning or landmark designation either, although one could argue that it would help build a case for a local official recognition.

Finally, listed or eligible status on the National Register does *not* mean the building or site is legally protected from demolition or misappropriation. While a listing can help build a case as to why a building should be preserved, the SHPO and the Section 106 process via the National Historic Preservation Act can only mandate that federal agencies *cooperate* with SHPOs who offer guidance and (strong) recommendations in pursuit of a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA). The MOA could include total preservation or protection of the site from demolition or misappropriation but it must be agreed upon by all parties and signatories. The only time legal protocol is breached is if the federal agency does not initiate the Section 106 process with the SHPO and proceeds with an undertaking involving a historic site or if any involved party violates the established Memorandum of Agreement. The *assumption* that the

National Register grants lawful protection for buildings from demolition can still be a source of exigence for *places*¹ to become *historic places on the National Register*.

Substantive Requirements

Substantive and stylistic requirements are the features of the rhetoric chosen by the rhetor to respond to the exigency presented in the perceived situation (Foss, p.137). Artifacts in question do not have to fulfill every single feature to be considered an exemplar of the genre. Instead, it is the artifact's ability to uniquely respond to the exigence *despite* its imperfect fit that elicits a new or nuanced understanding of a seemingly familiar genre (i.e., just because a lawyer uses humor in their prosecution does not mean they have forsaken judicial rhetoric altogether) . Fortunately for this project, *historic sites on the National Register* as a genre presents a clear set of substantive and stylistic requirements as explicated by the nomination form and listing process. The four Criteria [for establishing significance] and the seven Criteria Considerations [for exception] serve as the content, and the seven aspects of integrity serve as the form.

Foss explains that the substantive features are “those that constitute the content of the rhetoric,” (2004, p.137). In the case of *historic places*..., substantive features are not the content expressed, but rather the content embodied. For instance, the 9/11 Museum and Memorial might have been erected to house and display artifacts that express the experience and discourse surrounding the attacks on the Twin Towers. However, the museum itself is not immediately nor inherently “historic” or “worthy of preservation” – unless a historic event happens at or within the museum or the design of the museum becomes a distinct form that stands the test of time (the

¹ From here forward, “place” refers to the rhetorical construct, “property” is the term the National Register uses referring to nominated entities, and “site” is specific category of “property.” Refer to page 53 for more explanation.

latter of which has a strong possibility of happening). On other hand, the entire 16 acres of Ground Zero, the actually site of 9/11 impact, *is* “historic” and was expedited to “eligible” status on the National Register since 2004 with support from The New York Landmarks Conservancy, Lower Manhattan Development Corporation, and other preservation and civic groups from around the country (Dunlap, 2004; Technical Assistance; n.d.). The distinction between a “historic place” and a “places about history” might seem trivial to some, but considering the meticulous nature of this project and the nomination form, it becomes increasing important to keep in mind moving forward with the analysis.

For the *historic places on the National Register*, their substance is most identifiable in their “significance.” Significance is what gives these places meaning. The National Register offers four ways (or their words “Criteria”) to establish how a site is significant. Abbreviated within the *National Register Bulletin: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation* (1995), properties can be eligible if they are associated with an “(A) Event, (B) Person, (C) Design/Construction, and/or (D) Information Potential” – each regarding a specific “historic context” (pp. 12-24). Each nomination is only required to address one of the four criterion, although there is no limit as long as each one presented is well argued. Other substantive requirements can include what the National Register calls “Criterion Considerations” which are exceptions and explanations to unique situations such as “birthplaces and graves, moved properties, or properties that have achieved significance within the last fifty years” (pp. 27-43). Each criterion and consideration is discussed in turn as generic expectations *historic places on the National Register*.

First, according the Criterion A: Event, “properties can be eligible for the National Register if they are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad

patterns of our history,” (p.12). The Bulletin then offers two types of events: “A specific event marking an important moment in American pre-history or history” and “a pattern of events or a historic trend that made a significant contribution to the development of a community, a State, or the nation.” The property and the associated event must have existed at the same time and be supported and documented by historical or archaeological research.

Additionally, mere association with historic events or trends alone will not qualify. The property’s association and contribution to that historic narrative to also be significant or noteworthy. Significant association (which is applied to all four Criterion) is often relative to how many examples of the site remain for specific historic context. For instance, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania’s SHPO has become more receptive and attentive to nominations for metal truss bridges in the state considering they are being replaced or taken out of commission at alarming rates, where in previous years they might have cited that not just *any* bridge is exemplarity of the state’s engineering and transportation history (Zachar, 2009).

The Bulletin offers a few examples of properties associated with a specific event: “the site of a battle, the building in which an important invention was developed, a factory district where a significant strike occurred...” and properties associate with a pattern of events: “a trail associated with western migration, a building used by an important local social organization, a downtown district representing a town’s growth as the commercial focus of the surrounding agriculture area...” (p.12). For Criterion A, the burden of the nominator is to establish a significant historic event or pattern and explain why a site is significantly associated to that history.

Second, Criterion B: Person offers an alternative if a historic event did not happen directly at the property. Instead, it seeks properties “associated with the lives of persons

significant in our past” (p.14). For this type of significance, the Bulletin provides several steps to establishing fulfillment of the criterion:

“First, determine the importance of the individual [within a local, State, or national historic context]. Second, ascertain the length of his/her association with the property under study and identify the other properties associated with the individual. Third, consider the property under Criterion B, as outlined below [regarding significant association and comparison to related properties]” (pp.14-15).

Additionally, the Bulletin also uses term “productive life” to explain the types of association between property and historic person most commonly utilized under this criterion. For instance, Thomas Jefferson’s Monticello estate is listed primarily under Criterion B, because he spent most of his *productive life* there, where he developed his identity as one of America’s Founding Fathers. However, arguably the most significant *event* of his life regarding public American history was signing the Declaration of Independence at Independence Hall, which is listed under all four Criteria. Therefore, properties listed under Criterion B are most commonly but not limited to a historic figure’s home, business, office, laboratory, or studio that represent the formative years of a person’s legacy rather than the site singular instances of a historic event. Similar to Criterion A, properties listed under Criterion B must also be exemplary in highlighting a person’s significance. The Bulletin offers the follow examples: “the home of an important merchant or labor leader, the studio of a significant artist, the business headquarters of an important industrialist...” (p. 15). For Criterion B, nominators must first establish why a *person* is significant to local, State, or national history and then explain why the *property* is representative of that person’s formative experiences.

Third, Criterion C: Design/Construction confronts *history* very differently than the

previous two criterion. The Bulletin explains that properties may be eligible if “they embody [1] distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or [2] that represent the work of a master, or [3] that possess high artistic values, or [4] that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction.” The first three clauses explain why Criterion C is also referred to the “Architecture/Engineering” criterion, as it is catalogued in the official National Register database (NPGallery). However, the fourth clause is a reference and explanation to the eligibility of “districts” as a category of a historic property that can be listed on the National Register. While they are addressed in Criterion C, all four of the Criteria are acceptable when nominating a historic district.

Essentially, Criterion C is most concerned with establishing aesthetic and/or structural significance of a property within a historic context. “Distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction” can interpret to mean “exemplarity to an architecture style” (pp. 16). Architectural historians apply a genre analysis of their own to determine whether or not a building fits into a style. Examples of this include: “A late Mississippian village that illustrates the important concepts in prehistoric community design; a Hopewellian mound if it is an important example of mound building construction; a Gothic Revival [building that highlights] vertical and picturesque qualities of the style, such as pointed gables roofs, steep roof pitch...” (pp.17-20). The Bulletin also warns against nominating structures that include only a few characteristics of an identified style or trend. They explain that similar to the other Criteria, properties nominated under Criterion C must be *exemplary* and *significant* in its ability to represent an aesthetic or structural trend in history.

The Bulletin adds that “a property can be significant not only for the way it was originally constructed or crafted but also for the way it was adapted at a later period, or for the

way it illustrates changing tastes, attitudes, and uses over a period of time.” Examples include: “A Native American irrigation system modified for use by Europeans if it illustrates either or both periods of construction; an early 19th century farmhouse modified in the 1880s with Queen Anne style ornamentation if it represented local variation or represented significant trend in building construction or remodeling...” (p. 19). However, this sentiment is not to be confused with more contemporary forms of “adaptive reuse” or redevelopment of old buildings for new uses (at least not for a few more decades), but rather it is a reminder that architectural or engineering significance does not have to come from a structure’s original iteration.

The second option within Criterion C is identifying a property as a “work of a master.” The Bulletin defines a “master” as a “figure of generally recognized greatness in a field, a known craftsman of consummate skill, or an anonymous craftsman whose work is distinguishable from others by its characteristic style or quality” (p. 18). It clarifies that a site or structure must express a particular phase, aspect, idea, or theme of that master’s career and that works of an unidentified craftsman may be eligible if it “rises above the level of workmanship of other properties encompassed by the historic context” (p. 18). For example, most of famous architect Frank Lloyd Wright’s building are listed in Criterion C for “distinctive characteristics of a type” for his pioneering and contributions to the Prairie style -- but for his experimental work or designs that do fit in a well-established style, they could still be listed as a “work of a master.”

The third option within Criterion C includes “properties possessing high artistic value.” This clause is saved for properties that “express aesthetic ideals and design concepts more fully than other properties of its type” meaning properties that are “modest” or “typical” of type or period will not suffice. Examples of eligible properties under this clause include: “a sculpture in a town square that epitomizes the design principles of the Art Deco style; a landscaped park that

synthesizes early 20th century principles of landscape architecture; properties that are important representatives of the aesthetic values of a cultural group, such as petroglyphs and ground drawings by Native Americans...” (p. 20).

Criterion C also explains the rationale behind establishing “districts” by including “a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction.” The consideration for districts could be its own study on sense-of-place. The Bulletin explains that while a mill here and a ranch there might not be significant on their own, a historic district can be established if those components together provide a “visual sense of a historic environment or be an arrangement of historically or functionally related properties.” Familiar examples of a historic districts include many of America’s downtowns; lesser known examples include agricultural communities, industrial complexes, or swaths of archeological sites.

Finally, Criterion D: Information Potential states that properties are eligible “if they have yielded, or be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history. This criterion is most often associated with archeology’s role in historic preservation and cultural resource management but does *not* exclude above-ground buildings and structures. Criterion D has two requirements which both have to be met for a property to be eligible: “(1) property must have, or have had, information to contribute to our understanding of human history or prehistory; and (2) the information must be considered important.” Furthermore, “importance” is defined as yielding research that confronts “(1) current data gaps or alternative theories that challenge existing ones or (2) priority areas identified under a State or Federal agency management plan [such as Native lands in the Southwest America]” (p.21). Archeological sites under Criterion D often possess configurations of artifacts, soil strata, structural remains, or other natural or cultural features that help form hypotheses, corroborate existing hypotheses, or reconstruct the sequence of

archeological cultures. Buildings and structures under Criterion D often yield information on construction methods or materials that is not likely available or accessible in other properties if they do not meet the level of significance historically or structurally required by other Criteria. One example of a hybrid approach to Criterion D incorporating both archeology and building structure is the Roseland Plantation in Alabama which argued that “In spite of their dilapidated condition, the plantation house ruin and associated standing structures at Roseland indicate the essential integrity of the below-ground archeological remains” of slave quarters (NRIS Reference Number: 93001476).

While there are seven “Criterion Considerations” in addition to the four “Criteria,” I only address the two most related to this thesis: (E) reconstructed properties and (G) properties that have achieved significance within the last fifty years. The remaining five considerations address special cases like religious properties, cemeteries, and moved properties that are generally not eligible for various reasons but each have exceptions if under extraordinary circumstances.

For Criteria Consideration E: Reconstructed Properties, eligibility is retained when “it is accurately executed in a suitable environment *and* presented in a dignified manner as part of a restoration master plan *and* when no other building or structure with the same associations has survived. All three of these requirements must be met.” This consideration deters the nominations of commercial reconstruction of “historic-looking” properties which tends to not be historically accurate or sensitive in its materials, details, and construction methods. If the reconstruction *is* historically accurate and sensitive then it can be *considered* for eligibility, building a case around a restoration master plan or the last surviving member of its type. Nominations that meet Criterion Criteria Consideration E must provide an explanation as to why

a site should still be considered for eligible despite its reconstructed; minor remodeling or renovations are not subjected to this consideration.

The final substantive requirement expressed as Criterion Criteria Consideration G states “a property achieving significance within the last fifty (50) years is eligible if it is of exception significance” which effectively inscribes the “fifty-year rule” into the National Register of Historic Places. The Bulletin clarifies that it is the source of *significance* that must be older than fifty years rather than the construction date of the building – unless the significance is derived from its construction like with most Criterion C listings. The fifty-year rule is the only quantitative description of provided by the National Register, the Bulletin, and the nomination form, which prompts a study on its own. Fortunately for this project, John Sprinkle on behalf of the National Council on Public History (2007) already investigated what he calls “one of the most commonly accepted principles within American historic preservation” (p. 81). He finds that the fifty-year rule was inherited from the National Park Service historians in 1948 and survived the “advent of ‘new preservation’ with the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966” (p. 100). As a final remark, he asserts the rule operates “as a filter to ward off potentially controversial decisions about the nature of historic site significance, [and] understanding the origins of the fifty-year rule reveals how Americans have constructed the chronological boundaries of a useable past through historic preservation during the twentieth century” (pp. 102-103). Essentially, the fifty-year rule is a practical measure against premature assumptions about which histories will have lasting implications decades later, despite its arbitrarily-numerated origins.

Interpretation and leniency of the fifty-year rule is ultimately determined by each state’s SHPO and if necessary, the Keeper of the Register. Examples include “the launch pad at Cape Canaveral from which men first traveled to the moon, the home of nationally predominant

playwright Eugene O’Neill, and the Chrysler building (New York) significant as the epitome of the ‘Style Moderne’ architecture” (p.42). While the rule is still an integral standard in the contemplation of which sites to nominate and the application process itself, properties that meet Criteria Consideration G can still be eligible by providing an explanation as to why a property is of “exceptional importance” in its a local, State, or national historic context.

Translating the National Register of Historic Places from an “official list” to a rhetorical genre yields clear substantive requirements: a site, building, structure, object, or district must an exemplar representative a historic (A) event, (B) person, (C) architectural style or engineering feat, and/or (D) potential information. The property also cannot be a religious property or commemorative property, a birthplace or grave or cemetery, or be moved, reconstructed, or less than fifty-years old in its significance unless it is uniquely distinct and of exceptional importance – which I explain in the following section. Each of the requirements can be reconsidered under exceptional circumstances. While Criterion C and some of the seven Criteria Considerations lend themselves to a *stylistic* interpretation, they are indeed *substantive* because they address the content that the form supposedly embodies or expresses rather than the form itself. A building is listed on the National Register, not because it is two to three stories high, two rooms deeps, rectangular in shape, and ornamented with elliptical, circular and fan-shaped motifs formed by fluted radiating lines – but more likely because it collectively expresses the Federal style of architecture that was predominant is late 18th and early 19th century America. In theory, for the ninety-thousand places *listed* on the National Register and its database and the uncounted thousands of places *eligible* by the Section 106 process, each spatially represent a significant node of American history.

Stylistic Requirements

Stylistic features constitute the form of a genre, or in this case the collective participants of the genre (Foss, p.137). While all properties on the National Register pertain to American history, not all sites that pertain to American history are on the National Register – even if they fulfill the substantive requirements. Thus, the clichéd architectural quotation “form follows function” finds relevance again in genre criticism, specifically in identifying a genre’s stylistic requirements. In fact, the Bulletin explains “only after significance is full established can you proceed to the issue of integrity” meaning that quite literally the form requirements of *historic places on the National Register* is first dictated by each *place’s* content.

In its mission statement, the National Register is defined as “an official list of the Nation’s historic places worthy of preservation.” While “Nation’s history” is framed by the substantive requirements constituted by the Criteria and Criteria Considerations, “historic places worthy of preservation” still need to be accounted for. The following translates the “categories of historic properties” and the “aspects of integrity” as stylistic requirements to be a *historic place on the National Register of History Places*

First, “places” is a key term reiterated enough to be included in the title of the National Register. However, *place* is not explicitly emphasized in the Bulletin nor the application. Instead, they provide the disclaimer:

“[The National Register] is not use to list intangible values, except in so far as they are associated with historic properties... does list cultural events, or skilled or talented individuals, as is done in some countries...is oriented to recognizing physically concrete properties that are relatively fixed in location” (p. 4)

From this sentiment, the historic preservation ethic proffered in this project's introduction is definitely present: discursive history is intrinsic to material history, thus preserving material history is also preserving discursive history. However, what separates historic preservation from archival studies, and art conservation is the emphasis on spatial location.

The Bulletin and the application then uses the term "property" to account for all listings and potential listings and offers five acceptable forms of property for the National Register: building, structure, object, site, and district. The most familiar of these forms are *buildings* which are "created principally to shelter any form of human activity" (p.4) such as houses, schools, post offices, libraries, stores, and malls. Next, *structures* accounts for "functional constructions made usually for purposes other than creating human shelter" (p. 4). Often related but not limited to infrastructure, structures include bridges, tunnels, irrigation systems, fences, walls, windmills, aircrafts, automobiles, boats and ships. *Objects* are then "used to distinguish from buildings and structures that are primarily artistic in nature or relatively small in scale and simply constructed...with a specific setting or environment" (p. 4). The Bulletin cites boundary markers, fountains, mileposts, and monuments as a few examples. The last singular property type are *sites*, which are described as "a location of a significant event, a prehistoric or historic occupation or activity, or a building or structure, whether standing, ruined, or vanished, where the location itself possesses historic, cultural, or archeological value regardless of the value of any existing structure" (p. 4). While the description for site might be confusing considering it incorporates the terms used in other property types, site designation is used for spatial locations that do not have erected buildings or no longer have erected materiality – but its landscape, foundation, and environment still possess a materiality "worth preserving." Examples of site might clarify: battlefields, campsites, shipwrecks, petroglyphs, designed landscapes, trails, and rock shelters.

Finally, a district is a collection of any of the other property type that establishes its historic significance in its “concentration, linkage, or continuity.” Districts can include college campuses, industrial complexes, agricultural communities, rural villages, and residential neighborhoods. Through the categories of historic properties, form *type* clearly establishes that historic sites on the National Register are physical material entities that have spatial and locational association to significant American history.

However, having significant association to American history and prescribing to one of the five property types is still not enough to be listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The final requirement addresses the form of the property itself rather its categorization. Much like how the style facilitates the substance of an artifact in its ability to express a genre, the National Register uses the term “integrity” as “the ability of a property to convey its significance.” Thus for *historic places on the National Register*, they must substantively associate with historic *significance* while stylistically have historic *integrity*.

Integrity is constructed by the National Register from seven “aspects”: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. The Bulletin explains “to retain historic integrity, a property will always possess several, and usually most, of the aspects” (p. 44). The most important aspects to retain are the ones that most clearly expresses a property’s significance. For instance, if a metal truss bridge is listed under Criterion C for because it exemplifies a method of construction involving cast and wrought iron parts among other engineering feats, then integrity is most retained through original design, material, workmanship. If the same bridge is also listed under Criterion A for exemplifying the connection of trade portals between cities, a town’s first step in expanding its infrastructure, or the contributions of a local steel corporation, then integrity must also constitute the bridge’s location, setting, feeling,

and association. Loss of integrity comes from a variety of means: general aging without maintenance, unprofessional alterations, and misappropriation with consultation, relocation, or demolition. Much like the four Criterion for significance, understanding and applying the seven aspects of integrity is paramount in building a case for listing or eligibility on the National Register, thus each will be discussed briefly in turn.

First, *location* is defined as “the place where historic property was constructed or the place where the historic event occurred.” (p. 44). For properties that find its significance in construction (like with most Criterion C properties), locational integrity is compromised when the building, structure, or object is moved. While rare, relocations do happen. For example, the Cape Hatteras Light Station was moved 2,900 feet from its original location because of the threat of shoreline erosion (NPS, n.d.; NRIS 78000266). Other examples include bridges being moved for pedestrian reuse or homes being moved out of flood plains. For properties that find its significance in being the place at which a historic event occurred, locational integrity is a more difficult aspect to dismiss and is rarely challenged. Undocumented lore or histories passed down from generations can contribute to the uncertainty of locational integrity such as specific combat movements on a battlefield or exact stops along the Underground Railroad. For the National Register, original location is privileged because it is important in understanding why a property was created or why a historic event happened at that exact spot.

Design is “the combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property” (p. 44) While the language in this description may be confusing in context of this genre criticism, design refers to aesthetic intentions from those who constructed the site. Design is most pertinent to Criterion C when alterations, additions, renovations, and modernization violate the historic aesthetic. This aesthetic often refers to a building’s

organization of “space, proportion, scale, technology, ornamentations, and materials.” Design integrity must not be mistaken for design quality or evidence of architectural training, meaning a vernacular structure can have the same level of integrity as a “high style” building as long as neither have misappropriated the original builder’s visual-spatial intentions. Maintaining design is ultimately in pursuit of preserving “historic functions and technologies as well as aesthetic” (p. 44).

Like design, *material* integrity also considers the original and historic resources that makes up the site whether naturally or from construction. The Bulletin explains “materials are the physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time and in a particular pattern or configuration to form a historic property.” (p. 45). *Material* integrity prevents commercial reconstruction or modern adaption to pass as “historic.” Introduction of new or different materials are not strictly prohibited but they must be sensitive or discrete to the historic context and be explicit in differentiating the new and the original. Properties within historic districts follow this requirement more leniently, which is why those properties are listed as “contributing” to a district rather than its own individual listing. Not only does material integrity help identify the availability of particular technologies and resources, but it can also be used to scientifically date a building’s construction or renovation.

Workmanship is also one of the aspects that applies most to Criterion C as it concerned with “the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period in history or prehistory” (p. 45). Integrity of workmanship is most concerned with the actual labor and craft skills involved in constructing or adorning a property. Preservation of workmanship is important because of its ability to “furnish evidence of the technology of a craft, illustrate the aesthetic principles of a historic or prehistoric period, and reveal individual, local,

regional, or national applications of both technological practices and aesthetic principles.” A close inspection of a building can reveal what tools and methods were available and used to facilitate the aforementioned aspects of design and material.

The next three aspects are less concerned with architectural principles that often constitute Criterion C listings and arguably more difficult to articulate. For instance, *setting* refers to “the physical environment of a historic property” and “the character of the place in which the property played its historical role.” Although not limited to the natural environment, the Bulletin explains that such features that constitute setting includes: “topographic features, vegetation, simple manmade features like paths or fences, and relationships between buildings and other features of open space” (p. 45). For instance, if a hill or valley played a major role in the viewpoint of military generals in a battle, the integrity of the battlefield’s setting can be compromised if flood and erosion have flattened the topography or new trees have grown in place. Setting provides important information on the physical conditions under which a property was built or utilized and the functions it was intended to serve.

Association refers to “the direct link between an important historic event or person and a historic property” (p. 45). Integrity of association is retained if the property is the place where the event occurred and is sufficiently intact to convey the relationship to an observer. The Bulletin provides the example a Revolutionary War battlefield “whose natural and manmade elements have remained intact since the 18th century will retain its quality and association with the battle” (p. 45). If those elements were to be removed or altered in a way that made it difficult to associate the site with a battle, then its integrity has been compromised.

Finally, *feeling* refers to a “property’s expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time” (p. 45). More so than the other five aspects of integrity, association and

feeling are both depend on individual perception and interpretation, thus the Bulletin explains “their retention *alone* is never sufficient to support eligibility” (p. 46). While association may rely on isolated characteristics that truly highlight a significant relationship between a place and a historic person or event, feeling is derived from the rest of the aspects of integrity in generating a sense of aesthetic and physical historicity. The Bulletin provides the example: “a grouping of prehistoric petroglyphs, unmarred by graffiti and intrusions and located on its original isolated bluff, can evoke a sense of tribal spiritual life” (p.45). Obstructions to retaining integrity of a historic feeling can also include cellular towers installed in the backdrop of a historic district, satellites or antenna attached to historic facades, or even noise pollution from a nearby highway. Feeling ultimately addresses the essence of historic discontinuity.

Determining integrity of a property for nomination involves: first defining the physical features that must be present to properly represent its significance; then determine whether those features are visible enough to convey that significance; question whether the property needs to be compared to similar properties, before finally establishing which of the aspects are most vital to the property becoming eligible. The Bulletin concludes “the question of integrity is answered by whether or not the property retains the identity for which it is significant” (p. 46).

Identifying the stylistic requirements for properties to be listed on the National Register reveals the discursive difference between a “historic place” and a “historic place on the National Register.” The National Register becomes hard to navigate when it provides a clear set of requirements (Criteria, Criteri0061 Considerations, Aspects, etc.) while also leaving the fulfillment of those requirements up to the subjective interpretations between nominators and their corresponding SHPO. Personal communication with a panel of SHPO officers from

different states, the previous Keeper of the National Register, and National Park Service officials at the 2016 National Trust for Historic Preservation conference also revealed that there is a discrepancy in the interpretation and use of the National Register within the profession. According to the panel, that discrepancy is at least acknowledged and confronted at each of their respective agencies. However minor, what the public identifies as “historic place” might be different from what the National Register believes “is worthy of preservation” – or the public and preservation professions might agree on what a “historic place” is, but the application process is intimidating or inaccessible and the listing itself is irrelevant or not worthwhile. A further investigation in how the substance relates to the form that constitutes the whole rhetorical transition between a *historic place* and a *historic place on the National Register* can help further our understanding of the rhetorical gatekeeping involved in this genre.

Organizing Principles

Foss describes the organizing principle of a genre as “the internal dynamic of the constellation that is formed by the substantive, stylistic, and situation features” (2004, p. 138). Investigating the organizing principles is paramount in making sense of all three generic features as they function together to reveal the rhetorical work performed through the rhetoric. In this section, I identify five rhetorical structures that buttress the genre of historic sites listed on the National Register. These principles are merely previewed in this section and then reviewed in depth after analyzing the generic elements of the MOVE site.

Material Anchoring of Historic Reality

First, historic sites on the National Register privilege a material culture. While it is obvious that this genre revolves around physical *places*, this principle is worthy of explicitly

stating to squash the assumptions that the National Register operates altruistically in its preservation of the *history* embodied in those places. The inseparable bind between content and form (significance and integrity) reveals that the National Register is not concerned with histories that do not have physical, spatial, or visual references in the material world – nor does it claim to be. Proponents of this stasis cite that the National Register should not be taken out of context or dismissed for its original intention: [being] an official list of the nation’s historic places worthy of preservation. Yet, who determines what is “worthy of preservation”? For the National Register, worthiness of preservation requires both historic significance *and* structural integrity. While that requirement is understandable for the sake of practicality and preventing further backlogging the SHPOs, materiality still facilitates the rhetorical gatekeeping of a genre that excludes cultures who cannot or seldom have access to sustainable materiality. These cultural situations can include populaces who do not have the training or resources to participate in professional architecture nor the maintenance of vernacular architecture; who do not buy into the concept of space as “property”; who understand structural degradation as a natural process; and who are victims of eviction, demolition, invasion, or colonization – which altogether ironically signals the dominance of White capitalist socioeconomic structures in American history. The populaces that identify with those aforementioned ideologies include: Native and Indian tribes; African-Americans who are still impacted today by the fissure of slavery, segregation, and mass incarceration; immigrants and refugees from Eastern cultures; and even socioeconomically ignored White populations in Appalachia or the Ozarks – each of which can thrive in their own right when White Capitalism fails to colonize. It is true that there might be “better” outlets for the preservation of intangible or no-longer-tangible history than the National Register of Historic Places – such as oral history traditions, performance, and digital repositories

-- but those who opt into that reality must also acknowledge both the principles driving that reality and its implications.

Duality of Exigence and Sites of Contention

Through the National Register, historic places become sites of contention when exigence misaligns with the substantive and stylistic requirements. Between State or Federal preservation professionals and the rest of the lay public, the variety of exigence to nominate a place to become a historic place on the National Register contrasts with the narrow margin of aptitude needed to interpret and apply the criteria, considerations, and aspects of integrity. Essentially, the National Register presents two identities: (1) an official list of the historic properties that *mandate* special attention from State and federal entities and (2) an official list of historic properties that the local, State, or federal public particularly recognizes. Thus prompting the questions: (1) should <Section 106 – eligible> properties utilize different generic requirements than <National Register – listed> properties? And (2) what happens when the public disagrees with the government what is or is not a historic site “worthy of preservation?” The National Register bears a great rhetorical burden when tasked with fulfilling both prerogatives of the public and the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966.

Amalgamation of Citizen-Government

In a reciprocal interpretation of the historic places becoming sites of contention, the genre *historic sites on the National Register* can also be used to amalgamate the lay public and “the government” back together, which was never meant to separate under American democracy. Citizens and federal agencies in possession of a potentially “historic property” confront the National Register for a variety of reasons: the former in pursuit of tax incentives and prestige

(listed status) and the latter triggered by the Section 106 process (eligible status). Yet, both rhetorical agents must operate with the same standards of the genre. In theory, the SHPOs, acting as both the witness and gatekeeper of the rhetorical transition between place and historic place, treats National Register nominations from the public in the same manner as they would with Section 106 initiation from federal agencies. While the *amalgamation of public and government* may appear to privilege an ideology of solidarity, historic places are ultimately still facilitated by government officials using government rhetoric (e.g., acts, registers, and criteria). Despite being judged as “fair,” *historic sites on the National Register* help reveal that even when the public is “treated” as equal to its government, by its government, the public can still be at a disadvantage while its subcultures are still historically disenfranchised.

Documentation as a Tenet of Historicity

Finally, historic sites on the National Register perpetuate documentation as a tenet of historicity. For many of the procedures in the application (significance and integrity alike), nominators of historic places are prompted to provide documented (often published) forms of evidence for a historic significance. Once again at face value, this requirement is reasonable in preventing myths and assumptions from becoming “history.” However, it also privileges populaces that have had the means to not only produce written and photographic history but to make that history accessible. Throughout the Bulletin, “documentation” and “scholarly researched” is mentioned multiple times and “oral history” is mentioned once. While “oral history” may seem to be inclusive of story-telling cultures, full scholastic documentation of those oral histories is still expected: recording, transcription, formatting, publishing and archiving. Furthermore, historic preservation itself is a form of documentation, which then encourages cultures who already have familiar forms of documentation (e.g., White Capitalists) and

discourages those who do not (e.g., non-English speaking, indigenous, displaced, or historically oppressed cultures) from participating in the preservation tradition. Whether the National Register acknowledges that history can occur without documentation does not matter, because the genre it presents already implies that undocumented history is not “worthy of preservation.”

CHAPTER FIVE

Analysis – Evaluating the Rhetorical Site

This research examines the site of the MOVE bombing in the context of other historic sites on the National Register. This study utilizes generic application as a method of genre criticism to confront the rhetorical gatekeeping of National Register of Historic Places in pursuit of answering two research question:

RQ1: How does the National Register limit or expand the public’s understanding of racialized violence and marginalized histories?

RQ2: How can the National Register of Historic Places help or hinder understanding of the MOVE site?

In the previous section, “historic sites on the National Register” is examined through its generic parts regarding the rhetorical situation, substance, style, and organizing principles required to establish the genre. In this section, I apply those generic parts to the site of the MOVE bombing as a contender for being listed on the actual National Register and as participant of the *historic sites on the National Register* genre. This analysis navigates between the practical expectations of nomination and determination of eligibility process of the National Register and the critical implications of rhetorical gatekeeping posed by the genre.

Features of “the Site of the 1985 MOVE Bombing”

Rhetorical Situation

No public information suggests that the *site of the MOVE bombing* (herby “the MOVE site”) has been consider for that National Register of Historic Places (NPGallery last accessed March 2017). Recently, a private elementary school succeeded in procuring a “Pennsylvania

State historic marker” for the site to be erected later in 2017 – but that is a different program and situation than the National Register altogether. Personal visits to the site in October 2014, May 2015, and November 2016 revealed no change in the physical landscape; it consists of boarded and vacant row house units among inhabited units with no sign of an official or a vernacular memorial. According to personal communication with the Pennsylvania SHPO in January 2017, the site has no record of Section 106 initiation or general nomination for the National Register of Historic Places. Personal communication with Ramona Africa, the lone survivor of the MOVE bombing, in February 2017, indicates she does approve of this scholarship and its subsequent nomination for the National Register, but she is not aware of any other similar initiatives regarding the site. Other interviews with community members living on Osage Avenue and the Cobbs Creek neighborhood address the issue of blight and a lack of closure regarding the neighborhood 30 years later, but there is no mention of historic preservation or the National Register (Demby, 2015; Vargas, 2016). Therefore, exigence for the rhetorical transition of the site becoming a *historic place on the National Register* through “nomination” and “listed status” is wholly a personal and academic endeavor to investigate place-making and history-telling. This endeavor is supported by Ramona Africa and a variety of individuals from the Pennsylvania SHPO and DOT and from conferences hosted by the National Trust for Historic Preservation, the National Communication Association, and the National Organization of Minority Architects.

However, if the site were to become *historic...* through “Section 106” and a “determination of eligibility,” there is a completely different set of exigence to consider, one that could expedite this rhetorical discourse into material reality.

In November 2016, the Philadelphia Redevelopment Authority (PRA) released a Request for Proposal (RFP) titled “Osage/Pine Project: Development Opportunity for 6200 Osage

Avenue and 6200 Pine Street,” (Kostelni, 2016; Appendix C). In the introduction, PRA solicits “proposals from developers to purchase and develop homeownership housing on thirty six [city-owned] properties” along the two streets. The introduction also provides three points of information (which are worth reading in totality in this thesis’ appendix): a brief history of the 1985 fire involving the police and MOVE; the immediate reconstruction of 61 homes; and a settlement between 1996 to 2000 where the U.S Army Corp of Engineers found reconstruction deficiencies resulting in relocation of all but 16 homeowners on the block. The proposal states “These blocks have a tragic but significant history that is important for the developer to acknowledge and respect in the process of undertaking construction in this area” (p. 3) before continuing to “Scope of Work” and “Schedule.” Deadline for proposals was December 21, 2016. In an interview with Philadelphia Magazine, Greg Heller who was appointed to head PRA by the current mayor Jim Kennedy explains “The Authority hopes to select a developer who can commit to rehabilitating the existing homes at the site. But it hasn’t ruled out completely demolishing and replacing them, either” (Brey, 2016). PRA has explicitly stated their intentions regarding the site, but only time will tell what proposals are offered, which proposal PRA accepts, and if and how other parties will intervene.

Considering that the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers has already been involved with the site in the past, it is safe to assume that the Corp will be involved in the future redevelopment. Even if the Corp or other federal agencies had not been involved in the past, most large scale construction involves federal permitting of access to utility lines, oil and gas structures, watersheds, and dredging among a multitude of other resources. Thus, with certainty the Section 106 process will be triggered for the development of this site and the Pennsylvania SHPO will be explicitly involved in the new few months or years.

Exigence concerning PRA centers around their request to “acknowledge and respect” the “tragic and significant history” of the site and the impending lawful duties of the Section 106 process. If PRA had not mentioned the site’s history or a request to respect it, the ultimate fate of the site regarding historic preservation and the National Register would most likely be decided by the Pennsylvania SHPO which can include public input and NPS/ACHP intervention.

The audience for this specific situation *currently* involves the Philadelphia Redevelopment Authority and 23 interested development companies (Appendix #). *Potential* audiences include: Philadelphians, Cobbs Creek residents, the Pennsylvania SHPO, the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers, Ramona Africa and MOVE affiliates, and the state or national public at large. When I submit the National Register of Historic Places Registration Form after the submission of this project, I too will become an explicit rhetor, witness, and audience member regarding the rhetorical transition or inaction of this site.

Now that exigence exists for the MOVE site to rhetorically and realistically transition from being *place* to a *historic place on the National Register*, it is logical to next consider if and how the site the fulfill the substantive and stylistic requirements of the *historic sites...genre* and the actual National Register.

In Chapter Four, I explained how the substantive and stylistic requirements of the *historic places... genre* is constructed by the National Register’s four Criteria for establishing *historic significance*, seven Criteria Considerations for exceptional properties, and seven aspects of integrity, and five types of historic properties. In reality, usually only one or two of Criteria that best expresses the historic significance of the site is submitted as the “Statement of

Significance” required on the National Register of Historic Places Registration Form (Appendix C). In this section, I apply the two most applicable Criteria to establish historic significance (A and C). I then explain how the site is exceptional to Criteria Considerations E: Reconstruction and G: Achieving Significance within the past 50 years. For stylistic requirements, I consider which property type best fits 6221 Osage Avenue, the Osage Block, or the Cobbs Creek neighborhood before evaluating its retention of the seven aspects of integrity as it is prompted by the “Narrative Description.” While I use the registration form for the “May 4, 1970, Kent State Shootings Site” (listed February 2010) as a model structuring the case for the MOVE site as it is similar in scope, depth, and exceptionalism, this section is still critical, theoretical, and rhetorical in nature. Major linguistic and argumentative changes are needed after the completion of this project when I proceed with the actual nomination. Once substance and style for the MOVE site is explicated in this analysis as it would be on the Registration Form, I then discuss the organizing principles expressed by the site and the implications of its potential listing or rejection can be discussed.

Substantive Characteristics

“Summary Paragraph”

There are only two instances in American history in which police officers have resorted to incendiary devices as a tool of law enforcement: the first time in 1985 when the Philadelphia Police Department dropped two C4 bombs from a helicopter onto home and headquarters of the MOVE organization, and most recently in 2016 when Dallas Police used an automated robot to place and detonate a C4 bomb in the apprehension of a sniper (Assefa and Wahrhaftig, 1988; Selyuk, 2016). The rarity of bombings by police in the past three decades does not reflect a phenomenological anomaly, but rather highlights extreme ends of America’s development and

history of police militarization. Considering the last incident occurred less than a year ago, the “historic pattern” of bombings by police has not become antiquated. Thus, within only thirty-two years from its demise, [I argue] the site of the MOVE bombing has exceptionally achieved historic significance -- and should be listed on the National Register of Historic Places as a testament to the brutal might American law enforcement is capable of and the destruction that racially or otherwise marginalized communities historically and continuously face.

The “May 13, 1985, MOVE Bombing Site” is being nominated under Criterion A and C [and additionally evaluation in this thesis under B and D], with additional Criterion Criteria Consideration E and G. The property is nationally significant in the “Areas of... Politics/Government, Law, Ethic Heritage: Black, Social History, and Architecture” – given its ability to punctuate police militarization as result of law-and-order politics, reflect the violent relationship between law enforcement and African-Americans, and exemplify the architecture of erasure – throughout American history. Other themes worth mentioning include radical or counterculture groups, race relations of public figures, and the structural impacts of domestic terrorism.

The period of significance is 1972 - 1986 as it chronicles the rise and fall of the MOVE organization in parallel with Frank Rizzo and Wilson Goode during their respective terms as Mayor of Philadelphia. An alternative (more specific) period of significance can be May 12 – May 14, 1985 which was when the plan was formed, the bomb was dropped, and the fire was left to burn. The following subsections explicate each source of historic significance in relation to fulfilling one of four Criteria.

Criterion A (1): Police Militarization in the Rise of Law and Order Politics;

The MOVE Bombing Site fulfills Criterion A: Event because it is significantly associated with police militarization spawning from “law and order” politics of the 1960s. Introduced by 1964 presidential candidate Barry Goldwater, the campaign slogan “law and order” became a moniker for conservative Republican policies that were “tough on crime” as the contender against perceived Democratic inaction during the time of civil unrest (Flamm, 2005). As a result of the hundreds of riots breaking out in cities all over America after the murder of Martin Luther King Jr., Democratic President Lyndon B. Johnson signed into law the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968. The Act created the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration which pooled together financial funding for “local governments to develop and purchase military-type resources to suppress riots” (Schultz, 2014). Despite Johnson’s efforts to alleviate rising crime rates in city centers and reaffirm the White conservative voting bloc for Democratic succession in the 1968 presidential election, Republican nominee Richard Nixon and running mate Spiro Agnew untimely won by running explicitly on a “law and order” campaign. President Nixon went on to declare “The War on Drugs” which “produced profoundly unequal outcomes across racial groups, manifested through racial discrimination by law enforcement” (Drug Policy Alliance, 2016). Nixon laid the political foundation for the likes of Frank Rizzo Mayor-elect of Philadelphia in 1972, Ronald Reagan President-elect in 1981, and Rudolph Giuliani Mayor-elect of New York City in 1994 – all of whom ran on a “law and order” platform. These campaign promises were often followed through by federal, State, and local policies that involved the fortification of police force and resources, establishing mandatory minimum sentences for certain crimes, and an expansion of standard operating procedures. Arguably the most explicit reiteration of police militarization since the SWAT unit was first introduced in the 1960s was when President Reagan signing into law the 1981 Military Cooperation with Civilian Law

Enforcement Agencies Act. This Act gave legal approval of the U.S. military to cooperate with its law enforcement agencies in “counterdrug and counter-terrorism operations, assistance for civil disturbance, special security operations, and explosive ordnance disposal” (Balko, 2012).

“The MOVE site” is a direct results of law enforcement resorting to the use of war tactics and war technology in the face of civil disobedience. Beginning with the mayoral election of former police commission Frank Rizzo in 1972 and inherited by Philadelphia’s first African American mayor Wilson Goode in 1984, the feud between the MOVE organization and city officials saw its end on May 13, 1985 when an arrest warrant and eviction escalated to the dropping of a bomb and its subsequent fire. The event involved approximately six-hundred police officers, 10,000 rounds of ammunition backed up by high pressure water hoses, machine guns, antitank weapons, and smaller explosives that blew holes in the walls to insert more tear gas, a state helicopter, and two satchels of C4 plastic explosives. Thus resulted in 61 homes being destroyed, 110 others damaged, 250 Osage Avenue residents left homeless, and 11 people dead including 5 children. The site as it is today – reconstructed, condemned, and boarded up – serves as a physical and visual evidence that something destructive “happened here” and its impact has lingered throughout the decades of the neighborhood. The site represents not only impacts of material explosives, but more importantly the festering ideologies that allowed those material explosives to be used with impunity. This site is explicitly associated with a singular event: the time American law enforcement dropped a bomb on its own citizens, and the general trajectory of police militarization in the post-Civil Rights era.

Criterion A (2): Police Brutality upon Black Communities and Individuals

The MOVE site fulfills Criterion A: Event because it significantly exemplifies the violent historic relationship between law enforcement and Black communities and individuals. Some

historians date the police officer profession back to the advent of “slave patrols” during the contention of the Emancipation Proclamation in 19th century America (Kappeler, 2014). This nomination recognizes those historic origins while more closely applying the MOVE site to the context of 20th century America’s tumultuous transition out of segregation and evidently into mass incarceration. Again, as tug and pull of 1960s civil and racial unrest demanded political attention from public figures, city centers became the battleground for regaining control of public masses (Sharro, 2003).

Originally, MOVE’s struggle for agency began in 1972 at their Powelton Village home. Complaints from neighbors regarding squalid living conditions throughout the years lead to city officials becoming involved in the first attempt to evict MOVE. MOVE, who refused to leave or abide by the city’s demands, gained increasing attention and more patrols from police officers. This first incident that punctuate MOVE’s contentious relationship with the police was the police raid in 1978. Police officers stormed into the house in an attempt to remove MOVE but when the crossfire was cleared, Officer James Ramp was found dead. 11 MOVE members were tried, 2 denounced MOVE and were set free, and 9 members were found guilty for third degree murder of one officer. To this day, MOVE testifies that the Officer Ramp was a victim of friendly fire considering the autopsy reports the bullet that killed him entered the back of his neck and exited through his chest – and that all of MOVE’s brandished weapons were broken and unloaded. After relocating to their Cobbs Creek home, and under a new city administration, MOVE’s demise came in 1985 when six hundred police officers surrounded the neighborhood and ultimately dropped a bomb from a state helicopter.

Considering that MOVE members were predominantly African-American, who lived in a predominantly African-American neighborhood, recognized their roots in Africa and adopted the

surname Africa, and openly expressed their African-American identity and vernacular, the site on which they saw their demise by police articulates the extreme end results of police brutality upon an African-American community. In this case, like many others, police brutality, use of excessive force, and harsher sentencing has led to the physical and sentimental perforation of African-American communities in the form of death, incarceration, or displacement. This site represents that historic and continuous perforation, which is evidently difficult to recover from, in the visual and material landscape of a Philadelphia neighborhood.

Criterion C: The Site of the MOVE Bombing's Place in the Architecture of Erasure

The MOVE site fulfills Criterion C because it exemplifies the Architecture of Erasure. While erasure by neglect is certainly a worthwhile and necessary form to study, this nomination and potential listing hopes to confront and establish the historic trend of purposeful and planned destruction and displacement of American communities through the demolition or condemnation of the places in which those communities thrived. Nomination for the MOVE site under Criterion C yields two results: establishes the architecture “style” of Erasure that is not exclusive to the MOVE site, and recognizes Mayor Wilson Goode as a “master” whose “work” has retained integrity throughout the decades.

First, the MOVE site establishes an architecture style of erasure. Much like any other style, key visual and material characteristics must be present, visible, and authentic. For Erasure, characteristics of standing structures can include: prolonged vacancy, boarded windows and doors, broken or absence of glazing (glass), soiled or crumbling façades and structure, missing structural members or ornamentation, the presence of vandalism and dumping, and signage regarding private property, trespassing and prosecution, safety hazards, and business opportunity. Landscapes of erasure include similar signs of incomplete demolition or reconstruction, as well

as overgrown vegetation through concrete cracks or soft groundwork, piles of former structural members, and ineffective fencing. Ironically, the presence of many of these characteristics is counterintuitive to the traditional application and interpretations of the aspects of integrity. For instance, the MOVE site retains integrity of “feeling” and “material” through its wood-boarded windows and door, its 20-30 years of vacancy between various units, and the residents still residing on Osage have been there since the 1985 bombing and the 1996 settlement. However, that integrity can be challenged by the notion that the whole site is a reconstruction (commissioned by Goode) of pre-bombing structures, or that the window glazing and doors no longer have the same material, or that the façade is visually interrupted by structures and parts. This contention is resolved by articulating that *proper* materials, workmanship, and design is only relevant if the site is listed under Criterion C for its pre-bombing existence, for early 20th century Philadelphia row- houses. As it is now, 32 years after the process of erasure was initiated by the bombing, the site exemplifies the Architecture of Erasure by maintaining many of the signifiers of absence, destruction, and ambiguity expected with erasure.

Second, not only does the MOVE site fulfill Criterion C as an architecture style of erasure, but it is also exemplarity of the work that Mayor Wilson Goode contributed to Philadelphia’s hard landscapes. Just as Frank Lloyd Wright mastered horizontal forms and meticulously details in geometry, or Phillip Johnson experimented with concrete and glass facades, or Louis Khan transcended geographical or cultural expectations with monolithic structures, or Frederick Law Olmstead established public parks as a opportunities for peaceful and whimsical landscapes – Wilson Goode pioneered the use of incendiary devices in urban settings to destroy, alter, and recreate architectural forms. In an apprehension plan (similar to construction documents or schedule), Goode conspired with the Philadelphia police

commissioner, the head of the Bomb Disposal Unit, a sergeant from the pistol range, and a uniformed police officer to evacuate the Cobbs Creek neighborhood, surround the block with 600 police officers, station a bomb squad in a nearby parking lot, use machine guns, antitank weapons, bulldozers, cranes, water cannons, and plastic explosive satchels (C4 bombs) to break down MOVE's fortified rowhome-turned-fort and dislodge the rooftop bunker, effectively exposing and apprehending MOVE members. When the bomb was dropped in the evening of May 13, 1985, Goode permitted for the subsequent fire to burn and engulf the entire neighborhood. Immediately after the bombing, Goode commissioned for the reconstruction of the Cobbs Creek neighborhood which many of the units were condemned by the U.S Army Core of Engineers by 1996 and effectively vacated, boarded, and owned by the city to this day; shoddy reconstruction became the capstone of his Erasure style. In fact, without the reconstruction, one could mistake the MOVE site as an empty lot, a symptom of deindustrialization or a failing economy, rather seeing it for what it is: a victim of planned eradication and erasure. The presence of MOVE would reflect the City of Philadelphia and Goode's powerlessness against civil disobedience; thus their eradication in assembly and in the physical landscape exemplifies the authority and prowess that the City and Goode are apparently capable of.

For any master, certain tools and methods are a staple of that master's work. In this instance, Goode's tools are the militarized police and their equipment and his methods includes eviction, confrontation, controlled evacuation, and arson. Furthermore, mastery does not have to imply repetition as Goode was successful in erecting Erasure in his first use approved a bombing. That success can be seen at the MOVE site today as it still reflects the absence and ambiguity left by Goode's work even three decades later. For other architects, politicians, and public figures

seeking to eradicate a culture, community, or individual, referring to Goode's employment of police labor and fiery administration can yield productive results and distinct architecture.

Criterion Criteria Consideration – Reconstruction

Although the MOVE site is technically reconstructed, its reconstruction is key characteristic in fulfilling the Erasure style. Its reconstruction is what makes it distinct from other urban ruins developed by neglect. As an explicit act, Goode's commission to redevelop and reconstruct of the Cobbs Creek row homes suggests an intention to literally cover up the rubble left by the bombing. Additionally, the nature of the reconstruction itself – with many of the units condemned by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and vacated by the City – reveals the historic constraints in which the reconstruction spawned. Therefore, the MOVE site including its reconstruction still retains exceptional significance by highlighting a key characteristic in the architecture of Erasure and providing the necessary information to develop the context in which the historic event occurred (i.e., the bombing and its aftermath).

Criterion Criteria Consideration – Less than 50 years old

While the rest of the Cobbs Creek neighborhood was built from 1880s to 1920s, the three rows of homes on the south of Pine and both sides of Osage were bombed and reconstructed between 1985 and 1986. This May 13, 2017 marks the 32nd anniversary of the bombing. Despite not having reached the 50-year benchmark generically required by the National Register, the site is eligible for “exceptional importance.” First, because it has already punctuated the cultural moment surrounding law enforcement and African-Americans; and second, because without public and governmental intervention alike the site is subjected to the whim of the Request for Proposal's outcome. As explained with Criterion A: Event (1 and 2), the militarization and

brutality that Americans, specifically African-Americans, face is not exclusive to the 80s, nor is it a new phenomenon spawning from this present decade. Second, regarding the RFP released November 2016, the site is at risk of never reaching the 50-year benchmark if the Philadelphia Redevelopment Authority and its selected developers choose the complete the cycle of erasure by redeveloping the site without sensitivity. Thus, a sense of urgency is derived from this rhetorical situation to include or not include the MOVE site on the National Register. Although the RPF does include a measly paragraph mentioning the history of the site and requesting for respect and recognition of that history, the fate of the site is not under the stewardship of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 as it would be if it were listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Full enforcement of the 50-year criteria consideration in this case would be counterproductive to the preservation ethic the National Register poses. This site cannot wait another eighteen years to be preserved when it has already been subjected to a second round of erasure as of five months ago.

Stylistic Characteristics

Site Integrity

The MOVE site retains integrity in a variety of ways. While some are more relevant or applicable than others depending on the interpretation, each of the seven aspects of integrity is considered in the following section. Photographs before, during, and after the bombing, the reconstruction period, and the site's contemporary form and condition are attached in the appendix (and nomination form) for comparison.

First, integrity of location is retained. As a site, it is the geographically accurate and exact location in which the bombing occurred. The address at 6221 Osage Avenue serves as the locus

of the site right below where the bomb was dropped from a state helicopter. The primary target was the bunker attached to the rooftop of 6221 unit. The boundary of the whole site can be defined by whichever units were engulfed by the fire or reconstructed because of the fire. Integrity of location is pertinent to establish this site's historic significance because it provides the geographical context in which the bombing occurred regarding which locations in the greater Philadelphia area were exposed to the event; how police officers, the bomb squad, and the fire department situated themselves for evacuation and surrounding the block; how the fire spread; and what neighbors were secondarily affected.

Second, integrity of *Design* is arguably retained. The site as it is, thirty-two years since the bombing, still retains the aesthetics of Erasure style concerning the absence and ambiguity of a past livelihood. Furthermore, Goode's design intentions of evicting, removing, eradicating MOVE from the Osage Avenue and Cobbs Creek landscape is still seen when visiting the site today, as there is no explicit evidence of their former existence at the site. Specifically, this site retains the design characteristics of an Architecture of Erasure by featuring extended vacancy, boarded windows and doors, broken or missing glass, and signage indicating surveillance and city ownership. Another approach to the question of design integrity can be to evaluate the reconstruction as the contention subject rather than the isolated characteristics that make up the Erasure style. In this approach, the site still retains integrity despite it being reconstruction of existing rowhome architecture before the bombing – because it reflects the impact and aftermath of the bombing itself. In fact, if it were not reconstructed nor having needed to be reconstructed in the first place, the original turn-of-the-century Philadelphian rowhomes might not be historic significant at all. It is the bombing and the subsequent reconstruction after the bombing that imbues the site with such visceral significance in history and history's landscape.

Third, integrity of setting is inarguably retained for the MOVE site. Not only has the 6221 Osage Avenue, Osage Avenue, and the Cobbs Creek neighborhood remained geographically in the same position over the last three decades, the setting composed of its basic environmental features like streetscape, vegetation, topography, and vistas have also remained intact. That is, the MOVE bombing site is still a residential neighborhood arranged by linear rows of rowhomes, situated between 63rd street to the West and 62nd street to the East, with typical trees and utilities poles and lines running through each street. Setting, along with feeling and association, in this nomination is used to highlight the general states of nondisclosure from the City and its citizens left by the bombing onto the landscape.

Fourth, integrity of the material is arguably retained at the site. After the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers condemned the property and the city has kept most of the site vacant for two decades, there is no reason to believe that the site has had major material changes to it since the 1985-1986 reconstruction. The rowhomes were reconstructed predominantly with pressed bricks on the first-floor façade, and walnut wood siding on the second-floor façade, and generic rolled shingles on the roof - with no indication of significant damage, replacements, demolition, or additions. Nuanced alterations to the very moment the reconstruction ended could include the introduction of wooden boards into windows and doors after the 1996 vacancy and the metal awnings over each unit's door with no documented origin or age. Integrity of material provides insight to the material's available and selected at the time of reconstruction and the financial value and priority the City and the Mayor put back into the neighborhood after bombing it.

Fifth, integrity of workmanship is arguably retained for the MOVE site. The RFP provided by the PRA who owns many of the vacant units on the site states: "Most of the problems were attributable to design or construction deficiencies including improper selection of material,

specification of installation of substandard products and improper installation and construction” revealing the workmanship of the reconstruction as distinctly poor, negligent, hasty, and economical. However, workmanship attributed to the bombing and fire as a design technique and demolition method yields effective results, considering there are no traces of the former pre-bombing structures within the site. Workmanship reveals the hasty circumstances to which Goode wanted to reconstruct the units after the bombing and the effectiveness as explosives and arson as a means of structural annihilation.

Sixth, integrity of association is arguably retained for the MOVE site. First, verbal accounts and reflections on the bombing often frames the location of the bombing as the reason why the bombing was so contentious. Discourse surrounding the site inquired whether the police had the right to bomb a neighborhood, whether MOVE was a nuisance or terrorist group, whether racial discrimination or implications were considered, and what the future holds for the police, MOVE, and their neighbors. Headlines like “Philadelphia’s Osage Avenue,” “The Block the Philadelphia Bombed,” “Devastation on Osage Avenue,” and “Nightmare still on Osage Avenue” also allude turmoil left by the bombing. Through the discourse generated by the bombing, the signifiers and identification of “Osage Avenue” even as a simple as a street sign establishes the required association that links the site to bombing. Other weaker arguments to establish association can be the signage that indicates city ownership of the vacant homes or the presence of neighbors who have lived at the site since the 1985 bombing and through the 1996 settlement. Association with MOVE is not required because the site represents their demise and moment of eradication rather than their productive work within the city or neighborhood; the absence of MOVE only further supports the site’s association of being bombed and its impact on the social and physical landscape of the neighborhood.

Finally, integrity of feeling is inarguably retained for the MOVE site. As the most subjective of the seven aspects of integrity, feeling requires special attention because of the nature and nuance of the MOVE site. First, regarding the architecture of Erasure and erasure as a social phenomenon, the feeling that the site is associated with is absence and ambiguity. Boarded units and scatter vacancies in a once vibrant neighborhood gestures to absence; a lack of signage or memorial or vernacular intervention gestures towards the ambiguity. For visitors of the site (e.g., pedestrians and extended neighbors), visual clues in the environment like the boarded vacancy juxtaposed next to pristine facades suggests that “something” happened on Osage Avenue – but unless they explicitly know the history of the site on their own accord, they will not know of the bomb, the fire, or the reconstruction. Thus, ambiguity as expression of erasure is successful in its physical iteration at the MOVE site. Though the feeling may be grim, it is still worthy of recognition and reverence if not “preservation.”

The site as an example of the architecture of Erasure and as it is associated with the historic event of confrontation between the MOVE organization and the City, Mayor Goode, and the Philadelphia police department that ended in a bombing retains its integrity in various forms. Materiality, workmanship, and design of the site after the subsequent bombing highlights the resources, aptitude, effectiveness, and priorities of Goode’s confrontation strategies and contingency planning. Location, setting, association, and feeling of the site invokes the historic and geographic context that enabled the bombing to happen and the lingering effects of that bombing onto the Cobbs Creek neighborhood in West Philadelphia.

Organizing Principles

Duality of Exigence

First, the nomination process and the potential rhetorical and practical transition of the MOVE site from a *place* to a *historic place on the National Register* evokes a duality of exigence. This project began when I visited Osage Avenue for another endeavor: building a speech and case around the MOVE members who were still in prison. The second time I visited the site, in participation of 30-year anniversary of the fire, was also when I was entering my graduate studies in the field of historic preservation. Through my coursework, I began to think about sites I knew of that have been neglected by the field and the profession, which led me to return to subjects of my undergraduate project. Personally, I felt that the site is a “historic place” but I wondered what keeps, has kept, or will keep the site from becoming a “historic place on the National Register.” This prompted me to begin questioning what the differences between the two categorizations and the implications thereof. Thus, the MOVE site’s generic transition began as a personal academic inquiry for which I have garnered support and approval from various members of the preservation profession, MOVE advocates, and Ramona Africa herself. The main constraints expressed to me in this rhetorical situation I was creating was that the MOVE site was not yet 50 years old in its construction or its significance, or that it was reconstructed, or that while it is “important,” there is “nothing there to preserve.” Framing this rhetorical situation as merely an academic endeavor limits the project’s impact to the discourse it produces; it becomes trapped in as a think-piece with hopeful influence onto material reality.

However, exigence for this project becomes more substantial given the November 2016 Request for Proposal that will inevitably trigger the Section 106 Process if the redevelopment comes to fruition. Not only will public and personal considerations of place-making and history-

telling intervene with the fate of the MOVE site, but now so will the federal government; federal mandates; State facilitation of those mandates; contractors and developers; and their designs, bulldozers, and constructor workers. This form of double exigence helps expedite the consideration for the MOVE site to official become “historic” and recognized by the State and federal government under their own official list – but it also raises concerns as to why federal involvement is a requirement for punctual preservation.

While the Section 106 Process helps the MOVE site become a priority at the SHPO, it can also reduce the site to its legal obligations under the NHPA and undermines the site’s ability to evoke public memory of a historic event. The site becomes “paperwork” and a federal obstacle rather than a public opportunity for discourse, celebration, healing, and memorialization. It also frames the significance of the site as an obstacle in the way of developers and federal agency’s immaculate intentions for a site. Thus the quality of the situation is already undermined as Vatz had alluded to in his critique of Bitzer’s use of the rhetorical situation. The RFP’s insistence on “recognizing” and “respecting” the site’s history can help bolster the non-governmental sources of exigence for preserving (or in their case, redeveloping) a historic site, but the federal agency and corresponding SHPO ultimately facilitate the National Register, the Section 106 Process, and the federal funding or permit needed to proceed approach the physical site.

Site of Contention

The MOVE site in all of its complexity and nuance as an unresolved site yields contentious interpretations of the physical site, the site’s history, and the National Register. While I provided my own interpretations of each element that I believed are productive, logical, and ethical, I recognize that there are a plethora of other readings that yield different results

concerning listing or eligibility. In this section, I review the bifurcating interpretations of rhetorical situation that renders Osage Avenue as a site of contention.

First, Criterion A: Event is dependent on whether or not “police militarization” or “police brutality upon African American communities and individuals” is a recognized historic trend by the SHPO. Onus of establishing those phenomena falls onto the nominator if the SHPO is not already familiar with the historic trend. For instance, named historic events like “the Underground Railroad,” or “World War I and II,” or “the Great Depression” or “Segregation Era” may be more universally recognized terms for historians and the public. But events and patterns that are now just beginning to establish their historic resonance might need more convincing from nominators, who may or may not be historians.

Second, not only is the area of significance or associated historic pattern contentious, but so is the narrative about the MOVE site itself. Different readings backed by inherent bias or ideologies of what exactly happened on Osage Avenue renders different villains, victims, and accomplices. In my interpretation, I framed Mayor Goode as the mastermind behind the bombing whereas someone else might attribute the actual act of the bombing dropping to the police or a specific bomb squad member with Goode only as an accomplice. I characterize the police as a militarized unit who responded with excessive explosive force; someone else can reframe them as faced with no alternative to MOVE’s persistence in refusing to surrender. I characterize MOVE as militant, culturally fringed, and a nuisance to some neighbors, but they can also be read as criminal, cultish, and terrorizing. Whichever narrative is chosen as the true history by the SHPO and then published by NPS onto their National Register database becomes canonized, at least by whomever reads government-sanctioned history as canon. As owner of the property, the City of Philadelphia (through PRA) also has a say in how their site is described to an extent. In

its choice to frame the MOVE narrative, the City can enhance its own role in that history in a variety of ways. In one hand, the City can promote historic accuracy at the cost of acknowledging its complicity to bombing its own citizens. On the other, preservation of Goode's and the police department's legacy and contributions to Philadelphia might not be a worthwhile sacrifice for historicity.

Third, regardless of which narrative is canonized through the recognition or preservation of the MOVE site, MOVE members and past and present neighbors alike should have the right to closure regarding the traumatic nature of the site. In personal communication with Ramona Africa, the lone survivor of the bombing, she agrees that the site should be recognized in some way - as a lack of memorial suggests that "the city of Philadelphia does not want to admit that something happened on Osage Avenue 30 years ago." While no publication has suggested that any neighbors object to memorializing or recognizing the MOVE site, especially the 6221 unit, it does not require too much intellectual labor to at least consider potentially unheard perspectives. The MOVE site as a site of trauma (which also merits another study in its own) has the opportunity to serve as a history lesson in the use of incendiary devices in populated urban settings or to act as an agent of re-traumatizing for victims and witnesses alike, whether they are MOVE members and descendants, neighbors, police officers, the City, or citizens.

The history of the site evokes powerful emotional and rhetorical responses from a variety of audiences. However, the ultimate fate of the site is facilitated by whomever has the most power in the situation which is identifiable the SHPO with potentially the Keeper's input, then the City, then the public. The contention of the site is only illuminated by any potential National Register listing rather than resolved.

Material Anchoring of Historic Realities

Although not every aspect of integrity needs to be retained, even prompting to do so can reduce a site to its physical, visual, spatial dimensions. Thus the history of the MOVE site becomes “true” when the physical evidence in the hard landscape of Osage Avenue expresses it as true or “has integrity” -- whereas the lack of integrity by definition means to be “untrue.” In my process of making a case for the retention of integrity, I am certain to upset traditionalist interpretations and applications of the National Register. I have also been warned that the nomination form is not a place to argue theory but to supply the SHPO with the most coherent and categorical completion of the form. However, through my interpretation, I present a preservation ethic that is not bound to positive physical evidence of a history and reconsiders absence and ambiguity as just as potent markers of marginalized histories. The MOVE site has the opportunity to challenge hegemonic ideologies within the current historic preservation ethic considering material integrity is a privilege of the dominant culture.

Amalgamation of Citizen-Government

Throughout this thesis project and its nomination process counterpart, I have taken on the roles of scholar, advocate, critic, SHPO intern, and a public individual. And still, I will not know of the actual outcome of nomination until the SHPO responds weeks after an official postmarked submission. For sites with similar complexities as Osage Avenue, the transition (rhetorical or practical) from *place* to *historic place on the National Register* is not wholly a liberating experience but one that forces public nominators to identify with preservation professionals and government officials or be at risk of rejection. Discourse addressing a place might deem it “historic” but until the registration form is filled out correctly and the arguments are acceptable, the U.S. government will not recognize the place as “worthy of preservation.” The amalgamation

is foreseen by the likes of Triage (2016) who warned of the “neoliberal” co-opting of rhetorical spaces and situations. The MOVE site’s transition exemplifies another instance where the government retains its power while suggesting that the National Register is inclusive, approachable, and relevant to the public it governs.

Documentation as Historicity

The confrontation between MOVE and the Philadelphia Police Department is officially chronicled in five books, three documentaries, and a variety of news publications that seem to spawn on every May 13th anniversary. Temple University also houses the “Philadelphia Special Investigation Commission (MOVE) Records” in its “Urban Archives” collection. However, narrative descriptions of the actual site, Osage Avenue, between the bombing and today are limited to the few mentions of the 1996 settlement and interviews with the block captain, Gerald Renfrow (Matheson, 2010; Demby, 2015; Griffin, 2016). Other documents addressing the post-bomb reconstruction or the 1996 U.S. Army Corps of Engineer inspection are non-existent or inaccessible. While I had the privilege of visiting the site multiple times, I did not have the tools, authority, or extensive training to evaluate the specific materiality or structural deficiencies that an experienced professional or city official might have. Juxtaposed with the contention of the MOVE narrative regarding who is at fault, who is the victim, and what means were absolutely necessary – historic preservation practices like that of the National Register seem to only buff already accepted histories rather than establishing new, unwritten, or silenced histories.

Discussion

After establishing *historic sites on the National Register* as a rhetorical genre and then applying the genre’s perceived requirements to the MOVE site, the final step in generic

application within genre criticism is to evaluate the MOVE' site *success* in fulfilling the National Register's requirements. This section also serves to explore to various potential responses from the SHPO and the implications of those response.

First, the rhetorical process of the MOVE site transitioning from a *place* to a *historic place on the National Register* utilizes both sources of exigence outlined in the situational requirements of the genre: traditional nomination and the Section 106 process. For traditional nomination and listing, I began this project not in pursuit of the tax incentives, or rehabilitation grants, or code excepted afforded by the National Register but rather as an extension of my advocacy for incarcerated or survived MOVE members. My advocacy became *one* source of exigence for this rhetorical situation as I applied new methods of history-telling not yet applied to MOVE's story or the MOVE site: historic preservation. This mode of exigence falls in line with other historic places' regarding public and government recognition of a history, prestige that comes with National Register listing, and recordation on the NPGallery database.

The Request for Proposal released by the Philadelphia Redevelopment Authority complicates and bolsters my contributions to the exigence of the situation by foreshadowing Section 106 involvement in the redevelopment of the site. Not only do most public-sector large-scale constructions already involve some kind of federal funds or permit, the RFP made explicit that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has intervened with the site before regarding structural deficiencies. While correspondence with the Pennsylvania SHPO probably has not initiated yet, it surely will (and is legally required to) once a developer and proposal is selected. With the situational requirements in order, the rhetorical response of the MOVE site becoming a *historic site*...can commence.

For the substantive requirements, the MOVE site fulfills most traditionally the under Criterion A: Event. I argue that the MOVE site is significantly associated with the historic pattern of police militarization in America, where the use of a bomb punctuates the extreme peak of that pattern as a singular event. I add that the MOVE site is also significantly associated with the history pattern of police brutality upon African-American communities and individuals. Although there are a few searchable listings that tangentially mention or even directly address police brutality, none of these listings are listed *because* police brutality occurred there. For instance, Haymarket Martyr's Monument in Forest Park, Illinois is an object listed on the National Register for marking the site where "during a workers' rally being held to protest police brutality against strikers, a bomb went off in the midst of the crowd killing several police officers who had come to demand an end to the meeting"; the monument is categorized under "Labor" as its significant theme (NPS:NHL, n.d.). In another instance, when the New Pilgrim Baptist Church was listed in 2007 (6 years before the reaching the 50-year benchmark), its nomination form chronicled a few instances where police brutality had happened on the church grounds or the church hosted the funerals of African-American individuals who had been shot by the police or when church members held meetings to discuss police brutality. However, the Church was ultimately listed for its "place in the annals of Birmingham's Civil Rights Movement and the indispensable activities of the Alabama Christian Movement for Human Rights" citing predominantly the leadership of its reverends and invigoration of its African-American membership. For the MOVE site to pioneer the historic narrative of police militarization and/or brutality on the National Register can be a daunting task.

Another logistic obstacle to building a premiere case of "historic significance" is the inability to keyword search on the National Register NPGallery databases. Although there are

efforts in digitizing the hundred-thousand listings, the current interface is frustratingly faulty, outdated, or requires such precision that one would need to know the exact name, location, or reference number of a site to access the desired files. Not only does this anecdote potentially render the exigence of “database accessibility and recordation” weak, it also makes it difficult for the nominator to cite a pre-established “historic pattern” or a lack thereof.

Giving the corresponding SHPO the benefit of the doubt (in this case the Pennsylvania SHPO), the MOVE site’s listing under Criterion A is the most traditional, logical, non-confrontation interpretation of the National Register expectations. For this reason, I see no scenario in which they would reject this site in this stage of the nomination process – unless there are semantic errors in the form or a lack of thoroughness in my argumentation. As a premise, Criterion A: Event: police militarization and brutality should be acceptable and successfully fits the National Register’s substantive requirements.

However, my interpretation and application of Criterion C: Design/Construction is purposefully confrontational, but hopefully rhetorically productive. I first declare that the MOVE site is exemplarity of the architecture style of Erasure, and then I cite Mayor Wilson Goode as a master of that architecture style in his employment of incendiary devices and arson as architectural tools. In doing so, I hope to concisely expose the National Register’s structural functions that help facilitate the persisting dominance of the White Capitalist Patriarchy in an institution that is supposed to tell *all* of “the nation’s history.”

First, Criterion C relies on properties that “embody distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction” with the nomination form and NPGallery providing “architectural style” as a prompt to be filled in and searched by. Using the “architectural style” function on NPGallery yields 40 options to choose from: 37 of which account for post-American

settlement architectural trends from Colonial to Skyscraper – with the other three including Pueblo, Other, and No Style Listed.

A brief review of the architecture profession in America reveals why the current iteration of Criterion C is both accurate and problematic: Beyond early European pioneers creating vernacular settlements reminiscent of their country of origin's homes, "architecture" was a "gentlemen's hobby" that desired and put forth structures like Thomas' Jefferson's Monticello or George Washington's Mount Vernon. Architecture also played a specific cultural in the Founding Father's efforts to delineate from their English roots as the American landscape began reject Georgian architecture in preference of the Federal style. Westward expansion in the 19th century lead to Colonial Revival styles along the East Coast while Pueblo and Spanish Colonial forms were introduced and adapted in the American Southwest. In 1857, thirteen White men invited sixteen other White men to join them in forming the American Institute of Architects (AIA) who began to provide licensure for "professional architects" creating a standard of liability and rigor for the profession. The first woman to be licensed by the AIA was in the 1890s with Marion Mahony Griffin whose contributions to the field cannot escape the mention of her employer Frank Lloyd Wright and her husband Walter; obviously there were also non-licensed women who preceded her like Louise Blanchard Buthune, Mary L. Page, and Sophia Hayden. In 1923, Paul Revere Williams became the first African-American member of the AIA and licensed African-African architect in the United States. The title for first African-American woman be a licensed architect is shared between Beverly Loraine Greene, who was registered as an architect in Illinois in 1942, and Norma Merrick Sklarek, who was registered at large in 1954. Today, "even though nearly half of architecture school graduates are women, only 18% of licensed practitioners are women" and "fewer than 2% of licensed architects in the United States are

African American” (Stratigakos, 2016). The lineage of the architecture profession surely effects the lineage of architecture history regarding who preserves it and how it is preserved.

My interpretation of Criterion C addresses the rhetorical gatekeeping that affords hegemonic structures to define “architecture style” or “[work of a] master.” However, in my investigation, I found myself in a strange-loop of generic meta-criticism. In asking “who has the power to define *historic sites on the National Register*?” other questions emerged like who has the power to define what is “significant” or a “historic pattern” in Criterion A, “significant/historic person” in Criterion B, “well researched,” “integrity,” “exceptional,” and so on. In defense of the National Register, one might say that the nominator has the power to define these terms as long as they are “well-argued” – which spins the strange-loop all over again. For contentious and complex places like the MOVE site, subjecting their ineffable history to this cycle of irrelevant terminology can strip the potent public memory that was once imbued into the place. The National Register does not have to deny eligibility to properties that will never be nominated; sociocultural dominance does not have to employ rejection when intimidation has already exhausted the marginalized.

Regarding substantive requirements, the MOVE site retains both tradition and challenging interpretations of the seven aspects of integrity. I argue that location, feeling, association, and setting are undeniably retained. However, for the aspects often reserved for Criterion C, I bend the traditional meanings of material, workmanship, and design – framing Goode’s role in the bombing and burning of Osage Avenue as purposeful and aesthetic. In doing so, I reveal both deficit and irony in the preservation ethic. The premise is: “the confrontation between MOVE and the Philadelphia Police Department in 1985 should be protected from oblivion” in that it provides valuable lessons in countercultures, law enforcement, race relations,

community relations, militarization and apprehension tactics, local politics, conflict management and so on. Thus the premise is followed by the condition: “if the confrontation is embodied by the site, then preservation of the site is equitable to preservation of the confrontation (or its historical retelling).” However, if material absence is equally, if not more important to the site in retelling the site’s history, then how is absence preserved? This is not to say that absence cannot be preserved but that the National Register and our most familiar interpretations of it does outwardly entertain the possibility. The National Register lacks in recognition of “what was” by privileging “what is” and to challenge this status quo is to participate in the irony of historic preservation: the preservation of loss, the preservation of absence, the preservation of erasure.

Furthermore, as I explained in the introduction, while the subsequent nomination of this site serves as an act of advocacy and resistance, listed status does not have to be the end goal for the site or for this project. If the guidelines and interpretations of the National Register posed by NHPA, NPS, SHPOs, its Bulletin and publications are too systematically situated to be renegotiated, then the a new rhetorical response must be crafted for these disparaging rhetorical situations. For instance, the duality of exigence between history-telling and tax credits or the amalgamation of citizen-government can benefit from separating public nominations from Section 106 undertakings. State historical markers are an example of historic recognition (not preservation) efforts that despite being facilitated by the State are more liberated from structural or federal constraints. Yet even those alternatives often require capital and oversight. If the National Register of Historic Places and its proponents insist on “preserving places that still exist” then perhaps a National Register of Destroyed Places can implemented to recognize the history of America’s destructive tendencies.

CHAPTER SIX

Conclusions

This analysis illustrates that the site of the MOVE bombing *can* operate within the genre of *historic places on the National Register* – ultimately depending on the corresponding State Historic Preservation Office’s interpretation of the National Register of Historic Places. This project provides insight into the rhetorical transition of the MOVE site from *place* to *historic place...* and its potential role reframing the historic preservation ethic within the historic preservation profession. The following section answers the research questions directly as well as draws additional conclusions about the project regarding its limitations and contributions.

Answer to Research Questions

The first research question posed by this project asks: How does the National Register limit or expand the public’s understanding of racialized violence and marginalized histories? As the previous analysis suggests, the National Register can expand understanding by generating the discourse needed to facilitate material change through the Section 106 process. The National register through the SHPO has the authority and opportunity to draw attention and recognition to those sites of marginalized history, but only if they confront their own preconceived notions of what a historic site is and what is “worthy” or even capable of historic preservation. When Section 106 is involved, it is the federal agency that receives the “expansion of understanding” as they are mandated by NHPA to acknowledge the history of the site and to act accordingly – whereas the public may never have a reason or opportunity to confront these sites of racialized violence or marginalized history in the first place.

However, the National Register can also limit understanding by conglomerating governmental duties with public interest in addition to a government-first attitude and procedure. In regard to best practices, the government should preserve what its public deems a “historic site” or “worthy of preservation” – but when the government sets the standard of those terms, the public becomes subservient the needs of the government despite its democratic orientation. My discussion proposing a separation between National Register nominations and Section 106 eligible sites does not necessarily solve the issue of citizen-government amalgamation but it does begin a conversation for preservation to be a tool of liberation rather than assimilation.

As the analysis suggest, the National Register also privileges both a material culture and the architecture profession with lasting origins of White Capitalist Patriarchy. With 37 of the 40 “architecture styles” on the National Register’s database reflecting the work of White men who had the agency to create schools, start businesses, form organizations, and provide licenses and approximately 79% of the listings citing Criterion C as the source of the site’s significance, clearly there is a hegemony force swaying the relevancy of the *historic places...* genre. This is not to say that women or people of color have never contributed to design and construction of a Chicago Bungalow or a Gothic Revival Cathedral and so on. Rather, the analysis highlights the implications of privileging “architecture” and the “works of masters” when it should be “an official list that “supports public and private efforts to identify, evaluate, and protect America’s historic and archaeological resources.” In short, the National Register of Historic Places can limit the public’s understanding of racialized violence and marginalized history when it is treated as a “National Register of Aesthetically Pleasing Architecture.” Even the distinction between the “National Register of Historic Places” and a “National Register of Places Worthy of Preservation” can yield vastly responses. For the SHPO offices (and potentially NPS) who

facilitate both the rhetoric and results of National Register nominations, the next half-century of the National Historic Preservation Act provides a critical opportunity to compare the National Register's intentions with its reception and to adapt accordingly.

The second research question posed by this project asks: How can the National Register help or hinder understanding of the MOVE site? The analysis suggests that a National Register listing – to an extent – can reduce the rate of erasure regarding material reality and oblivion regarding public history. Mechanisms of that reduction are highlighted by the exigence of the rhetorical situation: the public pursuit of tax-credits, code exceptions, database recordation, recognition and prestige – and the federal government corresponding with SHPOs at NHPA mandates. However, in the process of nomination, the MOVE site can be reduced to its physical relevancy where any narrative, anecdote, historic reality not grounded in a physical or visual character is minimized or disregarded. In reframing the MOVE into its most palpable form for the National Register or to fit with the other *historic sites on the National Register*, the MOVE site is subjected to another round of erasure that may or may not be worthwhile to the victims, inhabitants, and witnesses of the site's history.

Contributions

This project sought to analyze the MOVE site in the context of other *historic places on the National Register* and to question the rhetorical and practical implications of the site's inclusion or exclusion within the genre.

This first half of this analysis takes a critical look at the National Register and how it facilitates its influence onto material reality. Through language and structure, the National Register becomes a gatekeeper for American populations and history to bypass to be recognized and potentially preserved by their own State. If the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966

acts a bridge between a place's past and present, surely the National Park Service and State Historic Preservation Office are trolls with the National Register being their riddle.

The second half of this analysis considers how the MOVE site would navigate the rhetorical transition posed by the National Register to become a *historic place*... In doing so, the project provides the practical contribution by building a framework for the site to be actually nominated in the future. This includes the gathering of historic documents and sources, an understanding of historic preservation practices and National Register expectations, first-hand exposure to the site, and direct communication with MOVE survivors and SHPO staff alike. Furthermore, by centering the site a place "worthy" of scholarly investigation, I hope to tell the story of MOVE and the happenings of Osage Avenue as act of preservation and an act of resistance against the current status quo where any other form of preservation might be impossible or high discouraged.

Finally, this project contributes to the field of Historic Preservation by providing the rhetorical grounded necessary to confront the efficacy of the professional institutions and resources like the National Register of Historic Places, the National Historic Preservation Act, and their corresponding federal or State agencies. In the reciprocal, the project contributes to the study of Communication and Rhetoric by extending the existing body of work on race, place, and public memory to historic preservation ethics and practices. This project hopes to spawn more scholarship that intersects rhetoric and historic preservation because together they can expand our understanding the human tendencies to not only erect structure and imbue them with symbolic meaning but also to preserve them far past their functioning expiration. Between MOVE and the National Register of Historic Places, only time will tell which histories we write and which historic places we erase.

APPENDIX

A. Background

This thesis examines the intersection of the National Register of the Historic Places as a rhetorical genre and the site of the MOVE bombing as a potential example of that genre. Both elements of that intersection are independently spawned from two other phenomena in American society: (1) the historic preservation legislation and (2) the MOVE organization's relationship with the Philadelphia Police Department. Therefore, to make sense of the analysis and criticism forthcoming, it is important that I first provide chronological and informational accounts of the two phenomena as the background for my study. Both of these subsections are generated by reviewing primary sources like National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 and the MOVE manifesto, as well as narrative accounts from books, documentaries, and news articles.

Historic Preservation in American Law

As its name suggests, the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA, Senate Bill 3035, Public Law 89-665) is the most comprehensive historic preservation legislation ever enacted in United States. However, it was surely not the first nor the only historic preservation legislation still active. Thus, I first review what the state of preservation looked like before NHPA, and then outline the policies it establishes. My goal for this section is to provide an adequate summary for readers who might not be as familiar with historic preservation.

Before the National Historic Preservation Act

The historic preservation movement or the desire to preserve old buildings for whatever reason predates NHPA by more than a century. Many preservationists point to America's first noted efforts in preservation occurring in the 1850s when George Washington's nephew did not have the means to maintain his presidential uncle's crumbling Mount Vernon home (Duerken,

1983). When the nephew failed to sell the property to the federal government for \$200,000, Ann Pamela Cunningham, heir of the Rosemont Plantation in South Carolina, created the Mount Vernon Ladies' Association to prevent further destruction as well as possible conversions to a resort. The success of the group in raising money to acquire the property and protect it from ruin not only provided the public to this day with an architectural symbol of "this nation and the birth of independence" but it also "served as a blueprint for later organizations" (Tunnard, 1994).

A later similar organization is William Sumner Appleton Jr.'s Society for the Preservation of New England Antiquities (SPNEA) established in 1910. Now known as Historic New England (HNE), this group was founded for "the purpose of posterity buildings, places, and objects of historic and other interested" because Appleton feared that "our New England antiquities [were] fast disappearing because no society has made their preservation its exclusive object" (Redfern, 2001). HNE functions as a charitable, non-profit organization headquarter. Its headquart in Boston, Massachusetts is arguable the oldest and largest regional preservation organization in the United States, owning 36 house museums and over 100,000 objects of historic significance and attracting nearly 200,000 visitors and program participants each year. Both the MVLA and SPNEA both point to the origins of historic preservation's local and regional recognition that places and objects have historical significance.

The first legislation tangential to historic preservation on a national scale is the Antiquities Act of 1906. In response to concerns about "pot hunters" or artifact looters at Native American/Indian sites like Chaco Canyon, New Mexico, President Theodore Roosevelt signed this act into law giving Presidents the power to set aside valuable public areas as "National Monuments" and made it illegal to excavate or remove resources from these areas without a specific federal permit. The purpose of this act as described in its legal doctrine was for "the

protection of objects of historic and scientific interest.” As a presidential power, it is much easier to use protect lands by turning them into a National Monument than going through Congress to make a National Park. However, some areas designated as National Monuments have later been converted into National Parks or incorporated into existing parks when it was fiscally or authoritatively advantageous. Since its inception, all but three presidents (i.e., Nixon, Reagan, and George H.W. Bush) have used the Antiquities Act. President Roosevelt first used it to protect Devils Tower National Monument and then Grand Canyon National Monument, which was later changed into a National Park. The Antiquities Act has been traditionally (but not always) used for natural lands. President Obama has been both praised and critiqued for his 23 proclamations of new national monuments, more than another other president. White House Correspondent Gregory Korte defends Obama stating “more than just about conservation...he’s also used them as a way to recognize formerly underappreciated chapters of American history – and to appease constituent groups with a mostly symbolic and low-coast presidential proclamation” (Korte, 2016). While not quite yet confronting the architectural nature of historic preservation, the Antiquities Act marks the first time federal power was procured for the acquisition, protection, and manage of public lands for their “historic and scientific resources” (The Wilderness Society, n.d.; Raffensperger, 2008).

Funnily enough, Congress realized that all these areas that they and President Roosevelt help designate as important and worthy of protection by proclaiming them as National Monuments under the Antiquities Act had no stewarding or enforcing agency to see through their preservation and conservation efforts. Thus, ten years later, the National Park Service Organic Act of 1916 was signed by President Woodrow Wilson, creating the National Park Service (NPS, the Park Service) as an agency under the Department of the Interior. NPS was mandated to

“conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and wildlife therein, and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations” meaning they provide and promote steward to the National Parks (NPS: History, n.d.). While the language provided by the act vaguely refers to historic preservation responsibilities, it was not until 1935 that the Historic Sites Act made those responsibilities explicit. With the bureaucratic overlap between ecological sites and architecture sites still present today, it is advantageous if not convenient for preservationists to identify with environmentalists and vice versa.

Historic preservation initiatives were not formalized for nearly another two decades, mostly because of America’s focus on recovering the Great Depression in which the only way historic preservation could be relevant was if it could somehow provide new jobs. Thus, the Historic American Building Survey (HABS) was formulated in 1933 by landscape architect Charles E. Peterson. Peterson saw the value in documenting and archiving the architecturally and historically significant buildings while at the same time re-employing architects, drafters, and photographers who were left jobless after the great Depression. For two years, HABS operated under emergency funding authorized by SOI of the time, Harold Ickes. Both HABS’s effectiveness and efficiency was improved in 1935 when local chapters of the American Institute of Architects in cooperation with the Park Service and the Library of Congress created a system where the documentation would be catalogued, stored, and made available to public. This system was then formally adopted into the Historic Sites Act meaning HABS overcame its unsettling “emergency funded” start to ultimately provide “an incomparable national archive [establishing] consistent recording techniques that contributed to high professional standards and broadened scope of preservation,” (Murtagh, p.55).

Evident by Secretary Ickes' willingness to authorize pioneering programs HABS and President Frank Roosevelt's momentum during the New Deal, the case for preservation was also further aided by their formulation of the Historic Sites Act of 1935. This seminal legislation explicitly declared for the first time in American history that historic preservation is a governmental duty, citing "that it is a national policy to preserve for public use historic sites, buildings, and objects of national significance." Moreover, this pragmatically translated to authorizing the Secretary of Interior to act in three ways: (1) to establish an information base for preservation by conducting surveys and engaging in research (HABS); (2) to implement preservation by acquiring, restoring, maintaining, and operating historic properties and by entering into cooperative agreements with like-minded private organizations; and (3) to interpret the heritage thus identified with historic markers or by other educational means. While the Historic Sites Act punctuated a seminal moment in historic preservation and its legislative abilities, it never reached its full potential because "the resources [the New Deal] was able to pour into economic recovery was preempted for the war effort (Murtagh, p. 58).

Even with the federal and fiscal limitations of preservation legislation like that of HABS and the Historic Sites Act, preservation initiatives still thrived at the local and state level. Most notably, the creation of the "historic district" in 1931 in Charleston, South Carolina broadened the concept of preservation "encompassing neighborhoods where average American citizens lived" (Murtagh, p.59). Historic districts utilized selective zoning laws to reject inconsiderate construction and development of structures that would quite literally ruin the historic fabric or aesthetic continuity of a neighborhood or region, usually for the sake of gaining capital. While the idea of the historic district was in its infancy in the first half of the twentieth century, it provided a crucial possible turning point for preservation away from its roots in the house

museum and national monuments. This turning point would later resurface in contemporary historic preservation when the “history in an untouchable box” model was no longer socially or economically viable. The historic district later became a vital tool utilized in the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 and is still ubiquitous in today’s preservation practices.

One last stop before fully arriving at NHPA must regard the National Trust for Historic Preservation (NTHP). With the anti-climactic results of the Historic Sites Act of 1935 in its attempt to empower federal officials, the late 1940s brought together leaders in historic preservation who saw the need for a national organization to support, rather than dictate, local preservation efforts (Finley, 1965). In 1947, representatives from a number of art, architectural, and historical societies gathered forming the National Council for Historic Sites and Buildings (NCHSB). The National Council formed the National Trust for Historic Preservation, modeling it after the British National Trust for Places of Historic Interest or Natural Beauty, which would be tasked with the acquisition and maintenance of historic properties with federal funds. In 1949, through the Act of Congress, President Truman signed the legislation creating the National Trust for Historic Preservation. For three years, the Council and the Trust existed side by side until the Executive Branch was compelled to merge their resources. This merger was officially completed in 1956 when the Trust became a member organization and assumed all other duties of the Council. Therefore, the Trust was now tasked with both acquisition and maintenance of historic sites as well as encouraging public participation in their preservation. Currently, the Trust is partially or fully in possession and responsible for twenty-seven historic sites (Historic Sites, n.d.). While federal funding for the Trust ceased in 1996, it has successfully operated as privately funded non-profit organization for the past twenty years and it remains as “the largest single national organization representing the private citizen on a broad spectrum of preservation issues”

(Murtagh, p.39).

The National Historic Preservation Act

Despite the mile stones of historic preservation legislation in the early decades of the twentieth-century, the 1950s and 1960s marked a contentious era for America's infrastructure and built environments (King, 2008). There are two primary contenders. First, when President Eisenhower signed into law the National Interstate and Defense Highway Act of 1956 to create interstate highways in case of troop mobilization, he incidentally encouraged careless but hasty construction resulting in lots of destroyed historic buildings. Second, when the Kennedy administration launched the Urban Renewal programs in the early 1960s in hopes of rejuvenating cities in the midst of sprawl, they did so at the cost of displacing people of color and the demolition of downtown areas (King, p.21). In response to the nationwide destruction that the Johnson administration inherited in the late 60s, Lady Bird Johnson in coordination with United States Conference of Mayors formed a special committee to analyze the effects of urban renewal on the country in May of 1965. The Rains Committee, as it was named, was chaired by Albert Rains who lead the charge for preserving historic (and at the time often neglected) American structures. By next spring, they published *With Heritage So Rich*, a seminal body of work consisting of essays, poetry, photography, and policy recommendations that was "so evocative that it was used as a major instrument in the introduction of congressional legislation leading to passage the National Historic Preservation Act" on October 15, 1966. (Murtagh, p. 64). NHPA established the following institutions, relations, and procedures:

The Secretary of Interior presiding with the National Park Service is tasked with creating and maintaining a (1) National Register of Historic Places "composed of districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects significant in American history, architecture, archaeology,

engineering, and culture” (16 U.S.C. 470a). NPS currently formally captions it on their website and publications as “the official list of the Nation’s historic places worthy of preservation.”

(NPS, National Register of Historic Places, n.d). In addition to the National Register, sites of outstanding historical significance were to also be distinguished as a (2) National Historic Landmark (NHL). Of the 86,000 sites listed on the National Register, less than 3,000 are also NHLs.

Next, NHPA also established (3) State Historic Preservation Officers (SHPOs). Each state was tasked to create and maintain a SHPO “providing matching funds, a designated State office, and a statewide preservation program tailored to State and local needs and designed to support and promote State and local historic preservation interests and priorities” (ACHP, 2002). Keeping in mind historic preservation’s origins regarding the reverence of Native American lands in the formation of the Antiquities Act, federally recognized tribes are represented by their own (4b) Tribal Historic Preservation Officers (THPOs) in consultations regarding their land.

At the federal level, (4) the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) was formed as the “first and only federal entity solely to address historic preservation issues.” The main task of ACHP is to advise the President and Congress on national historic preservation policy and should only intervene with SHPOs to handle conflicts with federal agencies or to participate in the Section 106 process. ACHP consists of 23 members from public and private sections with a chairperson appointed by the president. With the four institutions established, perhaps what connects them altogether and creates public sector of the preservation profession is the Section 106 review process. Section 106 of NHPA mandates that federal agencies undergo a review process for all federally funded and permitted “undertakings” that will impact sites listed or eligible to be listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Understanding Section 106 is

crucial to understanding the bulk of contemporary public sector historic preservation work as well as my intended analysis of the National Register. Therefore it is for the best that I explain it further.

Essentially, any project that involves the use of federal funds or a federal permit must ensure through the Section 106 process that there is minimal if any harm done to historic properties. Section 106 is how the federal government does its part to not contributing to the carelessness of post-WWII construction. This process is highlighted in four primary steps:

- 1) Initiate the process: Federal agency notifies SHPO/THPO that they are about to embark on an undertaking. In triage, SHPO/THPO staff determine if it is a substantial undertaking and if it has potential to cause effects. For instance, the Federal Communication Commission's requesting to replace a cell tower might not need to proceed in the Section 106 process if no (listed or eligible) properties are nearby.
- 2) Identify historic properties: Often conglomerated with the initiation step if the agency is certain that it has a potential to cause an effect, the identification process requires determination of the Area of Potential Effect (APE) of the project and the identify any historic properties within or about that APE. For instance, the Federal Highway Administration needs to provide a map outline which properties will be effected in their widening project to which the SHPO can help check which of those properties are historic. If no historic properties are within the APE, then mostly like the federal agency can proceed without further Section 106 consultation. This is when the National Register status is relevant.
- 3) Assess adverse effects: Adverse effects occur when an undertaking may directly or indirectly alter characteristics of a historic property that qualify it for inclusion in the

- Register. For instance, a housing development company (who triggers the Section 106 process by employing the Environmental Protection Agency's permit for construction regarding water and sewage) wants to turn a historic warehouse into an apartment complex. Ideally, to avoid charges of adverse effects, the development company would offer the design that least obstructs the reasons why that warehouse was on the register in the first place, like its distinct brick façade.
- 4) Resolve adverse effect: If adverse effects are found, then the federal agency must find ways to avoid, minimize, or mitigate the adverse to the satisfaction of the SHPO/THPO and public interest groups involved, ultimately in pursuit of a memorandum of agreement. For instance, in the previous example, the development company insists that one of the brick façade walls must be obstructed to install garage doors for its future residents. The SHPO can offer alternatives like street parking, reducing garage occupancy to every other resident, or trying to relocate the garage doors on a less important wall of the building. The company could say that they have reviewed the alternatives and their current design is the best financially and programmatically. The SHPO can then concede and demand appropriate forms of mitigation in return like allocating funds to another preservation effort or reutilizing the torn brick elsewhere. This dialogue can go on and on until both sides agree to sign an agreement. If parties cannot reach an agreement, then the Advisory Council gets involved.

Criticism of process stems from its potential to slow down construction as agencies wait for correspondence only to find out there is going to be an adverse effect. Proponents of NHPA argue that the process and its consulting agencies are vital tools to preventing recklessness of the

nation's landscapes and cultural resources. Others argue that the NHPA and the National Register do not have enough power in that process to help decide different approaches and solutions to a project, but ultimate Section 106 is a consultation process, not an enforcing one. Some consultations begin too late, after companies and agencies begin demolition and unbeknownst to them, the Section 106 process exists or perhaps worst, they assumed their site was not historic at first glance. Relevant to this thesis, reviewing the Section 106 process should explain why National Register eligibility also matters beyond discourse and symbolism. If employed correctly, National Register can help determine what happens to a site next.

B. MOVE

While MOVE is most associated with the bombing of their headquarters in 1985 that effectively punctuated their demise, MOVE's narrative is not complete without at least also reviewing their origins starting in 1972 and their first major confrontation with the Philadelphia Police Department in 1978. After I establish where MOVE came from and what they are about, I then review more in-depth the happenings around May 13, 1985 that make up the "the bombing of MOVE," before finally reviewing the status of MOVE and the Osage Avenue neighborhood three decades after the bombing.

Origin

In the wake of 1960s civil unrest and Philadelphia's tripling African-American population after World War II, former police commissioner Frank Rizzo campaigned for city mayor under a "law and order" platform and was elected in 1972. The year Rizzo took office was the same year that MOVE began to mobilize under the leadership of John Africa, a third-grade dropout and handy man (Pomer and Mancini, 1980). With the guidance of Donald Glassey, a social worker from the University of Pennsylvania and later one of MOVE's few White members, John Africa dictated a document called *The Guideline* which would then serve as the founding doctrine for the Christian Movement for Life organization (Assefa and Waharhaftig, 1988, p.20). Later shortened to MOVE, John Africa's organization, as explained in their bi-decadally revised pamphlet *20 Years On A Move*, is "characterized by dreadlock hair, the adopted surname 'Africa,' a principled unity, and an uncompromising commitment to their belief [which is] the teachings of MOVE founder JOHN AFRICA." Within this pamphlet (p.2), MOVE proclaims their mission statement:

"MOVE'S WORK IS TO STOP INDUSTRY FROM POISONING THE AIR, THE WATER, THE SOIL, AND TO PUT AN END TO THE ENSLAVEMENT OF LIFE –

PEOPLE, ANIMALS, ANY FORM OF LIFE. THE PURPOSE OF JOHN AFRICA'S REVOLUTION IS TO SHOW PEOPLE HOW CORRUPT, ROTTEN, CRIMINALLY ENSLAVING THIS SYSTEM IS, SHOW PEOPLE THROUGH JOHN AFRICA'S TEACHING, THE TRUTH, THAT THIS SYSTEM IS THE CAUSE OF ALL THEIR PROBLEMS (ALCOHOLISM, DRUG ADDICTION, UNEMPLOYMENT, WIFE ABUSE, CHILD PORNOGRAPHY, EVERY PROBLEM IN THE WORLD, AND TO SET THE EXAMPLE OF REVOLUTION FOR PEOPLE TO FOLLOW WHEN THEY REALIZE HOW THEY'VE BEEN OPPRESSED, REPRESSED, DUPED, TRICKED, BY THIS SYSTEM, THIS GOVERNMENT AND THE SEE THE NEED TO RID THEMSELVES OF THIS CANCEROUS SYSTEM AS MOVE DOES."

MOVE [sic]

University of the Pennsylvania students Karen Pomer and Jane Mancini narrate in their 1980 documentary "MOVE: Confrontation in Philadelphia" that the media at the time of MOVE's formation called them "a back-to-nature group of radicals, the human species at its lowest form, and finally wrote 'the word MOVE means nothing at all!'" In response to the press, prominent member Delbert Africa writes "MOVE means what it says: move, get active, change, revolution" (Pomer and Mancini, 1980). In another instance, when a reporter asked John Africa if he is returning to his "cult" on his way out of a court hearing, Africa replied, "It's not a cult. It's an organization" before refusing to answer any more questions (Woodruff, 1987). With their mission statement in mind, MOVE participated in protests and held demonstrations against institutions like zoos, pet stores, police stations, school board officials, and public figures such as Jesse Jackson and Jane Fonda who, in their words, would "mislead the public providing only the problem and never the answer" (Pomer and Mancini, 1980). At these public forums, MOVE employed non-violent protest and what they called "strategized profanity to expose the profane circumstances of the system's injustice" (MOVE, n.d., p.6).

By 1975, MOVE purchased a Victorian house at 309 N. 33rd Street in Powelton Village section of West Philadelphia, which became their first headquarters. At this location, MOVE claimed that "members had a preference for hard physical work and were constantly chopping

firewood, running dogs, shoveling snow or sweeping the street...helped homeless people find places to live, intervened in violence between local gangs and college fraternities, and helped incarcerated offenders meet parole requirements through a rehabilitation program,” (MOVE, n.d., p.6). In the summer of this year, “MOVE’s Powelton Village neighbors began to complained to the city of threats, the smell of garbage, and rats” to which city officials responded with a plan to coordinate a house and health inspection of the MOVE property; MOVE refused to let them in (Pomer and Mancini, 1980). Various footages of interviews with neighbors or public meetings with community members (of diverse ethnicities) showed a variety of responses and reactions towards MOVE. Some defended MOVE vouching that MOVE was congruent with its mission statement of non-violent protest and helping out community members, while others expressed that regardless if their protest was violent or not, their lifestyle and presence in the neighborhood was not only ineffective but even destructive (Pomer and Macini, 1980; Woodruff, 1987; Osder, 2013, Philly on Fire, 2016). Regardless of one’s perception of MOVE, the subsequent years of their Powelton Village residency and demonstrations lead to multiple encounters with the police that ended in hundreds of arrests of members and bail cumulating to millions of dollars (Assesfa and Wahrhaftig, p. 23). MOVE reacted by strengthening their religious beliefs and began boarding up their property, effectively making their Powelton Village house into a bunker.

Scholars who have written about MOVE punctuate their transition from being a neighborhood nuisance to a public enemy of the police with a conflict that occurred in March 1976. While the previous years featured repetitive encounters with law enforcement, perhaps the first egregious case of police brutality happened when police officers raided the MOVE property as they were having a party celebrating the release of another member from jail. Police claimed

that they were responding to a noise complaint from the neighbors. Phil Africa, who was the member that was recently released, argued that he was followed from jail by plainclothes officers and attacked once he got home. The confrontation resulted in several injured officers and MOVE members as well as charges of aggravated assault against three MOVE members: Jerry, Conrad, and Robert Africa. These were the most serious charges against MOVE up to that point. MOVE protested that Janine and Phil Africa's six-week old baby, Life Africa, was killed during the raid to which the police denied the charge claiming there was no baby involved. Because of MOVE's beliefs in home births and rejection of child registration, they were unable to present a birth certificate. MOVE invited City Councilman Lucien Blackwell to examine the corpse of the baby in their home. Blackwell later commented, "I found that the way they looked from the street was entirely differently from the way they lived. I found that the day I arrived. We went inside, everything was clean." MOVE's charge against the police was still dismissed for lack of concrete evidence, which reinforced MOVE's perception that "the system was totally unjust and was determined to exterminate it" (Assefa and Wahrhaftig, 22-24).

Two years after the 1976 incident, John Africa altered his nonviolence stance to one that focuses on self-defense, countering with violence if attacked. Prominent member and presently the lone survivor of the 1985 bombing, Ramona Africa clarified this position by saying that "nonviolence is not synonymous with masochism" (Assefa and Wahrhaftig, 24). As a result of their failings in court, MOVE started conducting mock trials in their home with each member assigned different roles to rebuttal against what they thought judges and prosecutors would charge. Additionally, because of their fear of the system further "proving misinformation" and twisting of the truth, MOVE built an eight-foot wall to keep various attempts at inspection out. Whether it was an inspection for sanitation concerns, building code, or welfare of the children,

MOVE asserted, “Any inspection violates the sanctity of our home, and [they] will consider any incursion as a declaration of war” (Caparella, 1978). MOVE believed that city did not care about the safety of MOVE, their children, or their neighbors, but rather these inspections were just a ploy to plant false evidence against MOVE because they were speaking truth against the Rizzo administration and “his Gestapo police” (Pomer and Mancini, 1980).

The Shoot-Out of 1978

As tensions between MOVE and the city escalated, MOVE brandished weapons and patrolled their property for the first time on May 20, 1977 proclaiming, “We will no longer be intimidated or beaten by the police without a like response.” This marks the first of two major confrontations between MOVE and the Philadelphia Police Department: the shoot-out of 1978 and the bombing of 1985. When neighbors saw the weapons and called the police, mayor Rizzo responded by sending in more than 200 police officers to MOVE’s headquarters. In a nine-hour stakeout, police officers with high-powered rifles took position in nearby apartments while MOVE members retreated into the interior of their home and headquarters. The stakeout ultimately ended when police officers declared eleven MOVE members were charged with weapons violation and vowed to arrest them when any of them stepped outside of the property.

This started the ten-month siege of Powelton Village as mayor Rizzo employed about 100 plainclothes officers to patrol the neighborhood around the clock. MOVE garnered the support of hundreds of community members who joined MOVE in protest against police brutality and brought them food and supplies through police lines. Some of these community members joined to form the Powelton United Neighbors (PUN) who advocated for a peaceful existence with MOVE. However, another group of neighbors formed the Powelton Village Emergency Human Rights Committee (PEHRC) who took the position that MOVE made the

neighborhood uninhabitable, ultimately filing a federal civil rights suit against MOVE with the help of the city (Assesfa and Wahrafatig, p.40). As millions of the city's tax dollars were spent just to maintain the police occupation, Mayor Rizzo finally fulfilled his threat on March 16, 1978 when a blockade involving about 1000 police officers was formed and the city cut off the property's electricity, gas, and water. In the same week, Rizzo announced that he would not be running for a third term and urged Whites to "join hands" against Blacks in pursuit of "better jobs, decent housing, and a better a better life" (Pomer and Mancini, 1980). On May 9, 1978, MOVE surrendered its weapons and allowed the city to search their home. This resulting in a formal eviction notice giving MOVE ninety days to move.

On August 8, 1978, MOVE had not evacuated and announced over their public address system that they refused to be evicted. MOVE, its supporters, the media, and police then waited and prepared themselves for the imminent confrontation as the court issued arrest warrants for twenty-one MOVE members for violating the original notice. By 4 a.m., six-hundred police equipped with flak jackets, helmets, tear gas, automatic weapons, and thousands of rounds of ammunition positioned their bulldozers, cranes, and water cannons. At 6 a.m., police commissioner Joseph O'Neill, who was personally directing the police demonstration through his bullhorn, ordered MOVE to surrender immediately. When MOVE ignored O'Neal's last orders, police bulldozers began their slow demolition of MOVE's exterior wooden defenses. Then wrecking balls began to take apart the house while a water cannon attempted to flood hiding MOVE members out of the basement. At 8:15 a.m., the first few shots rang out. To this day, it is still disputed on who opened fire first. Regardless, the police responded with more gunfire and a charge into the rubble. When the shootout out settled and MOVE members were

detained, Officer James Ramp was the only person found dead while four other officers, six firefighters, two MOVE members, and three MOVE sympathizers were injured.

MOVE's Powelton Village headquarter was destroyed and the eleven MOVE members (excluding the children) who were in the home were all charged for the murder of Officer Ramp. When two of them renounced MOVE, their charges were dropped. The remaining nine (i.e., Debbie, Janet, Janine, Merle, Chuck, Michael, Delbert, and Eddie Africa) were all convicted for third degree murder and sentenced 30-to-100 years in prison each. Merle died at the age of 47 in 1998 and Phil died at the age of 59 in 2015, both while still in prison. To this day, seven members remain incarcerated with each of them still denying all charges, protesting that Ramp's death was caused by friendly fire. Their main reason for this assertion cites an autopsy report disclosing that Ramp died from a bullet that entered his neck and exited his chest and a court transcript in which reporter Paul Bennet from the *Philadelphia Tribune* testified that the shots came from across the street while all MOVE members were in the basement (Philadelphia Daily News, 1978). Furthermore, no ballistic evidence was presented at the trial and subsequent sentencing because the city of Philadelphia bulldozed the scene of the crime immediately after the confrontation. When radio journalist Mumia Abu-Jamal (1979) asked presiding Judge Malmed "Who shot Officer James Ramp?" two days after the sentencing, Malmed responded "I haven't the faintest idea. They were tried as a family so I sentenced them as a family." The 30-to-100 years sentences for each of "the MOVE nine" remains to this day the "longest sentence in Pennsylvania history for third-degree murder and three times the average sentence for such a charge" (Abu-Jamal, 2016).

The Bombing of 1985

After the 1978 shootout, MOVE “dropped out of public view, but the Philadelphia political scene had been profoundly changed,” (Assefsa and Wahrhaftig, p.100-105). Some MOVE members fled to Rochester, New York while others disappeared altogether. While MOVE’s lack of activity in Philadelphia for the first few years after the shoot-out could have signaled a Rizzo victory, public outcry over his tactics ensured that he would never win another election in Philadelphia (Quinn, 1985; Weiss, 1985). Rizzo was succeeded by moderate Democrat Bill Green, who employed Wilson Goode as his city manager. Green’s first order of business was implementing “long-neglected police procedures that were designed to reduce the chance of citizen deaths and harassment by the police [like] defining the situations in which weapons could be used” which resulted in a decrease in citizen complaints.

In 1981, a few MOVE members were extradited from the states they fled to and were brought back to Philadelphia on outstanding warrants for the 1977 weapons violations. These MOVE members, along with the children of the imprisoned MOVE nine and new members, moved in 6221 Osage Avenue, a row house in the Cobbs Creek neighborhood belonging to John Africa’s sister Louise James. One notable difference between Cobbs Creek and Powelton Village was that it was mostly middle-class whereas their former headquarters was mostly among the lower class; both neighborhoods were predominantly occupied by African-Americans. Some people believed that this location was strategic. They assumed that MOVE planned a second confrontation and city would have to listen to its “more valued” citizens. Members like Jerry Africa claimed there was no motive behind MOVE’s relocation besides that “they had no other place to live and that John Africa’s sister made her house available to them” (Assefsa and Wahrhaftig, p.103).

Initially, there was little conflict between MOVE and their new neighbors. Some neighbors even bought coats for MOVE's children, fed them, and let their children play together while other "did not even realize that MOVE members were living there." That is until MOVE began to repeat some of the same behaviors regarding animal control and sanitation as they did at Powelton Village. While they were first reportedly cooperative when neighbors asked them directly to move trash or detain animals, "as time went on, conditions just grew continuously worse" (Washington, 1986).

Neighbors filed a variety of complaints and petitions with several city departments and met with politicians and police officials. Reluctantly, most of the petitions resulted in nothing more than plainclothes police presence and others reached odd conclusions. For instance, director of the Commission on Human Relations (CHR) met with MOVE to tell them their fencing up an alley to make a dog run violated their neighbors' access to their parking garages. MOVE first responded by explaining that the parking garages still had access on both ends of the street, that no one uses the alleyway, and that a police officer who lived up the alley built a cinderblock wall to the same effect but he was not confronted about it. MOVE then later added a bell to their fence, and anyone who needed access through the alley just had to ring the bell for MOVE to open the gate (Assefsa and Wahrhaftig, p.104).

Through neighborhood complaints and some of their own initiatives, MOVE met with more and more city officials. Some meetings were attempts to alleviate specific conflicts about their presence in the neighborhood while others were MOVE's attempts to revisit the 1978 case and/or to free the nine incarnated members. The revisiting the case was marked by Jerry Africa who said he "met with Managing Director Wilson Goode and documented [MOVE's] legal problems for him." Goode then arranged a meeting with District Attorney Ed Rendall to answer

MOVE's legal concerns (Assefsa and Wahrhaftig, p. 105). When that session with Rendall never happened, Jerry tried to reach out to Black city council members, judges, and the district attorney who were mostly discouraging against MOVE's demand to release their imprisoned family members. Officials called the task "impossible" and were confused if not frustrated about how MOVE could just blatantly ask for a release after final court decision. Imprisoned Phil Africa clarified that "all we were trying to do was to get people to put pressure on the city of Philadelphia not to release us, but to honestly investigate the facts. An honest investigation would lead to no other outcome but our release" (Assefsa and Wahrhaftig, p.107).

In response to reluctant conversations with city officials and director Farmer, who has at least maintained an open door policy regarding their legal inquiries, rejecting their plans to picket City Hall because their lack of sympathizers would be embarrassing and ineffective, MOVE once again took matters to their headquarters. On Christmas Eve, December 24th, 1983, MOVE boarded up their Osage Avenue home, and from the top floor with a bullhorn they began to blare obscenities all through the neighborhood beginning with "MOTHERFUCK SANTY CLAUS [sic]" and continuing phrases like "FUCK THIS CROOKED-ASS SYSTEM AND ITS POLICE" (Quinn, 1985; Assefsa and Wahrhaftig, p. 108). Obviously disturbing the peace of the neighborhood, MOVE members told its neighbors "all the complaints that you got, why don't you take them to the city? Tell them the reason MOVE is it is because [we] want [our] people home." They felt that city officials like Wilson Good and the district attorney would not listen to them directly. The haranguing and obscenities continued nearly every day at all times of the day for nearly a year.

Former City Manager Wilson Goode then succeeded Green and took office in January of 1984 as Philadelphia's first African American mayor. As neighbors approached mayor Goode,

the only response he gave at the time was that he had no legal basis for evicting MOVE. Violations regarding sanitation and disturbing of the peace were only summary offenses for which authorities could only order a court summons. In attempts to not make the same political mistakes as former mayor Rizzo, Goode assured the neighbors he was “searching for a permanent legal solution.” One May 30th, 1984, the mayor, managing director, police commissioner, city solicitor, and district attorney met with a U.S. attorney and some officials from the FBI and the Secret Service – only to conclude that there were no grounds for federal action against MOVE. In July, when the district attorney advised mayor Goode that there might be a legal way to remove some but not all MOVE members from the house, Goode decided to not take immediate action and waited to see what would occur on the sixth anniversary of the Powelton shoot-out. Nothing out of the usual haranguing happened on August 8, 1984 but by the end of that year, MOVE had fully fortified their house with tree trunks, steel sheeting, and lumber.

In the spring of 1985, events began accelerating as neighbors held press conferences complaining that city officials had consistently ignored their concerns and threatened to take matters in their own hands if the governor or attorney general could not help either. On May 7, 1985, the mayor met with the City’s managing director, police commissioner, and district attorney again to finally authorize the police commissioner to prepare and execute a tactical plan to evict MOVE and arrest members on firearms charges. The police commissioner then delegated the planning to three officers: the head of the Bomb Disposal Unit, a sergeant from the pistol range, a uniformed patrol officer. They formulated a plan within five days and mayor Goode authorized it to be executed the next day: May 13, 1985. Goode later testified that he “ordered all the children in the MOVE house to be taken out before any action to be taken and

that none of the police officers involved in the 1978 Powelton shoot-out should be participate in this eviction plan,” (Assefsa and Wahrhaftig, p.112).

The day before the eviction, police officers evacuated all Osage Avenue neighbors but they did not prevent the MOVE children from returning to their home when they came back from their daily exercise. The following chronicles May 13, 1985 according to the Philadelphia Special Investigation Commission’s report issued March 6, 1986.

At 3 a.m., police placed a bomb disposal and stakeout unit in a parking lot nearby while the fire department positioned high-pressure water hoses. Among the assault force were several officers who took part in the 1978 shoot-out contrary to mayor Goode’s alleged orders. At 5:35 a.m., the police commissioner announced over a bullhorn that four people inside MOVE’s house were named in arrest warrants and they had fifteen minutes to surrender. MOVE responded on their own bullhorn and loudspeaker system that they would not surrender. At 5:50 a.m., police fired tear gas and smoke bombs as they flanked the left and right homes of MOVE’s headquarters. MOVE and the Philadelphia Police Department began to open fire on each other. Within the next 90 minutes, more than 10,000 rounds of ammunition were fired and then backed up with machine guns, antitank weapons, and smaller explosives that blew holes in the home’s walls to insert more tear gas. By 10:40 a.m. the entire front of the house was blown out but MOVE’s fortification still prevented police from dislodging those still inside. By 3:35 p.m., Mayor Goode in a televised press conference stated that he intended to seize control of the property by any means necessary as police debated using other kinds of explosives. At 4:30 p.m., the police commissioner along with the managing director instructed the head of the Bomb Disposal Unit to assemble an explosive package to dislodge the rooftop bunker and Mayor Goode approved of the plan fifteen minutes later.

At 5:37 p.m, the bomb was dropped from a helicopter. While it initially failed to dislodge the bunker, the bomb did ignite a gasoline tank that started a fire. The police and fire commissioners, with approval of the mayor and managing director, let the fire burn with flames first engulfing the bunker, then the entire house, and finally spreading through the neighborhood. While the fire department turned on its hoses an hour after the dropping of the bomb, they were not put to active use until three hours after turning them on. The flames were not contained until midnight. The fire ultimately destroyed 61 homes, damaged 110 others, left about 250 Osage Avenue residents homeless, and killed six MOVE members and five MOVE children. Only two people survived the fire: Ramona Africa and child Birdie Africa.

Within a few months, the city began reconstruction of the row homes in Osage Avenue and Mayor Goode established a special 11-person commission to investigate the crisis and present recommendations for moving forward. The following are a few of their findings:

- The arrest warrants for four of the members did not justify the apprehension or use of deadly force for the rest of the occupants in the MOVE home.
- Once the house was on fire, some members and children tried to escape but were prevented by police gunfire.
- “The Mayor’s failure to call a halt to the operation on May 12th when he knew that children were in the house was grossly negligent.”
- “The plan to bomb the MOVE home was reckless, ill-conceived, and hastily approved.”
- “The hasty, reckless and irresponsible decision made by the Police Commissioner and the Fire Commissioner to use fire as a tactical weapon was unconscionable.”

The conclusion of the report states:

The Commission believes that the decision of various city officials to permit construction of the bunker, to allow the use of high explosives and, in a 90-minute period, the firing of at least 10,000 rounds of ammunition at the house, to sanction the dropping of a bomb on an occupied row home, and to let it burn in a row house occupied by children would not likely have been had the MOVE house and its occupants been situated in a comparable white neighborhood (Commission, 1986, p.31).

The Commission ultimately recommended that “the decisions and actions of all concerned city officials be fully investigated by the District Attorney and the United States Department of Justice. Former Pennsylvania Supreme Court Justice Bruce Kaufmann, who was a member of the Commission, disagreed with some findings of the majority and wrote a dissenting piece in a separate report (Assesfa and Wahrhaftig, p. 127).

30 Years Later

To this day, no city officials have been charged for the bombing of 1985. However, in 1996, a federal jury ordered the city to pay a \$1.5 million civil suit to survivor Ramona Africa and relatives of two people killed in the bombing. While each incarcerated member has been eligible for parole since 2008, their parole boards have routinely refused to grant their freedom predominantly citing three reasons for their ruling: (1) “denial of the nature and circumstances of the offense,” (2) “refusal to accept responsibility,” and (3) “lack of remorse,” (Piette, 2015). As of October 2016, the Africa family has served a collective 323 in prison for the death of one officer. While MOVE has not officially relocated or centralized anywhere known to the public, surviving member Ramona and those in support of MOVE still seek justice for the seven members still in prison for the 1978 shoot-out. They maintain an online presence at

onamove.com, recently held a 30-year anniversary march in May 2015, and plan to hold an informational conference in May 2017.

As for Osage Avenue, while the neighborhood was immediately rebuilt and to this day is mostly inhabited, the site of the bombing is still contentious. In a recent interview with NPR, block captain and lifelong Osage resident Gerald Renfrow explains, “Today, as you can see, we have at least 37 boarded-up homes and all of them are owned by the city” (Denmby, 2015). He continues that the city’s lack of responsibility for these homes are to blame for the neighborhood’s degradation concerning drug dealings and gun violence, a sentiment many of his neighbors share. In response, Everett Gillison, chief of staff for current Mayor Nutter explains that the city cannot rehab or sell the properties because some of the residents will not accept a \$190,000 settlement offered by the city in 2008. Of 24 families offered the settlement, Renfrow and five other families refused to give up their homes because of certain stipulations that “would force [them] to give up certain rights to be compensated that had not been addressed in court” (Bailey, 2015). This meant they believed what is owed to them as a result of the fire and its subsequent shoddy reconstruction was far beyond \$190,000 and to accept that buyout was to give up any leverage they had for actually restoring their neighborhood. Gillison is doubtful this issue will be resolved with the homeowners in the remainder of Nutter’s term, stating that one option for the next administration would be to “destroy all the properties and put out a bid for redevelopment” (Bailey, 2015). 6221 Osage Avenue remains as one of the boarded properties with no sign of an official or unofficial memorial or acknowledgement of what happened on May 13, 1985 in sight.

References

- Abu-Jamal, M. (2016, August 3). August 8th, 1978. Retrieved October 31, 2016, from <http://www.prisonradio.org/media/audio/mumia/august-8th-1978-243-mumia-abu-jamal>
- About the National Trust. (n.d.). Retrieved October 08, 2016, from https://savingplaces.org/we-are-saving-places#.V_l6guArJhE
- Al-Ali, M. N. (2006). Religious affiliations and masculine power in Jordanian wedding invitation genre. *Discourse & Society*, 17(6), 691-714.
- Assefa, H., & Wahrhaftig, P. (1988). *Extremist groups and conflict resolution: The MOVE crisis in Philadelphia*. New York: Praeger.
- Bailey, S. (2015, May 09). Nightmare still on Osage Avenue. Retrieved October 31, 2016, from http://www.phillytrib.com/news/nightmare-still-on-osage-avenue/article_5425636d-9533-5131-b26d-758f5b484155.html
- Birmingham, E. (1999). Reframing the ruins: Pruitt-Igoe, structural racism, and African American rhetoric as a space for C. *Western journal of communication*, 63(3), 291.
- Biesecker, B. A. (2002). Remembering World War II: The rhetoric and politics of national commemoration at the turn of the 21st century. *Quarterly Journal Of Speech*, 88(4), 393-409.
- Bitzer, L. F. (1992). The rhetorical situation. *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, 251-14.
- Blay, Z. (2016, July 13). One Year After Sandra Bland's Death, #SayHerName Is As ... Retrieved November 1, 2016, from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/one-year-after-sandra-blands-death-sayhername-is-as-important-as-ever_us_57852dcde4b0ed211d7bccf

- Bradner, E. (2016, September 21). Clinton, Trump navigate politics of police violence. Retrieved November 01, 2016, from <http://www.cnn.com/2016/09/21/politics/police-shootings-politics-trump-clinton/index.html>
- Bragg, K. (2016, July 8). Some celebs are still backing #AllLivesMatter but the internet feels a way about that. Retrieved November 01, 2016, from <http://www.nbcnews.com/news/nbcblk/celebrities-back-all-lives-matter-internet-reacts-n606031>
- Craven, J. (2016, June 23). Texas Police Officer Who Manhandled Black Teens At Pool ... Retrieved November 1, 2016, from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/texas-teen-pool-party-police-charges_us_576c3e97e4b0dbb1bbb9ef1a
- Day, E. (2015, July 19). #BlackLivesMatter: The birth of a new civil rights movement. Retrieved October 09, 2016, from <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/jul/19/blacklivesmatter-birth-civil-rights-movement>
- Data USA. (n.d.). Historic preservation & conservation: Employment demographics. Retrieved March 12, 2017, from <https://datausa.io/profile/cip/3012/#demographics>
- Demby, G. (2015, May 13). What it's like living on the block that Philadelphia bombed 30 years ago. Retrieved October 31, 2016, from <http://www.npr.org/sections/codeswitch/2015/05/13/406175991/what-its-like-to-live-on-the-block-that-philadelphia-bombed-30-years-ago>
- Dickinson, G., Blair, C., & Ott, B. L. (2010). *Places of public memory: The rhetoric of museums and memorials*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.

- Donofrio, T. A. (2010). Ground zero and place-making authority: The conservative metaphors in 9/11 families' "take back the memorial" rhetoric. *Western Journal of Communication*, 74(2), 150-169. doi:10.1080/10570311003614492
- Dunlap, D. (2004, February 07). In depths of ground zero, historic notice can't wait. Retrieved March 02, 2017, from http://www.nytimes.com/2004/02/08/nyregion/in-depths-of-ground-zero-historic-notice-can-t-wait.html?_r=0
- Finley, D. E. (1965). *History of the National Trust for Historic Preservation*. Washington: National Trust for Historic Preservation.
- GuideStar. (2017). National Trust for Historic Preservation in the US. Retrieved March 12, 2017, from <https://www.guidestar.org/profile/53-0210807>
- McGeough, R. E., Palczewski, C. H., & Lake, R. A. (2015). Oppositional memory practices: U.S. memorial spaces as arguments over public memory. *Argumentation & Advocacy*, 51(4), 231-254.
- Korte, G. (2016, June 26). Obama's national monuments are about more than conservation. Retrieved October 31, 2016, from <http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/2016/06/26/obamas-national-monuments-more-than-conservation/82931356/>
- Kostelni, N. (2016, November). Phila. Redevelopment Authority seeks sale of MOVE properties. Retrieved March 12, 2017, from <http://www.bizjournals.com/philadelphia/news/2016/11/15/move-osage-pine-62-redevelopment-authority-housing.html>
- Hattenhauer, D. (1984). The rhetoric of architecture: a semiotic approach. *Communication Quarterly*, 32(1), 71-77.

- Haney, L. (2010). Working through mass incarceration: Gender and the politics of prison labor from east to west. *Signs*, 36(1), 73-97. doi:10.1086/652917
- Historic Sites. (n.d.). Retrieved October 31, 2016, from <https://savingplaces.org/collections/historic-sites-collection#.WBgFodUrLRY>
- Huyssen, A. (2003). *Present pasts: Urban palimpsests and the politics of memory*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Luibrand, S. (2015, August 7). BlackLivesMatter: How the events in Ferguson sparked a movement in America. Retrieved October 09, 2016, from <http://www.cbsnews.com/news/how-the-black-lives-matter-movement-changed-america-one-year-later/>
- Marback, R. (2004). The rhetorical space of Robben Island. *RSQ: Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, 34(2), 7-27
- Marback, R. (2004). A tale of two plaques: Rhetoric in Cape Town. *Rhetoric Review*, 23(3), 253-268.
- Meeks, S. (2016). *Past and future city: How historic preservation is reviving America's communities*. S.l.: Island Press.
- MOVE (n.d.). *20 Years on the move* [Pamphlet]. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: (n.p.)
- Mulloy, E. (1976). *The history of the National Trust for Historic Preservation: 1963-1973*. Washington: National Trust for Historic Preservation.
- National Trust for Historic Preservation. (2016). *2015 financial summary*. Retrieved October 01, 2016, from https://nthp-savingplaces.s3.amazonaws.com/2016/04/22/13/42/59/205/NTHP_FY2015_Audit%20Summary.pdf

- National Park Service. (n.d.). History (U.S. National Park Service). Retrieved October 31, 2016, from <https://www.nps.gov/aboutus/history.htm>
- NPS fundamentals: Relevancy, diversity, inclusion. (2011). Retrieved October 01, 2016, from https://www.nps.gov/training/essentials/html/relev_div_inc_topic.html
- Osder, J. (Director). (2013). *Let the fire burn* [Video file]. United States: Zeitgeist Films. Retrieved October, 2016.
- Poirot, K. (2015). Gendered geographies of memory: Place, violence, and exigency at the Birmingham civil rights institute. *Rhetoric & Public Affairs*, 18(4), 621-647.
- Poirot, K., & Watson, S. E. (2015). Memories of freedom and white resilience: Place, tourism, and urban slavery. *RSQ: Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, 45(2), 91-116.
doi:10.1080/02773945.2014.991879
- Pomer, K., & Mancini, J. (Directors). (1980). *MOVE: Confrontation in Philadelphia* [Video file]. United States: Temple University. Retrieved October, 2016, from <https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCb8aGNw2RmOITgm4EjXhWFQ>
- Philly on fire: The MOVE bombing [Audio blog post]. (2016, July 4). Retrieved October, 2016, from <http://roxlabs.net/2016/07/04/146-philly-on-fire-the-move-bombing/>
- Preserving the World Trade Center site. (n.d.). Retrieved March 02, 2017, from http://www.nylandmarks.org/programs_services/technical_assistance/projects/preserving_the_world_trade_center_site/
- Raffensperger, L. (2008, May 23). The highs and lows of the Antiquities Act. Retrieved October 31, 2016, from <http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=90631198>

- Redfern, M. (2001, May 22). America's first preservationist. Retrieved October 31, 2016, from <http://www.historicnewengland.org/publications/historic-new-england-magazine/spring-2001/NEWWSpringPage02.htm>
- Rhodam, M. (2016, July 14). President Obama Defends Stance on Police, Black Lives Matter. Retrieved November 01, 2016, from <http://time.com/4407362/president-obama-police-black-lives-matter-town-hall/>
- Saindon, B. A. (2012). A doubled heterotopia: Shifting spatial and visual symbolism in the Jewish museum Berlin's development. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 98(1), 24-48.
doi:10.1080/00335630.2011.638657
- Schmitt, C. R. (2015). Contours of the land: Place-as-Rhetoric and Native American effigy mounds. *Western Journal of Communication*, 79(3), 307-326.
do:10.1080/10570314.2015.1041651
- Sisson, P. (2016, September 28). The future of historic preservation is about much more than old buildings. Retrieved October 01, 2016, from <http://www.curbed.com/2016/9/28/13098896/historic-preservation-national-trust-stephanie-meeks>
- Sprinkle, J. (2007). "Of exceptional importance": The origins of the "fifty-year rule" in historic preservation. *The Public Historian*, 29(2), 81-103. doi:10.1525/tph.2007.29.2.81
- Triece, M. E. (2016). *Urban renewal and resistance: Race, space, and the city in the late twentieth to the early twenty-first century*. Lanham: Lexington books.
- Turner, K. B., Giacomassi, D., & Vandiver, M. (2006). Ignoring the past: Coverage of slavery and slave patrols in criminal justice texts. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 17: (1), 181-195.

- U.S. Census Bureau. (2015, July 1). *State & county quickfacts: Allegany County, N.Y.* Retrieved October 01, 2016, from <http://quickfacts.census.gov>.
- Underhill, S. M. (2016). Urban jungle, Ferguson: Rhetorical homology and institutional critique. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 102*(4), 396-417.
doi:10.1080/00335630.2016.1213413
- Warnes, K. (2014, October 2). NPS Press Release. Retrieved October 08, 2016, from <https://www.nps.gov/aboutus/news/release.htm?id=1645>
- Washington, P. M. (1986). My experience with MOVE, Philadelphia, 1975-1986, presented at Third National Conference on Peacemaking and Conflict Resolution, Denver.
- Wertsch, J. V. (2009). Collective remembering. *Semiotica, 2009*(173), 233-247.
doi:10.1515/SEMI.2009.00
- The Wilderness Society: Antiquities Act. (n.d.). Retrieved October 31, 2016, from <http://wilderness.org/article/antiquities-act>
- Wilson, J. (2015, December 31). OPINION: How BlackLivesMatter saved higher education. Retrieved November 01, 2016, from <http://america.aljazeera.com/opinions/2015/12/how-black-lives-matter-saved-higher-education.html>
- Woodruff, J. (Adapter). (1987). *The bombing of West Philly* [Video file]. Frontline/PBS.
Retrieved October, 2016, from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8eHpRjxk7N4>
- Wright, E. A. (2005). Rhetorical spaces in memorial places: The cemetery as a rhetorical memory place/space. *RSQ: Rhetoric Society Quarterly, 35*(4), 51-81.
- Vatz, R. E. (1973). The myth of the rhetorical situation. *Philosophy & Rhetoric, 6*(3), 154-161.

Zachar, S. (2009). Driving a call to action for Pennsylvania's bridges. Retrieved March 04, 2017, from <http://www.phmc.state.pa.us/portal/communities/pa-heritage/driving-call-action-pennsylvania-bridges.html>