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Held in Trust:
Charles Eliot's Vision for the New England Landscape
by Keith N. Morgan

The contributions of Charles Eliot (1859-1897) to the American professions of landscape architecture and regional planning were applauded by his contemporaries and have been passingly acknowledged by the current generation of environmental historians.1 His reputation rests on two key accomplishments. First, Charles Eliot (Fig. 1) played the seminal role in the establishment of Massachusetts' Trustees of Public Reservations in 1891 which became a model for subsequent conservation and historic preservation organizations here and abroad.2 Second, Eliot led the conceptualization and implementation of the Boston Metropolitan Park System from 1892 on, one of the most significant early developments in the history of regional planning in the United States.3 Even Eliot's mentor, Frederick Law Olmsted, Sr., writing to his two sons and Eliot in 1893 stated:

...nothing else compares in importance to us with the Boston work, meaning the Metropolitan quite equally with the city work. The two together will be the most important work of our profession now in hand anywhere in the world...In your probable life-time, Muddy River, Blue Hills, the Fells, Waverley Oaks, Charles River, the Beaches will be points to date from in the history of American Landscape Architecture, as much as Central Park. They will be the opening of new chapters in the art.4

Of the list of landmark projects for the new generation, only Muddy River was not a commission that Eliot instigated and controlled.

To appreciate fully the significance, context, and novelty of Eliot's accomplishments, we must compare and contrast the ideals and achievements of Eliot with those of F. L. Olmsted, Sr. We need to explore Eliot's personal experience and education and the Boston/Cambridge social, political, economic and cultural environment from which he emerged and in which he functioned so successfully.

The differences between Olmsted and Eliot can be seen in both the language that they used to describe their work and the goals that they held for public landscapes. Olmsted talked about green country parks, parkways and pastoral retreats in which the modern city dweller could restore his spirit through the passive contemplation of nature.5 Eliot discussed reservations, trusteeships and rural landscape preservation that would provide the appropriate setting for active communing with nature. In his major urban parks, Olmsted sought to create a visual and physical ideal through the radical and artificial reshaping of the character of the site (Figs. 2 & 3); he held an abstract, intellectual concept of what each park should look like.6 Eliot, however, worked by a process of elimination and by management of resources chosen for their inherent landscape quality (Figs. 4 & 5). The Olmsted park is a landscape of creation and development; the Eliot landscape is one of choice and improvement. Such broad characterizations of the work of these two men must

Fig. 1. Photograph of Charles Eliot, ca. 1895.
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be modified in reference to certain activities—for example, Olmsted's pivotal role in landscape preservation at Yosemite and Niagara Falls, or Eliot's naturalized reclamation of the industrialized banks of the Charles River. Nevertheless, the distinctions remain valid and instructive.

The process of investigating Eliot's background begins with the environment from which he emerged. Born in Cambridge, Massachusetts on November 1, 1859, Eliot was the first of two sons born to Charles W. Eliot, then an assistant professor of mathematics and chemistry at Harvard College, and to Ellen Derby Peabody Eliot. On both sides of the family Eliot's ancestors had included political, social and financial leaders of the Commonwealth since the seventeenth century. Eliot was born with the benefit of privilege and the burden of responsibility clearly imprinted on his life. The most important early events of his childhood, both of which occurred in 1869, were the death of his mother, which contributed to the shyness and self-doubt that he worked hard to overcome throughout his life, and the election of his father as the president of Harvard University. His father's four decade presidency represents the acknowledged emergence of modern higher education at Harvard and for the nation at large. President Eliot organized his faculty into a series of departments, schools and colleges and instituted a liberal curriculum in which the student assumed the major responsibility for the direction of his studies through elective courses. Young Charles entered Harvard in 1876 as many of these changes were being implemented. The same dynamism and breadth of vision that President Eliot showed in his analysis and transformation of Harvard College would be seen later in his son's study and organization of landscape and recreational needs for the entire Boston metropolitan region. While the intellectual community of Harvard College and Cambridge during Charles' undergraduate years was certainly influential, it was the student's activities beyond the university that were more revealing of his future interests. Most significant during these years were the summers the Eliot family spent in Maine at their house near Bar Harbor, sailing along the jagged coast line, and investigating the natural environment of the region. During the summers of his final two years at Harvard, Charles Eliot organized and lead a small band of classmates for camping and scientific exploration on Mt. Desert in Maine. Named the Champlain Society, this group of friends, and especially Charles, enjoyed the vigorous life in the woods or on the family boat, just as the tramps through the Connecticut countryside had been so formative in young Olmsted's adolescence in the second quarter of the nineteenth century. One need only remember that Charles and Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., who shared an enthusiasm for rugged outdoor life, were contemporaries and spent two years at Harvard together. President Eliot reinforced the belief in physical activity and knowledge of the wilderness, emphasizing this experience as a way of counteracting his older son's melancholic withdrawal.

The education of Charles Eliot, however, really began after Harvard. The summers in Maine and his frequent hiking excursions out from Boston in all directions convinced Charles to enter the field of landscape architecture. Since no academic curriculum in landscape design would be established in the United States until after his death, Charles invented his own course of graduate studies. He took advantage of the various offerings at Harvard, especially the Bussey Institute, where he pursued botany and horticulture for most of one year. Through the family network that would remain an essential professional asset, Charles was introduced to Frederick Law Olmsted, Sr., by his uncle, the architect Robert Swain Peabody. In April, 1883, Eliot entered the Olmsted office as an apprentice. His mentor had recently established a home and studio at 99 Warren Street in Brookline, Massachusetts. There Charles spent two useful years. He benefitted from direct observation of Olmsted's ideas and working method, and rapidly became involved with major office projects, including the Arnold Arboretum, Franklin Park and Marine Park, all key elements in the
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Boston municipal park system.\textsuperscript{10} The office included John Charles Olmsted, already a partner and office manager, and eventually Henry Sargent Codman, an Eliot contemporary who benefitted from a comparable network of family connections, the most important being his uncle, Charles Sprague Sargent, Director of the Arnold Arboretum.\textsuperscript{11}

The son of the leading educational theorist of the period, Charles Eliot with his father's help, then developed a plan for his self-education as a landscape architect. After two years with Olmsted, Eliot returned to the Bussey Institute to complete his brief course of study and then embarked upon a year-and-a-half tour of the Eastern Seaboard of the United States and of Europe, which lasted from the fall of 1885 to the end of 1886.

During the year in Europe, he read the available landscape literature in English, French and German, met many of the leading landscape designers of the period, and visited private gardens, public parks and natural areas from England to Italy to Russia. He achieved a first-hand knowledge of working practices, plant materials, and design philosophy that was unequalled by any American at that time. While abroad, he wrote to his family and to Olmsted describing the people he met and places he visited, which led Olmsted to realize Eliot's exceptional gifts as a landscape critic. Olmsted wrote enthusiastically to his former apprentice: "You ought to make it part of your scheme to write for the public, a little at a time, if you please, but methodically, systematically. It is a part of your professional duty to do so."\textsuperscript{12} Olmsted also attempted to lure Eliot back from Europe to rejoin the office and assist in the designs for Stanford University. With gratitude but determination, Eliot chose to complete his personal curriculum of European study and to open his own office after his return.\textsuperscript{13} While abroad, Eliot was most taken with the English work, quite logically for a student of Olmsted, but he also admired what he saw in Germany, especially the large landscape park of Prince Hermann Ludwig von Pückler at Muskau. Eliot was impressed by Pückler's desire to improve all elements of the environment, from the pleasure grounds surrounding the schloss to the agricultural districts, and even to the industrial zones of the estate. Prince Pückler's writings and the estate at Muskau, which Eliot visited, are clearly the intellectual model for the comprehensive schemes Eliot envisioned for the Boston Basin and New England at large.\textsuperscript{14}

Upon his return in late 1886, Eliot set himself up in offices in the Amory Ticknor house at 9 Park Street, which had been the residence of his mother's ancestors. During the next two years, he undertook a series of projects that demonstrate, on a limited scale, the problems he would address in Boston. Representative of these early commissions are his plans for White Park, a gift to the Town of Concord, New Hampshire, and the Longfellow Park and Memorial Garden in Cambridge, Massachusetts. Both designs project the Eliot landscape philosophy and the importance of the cultural and historical environment to which they relate. In an article that he wrote for Garden and Forest in 1890, he described the White Park (Fig. 6) and its importance:

Every city of the new West may have its carpet bed "park" if it so wishes, but Concord proposes to seize her opportunity to provide for her citizens and their posterity something very much more valuable. She will set aside and preserve, for the enjoyment of all orderly townspeople, a typical, strikingly beautiful and very easily accessible bit of New England landscape. Would that every American city and town might thus save for its citizens some characteristic portion of its neighboring country. We should then possess public spaces which would exhibit something more refreshing than a monotony of clipped grass and scattered flower beds.\textsuperscript{15}

Eliot's opposition to the popular practice of carpet-bedding with annuals in urban parks is insignificant here in comparison with his concern for the preser-
vation of a "strikingly beautiful...bit of New England landscape."

Smaller in scale but richer in associations was the scheme that Eliot devised in June 1887, as a park memorial (Fig. 7) to Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, stretching from the Longfellow house on Brattle Street in Cambridge to the Charles River. Through a series of distinct landscape units, Eliot maintained a visual and historical link between the John Vassall house, (the Georgian mansion where Longfellow had lived), the Charles River, and, ultimately, to the Longfellow marshes across the River—all part of the historical definition of the property. Across Brattle Street from the house, Eliot laid out a greensward like a narrow Common, which connected to a lower and more naturalized area on the level of the flood plain of the River, now the site of a monument sculpted by Daniel Chester French. Eliot, of course, would have known "Old Poems," as the Harvard undergraduates called Longfellow, and conceived a design redolent with the Colonial Revival spirit that Longfellow's poetry had helped to inspire. While his family's connections helped to launch Charles Eliot's career in a more rapid and successful manner than others might have enjoyed, those same personal associations endowed these designs with a distinct sense of the local landscape and New England culture.

During these early years, Eliot also began to explain his ideas and to admonish the excesses of his contemporaries in lucid articles for *Garden and Forest*, and other popular and professional periodicals. With titles like, "The Suburbs in March," or "Beautiful Villages," these essays sought to interpret goals and techniques of the landscape architect to a wide audience. Most interesting among these articles is a series of descriptions of major American country houses from the eighteenth through the mid-nineteenth century, three in the Boston area and three along the Hudson River, which must represent one of the earliest American efforts at writing landscape history. Representative of these essays is one on The Vale (Fig. 8), the Lyman Family estate in Waltham, Massachusetts. Eliot, who was also a descendant of the Lymans, carefully analyzes the evolution of the houses, its gardens and agricultural districts. It is in his introduction to the initial article in the series, however, that he states his true purpose in undertaking these essays:

The rising tide of population has swallowed up the handsome estab-
lishments of Tories and Patriots alike. Boston and her surrounding sister cities grow continually. Farm after farm, and garden after garden are invaded by streets, sewers and waterpipes, owners being fairly compelled to sell lands which are taxed more and more heavily. Before destruction overtakes the few old seats now remaining, it will be well to make some sort of record of their character and beauty.17

In all these articles there seem to be common threads of importance. Eliot is concerned with the documentation of the estates and, therefore, with the preservation of the cultural content of these sites. Although never fully stated, Eliot was probably also concerned about the regional cultural traditions that these houses represent. There is no indication in Eliot's own writings that these articles or designs like the Longfellow Memorial Garden were intended as reinforcement for the beleaguered Yankee establishment and as lessons for the Americanization of the burgeoning Boston immigrant population. He was, however, certainly concerned about improving the conditions for the urban poor through his designs for the Boston metropolitan park system, and his father, who became a zealous advocate for park building, clearly saw the Americanization process as one of the major benefits of these democratic spaces.18

The ideas that Eliot evolved during his period of study abroad and demonstrated in his early designs and writings were crystallized into the most mature and far-reaching proposal in an article for Garden and Forest in February, 1890, entitled, "The Waverley Oaks, A Plan for their Preservation for the People."19 Here Eliot was dealing with a site that possessed all the value and potential that he considered most important. The Waverley Oaks was a stand of aboriginal trees overlooking a series of ponds and the stream of the Beaver Brook on the border of Belmont and Waltham, Massachusetts. The stream had first been dammed in the late seventeenth century for saw-milling and continued to be used for various light industrial purposes into the nineteenth century.20 The ponds and falls had been celebrated in the poetry of James Russell Lowell. The site was the residence of the landscape architect Robert Morris Copeland, whose important 1859 treatise, Country Life, included the view of the stream and mill wheel from the title page.21 Winslow Homer, when he lived in Belmont during the 1860s, had painted the Oaks (Fig. 9). The Waverley Oaks, therefore, possessed that overlay of cultural association with a unique natural resource that Eliot emphasized in his vision for landscape preservation.

The Waverley Oaks, and Eliot's concern for their preservation, raise the important, although often denied, issue of the relationship of landscape
painting to landscape architecture. In the third quarter of the nineteenth century, Boston adopted a strong cultural alliance to contemporary Paris, seen especially in the monumental boulevard of Commonwealth Avenue and the mansard-roofed houses that lined it and adjacent streets in the new Back Bay district of the city. Within those houses, many of Boston’s leading citizens adorned their walls with the genre-landscape paintings of the Barbizon group of French artists and the Americans who were inspired by their work. Eliot, as a member of the city’s cultural aristocracy, was reared in this environment of Francophilia. The landscapes he sought to preserve, and indeed his image of the New England landscape, were conditioned by this Barbizon vision. The Boston artists flocked to the Waverley Oaks (Fig. 10) to find the same kind of primeval forest environment that the Barbizon painters depicted. The type of woodland Eliot sought to preserve contrasts with the kinds of landscapes that Olmsted sought to create. A gentle undulating variation of ground form and light and shadow, still water and rounded planting groups characterize the seventeenth century idealized landscapes of Nicolas Poussin or Claude Le Lorrain. These landscape paintings speak of much the same gentle pastoral recreation that Olmsted desired for his passive, restorative spaces. By contrast, Eliot sought to preserve the characteristic and the unique New England landscape—both the unspoiled environment and the landscape that showed man’s interaction with his surroundings. Like the canvases of William Morris Hunt, the leader of Boston painters’ and patrons’ fascination with the Barbizon image, Eliot’s landscapes expressed the primeval conditions of the New England countryside and the settings of everyday life.

What Eliot proposed in his essay on the Waverley Oaks was a comprehensive concept of preservation:

Within ten miles of the State House there still remain several bits of scenery which possess uncommon beauty and more than usual refreshing power. Moreover, each of these scenes is, in its way, characteristic of the primitive wilderness of New England, of which indeed, they are surviving fragments...[He then proceeds to suggest the establishment of a state commission to oversee metropolitan landscape planning, but suggests that] This end might better be attained by an incorporated association, composed of citizens of all the Boston towns, and empowered by the state to hold small and well-distributed parcels of land free from taxes, just as the Public Library holds books and the Art Museum pictures. As has been fully documented by several scholars, Eliot moved rapidly from this concept to enlisting the assistance of key supporters like Frederick Law Olmsted and Charles Sprague Sargent, to utilizing the base of the Appalachian Mountain Club to launch a state-wide meeting of leading citizens, to the writing and passage of an act by the state legislature establishing the Trustees of Public Reservations. Now known simply as the Trustees of Reservations, this private-sector, not-for-profit organization continues to acquire and maintain lands significant for their natural beauty, unique resources and cultural associations throughout the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

With comparable speed, Eliot turned from the private-sector base of the Trustees to a campaign in 1893 for the creation of the Boston Metropolitan Park Commission by state legislation. In both of these efforts, Eliot displayed his exceptional ability to identify broad problems and develop appropriate, sophisticated and novel solutions, and to mount impressive public education and lobbying campaigns that ensured success. When one contrasts Eliot’s efficiency and prowess in these schemes with the decades of agonizing frustration that Olmsted endured in his dealings with public officials, one sees again important distinctions between these two men and their periods. Before discussing the actual program and progress of the Boston Metropolitan Park Commission, however, it is necessary to sketch briefly the context for these events.
The ideal of metropolitan landscape planning was not new to Boston or to Eliot. As early as 1844, in attempting to deal with the Charles River and Back Bay development for Boston, Cambridge and Brookline, a unified park-like development had been proposed. In the early discussions of a park system for Boston, from 1869 onward, proposals for metropolitan planning consistently emerged, such as the schemes of Robert Morris Copeland and his engineering partner, George Wadsworth. Metropolitan landscape planning for Boston, however, did not succeed until the 1890s.

Also important in the discussion of Eliot’s metropolitan planning ideal is the concurrent history of the conservation movement during the 1880s. The 1885 action of the New York State Legislature in setting aside thousands of acres of the Adirondack Forest as safe watershed district for New York City was preceded on a smaller scale by a comparable act in Lynn, Massachusetts, north of Boston in 1882. The Lynn town fathers and private individuals raised $70,000 for the acquisition of the Lynn Woods, a rugged, forested district that had originally been designated as commonland in the seventeenth century because it was unsuitable for farming. This large forest, which extended into two adjacent communities, was preserved for both the water quality of its reservoirs and as recreation grounds for the factory workers in Lynn, the City of Shoes.

Key to understanding the reason for the creation of a metropolitan park system in Boston at this time is the rate of urban expansion—through both rapid population growth and annexation of surrounding communities. By the 1890s, the rings of urban/suburban development that pushed north, south and west from Boston were served by an elaborate transportation network of railroad, streetcar and subway lines. Through this expanding web of transportation, all levels of society theoretically had access to the entire system of metropolitan parks. Eliot was committed to creating a uniform geographical distribution of park types for all levels of society.

After a rapid yet intensive survey of available land within a ten mile radius of the Massachusetts state house, Eliot devised a comprehensive system of parklands for the metropolitan district. These included: 1) ocean-front beaches; 2) harbor islands and beaches; 3) tidal estuaries of the Charles, Mystic and Neponset rivers, emptying into Boston Harbor; 4) woodland reservations from the scale of the fifty-eight acres for Beaver Brook, the reservation containing the Waverley Oaks—which was the first property acquired by the new commission—to immense reserves of thousands of acres, such as the Blue Hills to the south and the Middlesex Fells to the north. The fifth component of this scheme was the playgrounds and urban squares that were deemed the responsibility of individual communities, not the metropolitan commission.

Characteristic of Eliot’s achievements was his transformation of Revere Beach, an unregulated district that was overrun by railroad lines, industrial uses, and shanty-like residences. Eliot possessed both the vision to see the redeemed value of this beach and the power to attack the problem. He and the Metropolitan Park Commission systematically moved the railroad back from the beach and acquired property to permit a uniform public use of the site, enhanced by bathing and eating pavilions and a promenade on the high ground (Fig. 11). While the changes were perhaps more drastic and obvious at Revere Beach than in the other reservations, Eliot demonstrated an ability to set specific goals and achieve them quickly.

Conducted under a separate authority but clearly related to the master metropolitan park plans was the municipal park system that Eliot devised for the City of Cambridge. The largest and most important component of this system was the riverfront park designed to stretch from the West Boston Bridge (now the Longfellow Bridge) at the mouth of the Charles River all the way up to the Mount Auburn Cemetery property on the Watertown border. The improvements of the Cambridge side of the Charles River that he accom-
plished through this commission he hoped to complete on the Boston side through the Metropolitan Park Commission.

Eliot's work with both the Cambridge and Metropolitan park commissions displayed his ability to function in a political arena that was changing as rapidly as was the profession of landscape architecture during Eliot's career. In many phases of public activity, the late 1880s and the 1890s were a period of centralization of power and introduction of modern administrative methods. The drive to scientific management seen in municipal administrative reform at this time was the result of comparable, earlier development in business management. The ascendency of the centralized corporate capitalist system became a model for the large-scale analysis of needs and scientific management of resources that may be seen in municipal reform, in the academic restructuring that Eliot's father had implemented, and ultimately even in the comprehensive, regional landscape preservation program that he himself devised. While Eliot was not always in sympathy with the bottom-line mentality of some businessmen on the commissions with which he worked, he understood their concerns and seems to have appropriated some of their methods for his system of regional planning.

Despite the advantages of vision, intellect, social position and indefatigable energy, Eliot did not succeed in all his efforts to establish a regional park system for the Greater Boston Basin. In fact, it was the same isolationist myopia (the unwillingness of one community to cooperate with another, which Eliot had attempted to overcome with the metropolitan park system) that provided his major defeat. In 1892, the year before the passage of the Metropolitan Park Commission Act, Eliot was appointed to the Special Commission on the Improvement of the Charles River Basin. Those who know Boston today perhaps do not realize how relatively recently the Charles River was dammed, converting it from the brackish mix of fresh and salt water alternating with broad expanses of mud flats to a uniform fresh water park. The creation of this central waterpark was Eliot's greatest unrealized dream. It was precisely the political and social power structure that had supported so much of his grand landscape plan that ensured the defeat of the Charles River damming and park development during Eliot's lifetime. Indeed, strong opposition to the development of the Charles River Basin as a park came from the wealthy and powerful property owners along Boston's Beacon Street who feared they would lose their waterview through new development opportunities facing the River or would find their backyards overrun by the immigrant working classes coming to the Charles for recreation.

Nevertheless, Eliot's vision for the Charles River Basin, the sources for his ideas, and the methods used to convince his fellow Bostonians provide further insights into his landscape planning scheme for the entire region. While Boston foresaw no place to develop a "Central Park" comparable to that of New York City, the embankment and improvement of the Charles River Basin had been a dream from the mid-century onward. In the 1890s, Eliot exercised his considerable talents as a writer, publicist and lobbyist to persuade the City of Boston to cooperate in a master plan for the improvement of the Charles River. In his 1892 report for the Charles River Commission he made convincing descriptions of the civic pride, sanitation, recreation, and real estate development that would surely emerge from the cleaning of the River and the improvement of the riverbanks. In addition to the objections of the Beacon Street residents, there was an assumption that the tidal flow of the Charles acted as scourer for Boston Harbor, a myth that the most sophisticated scientific reports found hard to negate. But Eliot introduced in his report photographs and descriptions of the Alster Basin in Hamburg, Germany (Fig. 12) which ultimately became the model for the development of the Boston side of the Charles River shoreline by Charles Eliot's protege Arthur Shurtleff in the 1920s and 1930s.
Charles Eliot died of meningitis in the spring of 1897. In 1893, he had been convinced to join in the establishment of a new firm under the name of Olmsted, Olmsted & Eliot. He had constantly assumed a larger percentage of the responsibilities of the Olmsted, Olmsted and Eliot office while continuing his heavy commitment to the Cambridge Park Commission and the Metropolitan Park Commission. One of Eliot's final accomplishments is really an icon for all his efforts. In his last year, he directed a team of engineers, botanists and landscape architects in an exhaustive survey of the resources of the Metropolitan Park System and in the formulation of guidelines for the management and enhancement of these reservations. Published posthumously in 1898 for the Metropolitan Park Commission, *Vegetation and Scenery in the Metropolitan Reservations of Boston* is the clearest summary of Eliot's method of comprehensive analysis and organization on which to base planning for the open space and recreation needs of a region. Perhaps overwhelmed by the scientific and bureaucratic format of this publication is the underlying goal of Eliot's life, the reservation of those unspoiled elements of the New England landscape and his visionary plan for their preservation for the people.

In summary, Eliot's ideals and accomplishments can be understood in three ways.

1) He articulated in both his writings and his projects the need for and the methods to ensure the preservation of rural and wilderness areas that possess resources of natural and cultural significance and that can be actively experienced as an antidote to the emotional and mental pressures of modern urban life.

2) His work is a definite reflection of reformist goals of turn-of-the-century Americans, especially Bostonians, and represents the same striving for clear order based on thorough knowledge, and the centralization of power in the hands of enlightened professionals, that can be seen in American business, governmental and educational reform during his brief lifetime.

3) Finally, Eliot's vision for the New England landscape is a fascinating personal amalgam of Olmstedian inheritance, English and German landscape theory, the Barbizon School of landscape painting, a sensitivity to the character of the New England cultural landscape, and the enthusiastic outdoorsman, among other threads, while it retains a comprehensiveness and logic as timely and instructive as it was a century ago.

In a chapter entitled "Growth Invincible" from his 1906 book, *The Future in America*, H. G. Wells contrasts recent visits to New York and Boston: If possible it is more impressive, even, than the crowded largeness of New York. to trace the serene preparation Boston has made through this (Metropolitan Park) Commission to be widely and easily vast. New York's humanity has a curious air of being carried along upon a wave of irresistible prosperity, but Boston confesses design. I suppose no city in all the world...has ever produced so complete and ample a forecast of its own future as this commission's plan of Boston.

What Wells saw around Boston was representative of what Eliot had envisioned. Although it was not as consciously designed a landscape as other contemporary park making, Eliot's ideas clearly "confess design" and attempt to forecast a future not only for Boston but for the region as well.
FOOTNOTES


2. Eliot’s conception of a private board of trustees established to accept or acquire real property of natural, scenic or historic significance was a clear precedent for the establishment of the National Trust in Great Britain in 1895 and ultimately for our own National Trust in 1949.


9. Several biographies of Roosevelt stress and document the importance of camping and hunting expeditions for the future president, including David McCullough’s *Mornings on Horseback* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1981) which also includes a relevant and useful chapter on Harvard in the later 1870’s.

11. Newton, *Design on the Land*, provides initial information on many of these younger members of the Olmsted office, especially in his chapter on the founding of the American Society of Landscape Architects.

12. Letter, Frederick Law Olmsted, Sr., to Charles Eliot, October 28, 1886, Olmsted Collection. Earlier in this letter, Olmsted wrote:

   I know that you will feel more than most men what you owe to your profession— that is to “the cause.” I mean beyond the zealous pursuit of it. In one way I wish to give you my opinion, derived from reading your letters chiefly, that you are able to serve it better than any living English writing man... Perhaps better than any other man now writing.

   The letters between Olmsted and Eliot during the years that the latter was abroad show the strong affection and respect that these men shared for each other. Some of these letters are partially reproduced in chapters 4-10 of Charles W. Eliot’s biography of his son.

13. This effort to entice Eliot back to Brookline to assist on the Stanford designs is documented in a three-way correspondence between Olmsted, Charles Eliot and President Eliot from June 8-27, 1886, Olmsted Collection, Library of Congress.


16. *Garden and Forest. A Journal of Horticulture, Landscape Gardening and Forestry*, to which Eliot was a frequent contributor, was “conducted” in Boston by Charles Sprague Sargent, director of the Arnold Arboretum. Ironically, its decade existence corresponds almost exactly to the period of Eliot’s professional career. The magazine unfortunately ceased publication after its editor, William Augustus Stiles, died in October, 1897. For this crucial decade in the development of the profession of landscape architecture, however, *Garden and Forest* is a singularly important measure of the ideas and ideals of the emerging profession.


18. Charles W. Eliot wrote profusely on the importance of liberty to a democracy and the importance of individual accomplishment. One of the few areas in which he saw the need for collective action was in park making. His biography of his son is only one indication of the central importance he gave to the park movement in Boston and nationally. Following his son’s death, he was instrumental in introducing a graduate curriculum in landscape architecture at Harvard, asking Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr., and Arthur Shurliff, two Eliot proteges to direct the program.


20. For further information on the development of the Beaverbrook Reservation and on the use of the property from the seventeenth century onward, see: Eleanor MePeck, Keith Morgan and Cynthia Zaitzevsky, eds., *Olmsted in Massachusetts: The Public Legacy. A Report of the Inventory Committee of the Massachusetts Association for Olmsted Parks*
21. Robert Morris Copeland, *Country Life: A Handbook of Agriculture, Horticulture and Landscape Gardening* (Boston: Jewett, 1859). Before moving to Belmont, Copeland lived in Lexington and practiced landscape gardening. In 1855, he formed a partnership with Horace William Shaler Cleveland in Boston offering services in "landscape architecture and ornamental gardening." Copeland & Cleveland were unsuccessful entrants in the 1857 competition for the design of Central Park in New York City, and their partnership seems to have dissolved around the time of the Civil War. Cleveland subsequently served as the landscape architect for the South Park Commission in Chicago and for the Minneapolis Park Commission. Relatively little is known about Copeland’s subsequent work.


30. In June, 1930, Arthur Shurtleff had his named changed legally to Arthur Shurcliff. The second spelling has been used throughout this article for consistency.


Founded in 1980, the National Association for Olmsted Parks (NAOP) is a national network of volunteers and professionals, working to promote and protect the Olmsted legacy. NAOP is a non-profit membership organization.
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