

Suffolk University

Digital Collections @ Suffolk

Undergraduate Theses and Capstone Projects

Student Works

2005

The Contributions of Congressman John Joseph Moakley to Historical Preservation in Boston

Laura Muller

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dc.suffolk.edu/undergrad>



Part of the [Public History Commons](#), and the [Social History Commons](#)

The Contributions of Congressman John Joseph Moakley to Historical Preservation in Boston

By Laura Muller

December 6, 2005



Table of Contents

Introduction.....	p.1
EXPO '76: Opposition to a World's Fair in Boston.....	p.1
Fighting for Charlestown Navy Yard and the U.S.S. <i>Constitution</i>	p.3
The Establishment of the Boston National Historical Park.....	p.6
Lobbying for Dorchester Heights:	
A South Boston Site with National Significance.....	p.9
The Establishment of the Boston African American National	
Historic Site.....	p.12
The Funding Era: BOAF.....	p.15
The Funding Era: BNHP.....	p.16
A Return to His Preservation Roots:	
The Boston Harbor Islands National Recreation Area.....	p.32
A Final Funding Effort for BOAF.....	p.38
Good Work Does Not Go Unnoticed.....	p.39
The End of an Era.....	p.41

Introduction

As a Democrat representing Massachusetts' ninth congressional district, Congressman John Joseph Moakley is most often remembered for his dedicated constituent service, working tirelessly to help get "Mrs. O'Leary's social security check" with hopes of getting, in return, the votes of his constituents. It is thanks to him, however, that, since the 1970s, many of Boston's most significant historical sites have been preserved. Despite the fact that many of these structures have existed since the 18th century, they were not properly maintained or renovated until Moakley, knowing that historical preservation is not an issue that normally draws in election votes, lobbied extensively on their behalf for the federal recognition and funds that allowed them to be restored and allowed those who live in the city and those who visit the city to fully experience its rich history.

EXPO '76: Opposition to a Proposed World's Fair in Boston

While Moakley was a Massachusetts state senator, he became involved with the Boston Harbor Islands. In the late 1960s, a proposal was made to bring a World's Fair to Boston, specifically to the area surrounding Boston Harbor, as part of the nation's bicentennial celebrations in 1976. Moakley opposed EXPO '76, as the fair was called, based on the potential damage that its facilities would cause to the Boston Harbor Islands and the beaches of South Boston. An article from April 10, 1969, in the *South Boston Tribune* transcribed Moakley's statement before the Boston City Council's committee on Urban Affairs, in which he outlined his reasons for opposing the fair. As the chairman of a commission designed to study the harbor, Moakley had a vested interest in the Harbor Islands and his hometown of South Boston, which is home to several of the city's beaches, and noted that the fair proposal included the construction

of a landfill that could wreak havoc on the harbor's tides, causing the backup of raw sewage in the harbor and thus on the beaches. He also noted that his concerns were not fueled by his opposition to the fair, but rather vice versa, calling himself, in reference to the Harbor Islands and the Boston shoreline, someone "sincerely concerned with what is the proper utilization of a unique natural resource." Ultimately, there was no EXPO '76 in Boston.¹

Moakley's opposition to EXPO '76 might, on the surface, give the impression that the fair's commemoration of the American Revolution two hundred years earlier and the thousands of jobs that the fair could have brought to the city were factors that were unimportant to him. In fact, though, the opposite is true. Throughout his political career, one of Moakley's primary goals was to bring jobs to the city, specifically to his district. However, even though the waterfront area that would have been the site for EXPO '76 was in his district and would have provided many jobs, he opposed it. In this situation, his love for the city and his desire to see its resources and character preserved took precedence over the creation of jobs. Moakley undoubtedly felt that there were means of creating jobs for the citizens of Boston that did not involve the creation of landfills or further pollution of Boston Harbor.

Instead, throughout his nearly forty years of service to the City of Boston, Moakley found ways to simultaneously preserve the city, attract tourists to it, and provide jobs for its citizens. His upbringing in South Boston instilled in him a commitment to and love for the city and its rich heritage, and this commitment and love inspired him to work hard to preserve Boston's history, including some of its most important historical landmarks. While he did not support EXPO '76, his efforts to preserve the historical sites in Boston that were significant during the American Revolution were untiring, although his contributions to historical preservation in Boston were not limited to those of Revolutionary importance. Despite his blue-collar

¹ "Moakley Spells Out Opposition to World's Fair," *South Boston Tribune*, April 10, 1969.

background, Moakley forged ahead in the typically elitist field of historical preservation. Until his death in 2001, Moakley, supported Boston's historical preservation community, both by pushing for national recognition of the city's historical sites and by acquiring federal funding for their maintenance and rehabilitation. His commitment to historical preservation in Boston was unwavering, and many of the city's historical sites would not be what they are today had it not been for his dedication.

Fighting for Charlestown Navy Yard and the U.S.S. *Constitution*

Shortly after his election to the United States Congress in 1972, Moakley's direct involvement with historical preservation began. In 1973, the United States Navy announced plans to close the Boston Naval Shipyard (also known as Boston Navy Yard and Charlestown Navy Yard) in Charlestown and relocate the U.S.S. *Constitution*, the oldest commissioned warship still afloat in the United States, from Charlestown to Philadelphia. In July of that year, Moakley announced that he would fight to keep the shipyard open and keep the *Constitution* in Charlestown. His involvement in this issue is interesting because Charlestown was not part of the 9th Congressional district, which Moakley represented. It is quite possible that he felt a special affinity for the Navy Yard because he had been in the Navy, serving as Seabee from 1943 to 1946 (he altered his birth certificate and joined at the age of 16), and therefore wanted to preserve a part of it that was located in the city that he loved.² His opposition to the closure was initially based on his view that the Charlestown Navy Yard was "by far the most superior of the east coast yards" and that closing it would "create needless economic chaos,"³ but it developed

² Biographical information from "About Congressman Moakley: Early Life", <http://www.joemoakley.org/earlylife.cfm>, The John Joseph Moakley Archive and Institute at Suffolk University.

³ "Moakley Works to Block Shipyard Shutdown," Press releases: July 1973, Public Relations: Press Releases, MS 100, John Joseph Moakley Archive, Suffolk University, Boston, MA.

to include the loss of jobs that would result from the closure and the loss of history if the *Constitution* was relocated.

Moakley's attempts at keeping the shipyard open, while focused and unwavering, were ultimately unsuccessful, and on July 28, 1973, he spoke at the commissioning of its last combatant ship, the U.S.S. *Thomas C. Hart*, which later served in Operation Desert Storm.⁴ He spoke sadly, reminding the audience that "for almost two centuries the Boston Navy Yard has served as a symbol of America's naval superiority." Still planning on supporting the Navy Yard's cause, Moakley expressed his support for the shipyard staff and the job they were about to undertake, but he understood that while the commissioning of a ship is usually cause for celebration, in this case it was bittersweet because it would be the shipyard staff's last.⁵

While Moakley's efforts could not keep the shipyard open, he did not abandon the cause entirely. In November of 1973, Rear Admiral E.K. Snyder, the Navy's Chief of Legislative Affairs, announced that the Navy would support Moakley's efforts to stop the *Constitution's* relocation to Philadelphia. In a letter to Representative F. Edward Hebert, a Democrat from Louisiana and chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, Admiral Snyder expressed the Navy's support, on behalf of the Department of Defense, of H.Con.Res. 264, sponsored by Moakley and Representative Gerry Studds, also of Massachusetts, and reaffirmed "the intent of the Congress that the United States ship *Constitution* continue to be berthed in the port of Boston, Massachusetts."⁶

In December of 1973, Moakley led discussions in Washington regarding the Shipyard's future following its closure in 1974 and presented his concerns about the loss of jobs due to the

⁴ "Admiral Thomas C. Hart," Davis Community Schools, <http://www.davison.k12.mi.us/Alumni/hart.pdf>.

⁵ "Moakley: Commissioning of Last Combatant Ship at Boston Shipyard," Press releases: July 1973, Public Relations: Press Releases, MS 100, John Joseph Moakley Archive, Suffolk University, Boston, MA.

⁶ Letter to Rep. F. Edward Hebert from Rear Admiral E.K. Snyder of November 12, 1973, Press releases: November 1973, Public Relations: Press Releases, MS 100, John Joseph Moakley Archive, Suffolk University, Boston, MA.

shipyard's closure. One of his main concerns was that citizens once employed there would have to leave the city to find jobs, and keeping Boston residents in Boston, including, figuratively, the *Constitution*, was consistently one of his goals as a congressman.⁷ The outcome of these discussions was positive. The Boston Shipyard Corporation "outlined plans for using the existing facilities and providing employment for many who were displaced by the Navy Yard shut-down." The Charlestown Navy Yard did ultimately close in 1974, although the *Constitution* remained there.⁸

Moakley also wanted to preserve the efforts that Representative John McCormack, also of Massachusetts, had made nearly twenty years earlier in 1954 through Public Law 83-523, which marked the beginning of a major restoration of the *Constitution* and stipulated that the ship remain in Boston permanently. In a speech at Charlestown Navy Yard in 1979 for the commemoration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of this law being passed to make Boston the ship's permanent home, Moakley credited Rep. McCormack, whose Congressional career ended in 1970, with keeping the *Constitution* in Boston.⁹ Perhaps Representative McCormack's efforts are all the more commendable given that he, like Moakley, did not represent Charlestown. Representative Thomas "Tip" O'Neill represented Charlestown, but had just been elected to Congress in 1953.¹⁰ It is possible that O'Neill was not involved in the legislation to keep the *Constitution* in Boston because it was already in progress when he was elected, so he simply did not have the chance to become involved. He did care about the issue, given that he, along with Moakley, Congressman James Burke of Massachusetts and Senator Edward Kennedy, also of

⁷ "Moakley Slates Shipyard Talks," Press releases: December 1973, Public Relations, Press Releases, MS 100, John Joseph Moakley Archive, Suffolk University, Boston, MA.

⁸ "Moakley Reports on Shipyard Talks," Press releases: December 1973, Public Relations: Press Releases, MS 100, John Joseph Moakley Archive, Suffolk University, Boston, MA.

⁹ Rep. John Joseph Moakley, "Commemoration of USS *Constitution* 25th Anniversary," Press releases: July 1979, Public Relations: Press Releases, MS 100, John Joseph Moakley Archive, Suffolk University, Boston, MA.

¹⁰ Biographical Directory of the United States Congress, "O'Neill, Thomas Phillip, Jr. (Tip): Biographical Information," <http://bioguide.congress.gov/scripts/biodisplay.pl?index=O000098>.

Massachusetts, introduced legislation in 1973 as part of H.R. 7486 to establish a naval museum and historic park at the shipyard once it closed. Rep. McCormack, however, deserves much credit for his work on behalf of the Navy Yard and the *Constitution*. While Moakley gives him due credit in his speech commemorating the 25th anniversary of this legislation, were it not for Moakley's own efforts, McCormack's might have been wasted after less than twenty years of effectiveness. Moakley's efforts continued beyond keeping the *Constitution* in Boston, however, and in 1973 extended to include several more of Boston's most significant historical landmarks.

The Establishment of the Boston National Historical Park

Moakley, along with Congressmen O'Neill and Burke and Senator Edward Kennedy, hoped to further develop McCormack's efforts through H.R. 7486, which called for the establishment of the Boston National Historical Park¹¹ and included a potential site at the Charlestown Navy Yard. They believed that the presence of the *Constitution* would be essential to the success of the new park. The Navy supported the creation of a historical park and museum as well, and Admiral Snyder indicated in his letter that "the retention of the ship in Boston will nicely complement these efforts."¹²

The Charlestown Navy Yard was significant in the Boston National Historical Park's formation, not only as a member site but also as a major impetus. According to the Boston National Historical Park's 30th anniversary issue of its newsletter, *The Broadside*, "Many in Boston resented what they perceived as partisan politics involved in the closure of the Navy Yard by President Richard Nixon. The establishment of a national historical park was viewed by

¹¹ The official name of the park is "Boston National Historical Park," but Moakley often referred to it as "Boston National Historic Park."

¹² Letter to Rep. Hebert from Rear Admiral E.K. Snyder of November 12, 1973.

some as partial compensation for the loss.”¹³ Many Bostonians felt that the fact that Massachusetts was the only state whose electoral votes did not go to President Nixon in the 1972 election impacted the Nixon Administration’s treatment of the Navy Yard.¹⁴ Despite the fact that the Navy Yard itself was not specifically linked to the American Revolution, the fact that it was home to the U.S.S. *Constitution* and was about to be closed proved that it had historical significance and could be preserved as part of a larger project that would preserve many sites of historical significance in Boston.¹⁵

H.R. 7486, passing through the House of Representatives and then through the Senate at the same time as the proceedings involving the closure of Charlestown Navy Yard, had major implications for several other historic sites in Boston. In January 1974, Moakley testified before the Subcommittee of National Parks and Recreation, urging them to pass the resolution, which would create a national historic park in Boston. The bill would enable the National Park Service (NPS) to acquire six historical sites in Boston for immediate inclusion in the new park: Faneuil Hall, the Paul Revere House, the Old State House, Bunker Hill, the Old South Meeting House, and Old North Church. The bill required the Park Service to receive permission from the sites’ owners before incorporating the sites into the new park and to reach agreements with them to ensure that the sites would be maintained and would be accessible to the public. In addition to the six aforementioned sites, other sites were listed as possibilities for inclusion, including the Boston Common and Charlestown Navy Yard. Always one to listen to his constituents, Moakley respected the wishes of the congregation of the Old North Church that the church not be listed

¹³ Martin Blatt, “Boston National Historical Park Celebrates Thirty Years,” *The Broadside*, no. 2 (2004): 1.

¹⁴ Boston National Historical Park, *Charlestown Navy Yard* (Washington, D.C.: National Park Service, 1995), 72.

¹⁵ Blatt, 1.

for immediate inclusion and asked the Committee to place the site on the list of potential sites for inclusion, pending further discussion of ownership, maintenance, and accessibility.¹⁶

The legislation was passed on October 1, 1974, as public law 93-431, thereby creating the Boston National Historical Park (BNHP), a subdivision of the National Parks Service. In addition, a Visitors Center was created in downtown Boston. At the time of its creation, the Boston National Historical Park consisted of Faneuil Hall, the Paul Revere House, the Old State House, the Bunker Hill Monument, Old South Meeting House, and, after having time to discuss the situation and come to an agreement with the NPS, Old North Church.¹⁷ Shortly after the BNHP's inception, thirty acres of the recently closed Charlestown Navy Yard were added to its list of sites, including the area occupied by the U.S.S. *Constitution*.¹⁸ Dorchester Heights joined the park in 1978, when ownership of the site was transferred from the City of Boston to the National Park Service following the Nation Parks and Recreation Act.

Seven of the eight sites in the BNHP (all except Dorchester Heights) were and are part of the Freedom Trail, which consists of a red painted line that winds through the streets of Boston to connect 16 of its most significant historical sites. (Another semi-exception is the Charlestown Navy Yard; both the shipyard itself and the Constitution are part of the BNHP, but only the Constitution is part of the Freedom Trail.) Developed in 1951 and incorporated as a non-profit organization in 1964, the Freedom Trail Foundation is sponsored by private donations, both on corporate and individual levels. While the Freedom Trail has its own board of directors and staff, the establishment of the BNHP in 1974 created a necessary partnership that provided

¹⁶ "Boston National Historic Park," Press releases: January 1974, Public Relations: Press Releases, MS 100, John Joseph Moakley Archive, Suffolk University, Boston, MA.

¹⁷ The Library of Congress, "Bill Summary and Status for the 93rd Congress: S.210," <http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/z?d093:SN00210:@@L>.

¹⁸ "Charlestown Navy Yard," Boston National Historical Park, http://www.nps.gov/bost/Navy_Yard.htm.

federal funding for half of the sites on the Freedom Trail.¹⁹ Moakley's work for the BNHP, therefore, directly impacted the Freedom Trail, as well.

A major motivation behind Moakley's call for quick action regarding the BNHP legislation was the upcoming United States Bicentennial celebrations in 1976. Moakley argued that prompt passage of the bill was necessary because "perhaps no American city is so intimately linked with the Revolutionary War and certainly no city faces a more monumental task in preparing for the Bicentennial celebrations."²⁰ The BNHP legislation, signed into law by President Gerald Ford, designated "certain historic structures and properties of outstanding national significance located in Boston, Massachusetts, and associated with the American Revolution and the founding and growth of the United States."²¹ Moakley held great pride for his city, wanting to see it recognized for its historical significance in the Revolutionary War saga, and also hoping to see it benefit economically from the potential growth in tourism during and following the Bicentennial. This is also evident in Moakley's efforts to have Boston recognized as an official American Revolution Bicentennial Community. In January 1974, Boston received this designation, which recognized it as a city that played a part in the American Revolution and allowed it to "participate fully in the entire national program commemorating the Bicentennial...and cite its designation in any funding applications."²²

Lobbying for Dorchester Heights: A South Boston Site with National Significance

One site with Revolutionary War significance that was not included in the original proposal for the BNHP was Dorchester Heights, the South Boston site of the Revolutionary War

¹⁹ "History and Timeline," The Freedom Trail Foundation, <http://www.thefreedomtrail.org/home.htm>.

²⁰ "Boston National Historic Park."

²¹ Blatt, 1.

²² "Boston Named Bicentennial Community," Press releases: January 1974, Public Relations: Press Releases, MS 100, John Joseph Moakley Archive, Suffolk University, Boston, MA.

battle that resulted in the permanent evacuation of the British from Boston on March 17, 1776, a date now commemorated in Boston as Evacuation Day. A “white marble Georgian revival tower” has stood on the Heights since 1898 as a monument to the victory.²³ When the BNHP was first proposed Moakley asserted that Dorchester Heights should be listed with the other six sites for immediate inclusion because it is “the scene of the first American victory of the Revolutionary War,” and he introduced legislation in 1974 in hopes of achieving this.²⁴ To Moakley’s dismay, the inclusion of Dorchester Heights in the Boston National Historical Park in time for the bicentennial did not occur. In June of 1975, Moakley introduced legislation that authorized the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp for the Battle of Dorchester Heights’ 200th anniversary, stating that the battle “is a matter that those of us who live in South Boston take great pride in and I believe a commemorative stamp would be very appropriate.”²⁵ While the stamp was issued, perhaps a more appropriate form of recognition, in Moakley’s view, would have been Dorchester Heights’ inclusion in the BNHP by 1976. Moakley had a special connection to Dorchester Heights as a symbol of Boston’s rich heritage, given that it is located in his home neighborhood of South Boston.

In 1978, Moakley’s lobbying efforts for Dorchester Heights paid off, and the House of Representatives passed legislation adding the Heights to the BNHP. According to the legislation, ownership of the site was to be transferred from the City of Boston to the federal government, with the National Park Service overtaking responsibility for its rehabilitation and maintenance, as well as for funding for those projects. Moakley also involved his South Boston constituents in the Heights’ revitalization process, holding a meeting at which he and a

²³ “Dorchester Heights,” Boston National Historical Park, http://www.nps.gov/bost/Dorchester_Heights.htm

²⁴ “Boston National Historic Park”

²⁵ “Moakley Seeks Bicentennial Postage Stamp for Dorchester Heights,” *Bay State Banner*, press releases, and photographs: 1975, Public Relations: Press Releases, MS 100, John Joseph Moakley Archive, Suffolk University, Boston, MA.

representative from the NPS discussed the proposed improvement plan, which included lighting and drainage repairs, as well as walkway improvements.²⁶ The meeting occurred shortly after Moakley spoke at the 204th Anniversary Celebration of Dorchester Heights on March 17, 1979, during which he expressed his happiness that the site was to be included in the BNHP, stating, “Within a very short time, we can have a national historic site in our very own neighborhood that clearly looks like a national historic monument and that will merit our pride as well as the pride of our children in years to come.”²⁷

On March 3, 1980, Moakley’s Congressional office in Boston issued a press release announcing that the official title transfer of Dorchester Heights would occur on March 8, 1980. The release notes that Rep. John McCormack had championed for national recognition of Dorchester Heights in the late 1930s, and partly because of his efforts the site became a national historic site and was added to the National Register of Historic Places in 1951 and 1966, respectively.²⁸ McCormack lived to see Dorchester Heights receive its proper recognition. He died in November of 1980.²⁹

Moakley’s introduction of H.R. 9840, the passage of which added the Heights to the BNHP, expanded upon Rep. McCormack’s efforts by incorporating the site into the National Parks system, thus giving it access to federal appropriations. The release also quotes Moakley as saying, “As an integral part of the Boston National Historic Park, Dorchester Heights will assume its proper place in the annals of American history.” The transfer of title did occur on

²⁶ “Moakley Chairs Meeting on Dorchester Heights Program,” Press releases: April 1979, Public Relations: Press Releases, MS 100, John Joseph Moakley Archive, Suffolk University, Boston, MA.

²⁷ Moakley, “Speech at the 204th Anniversary Celebration of Dorchester Heights,” Press releases: March 1979, Public Relations: Press Releases, MS 100, John Joseph Moakley Archive, Suffolk University, Boston, MA.

²⁸ “Dorchester Heights Added to Boston National Historic Park,” Press releases: 1980, Public Relations: Press Releases, MS 100, John Joseph Moakley Archive, Suffolk University, Boston, MA.

²⁹ Biographical Directory of the United States Congress, “McCormack, John William – Biographical Information,” <http://bioguide.congress.gov/scripts/biodisplay.pl?index=M000364>.

March 8, 1980, at Dorchester Heights, and the site officially became a part of the Boston National Historical Park, making it the park's eighth and final addition.³⁰

The Establishment of the Boston African American National Historic Site

In addition to the Boston National Historical Park, Moakley was also instrumental in the creation of another NPS-sponsored historical park in Boston: the Boston African American National Historic Site. In the early 1970s, Senator Edward Kennedy, the BNHP's main source of support in the Senate, invited Byron Rushing, now a state representative (first elected in 1982), but then involved with a small African American historical society in Boston, to attend a public hearing on the proposed creation of the BNHP. At the hearing, Rushing testified that the proposed Boston National Historical Park did not recognize the contributions of African Americans to either the Revolutionary War specifically (referring to the bicentennial motivations for the creation of the park) or the nation in general. In 1975, a year after the BNHP was established, Rushing and Henry Hampton, who was the chairman of the board for the African American historical society, bought the African Meeting House, an early 19th century African Church located on the north slope of Beacon Hill (where many African Americans resided during the 19th century). This acquisition, made possible by private donations, marked the official establishment of the Museum of Afro-American History, with Rushing serving as its first executive director. Following the establishment of the museum in 1975, Senator Kennedy asked Rushing if he would like the African Meeting House to be included in BNHP. Unsure of what the nature of the BNHP was going to be, as it was still in its infancy, Rushing declined the offer, but said he was still interested in seeing how the park would develop.³¹

³⁰ "Dorchester Heights Added to Boston National Historic Park."

³¹ Byron Rushing, interview by Laura Muller, November 18, 2005, compact disc, in possession of Laura Muller

After several years of involvement with the BNHP as a member of its advisory board, Rushing decided that NPS involvement with the African Meeting House would be beneficial for the site, which had previously been funded solely from private donations. He felt that the other sites on the already-established Black Heritage Trail could also benefit from organization and funding under the NPS. The sites on the Black Heritage trail included, and still include, the Meeting House (owned by the Museum of Afro-American History), the Abiel Smith School (owned by the City of Boston), the monument located on Boston Common commemorating Robert Gould Shaw the Massachusetts 54th Regiment, which was the first all-black Civil War regiment (owned by the City of Boston's Parks Department), as well as several other privately-owned homes and other buildings.

Moakley and Rushing had become acquainted in 1970 during Moakley's first congressional campaign, and Moakley was eager to help Rushing's cause.³² As Rushing was very active in the African American community, Moakley sought his support and that of the residents of Roxbury during his 1970 primary campaign, in which he was running against Louise Day Hicks, whose platform was based on her opposition to forced busing in Boston as a means of achieving equality in the Boston Public Schools, and David Nelson, an African American lawyer. While Moakley lost the 1970 primary and Hicks was ultimately elected to Congress, he ran again in 1972. He ran as an independent, however, knowing that there was a good chance he would not win in a Democratic primary against Rep. Hicks, but would win in the general election. Again, he garnered support from Rushing and other African American community leaders, hoping to dissuade any of them from running against Rep. Hicks in the primary, which would ensure her win at the primaries and, hopefully, his win in the general election.³³

³² Rushing, interview by Laura Muller, November 18, 2005.

³³ Robert Allison, email comment to author, December 5, 2005.

Moakley's success in the 1972 Congressional election, therefore, could be partly attributed to Rushing's support, which gave Moakley good reason to aid Rushing's efforts to establish a federally-recognized African American historical site.

Since Moakley had already been involved with the NPS through the establishment of the BNHP and represented the district that included Beacon Hill, he spearheaded the Congressional efforts to create a new African American historical park in Boston. With Moakley's help, as well as that of Senator Kennedy and Senator Paul Tsongas, another preservation-minded Massachusetts congressman, legislation was passed in 1980 that created the Boston African American National Historic Site, or BOAF, as it was called by the NPS.³⁴

With the establishment of BOAF, the NPS entered into cooperative agreements with the City of Boston to allow for joint management of the Smith School and the Robert Gould Shaw/54th Regiment monument, while the other sites retained private ownership, with the exception of the African Meeting House, which retained non-profit ownership by the Museum of Afro-American History. Those sites that were privately owned were eligible for NPS funding for repairs, but remained closed to the public, as they still are today. Rushing indicates that one of these sites, the Hayden House, located on Phillips Street,³⁵ was given NPS funding for repairs, but after a some changes in BOAF's administration, none of the other private sites were given funding.³⁶ This could have been because they were not open to the public, so their restoration had little immediate value in terms of tourism. Without funding, they simply have designation as significant sites in Boston and American history.

³⁴ Letter to Byron Rushing, et al, from Rep. John Joseph Moakley and Sen. Paul Tsongas of July 27, 1983, not yet filed, John Joseph Moakley Archive, Suffolk University, Boston, MA.

³⁵ "The Black Heritage Trail," Boston African American National Historic site, <http://www.nps.gov/boaf/blackheritagetrail.htm>.

³⁶ Rushing, interview by Laura Muller, November 18, 2005.

Rushing indicates that a combination of factors probably influenced Moakley's desire to aid the creation of BOAF. First, Moakley seemed to have a general interest in history. In addition, he saw the Black Heritage Trail on Beacon Hill as a "significant piece" of Boston's history that was located in his district and for which he therefore had the ability to lobby in Congress.³⁷ In a speech that he gave nearly 25 years after the establishment of BOAF, Moakley called the Abiel Smith School and the African Meeting House "two incredible monuments to man's struggle for justice and equality" and notes that they, along with Boston's other historical sites, "must be preserved in order that all of our children and their children be afforded the opportunity to absorb the depth of history we share as Americans."³⁸ Finally, Moakley was always interested in the "advancement of the black community," which he saw as a "very, very important part of his constituency," even though it did not comprise the majority in his district, and his support of BOAF certainly indicates this interest.³⁹ These factors undoubtedly contributed not only to Moakley's work to create BOAF, but also to his continued involvement with the site, which lasted until 2000, just a year before his death.

The Funding Era: Boston African American National Historic Site

Moakley's contributions to historical preservation were not limited to the national recognition of sites and the creation of national historical parks; he devoted much of his time from the 1980s through the late 1990s to lobbying for the appropriation of funds for the sites in BOAF and the BNHP. In the early 1980s, he helped increase BOAF's initially low standing on the NPS's priorities list by, to the frustration of the NPS, going straight to the chairman of the

³⁷ Rushing, interview with Laura Muller, November 18, 2005.

³⁸ "Remarks of Congressman Joe Moakley, Grand Opening, Abiel Smith School, February 2000," Abiel Smith School Opening: February 2000, Speeches: Non-Congressional, MS 100, John Joseph Moakley Archive, Suffolk University, Boston, MA.

³⁹ Rushing, interview with Laura Muller, November 18, 2005.

House Committee on Appropriations to ask that funding be available for BOAF sooner. BOAF was given this low ranking on the priorities list shortly after its creation and was told that funds would not be available until 1990, ten years from its establishment. When Rushing expressed his concerns about this to Moakley, Moakley told him, “We’ll fix this.” Bypassing the “elaborate, bureaucratic process” that was required to establish how much funding a park would receive and when it would receive it, Moakley directly approached the chairman of the NPS’s budget committee.⁴⁰ After some negotiations, he was able to secure \$1 million in funding for BOAF for fiscal year 1983, within three years, rather than ten, of its establishment. This funding in part allowed the restoration of the African Meeting House, allowing it to be opened to the public in 1987.⁴¹

The Funding Era: Boston National Historical Park

The Boston National Historical Park also experienced funding problems during the 1980s. Despite the fact that the BNHP had been created to provide federal funding for and maintenance of the historical sites that were a part of it, some of the sites were seriously deteriorating. As was true with BOAF, there were delays in the allocation of NPS funds. Around 1984, John Burchill, then the Superintendent of the Boston National Historical Park approached Moakley to ask for help. Burchill was the cousin of Molly Hurley, Moakley’s secretary at his Congressional office in Boston, and it is quite probable that this connection is one of the major reasons that Moakley increased his involvement with the BNHP to include efforts to get funds appropriated for the sites. Sean Hennessey, presently the public affairs officer for the BNHP, however, indicates that in addition to Burchill being Molly Hurley’s

⁴⁰ Rushing, interview with Laura Muller, November 18, 2005.

⁴¹

cousin, he was also “cut from the same cloth” as Moakley, as they were both Irish, both came from modest means, and both loved Boston history. He notes that Burchill “educated” Moakley about the need for preserving the sites that were part of the BNHP, and Moakley “was in a position where he could do something about it.”⁴²

According to Hennessey, there was some concern within the National Park Service that by going directly to Moakley to ask for funding for various sites, Burchill was bypassing standard procedure for appropriations requests, and that by going directly to the Committee on Appropriations, Moakley, as he had done for BOAF, was bypassing these procedures as well. The normal process required going to Washington, asking for money, waiting in line, and other time-consuming steps, but Burchill apparently did not see any problem with going right to the source, since Moakley was willing to help and had the ability to do so.⁴³

At the time that Burchill first approached Moakley, several of the buildings on the BNHP, specifically and most urgently the Old State House and Faneuil Hall, both of which were in Moakley’s district, needed repairs including new roofs, new paint, repairs to their infrastructures, and improved heating, air conditioning, and ventilation systems in order for them to be safe and accessible for visitors. This deterioration was mostly due to deferred maintenance because their restoration was not at the top of budget lists for the National Park Service. Sean Hennessey indicates that the buildings were not specifically neglected, but the expenses involved in maintaining historical sites are very high, and before John Burchill approached Moakley, Boston and the entire country were experiencing an “era of diminished federal funding” for historical preservation projects.⁴⁴

⁴² Sean Hennessey (Public Affairs Officer, Boston National Historical Park), interview by Laura Muller, September 27, 2005, compact disc, in possession of Laura Muller.

⁴³ Hennessey, interview with Laura Muller, September 27, 2005.

⁴⁴ Hennessey, interview with Laura Muller, September 27, 2005.

President Ronald Reagan's domestic economic policy during the 1980s was one major reason for this lack of funding. Reagan's policies centered on budget reductions and tax cuts, both of which had serious affects on National Park Service funding. During a time of inflation, the Reagan administration sought to increase control over government spending, which resulted in tens of billions of dollars in budget cuts.⁴⁵ Reagan's controversial Secretary of the Interior and ultra-conservative Republican James Watt, was an undoubted enemy to historical preservation, as he favored urban development and commercial interests. In addition, in 1981, the Senate shifted to a Republican majority, which lasted until 1987 and most likely had an effect on the appropriation of funds for historical preservation, since it meant that Moakley did not have the Senate Majority leader as an ally, despite the Democratic majority in the House of Representatives.⁴⁶

Fortunately for Burchill and the historical preservation community in Boston, not to mention the million of visitors to the city, Moakley was not deterred by Reagan's policies and responded to Burchill's request for help by saying, "Tell me what you want me to do." "The rest," as Burchill stated in a Letter to the Editor published in the *Boston Globe* shortly after Moakley's death, "is history, or the rebirth of history."⁴⁷ Moakley's efforts began with the two sites in most dire need of attention: the Old State House, built in 1713 as the Massachusetts Bay Colony's government headquarters,⁴⁸ and Faneuil Hall, first built in 1742 as a public market and meeting place for the colonists and renovated in 1802.⁴⁹

⁴⁵ Robert J. Huckshorn, "Reagan, Ronald," The American Presidency, *Encyclopedia Americana*, <http://ap.grolier.com/article?assetid=0329270-00&templatename=/article/article.html>.

⁴⁶ "Majority and Minority Leaders and Part Whips," U.S. Senate, http://www.senate.gov/artandhistory/history/common/briefing/Majority_Minority_Leaders.htm

⁴⁷ John Burchill, "Another Legacy from Moakley," Letter to the Editor, *The Boston Globe*, June 2, 2001, <http://0-web.lexis-nexis.com.library.law.suffolk.edu/universe>.

⁴⁸ "Old State House History," The Bostonian Society, http://www.bostonhistory.org/old_state_hs_hist.php.

⁴⁹ "Freedom Trail – Faneuil Hall," Boston National Historical Park, http://www.nps.gov/bost/Faneuil_Hall.htm.

Since Faneuil Hall and the Old State House were both managed by the Boston National Historical Park, they were eligible for federal funding. In 1985, Moakley began what would prove to be a long and sometimes difficult process to acquire funding for the two sites. On April 18 of that year Moakley testified before the Subcommittee on Interior of the Committee on Appropriations, requesting funding to begin immediate repairs on the two buildings. Referring to the National Park Service's fiscal year 1986 budget that stated that "the \$1 billion administration initiative to ensure the quality and accessibility of the national parks to all Americans by increasing maintenance and by restoring and constructing facilities has been essentially completed," Moakley noted that "in Boston the job has yet to begin." He cited many serious interior and exterior problems at both sites, including structural deterioration, faulty plumbing, and electrical systems that did not meet current codes. The funds that Moakley requested for the rehabilitation of the two buildings totaled \$8,570,000, with \$4,585,00 for Faneuil Hall and \$3,570,000 for the Old State House,⁵⁰ although an Old State House "Fact Sheet" that accompanied a press release announcing Moakley's April 18th testimony indicated that \$3,958,000 was necessary for its rehabilitation.⁵¹

In his testimony, Moakley criticized the Department of the Interior, which manages the National Park Service, for delaying its restoration of the two buildings. He referred to a letter of February 20, 1985, that he had written to the Secretary of the Interior, Donald Hodel, in which he had stated that the NPS was under an agreement with the City of Boston to maintain them, but that had not done so adequately and had "not allocated any capital funds for either building since 1975." In the letter he had also cited consultations by engineers that found serious deficiencies

⁵⁰ "Remarks by the Honorable John Joseph Moakley, M.C. of Massachusetts: April 18, 1985, before the Subcommittee on Interior, Committee on Appropriations," Faneuil Hall and Old State House: 1985-1986, Legislative Files: 1980-1986, MS 100, John Joseph Moakley Archive, Suffolk University, Boston, MA.

⁵¹ "Old State House Fact Sheet," Faneuil Hall and Old State House: 1985-1986, Legislative Files: 1980-1986, MS 100, John Joseph Moakley Archive, Suffolk University, Boston, MA.

in the structures, most notably at the Old State House where a sidewalk support beam was found to be “in imminent danger of collapse.”⁵² In a response to the letter, J. Craig Potter, the Acting Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, writing on behalf of Secretary Hodel, had written that the studies that Moakley mentioned had not been fully reviewed by the NPS, but assured Moakley that “the condition of both the Old State House and Faneuil Hall is being carefully monitored and that neither structure is in any imminent danger of collapse or major structural failure.” Potter also indicated that the funds being allocated for the two sites were only *planning* funds, not actual repair funds.⁵³ In his testimony, Moakley expressed his dissatisfaction with the Department of the Interior’s approach to the Old State House and Faneuil Hall projects, implying that it was illogical and ignored the immediacy of the problems.⁵⁴

At the end of his testimony, Moakley stated that “the preservation of Faneuil Hall and the Old State House are of national significance and deserving of our immediate attention. For these structures to be damaged, deprives us not only of a cultural resource but a spiritual monument to the founding of this nation and the beliefs we hold dear.”⁵⁵ Despite his assertion of the importance of the two buildings and the necessity of immediate attention, the process of acquiring funding, planning the rehabilitation, and actually beginning construction was a slow one, although the Subcommittee on Interior did earmark \$600,000 in planning funds for Faneuil Hall, and the NPS made a commitment to advance its efforts at the Old State House, where

⁵² Letter to the Hon. Donald Hodel (Secretary of the Interior) from Congressman John Joseph Moakley of February 20, 1985, Faneuil Hall and Old State House: 1985-1986, Legislative Files: 1980-1986, MS 100, John Joseph Moakley Archive, Suffolk University, Boston, MA

⁵³ Letter to Congressman John Joseph Moakley from J. Craig Potter (Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior) of March 13, 1985, Faneuil Hall and Old State House: 1985-1986, Legislative Files: 1980-1986, MS 100, John Joseph Moakley Archive, Suffolk University, Boston, MA

⁵⁴ “Remarks by the Honorable John Joseph Moakley, M.C. of Massachusetts, April 18, 1985, before the Subcommittee on Interior, Committee on Appropriations.”

⁵⁵ “Remarks by the Honorable John Joseph Moakley, M.C. of Massachusetts, April 18, 1985, before the Subcommittee on Interior, Committee on Appropriations.”

preliminary planning had already begun to take place.⁵⁶ Correspondence continued in 1986 between Moakley and the Department of the Interior, with Moakley requesting budgets and timetables for the projects for fiscal years 1986 and 1987. A reply from P. Daniel Smith, the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, addressed both of those issues. \$75,000 had been allocated for FY 1986 and \$90,000 requested for FY 1987 for the Old State House, and \$20,000 had been allocated for FY 1986, but an amount had yet to be determined for FY 1987 for Faneuil Hall. All of these figures applied to planning funds, not construction funds. Smith indicated that it was possible that construction funding requests could be made by 1989.⁵⁷

In a letter to Representative Sidney “Sid” Yates, the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations’ Subcommittee on Interior, Moakley expressed his concern that despite P. Daniel Smith’s predictions, the timetable for the restoration projects could in fact take longer than planned, citing “the Department of the Interior’s poor record for maintaining either the Old State House or Faneuil Hall.” He also described increased deterioration of both buildings as further indication that timely rehabilitation was not just desirable, but necessary. Moakley basically felt that the entire process was moving too slowly, and unnecessarily so. The Department of the Interior did not place Faneuil Hall and the Old State House high enough on their priority list, which allowed the sites to descend further into disrepair. He concluded his letter by stating

I am not convinced...that the Administration is pursuing either project with the speed or conviction which they merit. I urge the Subcommittee on Interior to reemphasize to the Department of the Interior the national significance and importance of restoring both of

⁵⁶ Letter to the Hon. William P. Horn (Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior) from Moakley of March 13, 1986, Faneuil Hall and Old State House: 1985-1986, Legislative Files: 1980-1986, MS 100, John Joseph Moakley Archive, Suffolk University, Boston, MA.

⁵⁷ Letter to Moakley from P. Daniel Smith, (Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior) of April 30, 1986, Faneuil Hall and Old State House: 1985-1986, Legislative Files: 1980-1986, MS 100, John Joseph Moakley Archive, Suffolk University, Boston, MA.

these colonial buildings by directing them to move forward with restoring both buildings in a timely and responsible manner.⁵⁸

A letter from a few months later to the editor of *The Boston Globe* from Joshua A.S. Young, then president of the Bostonian Society (Boston's historical society, which runs a museum at the Old State House), echoed Moakley's feelings, chastising the National Park Service for delaying repairs to the two buildings, an act he called "disrespectful to our historical heritage."⁵⁹ The Bostonian Society's newsletter of September, 1986, urged readers to contact "key members of Congress," including Moakley, Rep. Yates, and Donald Hodel, to show their support for the proposed renovations and the funding to do them.⁶⁰

Undoubtedly to Moakley's dismay, the Faneuil Hall and Old State House projects continued to be delayed. On March 11, 1987, Moakley spoke in Congress in response to an article from the March/April 1987 issue of *Historic Preservation* magazine. The article outlined the deterioration of many of the historic sites that are maintained by the National Park service, citing, among other causes, lack of funding, insufficient staff, an increase in the number of NPS-operated sites, and the issue of what should be preserved and what should not. While Moakley acknowledged his agreement with much of the article's content, he also noted that it underestimated the problem, mentioning specifically the trouble he was having with the restoration projects at Faneuil Hall and the Old State House, and that it was "too lenient on the Reagan administration," which was responsible for the aforementioned statement that an historical preservation initiative to rehabilitate structures in need of repair had been completed,

⁵⁸ Letter to the Hon. Sidney R. Yates (Chairman, Subcommittee on Interior, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. House of Representatives) from Moakley of May 14, 1986, Faneuil Hall and Old State House: 1985-1986, Legislative Files: 1980-1986, MS 100, John Joseph Moakley Archive, Suffolk University, Boston, MA.

⁵⁹ Joshua A.S. Young, Letter to the Editor, *The Boston Globe*, July 28, 1986.

⁶⁰ "The Bostonian Society Newsletter: Number 4, September 1986," Faneuil Hall and Old State House: 1985-1986, Legislative Files: 1980-1986, MS 100, John Joseph Moakley Archive, Suffolk University, Boston, MA.

when in fact the Faneuil Hall and Old State House projects in Boston had not even begun. In closing, Moakley reiterated the threat to historic structures and said that “to delay answering this threat will not save any money, but rather, will risk our losing precious symbols of our Nation’s heritage. We must act.”⁶¹

Moakley acted the next day, writing a letter to Rep. Yates asking for funding, specifically multi-year funding so as to create a concrete timeline for the completion of the Old State House and Faneuil Hall projects. He included summaries of the two projects, outlining the required repairs, necessary funding, and projected timelines. The funding estimates increased to \$6,355,000 for Faneuil Hall and \$5,780,000 for the Old State House, up from the figures he cited in his 1985 testimony. The project schedules stated that construction contracts would be awarded for both projects in 1988. Moakley also noted in his letter that the Boston National Historical Park, the City of Boston, the Bostonian Society, and the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company had organized trusts to help fund the maintenance of the two buildings, which he probably hoped would increase the likeliness of Rep. Yates securing appropriations, since there would be private funding, as well. He concluded his letter by reiterating the National Park Service’s previous “footdragging,” asking that Rep. Yates help “to assure that both of these projects are completed in a timely and responsible manner.”⁶²

In April of 1987, as Moakley continued to lobby for the appropriation of the necessary funds for the Faneuil Hall and Old State House projects, Rep. Yates received many letters from individuals and organizations in support of the appropriations. Some of the letter-writers included Raymond Flynn, then mayor of Boston; United States Senator John Kerry; Nancy

⁶¹ “Congressional Record – Extensions of Remarks, March 11, 1987,” Faneuil Hall and Old State House: 1985-1986, Legislative Files: 1980-1986, MS 100, John Joseph Moakley Archive, Suffolk University, Boston, MA.

⁶² Letter to the Hon. Sidney R. Yates from Moakley of March 12, 1987, Faneuil Hall and Old State House: 1985-1986, Legislative Files: 1980-1986, MS 100, John Joseph Moakley Archive, Suffolk University, Boston, MA.

Coolidge, director of the Society for the Preservation of New England Antiquities; Antonia Pollack, executive director of the Boston Preservation Alliance; Rodney Armstrong, director and librarian at the Boston Athenaeum; Alden Gifford, Jr., president of the Bostonian Society; Nina Meyer, director of the Historic Neighborhoods Foundation in Boston; Bruce Rossley, commissioner of the Office of the Arts and Humanities, Boston Art Commission; and finally, “John Joseph Moakley, Member of Congress, Deputy Whip, and Chairman of the Rules Committee.”⁶³ In his letter, Moakley reiterated the poor condition of the two buildings and asked that the Subcommittee on the Interior provide enough funding to complete the rehabilitation projects. He ended his letter with a personal note, thanking “Sid” for the support he has given in the past and expressing confidence that he will do whatever he can to get the necessary funding.⁶⁴

Moakley’s persistence and the barrage of letters from concerned citizens that Rep. Yates received ultimately paid off, and on June 4, 1987, Moakley announced that the Subcommittee on Interior had “approved full construction funding for Faneuil Hall and the remaining design funds necessary to take the Old State House to construction.” \$6,355,000 was appropriated for Faneuil Hall, which was the amount cited as necessary for the entire planning and construction process. \$500,000 was appropriated for the Old State House, which covered the majority of funds necessary for the planning aspect of the restoration process. More time was needed to study the condition of the Old State House before full funding could be appropriated. Moakley was excited by the progress and thanked Rep. Yates, the City of Boston, the Bostonian Society, and the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company, the oldest chartered military organization in the

⁶³ Letters to the Hon. Sidney R. Yates, Faneuil Hall/Old State House: FY 1988: Appropriations 1987-1989, Legislative Files: 1980-1986, MS 100, John Joseph Moakley Archive, Suffolk University, Boston, MA.

⁶⁴ Letter to the Hon. Sidney R. Yates from Congressman John Joseph Moakley of April 30, 1987, Faneuil Hall/Old State House: FY 1988: Appropriations 1987-1989, Legislative Files: 1980-1986, MS 100, John Joseph Moakley Archive, Suffolk University, Boston, MA.

country and whose military museum is located on the top floor of Faneuil Hall, for their hard work, but acknowledged that the process was not over.⁶⁵

On May 3, 1988, Moakley wrote another letter to Rep. Yates. He asked him “to continue to provide the leadership and support which the Old State House and Faneuil Hall will need for their rehabilitation so that they can continue to be the prominent national historic shrines that they deserve to be.” With his letter Moakley enclosed revised funding requests for both sites, estimating that while planning funds had already been appropriated, \$5,280,000 was still needed for construction at the Old State House. He also gave a new amount for construction needs at Faneuil Hall, although his reasons for doing so are unclear, as over \$6 million had already been appropriated for the site in 1987. The new amount was actually less than the amount appropriated for construction.⁶⁶

Nonetheless, Moakley’s efforts were again successful. In 1989, Moakley was honored by the members of the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company for his efforts to acquire funding for Faneuil Hall and the Old State House. In his speech to accept the honor, Moakley noted that after a “lengthy hearing process” the previous year, he and Rep. Yates successfully secured \$12.1 million in appropriations for Faneuil Hall and the Old State House. (That figure combines the 1987 appropriations of \$6,355,000 for Faneuil Hall and \$500,000 for planning at the Old State House with the \$5,280,000 that Moakley cited as necessary for construction at the Old State House in his letter of May 3, 1988.) He anticipated that the restoration processes at both sites would begin shortly and not falter as they had in the past, expressing his confidence in the

⁶⁵ “Moakley Announces Major Funding Advances for Faneuil Hall and the Old State House,” Faneuil Hall/Old State House FY 1988: Appropriations 1987-1989, Legislative Files: 1980-1986, MS 100, John Joseph Moakley Archive, Suffolk University, Boston, MA.

⁶⁶ Letter to the Hon. Sidney R. Yates from Moakley of May 3, 1988, Faneuil Hall/Old State House: FY 1988: Appropriations 1987-1989, Legislative Files: 1980-1986, MS 100, John Joseph Moakley Archive, Suffolk University, Boston, MA.

National Park Service, which he had previously criticized for “dragging its feet” in relation to the two sites.⁶⁷

In September of 1990, Moakley spoke at Faneuil Hall in at a ceremony marking the beginning of the restoration process that he was so instrumental in initiating. He again thanked Rep. Yates for his untiring efforts. He also thanked an organization called the Faneuil Hall Restoration and Preservation Trust, which until this point had received little, if any, credit for its efforts.⁶⁸ Formed on April 18, 1985, the same day that Moakley gave his first testimony in Congress lobbying for Faneuil Hall and the Old State House, the group is a non-profit organization that became a trust following its initial meeting and intended to solicit funds from private corporations including Bank of Boston (now Bank of America) and Gillette to aid in the preservation of the site.⁶⁹ In his speech, Moakley noted that the Trust’s efforts had resulted in improved fire alarms, lighting, security, and handicapped accessibility, even before Moakley had gotten any appropriations for the site.⁷⁰ An article in *The Enterprise* announcing the restoration kick-off ceremony (which was also the kick-off for another fundraising campaign for Faneuil Hall called Rock the Cradle), noted that the Faneuil Hall Restoration and Preservation Trust had pledged to raise \$5 million to help maintain the site and supplement the nearly \$7 million that Moakley had helped secure from Congress.⁷¹ The restoration of Faneuil Hall officially began in 1990, as did that of the Old State House.

⁶⁷ Moakley, “Speech: Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company,” Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company Speech: February 20, 1989, Speeches: Non-Congressional, MS 100, John Joseph Moakley Archive, Suffolk University, Boston, MA.

⁶⁸ Moakley, “Speech: Faneuil Hall Preservation Trust,” Faneuil Hall Preservation Trust Speech: September 14, 1990, Speeches: Non-Congressional, MS 100, John Joseph Moakley Archive, Suffolk University, Boston, MA.

⁶⁹ “Faneuil Hall Restoration and Preservation Trust – Description,” Faneuil Hall Preservation Trust Speech: September 14, 1990, Speeches: Non-Congressional, MS 100, John Joseph Moakley Archive, Suffolk University, Boston, MA.

⁷⁰ Moakley, “Speech: Faneuil Hall Preservation Trust.”

⁷¹ “Faneuil Hall, Boston Landmark to be Renovated and Preserved,” *The Enterprise*, September 1, 1990.

The restoration plans for Faneuil Hall and the Old State House were made by Goody Clancy, an award-winning Boston-based architecture, preservation, and planning firm. Repairs and improvements were extensive at both sites. The Faneuil Hall project included restoration of the lighting system, improved accessibility, both new storm windows and the restoration of old windows, an improved sound system, and the preservation of historical stonework.⁷² The Old State House project included improved accessibility, interior restoration, a climate control system, the reinstallation of the building's historic clock, and the preservation and repair of brickwork.⁷³ The Old State House was closed from 1990 until 1992, when the restoration was completed.⁷⁴ Work on Faneuil Hall was completed around the same time.

Today Faneuil Hall and the Old State House are thriving as sites within the Boston National Historical Park and on the Freedom Trail. The thousands of visitors to the sites within the park and to the Trail each year testify to the significance of the sites, of which Moakley was very aware and about which he was very vocal. His speeches and testimony in Congress illustrate this, as do his tireless efforts to receive appropriations and ensure that the sites were handled in a timely manner. At the ceremony at which he was recognized by the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company in 1989, Moakley stated:

These two buildings stand for so much that is seared in our land and consciousness today, just as they did in 1673, in 1776, and in 1787. They symbolize the very nature and essence of our Republic and its form of government; the idea of compact, compromise, equality, and freedom...All of us have a collective responsibility to insure that these buildings and all that they embody live on...allowing unborn generations of Americans the experience of touching, feeling and experiencing their past...The miracle of freedom

⁷² "Faneuil Hall," Goody Clancy, http://www.gcassoc.com/html/proj_descr.asp?pageid=1222.

⁷³ "Old State House," Goody Clancy, http://www.gcassoc.com/html/proj_descry.asp?pageid=1223.

⁷⁴ "Old State House History," Bostonian Society, http://www.bostonhistory.org/old_state_hs_hist.php.

was conceived on this very spot. Our responsibility to those millions of Americans is to ensure that its birthplace continues to flourish.⁷⁵

These words summarize his reasons for working so hard for the preservation for the two buildings. Without Moakley's persistence and conviction, it is quite possible that Faneuil Hall and the Old State House would not have received adequate funding for repairs, and today would not even be accessible to the public. The two sites owe much of their current success to Moakley's efforts.

Moakley continued his funding efforts after the 1992 completion of the Faneuil Hall and Old State House projects, returning in 1994 to Dorchester Heights, the site whose inclusion in the BNHP he had supported through the 1970s. Nearly fifteen years after its designation as part of the BNHP, the site received a \$500,000 appropriation for the completion of its rehabilitation. A press release from the National Park Service dated October 13, 1994, indicated that Moakley announced the appropriation, and a later speech given by Moakley indicated that he was a driving force behind the efforts to secure the funding. That same year, the Dorchester Heights Association was formed to facilitate interactions between the South Boston community, as well as the city as a whole, and the National Park Service, regarding the revitalization of the Dorchester Heights Monument and the adjacent Thomas Park. The press release stated that Moakley attended a meeting of the association following the announcement of the appropriations. The addition of \$500,000 brought the total amount of improvement funds for Dorchester Heights and Thomas Park to \$4.8 million. The release also stated that construction would begin in the spring of 1995.⁷⁶

⁷⁵ Moakley, "Speech: Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company."

⁷⁶ "Dorchester Heights Rehabilitation Project Receives \$500,000 Congressional Appropriation," Press releases: 1994, Public Relations: Press Releases, MS 100, John Joseph Moakley Archive, Suffolk University, Boston, MA.

On June 19, 1995, Moakley gave a speech at Dorchester Heights announcing the commencement of the rehabilitation project, which was to begin that week (probably just in time for the aforementioned “spring of 1995” construction start to remain true in a literal sense). Moakley praised the National Park Service for its “diligen[ce] in safeguarding historic treasures wherever they find them,” as well as Rep. Sid Yates, who helped acquire the funding for the project.⁷⁷

Almost exactly two years later, on June 21, 1997, Moakley spoke again at Dorchester Heights, this time at its ribbon cutting ceremony. He again acknowledged the NPS for its significant contributions and effective use of the money appropriated for the Heights’ rehabilitation. He also thanked Ruth Rafael, who served as an intermediary between the NPS, the Dorchester Heights Association, and the neighborhood. While the weather during the restoration process, including the April Fools’ Day blizzard of 1995, did not cooperate and caused the project to take longer than was planned, Moakley poignantly pointed out that “if those colonists [of the Massachusetts Bay Colony] could send packing one of the mightiest armies [the British] on Earth just by building throughout the night, we certainly could restore their monument.”⁷⁸ Since 1997, Dorchester Heights and Thomas Park have thrived, attracting hundreds of thousands of visitors, with many thanks due to Congressman Moakley.

At the same time that he renewed his efforts on behalf of Dorchester Heights, Moakley began to push for funds for another Boston landmark, the Old South Meeting House. The structure was originally built in 1729 as a Puritan meeting house where both public meetings and religious services were held. It was the site for the 1773 meeting and debate, led by Samuel

⁷⁷ Moakley, “Speech: Dorchester Heights,” Dorchester Heights Speech: June 19, 1995, Speeches: Non-Congressional, MS 100, John Joseph Moakley Archive, Suffolk University, Boston, MA.

⁷⁸ Moakley, “Speech: Dorchester Heights Ribbon Cutting Ceremony,” Dorchester Heights Ribbon Cutting Ceremony: June 21, 1997, Speeches: Non-Congressional, MS 100, John Joseph Moakley Archive, Suffolk University, Boston, MA.

Adams and attended by more than five thousand men, which resulted in the Boston Tea Party. A group of the Meeting House's supporters established a museum there in 1877 (which is still operation today) when it faced demolition and raised enough money to keep it open. While it is no longer a church, Old South Meeting House still holds public meetings and welcomes tens of thousands of visitors to a year.⁷⁹ Its ability to do so can be partially attributed to Congressman Moakley.

On November 1, 1994, Moakley announced that he had helped secure \$3.7 million in appropriations for Old South Meeting House's restoration. This amount, combined with an appropriation from earlier that year, brought total restoration funds to \$7.1 million. In his announcement, Moakley referred to the difficulties in acquiring funds but noted that, as he had helped do with Faneuil Hall, the Old State House, Dorchester Heights, and Charlestown Navy Yard, he was able to convince the Subcommittee on Interior that Old South Meeting House is important not only to the City of Boston and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, but also to the nation as a whole. The Boston Tea Party was a significant act of rebellion against the British and paved the way for the Revolution, so the place where it was planned deserved to be preserved. While the Meeting House had been designated as a National Historic Landmark in 1960 and been a part of the Boston National Historical Park since 1976, it had not had any major rehabilitation in one hundred years.⁸⁰

Given the fact that a century had elapsed without any major work being done on the site, many repairs and updates were necessary. These included new utility systems, accessibility for the disabled, improved lighting and sound systems, a lower-level museum shop, a permanent

⁷⁹ "Old South Meeting House History," Old South Meeting House, <http://www.oldsouthmeetinghouse.org/history>.

⁸⁰ "Old South Meeting House Appropriations Announcement," Old South Meeting House Appropriations Announcement: November 1, 1994, Speeches: Non-Congressional, MS 100, John Joseph Moakley Archive, Suffolk University, Boston, MA.

exhibit, the creation of a usable basement for storage, offices, and an education room, as well as the preservation of the architecture itself.⁸¹ The National Park Service was responsible for this restoration project per the terms of an agreement that the NPS made with the Old South Association, the association established in 1877 by the citizens who kept the site from being demolished. According to the agreement, made in 1976 when the site joined the Boston National Historical Park, the NPS would be responsible “for the preservation, rehabilitation, and restoration of the Old South Meeting House,” but the Old South Association would continue “to own and manage the site.”⁸² Old South Meeting House closed and construction began in the fall of 1995. It reopened two years later.⁸³

On October 3, 1997, Moakley spoke at the re-opening of Old South Meeting House following the completion of the aforementioned repairs. He again mentioned his ability to convince the Subcommittee on Interior of the national significance of one of Boston’s historical sites and the necessity of preserving it. Referring to Old South Meeting House and the other sites on the Freedom Trail, Moakley stated, “I can think of few better tourist attractions than the sites that mark this country’s fight for independence.”⁸⁴ In an article in the *Boston Herald* on the day of the re-opening, Emily Curran, the executive director of the site commented that while much of the original wood from the interior of the building was destroyed by the British, “The building is amazing...the outside looks exactly as it did in 1729.” According to Curran, most of the

⁸¹ “National Parks Service News Release,” Old South Meeting House Appropriations Announcement: November 1, 1994, Speeches: Non-Congressional, MS 100, John Joseph Moakley Archive, Suffolk University, Boston, MA.

⁸² “Background on Old South Meeting House,” Old South Meeting House Appropriations Announcement: November 1, 1994, Speeches: Non-Congressional, MS 100, John Joseph Moakley Archive, Suffolk University, Boston, MA.

⁸³ Note to Moakley from Karin Walser (Congressman Moakley’s secretary), Old South Meeting House Appropriations Announcement: November 1, 1994, Speeches: Non-Congressional, MS 100, John Joseph Moakley Archive, Suffolk University, Boston, MA.

⁸⁴ Moakley, “Speech: Old South Meeting House Reopening,” Old South Meeting House Reopening Speech: September 30, 1997 [Speech date October 3, 1997], Speeches: Non-Congressional, MS 100, John Joseph Moakley Archive, Suffolk University, Boston, MA.

approximately 80,000 visitors to the site each year, who come from “all over the country, all over the world,” are drawn there because of its role in the Boston Tea Party.⁸⁵

In addition to the physical restoration of the building, the funding allowed for new exhibitions and guided tours, as well as weekend guides dressed as important historical figures, including Benjamin Franklin and Abigail Adams. Today the site offers advanced multimedia exhibits that are informative, interesting, and fun,⁸⁶ and continues to host meetings and other events such as, in December 2005 alone, a slideshow and lecture on shopping in Downtown Crossing, the Boston Tea Party Reenactment, and both vocal and instrumental concerts.⁸⁷ It is probable that Old South Meeting House’s repairs, programs, and events would not have been possible either at all or at least at the same level without Moakley’s commitment to the site and his push for not \$2 million or \$5 million but \$7 million to make the site’s restoration and revitalization into a reality.

A Return to His Preservation Roots: The Boston Harbor Islands National Recreation Area

Less than two years after his success in acquiring funds for the restoration of Old South Meeting House, Moakley’s preservation career returned to where it had begun nearly thirty years earlier: the Boston Harbor Islands. Beginning with his opposition to EXPO ’76, Moakley’s involvement had continued through the 1970s, was revived in 1995, and culminated in 1996 with the establishment of the Boston Harbor Islands National Recreation Site, which officially opened in June of 1997. While his opposition to the World’s Fair focused more on environmental issues

⁸⁵ Paul Sullivan, “What’s Old in New at Old South Meeting House,” *The Boston Herald*, October 3, 1997, <http://web.lexis-nexis.com.library.law.suffolk.edu/universe>.

⁸⁶ “Visitor Information,” Old South Meeting House, <http://www.oldsouthmeetinghouse.org/visitor>.

⁸⁷ “Calendar Information: December 2005,” Old South Meeting House, <http://www.oldsouthmeetinghouse.org/calendar/index.html#dec>.

than on historical issues, some of his later actions revealed that he recognized and wanted to preserve the historical significance of the Harbor Islands, as well.

In 1970, while he was still a state senator, Moakley introduced legislation to establish the Boston Harbor State Park, which Massachusetts enacted. Six years later, after he had become a congressman, he began to lobby for the creation of a Harbor Islands Recreation Area. In January of 1976, two years after he had successfully lobbied for the creation of the Boston National Historical Park, Moakley introduced a bill “to set up a Commission to study and make recommendations for the preservation and recreational development of the Boston coastal area, including the Harbor Islands.” In the press release announcing the introduction of the bill, Moakley asserted some of the reasons why the preservation of the Harbor Islands and the Boston coastline was necessary on a national level, which included the area’s “historical...heritage.” He felt that if the area was not protected, it would be overdeveloped and subsequently stripped of its natural beauty and historical significance. The passage of this bill began the process of the Harbor Islands becoming part of the National Park Service.⁸⁸

The bill provided for the creation of a commission “to study and make recommendations” for the Harbor Islands and the coastal area; Moakley introduced another bill in 1979 that was most likely based on the findings of that commission. This new bill provided for “a course of action” for the preservation and maintenance of the area and for increased funding to allow such a project to begin. It authorized the establishment of another commission, this one designed to create an actual plan for the project.⁸⁹

⁸⁸ “Moakley Introduces Bill to Make Harbor Islands a Recreation Area,” Press releases: January 1976, Public Relations: Press Releases, MS 100, John Joseph Moakley Archive, Suffolk University, Boston, MA.

⁸⁹ “Moakley Introduces Bill Establishing Boston Harbor Islands National Recreation Area,” Press releases: June 1979, Public Relations: Press Releases, MS 100, John Joseph Moakley Archive, Suffolk University, Boston, MA.

It is unclear what the immediate results of this bill were, because the Boston Harbor Islands National Recreation Area was not established until 1996. Moakley co-sponsored, along with Representatives from the other nine Massachusetts Congressional districts, a new bill that was first introduced by Rep. Gerry Studds, of Massachusetts' tenth congressional district, which included part of the Boston Harbor coastline.⁹⁰ Moakley testified in support of it in April of 1996 before the Senate Subcommittee on Parks, Historic Preservation, and Recreation, referring to his legislation that was enacted to create the Boston Harbor State Park and to the later legislation that he introduced with Senator Edward Kennedy to create the Boston Harbor Islands National Recreation Area. He then noted that "unfortunately, the Islands have not been used to their full potential for a number of reasons. They are not easily accessible to Bostonians, the cost of developing a recreational center is prohibitive, and the 31 islands are owned by 8 different entities."⁹¹

It is possible that a combination of factors present during the period from 1979 to 1996, including the deplorable condition of Boston Harbor and the numerous preservation issues involving "mainland" Boston, stalled efforts to establish the Harbor Islands as a national park. Historically, the Harbor had been polluted by sewage due to insufficient water treatment systems, and it is possible that Congress did not see the value in establishing a national park in an area that was so heavily polluted, especially not during a time of reduced NPS funding, since a dirty harbor is not a tourist draw. Following a series of lawsuits against the Metropolitan District Commission, its successor the Massachusetts Water Resources Authority, and the

⁹⁰ The Library of Congress, "H.R. 2763," <http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/z?d104:HR02763:@@L&summ2=m&>.

⁹¹ "Remarks by Joe Moakley, April 17, 1996, before the Senate Subcommittee on Parks, Historic Preservation, and Recreation," Speeches: Non-Congressional, MS 100, John Joseph Moakley Archive, Suffolk University, Boston, MA.

Environmental Protection Agency that asserted that the Harbor was unnecessarily dirty and unhealthy, the MWRA took steps, albeit slow steps, to “clean up” the Harbor (a project that Moakley helped facilitate). By 1995, sewage emissions into the Harbor had ended and a new water treatment plant had opened on Deer Island.⁹²

It was also during the 1980s that Moakley began his work with the BNHP. It is possible that Moakley chose to focus on working with the BNHP rather than on designating the Harbor Islands as a national park because the BNHP was already established as a part of the NPS. His efforts to acquire appropriations, therefore, were based on sites that Congress had already decided were deserving of federal funding rather than on the creation of an entirely new national park. (The Harbor Islands were a state park at the time, so they were being managed at least to some extent.) Since the NPS was already facing budget cuts by the Reagan administration during this time, trying to establish a new park while also trying to get funding for the various BNHP sites that were in desperate need of repair would have been a very daunting task. By 1995, however, the Old State House and Faneuil Hall projects, which took up much of Moakley’s time and the NPS’s money during the late 1980s and early 1990s, had both been completed, and he had just succeeded in acquiring funding for Old South Meeting House.

The legislation that Moakley introduced in 1995 for the establishment of the Boston Harbor Islands National Recreation Area came right around the time that the Deer Island water treatment facilities began operating and right after the completion of the Old State House and Faneuil Hall projects and the appropriation of funds for Old South Meeting House. This series of events is a likely indicator that the Harbor Cleanup and the completion of those major preservation projects provided Moakley and the legislation’s co-sponsors with the impetus to

⁹² Enrique Alonso and Ana Recane, *The Boston Harbor Project*, http://www.iuien-uah.net/es/imagenes/pdf_fot/Boston%20Harbor%20Project%20Case%20Study.pdf.

move forward with their efforts to establish the Harbor Islands as a national park. Even though the previous legislation had been dormant for over fifteen years, its provisions had not lost their relevance. It was at this point that Moakley revived his assertion that the Harbor Islands needed to be protected on a federal level in order for the public to benefit from their natural resources, as well as from their historical significance.

In his testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Parks, Historic Preservation, and Recreation in April of 1996, the first reason that Moakley gave for the creation of a National Recreation Area was that “the Boston Harbor Islands are home to two National Historic Landmarks,” Boston Light, the nation’s oldest operational lighthouse, on Little Brewster Island, and Fort Warren, which served as a Confederate prison during the Civil War, on George’s Island. The fact that Moakley mentioned these two historic sites at the outset of his testimony indicates that he thought that the Harbor Islands’ historical significance was just as important as their natural significance, even though their natural beauty is more widespread than their historical structures. He also referenced the author Edward Rowe Snow, who noted that Edgar Allan Poe was stationed at Fort Independence on Castle Island, and events that he experienced there inspired his story, “The Cask of Amontillado.” (As a frequent visitor to Castle Island and a member of the Castle Island Association, Moakley was undoubtedly very familiar with this story about Poe, as most residents of South Boston would have been, as well.) Moakley went on to describe the Islands’ natural beauty, including their glacier-formed terrain and the abundance of wildlife.⁹³

The bill, known as S. 1476 in the Senate and H.R. 2763 in the House of Representatives, was passed in 1996 and officially established the Boston Harbor Islands National Recreation

⁹³ “Remarks by Joe Moakley, April 17, 1996, before the Senate Subcommittee on Parks, Historic Preservation, and Recreation.”

Area (which is also sometimes called the Boston Harbor Islands National Park). According to the provisions of the bill, the park would be managed by representatives from the National Park Service and twelve other entities, including the United States Coast Guard, the City of Boston Office of Environmental Services, and the Massachusetts Water Resources Authority. The bill provided for the preservation of the area “for public use and enjoyment,” as well as for improved transportation systems to allow visitors easier access to the Islands. Another provision of the bill was that the National Park Service would “provide education and visitor information programs to increase public understanding of and appreciation for the natural and cultural resources of the Boston Harbor Islands.” The park would receive funding on the basis of a three to one non-federal to federal funding ration.⁹⁴ In his testimony, Moakley used this provision as an indication that “truly, the people of Massachusetts are committed and willing to do what it takes to preserve the natural beauty of the Islands for everyone to enjoy.”⁹⁵

On June 29, 1997, Moakley spoke at the opening of the new Boston Harbor Islands National Recreation Area, referring as he had in previous speeches and testimonies to his childhood experiences in South Boston, looking out into Boston Harbor and wishing that he could go to the Harbor Islands, but knowing that they were unreachable without his own boat. He expressed his pleasure that “today and from now on, thanks to this new delegation and a model public/private partnership, children and families from all over the country will be able to visit the islands and explore just as we [he and other children who had no way of getting to the islands] always dreamed of doing.”⁹⁶ A *Patriot Ledger* article about the opening ceremony

⁹⁴ “National Park Service Briefing Statement: Boston Harbor Islands National Recreation Area,” Department of the Interior, <http://www.nps.gov/boha/parlpress/02press13.html>.

⁹⁵ “Remarks by Joe Moakley, April 17, 1996, before the Senate Subcommittee on Parks, Historic Preservation, and Recreation,”

⁹⁶ Moakley, “Speech: Boston Harbor Islands National Park Opening,” Boston Harbor Islands National Park Opening Speech: June 29, 1997, Speeches, Non-Congressional, MS 100, John Joseph Moakley Archive, Suffolk University, Boston, MA.

echoed Moakley's feelings with the words of some visitors, who called the Harbor Islands "beautiful," "wonderful," and "a treasure."⁹⁷ The Harbor Islands truly are a treasure, and without Moakley's efforts, which spanned nearly twenty years, in support of their preservation, it is quite possible that they would not be the easily accessible, family-oriented natural and cultural resource that they are today.

A Final Funding Effort for BOAF

By the time of the opening of the Boston Harbor Islands National Recreation in 1997, historical preservation career had come full circle. It began in 1969 with his opposition to EXPO '76 on the Boston waterfront, continued through the 1970s, '80s, and early '90s with the creation of and funding for the BNHP and BOAF, and returned in 1996 to the Harbor Islands with the establishment of the Boston Harbor Islands National Recreation Area. Despite the figurative completion of this cycle, his work with historical preservation continued in the late 1990s, when his efforts returned to the Boston African American National Historical Site. In 1998, the Museum of Afro-American History began a capital campaign to raise money for repair and restoration projects at the Abiel Smith School and the African Meeting House. In a speech that he gave at the campaign's kick-off celebration, Moakley noted that he was able to secure one million dollars to begin the renovation project of the Smith School.⁹⁸ In 1999, he and Sen. Kennedy were able to get \$1.4 million for the completion of the renovations at the African Meeting House that had begun in the 1980s.⁹⁹ In February of 2000, the Abiel Smith School opened to the public after extensive repairs, with Moakley as the keynote speaker at the opening

⁹⁷ Brendan Farrington, "Harbor Islands Gain National Park Status," *The Patriot Ledger*, June 30, 1997, <http://0-web.lexis-nexis.com.library.law.Suffolk.edu/universe>.

⁹⁸ Moakley, "Speech: Museum of African History's Capital Campaign," Speeches: Non-Congressional, MS 100, John Joseph Moakley Archive, Suffolk University; Boston, MA.

⁹⁹ Peter Steele, "In Memoriam: Congressman John Joseph Moakley," *The Broadside*, no. 2 and 3, 1-2.

celebration. Today, work on the African Meeting House is nearly finished, slated for completion in 2006.¹⁰⁰ The completion of this project will mark the completion of the last segment of Moakley's contributions to historical preservation in Boston.

Good Work Does Not Go Unnoticed

In the 1990s, the historical preservation community in Boston began to realize the impact of Moakley's efforts. All of the sites for which he lobbied in Congress recognized him, in one way or another, for his contributions. On January 18th, 1994, Moakley was awarded the Charles Francis Adams Award for Public Service by the U.S.S. *Constitution* Museum for his service to the City of Boston, both in general and specifically for the Charlestown Navy Yard and the *Constitution*. As was true at the 1979 celebration for the 25th anniversary of the *Constitution*'s permanent mooring in Boston, in his acceptance speech Moakley again praised the effort of one of his colleagues, this time Representative and House Speaker Tip O'Neill, who had passed away just weeks before the awards ceremony. He credited Speaker O'Neill for getting him involved in the work going on at the *Constitution* Museum and lauded his "tireless campaign for funding through the House Appropriations Committee." Much credit is certainly due Speaker O'Neill, as well as Congressman John McCormack, but Moakley modestly downplays his own efforts. He deserves much credit as well for his support of the legislation which ultimately became the laws that ensured the preservation of Charlestown Navy Yard and the U.S.S. *Constitution*.¹⁰¹

¹⁰⁰ "Remarks of Congressman Joe Moakley: Abiel Smith School Grand Opening," Abiel Smith School Opening: February 2000, Speeches: Non-Congressional, MS 100, John Joseph Moakley Archive, Suffolk University; Boston, MA.

¹⁰¹ Moakley, "Acceptance Speech: Charles Francis Adams Award for Public Service," U.S.S. *Constitution* Adams Award Acceptance Speech: January 18, 1994, Speeches: Non-Congressional, MS 100, John Joseph Moakley Archive, Suffolk University, Boston, MA.

On May 29, 1998, Moakley was honored with a plaque dedicated to him at Faneuil Hall. His remarks at this celebration of his contributions to historical preservation in Boston summarized his commitment to the city, the necessity he saw in preserving its history, and his hopes for the city's future. He referred to the "fifty million dollars I was able to secure for the renovation of Faneuil Hall, the Old South Meeting House, the Old State House, the African Meeting House, Dorchester Heights, and Boston's Freedom Trail." He also noted that Boston's historical sites and the Harbor Islands bring thousands of tourists to the city each year, "and that means jobs for our citizens, and revenue for our city."¹⁰²

In October of 2000, Moakley was honored by the Island Alliance,¹⁰³ an organization designed to ensure for the Boston Harbor Islands National Recreation Area "a legacy of greater use, enhancement, and enjoyment for all."¹⁰⁴ This recognition is very appropriate, given that Moakley's efforts for the Harbor Islands embodied the Island Alliance's mission. Two months later, he was recognized by the Boston History Collaborative, which "advances the prosperity of the Boston region by helping to sustain its culture of innovation."¹⁰⁵ While in his acceptance speech for the honor Moakley recognized all of those "who have worked so passionately, and continue to do so in promoting and enriching the unique treasures that make Boston, its harbor, and its islands some of the world's greatest treasures,"¹⁰⁶ his words truly apply to himself and the thirty years that he devoted to the preservation of the city that he called home.

¹⁰² "Remarks of Congressman Joe Moakley: Faneuil Hall Plaque Dedication," Historic Preservation Remarks at Faneuil Hall: May 29, 1998, Speeches: Non-Congressional, MS 100, John Joseph Moakley Archive, Suffolk University, Boston, MA.

¹⁰³ "Boston Harbor Islands Partnership Thirty-first Meeting Minutes," Boston Harbor Islands, http://www.bostonislands.org/meetings/meetings_minutes/partner/00ptr0316.pdf.

¹⁰⁴ "Our Mission," The Island Alliance, <http://www.islandalliance.org>.

¹⁰⁵ "Boston History Collaborative," <http://www.bostonhistorycollaborative.org>.

¹⁰⁶ Moakley, "Remarks: Boston History Collaborative," Boston History Collaborative Remarks: December 4, 2000, Speeches: Non-Congressional, MS 100, John Joseph Moakley Archive, Suffolk University, Boston, MA.

The End of an Era

In the midst of his work with the Old South Meeting House, Dorchester Heights, and the establishment of the Boston Harbor Islands National Recreation Area, Moakley underwent a liver transplant.¹⁰⁷ Fred Clark, Moakley's former district director, indicates that at the reopening of Dorchester Heights in 1995, Moakley was very ill, but spoke anyway.¹⁰⁸ His health continued to deteriorate throughout the late 1990s after he was diagnosed with leukemia, yet he continued to work seemingly tirelessly, specifically for the Abiel Smith School and the African Meeting House. In 2001, however, Moakley was unable to continue his battle with leukemia; he passed away on May 28 at the age of 74.¹⁰⁹

Congressman John Joseph Moakley loved the City of Boston. At the time of his death, he still resided in South Boston, not far from where he spent his childhood. Despite the fact that he came from modest means, he did not shy away from the typically "elitist" field of historical preservation. Instead, he embraced it as a way to preserve and improve the city that he loved so much. Even though his political career encompassed a wide range of issues, his efforts on behalf of Boston's historical landmarks stand out because historical preservation was largely ignored by politicians in Boston until he was elected to Congress. Yet during his political career, Moakley led the efforts to establish three new National Parks in Boston: the Boston National Historical Park, the Boston African American National Historic Site, and the Boston Harbor Islands National Recreation Area, all of which encompass sites that are significant in Boston's history. As he noted in many of his speeches at various events, during his nearly thirty years as a congressman, he was able to secure, with the support of other members of Congress, \$50 million

¹⁰⁷ Biographical information from "About Congressman Joe Moakley: Congressional Years 1973-2001," Moakley Archive and Institute, <http://www.joemoakley.org/life3.cfm>.

¹⁰⁸ Fred Clark (Moakley's former district director), interview by Laura Muller, October 6, 2005, compact disc, in possession of Laura Muller.

¹⁰⁹ "About Congressman Joe Moakley: Congressional Years 1973-2001."

for historical preservation in Boston. These efforts are unmatched by any other single person in Boston's history, and he did not make them hoping to pick up some votes; he worked hard for the city because he loved the city and appreciated its legacy as the "cradle of democracy."

Through his efforts, Moakley hoped to preserve Boston's history for future generations to experience, appreciate, and enjoy, and he succeeded in doing so. Although he is no longer with us, his legacy will endure through the landmarks that he helped preserve, and he himself will become a unique and valuable part of the richness of Boston's history.