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1. Name of Property
   historic name  William Hall Walker Gymnasium
   other names/site number

2. Location
   street & number  Sixth Street at Fieldhouse Road, Castle Point on Hudson
   city or town  City of Hoboken
   state  New Jersey  code 034  county Hudson  code 017  zip code 07030

3. State/Federal Agency Certification
   As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended, I certify that this nomination request for determination of eligibility meets the documentation standards for registering properties in the National Register of Historic Places and meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60. In my opinion, the property meets X does not meet the National Register criteria. I recommend that this property be considered significant nationally  statewide  locally. See continuation sheet for additional comments.

   Signature of certifying official/Title
   Date

   State or Federal agency and bureau

   In my opinion, the property  meets  does not meet the National Register criteria. See continuation sheet for additional comments.

   Signature of certifying official/Title
   Date

   State or Federal agency and bureau

4. National Park Service Certification
   I hereby certify that this property is: entered in the National Register.
   X determined eligible for the National Register.
   determined not eligible for the National Register.
   removed from the National Register.
   other, (explain:)

   Signature of the Keeper
   Date of Action

   See continuation sheet.
William Hall Walker Gymnasium
Name of Property

Hudson County, New Jersey
County and State

5. Classification

Ownership of Property
(Check as many boxes as apply)

- [x] private
- [ ] public-local
- [ ] public-State
- [ ] public-Federal

Category of Property
(Check only one box)

- [x] building(s)
- [ ] district
- [ ] site
- [ ] structure
- [ ] object

Number of Resources within Property
(Do not include previously listed resources in the count.)

Contributing
Noncontributing

1 buildings
0 sites
0 structures
0 objects
1 Total

Name of related multiple property listing
(Enter “N/A” if property is not part of a multiple property listing.)

N/A

Number of contributing resources previously listed in the National Register
0

6. Function or Use

Historic Functions
(Enter categories from instructions)

- Education
- Recreation/Culture

Current Functions
(Enter categories from instructions)

- Education
- Recreation/Culture

7. Description

Architectural Classification
(Enter categories from instructions)

- Classical Revival

Materials
(Enter categories from instructions)

- foundation
- Brick
- walls
- Brick
- roof
- Slate
- other
- Terra Cotta

Narrative Description
(Describe the historic and current condition of the property on one or more continuation sheets.)

See attached.
### 8 Statement of Significance

**Applicable National Register Criteria**
(Mark "x" in one or more boxes for the criteria qualifying the property for National Register listing.)

- [ ] A Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.
- [ ] B Property is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.
- [x] C Property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction.
- [ ] D Property has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

**Criteria considerations**
(mark "x" in all the boxes that apply.)

Property is:
- [ ] A owned by a religious institution or used for religious purposes.
- [ ] B removed from its original location.
- [ ] C a birthplace or grave.
- [ ] D a cemetery.
- [ ] E a reconstructed building, object or structure.
- [ ] F a commemorative property.
- [ ] G less than 50 years of age or achieved significance within the past 50 years.

**Period of Significance**
1916

**Significant Dates**
1916

**Significant Person**
(Complete if Criterion B is marked above)

- [ ] A owned by a religious institution or used for religious purposes.

**Cultural Affiliation**
N/A

**Architect/Builder**
Ludlow and Peabody, Architect
Whitney Company, Builders

**Narrative Statement of Significance**
(Explain the significance of the property on one or more continuation sheets.)

### 9. Major Bibliographical References

**Bibliography**
(cite the books, articles, and other sources used in preparing this form on one or more continuation sheets.)

**Previous documentation on file (NPS):**
- [ ] preliminary determination of individual listing (36 CFR 67) has been requested
- [ ] previously listed in the National Register
- [ ] previously determined eligible by the National Register
- [ ] designated a National Historic Landmark
- [ ] recorded by Historic American Buildings Survey
  - [ ] #
- [ ] recorded by Historic American Engineering Record
  - [ ] #

**Primary location of additional data**
- [ ] State Historic Preservation Office
- [ ] Other State agency
- [ ] Federal agency
- [ ] Local government
- [x] University
- [ ] Other

**Name of repository:**
Stevens Institute of Technology, Archives
10. Geographical Data

Acreage of property  Approximately . 6 acres

Latitude/Longitude Coordinates
(Follow similar guidelines for entering these coordinates as for entering UTM references described on page 55, How to Complete the National Register Registration Form. For properties less than 10 acres, enter the lat/long coordinates for a point corresponding to the center of the property. For properties of 10 or more acres, enter three or more points that correspond to the vertices of a polygon drawn on the map. The polygon should approximately encompass the area to be registered. Add additional points below, if necessary.)

Datum: WGS 84
1. Latitude: 40.743765   Longitude: -74.205932
2. Latitude: 40.743884   Longitude: -74.025673
3. Latitude: 40.743671   Longitude: -74.025685
4. Latitude: 40.743208   Longitude: -74.026175

Verbal Boundary Description
(Describe the boundaries of the property on a continuation sheet.)

Boundary Justification
(Explain why the boundaries were selected on a continuation sheet.)

11. Form Prepared By

name/title  Meredith Arms Bzdak, PhD (Partner) and Michael J. Mills, FAIA (Partner)
organization  Mills + Schnoering Architects, LLC
date  August 2018
street & number  200 Forrestal Road, Suite 3A
telephone  609.681.2480

Additional Documentation
Submit the following items with the completed form:
Continuation Sheets
Maps...
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Additional items...
(Check with the SHPO or FPO for any additional items)

Property Owner
(Complete this item at the request of the SHPO or FPO.)

name  
street & number  
telephone  
city or town  state  zip code  
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Summary Paragraph

The William Hall Walker Gymnasium was one of the earliest athletic facilities built on the campus of Stevens Institute of Technology (Hoboken, NJ). This college gymnasium was designed by architects Ludlow and Peabody of New York City and constructed in 1915-1916. It is a carefully sited and well detailed architectural resource on the university campus. Its principal facade faces south and is framed by the historic Stevens Estate gates at Sixth Street. The main volume of the gymnasium inscribes a continuous curve that reflects the interior geometry of the oval running track. This form is fronted by a rectilinear, projecting temple façade that serves as the main entrance to the gymnasium. The building exhibits a Beaux-Arts formalism, reflecting the training of its architect; symmetrical architectural elements; and Classical Revival detailing. The design is an adaptation of the Italianate style and appears to be an amalgam of Roman temple forms and Roman bath architecture. Its ellipsoid form distinguishes it from the earlier, rectilinear buildings that had defined the campus until the time of its construction. The building has been carefully maintained over the last hundred years while being fully utilized for its original purpose, and with the exception of some reprogramming of interior spaces, retains a high degree of architectural integrity.

Narrative Description

Walker Gymnasium was constructed in accordance with a campus plan by Ludlow and Peabody to create a visual axis that rises from the gates at Sixth Street to the front façade of the building (See Photo1 and Figure 11). The building is flanked at the east by the pedestrian walkway known as Wittpenn Walk (Photo 1). Because the Walk follows the line of the escarpment that overlooks the Hudson River, a green space known as Walker Lawn is formed in front of the building. The green space is defined by Wittpenn Walk on the east, an east-west driveway below the forecourt of the building on the north, and a north-south driveway on the west that returns to the Sixth Street gates. Walker Lawn was originally landscaped with a few small trees and little else but is now edged with small granite blocks (added sometime before 1952), bordered with more mature trees, and defined by low plantings on its perimeter (Photo 1). The gently curved, almost triangular, shape of Walker Lawn and the open space at its center have been consistent over time. The perimeter of the building, as well as the narrow grassy strip in front of the entrance, is landscaped with low shrubs and seasonal flowering plants.

Historic Description

A description of the building published in November 1916 shortly after construction offers information on the original appearance of the building (primarily the interior) and how the space was utilized:

The exterior is of variegated deep-toned red brick with raked-out joints. The trim is of limestone and terra cotta and the roof is of green shingle tile.
The first floor contains the general locker room, the team locker room, the faculty locker room, the trophy room, washrooms and coat rooms, the supervision room where towels and other supplies may be obtained, the administration office and a large practice room, which will ordinarily be divided by means of folding partitions into three rooms, any one of which is capable of being used as a gym class room, though in all probability one of the sections will be reserved for boxing and fencing or some similar minor sport practice. With all partitions down the space, then about one hundred and ten by fifty with a twelve foot ceiling, may be used for baseball battery practice, football formation work, jumping and the like.

The second or main gymnasium floor is the full size of the ellipse and will be used for basketball, lacrosse practice, etc. The height of the gymnasium room to the underside of the roof trusses is 27 feet 6 inches and to the roof at the ridge 38 feet.

The running track which forms a gallery around the main gym floor is ten feet in width and has the usual concave contour and is covered with a cork carpet. The great width allows runners to pass each other freely and provides ample gallery for the spectators. Windows range along the greater part of the track and as the oval wall conforms to its shape, the usual dead corners are eliminated, making the track unusually attractive to the runner. It is claimed by some experts that the psychological effect of the aspect of any track makes or mars its popularity and consequently the extent of its use. Thus the conformity of the walls of the building to the shape of the track should make it unusually popular.

Besides the light obtained from the track windows already noted, the gymnasium floor and running track receive light also from a forty-foot ventilating oval skylight, thus allowing as near as possible all work to be done in natural light.

It is planned that the exercise room on the first floor will take care of all but the largest classes in gymnastics, and setting up exercises, etc., thus leaving the gymnasium floor proper available for more strictly athletic purposes. This room will also be available for dances and other gatherings too large to be accommodated at Castle Stevens.

In order to give maximum ventilation, most of the partitions in the first story are of wire grill work from a point six feet high to the ceiling. Artificial ventilation is also obtained in all the locker rooms, toilet and shower rooms by a system of exhaust ducts operated by a fan discharging above the roof.

The main entrance lobby is two stories in height and, with its band vaulted ceiling and walls lined with cases for the display of cups, prizes, and trophies, provides an interesting entrance to the visitor.

One of the most popular features of the building is the swimming pool. It is built at the south front of the building, the roof of which would form a terrace or little plaza. Direct sunlight will fall into the water of the pool and give not only a sun-flooded room but will do much to insure the best sanitary conditions.

The pool is standard length for swimming events – sixty feet – lined with mosaic tile, and will have the usual spring board, flying rings, and varying water depth to provide for deep diving and also for non-swimmers.
The top of the pool life rail forms the top rim of a tile gutter which constantly carries away the surface water and any impurities collecting on it. Tile numerals along the edge give the depth of the water above the sloping bottom and other similar numerals, the number of yards from the pool end. Dark tile lines along the bottom divide the pool longitudinally into swimming lanes.

One of the most important, yet often neglected provisions, is for an avoidance of a crossing of the trails of wet and dry feet going to and from the locker rooms to the pool and back. This is adequately taken care of by special stairways leading direct from each locker room through the shower room to the pool, thus, by the way, making neglect of the necessary shower bath difficult. A separate visitors stairway is also part of the plan. The pool water is thoroughly sterilized by being passed through a hypochloride of calcium chamber and then through a series of filters. For washing and sterilizing of garments, a laundry is placed in the basement which is reached direct from the locker rooms by a dumbwaiter.¹

Current Appearance

The three-story gymnasium is constructed of red brick, framed with steel, and sits on a raised plinth and basement of rusticated brick (Photos 1-3). The brick is laid in a decorative Flemish bond pattern (Photo 4). The building’s ellipsoid form has curved brick ends to the east and west. It is capped by a high, hipped roof also with curved extensions covering the brick walls with a central oval skylight that brings daylight into the principal gymnasium space.

The south facade consists of a projecting rectangular element that features a large, multi-story arched window over the entrance articulated by alternating bands of molded and soldier courses of brick (Photos 3 and 4). The paired entrance doors are reached by a set of monumental stone steps giving access from grade to a raised forecourt over the rusticated basement (Photos 2 and 3). The terraced area is enclosed by corner piers and a decorative brick balustrade made up of recessed and projecting headers that form balusters. The piers next to the stairs originally supported torchere light fixtures which are now missing (Photo 2).

The rusticated basement walls are pierced by six windows on the south, three to each side of the monumental steps, and are headed by segmental arches. The forecourt terrace originally contained two skylights that brought in light to a swimming pool at the basement level, neither of which are extant. It now consists of simple concrete tile pavers over a flat roof (Photos 2 and 3). The upper seven steps to the terrace are flagstone with granite risers enclosed with low brick walls. The lower three steps are of solid granite construction down to grade. The paneled wood entrance doors were originally flanked by paired iron sconces. There are now two replacement sconces with globes, one on each side of the entrance (Photo 3). The door panels themselves have been replaced by glass which brings additional light into the entry hall, which is also a trophy room.

Narrow, vertical windows on either side of the monumental arched window give natural light to the landings of stairways behind them (Photos 4 and 5). A long, rectangular terra cotta panel over the arch runs the length of the central entrance bay and is inscribed with the name "William Hall Walker Gymnasium" and bordered by stylized shields with inset red terra cotta highlights (Photos 4 and 5). The panel is framed between square shields with inscribed circles containing the initials "SI" for Stevens Institute (Photo 5).

The rectilinear central entrance is flanked by projecting antae that frame the composition. The second level of each has tall openings that originally contained French doors with transoms and projecting terra cotta balustrades that are now missing (Photo 5). The openings now contain double hung windows with infill wood panels below. The third level has small windows bordered by terra cotta ornament with red highlights on each side. The entire entrance element is capped by a heavy, projecting cornice with modillions and dentils (Photo 5). A brick parapet above the cornice is articulated by a red terra cotta coping and inset tiles on the end bays.

The ellipsoid volume of the main structure to the north of the entrance pavilion is not as highly ornamented as the classical front (Photos 6-10). The roof terminates at a lower elevation than the front section with a broad overhang supported by carved wooden outriggers. The roof consists of slate tiles. Like the front, the brick walls are laid in Flemish bond with alternating headers and stretchers. The walls are organized into large panels framed by triple headers on the top, bottom, and sides. The base consists of rusticated brick up to a brown stone stringcourse. It contains a series of monumental, double hung windows that give light to the spaces of the first floor. The continuous string course is broken at each window to form label lintels. As the grade rises at the north wall of the building, these windows are accommodated within a concrete areaway that forms a retaining wall (Photos 6 and 7). This wall defines an on-grade ramp up to double doors covered by a bracketed hood; the doors are centrally located on the north wall and give direct access to the gymnasium floor at the second level (Photo 7).

The brick walls rise to a brick trimmed band below the eaves that contains high, clerestory casement windows separated by terra cotta panels (Photo 8). This band is articulated at its base by the triple course of brick headers. These windows afford natural light and views directly to the running track that is hung from the roof trusses and forms a mezzanine level within the gymnasium. Also at this level were decorative metal leader heads that collected water from the hung gutter at the roof edge, but only one of which remains. The other leaders are piped directly from the gutter to interior leaders.

Most of the significant interior spaces of Walker Gymnasium, such as the main entrance hall/trophy room and the gymnasium space itself, have retained a high degree of architectural integrity. Some of the support spaces have been modernized several times and updated, including locker room facilities, offices, and storage (Photos 11-17). A large Recruiting Lounge has been added directly behind the Trophy Room with new wood finishes and comfortable furniture. Some renovation was completed in 1993, coincidental with the construction of the adjacent Charles V. Schaefer, Jr. Athletic and Recreation Center, with a more substantial $4 million modernization project occurring in 2004.
In spite of these changes, the interior retains a great deal of its original architectural fabric and integrity. Some of the intact, key features that contribute to its integrity are:

- The double height Trophy Room/Entrance Hall with its vaulted plaster ceiling (Photos 11 and 12)
- The wood exhibit cases and architectural trim in the Trophy Room including door and window enframements (Photo 11)
- The main space and walls of the gymnasium including brick and beaded board walls, and the built-in recesses for cast iron roof drainage pipes (Photos 14-16)
- The exposed steel roof structure and trusses that create a column free volume for the gymnasium (Photos 14-16)
- The banked running track on a hung mezzanine level (Photos 14 and 15)
- The glass skylight at the peak of the roof (Photos 14 and 16)
- The continuous band of clerestory windows articulated by grey and beige brick that form label lintels (Photo 14)

Several features have been sensitively updated to meet current Codes and use requirements. The original stairs have been at least partially rebuilt and replaced to become proper exits from the building. The design at the upper levels appears to be the same as the historical design. While the stairs no longer exit into the Trophy Room, the curved marble stairs within the room have been kept and the door openings to the stairwells have been infilled with plaster (Photo 11). Within the gymnasium, new exposed air conditioning ducts have been added that are hung from the original structure and encircle the space in a symmetrical way. The ductwork and the new lights, which are similar to the historic fixtures, maintain the industrial aesthetic of the space and are fully compatible with it.

The most significant alteration to the interior was the removal of the original swimming pool below the raised terrace to the front entrance. A photograph of the pool was published in the April 18, 1917 article in *The American Architect*. The pool was filled in during a renovation project in 1993 by the New York firm of The Eggers Group, and a new strength and conditioning center was developed within the space (Photo 17). The removal of the pool filtration equipment afforded additional area for program functions within the building, including the uses mentioned above. The original finishes with partitions having wire grill work for ventilation have been replaced with painted concrete block and hung ceilings with new lighting. HVAC, electrical, plumbing, and fire protection systems have all been upgraded and are state-of-the-art. The renovation was prompted by the completion of the Charles V. Schaefer Athletic and Recreation Center to the north of Walker Gymnasium. The new Schaefer Center became the principal athletic facility on the campus, with Walker Gymnasium, linked to the new building via an underground tunnel, serving as an adjunct recreational facility.
Summary Paragraph
The William Hall Walker Gymnasium at Stevens Institute of Technology (Hoboken, NJ) was designed by architects Ludlow and Peabody of New York City and constructed in 1915-1916. The College prioritized the construction of the gymnasium over new engineering laboratories, which reflected the increasing significance of physical education within an educational setting, but also the rise of competitive collegiate athletics and the associative need to prepare and safeguard students through improved physical fitness. Its distinctive, elliptical form, which was driven by site conditions and plan considerations, distinguished it from the earlier, strictly rectangular-plan buildings that defined the campus. The elliptical form was not only novel within the context of Stevens Institute; it was also an uncommon shape for gymnasia of the time. Walker Gymnasium, as well as its immediate setting and context, has been minimally altered over the last hundred years. The building is in excellent physical condition and retains a high degree of architectural integrity, with modest programmatic changes on the interior. It meets Criterion C with local significance as an excellent example of an early 20th century college gymnasium.

Planning and Construction
Charles Klauder and Herbert Wise, writing in the 1929 publication College Architecture in America and its Part in the Development of the Campus began their chapter on Structures for Athletics by summarizing:

The activities carried on in a complete gymnasium building are more varied than those of any other structure of the college or university group. The gymnasium is for both work and play, for students and faculty, often also for both sexes; and it must be hospitable to the visiting public, whether as individuals or in great numbers...Furthermore, the gymnasium is at many institutions the largest covered floor space, and as such is hospitable at times to concerts, pageants, student gatherings and dances.¹

Without a doubt, the construction of the Walker Gymnasium at Stevens would fit this description, and would, for the first time in the institution’s nearly 50 year history, expand the campus and thus the college physically, philosophically, and pedagogically. The students recognized the importance of this shift, reporting in their own news publication, The Stute, upon the building’s completion, “Stevens is now a real college, for we have a real place for college dances.”²

Stevens Institute of Technology was founded in 1870.³ The school’s first building, constructed in that year and now known as Edwin A. Stevens Hall, was designed in the High Victorian Gothic style by well-known New York architect RM Upjohn. The growth and development of the campus over the first thirty years of its existence was slow and, to a certain extent, carried out with minimal strategic planning. Edwin A. Stevens Hall housed all campus functions until the construction of a second building, the Carnegie Mechanical Laboratory, to the north of and behind Edwin A. Stevens Hall on Hudson Street in 1902.

The University’s second president, Alexander C. Humphreys, who served from 1902-1927, envisioned and worked toward an expanded campus that incorporated portions of the adjacent, historic Stevens estate, which had been divided into five parcels in 1899. This vision was supported and facilitated by two Stevens family heirs, Edwin A. Stevens II and Richard Stevens, both of whom were Trustees. Expansion during Humphreys’ tenure was made possible by increasing student enrollment, loyal alumni, and philanthropists and trustees like Andrew Carnegie, and included construction of Morton Hall in 1906 and, in 1915-16, Walker Gymnasium, both located to the north of Edwin A. Stevens Hall and the Carnegie Mechanical Laboratory.

One of the earliest campus plans was drawn circa 1914 by Ludlow and Peabody. The Ludlow and Peabody plan, which was never specifically carried out with the exception of the Gymnasium, shows the campus from a bird’s-eye view as well as in plan view. The architects clearly relied upon established Beaux-Arts concepts in developing the plan, creating thoughtfully laid out campus zones and broad, landscaped paths, and making use of symmetry where possible.

The college was working diligently to clear existing debt and increase its endowment in the spring of 1915. At a luncheon in May 1915, President Humphreys announced the success of the “Stevens Tech Fund Campaign” in these arenas, as well as the donation of $100,000 by Mr. William Hall Walker of New York City to be used for construction of a new “Walker Laboratory of Mechanical Arts.” A Mechanical Laboratory is shown on the 1914 Ludlow and Peabody plan at the eastern edge of the campus, on the edge of the bluffs overlooking the Hudson River.

Later that same year, however, Walker’s donation had been redirected to fund a new campus gymnasium, which became the first building to be constructed as a result of the Stevens Tech Fund Campaign. The “William Hall Walker Gymnasium” was officially announced in the October 1915 issue of the Stevens Indicator. The Gymnasium was to be located “between the diverging lines of the main path from the Green Gate to the Castle, and the easterly line of the athletic field....” As such, it would be the first purpose-built campus building to encroach upon former Stevens family land, inside the serpentine gates that marked the entrance to the estate, on what was then a relatively open and undeveloped parcel of land set at a distance from the existing laboratory and classroom buildings. The location and setting of the new gymnasium clearly reflected current campus planning standards as espoused by architects and writers Klauder and Wise, who noted “…the need of placing the physical activities buildings near the playing fields and apart from the main campus group....

4 Ultimately, the growth and development of the University did not adhere to Beaux-Arts ideals that were more strongly espoused in the plan, but instead took a more romantic direction that complemented the irregular topography rather than attempting to reorder it.
7 Ibid.
8 Klauder and Wise, 223.
The Stevens Indicator went on to explain the design of the new gymnasium, making it clear before the building was even under construction that the college understood that they had a special and distinctive building:

The new building will mark a departure from the usual gymnasium plan. Elliptical buildings are not common and at first thought, when the architects set themselves to solve the problem of the best possible gymnasium for Stevens, the usual rectangular form naturally suggested itself. A local condition, however, pointed to an unusual premise in this problem and that was the shape of the plot of ground on which the gymnasium is to be built...it was at once realized that a rectangular building would be a most uncomfortable fit for this trapezoidal piece of ground.9

President Humphreys, discussing the new gymnasium during a speech at an Alumni Banquet in 1916, called it “the center of the physical education and activities of the undergraduates.”10 Responding to apparent criticism of the prioritization of a gymnasium over a new educational building, the President noted “My first answer to this criticism is that it is intended for education, for education is not all obtained from books; and furthermore, we need healthy and trained bodies to enable us to absorb from books and later to apply effectively what we so absorb.”11

Construction of the new gymnasium began in either late 1915 or early 1916, with the Whitney Company serving as contractor, and work progressing quickly.12 President Humphreys noted in his talk at an Alumni Banquet in early 1916, “Notwithstanding the fact that this is the weather not best for building, very considerable progress is being made in the erection of the gymnasium. The excavation, which was a very complicated piece of business, has been finished, and a large part of the foundation has already been laid.”13

The Stute announced the impending completion of the new gymnasium in October 1916, noting that “the big building, the progress on which was so eagerly watched by student and Alumnus alike is now undergoing the final stages of decorative work before being formally turned over to the Trustees the latter part of this month.”14 The article commented on the principal features of the building: the basement pool, the drill court on the first floor, and the track above the gym. It also explained that the landscape around the building was undergoing work, including extension of the driveway from the Sixth Street Gate to the front of the new gymnasium, and back down to Sixth Street, where it would pass through a new gate in a wall to be built between the Gate and Morton Laboratory. To facilitate the new drive, one of the two existing field houses was removed, and the other relocated slightly to the southeast.

9 “The William Hall Walker Gymnasium.”
11 Ibid.
12 Alfred Rutgers Whitney, Jr. was a Stevens graduate, Class of 1890.
Dedication and Opening

The official dedication and opening of the new Gymnasium was scheduled for November 18, 1916, which was to be known as “The William Hall Walker Day.” The dedication was intended from the outset of the planning to allow the students to play a significant role.\footnote{“Gymnasium to be Dedicated,” \textit{The Stute}, XIII, no. 6, 11 November 1916; “Gymnasium to be Dedicated To-Day,” \textit{The Stute}, XIII, no. 7, 18 November 1916.} They gathered at the athletic field at 1:30 and marched up the drive to the Stevens Castle to meet President Humphreys, William Hall Walker, and Professor Ganz. The students then lined up along the Board Walk so the faculty as well as Mr. Walker, the President, and other guests could walk through the formation and on to the Gymnasium. Walter Kidde (a graduate of the Class of 1897 and Chairman of the Fundraising Committee) served as Master of Ceremonies and provided a formal welcome, and then introduced President Humphreys, who discussed the need for the Gymnasium and the progress of the Stevens Tech Fund. The President thanked Mr. Walker and presented him with a trowel for the laying of the cornerstone, which he set while the Alma Mater was sung. The cornerstone included copies of several college publications (\textit{The Link}, \textit{The Stute}, \textit{The Indicator}) and a catalog; a biography of Mr. Walker; a photograph of Dr. Humphreys; and the architect’s contract. The builder (the Whitney Company) turned the keys over to the Architect (Ludlow and Peabody) and then to Mr. Walker, who formally presented them to the President. All then went inside the building for a tour.

The ceremony was followed by a football game – Stevens defeated RPI, 19-0 - and a dance, which was held inside the Gymnasium: “It was as fine within as without. Softly lighted, bunting draped, filled with dancing couples. Over three hundred waltzed and one-stepped on the spacious floor to the strains of Jacob’s orchestra...The evening wore to a close. So ended the best of days – William Hall Walker Day.”\footnote{“William Hall Walker Gymnasium Dedicated with Great Enthusiasm,” \textit{The Stute}, XIII, no. 8, 25 November 1916.}

An editorial in the student paper, \textit{The Stute}, praised the new building and the college’s choice in making it a priority: “…by the diversion of the donation to the present building, the President and Trustees have added probably more to the course and school than would have been possible in any other way. They have placed within reach of every man the possibilities of a well balanced being. They have added much to the incentive for individual effort on the part of every student. They have opened opportunities for new lines of student endeavor and have furthermore strengthened the college and campus life in general.”\footnote{“Editorial,” \textit{The Stute}, XIII, no. 7, 18 November 1916, 2.}

The Donor, William Hall Walker

William Hall Walker was born in Scio, Michigan on July 26, 1846.\footnote{Biographical information was compiled from “William Hall Walker, Obituary,” \textit{Stevens Indicator}, XXXV, January 1918, 70-75; “Death of William Hall Walker, Kodak Pioneer,” \textit{The Photographic Journal of America}, LV, January 1918, 26; “William Hall Walker,” \textit{Stevens Indicator}, XXXIII, January 1916, 1-6.} He attended several boarding schools and expressed an early interest in engineering, but due to family hardships did not immediately pursue a college education, instead beginning work as an apprentice at Colt’s Armory in Hartford. He found subsequent employment as a machinist at Pratt and Whitney and at the Morgan Iron Works. Walker attended night school
at the Cooper Union, taking classes in mathematics and mechanical drawing. When he had completed his
course of study, he became a partner in a business that specialized in the manufacture of machinery and
traveled extensively in the United States.

During the course of his employment, he became interested in the study of photographic processes, which
ultimately led to the development of a small camera that became known as Walker’s Pocket Camera. The
camera was marketed to amateurs and became popular among engineers who used it to assist in their survey
work. Walker’s interest in photography led him to the Eastman Dry Plate Company of Rochester, where he
developed a commercial roll holder, a precursor of the hand camera that was later sold under the name
“Kodak.” While he was with Eastman, Walker was responsible for perfecting machinery for coating
photographic films and paper, dividing glass plates, and automatically spooling film.19 Walker became the
head of Kodak, Limited, of London later in his career, and retired from the Eastman Kodak Company of
Rochester to his estate in the Berkshires (Massachusetts).20

Walker died at his home in New York City on November 29, 1917, at the age of 71. His generosity continued to
benefit the University even after his death. The Walker Trust Fund was established in 1942 by Gertrude D.
Walker, William Hall Walker’s only child.21 The Jersey Journal reported in January 1982 that $4.3 million from
the Walker Trust Fund was being utilized for the creation of a new engineering center on the site of the former
Navy Building at Sixth and River Streets.

The Architects, Ludlow and Peabody
The New York City-based architectural firm of Ludlow and Peabody is credited with the design of Walker
Gymnasium. The firm was formed in 1909 by William Orr Ludlow (1870-1954) and Charles S. Peabody (1880-
1935), who continued to practice together until 1935 (likely until Peabody’s death). Ludlow, a member of the
Stevens class of 1892 (where he received a degree in mechanical engineering) seems to have had the primary
relationship with the college, as his prior firm, Ludlow and Valentine, designed a field house and an
ornamental iron gate for the campus in 1907 and 1908, respectively.22 Both Ludlow and Peabody would have
had a full understanding of the history of architecture and the design principles then in vogue, Ludlow through
his three years as a draftsman in the office of Carrere and Hastings immediately following his graduation from
Stevens, and Peabody through his education at Harvard and Columbia, as well as his direct course of study at
the Ecole des Beaux-Arts in Paris.

20 Walker purchased “Brookside,” on Brookside Road in Great Barrington, MA in 1908. At the time he made the purchase, the main
house was in the process of being rebuilt – principally in concrete - by the prior owner following a fire; the new house had been
designed by the prominent firm Carrere and Hastings. In 1912, Walker hired landscape architect Ferruccio Vitale to design the
estate’s formal gardens. The property exists today as the Eisner Camp; the mansion survives but the gardens, which are documented
in the Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Division, were removed in 1975. (J. Huberdeau, “The Cottager | Brookside: Home
of inventor rebuilt with concrete walls after 1904 fire,” The Berkshire Eagle, 28 September 2016.)
21 The building funded in part by the Walker Trust Fund ultimately became known as the Babbio Center.
22 The field house is no longer extant, but the iron gate, also known as the Class of 1897 Memorial Gate, remains at Eighth Street at
the entrance to the parking area that faces Castle Point Terrace.
As a firm, Ludlow and Peabody were noted for their work on college campuses, something they began to specialize in shortly after they were formed. One of their first projects was the design of five buildings for the Sitka, Alaska campus of Sheldon Jackson College; their Allen Memorial building (the main building in the design of the campus), completed in 1910-11, served as both a gymnasium and a classroom building (Photo S1). One source described their work at Sheldon Jackson College as “Eclectic Tudor Gothic mixed a little with Eastern Stick and a pinch of Greene and Greene’s Bungalow Craftsman Stirred in with some Adirondack Lodge.” Ludlow and Peabody would go on to design at least forty college and university buildings during their twenty-six years together.

Just prior to designing the Walker Gymnasium, Ludlow and Peabody were engaged to plan the campus of the George Peabody College for Teachers in Nashville, TN (now part of Vanderbilt University). Their master plan, which dates to 1912, reflects Beaux-Arts principles of symmetry and an emphasis on Classical precedents. The firm also designed the first several buildings on the campus, which included Mayborn Hall, the Jesup Psychological Laboratory, and the Social Religious Building (now Wyatt Center) (Photo S2). While the Wyatt Center is a much more grandiose building than Walker Gymnasium, it further demonstrates Ludlow and Peabody’s stylistic flexibility, all rooted in the Classical past, and their keen ability to plan and site their buildings to achieve the most dramatic impact. This skill is in ample evidence at Stevens Institute, where the Gymnasium is set at the top of a small rise and is framed by the Sixth Street Gate.

Early 20th century gymnasias

Nineteenth century physical education centered on health (hygiene, physiology) and incorporated gymnastics and calisthenics. Barrett Gymnasium at Amherst College (Amherst, MA) by Charles E. Parke, completed in 1860, is a good example of an early collegiate gymnasium (Photo S3); Amherst was the first college in the country to have a physical education department. Barrett included a physician’s office, dressing rooms, and bowling alleys on the ground floor, and the main hall for classes and special exercise on the second. Architecturally, this program did not require any special arrangement of space, and thus a simple rectangular-plan building with multiple floors, stylistically compatible with the rest of the campus, was adequate.

The emphasis on health, gymnastics, and calisthenics – non-competitive athletics – began to shift in the early 20th century, with physical education becoming a significant component of the curriculum. A focus on fitness

---

23 The campus was designated a National Historic Landmark District in 2001; the Allen Memorial Building is a contributing property.
27 The granite building is known as Barrett Hall today and has been adapted to serve as the home of the department of modern languages.
and training was joined by a desire to prepare students for both intercollegiate and intramural athletics – in other words, competition – which only increased during the first decade of the 20th century.\textsuperscript{29} Sports and physical education became inextricably linked.

The rise of competitive sports was quick and unregulated. Football, which dominated sports during this period, was dangerous and often associated with serious physical injuries. Gymnasia, where students could receive proper training, ensured that students would be physically prepared for competition.

The sport of basketball was also growing in popularity. Created in Springfield, MA, in 1891, the first public game was played in 1892, and intercollegiate matches followed by the mid-1890s. Unlike football, basketball could be played indoors, and offered a more exciting and competitive alternative to gymnastics and calisthenics. Discussions of the dedication of Walker Gymnasium specifically mention its use for basketball and lacrosse practice.\textsuperscript{30}

In the period of time when Walker Gymnasium was being constructed, the approach to physical education was being studied and re-thought. It began to incorporate elements of psychology and other social sciences, and the development of Play Theory (which offered that play behavior was instinctual, important for both physical and mental development and education, and, in the long run, character-building) helped to shift physical education further away from simple health benefits and toward more well-rounded development of the individual.\textsuperscript{31}

As physical education shifted and competitive athletics increased, the scale of gymnasia grew exponentially and the diversity of their spaces multiplied. Natural light and ventilation was critical and thus larger windows and even skylighting were recommended. In addition to the main gymnasium floor, space was required for a running track, spectator seating, offices, weighing and measuring rooms, locker rooms and showers, and trophy display; larger gymnasia might incorporate handball and squash courts, boxing and wrestling rooms, or a pool.\textsuperscript{32}

*Engineering Record* reported on the dedication of Walker Gymnasium in its December 2, 1916 issue, noting that it was “thought to be the first of its kind to be built elliptical in plan.”\textsuperscript{33} This distinctive characteristic was also a topic of discussion when the building was featured in *The American Architect* in its April 18, 1917 issue.

\textsuperscript{30} “William Hall Walker Gymnasium Dedicated with Great Enthusiasm,” 3.
\textsuperscript{31} “The Transformation of Physical Education: 1900-1939,” in Mechikoff & Estes, *A History and Philosophy of Sport and Physical Education*, fourth edition, The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc. The potential need for young men to be in peak physical fitness, with World War I playing out in Europe, was also likely not lost on those planning gymnasia in the mid-1910s.
\textsuperscript{32} C.Z. Klauder, 224.
\textsuperscript{33} “Stevens Dedicates New Gymnasium,” *Engineering Record*, 74, 2 December 1916, 695.
The shape of the plot of land available for the building, the need for a running track, and cost efficiency were cited as the reasons for the gymnasium’s unusual form: “That this form adapts itself to the plot is obvious; that it was logical to build an elliptical wall around the necessarily elliptical running track is also obvious; that economy would be effected was not so clear at the outset...but careful analysis and the drawing of different types of plans upon which estimates were obtained, proved that this was the case.” The genesis of the design for Walker Gymnasium seems to be a clear case of form following function, as there are no immediate formal precedents. Walker seems to be both the first elliptical-plan college gymnasium, as well as the only one of its kind in the country.

Locally, the architects would have at least looked at the recently completed work at Rutgers College and Princeton University in considering architectural styles for their new building, but both solutions were ultimately quite specific to their institution’s history and architectural traditions and did not serve as models for Walker.

At Rutgers, the Robert F. Ballantine Gymnasium, designed by Charles Alling Gifford of New York, had been completed more than twenty years earlier (1893) in the Colonial Revival style at the corner of Somerset and George Streets (Photo S4). Ballantine, like Walker, featured a suspended running track within its gymnasium space. The Colonial Revival exterior allowed it to exist easily with its immediate physical context, the historic core of the College known as Queens Campus. Princeton University’s University Gymnasium, designed by Cope and Stewardson and completed 1901-1903, was completed in the Collegiate Gothic style, newly mandated by the University trustees as a means of associating the school with the long-standing traditions and prestige of institutions such as Oxford and Cambridge and a celebration of their recent Sesquicentennial. While the programs of University Gymnasium and Walker Gymnasium might have been similar, their exterior details were not.

Stylistically, the architects may have been familiar with Alumni Gymnasium at Dartmouth College (Hanover, NH), which was constructed in 1909-1910 according to designs by Charles Rich and Fredrick Mathesius (Photo S5). It is one of the most physically similar structures to Walker Gymnasium and may have served as a design

---

36 The New Providence School Gymnasium in New Providence, Iowa, was constructed as a PWA project in 1936 as a high school gymnasium and has a plan that is referred to as “round.” “At the time of its construction, the round shape of the building was so unusual that many people made fun of it.” The building has been restored and is being used by the local community. “New Providence School Gymnasium,” National Register of Historic Places Hardin County, Iowa Travel Itinerary, https://www.nps.gov/nr/travel/hardin/gym.htm, accessed 30 November 2017.
37 Rutgers College Catalogue for 1917-1918, Rutgers College, New Brunswick, NJ, December 1917, 200-201. Ballantine Gymnasium was destroyed by fire in 1930, and replaced by what is today the Zimmerli Museum.
38 Ten Years of Princeton University (New York: F.P. McBreen & Co., 1906) 9. University Gymnasium was destroyed by fire in 1944 and replaced by Dillon Gymnasium three years later, which was essentially a reconstruction of the earlier building.
inspiration, although again, it does not share its very distinctive plan. Charles Rich, Alumni’s architect, was a graduate of Dartmouth (just as Ludlow was at Stevens), and, like Ludlow, Rich played a significant role in creating a master plan for the campus prior to beginning design of his gymnasium.39

Like Walker, Alumni Gymnasium was designed according to Beaux-Arts principles. The main character-defining feature of each facade is a multi-story, arched window that is Roman in inspiration, and both buildings originally contained a basketball court with suspended track and a swimming pool (the track at Alumni was actually added in 1939). Alumni Gymnasium has lost much of its original integrity, however, with interior renovations to various parts of the building undertaken during World War I, when it was converted for use as barracks, and World War II, when it became an armory and lounge. Subsequent renovations occurred in 1962-63 (new basketball court and aquatic facilities), 1972 (new two-story women’s locker room) and 2006 (new fitness center, structural upgrades, new entrances, an elevator, and accessibility upgrades). In contrast, much of Walker Gymnasium’s original character has been maintained despite the reprogramming of some of its interior spaces.

Contemporary with Alumni Gymnasium is the 1909 Iglehart Gymnasium at St. John’s College in Annapolis, MD. Designed by architects Wyatt & Nolting, the building’s principal similarity to Walker is its truss-roofed gymnasium with suspended wood running track that encircles the space. Both gymnasia as originally constructed also supported a pool; both have now been infilled and replaced with strength training equipment. The building’s exterior is, like Walker, designed in an academic style, but that is the extent of their similarities as Iglehart Gymnasium features a tall, Classical portico and side wings.

There were several gymnasia constructed in the decade following Walker’s completion that are at least stylistically similar, although none make use of an elliptical plan. The 1920s seemed to be fruitful years for the construction of gymnasia in general, whereas the preceding war years yielded very few new athletic facilities. Memorial Gymnasium at the University of Virginia, Charlottesville was completed in 1924 and was designed by architect Fiske Kimball (Photos S6 and S7). It too retains an elevated wooden running track within a truss-roofed gymnasium, and at one time housed a swimming pool (now indoor soccer arena). Like Walker Gymnasium, Memorial Gymnasium’s Beaux-Arts style elevations (much grander than Walker’s) were inspired by Roman bath architecture. Two athletic facilities designed by the firm of Smith, Hinchman & Grylls, Architects for the University of Michigan (Ann Arbor, MI) – the Yost Field House (1923) (Photo S8) and the Intramural Building (1928) (Photo S9) – are also Roman in inspiration and retain considerable architectural integrity despite slightly altered programs. The Yost Field House, which is now known as Yost Ice Arena, was built to house the school’s basketball teams under an expansive, trussed roof. The Intramural Building, like Yost, is more grand in scale and detail than Walker, but does bear a physical resemblance in its use of materials and Beaux-Arts stylistic influences.

---

Steinhauer Fieldhouse, located at the Colorado School of Mines in Golden, CO, is slightly later (1937) and more playful than Walker Gymnasium, incorporating what would become the school logo – a bucking burro – into the façade, but they do share common design elements, including a combination of brick and terra cotta on the building exterior and a dominating central, Roman bath inspired window on the main elevation (Photo S10).

In summary, the William Hall Walker Gymnasium is a unique, architecturally significant resource whose design inspiration was driven nearly completely by the special qualities of the site and budgetary concerns. The architects, who were well versed in the Beaux-Arts approach to planning and design, and who were experienced in working with institutions of higher education, brought together the needs of the college, current thinking regarding athletic programs and their space requirements, and an interest in Roman architecture to create a facility that had no specific precedent and would have no immediate followers. Walker Gymnasium has been well cared for by Stevens Institute of Technology over the last hundred years, with minor changes to the building’s original design and program. The building retains a high degree of integrity of design, workmanship, and materials, as well as integrity of location, setting, feeling, and association.
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Boundary Description
The nominated property is approximately .6 acres, and includes William Hall Walker Gymnasium and Walker Lawn, located to the north of the intersection of Sixth Street and Wittpenn Walk, as shown on the Boundary Map located on the Continuation Sheet, Section 10. The nominated property includes the entirety of the building, the east-west access drive that fronts the building and separates it from Walker Lawn, and all of Walker Lawn and its plantings and/or site features. Sidewalks and roadways (other than the aforementioned access drive) that flank the Gymnasium and the Lawn are not incorporated within the boundaries of the nominated property.

Boundary Justification
The nominated property includes the entire built resource (William Hall Walker Gymnasium) and the lawn that is historically associated with the Gymnasium and shares its name (Walker Lawn).
PHOTOGRAPHS

The following information applies to all photographs:

Location of Digital Files:    New Jersey Historic Preservation Office

Photo locations are shown on Figures 3-6 in the Accompanying Documentation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Photo</th>
<th>Subject/Location</th>
<th>Photographer</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Photo 1</td>
<td>View of main (south) elevation from the Sixth Street Gate, showing Walker Lawn in the foreground and Wittpenn Walk at the right</td>
<td>Meredith Arms Bzdak</td>
<td>October 6, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo 2</td>
<td>Main (south) elevation</td>
<td>Meredith Arms Bzdak</td>
<td>October 6, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo 3</td>
<td>Main (south) elevation, entrance detail</td>
<td>Meredith Arms Bzdak</td>
<td>October 6, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo 4</td>
<td>Main (south) elevation, entrance detail showing terra cotta panel</td>
<td>Meredith Arms Bzdak</td>
<td>October 6, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo 5</td>
<td>Main (south) elevation, detail of cornice, terra cotta panels, and brick</td>
<td>Meredith Arms Bzdak</td>
<td>October 6, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo 6</td>
<td>Side (east) elevation</td>
<td>Meredith Arms Bzdak</td>
<td>October 6, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo 7</td>
<td>Side (east) and rear (north) elevations</td>
<td>Meredith Arms Bzdak</td>
<td>October 6, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo 8</td>
<td>East elevation detail showing brick pattern, terra cotta panels, and original rafter ends</td>
<td>Meredith Arms Bzdak</td>
<td>October 6, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo 9</td>
<td>Rear (north) elevation</td>
<td>Meredith Arms Bzdak</td>
<td>October 6, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Photographer</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Side (west) elevation</td>
<td>Meredith Arms Bzdak</td>
<td>October 6, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Entrance lobby (Trophy Room)</td>
<td>Meredith Arms Bzdak</td>
<td>October 6, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Entrance lobby (Trophy Room) looking south</td>
<td>Meredith Arms Bzdak</td>
<td>October 6, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Renovated corridor on first floor, looking to side (west) exit</td>
<td>Meredith Arms Bzdak</td>
<td>October 6, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Gymnasium with suspended running track and skylight</td>
<td>Meredith Arms Bzdak</td>
<td>October 6, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Gymnasium with suspended running track and skylight</td>
<td>Meredith Arms Bzdak</td>
<td>October 6, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Gymnasium skylight detail</td>
<td>Meredith Arms Bzdak</td>
<td>October 6, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Strength training room, location of former pool</td>
<td>Meredith Arms Bzdak</td>
<td>October 6, 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
William Hall Walker Gymnasium

National and New Jersey Registers Nomination
City of Hoboken
Hudson County, New Jersey

Legend

NJ & NR Nomination
Coordinates
Tax Parcels

0.45 Acres

NJDEP,
Historic Preservation Office
July 2018
Figure 1. Location of William Hall Walker Gymnasium, Stevens Institute of Technology, Hoboken (Hudson County) New Jersey. (Property circled.) (Source: https://www.google.com/maps)
Figure 2. Boundary Map; nominated property outlined in red. (Source: https://www.google.com/maps)
Figure 3. Exterior Photo Key.
Figure 4. First Floor Photo Key.
Figure 5. Third Floor Photo Key.
Figure 6. Basement Photo Key.
Figure 7. William Hall Walker Gymnasium, Basement Plan (2016).
Figure 8. William Hall Walker Gymnasium, First Floor Plan (2016).
Figure 9. William Hall Walker Gymnasium, Second Floor Plan (2016).
Figure 10. William Hall Walker Gymnasium, Third Floor Plan (2016).
Figure 11. Ludlow and Peabody, Stevens Institute of Technology Campus Plan, circa 1914, as published in *The American Architect*, CXI, no. 2156, 18 April 1917.
Figure 12. Ludlow and Peabody, Rendering of Walker Gymnasium, circa 1915. (Archives and Special Collections, Stevens Institute of Technology)
Figure 13. Walker Gymnasium under construction, 1916. Note athletic fields and field houses in the foreground and Stevens Castle in the background. Wittppenn Walk, which extended from the Sixth Street Gate to the Stevens Castle (and which is extant today) is clearly visible at the right side of the photo. (Archives and Special Collections, Stevens Institute of Technology)
Figure 14. Walker Gymnasium, shortly after completion in 1916. (Archives and Special Collections, Stevens Institute of Technology)
Figure 15. Walker Gymnasium Dedication Ceremonies, 18 November 1916. Walter Kidde, Chairman of the fundraising campaign, waves a banner; President Alexander C. Humphreys is at the center with cap and gown; and William Hall Walker, donor, holds a cane. (Archives and Special Collections, Stevens Institute of Technology)
Figure 16. Walker Gymnasium Main Gym Floor and Running Track, shortly after completion in 1916. (Archives and Special Collections, Stevens Institute of Technology)
Figure 17. Walker Gymnasium Pool, shortly after completion in 1916. Credit Batori Photographic Service, New York, NY. (Archives and Special Collections, Stevens Institute of Technology)
Figure 18. Walker Gymnasium from Morton Hall, February 1952. (Archives and Special Collections, Stevens Institute of Technology)
Photo 1. William Hall Walker Gymnasium, View of main (south) elevation from the Sixth Street Gate, showing Walker Lawn in the foreground and Wittpenn Walk at the right. Stevens Institute of Technology, Hoboken (Hudson County), NJ. (Meredith Arms Bzdak, 6 October 2017.)
Photo 2. William Hall Walker Gymnasium, main (south) elevation. Stevens Institute of Technology, Hoboken (Hudson County), NJ. (Meredith Arms Bzdak, 6 October 2017.)
Photo 3. William Hall Walker Gymnasium, main (south) elevation, entrance detail. Stevens Institute of Technology, Hoboken (Hudson County), NJ. (Meredith Arms Bzdak, 6 October 2017.)
Photo 4. William Hall Walker Gymnasium, main (south) elevation, entrance detail showing terra cotta panel. Stevens Institute of Technology, Hoboken (Hudson County), NJ. (Meredith Arms Bzdak, 6 October 2017.)
Photo 5. William Hall Walker Gymnasium, main (south) elevation, detail of cornice, terra cotta panels, and brick. Stevens Institute of Technology, Hoboken (Hudson County), NJ. (Meredith Arms Bzdak, 6 October 2017.)
Photo 6. William Hall Walker Gymnasium, side (east) elevation. Stevens Institute of Technology, Hoboken (Hudson County), NJ. (Meredith Arms Bzdak, 6 October 2017.)
Photo 7. William Hall Walker Gymnasium, side (east) and rear (north) elevations. Stevens Institute of Technology, Hoboken (Hudson County), NJ. (Meredith Arms Bzdak, 6 October 2017.)
Photo 8. William Hall Walker Gymnasium, east elevation detail showing brick pattern, terra cotta panels, and original rafter ends. Stevens Institute of Technology, Hoboken (Hudson County), NJ. (Meredith Arms Bzdak, 6 October 2017.)
Photo 9. William Hall Walker Gymnasium, rear (north) elevation. Stevens Institute of Technology, Hoboken (Hudson County), NJ. (Meredith Arms Bzdak, 6 October 2017.)
Photo 10. William Hall Walker Gymnasium, side (west) elevation. Stevens Institute of Technology, Hoboken (Hudson County), NJ. (Meredith Arms Bzdak, 6 October 2017.)
Photo 11. William Hall Walker Gymnasium, entrance lobby (Trophy Room); note former stair hall openings, now blocked. Stevens Institute of Technology, Hoboken (Hudson County), NJ. (Meredith Arms Bzdak, 6 October 2017.)
Photo 12. William Hall Walker Gymnasium, entrance lobby (Trophy Room) looking south to entry doors. Stevens Institute of Technology, Hoboken (Hudson County), NJ. (Meredith Arms Bzdak, 6 October 2017.)
Photo 13. William Hall Walker Gymnasium, Renovated corridor on first floor, looking to side (west) exit. Stevens Institute of Technology, Hoboken (Hudson County), NJ. (Meredith Arms Bzdak, 6 October 2017.)
Photo 14. William Hall Walker Gymnasium, gymnasium with suspended running track and skylight. Stevens Institute of Technology, Hoboken (Hudson County), NJ. (Meredith Arms Bzdak, 6 October 2017.)
Photo 15. William Hall Walker Gymnasium, gymnasium with suspended running track and skylight. Stevens Institute of Technology, Hoboken (Hudson County), NJ. (Meredith Arms Bzdak, 6 October 2017.)
Photo 16. William Hall Walker Gymnasium, gymnasium skylight detail. Stevens Institute of Technology, Hoboken (Hudson County), NJ. (Meredith Arms Bzdak, 6 October 2017.)
Photo 17. William Hall Walker Gymnasium, strength training room, location of former pool. Stevens Institute of Technology, Hoboken (Hudson County), NJ. (Meredith Arms Bzdak, 6 October 2017.)
Photo S1. Ludlow and Peabody, Richard Allen Memorial Hall, 1910-11, Sheldon Jackson College, Sitka, AL. (Jet Lowe [Public domain], via Wikimedia Commons)
Photo S2. Ludlow and Peabody, Wyatt Center, 1915, Peabody Campus (Vanderbilt University), Nashville, TN. (Meredith Arms Bzdak, July 2015.)
Photo S4. Charles Alling Gifford, Ballentine Gymnasium, 1893 (photo circa 1901), Rutgers College, New Brunswick, NJ. ([https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Ballentine_Gymnasium_on_Voorhees_Mall_Rutgers_College_New_Brunswick_NJ_c1901.jpg](https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Ballentine_Gymnasium_on_Voorhees_Mall_Rutgers_College_New_Brunswick_NJ_c1901.jpg), Photographer unknown; public domain, via Wikimedia Commons.)
Photo S5. Charles Rich and Fredrick Mathesius, Alumni Gymnasium, Dartmouth College, 1910. (By Kane5187 (Own work) [Public domain], via Wikimedia Commons.)
Photo S9. Smith, Hinchman & Grylls, Architects, Ferry Field and the Intramural Building, 1928, University of Michigan. (Photo Dave Parker, https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File%3AFerryFieldIMBuilding.jpg.)