

**ETHICS
IN
PRESERVATION**

Lectures Presented at the Annual Meeting
of the National Council for Preservation Education
Indianapolis, Indiana
October 23, 1993

DeTeel Patterson Tiller
National Park Service

Copyright 1995 by the National Council for Preservation
Education
All Rights Reserved

INTRODUCTION

In 1989 the Board of the National Council for Preservation Education decided to follow the suggestion of one of its directors, Richard Longstreth, and hold future annual meetings at one of its member institutions. The discussion at these meetings has focused on the need to meet curriculum deficiencies in such areas as preservation law, building materials conservation, and the evaluation of the landscape. More at the heart of the historic preservation curriculum, regardless of the discipline or level of the audience, are the ethical concerns in the field. Curiously, although a variety of charters, standards and guidelines have been issued, comparatively little published material exists regarding the application of these principles.

To help fill this void, the National Council sought the support of the National Park Service and selected three prominent preservationists to address those assembled at the annual meeting in Indianapolis, Indiana. Professor Richard Striner is perhaps best known as an advocate in the District of Columbia, where he served as the President of the Art Deco Society of Washington. Prof. W. Brown Morton III, former Chair of the Historic Preservation Department at Mary Washington College, was the coauthor of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. Dr. De Teel Patterson Tiller, Chief, Preservation Planning Branch, National Park Service, offers his thoughts from his nearly unique position in the federal government with a keen eye toward educating the tomorrow's preservationists. It is hoped that those who did not have the opportunity to attend the Indianapolis meeting nevertheless learn from and enjoy these perspectives.

Respectfully submitted,
Michael A. Tomlan

HISTORIC PRESERVATION AND THE CHALLENGE OF ETHICAL COHERENCE

by

Richard Striner

Assistant Professor

Washington College, Chestertown, Maryland

Imagine yourselves invited to a Halloween party for preservationists. I propose to entertain you with some horror stories, so allow your imaginations to run wild. For sheer gothic horror, imagine the following preservation scenarios:

1) A staff member who formerly occupied a prominent position in the preservation office of a major city is hired by a zoning and development law firm. A major responsibility of this position with the law firm is the orchestration of paid antipreservation testimony in contested cases. This individual continues to be treated with the utmost respect and deference by most members of the city's preservation movement. The law firm proudly refers to the individual as its "architectural historian."

2) A consultant who frequently accepted fees for antipreservation testimony is hired as the chief preservation planner by a city with one of the oldest locally designated historic districts in the United States.

3) The owners of an ensemble of turnofthecentury townhouses preempt a preservation campaign by smashing the fronts of the houses with sledgehammers. One of these property owners is subsequently revealed to be a member of the board of directors of the city's principal nonprofit preservation organization.

4) An attorney serving on the board of a citywide nonprofit preservation group takes a case in which he advocates (on behalf of his client) the demolition of a building listed in the National Register of Historic Places. Not one single member of the board of directors of the preservation group appears to see anything amiss in this action, even though the demolition is widely opposed by others in the preservation community. This attorney is subsequently appointed to a commission with major preservation and planning responsibilities. The attorney is appointed as a representative of the preservation movement.

5) Two former Vice Presidents of the National Trust for Historic Preservation give antipreservation testimony in cases where the preservation campaigns have elicited support from a wide array of scholars and preservation organizations, both private sector and public sector.

6) A historic building is sold by the federal government to a private owner and the sale includes deed restrictions that apply the Secretary of Interior's Standards to any proposed rehabilitation. A developer subsequently proposes a scheme that is grossly at odds with those standards. A hired expert retained by the developer argues that the historic building's integrity is sufficiently compromised that the Secretary of Interiors Standards do not apply. This hired expert turns out to be a fulltime employee of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and one of the people responsible for creating the initial deed restrictions on the property.

7) The owners of a historic theatre oppose preservation but offer to save the facade. The preservation advocates reject this proposal. Within a week before the local landmark designation hearing, the staff member of the local preservation office who was originally assigned to write the staff report on the case is replaced (without explanation) by another staff member who proceeds to write a staff report claiming that the theatre auditorium is a completely separate building from the front portion of the theater. The theatre's front portion is accordingly designated a landmark building but the auditorium is not designated. The auditorium is demolished, and the mutilated remnant survives as a truncated facade. The theatre building, of course, had always constituted one inseparable entity.

Did you enjoy this Halloween party? Did the stories make your flesh crawl? You have probably had about enough by now, and you are ready for the ghouls to depart. You are waiting for the Halloween revelers to take off their hideous masks and resume their everyday appearance. But this is their everyday appearance. Every one of these preservation horror stories was completely true. Every day can turn out to be Halloween for the preservation movement in many parts of this country.

These honor stories aside from the obvious instances of conflict of interest or official malfeasance present us with some very serious ethical questions upon which the preservation movement has not achieved consensus. Many of us would say that the behavior reflected in these stories is disturbing; some of us would go so far as to say that the behavior is appalling. This is all a matter of opinion. But can any of us say without equivocation that the troubling behavior depicted in these stories is morally and ethically wrong? If so, what basis do we have for advancing these sorts of moral judgments in preservation matters?

One thing seems to be clear: historic preservation is rife

with behavior that calls the fundamental values of the movement into question. One is left to wonder: can the preservation movement effectively respond to this challenge from within its own ranks? The answer to this question may determine to a great extent the success or the failure of historic preservation in the years to come.

Certain problems of preservation ethics are nothing more than problems of age-old human weaknesses. Take the problems of conflict of interest and malfeasance: as long as human nature remains what it is, we will have to be prepared for the sort of people who may yield to temptation or coercion. In high-stakes real estate battles the temptations can be overwhelming: more money than the struggling young professional can easily ignore. Even well-established preservation veterans may yield to temptation if the times get tough and they happen to find themselves at loose ends. Moreover, when the times get tough preservation professionals in government and public service may yield to political pressure and distort professional analyses instead of taking the courageous (and indeed the only honorable) courses of action: blowing the whistle or quitting. Of course this is easier said than done: the flip side of financial temptation is fear for one's job security. For this reason, the preservation movement should be ready to provide the sort of counterpressure that could strengthen the resolve (and strengthen the hand) of preservation staff when they are subject to political pressure. Such people should be able to look their political straw boss directly in the eye and say, "the orders you are giving me will backfire every preservationist in town will start screaming if this course of action is pursued."

But as most of us know too well the preservation community cannot be counted on to act with appropriate forcefulness. A genteel weakness prevents preservationists from facing up to ethical challenges as often as not. However confrontational the old-fashioned picket-sign tactics of the preservation movement might be, there is also a very strong (and perhaps compensatory) countertendency within the preservation subculture that can emphasize the need to "be nice" regardless of the cost. Preservationists are frequently stupefied in the face of betrayal. They react to ethical horror stories with weak and spineless observations like "Isn't it frustrating?" They are terrified of breaking ranks in the social minutely terrified of what their peers might think if they failed to greet a wayward colleague with a fixed smile and a ritualistic "Nice to see you."

There are several ways to remove this stigma from

expressions of principled anger. We can turn, for example, to comparisons with other advocacy movements whose forcefulness and determination may sometimes put us to shame. We can avail ourselves of certain timehonored tests for determining unethical conduct: a new articulation of behavior that constitutes conflict of interest and official malfeasance would assist the preservation movement tremendously in maintaining high moral standards. We can even turn to the classics: "Those who are not angry at the things that they should be angry at," said Aristotle in the *Nicomachean Ethics* (Book IV, Chapter 5), "are thought to be fools." Aristotle stressed that moral anger need not become excessive; it can be highly appropriate in target, duration, and intensity. Hence Aristotle's observation that "the man who is angry at the right things and at the right people... as he ought, and as long as he ought, is praised" among people of sagacity.

But in some respects these are easy issues to resolve: issues that derive from the age-old problems of integrity, honesty, and character. There is nothing at all unique to the preservation movement in these sorts of challenges. Whatever its particular strengths and weaknesses and foibles, the historic preservation movement is faced with the same degree of challenge in this realm as any other movement.

We had better admit, however, that beyond these timeless issues of personal integrity, the preservation movement is faced with a number of ethical problems that are not at all easy to face, let alone resolve. These problems derive from a fundamental lack of consensus within the movement regarding some of the most basic objectives and principles of historic preservation.

A great many people in historic preservation routinely confuse two very different objectives: the preservation of our heritage and the enhancement of our physical environment. Let us hasten to affirm that there is nothing necessarily wrong with the attempt to make these missions overlap. The problem arises when people regard them as inherently complementary, or inherently one and the same. But they are not the same thing at all—a fact that has profound repercussions in the world of preservation ethics. However paradoxical (if not downright heretical) the proposition may appear, the work of heritage protection and the work of environmental enhancement may at times become antagonistic to each other. And the refusal to confront this painful truth has been a source of great stress within the ranks of committed preservationists.

Most of us can easily agree that the fundamental goal

of historic preservation is the work of heritage protection. We fight to save historic resources because we believe in values that transcend the here and now. We have a stewardship mission on behalf of other generations. We intervene in business as usual in order to pass along a valuable legacy. Preservationists agree with Edmund Burke's observation that society is a "partnership .. between those who are living, those who are dead, and those who are to be born"

This goal of heritage protection may obviously overlap with the goal of environmental enhancement. Most of us are drawn to historic buildings for reasons of personal affinity. As people and as citizens we naturally associate our love for certain types of historic buildings with a broader range of personal and civic preferences. The cause of preservation, moreover, can be strongly advanced if the rehabilitation of historic resources is attractive to the general public. It behooves us for obvious reasons to make the retention and reuse of historic resources an appealing proposition. Lastly, and most importantly, the environmental settings of historic resources are themselves, at times, fully integral parts of the legacy we seek to preserve.

Well and good: at its most successful, historic preservation has reconciled the intergenerational partnership described by Edmund Burke with the famous Jeffersonian dictum that "the earth belongs to the living." Small wonder that historic preservation is so frequently linked with the cause of "scenic beauty," or in today's vocabulary with the cause of preserving a humane scale in streetscapes, with the protection of our "sense of place," with the guardianship of exquisite and fragile environments, and with the propagation of "people values." Related to this when offered in the rubric of education is the impulse to use historic preservation as a method for advancing the work of aesthetic connoisseurship: as a method for saving the "best" examples of architectural "styles," for promoting a better understanding of "good design," and for fostering a broader appreciation for (and discernment of) "style."

For all of these reasons, there are times when the missions of heritage protection and environmental enhancement appear to be easily synonymous.

The danger arises when we start to presume that our own aesthetic values are eternal ones, and that our efforts to enhance the environment are ipso facto crusades for the needs of all generations, past and future. It is precisely when we make this presumption that we start to endanger and even

betray our deepest preservation ideals.

The enhancement of our physical environment is always to a certain extent a matter of subjective values. There may be certain environmental values that are close to being universal and even timelessly objective but others are notoriously subject to change. Standards of "good design" could be debated endlessly. Some of the most treasured historic buildings in America today were once universally reviled. In the fast half of this century, for instance, the legacy of Victorians, was subjected to savage and almost universal vilification. The canons of environmental enhancement were cited insistently in campaigns to improve the environment by stripping away Victorian "ugliness." Many of these campaigns were in other ways laudable: consider the case of the Senate Park Commission, whose environmental enhancement of the nation's capital through the McMillan plan of 1901⁰² is rightly regarded as a splendid contribution to the legacy of Washington, D.C. and the entire nation. But the price for this infusion of "City Beautiful" enhancement might well have entailed the destruction of an equally splendid Victorian legacy unless preservation values had eventually intervened. The Smithsonian Castle building and the adjoining Arts and Industries building would both have been destroyed in the original McMillan scheme. The moral of the story is obvious in hindsight, and so is the lesson for ourselves: taste is subjective and it runs in cycles, wherefore we are sometimes obliged to defer to the needs of other generations when our own predilections may threaten the existence of a place that has historic significance.

So I return to my initial point the point that two legitimate objectives in the built environment the espousal of our own aesthetic preferences and the duty to defer to the needs of other generations when heritage protection is at stake may at times become antagonistic. The occasional tension between these equally legitimate social objectives is the source of a pervasive problem in the realm of preservation ethics, a problem compounded by the fact that very few preservationists are even willing to acknowledge it. The very idea that there could be any tension at all between the goals of heritage protection and the goals of environmental enhancement is almost unthinkable to many preservationists. To be sure, we are certainly willing to admit that the needs of people in our own generation may conflict with the needs of other generations: every preservationist who ever confronted a developer has made the inevitable plea to respect the rights of

posterity. What is awkward and unfamiliar to us is the possibility that we ourselves may threaten the rights of other generations when we blur the distinction between our right (as citizens) to shape the built environment and our mission (as heritage protectors) to rise above personal taste on certain occasions. The neglect of this issue has resulted in a failure that can justly be described as a breakdown of ethics: a failure to articulate properly the needs of self as they relate to the needs of others. It accounts for the extraordinary speed with which guardians of heritage can turn with an air of utter nonchalance into the most pernicious of destroyers. It accounts in part for the spectacle of preservation veterans campaigning as "expert witnesses" against the preservation of buildings that are less than architectural masterworks buildings whose retention, we are told, would somehow "lower the standards of the preservation movement."

There is another contributing factor in this situation. the relative paucity of academic historians involved in historic preservation. On a certain level, of course, almost every preservationist acknowledges that the mission of heritage protection is linked to the serious study of history. We save historic buildings not only because we happen to like them but also because we are entrusted with a duty to pass along significant evidence of history to our descendants. We know that historic buildings are a form of documentation and that the preservation of significant parts of our built environment relates to the broader mandate to study and interpret and teach about the history of our society. We know all this: but how often do preservationists consciously reflect that it may be just as wrong to obliterate historic buildings for reasons of personal taste as it would be wrong and foolish to expunge from the written historical record an account of incidents or institutions of which we do not personally approve? The problem is that social and cultural historians generally spurn the field of historic preservation and vice versa. Such academicians unfortunately tend to presume that historic preservation is the purview of architects and architectural historians and generally speaking, the preservation field gives precisely that exclusionist impression. There is no escaping the fact that the professional subculture of historic preservation is excessively architectdriven and the broader preservation subculture is excessively connoisseurdominated. Most troubling of all, the field of architectural history with all due respect to the architectural historians who study vernacular design and its social context - remains heavily composed of individuals who

scorn the study of anything less than elite masterworks. The result can be a serious inversion of values whereby our heritage mission is subverted into a genteel rampage for "good design" however we happen to define it.

An extraordinary example of the sort of design mania that vitiates the heritage mission of the preservation movement occurred in a major city about a half dozen years ago. The local nonprofit preservation organization agreed to the demolition of a major contributing building within a historic district on the condition that they would be allowed to participate in the design of the new building that would replace it. The new building, allegedly to be designed in the idiom of the building that it would replace, would supposedly constitute a "superior" version of the aesthetic principles embodied in the original historic building. The architect who designed the new building argued that his building was actually "better" for the historic district than the historic building. This architect was and is widely praised for being "sensitive" to preservation. Many people refer to him as a "preservationist."

This type of "preservation connoisseurship" becomes even more excruciating when the understanding of what constitutes "architecture" degenerates to the level of mere motifs and ornamentation. An example of this occurred at a recent public hearing before a local regulatory commission at which the preservation staff of the local government argued that the roof of a historic building was "not an architecturally significant element" presumably because it did not possess ornamental qualities reflective of a "style." In this manner a building that was a unique historical document a historic resource exuding the authentic qualities of the longvanished period in which it was created was mentally reduced from a unified entity (a building) to a disconnected series of visual motifs. Even the developer's architect chuckled that the roof of the historic building seemed like a rather significant architectural element to him: it kept out the rain.

These cases are powerfully illustrative because of their sheer grotesquerie: they are not illustrations of dishonesty at all; they are illustrations of confusion. But the sort of perversity revealed by these case studies is far more prevalent within the preservation movement than many might care to acknowledge. Consider the fact that for a great many years the preservation movement has promoted an absurd dichotomy between the attributes of historic resources that are said to possess purely "architectural significance" and the attributes

that are supposed to possess purely "historical significance" as though the realms of architecture and history can be totally divorced from each other. But it should go without saying that history encompasses everything in human experience of which we have a record consequently, it should go without saying that history, in a certain fundamental way, encompasses architecture.

I submit that if we wish to uphold and perpetuate our mission of heritage conservation, we are urgently obliged to return to first principles. Specifically, the time has come for us to put the architects and design enthusiasts back in their proper place politely but firmly. The time has come for us to put history in all of its humanistic and interdisciplinary glory into a position of moral primacy. We must vigorously reestablish the validity of social and cultural history in the interpretation of buildings. Otherwise the buildings themselves may quickly dissolve into nebulous aggregations of motifs and ornaments for cultural dabblers to pick apart according to their whims.

The harshness of this prescription should not be taken to imply that the ethical challenge of historic preservation is uniformly easy or unambiguous. To the contrary: there are times when the most conscientious preservationist will have to engage in soulsearching. On the one hand, we have to confess that our own editorial readings of architecture may well turn out to be as much the stuff of human vanity as any other aspect of our existence. The gods laugh and without a doubt, the contemporary buildings that strike us as vulgar will eventually enter the realm of our society's heritage if they survive. Uncomfortable as this thought may be, there is consolation in the knowledge that life is after all a great deal bigger than us and our personal taste. It is endlessly instinctive to reread the intolerant polemics directed against the legacy of Victoriana through the midtwentieth century.

But on the other hand, our most saintly devotion to the rights of other generations can never negate the fact that we, as citizens, possess a few rights of our own. Surely we have the right to see our personal preferences in urban design and aesthetics play a role in our own communities, at least to a certain extent. There are times when we feel it is perfectly proper to engage in a bit of pruning and weeding of the built environment. There are times when every one of us will smile with pleasure as we watch the wrecking ball smash an edifice we happen to loathe and despise. We are all bedeviled by the buildings we regard as eyesores, buildings that strike us as being outrageously mediocre or outrageously

intrusive and arrogant. Are we not dutybound to confess that this is sometimes the case?

The problem, of course, is the challenge of determining how to strike the right balance between our own legitimate needs and the needs of other generations. This problem is especially severe when buildings from the recent past become the subject matter of historical survey work. When historical analysis approaches a bit too close to our contemporary passions, the most benign motivations of others may seem to be malignant threats to the heritage resources that are nearest and dearest to us. An exchange of viewpoints in two recent issues of the S.A.H. Forum the bulletin of the Society of Architectural Historians' Committee on Preservation -- is especially illustrative in this regard.

The controversy started with an essay exploring the significance of twentiethcentury commercial buildings that are rapidly disappearing from the American landscape pioneer examples of motorage shopping centers in particular. This article elicited a scathing reaction from a selfproclaimed preservationist who blasted "the preoccupation of some architectural historians and preservationists with salvaging each bit of instructive ugliness of our built environment." The very act of asking questions regarding the significance of certain twentiethcentury buildings seemed to this person a "flatulent distraction" from the work of "community enhancement." "We are being told to embrace every piece of detritus as part of the living record of our commercial culture," the critic complained. The act of saving even one example of a vanishing building type (regardless of where the particular building is located) seems equivalent in the view of this critic to demanding that every single example of the building type "every piece of detritus" be retained upon the North American continent in perpetuity. This spectacle of an allornothing fight to the death between "my preferred heritage" and "your preferred heritage" is clear and depressing evidence of the direction in which the preservation movement may be heading unless we start to articulate the issues of preservation ethics with greater clarity.

The ethical climate in which preservationists function must do ample justice to the types of questions upon which sincere and dedicated preservationists will disagree. Preservationists with genuine scholarly credentials may nonetheless honestly differ regarding the historic significance of a disputed building or site. Preservationists with unimpeachable records of dedication to the movement may

sincerely disagree regarding the extent of rehabilitation that is justified in a [missing text] preservationists who were trying to save it kept pleading with us to understand.

Is this admittedly radical proposal too extreme for us to entertain? Does it force us into standards of selfdenial that none of us would care to live with? If so, consider the second proposal more conservative in some respects, but equally dramatic. How would it be if we declared it unethical for anyone to call for the destruction of a property listed in (or determined eligible for) the National Register of Historic Places? How would it be if we declared that a person who does such a thing can no longer be regarded as a preservationist? Think of what this simple step could mean for the preservation movement. And consider the possible spinoffs: think of the change that would occur if the National Trust for Historic Preservation could prevail upon the American Institute of Architects to call it unethical for any member architect to take a commission that involves the destruction of a National Register property.

Is this second proposal too extreme and radical as well? I submit that if the preservation movement cannot find the clarity of purpose to take at least some sorts of steps like the ones that I have just described, we might as well resign ourselves to being part of a movement that cannot claim firstrank status in the roster of advocacy movements that have changed American history. Second or thirdrank, perhaps but that will be all. The moral strength of the mission for heritage protection is ours if we have the will to use it. We can summon to our cause the profundity of Edmund Burke's visionthe vision of intergenerational duty that expresses the ethical basis for the preservation movement with matchless eloquence.

If this is too much for us, then the practical alternative is clear: we can always return to the Halloween revel, the witches' sabbath where the members of other generations with a stake in our collective heritage are told (in effect) with a selfindulgent sneer that they can all go to hell Think it over carefully otherwise, happy Halloween for the foreseeable future.[missing text] particularly sensitive preservation project. Preservationists known for their fearless honesty may very well differ dramatically on the question of whether a particular compromise between development and preservation is defensible.

Nonetheless while making due allowance for the obvious benefits that flow, from debate within the preservation

movement the need for philosophic and practical guidelines arming the basic tenets of the movement has been long apparent. In the 1960s the National Register criteria legitimized the preservation of buildings and sites whose significance is local or regional. In the 1970s the Secretary of Interior's Standards codified the practices essential to maintaining the identity and intelligibility of historic buildings and structures. In the 1980s the testimony guidelines promulgated by the Society of Architectural Historians established some ground rules for differentiating the work of intellectual hacks from the work of reputable scholars. In the 1990s we should build upon this work in the realm of preservation ethics. I will now suggest two alternative but mutually consistent strategies one of them radical and one of them conservative for your consideration. These proposals in no way preclude a more fully articulated code of ethics; they are simply intended to trigger discussion and action.

First, the radical proposal. How would it be if we defined the ethical basis for preservationism as a fundamental commitment to put the rights of other generations first if the issue of heritage protection is raised? This would mean, that we would always choose to err on the side of posterity if a responsible case for the preservation of a building or structure is being advanced. It would not mean that every single building on the surface of this planet must continue to exist in perpetuity. It would not mean that we would lose our freedom of speech our freedom to disagree about the merits of the case for preservation. But it would mean that we would consciously refrain from airing these disagreements publicly, in a manner that would undermine the work of our fellow preservationists. It would mean something comparable to the Hippocratic oath among physicians: do no harm. It would mean that we would never allow ourselves to be perceived as saying "Yes, tear it down" when responsible colleagues were invoking the cause of heritage. It would mean that we acknowledge the terrible truth that when a building or structure is demolished it is gone forever. It would mean that we understand what a dreadful thing it is to realize too late that a demolished building was indeed as important as the [missing text]

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR'S
STANDARDS
FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION PROJECTS:
ETHICS IN ACTION

by

W. Brown Morton III, Hon. AIA
Chair, Department of Historic Preservation
Mary Washington College, Fredericksburg,
Virginia

Informed intervention is the basic task of successful historic preservation. When all survey and evaluation work has been accomplished, all historical and archaeological research completed, and all planning questions resolved, historic preservation boils down to the job of maintaining what we have resolved to keep. To be successful this requires three things: sound professional policies or standards on which to base our actions; thorough scientific knowledge of the conservation needs of the many different materials found in cultural resources; and a responsible and efficient maintenance program.

The need for sound professional policies or standards as the basis for informed intervention cannot be emphasized. The word standard used in reference to historic preservation has two basic meanings, the first and most common is "that which is set up and established by authority as a rule for the measure of quantity, weight, extent, value or quality." An example of this is an ASTM Standard Specification, "a precise statement of a sheet of requirements to be satisfied by a material, product, system, or service that also indicates the procedures for determining whether each of the requirements is satisfied." ASTM, formerly The American Society for Testing and Materials, develops and publishes technical standards that are internationally accepted.

A second meaning is of the word standard is "that which is established by authority, custom, or general consent, as a model or example." It is in this second sense that

standards are addressed in this paper; standards as a code of ethics as general statements that apply to all preservation work and which articulate an attitude or set of values against which a specific action or plan can be evaluated.

The development of preservation standards in the United States can be traced back to early mission statements for individual projects, such as the stirring words of Ann Pamela Cunningham included in her 1874 farewell address to the Council of the Mount Vernon Ladies' Association of the Union. "Ladies, the home of Washington is in your charge see to it that you keep it the home of Washington!! Let no irreverent hand change it; let no vandal hands desecrate it with the fingers of 'progress'. Those who go to the home in which he lived and died wish to see in what he lived and died. Let one spot in this grand country of ours be saved from change."

Professionally trained individuals such as architect, architectural historian and museum director, Fiske Kimball also forged policies and standards for preservation through their advice to private clients and their service on important advisory committees. Kimball advised the Robert E. Lee Memorial Foundation on the restoration of Stratford Hall in Virginia. In 1930 he wrote, "In such a precious building the dominant thought, no doubt, should be preservation and the greatest conservation should be exercised as to changing anything, even if this is believed to be changing it back to the way it was supposed formerly to have been."

In 1936, Kimball, also serving on the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings and Monuments stimulated the first National Park Service preservation policy for historic preservation work.

This policy, first published in 1937, articulated an intellectual and methodological framework for historic preservation and interpretation that became the model for the nation for the next three decades. The National Park Service Restoration Policy Statement included an aphorism that had become the backbone of American preservation ethics, "Better preserve than repair, better repair than restore, better restore than reconstruct." At Colonial Williamsburg in the 1930's preservation standards were developed in large part by the Advisory Committee of Architects, a group which also included Fiske Kimball. American preservation policies and standards have developed, for the most part, out of American experience of preserving American resources. There has always been, however, an awareness of preservation practice in other countries, especially Great Britain and France. An

American preservation pioneer, William Sumner Appleton, founder of the Society for the Preservation of New England Antiquities, was in regular contact with the Society for the Preservation of Ancient Buildings in England and he was familiar with its "antiscrape" policy articulated by its founder William Morris, and, no doubt, with John Ruskin's influential book, *Seven Lamps of Architecture*, published in 1849, which deplored the "restoration" or backdating of historic buildings. The views of Morris and Ruskin were in contrast to the standards practiced by the mid-19th century French architect/restorer Eugene Emmanuel Viollet-le-Duc who did not hesitate to remove later work from ancient buildings or replace missing or never fully achieved architectural features with versions from his own hand.

American attitudes towards preservation have also been influenced by the 20th century effort to develop internationally accepted policies and standards for historic preservation work. Contemporary international preservation policies and standards have their beginning in the Athens Charter of 1931 and were further expanded by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) in a series of Conventions and Recommendations concerning the protection of the cultural heritage, beginning in the 1950s. In 1964, the 2nd International Congress of Architects and Technicians of Historic Monuments enlarged upon the concepts of the Athens Charter and adopted the International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments which has become known as the Venice Charter. Although several Americans attended that congress, none of them served on the drafting committee for the new charter.

The preamble to the Venice Charter states, "It is essential that the principles guiding the preservation and restoration of ancient buildings should be agreed upon and laid down on an international basis, with each country being responsible for applying the plan within the framework of its own culture and traditions." The historic preservation community in the United States has never formally adopted the Venice Charter as a basis for American preservation practice. Conservation attitudes about private property ownership and the essentially grass roots nature of the effort set the United States too far apart from the European model to be a perfect or easy fit. However, the participation of the United States as a member state in international intergovernmental organizations such as UNESCO and the International Centre for the Study of Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM)

and the participation of many American preservationists in those organizations and in international nongovernmental organizations such as the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) and the International Council of Museums (ICOM) has resulted in the integration of many of the concepts of the Venice Charter into American preservation thinking.

A look at the first two articles of the Venice charter clearly demonstrated the degree to which this integration has taken place.

Article 1. The concept of an historic monument embraces not only the single architectural work but also the urban or rural setting in which is found the evidence of a particular civilization, a significant development or an historical event. This applies not only to great works of art but also to more modest works of the past which has acquired cultural significance with the passing time.

In the United States, since the 1960s, there has been a steady move away from thinking of historic preservation in terms of individual isolated high style buildings towards an appreciation of the historic context of any building in the totality of its setting. Concurrently, there has been growing interest in the study of vernacular buildings all across America. It is interesting to note, however, that the concept of an historic district is not mentioned in the Venice Charter.

Article 2. The conservation and restoration of monuments must have recourse to all the sciences and techniques which can contribute to the study of safeguarding of the architectural heritage.

Prior to the 1960s, historic preservation in America was largely the province of architects, archaeologists, historians and people skilled in traditional building crafts. Since that time the understanding that historic preservation is truly an interdisciplinary undertaking has become commonplace. Today, chemists, engineers, geographers, anthropologists, biologists, botanists, geologists, economists, and physicists are routinely found on preservation projects.

In 1979, in response to a variety of national preservation initiatives in the United States undertaken by the Federal government, the Department of the Interior published The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Preservation Projects with Guidelines for Applying the Standards, prepared by W. Brown Morton III and Gary L. Hume of the National Park Service. The purpose of the Secretary's Standards was to provide a basis for evaluating the quality of preservation work carried out with federal assistance that was

not arbitrary. Drafting national standards for historic preservation projects grew out of a request to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the National Park Service from the Department of Housing and Urban Development to assist HUD in defining the nature and scope of a program for low interest loans for rehabilitating historic houses, under provision of the 1974 Emergency Home Purchase Act. Morton and Hume, working with the Advisory Council staff, developed Guidelines for Rehabilitating Old Buildings, published by HUD in 1976. At the same time, they worked with the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers to prepare guidelines for all eligible grantinaid activities permitted under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966.

Just at this juncture, Congress passed the Tax Reform Act of 1976, signed by President Gerald Ford in October, 1976, shortly before he lost the election campaign to Jimmy Carter. The Tax Reform Act provided for "tax incentives to encourage the preservation of historic structures." The incentives included provisions for "amortization of certain rehabilitation expenditures for certified historic structures," and applied to structures used for business related purposes certified by the Secretary of the Interior as being "Certified Historic Structures" which has received "Certified Rehabilitation." Certified Rehabilitation was defined in the act as "any rehabilitation of a certified historic structure which the Secretary of the Interior has certified... as being consistent with the historic character of such property or the district in which such property is located." Federal regulations issued in 1977 further stated, "In order for the tax consequences described above relating to rehabilitation to accrue, the Secretary must determine that it meets certain standards with respect to the historic integrity of the rehabilitation work."

Since the 1977 interim Federal regulations called for "standards" for rehabilitation, Morton and Hume recast and expanded the HUD "guidelines" for rehabilitation as "standards." The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation were published in the Code of Federal Regulations in March, 1977. They were followed, later in 1977, by the full set of standards, The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Preservation Projects with Guidelines for Applying the Standards. These standards, finally published for wide national distribution in 1979, represent the first effort in the history of the United States to articulate and place in Federal regulations an ethical framework for historic

preservation work and to foster a national consensus for appropriate action.

The Secretary's Standards have undergone revision on several occasions, most recently last year. The current version is titled, *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties 1992*.

The thrust of the Secretary's Standards was to provide clear but flexible guidance for government agencies, institutions and individuals to make responsible decisions when undertaking preservation projects anywhere in the United States. Eight general standards were developed for all preservation projects and additional standards were developed appropriate only to particular undertakings such as acquisition, protection, stabilization, preservation, rehabilitation, restoration and reconstruction. The influence of the Venice Charter on the Secretary's Standards is clear.

A comparison of a few of the articles of the Venice Charter with some of the Secretary's Standards demonstrates this.

The Venice Charter

Article 5. The conservation of monuments is always facilitated by making use of them for some socially useful purpose. Such use is therefore desirable but it must not change the layout or decoration of the building. It is within these limits only that modifications demanded by a change of function should be envisaged and may be permitted.

The Secretary's Standards

Standard 1. Every reasonable effort shall be made to provide a compatible use for a property that required minimal alteration of the building, structure, or site and its environment, or to use a property for its originally intended purpose.

The Venice Charter

Article 8. Items of sculpture, painting or decoration which form an integral part of a monument may only be removed from it if this is the sole means of ensuring their preservation.

The Secretary's Standards

Standard 2. The distinguishing original qualities or character of a building, structure or site and its environment shall not be destroyed. The removal or alteration of any historic material or distinctive architectural features should be avoided when possible.

Standard 5. Distinctive stylistic features or examples of skilled craftsmanship which characterize a building, structure, or site, shall be treated with sensitivity.

The Venice Charter

Article 11. The valid contribution of all periods to the building of a monument must be respected, since unity of style is not the aim of a restoration. When a building includes the superimposed work of different periods, the revealing of an underlying style can only be justified in exceptional circumstances and when what is removed is of little interest and is the material which is brought to light is of great historical, archaeological or aesthetic value, and its state of preservation good enough to justify the action. Evaluation of the importance of the elements involved and the decision as to what may be destroyed cannot rest solely on the individual in charge of the work.

The Secretary's Standards

Standard 4. Changes which may have taken place in the course of time are evidence of the history and development of a building, structure, or site and its environment. These changes may have acquired significance in their own right, and this significance shall be recognized and respected.

Shared standards are needed at every scale of preservation work, from international programs touching every corner of the globe to the most modest local preservation initiative. It is heartening to note that since 1979 many local governments, architectural review boards, private preservation organizations and individual property owners and developers across the nation have adopted The Secretary of the Interior's Standard's for Historic Preservation Projects, or later versions, to be their standards. Without shared preservation standards of the highest quality in place and agreed upon, local preservation more often than not is reduced to bickering and chaos.

The Secretary's Standards seek to establish an ethical framework or "temenos" within which responsible preservation work can take place throughout a community or region.

Standard 1 addresses the basic principal that a compatible use for a property is one that required the minimum of change, preferably no change at all, from the original intended purpose. The ethical idea here is that "less is more" the smaller the degree of change the greater the level of retained integrity.

A guiding concept of cultural resource management throughout the Western world is that the retention of original or early material is essential to the integrity and significance of the resource. "Is this Grandfather's axe?". We may ask the question? Not if it has had two new blades and three new

handles since his lifetime! It may look like Grandfather's axe. It may work like Grandfather's axe. It may be an exact replication of Grandfather's axe. But it is not the genuine article.

Therefore, Standard 2, quoted earlier, seeks to prevent the indiscriminate alteration or destruction of those materials and features of historic resources that give a community or rural area its visual character, such as landscape

20

features, outbuildings, windows, doors, porches, stairs and mantels. Far too many historic American buildings have been stripped, gutted, amputated or camouflaged in the name of "rehabilitation."

In this context it may be helpful to distinguish a preservation nuance between the words "genuine" and "authentic", although in fact both words spring from the same Greek root. Genuine can be defined as "actually belonging to, or proceeding, from the reputed sources, origin, or author;" authentic as "authoritative trustworthy, credible, true." Thus a reconstruction of an historic building can be authentic but never genuine.

Standard 3 addresses the almost universal and inappropriate urge of newcomers to historic preservation to backdate historic resources in order to create a flattering past. In Alexandria, Virginia, in the 1950s, the 19th century building stock vanished beneath layers of mock 18th century kitsch. It went without saying that a doorway without brass coach lights and a room without chair rail were beneath one's notice.

Standard 4 extends the thinking of Standard 2 in order to protect later additions or alterations to historic resources that have significance and value in their own right although they may be of a later period than the original. Americans are much too ready to remove 19th century additions to 18th century American buildings, or rip 1930's ArtDeco storefronts off of commercial buildings of the last century, whereas they would be horrified if someone suggested removing a 14th century addition from a 13th century Gothic church in Normandy or a Georgian drawing room from a Jacobean manor house in Gloucestershire.

Standard 5 seeks to instill respect for examples of skilled craftsmanship. It is self evident that we cannot preserve the past, we can only protect and honor those "things" from the past that have survived, by some miracle, into the present with us, and to which we attach some value. The reason why sensitivity to original or early material is

essential to the integrity and significance of a cultural resource is the simple fact that no reproduction, however well done, can ever be more than an elegant fake. We who live in the present time cannot have the artistic vision or the social, political and spiritual perspective of any era but our own. We cannot recapture the creativity impulse or have the artistic hand or eye of another age.

Standard 6, echoes the 1937 National Park Service Restoration Policy Statement: "Better preserve than repair, etc." We can preserve past work but we can never create it. This is why reproductions or reconstructions of historic buildings soon cease to fool the eye and are quickly recognized as products of their own time.

Standard 7 warns against the dangers of inappropriate cleaning methods, sandblasting in particular. The ethic here, is by now self-evident: historic fabric loses value through change.

Standard 8 seeks to raise our consciousness of the importance of protecting archaeological resources. Such resources are largely ignored by private property owners. "Out of sight, out of mind." is a true cliché. When thought of at all, many people, associate archaeology exclusively with excavation, which sounds expensive and time consuming to the common ear. We need to say the word "protection" more loudly.

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation add two more standards to the eight general standards. They both address the ethics of new construction.

Contemporary preservation thinking, common to both the Venice Charter and the Secretary's Standards, is that new work should not mock old world. New additions to old buildings or, for that matter, new construction within a historic district should be of contemporary design although compatible in size, scale, color, material and character with earlier work. New work should never be mistaken for old work. To make a new building look like an old one is intellectually dishonest. It creates the false impression that there is more remaining from the past than there actually is. Faking the historic scene by adding copycat additions to existing structure or erecting lookalike infill structure in historic districts is like adding a new sentence or two to the Declaration of Independence or inserting an entirely new act in Shakespearean English into Hamlet and hoping that no one will notice.

Partner to the idea that new is new, is that new additions to older buildings should always be reversible, so

that they may be removed in the future without inflicting damage to the historic fabric of the earlier structure. The ethics here is sheer common sense. In an age of rapidly changing technology, it is to be hoped that our older buildings will be retrofitted many times over in the future.

The Secretary of the Interior Standards for Historic Preservation Projects have made positive contribution to historic preservation efforts not only in the United States but around the world. The Standards were, for example, included verbatim in Sir Bernard Feilden's seminal work, *Conservation of Historic Buildings*. The Standards have encouraged thoughtful debate and discussion. The Standards have slowed the hands of the hasty. In those instances, however, where the Standards have been mistaken for rules where ethical reflection has been replaced by bureaucratic fiat, the Standards have sometimes failed. No standard, no matter how thoughtfully worded, can ever replace the hard work of fresh thinking, with open eyes.

ENDNOTES

SUBJECTIVITY IN ETHICS

by DeTeel Patterson Tiller

Chief, Preservation Planning Branch

National Park Service, Washington, D.C.

Colleagues, good morning. What intrigued me on the subject of preservation ethics was a particular slant that I have been mulling over for some time. This is a topic on which I have some rather specific opinions and on which Michael has been forced to endure a number of my musings. I guess that he wanted to spread around the wealth and subject you to it. So here I am today.

We who practice in the field of historic preservation or you who teach preservation courses promote the belief that it embodies values that are objectively right and true. We're the good guys! The practice of historic preservation is founded on this core belief.

What I hope to suggest today is that historic preservation ethics and practices, particularly as they function through public policy, advance paradigms (like history) that are highly subjective, based in certain practices and standards that are the products of the history of our profession and a product of certain academic methodologies, and (THIS IS THE IMPORTANT PART) these are not always resonant with our nation's population, policy and law makers, and elected officials.

I use the terms ethic for purposes of this discussion not as a measure of moral rightness or good versus evil, but in the root of the word "ethos" as the distinguishing characteristics of guiding beliefs of the way that historic preservation does business. "Ethos" = the guiding moral (small m) principles or practices of our profession. I choose to field the challenge to address some aspect of historic preservation ethics from a perspective about which I am most familiar as head of an office in the National Park Service whose job is public policy in historic preservation. This was a point from which I thought I might offer observations and contribute most usefully to the discussions today.

I want to frame our discussions within the context of the familiar: the National Register of Historic Places, the Secretary of the Interior's "Standards for Rehabilitation", survey and inventory practices, the Certified Local Government Program, and the Section 106 process building blocks of the core, national preservation program. Familiar to anyone remotely interested in this business.

What I want to do is address the ethical premises behind the policies and practices of our national program as these are delivered through such mechanisms as the National Register. I want to ask questions today about the ethical objectivity of these policies within a political climate that is increasingly "anything but friendly".

Several years ago and with much hoopla, the preservation community joined the National Trust in San Francisco to celebrate the 25th anniversary of the National Historic Preservation Act. Within the walls of our meeting there was more self congratulation and yet, appropriately, recognition of the challenges that lie ahead as we face the next millennia

I find this intriguing given the palpably hostile climate in which historic preservation "writ large" often finds itself today. A few years ago, the Congress held up creation of a new unit of the National Park Service, until the Secretary of the Interior withdrew a contested Determination of Eligibility a credible determination, well researched and readily justifiable. It was withdrawn. The National Register is now widely under attack nationwide by those who equate designation as a taking under the fifth amendment to the Constitution. Appropriations to the Historic Preservation Fund have remained largely underwhelming and, in terms of actual dollars factoring for inflation, have decreased over the years. The courts are moving to ever increasing ambiguity towards historic preservation. The

Penn Central Case seems more a distant memory than a legal touchstone. Expansion of the Charleston, South Carolina Historic District was vigorously opposed recently by the local political structure and citizens alikedespite the overwhelming influence and economic benefits of heritage tourism on the local economy.

Does this mean that the nation is newly hostile to historic preservation and the past writ large? If the cause is just and the course true as we see and teach it, why the opposition?

The answer to this conundrum lies, I believe, in a series of policies and professional practices in historic preservation that we believe are the appropriate way to do business (OUR ETHIC) that we believe are objective and well rooted in science and/or academic methods and practices BUT THAT nonetheless, often place us at odds with just about every body else. This is not necessarily a "bad" thing unless of course we want others to buy into our vision of a "city on the hill" in which the preservation of our cultural patrimony plays a large quality of life role. What's the problem?

My short answer is what I call the, "my history is not your history" OR "My preservation is not your Preservation" problem. Let me give you an example. As I have begun to understand this problem from experiences in different parts of the nation, I have searched largely in vain for thoughtful writings in the preservation community on this idea in both the published and gray literature. There is not much out there. I did find one colleague, Catherine Bisher (from the North Carolina State Historic Preservation Office) writing in her usual witty and incisive style in *Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture* in a small article called "Yuppies, Bubbas, and the Politics of Culture". If you are not familiar with it, may I recommend it. It is always popular in my class reading compendium.

Catherine muses about the preservation ethic of the practice of SURVEY the backbone of our nation's preservation program and frontline employer of almost every graduate of an historic preservation program. Speaking about survey, she says, "Many of us as preservation professionals have said something like this (in however tactful terms) to a local political figure or preservation buff after the obligatory introductory tour of the community: "This house you love because it was your grandmother's house isn't all that significant, because stylistically it's marginal at best." Or, "This mansion your committee wants to save because it belonged to Colonel Ravenel and Miss Julia who had the Civil War monument

erected and the library established, that's quite admirable. But let me explain to you about the greater significance of this other thing." The "Other Thing" is usually a resource evaluated under Criterion C for the National Register the best commercial structure, the best dogtrot, best of exemplary 1950s drive in market, best whatever.

What is it we're hearing here? Two different value or ethical systems at work. National Register statistics give an interesting spin on this. Fully 81% of all listing in the National Register are under criterion C. The surveyor in Catherine's story is hearing National Register criteria A & B from the locals, but steering them to Criterion C. My history is not your history. My preservation is not your preservation.

Might I also recommend a similar thoughtful piece about historic resource surveys? Read Randolph T. Hester, Jr.'s 1990 article in *Small Town* entitled "The Sacred Structure in Small Towns: A Return to Manteo, North Carolina." Hester, a landscape architect and Chair of the Department of Landscape Architecture at the University of California, Berkeley, was employed by the town of Manteo, North Carolina to develop a community plan in 1980. Hester found similar problems in traditional historic preservation survey methodologies, but resolved them by letting the community develop its own survey and evaluation criteria.

What gives rise to this? Catherine Bisher attributes this to the fact that most preservationists, in their academic training, are educated in methodologies borne out of practices from art and architectural history backgrounds and are not suited or prepared to address the greater complexities needed in these two small towns one mythical, one not.

This is a break down, in my opinion, of very real and ethical proportions for all of the obvious reasons. Another example is Foley Square in Lower Manhattan. This is much in the news lately. For those of you unfamiliar with the situation, the Government Service Administration (GSA) began excavating a lot in Manhattan to construct a high-rise office building. A nominal effort at the most basic research (I am told) would have shown the potential for an archeological site of national significance. However it wasn't done. Construction unearthed the remains of an 18th and 19th century African American burying ground. Construction was halted, the 106 process swung into place, top flight archeology was undertaken using the best professional practices, the site determined eligible for the National Register under Criterion D, site recovery work begun, and plans to remove the bodies

developed. These are standard and acceptable politics, practices, and procedures.

The preservation ethic in full force. But they came up with the WRONG ANSWER, at least an incomplete answer. In historic preservation paradigms this as an archeological resource, significant under criterion D, but the African American community in the greater metropolitan area and throughout the nation saw a very different resource one more appropriately covered under Criteria A and B. These are different resources with probably different preservation outcomes. Our policies and practices led us to make the wrong choice at least from the perspective of one community.

I read with interest last week that a similar situation is arising at my alma mater, the University of Virginia. Construction on the grounds has uncovered the remains of a small 19th century African American cemetery. One hopes that the University will learn something from the Foley Square situation.

What am I pointing to? Simply that ethics of historic preservation are not always necessarily objectively right and true. That our public policy and professional practices are deeply rooted in specific ways of doing business that do not necessarily make sense to others.

Another ethical issue: standards of documentation and proof. Why is something historically significant? Historic preservation has developed detailed methods of proof, rooted in accepted Western standards of documentation. The completion of National Register nominations is a good case to examine, although the requirements in survey methodology or similar exercises in HABS/HAER documentation work as well.

What does it take to prove something historically significant? It is all clear in our minds. Yet increasingly, we are running afoul of cultures in this country who do not ascribe to the same Western standards of proof. Indians, Alaska Natives, Native Hawaiian, coral African American communities, and increasing influxes of immigrant populations are at odds with our ethos or public policy of proof.

Whole livelihoods in the field of historic preservation are made cranking out pages of statements of significance about a resource or historic district. We have hundreds of professionals in SHPO offices and the National Register pouring over these against a Platonic ideal of sufficiency bouncing these back when they are found wanting. But consider a culture for which this exercise is irrelevant. In Indian tribes, certain clans, families, or individuals are vested

as "keepers of information." If the individual so empowered by the community states that a place is holy or significant in the history of lore of his or her people, the IT IS. NO FURTHER PROOF IS NEEDED! Documenting our "Western" standards is irrelevant and culturally insulting. In many instances, it is breach of deeply held religious beliefs to indicate that location of these sites except in the most general of terms. Yet these sites are protected under the aegis of Section 106 of the Nation Historic Preservation Act. The conundrum is widely present in the 106/National Register nomination arena. Increasingly this is problematic for SHPOs, local, and federal preservation programs in the West, MidWest, Alaska, and Hawaii particularly in this decade of growing empowerment and litigiousness of the Native American populations.

A similar drama between different ethics in preservation is likewise playing out as the preservation/academic/ and museum communities wrestle with implementation of NAGPRA (Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act). The law provides for the return of Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian cultural remains and bodies held by museums and universities funded by Federal support. By some estimates, the skeletal remains of between 10 and 200,000 Native American are in the possession of such institutions. The Smithsonian alone possesses more than 18,500 Native American bodies, and it is estimated that the bones of approximately 3,500 individuals repose in the custody of the museums of the National Park Service. For many, especially Native Americans, the prospect of archaeologists digging up their ancestors, handling their bones, possibly cutting them up for sophisticated laboratory analysis, and then displaying them is disturbing if not horrifying.

NAGPRA seeks to return these bodies to their rightful families, tribes, and kinship groups. But taking these "resources" away from archaeologists and anthropologists is tantamount to forbidding architectural historians access to their books. Two preservation ethics at odds in a seemingly unsolvable struggle.

It is easy to marginalize many of the issues I have raised here by dismissing them as minor areas of interest to the practice and paradigms of historic preservation. After all, how many Indian tribes will my students have to deal with? (Actually, the answer will be MANY before their careers are over). I would like to continue to address my thesis on two more mainstreamed issues in historic preservation before I

close with you today the ethos of survey and the inventory of that data AND The Secretary of the Interior's "Standards for Rehabilitation."

Survey is the most fundamental bedrock ethos of how we work. "You can't save them unless you know where they are," a colleague in the West Virginia SHPO likes to say. Since the passage of the National Historic Preservation Act in 1966 as part of LBJ's Great Society, the national preservation program has spent millions on the search for, identification and evaluation of historic and archeological resources. The act of surveying and the inventory repository of these data are at the core of every SHPO and local preservation organization.

As a profession we have developed highly standardized methodological approaches and public policies for conducting survey and inventorying the data derived. Research designs and final project reports have become highly formalized. The data itself (while variations occur from State to State and locality to locality) are largely based upon the elements of the National Register form what is it, how old is it, where is it, who built it and why is it significant, describe it and give me a bibliography, a picture, and a locator on a map.

And therein lies the problem. Let me relate an interesting story. In the aftermath of the Loma Prieta earthquake in the San Francisco Bay area, the federal and state disaster response teams (wishing to be fully responsive to historic preservation concerns) went to the California State Historic Preservation Office and the local preservation offices and asked the following question. "We want to be able to get as many people made homeless by the earthquake off the streets as soon as possible but, at the same time, want to be responsive to your needs. Can you tell us where the historically significant SRO (SINGLE ROOM OCCUPANCY) hotels or apartment buildings are so that we can give higher priority to making these habitable?" The offices could not!

Another story. In the aftermath of Hurricane Hugo, disaster recovery teams asked for the locations of historic properties in Charleston and the surrounding low country. Of course, the state could tell them, provided enough lead time. In this case because the state office does not have its database computerized, the lead time would have to be many weeks. FEMA and the local and State disaster recovery offices in both instances had to pass. Another critical missed opportunity! What does this tell us?

This tells us that historic resource inventories (our policies that have driven them) are largely not responsive to critical audiences for which their creation and federal support were originally intended. If you study the testimony in the 196566

bearings that lead up to the creation of the National Historic Preservation Act, one key moving force behind authorizing a national survey at the state and local levels was to respond to the rampant federal urban development that was decimating the historic neighborhoods in our many metropolitan areas, and to respond to the dredging of waterfronts and the Western reclamation projects which were destroying untold archeological sites. Survey was conceived as a tool in landuse planning.

Historic preservation is first and foremost a land use issue (to my mind no different from transportation, criminal justice, natural conservation, and housing). We are an interest area on the land. Yet most historic resource inventories have been developed and continue to be seen by State Historic Preservation offices, universities, and local preservation organizations as an archive of resources, based upon archeological, anthropological, art history, or architectural history methodologies and information needs. Our inventory information is more interested in whether or not a building water table is a cavetto overan ovolo rather than whether the building is in a 100 year flood plain.

I am not (AND LET ME BE CLEAR HERE) suggesting that we should not be collecting the important historical data. This is first and foremost our mission. What I am proposing is an "AND ALSO" situation rather than an "EITHER OR". Historic resource inventories must become more management oriented in the information they collect and the way they are managed.

"Well that's not our job," is the usual response that I am given by my colleagues in the SHPO offices when I bring this issue up. My response is, "Well, then whose is it?" Historic preservation concerns are a small player in the larger field of landuse planning and management. While government and planning entities will try to do the best of their abilities to comply with NEPA, Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, AIRFA, etc., they should not be required to pick their way through the mine fields of our profession. That's our job, not theirs. And that's the answer. Historic resource inventories must be seen by the historic preservation profession not as arcane repositories of information open to researchers and those undaunted by the challenge of finding the information, but as open interactive databases that assist in the management of these resources and ensure their preservation for future generations.

A codicil to the Hurricane Hugo story. The Hugo situation points out another problem with historic resource inventories. Actually it points out two, and both center on technology. Increasingly, SHPOs and local resource inventories are becoming victims of their own efforts. Databases, which are not

computerized, are becoming increasingly bloated with information that is all but inaccessible except to those with saintlike patience. Any level of empirical analyses (even at the most fundamental level) for instance, "How many Woodland or Extended Coalescent sites are there in x, y, and z counties within an SMSA and within a flood plain?" is all but impossible to determine without endless, hand manipulated searches.

In addition to the issue of SHPO inventories not collecting adequate data to manage the resources, the manner in which the information is kept is also problematic.

Governments and land use planners tend to work in terms of map data most moving towards a GIS information database. Historic resource inventories are exclusively (at least to my knowledge) analog. This makes sense given our academic roots. The problem is, though, that if these data cannot be exported to those who need it (governments, COGS, and land planning agencies) it is virtually useless within that arena.

Lastly, I want to raise the issue of the Secretary of the Interior's "Standards for Rehabilitation". They, and the National Register of Historic Places, are perhaps the two most pervasive public policies and ethics of our national preservation program. The "Standards" guide the preservation tax incentives program, direct expenditures of the Historic Preservation Fund on development work through our SHPO offices and Certified Local Governments, and are at the core of most every historic district throughout the nation. They are significant and important achievements.

They are genetic lineal descendants of William Morris and the AntiScrape Society in the UK made American through such distinguished alumni as William Summer Appleton at SPNEA. They make sound intellectual sense to us and we believe them to be a sound ethos for the nation's public policy.

But I must tell you as one who administered the Tax Program over an 8-year period, they do not have intellectual resonance with the broad populace in this country a population where the power of reconstruction and restoration remain towering intellectual ideals. AntiScrape does not make sense to most people. They see no sense in leaving the 1930s storefront on the 1879 commercial building. "After all, we're restoring the building, aren't we?", they say. 60 years after the fact, Williamsburg remains a powerful avatar to those who like historic preservation but who are not "in the profession." Citizens, architects, and lawmakers alike have teamed to adopt the "Standards" because they want the money or the tax

credits or need clearance for purposes of the Section 106 reviews, but to my experience, have never wholeheartedly bought into the ethos.

The changing demographics of our nation also call into question the cultural applicability of the Secretary's "Standards". Increasing waves of immigrant Americans find the founding ethos behind them strange and unfamiliar. In many cultures, the object itself is immaterial to the process that created it. We are all familiar with the Grand Shrines at use in Japan where every 20 years for the past 1,300 the buildings have been demolished and recreated identically. The historic tradition of the ACT is far greater than the historic resource itself.

The Secretary's "Standards for Rehabilitation" increasingly are in conflict with the cultural values of our native populations (Indians, Native Hawaiians, and Alaska Natives). As this nation grows in cultural diversity (we are told that within the next 2030 years, we will be a nation of minorities). We must, as a profession remain vigilant to the continuing relevance of our public policy to our constituency.

I want to close by punctuating my points this morning with a very real issue. The American Heritage Partnership Act of 1993. This bill (still in draft) may soon be winding its way through the Congress. If enacted, the legislation would allow the Department of the Interior (through the National Park Service) to recognize, promote, and assist designated heritage areas throughout the country working in cooperation with public and private entities at the State and local levels.

At present there are 4 such Congressionally designated heritage areas: 1. The Blackstone River Valley in Massachusetts and Rhode Island; 2. the Delaware and Lehigh Valley Canal in Pennsylvania; 3. the Illinois and Michigan Canal in Illinois; and 4. America's Industrial Heritage Project in Pennsylvania.

A National Heritage Area will be a place where natural, cultural, and historic resources combine to form a cohesive, nationally significant cultural landscape arising from patterns of human activity shaped by geography. The proposed legislation would designate these areas upon signing the Bill, and others could be periodically added to the system through a formal designation process between Congress and the National Park Service. But they are not National Parks.

Behind the public face of it, the bill is an effort to forestall the "pork barrel" heritage area projects that have been the subject of so much press in the past. In particular, it is an

effort of the National Park Service to control such heritage park additions to the system as Steamtown or Johnstown Flood, as these are little more than Congressional pork to pump money and tourism into flagging local economies.

The proposal authorizes the National Park Service to work within these areas under the imprimatur of our arrowhead logo, with the local and state government to locate the significant historic resources, develop management and interpretation plans, and support entrepreneurial efforts over a 5 or 10 year period to help the locality to protect their heritage and to make it economically viable. At the end of a predetermined time, the National Park Service would withdraw, local economy thriving, and no unwanted additions to the Park System. Sound good? It is!

But wait a minute! Isn't this much of what the national preservation community is supposed to be doing? What about the SHPOs? The key word in the legislation is, after all, HERITAGE.

But nowhere in the bill do you see the words National Register, SHPO, Secretary of the Interior's Standards, Section 106, etc. In speaking with the drafters of the bill and the members of the Congress and their staffs, one picture becomes clear: FRUSTRATION. They in no way want the National Register or State Historic Preservation Offices anywhere near these projects. Those who are drafting the bill believe that the national preservation is mired hopelessly in archaia, redtape, academic squabbling more worried about a muntin profile in a rehabilitated warehouse than the economic benefits derived from the rehabilitation itself.

I believe that this bill is a very powerful concept which has a more than reasonable chance of survival. It conceives heritage areas as ecosystems and proposes to manage them as such. It also helps us dodge the bullet of unwanted additions to the National Park system. What is sad and telling is the vehemence with which the traditional historic preservation community is shut out of this, based on the general population's perception of our inability to manage the national preservation program in any fashion that meets the local and state needs.

**THE NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR
PRESERVATION EDUCATION**

Executive Committee, 1995-97:

David Ames, *Chair*

David Mertz, *1st Vice Chair*
Kevin Jordan, *2nd Vice Chair*
Donald Peting, *Secretary*
James Glass, *Treasurer*
Michael Tomlan, *Project Director*
Institutional Members:
University of Arizona
Armstrong State College
Ball State University
Belmont Technical College
Boston University
Bucks County Community College
Univ. of CaliforniaRiverside
University of Cincinnati
Colorado State University
Columbia University
Cornell University
University of Delaware
Eastern Michigan University
University of Florida
George Washington University
University of Georgia
Georgia State University
Goucher College
University of HawaiiManoa
Univ. of IllinoisUrbaneChampaign
Kansas State University
Kent State University
Mary Washington College
University of Maryland
Michigan State University
Middle Tennessee State University
University of MissouriColumbia
University of NevadaReno
University of New Orleans
Oklahoma State University
University of Oregon
University of Pennsylvania
RESTORE
Roger Williams University
Savannah College of Art and Design
Society of Architectural Historians
University of South Carolina
Southeast Missouri State University
University of Tennessee

University of Texas
Texas A&M University
University of Vermont
University of Virginia
University of Washington
Western Kentucky University
University of Wisconsin Milwaukee