National Park Service
U.S. Department of the Interior

CRM: The Journal of Heritage Stewardship

Volume 3 Number 1 Winter 2006

National Park Service
U.S. Department of the Interior

Cultural Resources

Gale A. Norton
Secretary of the Interior

Fran P. Mainella
Director, National Park Service

Janet Snyder Matthews, Ph.D.
Associate Director, Cultural Resources

CRM: The Journal of Heritage Stewardship

Winter 2006
ISSN 1068-4999

Sue Waldron
Publisher

Dennis | Konetzka | Design Group, LLC
Design

Staff

Antoinette J. Lee, Ph.D.
Editor

Martin Perschler, Ph.D.
Assistant Editor

Michele Gates Moresi, Ph.D.
Articles Editor

Lisa Pfueller Davidson, Ph.D.
Virginia Barrett Price
Research Reports Editors

Michelle J. Wilkinson, Ph.D.
Book Review Editor

Brian D. Joyner
Exhibits and Multimedia Review Editor

Editorial Board

David G. Anderson, Ph.D.
Department of Anthropology, University of Tennessee

Gordon W. Fulton
National Historic Sites Directorate, Parks Canada

Art Gomez, Ph.D.
Intermountain Regional Office, National Park Service

Michael Holleran, Ph.D.
Department of Planning and Design, University of Colorado, Denver

Elizabeth A. Lyon, Ph.D.
Independent Scholar; Former State Historic Preservation Officer, Georgia

Frank G. Matero, Ph.D.
Historic Preservation Program, University of Pennsylvania

Moises Rosas Silva, Ph.D.
Instutito Nacional de Antropologia e Historia, Mexico

Jim W. Steely
SWCA Environmental Consultants, Phoenix, Arizona

Diane Vogt-O'Connor
National Archives and Records Administration

Contributing Editors

Megan Brown
Historic Preservation Grants, National Park Service

Timothy M. Davis, Ph.D.
Park Historic Structures and Cultural Landscapes, National Park Service

Elaine Jackson-Retondo, Ph.D.
Pacific West Regional Office, National Park Service

J. Lawrence Lee, Ph.D., P.E.
Heritage Documentation Programs, National Park Service

Barbara J. Little, Ph.D.
Archeological Assistance Programs, National Park Service

David Louter, Ph.D.
Pacific West Regional Office, National Park Service

Chad Randl
Heritage Preservation Service, National Park Service

Daniel J. Vivian
National Register of Historic Places/National Historic Landmarks, National Park Service

Editorial Advisors

Randall J. Biallas, AIA
Park Cultural Resources Programs, National Park Service

John A. Burns, FAIA
Heritage Preservation Assistance Programs, National Park Service

Antoinette J. Lee, Ph.D.
Historical Documentation Programs, National Park Service

CRM: The Journal of Heritage Stewardship

CRM: The Journal of Heritage Stewardship is published

by the National Park Service for the heritage community.

CRM: The Journal of Heritage Stewardship
Winter 2006
ISSN 1068-4999

CRM = cultural resource management

CRM: The Journal of Heritage Stewardship is published twice each year by the National Park Service to address the history and development of and trends and emerging issues in cultural resource management in the United States and abroad. Its purpose is to broaden the intellectual foundation of the management of cultural resources.

The online version of *CRM Journal* is available at www.cr.nps.gov/CRMJournal. Back issues of *CRM* magazine (1978–2002) are available online at http://www.cr.nps.gov/crm.

Guidance for authors is available online at http://www.cr.nps.gov/CRMJournal.

Manuscripts, letters to the editor, and all questions and recommendations of an editorial nature should be addressed to Martin Perschler, Editor, email martin_perschler@nps.gov, telephone (202) 354-2165, or fax (202) 371-2422. Incoming mail to the Federal Government is irradiated, which damages computer disks, CDs, and paper products. These materials should be sent by a commercial delivery service to Editor, *CRM Journal*, National Park Service, 1201 Eye Street, NW (2286), Washington, DC 20005.

Views and conclusions in *CRM Journal* are those of the authors and should not be interpreted as representing the opinions or policies of the U.S. Government. Acceptance of material for publication does not necessarily reflect an opinion or endorsement on the part of the *CRM Journal* staff or the National Park Service.

CRM Journal is produced under a cooperative agreement between the National Park Service and the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers.

To subscribe to *CRM Journal*—

Online http://www.cr.nps.gov/CRMJournal
email NPS_CRMJournal@nps.gov
Facsimile (202) 371-2422

U.S. Mail—
CRM Journal
National Park Service
1849 C Street, NW (2286)
Washington, DC 20240-0001

CRM: The Journal of Heritage Stewardship

Volume 3 Number 1 Winter 2006

4 INTRODUCTION

VIEWPOINTS

6 The Difficult Legacy of Urban Renewal
by Richard Longstreth

24 A Doctoral Program in Industrial Heritage and Archeology at Michigan Tech
by Bruce E. Seely and Patrick E. Martin

ARTICLES

36 The Antiquities Act of 1906 at Its Centennial
by Richard Waldbauer and Sherry Hutt

49 Interpreting the Shakers: Opening the Villages to the Public, 1955-1965
by William D. Moore

RESEARCH REPORTS

70 Rediscovering a Las Vegas Neighborhood's African American Roots
by Courtney Mooney

74 The National Cemetery Administration's Documentation Initiative
by Sara Amy Leach

79 Heritage Documentation Programs Record Baltimore's Mount Vernon Place
by Martin Perschler

84 The Preservation Arts and Technology Curriculum at
Brooklyn High School of the Arts
by Kate Burns Ottavino

89 REVIEWS: BOOKS (89), EXHIBITS (116), and WEBSITES (124)

136 LETTERS

Introduction

by Antoinette J. Lee, Editor

For many heritage professionals, historic preservation connotes active work in advocacy, persuasion, and using public tools to save buildings, designate distinctive landscapes, and protect important archeological sites. Much of preservation work occurs in formal governmental hearings where proponents of designation make the case for their properties before a board or commission. Other preservationists work for private, nonprofit organizations and prepare print and Internet materials to educate the public about preservation matters. Others organize tours, training programs, exhibits, and other educational programs for community members.

Less known to many is the scholarly side of historic preservation work that takes place in libraries, archives, and other research facilities. Historical research is the basis of preparing authoritative documentation for nominations of historic properties for local designation, nominations to state and federal registers, or nominations for National Historic Landmark designation. Research is also necessary for the preparation of historical books that may be of interest to academics. The same books may be helpful to those who are seeking historic contexts for evaluating single properties or groups of historic properties. Research is undertaken by those who are writing about the history of the preservation field through investigations of organizations and their histories or the preservation of types of properties over time. Finally, research is a mainstay of those who write about the evolution of the field and how decisions about the past reflect larger trends in society.

Those who work on the research side of the preservation field may be the professionals who work in government agencies and are assigned to oversee documentation efforts. Others include consultants and independent researchers who prepare official documentation under contract with government agencies. They also include academics for whom heritage is one of their scholarly interests. Researchers are integral players in the preservation field, even if they may be less visible than preservation advocates.

The intellectual foundations of heritage and its preservation is the key purpose of *CRM: The Journal of Heritage Stewardship*. Its contents reflect the scholarly and research work that is part of the larger heritage preservation field. In the more than two years that the *CRM Journal* has been published, the editors have been pleased that so many established as well as younger professionals have submitted their work for consideration. Many professionals also have been willing to sit for interviews for the Spotlight features. Others have agreed to review books, exhibits, or websites.

The intellectual foundations of heritage and its preservation is the key purpose of CRM: The Journal of Heritage Stewardship. *Its contents reflect the scholarly and research work that is part of the larger heritage preservation field.*

Each issue of *CRM Journal* represents the work of many professionals, both in the United States and other countries. Now that it has been established as a key part of the National Park Service cultural resources programs, it is time to pass the editorship to a new person. Starting with the Summer 2006 issue, Martin Perschler will be the editor. Martin's work with the *CRM Journal* started with providing the cover illustration and continued through articles, research reports, and book reviews. *CRM Journal* readers are familiar with his exceptional intellectual gifts and are invited to send their inquiries about potential articles to him at martin_perschler@nps.gov.

The Difficult Legacy of Urban Renewal

by Richard Longstreth

Perhaps no term associated with the American landscape is fraught with more pejorative connotations than "urban renewal." Although the Federal Government program bearing that name ended over 30 years ago, the term remains in common parlance, almost always in reference to something that should not have occurred (as in, "This city suffered from widespread urban renewal") or something unfortunate that might occur ("That project would be as devastating as urban renewal"). The term evokes myriad negative references—from the wholesale destruction of neighborhoods we would rush to preserve today; to forced relocation and, with it, community dissolution, primarily affecting underprivileged minority communities; to large-scale commercial development, with cold, anonymous-looking architecture that is incompatible with the urban fabric around it; to vast, little used pedestrian plazas; to boundless accommodation of motor vehicles, including freeway networks destined to augment, rather than relieve, congestion almost from the time of their completion, and immense parking garages that dwarf all that is around them. Critics continue to ask how we, as a society, could have ravaged our cities and towns the way we did. The prevailing view remains that urban renewal affords only lessons in what we must avoid.

The historical reality is, of course, much more complicated. While many of the stereotypical castings have some foundation in reality, our perspective also has been shaped by myths and half knowledge. The urban renewal program is conflated with that for public housing, for example. Advocates for the latter became reluctant allies of urban renewal, but the two programs had entirely different origins and objectives. Initially, their backers were at odds with one another—a relationship that was never entirely rectified.[1] Urban renewal was also not primarily a case of federal officials dictating practices to communities. The heads of local agencies initiated and framed the projects they wished to undertake. The federal role had more to do with enforcing regulations, which, for better or worse, were developed to ensure a reasonable level of professionalism in planning and other relevant functions that were part of the process. Federal standards affected the shape of *every* urban renewal scheme in various ways. Moreover, the immense amounts of money in the federal highway program and decisions at the federal and state levels as to where those highways would go in the inner city had an enormous impact on what areas became targeted for urban renewal.

On the other hand, the ball was in the court of local authorities to determine the basic form, character, and functions of a project as well as to select the consultants, planners, and developers who would translate initiatives from a rough idea to a concrete proposal, then a reality. A number of the best-known and influential urban renewal projects, such as Gateway Center in Pittsburgh (begun 1950), Penn Center in Philadelphia (begun 1956), and Charles Center in Baltimore (begun 1958), were indeed entirely local undertakings, with no federal involvement in any defining aspect of their plans. The federal legislation that framed and facilitated urban renewal—provisions in the housing acts of 1949 and, especially, 1954—was the result of strenuous lobbying by local business interests. Whatever was done to the core of American communities during the 1950s and 1960s was the result of local agendas, not those of the Federal Government.

Urban renewal was foremost the creation of downtown property owners and business interests who, beginning in the 1930s, sought to stem what they saw as a steadily advancing tide of abandonment and decline, which, if left unchecked, would eventually destroy the lifeblood of the city. The word "blight" was commonly used to describe an erosion of commercial property value, and the worst of it purportedly lay on the periphery of downtown. Deteriorated housing and outmoded, small-scale commercial and industrial plants in particular were seen as serious hindrances to downtown growth. Land was difficult to acquire for new commercial development and for new access routes. Blight also tarnished the image of downtown, discouraging investment. Business interests may have propelled blight into the fore, but they found strong allies among planners and many concerned with public policy. In the formative stages of urban renewal, their collective argument was remarkably simplistic: Remove blight and the problems of people who resided in those areas would dissipate as well.

Compounding the problem of declining land values were the ever-increasing movement of the middle class to the urban periphery and the emergence of new facilities in those outlying areas to serve them. Many feared that even if blight were removed, the impetus to build new projects of a scale sufficient to reinvigorate in-town areas would be insufficient when they had to compete with affluent outlying districts. Piecemeal, incremental solutions would prove ineffectual, the argument ran; only sizable undertakings could yield significant change. Comprehensive planning and the power of eminent domain were the essential instruments to retrieve the urban core. A long gestation period led to the federal laws that gave local authorities the tools to regenerate the multifaceted, dominant role the central business district had long enjoyed in large towns and cities nationwide.

Urban renewal thus tended not to occur in places where property values were high—in the retail and office cores of cities—but rather in places close by so as

to enable expansion or modernization of what were deemed vital core components. Projects included office buildings and hotels, convention halls, government centers, institutional complexes such as hospitals and universities, and cultural facilities such as theaters and concert halls. Equally important was the creation of large new residential areas tailored to middle- and upper middle-income households to bolster patronage of downtown places and to revive the desirability of living in the urban core. Sweeping improvements to transportation infrastructure, almost all of which catered to motor vehicles, were also viewed as key projects. Limited-access highways were deemed essential to facilitate access to downtown, as were capacious parking garages to serve new and existing development alike. Tracts near downtown and sometimes further afield were purposely designated for many wholesale, warehousing, and light manufacturing functions housed in "antiquated" core plants so that the land they occupied could be cleared for more profitable uses. Only toward the end of the period, around the mid 1960s, as the decline of downtown retailing accelerated, did plans emerge in some cities to recast that significant core function in a radical way.

Most cities and many towns in the United States undertook some form of urban renewal activity during the quarter century following World War II. Portions of some major metropolises, including Boston, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Pittsburgh, Detroit, Chicago, St. Louis, Kansas City, Denver, and San Francisco, were substantially changed as a result. Numerous smaller cities from Tucson to New Haven, Sacramento to Sheboygan, were likewise altered. Few movements in American city building have resulted in more sweeping changes.

Quantitative yardsticks aside, the scope and nature of change induced by urban renewal—from in-town living to the proliferation of urban freeways, and from large-scale displacement to accelerated decrease in the very activities identified for rejuvenation—continue to affect the ways in which we inhabit and use cities. Given such factors, the significance of urban renewal in the history of American cities cannot be denied. But what about the *physical* significance of this phenomenon from a historical perspective? Is the landscape of urban renewal imbued with attributes that merit its preservation? Until recently, few people cared to address the issue. Dismissing the whole episode as an aberration in the material as well as in the social and sometimes even in the economic arenas was seldom called into question. The time has come, however, for a fresh, more detached perspective. Urban renewal bestowed upon communities some places of lasting value that can be appreciated if we consider them apart from the baggage they have acquired.

Addressing the issue of preservation for urban renewal sites has been particularly encumbered by recollections of what such projects replaced. Hundreds of Victorian houses in San Francisco's Western Addition and hundreds of an

earlier vintage in Southwest Washington, DC, were among the many thousands in quarters that would have been considered prime historic districts by the 1970s had they not been leveled under the aegis of urban renewal. Preservationists frequently fought against urban renewal; some of their organizations were formed in order to oppose the wholesale clearance that came to be closely identified with that program. Arguably, much of the impetus for the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 emanated from the many who feared the wholesale destruction of the past if urban renewal programs remained unchecked. An equally repugnant aspect of urban renewal in the minds of many people was the uprooting of neighborhoods whose residents did not have the resources or clout to fight back effectively—people who, as sociologist Herbert Gans demonstrated early on, had stable, nourishing communities even if they lived in limited circumstances.[2]

However regrettable, neither the destruction of building fabric nor of communities should detract from the historical significance of what was developed anew. Innumerable buildings and other components of the landscape have replaced things that we would venerate were they standing today. The Empire State Building (1929-31), to name an obvious example, rose on the site of the Waldorf-Astoria (1891-93, 1895-97), which was a key prototype for recasting the urban luxury hotel in the late 19th century and a defining work for its architect, Henry Janeway Hardenbergh, who continued to be instrumental in the development of that type. Indeed, much of Gilded Age Fifth Avenue was replaced by stores, office buildings, and other commercial piles long venerated. Crown Hall at the Illinois Institute of Technology (1955-56), one of the most important buildings designed by Ludwig Mies van der Rohe and an icon of Modern Architecture worldwide, replaced The Mecca (1891-92), a remarkable apartment building constructed around twin, multi-story atria.[3] Advocates of the Colonial Revival regarded the Victorian legacy as detritus and recommended remodeling or destroying it at every opportunity, but that position does not detract from the significance of their own work.

Nor can the social displacement caused by wholesale clearance in urban renewal, however onerous it was, undermine the determination of significance today. Countless historic sites have tainted pasts in this respect. Central Park displaced a substantial squatter population, and its creation was propelled to a significant degree by the quest for high-end residential development around it. Many loft buildings prized today began their lives as sweatshops.[4] What urban renewal projects replaced must always be remembered, but should not give cause for rejecting the potential value of what came afterwards.

Another prejudice that needs to be cast aside is ineligibility due to age. Few urban renewal projects broke ground before the mid 1950s. Most were underway through the 1960s or later. The fact that they are less than 50 years old, however, should not inhibit their study and evaluation. The projects that clearly

merit such inquiry from a historical perspective are almost certainly ones that possess exceptional importance within the *local* context, the threshold for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. Some examples are arguably of national significance and primary manifestations of important tendencies in design and urbanism of the period. Irrespective of the level of significance, such work generally had a profound impact on the communities in which it was executed. Today, many of these endeavors are vulnerable to changes that may not be for the better. Ignoring the issue under the guise of the standard 50-year rule is to dismiss a historical phenomenon of obvious magnitude.

The tenuous position of urban renewal's legacy is underscored by looking through the lens of landscape design. Preservationists as well as numerous other contingents all too frequently consider these ensembles primarily as buildings, with site and landscape design unrecognized or undervalued.

Taking sound stock of the historical significance of urban renewal is urgently needed because the resources in question are fragile. As has long been the case, the heritage of the recent past seems dated, even antiquated, certainly unfashionable, different from and even counter to the ways in which we prefer to design places today. At the same time, this legacy is insufficiently old in the minds of many people to be designated as historic. Urban renewal projects are especially vulnerable to change since they generally entail complexes or even whole neighborhoods. Thus, *both* buildings and the environment in which they are set are susceptible to unsympathetic changes.

The tenuous position of urban renewal's legacy is underscored by looking through the lens of landscape design. Preservationists as well as numerous other contingents all too frequently consider these ensembles primarily as buildings, with site and landscape design unrecognized or undervalued. Moreover, the copious amounts of open space that characterized site and landscape design of the period are now all too often seen as blank slates for denser development. Why retain an expansive plaza when the site could host a new office tower? Ignoring the landscape dimension runs counter to the framework in which numerous examples were conceived, where landscape architecture was an integral, often underlying, facet of the entire scheme. Open space allotted in generous amounts that today might be castigated as wasteful was indeed considered to be as important to the design concept as the buildings. A misunderstanding of this perspective and a tendency to criticize the results because they are different from what would be done today have led to a very alarming rate of destruction of mid-20th-century landscape designs, many of them developed under the aegis of urban renewal, and promises to threaten many more in the near future.[5]

Presumptions aside, pursuing a rigorous historical assessment will entail no small degree of original research, for systematic, scholarly investigation of the subject remains in a nascent state. There is no shortage of primary source material from the period. The scope and policies of urban renewal were well chronicled in its own day by planners, sociologists, political scientists, and journalists among others.[6] Issues were debated and many projects critiqued in architectural and other professional journals. Newspaper coverage in the affected communities was extensive. The archives of some local redevelopment agencies have been preserved, but few have been catalogued. Yet, no matter how extensive and accessible the record, it requires substantial amounts of time to review, let alone digest.

Historical interest in urban renewal has increased considerably in recent years, but the resulting studies tend to be broadly based, addressing policies, practices, and their social and political consequences, with scant attention paid to the physical realm.[7] Scholarly interest to date also has focused more on the shortcomings of the program than on any strong points. A negative profile particularly applies to the relatively few case studies that afford substantive analysis of urban renewal's physical dimensions. Probably the most copious work of this kind is David Schuyler's examination of Lancaster, Pennsylvania, which documents the ravaging of the commercial center for a new complex that was in part a functional failure. While of great value for the insights it yields and the detail with which it analyzes the pitfalls of the process, the text can also reinforce the stereotypical view that urban renewal was a pervasive disaster.[8] Work needs to be done on endeavors that led to more beneficial outcomes.

Begging focused investigation, too, are the biographies of key figures involved: public officials such as William Slayton, Commissioner of the Urban Renewal Administration; Richard Lee, Mayor of New Haven; and planners such as Edmund Bacon of Philadelphia or Edward Logue of Boston. Little is available on the developers who played a major role in a number of cities and whose work, in turn, helped define the nature of that done in many other places. William Zeckendorf perhaps ranks among the most extraordinary and unorthodox of these individuals, but many others, such as Roger Stevens and James Scheuer, as well as corporations such as Reynolds Aluminum and Tishman Construction, are worth further examination.[9]

No matter how bountiful the sources, much of the challenge in assessing urban renewal projects lies with their multiple characteristics and the unevenness with which their objectives were realized. Examination needs to be on a case-by-case basis, with projects analyzed as individual endeavors within a local framework, as well as part of a national phenomenon. The difficult complexion of some projects is well illustrated by New Haven's Church Street Redevelopment Area. Intended to propel the city center into regional dominance as a retail and office hub, the complex suffered at the outset from never

having a master plan shaped by business needs, from a piecemeal layout, and from an inward-looking orientation that perceptually isolated it from neighboring blocks.[10] Although it has often been criticized as a transplanted regional shopping mall, Church Street possessed little of the detailed, program-driven planning that characterized such complexes.

Despite predictions of swift realization, the project took a decade (1957-67) to execute, causing no small degree of disruption to and displacement of the business community in the process. There is no question that Church Street is historically significant, but some of that significance lies in its example as a failure—a scheme that was poorly planned, fell short of its goal to revitalize the business core, and enjoyed a relatively brief life as a viable operation. Today, open land exists where one of the anchor department stores stood; the companion emporium built by Macy's has been vacant for some years. A long moribund, disconnected interior mall lies in the third block, called Chapel Square. The somber, neglected appearance of the ensemble only underscores its tarnished legacy.(Figure 1)

Under the circumstances, the separation of determining significance and determining treatment may be unusually pronounced. If significance is indisputable, what about retention? Some may contend that the whole endeavor falls far short of a priority for preservation and indeed might best be replaced by more site- and need-sensitive development. Yet, Chapel Square itself was not only an early large-scale mixed-use project (shops, offices, hotel) designed by a leading commercial architect in New York (Lathrop Douglass), its spaces are readily adaptable to other functions. Its laconic modernist design is a good representative of its genre and has been a substantial part of the skyline facing the New Haven Green for nearly 40 years. Behind Chapel Square lies another component worth further scrutiny: the Temple Street Parking Garage. Designed by the internationally renowned modernist Paul Rudolph, then dean of Yale's School of Architecture, the garage is a work of great originality, although it presents a massive, foreboding face to the businesses on the opposite side of the street for a two-block stretch.

Relating well to adjacent urban fabric was seldom a concern among those who shaped urban renewal projects and thus should not be a major factor is evaluating the historical significance of such work. Hartford's Constitution Plaza (1959-63), for example, was developed on then-marginal commercial land as a gateway to downtown and a substantial addition to its office, hotel, and parking capacities. Unlike Church Street, it had a strong master plan and represented one of the most ambitious undertakings of its kind from the era. The system of plazas, walkways, and planted open space that gives the complex its pervasive unity was a major work of Sasaki, Walker Associates, among the most prominent landscape architecture firms in the country, and the signature building for the Phoenix Mutual Life Insurance Company was designed by the distin-

FIGURE 1
This 2004 view of the mostly vacant Church Street Redevelopment Area in New Haven, CT, with Macy's department store (1962-64) at left and Chapel Square (1964-67) at right, illustrates the foreboding presence of the complex. In the opinion of many observers, it is an apt testament to the failure of urban renewal. (Courtesy of the author)

FIGURE 2
The great expanses of open space at Constitution Plaza (1959-63) in Hartford, CT, shown here in this view from 2002, represent an important design by Sasaki, Walker & Associates and give coherence to an array of commercial facilities, including Harrison & Abramovitz's Phoenix Mutual Life Insurance Company Building, seen in the background. (Courtesy of the author)

guished New York architects, Harrison & Abramovitz.[11] Constitution Plaza remains an important business center for the city, but its limited range of functions and the absence of residential areas nearby mean that its expansive spaces remain unpopulated after hours, and since they lie a story or more above street level, the immediate environs lacks much pedestrian activity at any time. (Figure 2)

Functionally and physically, Constitution Plaza has worked as an ensemble, and preserving anything less than the entire complex would undermine that integrity. But how should one approach the less cohesive legacy of Church Street? Can only a portion of what survives be justified for preservation even though the complex was conceived, however poorly, as a single entity? Does such partitioning run counter to sound preservation practice even though it is hard to assign high priority to a building such as the former Macy's store? Macy's decision to participate, which did not occur until 1962, saved the project

from oblivion and represented a milestone in that firm's expansion program. When it opened two years later, it was not only the first full-fledged department store from New York to operate in New England, but also the second largest emporium in the state. Nevertheless, retaining the building's exterior in anything approximating its original form is problematic given its huge, windowless mass and the absence of demand for so large a retail facility in that location.

Fragmentation may be an undercurrent even when a project had a cohesive, well-considered plan and coherent execution. Baltimore's Charles Center not only ranked among the most ambitious schemes to enlarge a city's commercial core, it also became a poster child for large-scale redevelopment generally and was conceived and executed independent of the federal program. Developed under the aegis of planner David Wallace, the master plan offered a conspicuous exception to the norm in the degree to which it interwove old and new fabric.[12] The initial building, One Charles Center (1960-62) was designed by Mies van der Rohe. A prominent member of New York's architectural avant-garde, John M. Johansen, designed the Mechanic Theater (1965-67), a facility intended to bring major cultural activities to the heart of downtown. Other components were of less singularly distinguished design, but unlike Constitution Plaza, Charles Center as realized has never imparted the sense of a strongly unified ensemble. Indeed, the effect is more of an assemblage of discrete undertakings. Should preservation, then, focus on the most significant parts rather than the whole? Has the ensemble lost a key contributor to its integrity because the skyway system, which never lived up to expectations, has been mostly dismantled?(Figure 3) Conversely, should Charles Center be considered, not only as a single entity, but also as part of a much larger renewal effort that includes the Convention Center and the Inner Harbor for which it served as a catalyst?

Many downtown urban renewal initiatives consisted of multiple projects conceived as components of a long-range master plan. The functional relationships among these undertakings were considered to be central to the viability of the whole and often of the parts. The building of new office towers, the argument ran, would not live up to expectations unless the street and highway network was improved. New cultural facilities would not have sufficient draw unless housing was created nearby for a substantial population with disposable income—a population also important to sustain the office developments. Even a large tract far afield designated as a site for a new mass distribution center could enter the equation because it would replace aged facilities in town so that they could be cleared for some of those housing or new commercial functions. Clearly, evaluation of any given component should take the master plan context into account, but to what degree should preservation objectives be tied to the entire spectrum of work in a community? To what degree, in other words, should an urban renewal project be treated as an entity in its own

FIGURE 3
A major portion of the skyway system at Baltimore's Charles Center (begun 1958), shown here in a 1971 view, has been demolished in an attempt to relate the complex to street level and the surrounding blocks more effectively. (Courtesy of the author)

right, and to what degree should it be regarded merely as a part of an integrated master plan? Is the latter approach practical or even desirable given the scattered array of sites and the varying degrees to which projects were realized and met their objectives?

The answers to such questions, of course, depend on the community. One of the major urban renewal projects in Sacramento, for instance, was Capitol Mall, which transformed the blocks between the river and the state house from an agglomeration of marginal commercial facilities to ranges of public- and private-sector office buildings that were viewed as far more appropriate for the primary approach to the governmental center. While the project was effectively realized, the near contemporary one to extend the retail core along adjacent blocks to the north yielded few concrete results. A series of ambitious plans failed to materialize beyond the conceptual stage. A pedestrian mall and a large, isolated department store that was not an outgrowth of any master plan were the principal products of an effort that extended for over a decade.

Even though current design preferences should never influence the assessment of work from a historical perspective, taste persists as an influential, if not always acknowledged, undertow, especially when addressing work of the recent past.[13] Boston's Government Center (1964-70) well illustrates the difficulties in allaying taste prejudices despite the fact that the scheme was strong and much praised when it was new. Replacing the Scollay Square area adjacent to the financial district, Government Center was anchored by a grand plaza, which was compared to those of St. Peter's in Rome and St. Mark's in Venice.[14] No less a sweeping gesture was made by the city hall, which rose in the northeast sector of the plaza and was heralded for the bold new language of monumentality it brought to the public realm. Both components were by the then-young architecture firm of Kallman, McKinnell & Knowles and were won in competition predicated on an urban design plan developed by

I. M. Pei & Partners. (Figure 4) To the west rose the federal office building, one of the last designs of Walter Gropius, founder of the Bauhaus and The Architects' Collaborative. Beyond lay a spectrum of other facilities, including the State Service Center by Rudolph, all contributing to an ensemble that ranks as an unusually powerful design of the era.

FIGURE 4
Bracketed by the Federal Building (1962-66) and City Hall (1962-68), Boston's Government Center Plaza, shown here in this view from 1970, is still highly admired as a modernist space by some and disparaged by others. (Courtesy of the author)

Yet, the city hall and plaza in particular have long been vilified as ominous places. The plaza is typically viewed as a barren sea of pavement, lacking any elements that would give it life. City Hall's impact is equally disturbing in the minds of many observers, reading more as a brutal bastion than a harbor of democratic governance. It is hard to find the entrance and one's destination beyond. Inside no less than out, the atmosphere is cast as the antithesis of a welcoming public place. How does one respond to these deeply held views among so many of the people who frequent the premises or work there? Can these issues be addressed without compromising the design's integrity? *Should* they be addressed, or is the design of sufficient import to justify its full retention?

Examining residential redevelopment under urban renewal may prove easier in certain respects, for program initiatives tended to result in schemes that were not only strong and coherent designs but also appreciated by their constituencies. At the same time, these projects generally represented avant-garde views of community that created settings very different from traditional neighborhoods. Unlike areas that extended the commercial core, where the existing street configuration could seldom be modified to any great degree, new housing tracts tended to be somewhat further afield in places where the matrix could be modified to suit the modernist canon. Thus, superblocks became the norm, penetrated only by small streets and cul-de-sacs, with through traffic kept to the periphery. The presence of motor vehicles was indeed minimalized. The traditional American pattern of parking the car close

or adjacent to the dwelling was abandoned for more remote parking lots that often were screened from view. Sometimes enclosed, even underground, parking garages were utilized. All these arrangements facilitated devoting large amounts of open space to pedestrians.

Site planning was closely tied to building design. The row house, which had fallen from favor among the middle class by the second quarter of the 20th century, was revived—and re-christened the "town house" to enhance its marketability—to render the area occupied by buildings as compact as possible. Houses were generally accorded small private yards; most of the open space was communal—another feature that ran directly against long prevailing patterns. The arrangement of housing clusters, as they were called, was done in ways to encourage community interaction. Open spaces were frequently varied somewhat in their dimensions and components, and the houses could have staggered setbacks, differ in size, or have varying details to avoid the sense of monotony associated with historic row house neighborhoods. Often, too, houses were interspersed with apartment towers, which were not the traditional chunky blocks with embellished fronts and utilitarian sides, but rather were freestanding towers—linear "slabs"—that maximized exposure to natural light and air as well as to views for all the dwelling units.

In another pronounced departure from tradition, urban renewal housing complexes tended to be inward looking without necessarily having a strong presence when viewed from the principal streets. Their public face, in other words, may not be nearly as engaging as their private one. The inner sanctum was enhanced through landscape design. As some of the primary examples of large-scale development forged on the principles of modernist urbanism, the projects attracted many of the nation's foremost landscape architects who used them as opportunities to refine their ideas. Today, these landscapes have reached maturity and often have sustained little or no substantial alterations, making them distinguished and significant examples of the period.

Prominent modernist architects also were attracted to these projects. As a result, numerous cities have major residential projects of high caliber. The Portland Center in Portland, Oregon, by Skidmore, Owings & Merrill and Lawrence Halprin & Associates (1968-71); St. Louis's Plaza Square by Harris Armstrong and Hellmuth, Obata & Kassabaum (1960-61); San Francisco's St. Francis Square by Marquis & Stoller and Halprin (1963-65); Minneapolis's Cedar Square West by Ralph Rapson (1968-73); and Chicago's Hyde Park by I. M. Pei and Harry Weese (1957-61) are among the numerous exceptional enclaves of this genre. Mies van der Rohe and his close associates, planner Ludwig Hilberseimer and landscape architect Alfred Caldwell, designed Detroit's Lafayette Park (1956-65) for Herbert Greenwald, the maverick Chicago developer who became a leading sponsor of avant-garde design.

Even as realized with later additions, the ensemble represents the most fully formed manifestation of their internationally influential urban vision.[15]

Equally ambitious residential undertakings of this kind occurred in the Southwest Redevelopment Area of Washington, DC, which, between 1959 and 1972, emerged as a precinct of 10 housing projects as well as a number of individual buildings. Intended as a model for the urban renewal program, the enterprise included work by an array of young talent. The first complex helped propel its architect, Chloethiel Woodard Smith, into the national limelight as a leader in the housing field. Two other distinguished Washington firms—Charles Goodman and Keyes, Lethbridge & Condon—also made major contributions that received widespread acclaim.(Figure 5) Pei, Weese, and Morris Lapidus contributed also. Major portions of the landscape were designed by Daniel Urban Kiley, Sasaki, Walker & Associates, and Wallace, McHarg, Roberts & Todd. Few other places rival the degree to which the brave new world of urban life envisioned by modernists was manifested with such richness and variety.[16]

Such projects attracted many households who likewise harbored a view of community that differed from the norm—one that was grounded in engagement and activism. Their neighborhood was not just a domestic sanctuary, but a staging ground for change. Many embraced residential diversity, at least to the degree that the cost of purchasing these dwelling units allowed. Often, the projects were the first in their cities to be planned from the start as racially integrated. Many residents considered themselves to be pioneers whose commitment to the city was nurtured by the desire to make urban life a better experience. That spirit can still be found decades later and has led to steps that will ensure protection in some cases. Surrounded by decay, Lafayette Park was recently designated as a local historic district in response to a residents' initiative. Threat of overdevelopment has spurred discussion to take similar steps in Washington, DC. Although now considered to be dated and even "failed experiments" by some planners, these communities have remained viable places to live and are indeed enjoying a revival among a new generation who finds both the physical environment and the community it shelters an appealing alternative to conventional market housing.

If urban renewal's residential projects did suffer from a failed agenda, it was that they seldom served their intended role as catalysts for additional revitalization but instead remained oasis-like enclaves. The major exception was Philadelphia's Society Hill (officially called Washington Square East; 1960-75), which set preservation as a top priority. In the great majority of urban renewal endeavors, existing fabric was seen as something best eliminated. Occasionally, a remnant of the early 19th century was judged to be of sufficient historical significance to retain. These vestiges of a distant past were either left to stand in isolation, affording a sticking contrast to everything around them, as with

the Basilica of St. Louis, King of France (1831-34), in St. Louis, or, less often, were woven into a new context, as with Wheat Row (1794-95) in Southwest Washington, which became part of a large new row house and apartment complex.[17] Even in a rare case where the existing stock in the Southwest was acknowledged to have some historic merit, authorities believed that the market did not exist for restoration and rehabilitation. Work of that order then underway in Georgetown and in Alexandria, Virginia, was believed to be saturating the meager demand for such places.

FIGURE 5
Tiber Island (1963-65) by Keyes, Condon & Lethbridge, shown in this view from 1991, was one of more than 10 housing projects that made Washington's Southwest Redevelopment Area one of the nation's most ambitious urban renewal undertakings. It was widely praised for the high caliber of its design. (Courtesy of the author)

In Society Hill, by contrast, massive retrieval of historic fabric was employed for the first time as an instrument to spearhead urban revitalization. Numerous dwellings, churches, and a few other building types, all dating from before the mid 19th century, remained, affording an incomparable urban landscape. Although most of this fabric had long deteriorated as low-rent rooming houses and small-scale commercial facilities, it was earmarked as the key inducement to turn the precinct into one of choice among households of substantial means. Society Hill was to a large degree the conception of Edmund Bacon, director of the Philadelphia Planning Commission, who believed the area should also be a showcase of modern design. Through the work of Pei as well as such prominent local firms as Mitchell/Giurgola and Louis Sauer, Society Hill bucked the then-prevailing trend of having infill buildings in a historic district feign the appearance of period pieces. Equally unusual was Bacon's plan to retain all streets and alleyways *and* weave into this grid a subtle network of pedestrian ways and plazas—designed by the landscape architecture firm of Collins, Adelman & Dutot—that were places to foster community interaction. Society Hill was a benchmark in demonstrating that preservation could be a powerful tool in revitalizing cities and that old and new design could be compatible.[18] The project also spawned what remains a growing field of investment in historic properties over many blocks to the west and south. Society Hill was one of the rare cases where the renewal activities became contagious.[19]

The issues involved in addressing urban renewal projects are hardly new. They rise to the fore constantly in preservation when evaluating resources of many types and especially when examining districts and such complexes as institutional campuses. The underlying challenge is to approach the task with an open mind, checking one's assumptions at the door as it were, and acquiring a strong base of knowledge of pertinent source material. The concept of cultural landscape is particularly valuable for examining the legacy of urban renewal because of the emphasis it gives to multi-faceted parts as well as to the processes of change over time. This concept, too, brings the significance of *designed* landscapes to the fore, while placing them in larger physical and cultural contexts. The widespread prejudices against urban renewal and much of the legacy of the second half of the 20th century generally must be set aside in order to assess the real significance of such initiatives. Our cities and towns changed dramatically during the postwar era, and we can ill afford to dismiss those transformations out of hand.

Richard Longstreth is professor of American studies and director of the Graduate Program in Historic Preservation, George Washington University. He is a past president of the Society of Architectural Historians and founding member of the Recent Past Preservation Network. Currently he is completing *The Department Store Transformed, 1920-1960*, to be published by Johns Hopkins University Press. He may be reached at rwl@gwu.edu.

Notes

1. For background, see Marc A. Weiss, "The Origins and Legacy of Urban Renewal," in *Urban and Regional Planning in an Age of Austerity*, eds. Pierre Clavel, John Forester, and William W. Goldsmith (New York, NY: Pergamon Press, 1980), 53-80, which offers an excellent overview of the subject.

2. Herbert J. Gans, *The Urban Villagers: Group and Class in the Life of Italian-Americans* (New York, NY: Free Press, 1962).

3. Concerning the Waldorf-Astoria and its replacement, see Robert A. M. Stern, Gregory Gilmartin, and John Montague Massengale, *New York 1900: Metropolitan Architecture and Urbanism 1890-1915* (New York, NY: Rizzoli, 1983), 254-55, 261; Robert A. M. Stern, Gregory Gilmartin, and Thomas Mellins, *New York 1930: Architecture and Urbanism between the Two World Wars* (New York, NY: Rizzoli, 1987), 611-15; John Tauranac, *The Empire State Building: The Making of a Landmark* (New York, NY: Scribner, 1995); and Lisa Pfueller Davidson, "Consumption and Efficiency in the 'City within a City': Commercial Hotel Architecture and the Emergence of Modern American Culture, 1890-1930" (Ph.D. dissertation, George Washington University, 2002), 1-9. Concerning Crown Hall and The Mecca, see Daniel Bluestone, "Chicago's Mecca Flat Blues," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 57 (December 1998): 382-403.

4. Concerning Central Park, see Roy Rosenzweig and Elizabeth Blackmar, *The Park and the People: A History of Central Park* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1992).

5. This subject is discussed in several essays in Charles A. Birnbaum, ed., *Preserving Modern Landscape Architecture II: Making Postwar Landscapes Visible* (Washington, DC: Spacemaker Press, 2004).

6. The extent of such writings is vast. Basic works include Martin Anderson, *The Federal Bulldozer* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1964); Scott Greer, *Urban Renewal and American Cities* (New York, NY: Bobbs Merrill, 1965); James Q. Wilson, ed., *Urban Renewal: The Record and the Controversy* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1966); and Jeanne R. Lowe, *Cities in a Race with Time: Progress and Poverty in America's Renewing Cities* (New York, NY: Random House, 1967).

7. Most notably Mark I. Gelfand, *A Nation of Cities: The Federal Government and Urban America, 1933-1965* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1975); and Jon C. Teaford, *The Rough Road to Renaissance: Urban Revitalization in America, 1940-1985* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990). Substantive analyses are also found in broader studies such as Robert M. Fogelson, *Downtown: Its Rise and Fall, 1880-1950* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2001), Chapter 7; and Alison Isenberg, *Downtown America: A History of the Place and the People Who Made It* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2004), Chapter 5. A useful retrospective examination that considers both process and product is found in Alexander Garvin, *The American City: What Works, What Doesn't* (New York, NY: McGraw Hill, 1996), Chapter 6.

8. David Schuyler, *A City Transformed: Redevelopment, Race, and Suburbanization in Lancaster, Pennsylvania 1940-1980* (University Park, PA: Penn State Press, 2002). Other examples include Arthur Simon, *Stuyvesant Town, U.S.A.: Pattern for Two Americas* (New York, NY: New York University Press, 1970); Carl W. Condit, *Chicago 1930-1970: Building, Planning, and Urban Technology* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1974), Chapter 5; and Jeff Hardwick, "A Downtown Utopia? Suburbanization, Urban Renewal and Consumption in New Haven," *Planning History Studies* 10 (1996): 41-54. Additional case studies include C. William Domhoff, *Who Really Rules? New Haven and Community Power Reexamined* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books, 1978); Christopher Silver, *Twentieth-Century Richmond: Planning, Politics, and Race* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1984), Chapters 6–10; Jean R. Daly-Bednarck, *The Changing Image of the City: Planning for Downtown Omaha, 1945-1973* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1992); Thomas H. O'Connor, *Building a New Boston: Politics and Urban Renewal 1950-1970* (Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press, 1993); Joel Schwartz, *The New York Approach: Robert Moses, Urban Liberals, and Redevelopment of the Inner City* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1993); Don Parson, "'This Modern Marvel': Bunker Hill, Chavez Ravine, and the Politics of Modernism in Los Angeles," *Southern California Quarterly* 75 (fall-winter 1993): 333-50; Roy Lubove, *Twentieth-Century Pittsburgh, Volume 1: Government, Business, and Environmental Change* (Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1996), Chapters 6-7; William D. Jenkins, "Before Downtown: Cleveland, Ohio, and Urban Renewal, 1949-1958," *Journal of Urban History* 27 (May 2001): 471-96; Guian A. McKee, "Liberal Ends through Illiberal Means: Race, Urban Renewal, and Community in the Eastwick Section of Philadelphia, 1949-1990," *Journal of Urban History* 27 (July 2001): 547-83; Mara A. Marks, "Shifting Ground: The Rise and Fall of the Los Angeles Community Redevelopment Agency," *Southern California Quarterly* 86 (fall 2004): 241-90; Charles E. Connerly, *"The Most Segregated City in America": City Planning and Civil Rights in Birmingham, 1920-1980* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2005); and Joseph Heathcott and Marie Agnes Murphy, "Corridors of Flight, Zones of Renewal: Industry, Planning, and Politics in the Making of Metropolitan St. Louis, 1940-1980," *Journal of Urban History* 31 (January 2005): 151-189. A more upbeat interpretation is offered by Carl Abbott, *Portland: Planning, Politics, and Growth in a Twentieth-Century City* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1983).

9. Unlike architects, planners and real estate developers have received little scholarly attention. A noteworthy exception is Miles L. Berger, *They Built Chicago: Entrepreneurs Who Shaped A Great City's Architecture* (Chicago, IL: Bonus Books, 1992). A detailed autobiographical account of his urban renewal work in Baltimore and elsewhere is given in David A. Wallace, *Urban Planning My Way* (Chicago, IL: Planners Press, American Planning Association, 2005). Zeckendorf also produced an autobiography, *Zeckendorf* (New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1970), but such works are the exception.

10. For background, see Lowe, *Cities in a Race*, Chapter 9; Domhoff, *Who Really Rules?*; and Hardwick, "A Downtown Utopia?"

11. Period sources include "Financing Set," *Women's Wear Daily* (February 2, 1960): 6; "Hartford: Renewal in the Round," *Architectural Forum* 113 (December 1960): 72-76; and "Planning the

Downtown Center," *Architectural Record* 135 (March 1964): 177-85. For recent discussion, see Bernard J. Frieden and Lynn B. Sagalyn, *Downtown, Inc.: How America Rebuilds Cities* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1989), Chapter 13; and Garvin, *American City*, Chapter 6.

12. Period sources include Jane Jacobs, "New Heart for Baltimore," *Architectural Forum* 108 (June 1958): 88-92; Archibald C. Rogers, "Charles Center, Baltimore," *AIA Journal* 31 (March 1959): 30-40; Martin Milspaugh, ed., "Baltimore's Charles Center: A Case Study in Downtown Renewal," *Urban Land Institute Technical Bulletin* 51 (November 1964): whole issue; "Charles Center in Baltimore: How the Plan Didn't Get Compromised," *Landscape Architecture* 59 (January 1969): 122-27. Recent analyses include Katharine Lyall, "A Bicycle Built-for-Two: Public-Private Partnership in Baltimore," *National Civic Review* 72 (November 1983): esp. 546-51; Garvin, *American City*, 129-32; Marion E. Warren and Michael P. McCarthy, *The Living City: Baltimore's Charles Center & Inner Harbor Development* (Baltimore, MD: Maryland Historical Society, 2002); Mary Ellen Hayward and Frank R. Shivers, eds., *The Architecture of Baltimore: An Illustrated History* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004), 278-85; and Wallace, *Urban Planning*, Chapters 1-3.

13. For further discussion, see Richard Longstreth, "I Can't See It; I Don't Understand It; and It Doesn't Look Old to Me," *Historic Preservation Forum* 10 (fall 1995): 6-15; and idem "Taste versus History," *Historic Preservation Forum* 8 (May-June 1994): 40-45.

14. Contemporary accounts include Walter McQuade, "Toughness before Gentility Wins in Boston," *Architectural Forum* 117 (August 1962): 96-101; "Boston City Hall," *Casabella* 271 (January 1963): 17-27; "Another Major Project for Boston," *Progressive Architecture* 45 (February 1964): 62-64; "A Great Plaza for Boston Government Center," *Architectural Record* 135 (March 1964): 190-200; "Boston's City Hall," *Architectural Forum*, 130 (January 1969): 38-53; "The New Boston City Hall," *Architectural Record* 145 (February 1969): 133-44; "Boston's Open Center," *Architectural Forum* 132 (June 1970): 24-31; James Marston Fitch, "City Hall Boston," *Architectural Review* 147 (June 1970): 398-41; Diana Ford and Geoffrey Collins, "Boston City Hall Government Center Plaza, USA," *Landscape Design* 101 (May 1973): 8-10; and Carl John Black, "A Vision of Human Space: Paul Rudolph, Boston State Service Center," *Architectural Record* 145 (July 1973): 105-16. Retrospective accounts include Jane Holtz Kay, "Saving a Modern Masterpiece," *Progressive Architecture* 69 (April 1988): 25, 30; David A. Crane, "The Federal Building in the Making of Boston's Government Center: A Struggle for Sovereignty in Local Design Review," and Norman Fletcher, "The John F. Kennedy Federal Office Building," in *Federal Buildings in Context: The Role of Design Review*, ed. J. Carter Brown (Washington, DC: National Gallery of Art, and Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1995), 21-38, 39-43, resp.; Gretchen Schneider, "The Never Ending Story: City Hall Plaza," *Architecture Boston* 4, no.5 (2001): 16-19; and Gerhard Kallman and Michael McKinnell, "Original Thinking: Reflections on the Genesis of Boston City Hall," *Architecture Boston* 8 (May-June 2005): 33-35.

15. For a sampling of accounts, see Howard Davis, "Portland Center, Portland, Oregon: Skidmore, Owings and Merrill; Lawrence Halprin," *Center* 5 (1989): 128-29; Judith A. Martin, "Recycling the Central City: The Development of a New Town-In Town" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1976); Jane King Hession, Rip Rapson, and Bruce N. Wright, *Ralph Rapson: Sixty Years of Modern Design* (Afton, MN: Afton Historical Society Press, 1999), 192-201; Lisa Newman, "Lafayette Park, Detroit, Michigan, Mies van der Rohe and Ludwig Hilberseimer," *Center* 5 (1989): 124-27; and Charles Waldheim, *Case: Hilberseimer/Mies van der Rohe, Lafayette Park, Detroit* (Munich, Germany: Prestel, 2004).

16. The most detailed coverage of the precinct is given in "Historic American Buildings Survey, Southwest Washington, DC, Urban Renewal Area" (HABS No. DC-856) [2005]. For a sampling of published historical accounts, see Frederick Gutheim and National Capital Planning Commission, *Worthy of the Nation: The History of Planning for the National Capital* (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1977), Chapter 14; James M. Goode, *Best Addresses: A Century of Washington's Distinguished Apartment Houses* (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1988), 398-412, 426-31; and Howard Gillette, Jr., *Between Justice and Beauty: Race, Planning, and the Failure of Urban Policy in Washington, D.C.*, (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995), Chapter 8.

17. The Urban Renewal Program actually funded a number of historic preservation endeavors, including the seminal College Hill and Vieux Carré surveys in Providence, RI, and New Orleans, LA, respectively. For brief discussion, see "Interview with Dorn C. McGrath, Jr.," *CRM: The Journal of Heritage Stewardship* 2 (winter 2005): 16-18.

18. For background, see Valerie Sue Halverson Pace, "Society Hill, Philadelphia: Historic Preservation and Urban Renewal in Washington Square East" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1976); and Marietta Harte Barbour, "Overcoming Urban Renewal: Preservation in Society Hill, Philadelphia" (master's thesis, George Washington University, 2005). The significance of Society Hill in preservation and as a modern landscape is discussed briefly in Richard Longstreth, "Integrity and the Recent Past," in *Preserving the Recent Past 2*, ed. Deborah Slaton and William G. Foulks (Washington, DC: National Park Service, Historic Preservation Education Foundation, and Association for Preservation Technology, 2000), 2-1 to 2-6; and idem, "The Last Landscape," in *Preserving Postwar Landscapes*, 118-25. Period sources include Stephen J. Thompson, "Philadelphia Design Sweepstakes," *Architectural Forum* 109 (December 1958): 94-99; Edmund N. Bacon, "Pei in the Sky and Other Aspects of the Philadelphia Story," *Architectural Association Journal* 79 (November 1963): 103-12; Philip Herrera, "Philadelphia: How Far Can Renewal Go?" *Architectural Forum* 119 (August-September 1964): 179-93; and William L. Rafsky, "Success Comes to Society Hill," *Historic Preservation* 18 (September-October 1966): 194-95.

19. The historic district nomination approved by the Philadelphia Historical Commission several years ago extends Society Hill's period of significance through the 1960s, acknowledging the importance of the mid 20th century for that precinct and enhancing the protection of components from that period.

A Doctoral Program in Industrial Heritage and Archeology at Michigan Tech

by Bruce E. Seely and Patrick E. Martin

Ph.D. students in industrial archeology are beginning to emerge... There are not yet enough of them.

—Marilyn Palmer, University of Leicester, 2000[1]

In the fall of 2005, the Department of Social Sciences at Michigan Technological University (Michigan Tech) launched an interdisciplinary doctoral program in industrial heritage and archeology. The effort is built upon a successful and unique master's program in industrial archeology begun at Michigan Tech in 1991. About the program, some observers have commented—

[Although] a number of U.S. institutions of higher learning offer programs of study in archeology, only Michigan Technological University offers a degree specifically in industrial archeology. MTU's Master of Science program stresses an interdisciplinary approach to the field that includes the study of archaeology, historic preservation, the history of technology, and anthropology.[2]

Indeed, only a handful of schools, notably the Ironbridge Institute and the University of Leicester in England, offer graduate degrees in this field.[3] The Department believes an opportunity is emerging for graduates interested in heritage management, who hold a doctorate, and who are broadly prepared to study and interpret the history of industry and labor through its material culture. What follows is a justification for developing a doctoral program and the basic outline of the program at Michigan Tech.

Intellectual Origins

Scholars interested in cultural heritage have found their way to the field from a variety of academic disciplines, including history, American studies, museum studies, decorative arts and material cultures studies, library and archival management, architectural history, archeology, and historic preservation. For those interested in the specific domain of industrial heritage, two regular points of entry have been through the history of technology and industrial archeology even though these related fields approach heritage questions differently. The crucial commonality between these two areas has been the shared interest of scholars in both domains in the physical reality of technology. Indeed, John Staudenmaier, editor of the journal *Technology and Culture*, has

identified this interest in what happens inside the "black box" of technological artifacts and systems as a defining attribute of the history of technology, even with the growing popularity of newer theoretical approaches.[4]

For several reasons, industrial archeology originated independently in England during the early 1960s. Many physical features of the Industrial Revolution (mills, factories, smelters, mines, and canals) were falling victim to the wrecker's ball and urban renewal. Concerned individuals pressed for the preservation and study of the history and significance of structures and sites that marked high points of this period in British history. Further, a community of enthusiasts existed among engineers, mechanics, and workers, as well as historians of technology and museum curators who were committed to preserving evidence of England's past industrial leadership, such as steam engines, locomotives, factories, and machine tools. Several centers of activity emerged, including London, Bristol, Bath, and the Midlands, in particular the area around Ironbridge, where iron was first smelted with coke fuel and a spectacular cast iron arch bridge still stands. The scholarship of historical archeologist Kenneth Hudson carried word of industrial archeology to North America and beyond in the 1960s and 1970s.[5]

Over the past three decades, interest in industrial archeology has expanded on an international front as work in this field has become more closely connected to cultural resource management. Developments have been most pronounced in Europe, but in the United States, federal, state, and local regulations related to historic preservation and the preparation of impact statements have required greater attention to the documentation and preservation of significant cultural resources. An important signal of the expanding interest in industrial archeology was the establishment of an umbrella group, the International Committee for the Conservation of the Industrial Heritage (TICCIH), in 1978. This organization grew out of the First International Congress on the Conservation of Industrial Monuments (FICCIM) held at Ironbridge in 1971. As conference organizer Barrie Trinder later recollected, "There was no international network linking people interested in the industrial past in 1973... It seemed a considerable achievement to bring together 61 people...from Canada, East and West Germany, Ireland, the Netherlands, Sweden and the United States."[6] By 2000, TICCIH had delegates from 54 countries, and its meeting attracted more than 200 participants. Moreover, TICCIH became the scientific advisor on industrial heritage to UNESCO's International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS).

The inclusion of the word *heritage* in TICCIH's name points to a vital development that has broadened the possibilities associated with industrial archeology. During the last quarter century, preservation and interpretation of the remains of industry have become a matter of interest to a much wider circle of scholars, extending well beyond those interested in industrial archeology.

Clearly, the preservation of industrial artifacts and sites fits into the larger international movement to preserve the world's historic sites and monuments. Symbolizing this shift was the inclusion of industrial structures on UNESCO's World Heritage List. By 1990, the term *industrial heritage* was widely used in Europe, as interest in preserving, restoring, and interpreting historic industrial sites spread from England, to the continent, and beyond.[7]

The placement of industrial sites on the World Heritage List produced another incentive for work in the field: heritage tourism.[8] In fact, a dozen of the most recent additions to UNESCO's World Heritage List are industrial sites and landscapes.[9] A successful project in Germany's iron and steel region resulted in the establishment of the Route of Industrial Heritage of the Ruhr. This concept was recently expanded into a European Route of Industrial Heritage, and similar regional efforts are to be found throughout Europe.[10]

In North America, the level of recognition of industrial heritage has not yet matched that of Europe, but the Lowell and Keweenaw National Historical Parks, the America's Industrial Heritage Park project focusing on the steel industry in southwestern Pennsylvania, and the Motor Cities National Heritage Area centered on Detroit are examples of emerging interest within the past two decades.[11] Each site involves local, state, federal, and corporate partners. Other factors also have heightened demand for broader professionalism in the cultural resource management field in the United States and elsewhere. Environmental requirements governing development projects, such as environmental impact statements mandated by legislation and regulations, have opened pathways for professional practitioners over the last 30 years, especially for archeologists.

This pattern of growth reflects significant connections between industrial archeology and industrial heritage as a branch of cultural resource management. That link appears problematic to some, notably Marilyn Palmer at the University of Leicester, who has worked to bring industrial archeology into the mainstream of university archeology departments as a recognized period study. To do so, she argues, industrial archeologists might have to leave the conservation and preservation of industrial heritage to others.[12] This position reflects somewhat stronger links between traditional archeology programs and industrial archeology in England than in the United States.

The authors think differently, believing that industrial archeology and industrial heritage are mutually reinforcing. The program at Michigan Tech explicitly seeks to meet the growing demand for highly trained and academically certified historians of technology and industrial archeologists in academic and non-academic markets. Michigan Tech's experience teaching graduate students suggests that the two years required for the master's degree are no longer sufficient for providing the depth of training some research projects

require. Industrial heritage scholars should be knowledgeable in three core areas: the history of technology; the use of archeological tools and the interpretation of artifacts; and the basic issues surrounding cultural resource management vis-à-vis industrial heritage. Stronger academic credentials would also allow graduates to rise to the highest positions in the public and private sectors. The emerging pattern resembles the path historians of technology and historical archeologists followed after 1950 as both developed opportunities within classic academic departments that traditionally did not include them. The authors also believe that industrial archeologists and heritage specialists are likely to enter academic and non-academic positions on the basis of their work, not through connections to traditional academic disciplines.

Yet, educational programs that prepare scholars, researchers, and historical site administrators for heritage related tasks at any level, academic or otherwise, have been limited in number. The earliest and most important program is at Ironbridge in England. Now known as the Ironbridge Institute, this program is affiliated with the University of Birmingham and offers master's degrees and diplomas in Heritage Management and Industrial Archaeology, as well as a certificate in Museum Management. In addition, the program awards research-based advanced degrees.[13] A handful of academic programs exist elsewhere, including a small industrial archeology group at the University of Leicester, which awards a master's degree in archeology and heritage via distance learning. The University of Exeter offers a master's in mining archeology and mining heritage management. In Stockholm, an excellent industrial heritage research program created by Marie Nisser at the Royal Institute of Technology awards the doctorate.[14]

Graduate programs at a handful of universities in the United States devote some attention to industrial archeology. The University of Vermont's historic preservation program, founded in 1975, covered industrial archeology, thanks to the interest of program founder Chester Liebs. A similar program at George Washington University offered industrial archeology courses in the late 1970s. By the 1980s, such courses could be found at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, and by the end of the decade West Virginia University had formed an Institute for the History of Technology and Industrial Archeology under the direction of Emory Kemp. Perhaps the most important training ground for industrial archeologists was the Historic American Engineering Record (HAER), organized in the National Park Service in 1969. A sister to the older Historic American Buildings Survey, HAER records significant industrial sites and structures. The agency uses teams of architects and historians to produce measured and interpretive drawings and historical monographs, along with professional quality photographs. Many HAER recording team members were graduate students or young professionals who received their first industrial archeology field experience on these projects.[15]

Over the past several years, a number of U.S. schools have responded to the growing interest in heritage studies with new programs. Arkansas State University in Jonesboro, for example, offers a doctoral program in heritage studies that focuses on the history of the Mississippi Delta region. The Tsongas Industrial History Center in the Graduate School of Education at the University of Massachusetts at Lowell offers training and other guidance in teaching the history of the American Industrial Revolution. The Center for Heritage Resource Studies at the University of Maryland, formed in December 2000, emphasizes the connection between heritage and the environment, offering a master's in applied archeology, and the University of Montana has recently announced a Ph.D. in anthropology with a specialization in cultural heritage studies. However, none of these programs has industrial heritage as its main focus.[16]

The Master's Degree Program at Michigan Tech

Against this backdrop of limited educational opportunities, the Department of Social Sciences at Michigan Tech inaugurated a master of science program in industrial archeology in 1991.[17] From the outset, the program's guiding principle, as restated recently by historian Larry Gross, has been that industrial archeology should be based on the "direct knowledge of *objets d'industrie*."[18] The program's core educational philosophy is one that integrates the history of technology with historical archeology to emphasize the material culture of industry.[19]

The historians on the faculty all have field experience in industrial archeology. Larry Lankton was historian of technology at HAER in the mid 1970s; Alison Hoagland was senior historian at the Historic American Buildings Survey in the 1980s and early 1990s. Terry Reynolds and co-author Bruce Seely worked as HAER summer historians on several projects, and both won awards for articles published in *IA: The Journal of the Society for Industrial Archeology*. Hoagland's background is in historic preservation, and her research interests are in architectural history and material culture. Lankton, who was Curator of Power and Shop Machinery at the Henry Ford Museum before going to HAER, brings experience in the interpretation of artifacts and the material culture of industry and work, with a special focus on copper mining. Historian of technology Hugh Gorman brings expertise in environmental history and policy—a matter of increasing importance at industrial sites.

A second key faculty group includes archeologists and anthropologists. Carol MacLennan focuses on work and workers, the anthropology of industry, and theoretical approaches such as political ecology. Susan Martin's graduate teaching focus is on heritage management, while her research has emphasized the development and use of metallic copper by Native Americans. Archeologists Timothy Scarlett and co-author Patrick Martin have conducted

digs throughout Michigan; Scarlett also focuses on the Mormon pottery industry in Utah, and Martin directs the annual field school, which is the centerpiece of the program.

Students in the Michigan Tech program master excavation techniques as well as scientific tools, such as ground penetrating radar, dating technologies, and global positioning (GPS) and geographic information (GIS) systems technologies. These formal archeological skills, combined with historical research techniques, distinguish Michigan Tech's efforts from other archeology education programs. The proving ground is a required field experience, usually as part of the annual field school. Excavations have taken place throughout the Upper Peninsula of Michigan and have included a blacksmith's shop and lighthouse at Ft. Wilkins State Park in Copper Harbor; iron furnaces, bloomary forges, and kilns at Munising, Negaunee, and Fayette; and copper mining activities near Victoria.[20] Not all fieldwork has focused on industrial equipment. At Fayette, students excavated a boarding house and accompanying 2-story privy to learn more about the lives of 19th-century ironworkers. Other students have pursued externally funded projects in the West Indies, Wisconsin, Kentucky, Alaska, and California.[21]

The master's program has served Michigan Tech's students well.[22] A total of 63 students entered between 1991 and 2004; 43 have completed degrees. Ten graduates have pursued doctorates, while 26 hold positions in cultural resource management and engineering consulting firms or in federal and state agencies. As noted above, however, changes in industrial heritage suggest the need for broader and deeper educational and research experiences.

From Master's to Doctorate in Industrial Heritage and Archeology

The doctoral program in industrial heritage and archeology is a natural extension of Michigan Tech's master's program. Like the master's, the doctoral program springs from the same foundation of core classes in the history of technology, historical archeology, material culture, the documentation of historic structures, industrial archeology, methods of archeology, and heritage management. A grant from the National Science Foundation's Program in Science and Technology Studies made it possible for the Department of Social Sciences to add other elements to the doctoral program. Doctoral students pursue individualized programs of study that rely heavily on directed reading with faculty, and they participate in seminars intended to help shape intellectual explorations of critical issues in industrial heritage.

The first of these seminars focuses specifically on industrial heritage, including the nature of heritage, the relationship of heritage to history, questions related to advanced cultural resource and heritage management, heritage tourism, industrial heritage field methods, and material culture and museum studies. A

second seminar emphasizes industrial history, including the global history of industrialization, theoretical models of industrial evolution, and the social history of technology and work. The Department anticipates additional seminars tailored to the specific interests of students. Students must also take three classes from a list that includes GIS techniques, archeological field methods, geophysics for archeology, architectural history, regional history, and environmental history.

One of the distinguishing characteristics of the doctoral program is its core intellectual focus on material culture. Scholarly interest in this area is not new, dating back at least to the 1950s if not earlier.[23] In 1996, the *Journal of Material Culture* first appeared, building on the base established by scholars such as Henry Glassie, Thomas Schlereth, and Kenneth Ames.[24] Their work has held up amazingly well, but new insights continue to emerge from different points of the academic compass.[25] The focus at Michigan Tech is particularly informed by the work of researchers oriented to technology, specifically the work of David Kingery, Patrick Malone, and Steven Lubar, in large part because Michigan Tech is surrounded by the remains of Michigan's copper mining industry.[26]

The program expects to draw upon faculty from other departments at the university, notably the Geological Engineering, Forest Resources, and Environmental Sciences, and Materials Science and Engineering Departments, to teach classes in pivotal technical methodologies. The program already depends heavily on the University Archives and Copper Country Historical Collection in the University Library for essential resources on local copper mining and other industrial activities and has developed important relationships with museums, state bureaus, and federal agencies that may be of benefit to students seeking curatorial or administrative experience.

Mindful of European leadership in the area of industrial heritage, the Department is creating mechanisms for annual faculty and student exchanges and an international visitor in residence program at Michigan Tech. Scholars at four European institutions have already expressed interest in developing cooperative relationships with the doctoral program. Such international participation will vastly enrich the doctoral program while at the same time contribute to improved communication among leading international organizations in industrial archeology.

Graduate and Faculty Research Opportunities

While research has always been a key aspect of the master's program, the doctoral program warrants projects of greater scope. Michigan Tech is currently engaged in a multi-year investigation of the site of the West Point Foundry in Cold Spring, New York, one of the nation's most important ante-

bellum manufacturing centers and producers of steam engines, locomotives, and cannon. (Figure 1) Working in partnership with the Scenic Hudson Land Trust, the program has already conducted four annual field schools on the site during the summer months and anticipates another five to seven years of fieldwork. The authors expect several dissertation topics to come out of the project, ranging from the history of the foundry and its industrial archeology to working conditions and worker housing in Cold Spring and the environmental history of the West Point Foundry site.

FIGURE 1
This graduate student in Michigan Tech's industrial archeology program is surveying a wall at the West Point Foundry site in Cold Spring, New York, during the program's annual field school. (Courtesy of the authors.)

Equally exciting is the prospect of large-scale international projects, the first of which began in 2004. Michigan Tech led an international team on a project to document coal mining activities on the Svalbard archipelago north of Norway.[27] The island's coal mines were opened at the turn of the 20th century by Michigan native John M. Longyear and managed by graduates of the Michigan School of Mines, the forerunner to Michigan Tech.[28] Documenting the archipelago's many physical remains highlights the intimate relationship between the history of technology and material culture. Significantly, the material culture of every scientific or industrial endeavor on Svalbard from before 1946 is specifically protected by historic preservation laws.

The Concept of Heritage

The research projects at West Point, Svalbard, and elsewhere offer students and faculty valuable opportunities to address fundamental issues related to the concept of heritage. A number of scholars have problematized the very idea of heritage in recent years; some have been openly critical of the entire concept.[29] David Lowenthal has offered perhaps the most thoughtful critiques, observing

recently that "[a]ll at once, heritage is everywhere—in the news, in the movies, in the marketplace—in everything from galaxies to genes. It is the chief focus of patriotism and a prime lure of tourism. One can barely move without bumping into a heritage site."[30] At the core of Lowenthal's critique is the call to recognize the important distinction between history and heritage—a distinction that is all too often overlooked in politics, business, and the media. He calls for stewardship that "tempers[s] the clamorous demands of the immediate present with a compelling rationale for the claims of both the past and the future."[31]

Michigan Tech's doctoral program seeks to play a role in educating professionals who will be involved in work that crosses this divide between history and heritage. The program combines history and archeology in ways that link sites, artifacts, and documents together. Just because heritage has been misused for short-term political or economic gain does not mean that the concept of heritage itself is invalid. The authors hope to impress upon future resource stewards the value of interdisciplinary approaches to history and heritage.

Recently, social scientists have borrowed concepts from the fields of ecology and landscape for their analytical utility. Such developments, argues industrial archeologist Fred Quivik, are especially promising for industrial archeology because they refocus attention on the big picture and away from isolated objects or phenomena. "We can now not only illuminate how machines worked or were made," he writes, "but also how workers interacted with each other or their bosses, for example, based on the patterns of buildings people developed to carry out those interactions."[32] In the end, a focus on large projects, international cooperation, and the nature of heritage adds up to a new research agenda for scholarship on material culture that bridges the gap between the history of technology and industrial archeology, all the while touching on architectural and environmental history, historic preservation, cultural anthropology, and other related fields.

Bruce E. Seely, Ph.D. is chair of the Department of Social Sciences and professor of history, and **Patrick E. Martin, Ph.D.** is director of the graduate program in industrial archeology and a professor of archeology at Michigan Tech. Please direct questions to the authors via email at bseely@mtu.edu and pemartin@mtu.edu or find application information online at http://www.social.mtu.edu/IHAPhD.htm.

Notes

1. Marilyn Palmer, "Archeology or Heritage Management: The Conflict of Objectives in the Training of Industrial Archeologists," *IA* 26, no. 2 (2000): 54.

2. William Crandall, Alan Rowe, and John A. Parnell, "New Frontiers in Management Research: The Case for Industrial Archeology," *The Coastal Business Journal* 2, no. 1 (fall 2003): 57.

3. See http://www.ironbridge.bham.ac.uk/, accessed December 1, 2005.

4. See Brooke Hindle, *Technology in Early America: Needs and Opportunities for Study* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1966); Robert Post, "Technology in Early America: A View from the 1990s," in Judith A. McGaw, *Early American Technology: Making and Doing Things from the Colonial Era to 1850* (Charlotte: University of North Carolina Press, 1994): 16-39; John M. Staudenmaier, "Rationality, Agency, Contingency: Recent Trends in the History of Technology," *Reviews in American History* 30, no. 1 (2002): 170.

5. Barrie Trinder, "Coming to Terms with the 20th Century: Changing Perceptions of the British Industrial Revolution," *IA* 26, no. 2 (2000): 65-80. Early British supporters included professor Angus Buchanan and Ironbridge director Neil Cossons. See R. A. Buchanan and Neil Cossons, *The Industrial Archaeology of the Bristol Region* (New York, NY: A.M. Kelley Publishers, 1969); and R. A. Buchanan, *Industrial Archeology in Britain* (Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin, 1972).

   Kenneth Hudson has published a number of books, of which the most important are *Industrial Archaeology: An introduction* (London, UK: Baker, 1966); *Handbook for Industrial Archaeologists: A Guide to Fieldwork and Research* (London, UK: Baker, 1967); and *World Industrial Archaeology* (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 1979).

6. Barrie Trinder, "From FICCIM to TICCIH 2000: Reflections on 27 years," *TICCIH Bulletin* (October 2000); See also http://www.mnactec.com/TICCIH/, accessed December 1, 2005.

7. See http://www.international.icomos.org/about.htm, accessed December 1, 2005. The World Heritage List is available online at http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/, accessed December 2, 2005. An early use of the term was Aubrey Wilson and Joseph McKeown, *London's Industrial Heritage* (Newton Abbot, UK: David & Charles, 1967).

8. On heritage tourism, see Heather Mary Worrall, *The Impact of Industrial Heritage Related Tourism on Tayside Region* (Thesis, University of Dundee, 1996); Deborah Baldwin, *Experiencing Heritage: Making Sense of Industrial Heritage Tourism* (Thesis, University of Bristol, 1999); also Claude Moulin and Priscilla Boniface, "Routeing Heritage for Tourism: Making Heritage and Cultural Tourism Networks for Socio-Economic Development," *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 7, no. 3 (2001): 237-248.

9. On industrial heritage sites, see http://whc.unesco.org/sites/industrial.htm, accessed December 2, 2005; and Henry Cleere, "The World Heritage Convention as a Medium for Promoting the Industrial Heritage," *IA* 26, no. 2 (2000): 31-42.

10. On the Ruhr project see http://www.route-industriekultur.de/steuer/menue/menue.htm, accessed December 2, 2005; on the wider European project see http://www.nweurope.org/page/projet.php?p=31&id=548, accessed December 2, 2005.

11. On the Lowell and Keweenaw Parks, see http://www.nps.gov/lowe/ and http://www.nps.gov/kewe/; on the America's Industrial Heritage Project see http://www.sphpc.org/sphpc1/about_sphpc.htm, accessed December 2, 2005; on the Motor Cities National Heritage Area, see http://www.experienceeverythingautomotive.org, accessed December 22, 2005.

12. See Palmer, "Archeology or Heritage Management," 49-54.

13. The Ironbridge Institute also awards Master of Philosophy (M.Phil.) and Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) degrees. See the program's web page at http://www.ironbridge.bham.ac.uk/higher-degrees.htm, accessed December 2, 2005.

14. Palmer, "Archeology or Heritage Management," 52-54.
    Industrial heritage research at the Royal Institute of Technology in Sweden is part of the research effort on "Scientific research—technological change—industrial renewal." See http://www.kth.se/forskning/pocket/ project.asp?id=2102, accessed December 2, 2005. On other European programs, see links on the Association of Industrial Archeology website, http://www.industrial-archaeology.org.uk/alink.htm, accessed December 2, 2005.

15. On West Virginia University's Institute for the History of Technology and Industrial Archaeology, see http://www.as.wvu.edu/ihtia/, accessed December 2, 2005. On HAER, see Eric DeLony, "HAER and the Recording of Technological Heritage: Reflections on 30 Years' Work," *IA* 25, no. 1 (1999): 5-28; and idem, "HAER Recording Projects Conducted by the Washington Office, 1969-1998," *IA* 25, no. 1 (1999): 29-55. Four of Michigan Tech's faculty have significant experience with HAER and HABS.

16. For information on the University of Arkansas program, see http://www.clt.astate.edu/heritagestudies/mission.htm; for the University of Maryland, see http://www.heritage.umd.edu/INDEX.htm; for the University of Massachusetts, see http://www.uml.edu/tsongas/index2.htm; for the University of Montana, see http://www.anthro.umt.edu/graduate/phd.htm; all accessed December 12, 2005.

17. Michigan Tech's master's program is the only degree-granting program in industrial archeology in the United States.

18. Larry Gross, "Industrial Archeology: An Aggressive Agenda," *IA* 27, no. 1 (2001): 39. Gross made a similar point earlier in "The Importance of Research Outside the Library: Watkins Mills, A Case Study," *IA* 7, no. 1 (1981): 15-26; as did Bruce Seely in his article, "Blast Furnace Technology in the Nineteenth Century: A Case Study," *IA* 7 (April 1981): 27-54. Many articles in SIA's journal emphasize this point. See Robert B. Gordon, "Material Evidence of Ironmaking Techniques," *IA* 21, no. 2 (1995): 69-80; and idem, "Analysis and Interpretation of Artifacts in Industrial Archeology," *IA* 26 no. 1 (2000): 103-111.

19. Patrick E. Martin, "Training Industrial Heritage Professionals at Michigan Technological University," *Proceedings from Future's Past; An International Seminar on Conservation and Regeneration of Industrial Heritage through Training and Research* (Stockholm, Sweden: Royal Institute of Technology, 2004); and idem, "The Importance of Networking and the American IA Experience" *Proceedings from Nordrhein-Westphalia Symposium on Industrial Heritage* (Duisburg, Germany: Deutsche Gesellschaft fur Industriekultur, 2001).

20. At the last site, participants unearthed a surprisingly intact Cornish buddle used to separate metallic copper from crushed rock. Although made largely of wood, the device had been buried in stamp sands with a high copper content, thus preserving the wood.

21. On the field schools, see http://www.industrialarchaeology.net/IAWeb/iaprojects/projects.html, accessed December 2, 2005. See also David B. Landon and Timothy A. Tumberg, "Archeological Perspectives on the Diffusion of Technology: An Example from the Ohio Trap Rock Mine Site," *IA* 22, no. 2 (1996): 40-57; and David Landon, Patrick Martin, Andrew Sewell, Paul White, Timothy Tumberg, and Jason Menard, "'A Monument to Misguided Enterprise': The Carp River Bloomary Iron Forge," *IA* 27, no. 2 (2001): 5-22.

22. An external review of the program conducted in 2002 is available online at http://www.social.mtu.edu/documents/ReportonDeptSSMTU.doc, accessed December 2, 2005. See also Jed Weisberger, "Industrial Archaeology Master's Program, Michigan Technological University: Leading the Way in a Developing Genre," *Journal of Higher Education Strategists* 2 (summer 2003): 201-206. See also William Crandall, Alan Rowe, and John A. Parnell, "New Frontiers in Management Research: The Case for Industrial Archeology," *The Coastal Business Journal* 2, no. 1 (fall 2003): 45-60; and Patrick E. Martin, "Industrial Archeology and Historic Mining Studies at Michigan Tech," *CRM Magazine* 21, no. 7 (1998): 4-7.

23. In 1952, the Henry Francis du Pont Winterthur Museum and the University of Delaware established the Winterthur Program in Early American Culture, a recognized leader in the study of American decorative arts and material culture.

24. Henry H. Glassie, *Pattern in The Material Folk Culture of the Eastern United States* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1968); Thomas J. Schlereth, *Material Culture Studies in America* (Nashville, TN: American Association for State and Local History, 1982); Kenneth L. Ames and Thomas J. Schlereth, *Material Culture: A Research Guide* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1985); Henry Glassie, *Material Culture* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1999).

25. Despite the plurality of opinions on material culture that have surfaced over the years, they all stem from roughly the same premise, namely, that artifacts offer an important source of information unlike anything found in written texts. This point runs through the chapters of Ann Smart Martin and J. Ritchie Garrison, eds., *American Material Culture: The Shape of the Field* (Winterthur, DE, and Knoxville, TN: Henry Francis du Pont Winterthur Museum and the University of Tennessee Press, 1997).

26. Steven D. Lubar and W.D. Kingery, *History From Things: Essays on Material Culture* (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1993); W.D. Kingery, *Learning From Things: Method and Theory of Material Culture Studies* (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1996); Robert B. Gordon and Patrick M. Malone, *The Texture of Industry: An Archaeological View of The Industrialization of North America* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1994); Edward Jay Pershey, "Handling History: Using Material Culture to Create New Perspectives on the Role of Technology in Society," *Magazine of History* 12, no. 2 (1998): 18-24. See also contributions from archeologists, including James M. Skibo and William H. Walker, *Expanding Archaeology* (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1995), and Peter Bleed, "Why Do Artifacts Look the Way They Do?" *Reviews in Anthropology* 22, no. 1 (1993): 41.

27. The international team included Miles Ogelthorpe and Ian West from England, L. Hacquebord from the Netherlands, Marie Nisser from Sweden, and participants from Norway's National Technical University in Trondheim. Michigan Tech's role in the project was made possible by a Small Grant for Exploratory Research (SGER) from the Science and Technology Studies and Polar programs at the National Science Foundation.

    Svalbard served as the launching point in the 1920s for Norwegian dirigibles bound for the North Pole.

28. Longyear's letters, photographs, and company records are deposited at the University Archives at Michigan Tech.

29. See, for example, Thomas E. Leary and Elizabeth C. Sholes, "Fragments Shoed Against the Ruins: Industrial Archeology and Heritage Preservation," *IA* 26 no. 1 (2000): 96; Frank Harris, "From the Industrial Revolution to the Heritage Industry," *Geographical Magazine* 61, no. 5 (May 1989): 38-42; and Mike Wallace, *Mickey Mouse History and Other Essays on American Memory* (Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 1996).

30. David Lowenthal, *The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History*, 2nd edition (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 1998), xiii. See also idem, *The Past is a Foreign Country* (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 1985); Raoul Bianchi and Priscilla Boniface, "Editorial: the Politics of World Heritage," *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 8, no. 2 (2002): 79-80.

31. David Lowenthal, "Pioneering Stewardship: New Challenges for CRM," *CRM: The Journal of Heritage Stewardship* 1, no. 1 (fall 2003): 11.

32. Frederic L. Quivik, "Landscapes as Industrial Artifacts: Lessons from Environmental History," *IA* 26, no. 2 (2000): 56; see also Barrie Stuart Trinder, *The Making of the Industrial Landscape* (London, UK: Dent, 1982); John R. Stilgoe, *Metropolitan Corridor: Railroads and the American Scene* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1983); and John R. Stilgoe and Roderick Nash, *Perceptions of the Landscape and its Preservation* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society, 1984).

The Antiquities Act of 1906 at Its Centennial

by Richard Waldbauer and Sherry Hutt

This year marks the centennial of the Antiquities Act, the first law in the United States to establish federal management authority over cultural and scientific resources.[1] Formalized notions of "conservation" and "environment" had already existed prior to the Antiquities Act, but there was no legislative or institutional framework for implementing or sustaining those ideas. The passage of the Act in 1906 was a decisive step in that direction—a direction that culminated, in many respects, a decade later in the passage of the Organic Act creating the National Park Service.

The simplicity and brevity of the Act belies the magnitude of its effect. Over the past 100 years, the Act has shaped many subsequent laws, including the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA), the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), and the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979 (ARPA).[2] Former National Park Service chief historian Ronald Lee thoroughly documented the historical context, legislative history, and early accomplishments of the Antiquities Act in *The Antiquities Act of 1906*.[3] Hal Rothman followed up with a thoughtful analysis of the Act in *America's National Monuments*, and Raymond Thompson offered additional insight and commentary in the 2000 issue of the *Journal of the Southwest*.[4] The Act has been the subject of many other articles and commentaries. This brief essay offers a summary of the early efforts and sentiments that culminated in the passage of the Act and its legacy of resource stewardship. Although several other cultural resource laws have appeared on the books since 1906, the Antiquities Act continues to guide resource management. Its concepts of conservation and protection form the basis of public lands management policy and operations in the United States.

Knowledge is Power

Known officially as the Corps of Discovery, the 1804 Lewis and Clark expedition was the first federally funded scientific expedition in the United States charged with the collection of natural and cultural data for eventual use in the formulation of public policy. Traveling from St. Louis on the Mississippi River to the mouth of the Columbia River on the Pacific coast, Meriwether Lewis and William Clark mapped the northern frontier, gathering information on biota and the lifeways of Indian tribes while surveying a practicable route for commerce. The man behind the Corps of Discovery, President Thomas

Jefferson, believed that knowledge of Indian cultures and tribal organization would help in establishing trade and peaceful relations with Indian tribes and thereby facilitate the territorial expansion of the United States westward across the continent.

The idea that natural and cultural data could be used to achieve policy objectives received a boost in 1831 from John Marshall, Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court. In *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia*, a case concerning the legal control of commerce with Indian tribes, Marshall articulated the doctrine of "dependent domestic nations" based on a clause in the Constitution that created the government-to-government relationship of mutual respect for sovereignty between the United States and Indian tribes. One of the implications of the doctrine was a re-emphasis on data collection as an important step in the creation and implementation of public policy.[5]

The Moundbuilder Controversy of the late 19th century underscored the importance of data collection. The extraordinary earthen mounds scattered throughout the Midwest were well known, and people had long speculated about their origins. By 1875, many had accepted the opinion of historian Hubert Bancroft that the ancestors of the Indian tribes could not have produced them.[6] The controversy eventually caught the attention of Congress, which authorized funding in 1881 for the Smithsonian Institution's Bureau of Ethnology to carry out excavations across the eastern United States and thereby resolve the matter.[7] The final report by archeologist and entomologist Cyrus Thomas, published in 1894, concluded that the ancestors of modern Indian tribes—not some lost race—had, in fact, built the mounds.[8]

The collection of natural and cultural data for use was, in fact, the major purpose of several prominent expeditions and surveys throughout the 19th century. The Federal Government sponsored a number of geological and geographical surveys of the western territories after 1865. Some of the most prominent ones were conducted by Ferdinand V. Hayden between 1867 and 1878.[9] Hayden's team included William Henry Holmes, an archeologist, artist, and geologist who would later become the director of the National Gallery of Art in Washington, DC, and the artists William Henry Jackson and Thomas Moran.[10] John Wesley Powell's daring explorations of the Rockies, the Colorado River, and the Green River spurred federally funded scientific projects that would encourage Western settlement and the conservation of arid lands otherwise unsuitable for habitation. In one of his reports, Powell developed a standardized land classification system for homesteads.[11] He appreciated the connections between geology, ethnology, botany, literature, and philosophy, and he included information about Indian tribes in his reports. In 1881, he became director of the U.S. Geological Survey, joining the Bureau of American Ethnology (previously the Bureau of Ethnology) in 1894.

Among the noteworthy privately financed expeditions was the Jessup North Pacific Expedition of 1897, the purpose of which was the study of prehistoric human passage across the Bering Strait from Asia to North America.[12] Sponsored by the American Museum of Natural History in New York, funded by its director, Morris K. Jessup, and organized under the direction of anthropologist Franz Boas, the expedition included ethnographers, archeologists, and linguists, along with two Russian revolutionaries who had made social observations during their exiles in Siberia. Whereas the purpose of the Harriman Alaska Expedition of 1899—another privately funded expedition of the era—has been a matter of considerable debate, its methodology and interdisciplinary focus was equally of solid benefit.[13] Scientists, philosophers, and artists interacted with each other on a daily basis while they pursued their respective studies. Participants included Edward S. Curtis, for whom the expedition launched his remarkable career as a photographer of American Indians; Louis Agassiz Fuertes, then just at the beginning of his career as an ornithological painter; pioneering forester Bernhard E. Fernow, who collected data on the region's indigenous trees; wildlife conservationist George B. Grinnell; nature essayist John Burroughs; and naturalist and philosopher, John Muir.[14]

These and other surveys and expeditions generated vast amounts of natural and cultural information about places previously "undiscovered." If they did not contribute directly, they dovetailed nicely with parallel scientific and intellectual explorations of the interrelationship of the natural and cultural realms that helped shape the emerging concept of "environment."

Conserve the Environment

The first American publication to describe environment as a complex system was George Perkins Marsh's *Man and Nature; or Physical Geography, as Modified by Human Action.*[15] Marsh himself was not a professional scientist. Over the course of his life he had been a lawyer, farmer, manufacturer, Congressman, diplomat, and a master of 20 languages.[16] In *Man and Nature,* he synthesized a vast amount of scientific and cultural information into a coherent interdisciplinary interpretation of human history and its impacts. His concept of ecology encompassed the twinned dynamics of nature and culture and their tendencies towards equilibrium and change respectively.[17] He observed that the widespread removal of trees and other vegetation from areas of substantial and sustained human habitation had resulted in catastrophic flooding, extensive soil erosion, and massive fluctuations in stream flow. Based on these observations, he concluded that humans had created environmental problems for themselves by exerting too much pressure on nature.

Published in a new edition in 1874, Marsh's book served to ignite action on the public policy front.[18] In 1876, for example, the U.S. Department of Agriculture

launched an investigation into the environmental situation of the national forests, commissioning Franklin B. Hough, the first chief of the agency's forestry division, to assess what might be needed for their renewal. In 1886, the Federal Government began an evaluation of environmental impacts on birds and fish, the result of which was the creation of the Fish Commission, a forerunner of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.[19]

Gifford Pinchot was among those most influenced by Marsh's book. A Yale graduate, Pinchot had studied forestry in Europe and was among the scientific foresters in the National Academy of Sciences who sought to prevent the over-exploitation of the national forest reserves then under the control of the U.S. Department of the Interior. When he became chief forester in the Department of Agriculture in 1898, he advanced the role of natural science in the management of timber resources. He quickly became one of President Theodore Roosevelt's most trusted advisors.

Pinchot's conservation philosophy involved the application of science to maintain resource profitability, ensure sustainable timber yields, and improve the conditions of forests.[20] One of his closest colleagues was W. J. McGee, an anthropologist, geologist, and topographer who had served with Powell in the U.S. Geological Survey and the Bureau of American Ethnology. The Pinchot-McGee partnership played an important role in shaping the practical side of conservation that led to the Antiquities Act and other legislation. Their work in the Roosevelt administration solidified the interdisciplinary nature of the conservation movement.

In 1893, historian Frederick Jackson Turner sent shockwaves through the intellectual community with his announcement of the "closing" of the American frontier.[21] In a presentation to members of the American Historical Association, Turner implied that public lands were not an endless source of wealth for exploitation; rather, the lands and the economic resources they contained were finite.

Through their words and actions, Marsh, Pinchot, and Turner provided important theoretical foundations for environmental conservation. In their view, conservation was something dynamic: it did not imply non-intervention in the natural or cultural realms. At least with regard to public lands, it implied the active collection of data using the latest technology and according to the latest theories. Moreover, it was based on the presumptions that the "nation's pristine base was both finite and fragile," and that scientists were in a race against time in terms of collecting natural and cultural information for use.[22] Their concept of conservation was also inherently interdisciplinary: Whereas scientists and other experts could collect and collate information, others had to be on hand to interpret the information to interested individuals and the public.

One of the pivotal events that helped define conservationist legislation on the nature side was the 1905 American Forest Conference led by Pinchot.[23] The conference succeeded in getting Congress to transfer the national forest reserves from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Agriculture. Although the move privileged scientific forestry management over preservation, it nevertheless confirmed resource stewardship as a function of the Federal Government.

Even before the 1905 Forest Conference, the proponents of scientific management had sparred with those in favor of preservation. The creation of Mount Rainier National Park in Washington in 1899 was said by some ultimately to benefit the railroad companies for whom access to virgin timberlands was destined to improve elsewhere because of the designation.[24] Even so, the enabling legislation required the Secretary of the Interior to "provide for the preservation from injury or spoliation of all timber, mineral deposits, natural curiosities, or wonders...and their retention in their natural condition" within the boundaries of the new park itself.[25]

Following the law creating Mount Rainier National Park was the Lacey Act, which prohibited interstate transport of birds and animals taken in violation of state laws.[26] The first comprehensive law to protect wildlife, the Lacey Act remains one of the most durable pieces of conservation legislation. It was the work of Representative John Fletcher Lacey of Iowa, who would later figure prominently in the passage of the Antiquities Act.[27]

The creation of forest reserves and the implementation of boundary revisions by presidential proclamation involved the redesignation of Indian lands, including lands belonging to the Chippewa in Minnesota, the Hoopa Valley and Tule River in California, and the Mescalero Apache, Jicarilla Apache, White Mountain Apache, Zuni, and Navajo in Arizona and New Mexico.[28] Pursuant to presidential proclamation, forests on other remaining Indian lands were to be managed to meet the growing domestic demand for timber. These proclamations were authorized by the Forest Management Act of 1897, which expressly addressed the managed use of resources in the public domain.[29] Although preservationists scored a victory in 1904 with the creation of Sully's Hill National Park in North Dakota as part of an agreement with the Sioux peoples living on the Devil's Lake Reservation, the victory was small by comparison.[30]

Cultural Heritage Can Be Managed

Meanwhile, thoughts of archeological preservation and historic preservation were being galvanized into a similar call for federal action.[31] Pothunters on remote landscapes had long considered themselves beyond the reach of the law. Concerned that notorious relic hunters, such as Richard Wetherill in

Utah, would clear the deserts of sites ripe for scientific exploration, anthropologists at American universities and other institutions organized an appeal for legislative action beginning in the late 1890s.[32]

One of the principal authors of the Antiquities Act, Edgar Lee Hewitt, stated in 1905 that "for a quarter of a century certain thoughtful people have been calling attention to the matter" of protecting archeological resources on federal land.[33] Hewitt's interest in anthropology and archeology began in the 1890s when he and his wife moved to New Mexico. He eventually became involved in efforts to preserve archeological sites and developed a relationship with Lacey. Hewitt appreciated the close connection between scientific knowledge and conservation management of forests and archeological resources. By 1904, he could authoritatively write: "A system of governmental protection of archeological remains is manifestly an accomplished fact, as much so and after the same manner as the protection of timber on public lands."[34]

The ultimate push to legislation to protect cultural resources specifically came in three focused efforts between 1900 and 1906. In the first phase, the Committee on the Protection and Preservation of Objects of Archaeological Interest, formed by the American Association for the Advancement of Science in 1899, promoted a bill for the preservation of aboriginal antiquities on federal lands. As drafted, the bill would have protected existing "monuments, cliff-dwellings, cemeteries, graves, mounds, forts, or any other work of prehistoric, primitive, or aboriginal man, and also any natural formation of scientific or scenic value or interest, or natural wonder or curiosity."[35] It also would have authorized the Secretary of the Interior to issue permits to qualified institutions for lawful archeological excavations and granted the President of the United States the authority to set apart tracts of land in reserves for the protection of "natural wonders or curiosities, ancient ruins or relics, or other objects of scientific or historic interest, or springs of medicinal or other properties."[36] While the Public Lands Committee of the House of Representatives received a favorable report on the proposed legislation, Congress took no action.

The second round of legislative activity began in 1902 with a bill drafted by the Reverend Henry Mason Baum of the Records of the Past Exploration Society and introduced by Senator Henry Cabot Lodge in 1904. The "Lodge bill" competed with a bill, known as the "Smithsonian bill," drafted by Holmes of the Bureau of American Ethnology. Whereas the Lodge bill resembled the earlier bill, the Smithsonian bill gave the Smithsonian Institution "supervision of all aboriginal monuments, ruins, and other antiquities" but stopped short of extending protection to historic, scenic, or scientific resources on the public lands.[37] The Lodge bill cleared the Senate but Congress took no final action on either it or the Smithsonian bill.

In 1905, Hewett led the third and successful attempt on behalf of the legislative committee of the American Anthropological Association. He reconciled the competing interests of the archeological groups and took the interests of various federal agencies into account.[38] Representative Lacey introduced the bill in the House on January 9, 1906, and Senator Thomas MacDonald Patterson of Colorado followed with a bill in the Senate on February 26. The final version of the bill became law on June 8, 1906.

As passed, the Act granted the President of the United States the authority to protect areas of public land by designating national monuments. This type of authority had existed prior to 1906, but passage of the Act meant that the President could exercise this authority systematically to protect historic landmarks, historic and prehistoric structures, and other objects of historic or scientific interest provided there was sufficient scientific evidence to support the designations.[39]

President Theodore Roosevelt invoked the Antiquities Act soon after its passage to declare national monuments, thus setting the precedent for using the Act as a vehicle for protecting both natural and cultural heritage. Mindful of the Act's intellectual and practical origins in the conservation movement, Roosevelt designated Devil's Tower in Wyoming—a "natural wonder and an object of historic and great scientific interest"—on September 24, 1906, making it the first designated national monument under the new legislation.[40] He designated the Petrified Forest in Arizona on December 8, 1906, citing the fossil deposits of Mesozoic wood as being "of the greatest scientific interest and value."[41] He also designated Platt National Park (now the Chickasaw National Recreation Area) in Oklahoma, which consisted of sulfur springs bought in 1902 from the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations.[42]

Second, the Act included an enforcement provision with penalties for criminal actions. It prohibited the injury to or the appropriation, excavation, or destruction of any "historic or prehistoric ruin or monument, or any object of antiquity."[43] The records on convictions under the Act itself are sketchy, but the regulations promulgated under its authority continue to serve as the basis for issuing citations and collecting fines today. From 1906 to 1979, the Act also provided the first and only federal sanction for prosecuting crimes against domestic terrestrial and submerged cultural resources on federal and tribal lands controlled by the United States.

Third, the Act established permitting provisions under which qualified individuals or groups could conduct research in the public interest on public lands, subject to comment from the Smithsonian Institution. Lacking uniform guidance from the Act, the Secretaries of the Interior, Agriculture, and War (now, Defense) were on their own when it came to the substantive and procedural aspects of permitting; however, the law stipulated that permits were only

to be issued to qualified institutions and that the information gathered was to be "for the benefit of reputable museums, universities, colleges, or other recognized scientific or educational institutions, with a view to increasing the knowledge of such objects." Moreover, any and all items retrieved were considered government property and were to be preserved in public museums.

Finally, the Act required each agency that exercised jurisdiction over federal lands to maintain a program for carrying out the Antiquities Act. This provision not only preserved departmental authority over the application of the Act, it also protected against the creation of one centralized agency having full control over certain types of resources across all agencies of the Federal Government.

Since 1906, a number of court cases, commissions, and one Congressional amendment have further refined the provisions of the Antiquities Act.

In response to a federal court decision that upheld President Franklin D. Roosevelt's designation of Jackson Hole National Monument, Congress amended the Act in 1945 to restrict the designation of national monuments in Wyoming except by express Congressional authorization; eventually, the monument became part of Grand Teton National Park.[44]

In 1974, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit struck down the criminal portion of the Antiquities Act, making it void in the western states, Alaska, and Hawaii. The pivotal case arose from the theft of five masks and other ceremonial objects from an Apache medicine man that were used in a centuries-old sacred ceremony. The defendant in the case was charged with having appropriated "objects of antiquity" and convicted in district court, but the Ninth Circuit overturned the decision on the grounds that a law classifying certain 5- to 7-year-old masks as "antiquities" was unconstitutionally vague, and, therefore, void.[45]

Subsequently, the neighboring Tenth Circuit affirmed the constitutionality of the Act and upheld the convictions of two men charged with taking antiquities from federal and tribal land.[46] Lacking judicial consensus on the legality of the Act's criminal provision, federal prosecutors charged the looters with theft and destruction of government property.[47] The passage of ARPA in 1979 filled this gap by providing the specific criminal law with express definitions.[48]

The permitting provision of the Antiquities Act was tested and upheld in 1993 in *Lathrop v. Unidentified, Wrecked and Abandoned Vessel*, a case involving the excavation of a shipwreck in submerged lands within Canaveral National Seashore that are legally owned by the State of Florida but controlled by the National Park Service.[49] In that case, the district court used the Act's territorial jurisdiction to halt a treasure hunter from removing marine resources within

the park. The Act's subject matter jurisdiction over natural resources had already been affirmed earlier in 1980 in *People of the State of California v. Mead*, in which California sought to prevent the Smithsonian Institution from removing a meteorite from the state.[50] In that case, the Ninth Circuit held that the Antiquities Act gave the Secretary of the Interior the authority to issue the Smithsonian permit in the interests of science.

While the affected agencies exercised their jurisdictional authority over cultural heritage, no such approach was taken immediately with regard to natural heritage. Instead, a centralized, government-wide approach to policy-making held sway. One noteworthy attempt came in 1908 in the form of the National Conservation Commission, the objective of which was to inventory the nation's natural resources.[51] Eventually, however, environmental legislation embraced the resource management model of the Antiquities Act.

A Century of Resource Stewardship

The Antiquities Act established federal preservation policy that would eventually shape subsequent legislation and the designation of new national monuments. The Act itself has not been substantively amended; rather, Congress has determined at various times since the passage of the Act that new legislation was necessary for the advancement of the objectives set forth in 1906. The subsequent statutes, regulations, and resultant executive actions did not necessarily refer directly to the Antiquities Act, but they all bear its distinctive imprint.

The creation of the National Park Service in 1916 reinforced the ideas of 1906. The Organic Act that created the Service also determined its mode of stewardship and effectively ended the debate over scientific management versus preservation. While utilitarians like Pinchot felt that parks should be open to sustainable development, preservationists felt they should be maintained unimpaired. The Organic Act sided with the latter, stating, in part, that parks, monuments, and reservations shall be managed "to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."[52]

One of the indirect impacts of the Antiquities Act was the creation of official positions. In 1927, the Secretary of the Interior, finding that advice on archeological matters and coordinated approaches to governmental archeological work was beneficial, created the position of Departmental Consulting Archeologist to further the purposes of the Act.

The chain of legislation that followed the passage of the Antiquities Act is perhaps a more meaningful measure of the magnitude of its effect. In 1935,

Congress formalized the interdisciplinary approach to cultural resources management with passage of the Historic Sites Act, which gave the Secretary of the Interior government-wide responsibilities for leadership and guidance in historic preservation through record keeping, contracts, property acquisition, management, and education.[53] The Act also authorized the National Park Service to collect and preserve documentation on historic and archeological sites and to make a survey of sites of exceptional value in commemorating and illustrating the history of the United States, the basis of the Historic American Buildings Survey and the National Historic Landmarks program respectively. At the same time, this law created the National Park System Advisory Board, thus ensuring a role for the public in conserving the national cultural heritage.

The impact of the Antiquities Act since 1935 has been equally profound. Its permitting requirements and criminal enforcement provisions have been incorporated into ARPA; its protection provisions have been expanded and reaffirmed in NHPA and NEPA respectively; the National Marine Sanctuaries Act (1972), the Coastal Zone Management Act (1972), and the Abandoned Shipwreck Act (1987) provide comparable protections for resources in marine environments; and cultural resources from federal and Indian lands are now controlled and cared for according to curatorial regulations promulgated under ARPA and the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990 (NAGPRA).[54]

Despite the more detailed cultural resource management legislation that has followed in the intervening 100 years, the Act continues to play a central role in heritage stewardship in the United States. It alone grants the U.S. President the authority to designate national monuments. Except within the jurisdiction of the Ninth Circuit, it alone provides criminal prosecutors the option of extracting a moderate penalty for damage to resources and asserting protective authority over areas controlled but not necessarily owned by the United States. It has recently been suggested that the Antiquities Act be used to designate marine sites as national monuments as a way of protecting them from looting and degradation.[55]

The Antiquities Act is a unique statement, set in law, about how the nation should manage its natural and cultural heritage. The Act preserves the intellectual perspectives of conservationists—both utilitarians and preservationists—of previous generations who meant for heritage stewardship to be skilled, significant, inclusive, and participatory. It remains the legal foundation of federal historic preservation programs. Simply stated, the Antiquities Act was the opening statement in an on-going national conversation about the nation's shared heritage.

Richard Waldbauer, Ph.D. is assistant director of the National Park Service's Federal Preservation Institute in Washington, DC. **Sherry Hutt, Ph.D., J.D.** is manager of the National NAGPRA program, also in Washington. They may be reached at richard_waldbauer@nps.gov and sherry_hutt@nps.gov respectively.

Notes

1. *American Antiquities Act, U.S. Code*, vol. 16, sec. 431-433 (1906).

2. *National Historic Preservation Act, U.S. Code*, vol. 16, sec. 470 (1966); *National Environmental Policy Act, U.S. Code*, vol. 42, sec. 4321, 4331-4335 (1969); *Archaeological Resources Protection Act, U.S. Code*, vol. 16, sec. 470aa-mm (1979).

3. See Ronald F. Lee, *The Antiquities Act of 1906* (Washington, DC: National Park Service, 1970).

4. See Hal Rothman, *America's National Monuments: The Politics of Preservation* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1989), and Raymond Harris Thompson, "An Old and Reliable Authority: An Act for the Preservation of American Antiquities," *Journal of the Southwest*, special edition (2000).

5. *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia*, 30 US 1 (1831).

6. David Hurst Thomas, *Skull Wars: Kennewick Man, Archaeology, and the Battle for Native American Identity* (New York, NY: Neveraumont, 2000), 125-132.

7. Congress created the Bureau of Ethnology (later called the Bureau of American Ethnology) in 1879 as a permanent anthropological survey.

8. Cyrus Thomas, "Report on the Mound Explorations of the Bureau of Ethnology," *Twelfth Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology, 1890-1891* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1894).

9. Trained in medicine, Hayden had served as a doctor during the Civil War but shifted his focus to geology. He became the first federal geologist and an ardent proponent of Congressional support for projects that furthered the understanding of the relationships between natural history and economic science. In his surveys and extensive reports, Hayden paid particular attention to potential railroad routes.

10. Curtis M. Hinsley, Jr., *Savages and Scientists: The Smithsonian Institution and the Development of American Anthropology, 1846-1910* (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution, 1981), 101.

11. Douglas H. Strong, *Dreamers and Defenders: American Conservationists* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1971), 39-51.

12. Melville Herskovits, *Franz Boas: The Science of Man in the Making* (1953; Clifton, NJ: Augustus M. Kelley, 1973), 18-19, 58-59.

13. Harriman conceived, planned, and organized the expedition, especially with C. Hart Merriam, a scientist with the Department of Agriculture who pioneered concepts of ecological "zones." Though he spoke of philanthropic notions, it is possible that he had railroad investment interests in mind or simply wanted to have a grand vacation such as only a magnate of his stature could achieve. If it was a whim, he gave Merriam only two months to assemble the extraordinary members of the expedition.

14. Library of Congress, "The Evolution of the Conservation Movement," http://memory.loc.gov/ammem/amrvhtml/conshome.html, accessed December 5, 2005.

15. George Perkins Marsh, *Man and Nature; or Physical Geography, as Modified by Human Action*. 8 vols. (New York, NY: C. Scribner, 1864).

16. During his time in Congress, he helped establish the Smithsonian Institution.

17. David Lowenthal, *George Perkins Marsh: Prophet of Conservation* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2000), 292-312.

18. George Perkins Marsh, *Man and Nature; The Earth as Modified by Human Action* (New York, NY: Scribner, Armstrong & Company, 1874).

19. Richard H. Stroud, *National Leaders of American Conservation* (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution, 1985), 15-16.

20. Gifford Pinchot, *Breaking New Ground*, commemorative edition (1947; reprint, Washington, DC: Island Press, 1998), xv. Pinchot expanded on his views about conservation in this autobiography, which was published posthumously in 1947. In it, he clarified his utilitarian concepts with direct statements about the protection and preservation of human society.

21. Frederick Jackson Turner, "The Significance of the American Frontier," a paper presented at the meeting of the American Historical Association, Chicago, IL, 1893, as reproduced online at http://www.learner.org/channel/workshops/primarysources/corporations/docs/turner.html, accessed December 1, 2005.

22. Stroud, 15.

23. Harold T. Pinkett, *Gifford Pinchot: Private and Public Forester* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1970), 56-65.

24. *U.S. Statutes at Large* 30 (1899): 993-995.

25. *U.S. Statutes at Large* 31 (1900): 187-189.

26. *U.S. Statutes at Large* 30 (1899): 993-995.

27. "Senate concurrent resolution 108 recognizing the accomplishments of John Fletcher Lacey and commemorating the one-hundredth-year anniversary of the Lacey Act," *Iowa Senate Journal* (2000): 1435.

28. There was a complex array of numerous and frequent presidential proclamations and executive orders after 1897, when the Forest Management Act was passed, that had major impacts on Indian tribes and their lands. Congress rescinded some of this presidential authority in 1907.

29. *U.S. Statutes at Large* 30 (1898): 32-36.

30. *U.S. Statutes at Large* 33 (1904): 2368-2372. In 1931, Congress transferred Sullys Hill to the National Wildlife Refuge System. It is now Sullys Hill National Game Preserve.

31. Rothman, 6.

32. Ibid., 20.

33. Thompson, "An Old and Reliable Authority: An Act for the Preservation of American Antiquities," 273.

34. Ibid., 222.

35. Ibid., 224. The Committee was able to raise concern in Congress over the connection between railroad expansion in the West and the removal of antiquities from federal lands to Russia and Sweden.

36. Ibid., 227.

37. Ibid., 230-233.

38. Ibid., 236-242.

39. This provision of the law satisfied the conservationist interest in incorporating scientific knowledge into the process of creating and implementing federal policy.

40. *U.S. Statutes at Large* 34 (1906): 3236-3237.

41. Ibid.

42. *U.S. Statutes at Large* 34 (1906): 837. The precedent of federal ownership of medicinal springs goes back to 1832, when the Hot Springs Reservation was created in Arkansas.

43. The maximum penalty of $500 and a 90-day prison term may not seem substantial today, but in 1906, $500 was equal to an average yearly income.

44. *Wyoming v. Franke*, 58 F. Supp. 890 (D. Wyo. 1945).

45. *United States v. Diaz*, 368 F. Supp. 856 (D. Ariz. 1973), rev'd, 499 F.2d 113 (9th Cir. 1974).

46. *United States v. Smyer*, 596 F.2d 939 (10th Cir.), cert denied, 4444 US 843 (1979).

47. *United States v. Jones*, 449 F. Supp. 42 (D. Ariz. 1978), rev'd, 607 F.2d 269 (9th Cir. 1979), *cert denied*, 444 US 1085 (1980).

48. *U.S. Code*, vol. 16, sec. 470aa.

49. *Lathrop v. Unidentified, Wrecked & Abandoned Vessel*, 817 F. Supp. 953 (M.D. Fla. 1993).

50. *California* ex rel. *Younger v. Mead*, 618 F.2d 618 (9th Cir. 1980).

51. Stroud, 17. Gifford Pinchot served as chair of the commission. Coincidentally, the third edition of Marsh's *Man and Nature* had appeared in print in 1907 in advance of the White House conference that called for the Commission.

52. *U.S. Code*, vol. 16, sec. 1 (1916). The Act that created the National Park Service has no official short title but is commonly called "The National Park Service Organic Act."

53. *Historic Sites, Buildings, Objects and Antiquities Act*, U.S. Code, vol. 16, sec. 461-467 (1935).

54. *National Marine Sanctuaries* Act, *U.S.* Code, vol. 16, sec. 1431 (1972); *Coastal Zone Management Act, U.S. Code*, vol. 16, sec. 1451-1456 (1972); *Abandoned Shipwreck Act, U.S. Code*, vol. 43, sec. 2101-2106 (1987); "Curation of Federally-Owned and Administered Archaeological Collections" (36CFR79), *Code of Federal Regulations*, vol. 36, part 79 (1990); *Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, U.S. Code*, vol. 25, sec. 3001 (1990).

55. See Jeff Brax, "Zoning the Oceans: Using the National Marine Sanctuaries Act and the Antiquities Act to Establish Marine Protection Areas and Marine Reserves in America," *Ecology Law Quarterly* 29 (2002):125. See note 2 (above) for bibliographical information on NHPA, NEPA, and ARPA.

Interpreting the Shakers: Opening the Villages to the Public, 1955-1965[1]

by William D. Moore

In 1962, journalist Richard Shanor, writing in the magazine *Travel*, reported on a booming subfield of heritage tourism. "Today," he wrote, "an increasing number of visitors each year are discovering . . . the fascination of Shaker history, the beauty of Shaker craftsmanship, and the amazing number of ways Shaker hands and minds have contributed to the American heritage."[2] Shanor and the editors of *Travel* recognized the fruits of the efforts of individuals from New Hampshire to Kentucky who were opening Shaker villages to the public as heritage sites.

Established in North America at the end of the 18th century, the Shakers were a religious society with historical roots in the British Isles. Under the leadership of prophet Mother Ann Lee and her successor Joseph Meacham, the group, formally known as the United Society of Believers in Christ's Second Appearing, congregated in celibate, communitarian villages and lived according to a set of strictures, known as the "Millennial Laws," which guided both public and private behavior. According to these codes, all economic resources were shared, individuals worked for the common good, and pairs of male and female leaders attempted to steer the community to spiritual perfection and economic self-sufficiency. The Millennial Laws, grounded in Protestant avoidance of temptation and abhorrence of excess, also guided believers in their material life, leading to architecture and furniture that tended away from extravagant design and ornamentation.

Following the Second Great Awakening, the society grew to comprise 18 villages located from Maine to Kentucky. Within these communities, the Shakers organized themselves into families composed of individuals who were biologically unrelated. Men and women who espoused, and attempted to practice, celibacy slept in chambers in sexually segregated areas of communal dwellings but ate, socialized, and worshipped together. Ecstatic and inspired trembling and shaking during worship, from which the group's popular name was derived, developed into a ritualized liturgical dance practiced by the community as a whole during religious services. The group's emphasis on communal labor as an expression of religious devotion led to prosperity in many communities, as well as to innovative agricultural and manufacturing processes. Shaker villages produced and sold packaged seeds, medicinal compounds, furniture, clothing, and agricultural equipment, including wooden buckets and other containers. The sect reached its largest member-

ship of more than 4,000 members in the 1840s and subsequently declined.[3]

Between 1925 and 1965, the American public's perceptions of the Shakers changed dramatically. Before 1925, the sect had received little attention or recognition beyond the immediate vicinities of its villages in New England, Ohio, and Kentucky. People from outside these areas who were aware of the Shakers tended to dismiss them as bizarre religious fanatics. By 1965, Americans had come to value the Shakers as exemplars of the virtues of reverence, ingenuity, simplicity, sobriety, and selflessness.[4]

This positive reevaluation of Shakerism and the Shaker legacy coincided with the painful and prolonged collapse of Shakerism within the institution itself.[5] Journalists frequently predicted the sect's demise. In 1922, a newspaperman reporting on the closing of the Shaker village in South Union, Kentucky, commented that the "picturesque colony of Shakers, that unusual religious sect which takes its name from the peculiar motion they manifest when wrought up to religious ecstasy, at South Union, in Warren, County, Ky., will soon be but a memory. Most of the quaint and deeply religious people who once made up the colony have died."[6]

Similarly, in describing the end of the Shaker village in Alfred, Maine, Karl Schriftgiesser of the *Boston Evening Transcript* wrote in 1931, "Their buildings will be deserted, their farms let go to seed, and an even more deathly silence than usual will settle over their little community where they have worked so hard and lived so long."[7] Schriftgiesser's prediction proved accurate: By 1951, only three active communities remained, containing just 40 members of the faith.[8]

The decline of Shakerism during these years also coincided with a surge of interest in American history and material culture in general. Collectors, such as Henry Mercer in Pennsylvania and Edna Hilburn Greenwood in Massachusetts, gathered artifacts that spoke to them of the country's past, and preservationists, including William Sumner Appleton of Boston and the Rev. William A.R. Godwin, of Williamsburg, Virginia, organized to protect buildings and sites that could be used to educate the public about America's history.[9] Meanwhile, others, including photographer William Winter, artist Charles Sheeler, antique dealers Faith and Edward Deming Andrews, and Charles Adams, the director of the New York State Museum, introduced the public to Shaker art and architecture.[10]

Between 1955 and 1965, the four Shaker villages of Hancock, Massachusetts; Canterbury, New Hampshire; and Harrodsburg and South Union, Kentucky, were opened to the public as heritage sites. The openings were milestones in the reevaluation of Shaker life and culture. For the most part, Shakers did not play leading roles in these undertakings; rather, they paid close attention as

historic preservationists, economic developers, history enthusiasts, and local elites attempted to reshape the villages to serve, not the needs of the sect, but those of the American touring public. At all four sites, non-Shakers made decisions that advanced the status of the villages as didactic landscapes and tourist attractions rather than as religious communities.[11]

The people who reshaped these villages into heritage sites were in regular correspondence with each other.[12] They visited one another's sites.[13] They read and evaluated their press coverage and learned from each other's successes and failures. However, they also functioned within their respective institutional contexts, and even though they had all started with roughly the same raw material (that is to say, declining or abandoned Shaker villages), they achieved markedly different outcomes. Whereas the backers of Hancock Shaker Village in the Berkshires posited a role for Shaker architecture and material culture in the evolution of a modern and distinctly American aesthetic, Shakertown at Pleasant Hill outside Harrodsburg promoted the Shaker village as an agrarian retreat. The Shaker Museum at South Union just west of Bowling Green literally used the village as a stage for celebrating local history, whereas Canterbury Shaker Village nurtured a personality cult that formed around the surviving Shaker sisters there. How site administrators understood their missions affected decisions concerning the restoration and interpretation of the villages. Whereas the Shakers had shaped the villages in accordance with their religious beliefs, the various Shaker village administrators tailored them to fit decidedly different, secular visions.

Whereas the Shakers had shaped the villages in accordance with their religious beliefs, the various Shaker village administrators tailored them to fit decidedly different, secular visions.

Placing the various restorations within their historic contexts helps explain how different interpretations of the Shakers and the Shaker legacy were imposed upon each site. When set against the backdrop of the post-war *pax Americana* and the economic, social, and political circumstances of the 1950s and 1960s, the restorations offer insight into how some Americans, both individually and collectively, negotiated transformative events in the life of the nation, whether it be the Cold War, the Red Scare, the Civil Rights movement, or the nuclear arms race. During these years, Americans also celebrated the Civil War centennial and scored important victories for historic preservation, including the creation of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 and the success of the National Trust for Historic Preservation following its establishment in 1949.[14] In many respects, the surge of interest in Shaker history and material culture functioned to ameliorate national anxieties associated with change.

Hancock Shaker Village

The effort to preserve Hancock Shaker Village began shortly after the death in 1957 of Eldress Frances Hall, the leader of the sect's central ministry and one of the last of that community's believers. Eldress Emma B. King, a Canterbury, New Hampshire, resident and Hall's successor, decided in 1959 to close and sell Hancock Village, just as the Shaker leadership had disposed of moribund Shaker villages in the past. In July 1960, a group of preservationists headed by Amy Bess Miller, the wealthy wife of the publisher of the local newspaper, the *Berkshire Eagle*, bought the village.[15] Miller surrounded herself with an impressive group that included Dorothy Miller, a curator at the Museum of Modern Art in New York and wife of seminal folk art scholar Holger Cahill; Professor David Potter, Coe Professor of American History at Yale and former chairman of the university's American Studies Program; Carl Rollins, director of Yale University Press; and Philip Guyol, director of the New Hampshire Historical Society.[16] Faith and Edward Deming Andrews, who had established themselves as authorities on the Shakers, were also instrumental in the organization.[17]

Miller was able to assemble an august board because the Berkshires had long been a retreat for cosmopolitan sophisticates with an interest in arts and culture.[18] Notable residents included writers Herman Melville and Edith Wharton, sculptor Daniel Chester French, and diplomat Joseph Hodges Choate. Although picturesque, beautiful, and rural, the area is easily accessible from both Boston and New York. *Time* magazine described Hancock's supporters as being "made up largely of well-off summer residents of the Berkshires."[19] The nonprofit organization to preserve the Shaker village established by Miller and her associates complemented others already in the region dedicated to the promotion of classical music, gardening, drama, and sculpture.[20]

Miller, the Andrewses, and the museum's board were guided in their restoration of Hancock village by a conflation of Shakerism and modern design that the Andrewses and others had cultivated over the preceding four decades. Photographs made in the 1920s and 1930s by William Winter of Schenectady, New York, were central to this contrivance. Winter, in turn, was influenced by the contemporary compositions of photographers Alfred Steiglitz, Paul Strand, and Charles Sheeler. His black-and-white images followed the dictates of the modernist photographic canon that reveled in the formal qualities of images, particularly flat surfaces, straight lines, shadows, and empty spaces.[21] He frequently arranged furniture in vacant buildings to achieve specific visual affects.[22]

Winter's manipulated and largely uninhabited images were broadly reproduced and presented to the public in a variety of contexts. A Winter photograph labeled "Shaker Simplicity" appeared as the frontispiece for the December

FIGURE 1
This photograph by William Winter from the 1930s uses Shaker architecture and furnishings to create a modernist visual composition and was reproduced as Plate 6 in Faith and Edward Deming Andrews' Shaker Furniture. *(Courtesy of the Winterthur Library, the Edward Deming Andrews Memorial Shaker Collection)*

1934 issue of *Antiques Magazine*. Another Winter composition was used in 1935 to illustrate an article in the *New York Times Magazine* celebrating folk art.[23] His images accompanied a 1937 article by Edward Deming Andrews in the *Magazine of Art* concerning Shaker architecture and were featured in a special 1945 Shaker issue of *House & Garden*.[24] They were also exhibited to the public at the New York State Museum, the Albany Institute of History & Art, the Berkshire Museum, the Lenox Library, in Lenox, Massachusetts, and the Whitney Museum in New York.[25] Most importantly, the Andrewses used 48 of Winter's black-and-white photographs to illustrate their influential *Shaker Furniture: The Craftsmanship of an American Communal Sect*.[26]

Winter's photographs, like the one reproduced as the sixth plate in *Shaker Furniture*, portray the Shakers as religiously motivated, aesthetically attuned modernists.(Figure 1) For this image, Winter folded and arranged towels on a Shaker towel rack so that they harmonized with the window panes, the shadows on the wall, and the rectangles formed by the stretchers in the chair legs, as well as by the pegboards and the room's other architectural elements.[27] The stark black-and-white contrast of the printed image contributes to an aura of restraint and self-denial.

In 1931, Winter photographed the dining room in Hancock's Church Family Dwelling House.[28](Figure 2) This view records the space as the residents knew

FIGURE 2
This 1931 photograph by William Winter of the dining room of the Church Family Dwelling House in Hancock, MA, illustrates how the Shakers lived in the space in the early 20th century. (Courtesy of the Library of Congress, Prints and Photographs Division, HABS Collection)

it at the time, with patterned linoleum floor coverings, factory-produced chairs, framed works of art on the walls, a mass-produced stove, and ordinary electrical light fixtures constructed of chain and white glass. Potted plants crowded the windowsills. The mundane, industrial, and institutional aspects of communal existence recorded in this photograph stand in marked contrast to the impression given by the ahistorical image of the ironing room which, ultimately, was an abstracted ideal grounded in Winter's aesthetics and photographic style rather than in the reality of Shaker daily life.[29]

Winter's photographs of Shaker architecture and material culture are part of a larger early 20th-century endeavor in the United States to create an art that expressed national identity.[30] Artists as diverse as Stuart Davis, Georgia O'Keefe, Marsden Hartley, and Joseph Stella were drawn to this mission to create an artistic modernism distinct from that of Europe. Some patriotic, artistic modernists claimed Shaker craftsmen as their spiritual forbears and presented Shaker objects as proof of a distinctly American modernist aesthetic inheritance that predated the European artistic movements introduced at the 1913 Armory Show. Announcing an exhibition of Shaker furniture held at the Whitney Museum in 1935, Homer Eaton Keyes, the editor of *Antiques Magazine* wrote, "The exhibition of Shaker furniture . . . should attract wide attention . . . I shall be particularly interested to observe the reactions of the modernistic tribe . . . This furniture comports, in theory at least, with the ideas of sundry contemporary designers."[31]

Charles Sheeler, Winter's contemporary, simultaneously crafted an autochthonous American modernism from regional materials including Shaker objects, hooked rugs, antique chairs, and Pennsylvania barns.[32] Sheeler himself commented, "It is interesting to note in some [Shaker] cabinet work the anticipation, by a hundred years or more, of the tendencies of some of our contemporary designers toward economy and what we call the functional in design."[33] In her influential article, "American Art: A Possible Future," Constance Rourke, the American cultural critic and Sheeler's intimate, hailed, "the spare abstract as this appears in many phases of our folk-expression."[34] Rourke's description of unornamented, well-crafted items arrayed in harmonious compositions as distinctively American applied equally to the Shaker antiques and architecture that Keyes and the Andrewses promoted and to Sheeler's paintings and Winter's photographs.

The skewed modernist aesthetic appreciation of Shaker architecture and material culture upheld by the Andrewses, Winter, and others informed the restoration and interpretation of Hancock Shaker Village. The village administrators, including Edward Deming Andrews who served as its curator, did what they could to reshape the village according to their shared vision of how an ideal Shaker village should look. Linoleum flooring was removed. Framed portraits and lithographs were taken down from the walls. Objects manufactured in the world outside the village were banished from view. Rooms that were to be open to the public were furnished with the finest examples of Shaker craftsmanship available. These changes perpetuated an aesthetically pleasing and artistically gratifying, albeit erroneous, representation of the Shakers.

The Church Family's brick dwelling house, furnished with objects from the Andrewses' personal collection, was the first space opened to the public.[35] Sympathetic journalists and connoisseurs of art and architecture from across the country repeated the aesthetic judgments concerning the Shakers that they had heard from curators, commentators, and scholars over the course of the previous 30 years. In describing the Hancock project for the *New York Times* in 1961, Richard Shanor noted that "[the] Typical Shaker living quarters . . . will show graphically why the clean, simple Shaker look is so admired by modern decorators. Their craftsmen designed with function uppermost, built well and never spoiled their straight-grained maple or pine with unnecessary weight, ornament or finishes."[36]

Shakertown at Pleasant Hill

Hancock Shaker Village served as a site through which the educated elite of Massachusetts and New York constructed a modernist and nationalist genealogy to challenge the continental aesthetics of European modernism.[37] At Shakertown at Pleasant Hill, outside Harrodsburg, Kentucky, the circumstances were different. In 1935, James Isenberg, a visionary heritage tourism

entrepreneur, recognized the economic potential of the Shaker legacy and attempted to establish a Shaker-themed settlement house at recently abandoned Pleasant Hill that would generate revenue by making and marketing craft work.[38] Although Goodwill Industries ran a home for girls and an income-producing hand weaving program on the site into the 1940s, Isenberg's vision faded following his untimely death in 1938.[39]

Isenberg's efforts, however, bore fruit, when Jane Bird Hutton, the boosterist newspaper editor of the *Harrodsburg Herald* and the daughter of Isenberg's closest associate, drew Barry Bingham, the wealthy philanthropic editor of the *Louisville Courier*, into a movement to consider anew economic development strategies for Pleasant Hill.[40] Bingham, in turn, brought Earl Wallace, an influential petroleum executive and Wall Street financier, into the project.[41]

A self-described "history buff" who dismissed the Shakers as "misfits and eccentrics," Wallace nevertheless fell in love with Shakertown because it offered "an oasis" of peace from the transformations Kentucky was undergoing in the 20th century.[42] Under Wallace's leadership, a nonprofit organization was formed in 1961 composed of many of the state's most prominent families. In 1963, the group secured an economic development loan from the U.S. Department of Commerce to help transform the Shaker village into an economic engine for the region.[43]

The fact that the Shakers had not relied upon slave labor to support their agricultural endeavors allowed Shakertown at Pleasant Hill to celebrate Kentucky's antebellum, pre-industrial society without broaching the fractious issue of slavery in the midst of the national debate over segregation.

Although the Shakers themselves had exploited industrial technologies, Wallace envisioned a pre-industrial, pre-modern village. He hired James Cogar, who previously had worked at Colonial Williamsburg, the nation's leading purveyor of picturesque history, to implement that vision.[44] Besides having significant experience at Williamsburg, Cogar was a native of Kentucky, and held a B.A. from the University of Kentucky and M.A. from Harvard University.[45] Cogar, in turn, brought in Peter A.G. Brown, director of presentation services for Colonial Williamsburg, to confer on how to configure the site to realize its maximum potential as a tourist attraction.[46]

Wallace and Cogar's plan, which was implemented beginning in 1965, focused on erasing late-19th- and early-20th-century modifications from the landscape. Utility lines were buried, Victorian porches were removed, and missing architectural elements were replaced. Guest rooms, conference facilities, and

simple craft shops were created within an Arcadian setting.[47] Just as John D. and Abby Aldrich Rockefeller maintained Basset Hall as a residence at Colonial Williamsburg, Bingham and his wife established a residence in a renovated building on the property at Pleasant Hill.

Wallace and Cogar reshaped Pleasant Hill into a bucolic landscape undisturbed by the strife, conflict, and technological transformations of the 20th century. Even though the Shakers were technological innovators, the site's 20th-century stewards chose not to restore or interpret the village's water-powered fulling and saw mills. According to Cogar, Pleasant Hill would be attractive for conferences because large organizations demanded a quiet place away from the rush and noise of metropolitan areas for study and reflection.[48] The fact that the Shakers had not relied upon slave labor to support their agricultural endeavors allowed Shakertown at Pleasant Hill to celebrate Kentucky's antebellum, pre-industrial society without broaching the fractious issue of slavery in the midst of the national debate over segregation.[49]

Following James Isenberg's lead in understanding heritage tourism as a springboard for economic development, many Mercer County residents, including Jane Bird Hutton, saw a direct connection between the work at Pleasant Hill and efforts to address rural poverty in the region.[50] In 1961, the *Lexington Leader* noted—

Kentucky's Shakertown can easily become as famous as Virginia's Williamsburg, Ford's Dearborn Village and the comparatively few other restorations of this kind. The successful preservation and operation of Shakertown will bring to Lexington and other central Kentucky cities many, many times the amount of money they invest in this campaign.[51]

Similarly, that same year, the Kentucky Travel Council chairman, Alex Chamberlain, endorsed the Shakertown project "both for its economic advantages to the Commonwealth as a major tourist attraction and as an important cultural agency of the region."[52] In response to the news that the Shakertown restoration had received a federal Economic Development Administration loan, the *Harrodsburg Herald* predicted that the village would develop into a "tourist attraction that will pull in at least 150,000 people a year and provide jobs for more than 280 people."[53]

Although Pleasant Hill was successful as a tourist attraction, some critics said that its research and interpretation lacked intellectual rigor. In 1964, for example, Robert Meader, the director of the Shaker Museum at Old Chatham, New York, wrote—

Pleasant Hill seems to be a gung-ho for the fast buck and the superficialities. They are plowing ahead at a great rate without either researching what they are doing

or being interested in doing so. . . I have little use for Cogar, and find that use decreasing. He's just a shallow tourist-maniac, for my money, interested in the externals and without much of an idea what to look for."[54]

Meader's comments may reflect professional enmity, but they also highlight the endemic concern for balancing historical research and interpretation with commercial exploitation of a village that is both an historic site and a tourist attraction.

South Union, Kentucky

The result of a long-term local interest in the site shared by two friends, Mrs. Curry Hall and Miss Julia Neal, the Shaker Museum at South Union, Kentucky, opened to the public in 1960. Hall's contribution was largely antiquarian, whereas Neal's was literary. In the late 1930s, Hall, known informally as Deedy, had started collecting materials that had belonged to the Shakers of South Union. In 1960, she installed her holdings in a vacant church located on property previously owned by the Shakers. She labeled this structure "Shaker Museum."[55] Aware of the vogue for costumed interpreters, Hall arranged to have a home economics class at Auburn High School, located in the town adjacent to the Shaker settlement, produce "costumes" evocative of Shaker traditions for the museum's "hostesses," or docents.[56]

Like Deedy Hall, Julia Neal had grown up near South Union and interacted with the last Shakers living on the site before the village closed in 1923. Although not formally trained as an historian, she wrote a celebratory history of the local Shaker village while a graduate student at Western Kentucky State Teacher's College in nearby Bowling Green, which was later published in 1947 by the University of North Carolina Press under the title *By Their Fruits, the Story of Shakerism in South Union, Kentucky*.[57] Neal was teaching English at Florence State College in Florence, Alabama, when Hall asked her to assist with the museum's interpretation of Shaker life.[58]

Drawing upon the tradition of early-20th-century civic pageantry and hoping to replicate the popularity of summer tourist theatricals such as Paul Green's *Unto These Hills* and *The Lost Colony* in North Carolina and *The Stephen Foster Story* presented in nearby Bardstown, Kentucky, residents from the Auburn area produced a pageant during the summer of 1962 based on Neal's book.[59] Adapted by Russell H. Miller, director of Speech and Dramatics at Western Kentucky State College (formerly Western Kentucky State Teacher's College and currently Western Kentucky University), the pageant debuted in the Auburn High School gymnasium under the title "Shakertown Revisited."[60] Performed during the Civil War centennial, the pageant's central scenes focused on the Shakers' interaction with both the Union and Confederate Armies.(Figure 3) Ruth Morris, also on the faculty of Western Kentucky State

FIGURE 3
In 1962, the Shaker Museum at South Union, Kentucky, presented a pageant entitled Shakertown Revisited *in a local high school gymnasium. (Courtesy of the Shaker Museum at South Union Library Collection, South Union, Kentucky)*

College, arranged and directed the music and choreography based on Shaker precedents.[61]

The pageant received positive reviews.[62] George M. Chinn, director of the Kentucky Historical Society, wrote to Russell Miller: "By your genius, you have reached the highest form of the art by weaving into the fabric of entertainment a simple but colorful pattern. This is by far the most outstanding presentation of its kind in existence and its flawless interpretation by local folks is truly remarkable."[63]

Even Edward Deming Andrews, often a harsh critic when it came to the work of others in the field, gave it a positive, albeit lukewarm, review. Writing to Barry Bingham in the summer of 1963, Andrews said of the South Union production: "Though the pageant at Auburn may leave much to be desired, it shows what can be done with cooperation and enthusiasm. At least it was a beginning, and more than we have been able to do here [at Hancock] pageant-wise."[64]

For decades, the summer Shaker pageant was the defining event for the Shaker Museum at South Union. The musical performance took place regularly until 1991, moving from the high school to the historic Shaker complex even before the museum purchased it in 1971.[65]

Canterbury Shaker Village

Whereas the Shaker village at South Union largely served as a stage for reenacting local history, the stars of the show at Canterbury Shaker Village were the surviving Shakers themselves. Motivated in part by economic necessity, the 11 remaining Shaker sisters actively welcomed visitors to the village beginning in the 1950s.[66] In June 1962, Sister Mildred Barker noted that she looked forward to an increase in visitors at Canterbury once the schools closed. "Sister Ethel has a party of four at the museum right now," she wrote to Julia Neal in Kentucky; "I wish it were forty."[67]

Charles "Bud" Thompson, a non-Shaker in the sisters' employ, played a central role in opening the village to the public. A folk singer from the Boston suburb of Roslindale, Thompson was enamored of Shaker music and arrived in Canterbury in the late 1950s seeking new songs.[68] The Shakers befriended Thompson and hired him as a factotum and man of general purposes.[69] He lived in the village with his wife and family and helped the Shaker sisters maintain the facility, escorted them to business meetings, drove them to church, and performed other tasks.[70] Over time, Thompson acquired authority and responsibility and was referred to as the village's curator and director of interpretation, among other honorifics.[71]

In 1960, Thompson established a museum of Shaker objects in the village's meeting house.[72] Next to items created in the village, he displayed artifacts that had been brought to Canterbury as other villages folded. In describing the installation in 1961, the *New Hampshire Sunday News* reported, "Hundreds of items, representative of Shaker life in years long past, have been gathered from many of the former villages. They are on display daily, except Sunday and Monday."[73]

Although the Canterbury Shakers had allowed visitors to the village since the first half of the 19th century, Thompson's museum marked a turning point in the life and history of the community. With Thompson's help, the residents of Canterbury grew increasingly aware of the village's potential as a tourist attraction. The Shaker sisters themselves, particularly Marguerite Frost, Aida Elam, and Ethel Hudson, worked with Thompson by incorporating tours into their communal work. By 1966, the Shakers were reporting approximately 4,000 visitors annually.[74]

For many visitors to Canterbury, the surviving Shakers were more of an attraction than the museum or the village itself. These women, however, were not representative of the sect's historical mainstreams. Although they practiced celibacy and lived communally, their lives differed in many respects from those of their institutional predecessors. Notably, they lived in a village that was much more homogenous in terms of age and gender than most previous

FIGURE 4
In 1970, the Historic American Buildings Survey photographed Bertha Lindsay and another Shaker sister, possibly Miriam Wall, on the porch of the Trustee's Office as part of their effort to document the Canterbury Shaker Village. (Courtesy of the Library of Congress, Prints and Photographs Division, HABS Collection)

Shaker settlements. They were no longer engaged in large-scale agriculture or manufacturing. They had even stopped performing the sect's characteristic dances during worship.

Yet, in the eyes of many of their admirers, they epitomized the Shaker experience.[75](Figure 4) The sisters became central to the interpretation of Canterbury Shaker Village, and a cult of personality quickly formed around them. Repeat visitors to the site curried favor with their favorite Shakers, who on occasion gave spiritual and personal guidance. The "regulars" also competed with each other to see who could gain greatest access to the private spaces of the dwelling house.[76]

For the Shaker sisters themselves, the role of the village—and their roles in the village—remained largely unchanged. Canterbury was their home *first* and a tourist attraction *second*, even after the establishment of Thompson's museum. It was also the backdrop against which they observed and applied Shaker traditions and beliefs as they understood them at the time.[77] As Stephen J. Stein has shown, Shaker belief was not static: The group's theology had shifted and transformed over the centuries, and the beliefs held by the last sisters at Canterbury were but one temporally-grounded version of the faith.[78] As long as they were alive, though, their personal experiences, religious worldviews, and "serene presence" were what mattered most to the steady stream of visitors who returned time and again to interact with them in their residential setting.[79] The ways in which they lived and worshipped—and, perhaps most importantly, their first-person accounts of their lives and beliefs—trumped all non-Shaker interpretations of Shakerism and the Shaker past at Canterbury no matter how nuanced, researched, or historically accurate.[80]

The cult of personality endures at Canterbury. Years after the death of Ethel Hudson, the last of Canterbury's Shakers, the Canterbury tour guides still reinforce perceptions of a personal connection to the sisters. The gift shop sells postcards with portraits of them. In the restored 18th-century dwelling house, Sister Ethel's room remains as she left it at her death.

Two Legacies

The ways in which these Shaker villages were interpreted to the public during their formative years as heritage sites and tourist attractions continue to influence how Americans understand the Shakers and the Shaker legacy today. While Shaker architecture and material culture were presented as antecedents to American modernism in art and architecture as at Hancock, the Shakers themselves were portrayed as picturesque pre-modern agrarians (Shakertown), treated as local history (South Union), or marketed as living relics (Canterbury). Visitors came away from these villages with composite impressions of the Shakers that went beyond the schematic interpretations of the sect and its legacy that were implemented by the site administrators and their sponsors. In collecting materials for South Union, for example, Deedy Hall and Julia Neal were drawn particularly to items that fit the modernist interpretation of Shaker life and material culture even if the objects did not have a Kentucky provenance. In the restoration of Hancock Shaker Village, Victorian alterations to the trustees' house were retained because Amy Bess Miller, the president of the museum's board, fondly remembered meeting there with the last Hancock sisters.[8]

To a certain extent, the outcomes at each village were a function of geography. Hancock, located in a resort community convenient to New York and Boston, was heavily influenced by major cultural institutions, including magazines like *House & Garden* and museums such as the Whitney and the Museum of Modern Art, and by cultural elites who were involved in international artistic movements and visual culture. Pleasant Hill, which was located in a poor agricultural region but not too far from Louisville and the state capital of Frankfort, had access to local leaders such as Jane Bird Hutton, for whom regional economic development was a priority, as well as to urbanites, such as Barry Bingham and Ed Wallace, whose nostalgia for simpler times drove many of their decisions. South Union, located farther from Kentucky's seats of power, struggled to attract support and visitors from outside the immediate area and thus remained largely a community institution. Of the four sites, Canterbury had the distinction of serving as the Shakers' home while simultaneously functioning as a museum. The remaining Shaker sisters shaped it in its formative years and left their enduring mark on the institution.

More broadly, however, these Shaker villages speak to larger cultural issues of the mid 20th century. Faith and Edward Deming Andrews, Barry Bingham,

James Cogar, Deedy Hall, Jane Bird Hutton, Amy Bess Miller, Julia Neal, Earl Wallace and their colleagues and supporters all believed that Shaker villages should be preserved and that Americans would want to visit them. The Shakers—pacifists and communitarians—resonated with them and others at a time of sweeping economic and social change. When the Shakers were presented as precursors to modernism, American culture as a whole was vindicated as being something other than crass or gauche. Shaker material culture challenged the long-standing European notion of Americans as being uncultivated vulgarians. This sect's furniture, widely recognized for its design and fine craftsmanship, was presented as proof of a distinctly American tradition in the decorative and applied arts. The reevaluation of Shaker architecture and material culture coincided with the New York School of abstract expressionism's ascendancy in the art world, and it established cultural legitimacy for the United States' position as a leader on the world political stage.

When site administrators presented Shaker villages as bucolic, classless, raceless, and pre-modern, they were responding in part to societal anxieties about economic and social transformations. Similarly, when the villages were used as stage sets for the reenactment of local history, organizers were asserting the continuity of both local and national traditions in the midst of change. Shaker villages allowed visitors to ground themselves comfortably in a stable and unchanging past.

During this period, many Americans whose extended families might have been split by corporate relocations or rising divorce rates claimed Canterbury's surviving Shakers sisters as adoptive grandmothers.[82] Buffered from worldly affairs, living virtuous, celibate lives and seemingly financially secure, they were treated like convenient relatives whom experience-seekers could emulate and visit when they desired without being burdened by familial responsibilities.[83] The sisters projected a strong, historically-grounded female identity that could not be undermined by either the new role for women posited by Helen Gurley Brown or the feminist critique of Betty Friedan's *The Feminine Mystique*.[84] The postcards bearing their images, which still sell briskly in the Canterbury gift shop, testify to their enduring value as role models.

While these Shaker villages are important as places where the Shakers lived out their communal experiment, they also have histories as museums and cultural institutions. As institutions, they are significant in their own right as testaments to the ideologies and perspectives of the first generation of curators, preservationists, and enthusiasts who, whether they realized it or not, inscribed new layers of meaning upon them. By understanding, maintaining, and interpreting Shaker villages in this more complex light, researchers, curators, site administrators, and the visiting public can better distinguish the Shaker legacy from 20th-century interpretations of that legacy and learn, perhaps, to appreciate both.

William D. Moore, Ph.D., is director of the Public History program at the University of North Carolina at Wilmington. From 1999 to 2001, he served as executive director of the Enfield Shaker Museum in Enfield, New Hampshire. His book, *Masonic Temples: Freemasonry, Ritual Architecture, and Masculine Archetypes*, is forthcoming from the University of Tennessee Press.

Notes

1. This study was inspired by the call of cultural historians Delores Hayden, Dell Upton, and others to examine buildings and landscapes over their entire histories, to think of forms shaped by human culture as palimpsests upon which meaning is inscribed serially and repeatedly. The argument also has been shaped by the growing literature in the field of public history, by authors including Patricia West, Chris Wilson, David Lowenthal, James Loewen, and others who have sought to enrich our understanding of historic places by examining the contexts in which they were preserved. These authors assert that sites often carry messages concerning the individuals who introduced them into the public realm as well as information about those who originally created them.

   See, for instance, Dell Upton, *Architecture in the United States* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1998), 12; Delores Hayden, *The Power of Place: Urban Landscapes as Public History* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1995); John R. Stilgoe, *Outside Lies Magic* (New York, NY: Walker and Company, 1998), 6. See also Patricia West, *Domesticating History: The Political Origins of America's House Museums* (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1999); Chris Wilson, *The Myth of Santa Fe: Creating a Modern Regional Tradition* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1997); David Lowenthal, *Possessed by the Past: The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History* (New York, NY: The Free Press, 1996); James W. Loewen, *Lies Across America: What Our Historic Sites Get Wrong* (New York, NY: Touchstone, 1999). See also Max Page and Randall Mason, eds., *Giving Preservation a History* (New York, NY: Routledge, 2004).

   This work was made possible in part by fellowships at the Winterthur Museum, Winterthur, DE, and the Filson Historical Society, Louisville, KY. The University of North Carolina at Wilmington supported this work, in part, with a Charles L. Cahill Award, a Summer Faculty Research Initiative, and an award from the History Department's William Moseley Fund. Galen Beal, Michael Ann Williams, Virginia Stewart, and Scott Swank assisted with discussions and collegiality. An earlier version of this article was presented at the 2004 meeting of the Vernacular Architecture Forum in Harrisburg, PA.

2. Richard Shanor, "Shaker Country," *Travel* 118 (July 1962): 50.

3. An extensive current literature exists concerning the Shakers, their history, and culture. Notable works include: Stephen Stein, *The Shaker Experience in America* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1992); Elizabeth A. De Wolfe, *Shaking the Faith: Women, Family, and Mary Marshall Dyer's Anti-Shaker Campaign, 1815-1862* (New York, NY: Palgrave, 2002); Priscilla J. Brewer, *Shaker Communities, Shaker Lives* (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1992); Clarke Garret, *Spirit Possession and Popular Religion: From the Camisards to the Shakers* (Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press, 1987); John T. Kirk, *Shaker World* (New York, NY: Harry N. Abrams, 1997); Scott T. Swank, *Shaker Life, Art, and Architecture: Hands to Work, Hearts to God* (New York, NY: Abbeville Press, 1999); Julie Nicoletta, *The Architecture of the Shakers* (Woodstock, VT: Countryman Press, 1995); Suzanne Thurman, *"O Sisters Ain't You Happy?": Gender, Family, and Community among the Harvard and Shirley Shakers, 1781-1918* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2002). The range of documentary materials available for the study of Shaker history is indicated in Mary L. Richmond, *Shaker Literature: A Bibliography*, 2 vols. (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1977). For concise statements concerning the Shakers, see Stephen J. Stein, "Shakers," in *Encyclopedia of American Studies*, vol. 4 (New York, NY: Grolier Educational, 2001), 109-110; Lewis Perry, "Shakers," in *Dictionary of American History*, ed. Stanley J. Kutler, 3rd ed., vol. 7 (New York, NY: Charles Scribner's Sons, 2003), 333-335; and Gerard C. Wertkin, "Shakers," in idem, *Encyclopedia of American Folk Art* (New York, NY: Routledge, 2004), 479-482.

4. An analysis of why and how this change occurred is beyond the scope of this essay. The author currently is at work on a book addressing this subject.

5. Stein, *Shaker Experience*, 356-370.

6. "The Approaching End of the 'Shakers,'" *Literary Digest* 74 (September 30, 1922): 37.

7. Karl Schriftgiesser, "Alfred Sad as Shakers Pack up to Leave Old Home Forever," *Boston Evening Transcript* (April 25, 1931): 2.

8. Stein, *Shaker Experience*, 360. A discussion of the causes of the Shakers' collapse is beyond the scope of this essay. Stein, Thurman, and others treat it at length.

9. Elizabeth Stillinger, "From Attics, Sheds, and Secondhand Shops: Collecting Folk Art in America, 1880-1940," in *Drawing on America's Past: Folk Art, Modernism, and the Index of American Design*, ed. Virginia Tuttle Clayton (Washington, DC: National Gallery of Art, 2002), 45-59; James M. Lindgren, "'A Spirit that Fires the Imagination': Historic Preservation and Cultural Regeneration in Virginia and New England, 1850-1950," in *Giving Preservation a History: Histories of Historic Preservation in the United States*, ed. Max Page and Randall Mason (New York, NY: Routledge, 2004), 107-129. See also Michael Kammen, *Mystic Chords of Memory* (New York, NY: Vintage Books, 1991).

10. Stein, *Shaker Experience*, 372-380.

11. The public's sustained interest in these complexes is indicated by the publication of Stuart Murray, *Shaker Heritage Guidebook* (Spencertown, NY: Golden Hill Press, 1994). For a discussion of the shaping of a didactic historic landscape, see James W. Baker, "'As Time May Serve': The Evolution of Plimoth Plantation's Recreated Architecture," *Old Time New England* 74, no. 261 (Spring 1996): 49-74. See also, Barbara Burlison Mooney, "Lincoln's New Salem: Or, The Trigonometric Theorem of Vernacular Restoration," *Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture* 11 (2004): 19-39.

12. See, for example, correspondence between Barry Bingham and Edward Deming Andrews while Bingham was planning the restoration of Kentucky's Pleasant Hill and Andrews was involved in establishing Massachusetts' Hancock Shaker Village as a museum. Box 18, Folder: Pleasant Hill (1) Correspondence, Pamphlets, Clippings; Edward Deming Andrews Memorial Collection, Winterthur Library, Winterthur, DE. See also undated letters from Julia Neal to Mac (E. L. McCormick), manuscript nos. M00-102hh and M00-102jj, Collection of the Shaker Museum at South Union, South Union, KY.

13. "Shaker Project in Kentucky Plans $1.5 Million Restoration," *Berkshire Eagle* (November 11, 1961).

14. Diane Lea, "America's Preservation Ethos: A Tribute to Enduring Ideals," in *A Richer Heritage: Historic Preservation in the Twenty-First Century*, ed. Robert E. Stipe (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003), 8-10. See also William J. Murtagh, *Keeping Time*, rev. ed. (New York, NY: Preservation Press, 1997), 39-61. For the Civil War Centennial, see Kammen, 590-610.

15. "Shaker Property Sale for Museum Approved," *Berkshire Eagle* (July 18, 1960); Eric Pace, "Amy Miller, 90, a Founder of Shaker Village," *New York Times* (February 26, 2003): A23; Ruth Bass, "Amy Bess Miller: A Believer in Shakers," *Berkshire Week* (August 8, 1964). See also, Stein, *Shaker Experience*, 364-366.

16. Amy Bess Miller, *Hancock Shaker Village/The City of Peace: An Effort to Restore a Vision 1960-1985* (Hancock, MA: Hancock Shaker Village, 1984), 164-165.

17. Stephen J. Stein, "Andrews, Edward Deming," *American National Biography*, vol. 1 (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1999), 493-494; "Edward D. Andrews, Expert on Shakers," *New York Times* (June 13, 1964). For a glowing portrayal of Faith and Edward Deming Andrews, see Gerard C. Wertkin, "Andrews, Edward Deming and Faith," in idem, *Encyclopedia of American Folk Art* (New York, NY: Routledge, 2004), 20-21. For the couple's memoirs, see Faith and Edward Deming Andrews, *Fruits of the Shaker Tree of Life* (Stockbridge, MA: The Berkshire

Traveler Press, 1975). See also Stein, *Shaker Experience*, 374-378, and Scott F. DeWolfe, "Simply Shaker: The Rise and Development of Popular Images of the Shakers" (master's thesis, University of Southern Maine, 1991), 24-34.

18. For a description of one such figure see Charlotte Emans Moore, "Another Generation's Folk Art: Edward Duff Balken and His Collection of American Provincial Paintings and Drawings," in *A Window into Collecting American Folk Art: The Edward Duff Balken Collection at Princeton* (Princeton, NJ: The Art Museum, Princeton University, 1999), 11-23.

19. "The Shakers," *Time* 78 (July 28, 1961): 53.

20. Moore, 15; "Berkshires Live Anew: Old Colonists' Love of the Hills is Shown in the Spread of Cultural Projects," *New York Times* (July 28, 1935).

21. For examples of Winter's modernist photographs of subjects other than Shaker material culture, see David A. Schorsch, *The Photographs of William F. Winter, Jr., 1899-1939* (New York, NY: David A. Schorsch, 1989).

22. Stein, *Shaker Experience*, 375-376; Hugh Howard and Jerry V. Grant, "Reinventing the Shakers," *The Eastfield Record* 11 (winter 2002-2003): 1-16. William F. Winter, "Shaker Portfolio: A Picture Record of an American Community," *U.S. Camera* 1, no. 3 (March-April 1939): 22-25, 73.

23. Walter Rendell Storey, "Folk Art Inspires the Designer," *New York Times Magazine* (November 24, 1935): SM14.

24. Edward Deming Andrews, "Communal Architecture of the Shakers," *The Magazine of Art* 30 (December 1937): 710-715; "Shaker Bouquets," *House & Garden* 87 (March 1945): 108-112.

25. John L. Scherer, ed., *A Shaker Legacy: The Shaker Collection at the New York State Museum*, rev. ed., New York State Museum Circular 63 (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2000), xii-xiii; Walter Rendell Storey, "Native Art from Old Shaker Colonies," *New York Times Magazine* (October 23, 1932): 14; "Mode of Shaker Life Preserved in Museum," *Springfield* (MA) *Sunday Union and Republican* (February 11, 1934); "Lenox is Interested in Shaker Exhibition," *Springfield Republican* (August 26, 1934); Harriet Dyer Adams, "Whitney Museum Shows Shaker Handicrafts," *Brooklyn Daily Eagle* (November 24, 1935).

26. Edward Deming Andrews and Faith Andrews, *Shaker Furniture: The Craftsmanship of an American Communal Sect* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1937). For a review of this important work, see Constance Rourke, "Authentic American Commune," *New York Herald Tribune* (May 16, 1937).

27. A Winter photograph of Shaker material culture held in the Andrews Collection is self-consciously labeled, on the verso in pencil, "A Study in Angles and Shapes." Photograph No. SA677, Edward Deming Andrews Memorial Collection, Winterthur Library.

28. This image is now in the Library of Congress as part of the holdings of the Historic American Buildings Survey. It was probably acquired from Winter, who produced the image before the establishment of HABS. For the role of photographers in the Historic American Buildings Survey, see Lisa Pfueller Davidson and Martin J. Perschler, "The Historic American Buildings Survey During the New Deal Era," *CRM: The Journal of Heritage Stewardship* 1, no. 1 (fall 2003): 62-65.

29. Winter was producing his Shaker images just as the expatriate modernist painter Piet Mondrian was developing the geometric abstract style that culminated in works such as *Broadway Boogie Woogie*. For a mid-20th-century statement concerning abstraction in American art, see Edwin Morgan, "American Art at Mid-Century," *American Quarterly* 1, no. 4 (winter 1949): 326-330.

30. Art historian Wanda Corn has noted that in this period, "American artists, supported by Europeans such as Marcel Duchamp and Fernand Léger and by writers such as D.H. Lawrence, Van Wyck Brooks, Lewis Mumford, Matthew Josephson, and Paul Rosenfeld, envisioned a new art, distinctively modern and American." See Wanda Corn, *The Great*

American Thing: Modern Art and National Identity, 1915-1935 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), xv; see also Kannen, 302-327.

31. Homer Eaton Keyes, "The Coming Shaker Exhibition in Manhattan," *Antiques* 28, no. 5 (November 1935): 204.

32. Corn, 293-337.

33. Charles Sheeler, quoted in Karen Lucic, "Charles Sheeler and Henry Ford: A Craft Heritage for the Machine Age," *Bulletin of the Detroit Institute of Arts* 65, no. 1 (1989): 44.

34. Joan Shelley Rubin, "A Convergence of Vision: Constance Rourke, Charles Sheeler, and American Art," *American Quarterly* 42, no. 2 (June 1990): 191-222; Constance Rourke, "American Art: A Possible Future, *Magazine of Art* (July 1935), reprinted in idem, *The Roots of American Culture and Other Essays*, ed. Van Wyck Brooks (New York, NY: Harcourt Brace, 1942).

35. The dwelling house first opened to the public in June 1961. See "Shaker Community Museum Opening Monday Represents Work of More Than 50 Persons," *Berkshire Eagle* (June 29, 1961); Richard Happel, "'Miracle' in Hancock," *Berkshire Eagle* (July 1, 1961).

36. Richard Shanor, "Berkshire Shaker Village to be Museum Town," *New York Times* (June 18, 1961). See also Richard V. Happel, "Shaker Simplicity-A Modern Trend," *The Eagle's Summer Calendar* (1963): 13.

37. Hancock Shaker Village has recently been working to revise its earlier interpretation. See Matthew Cooper, "Representing Historic Groups Outside the Mainstream: Hancock Shaker Village," *CRM Magazine* 24, no. 9 (2001): 36-37.

38. Carolyn H. Grimes, "Isenberg . . . Leader and Citizen," *Harrodsburg Herald*, Bicentennial Edition (June 1974): AA-5; "City Joins Shakertown Subsistence Plan; Isenberg Tells of Shakertown Industry Plan," *Danville Daily Messenger* (February 19, 1935). The Shakers abandoned Pleasant Hill in the 1920s.

39. "Pleasant Hill Begins Craft Industry," *Harrodsburg Herald* (January 17, 1964); Clavia Goodman, "Old Shakertown Revived," *Sunday Herald-Leader* (Lexington, KY) (January 11, 1942); Alex Bower, "Goodwill Industry Revives Ancient, Successful Crafts at Shakertown, Where Celibate Workers Once Wrought," *The Lexington Leader* (July 30, 1940). See also photographs in *Louisville Courier-Journal* (May 26, 1940).

40. "The Sacred 'Yea' and 'Nay' of the Shakers Remained in Mercer's Heart," *Harrodsburg Herald*, Bicentennial Edition (June 1974): D-11. For an obituary of Bingham, see Alex S. Jones, "Barry Bingham, Sr. is Dead at 82; Louisville Newspaper Publisher," *New York Times* (August 16, 1988): D-22.

41. "Earl D. Wallace," *Louisville Courier-Journal* (April 4, 1990).

42. Ed Ryan, "Of Shakertown Savior Wallace," *Louisville Courier-Journal* (October 23, 1982).

43. Earl D. Wallace, *Shakertown at Pleasant Hill: The First Fifteen Years* (Harrodsburg, KY: Shakertown at Pleasant Hill, Kentucky, Inc., n.d.), 3-6.

44. For a thoughtful history of the Colonial Williamsburg restoration, see Anders Greenspan, *Creating Colonial Williamsburg* (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 2002).

45. "Williamsburg Curator to Restore Shakertown Village," *Harrodsburg Herald* (June 22, 1962). See letter from Barry Bingham, Sr. to Frederick Haupt III of the National Trust for Historic Preservation, nominating James Cogar for the Crowninshield Award, February 26, 1971, Barry Bingham Papers, MSS A B613a 816, Filson Club Historical Society, Louisville, KY.

46. "Present Shaker Story Simply, Consultant Says," *Harrodsburg Herald* (July 20, 1962).

47. For a celebratory history written by Pleasant Hill's director of marketing and public relations, see Diana B. Ratliff, "The Preservation of Pleasant Hill," *CRM Magazine* 24, no. 9 (2001): 38-40.

48. "Harrodsburg's 188th Birthday Celebrated at Shakertown," *Harrodsburg Herald* (June 22, 1962).

49. For lovely, luminous photographs presenting the restored Pleasant Hill as a pre-modern utopia, see Ross Bennett, ed., *Visiting our Past: America's Historylands*, rev. ed. (Washington, DC: National Geographic Society, 1986), 220-229.

50. "Shakertown a Must," *Harrodsburg Herald* (August 11, 1961); "Mercer's Part in Shaker Project is Explained," *Harrodsburg Herald* (August 18, 1961); "Mass Meeting on Shakertown," *Harrodsburg Herald* (August 25, 1961); see also "Full Scale Drive to End Rural Poverty," *Harrodsburg Herald* (August 18, 1961).

51. "What Others Think," *Harrodsburg Herald* (November 17, 1961).

52. "Shakertown Support Urged," *Harrodsburg Herald* (December 29, 1961).

53. "$2-Million Loan Approved for Restoration Project," *Harrodsburg Herald* (January 10, 1964). In the late 1980s, the site reportedly had an annual visitation of approximately 250,000. See "Earl D. Wallace," *Louisville Courier-Journal* (April 4, 1990).

54. Robert F.W. Meader to Brother Thomas Whitaker, August 31, 1964, Francis J. Whitaker Papers, Box 1, Folder 8, Western Kentucky University, Bowling Green, KY.

55. Marion Porter, "Dedication of Shaker Museum Recalls Flourishing Auburn Colony," *Louisville Courier-Journal* (May 29, 1960); "Revisiting the Shakers," *Courier-Journal Magazine* (July 21, 1963): 12-15; Ray Glenn, "Shaker Museum Dedication is Scheduled for May 28," *Park City Daily News* (May 1, 1960): 24.

56. Porter, "Dedication." Photographs of these costumed guides appear in the Local News section of the *Louisville Courier-Journal* (May 29, 1960).

57. Neal received both her Bachelor's and Master's degrees from Western Kentucky State Teacher's College. See D.W., "Julia Neal Showed Early Interest in Kentucky Shakers," *The Shaker Messenger* (summer 1989): 8-9; Julia Neal, *By Their Fruits, the Story of Shakerism in South Union, Kentucky* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1947).

58. D.W., "Julia Neal Showed Early Interest in Kentucky Shakers."

59. For pageants, see David Glassberg, *American Historical Pageantry* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1990). For Green, see John Herbert Roper, *Paul Green: Playwright of the New South* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2003); "Revisiting the Shakers," *Courier-Journal Magazine* (July 21, 1963): 12-15.

60. Julia Neal, "Shaker Festival," *Kentucky Folklore Record* 8, no. 4 (1962): 127-135; "Russell H. Miller to Direct Shaker Pageant," *College Heights Herald* (July 18, 1962). A typescript of the pageant's script exists in the Russell Miller Papers, Box 1, Folder 6, Kentucky Room, Western Kentucky University. For Miller, see Cyndi M. Chaffin, "Russell Miller and his Contributions to the Theatre in Bowling Green from 1947-1968," typescript research paper, archives, Western Kentucky University.

61. Al Smith, "'Shakertown Revisited' Like Seeing an Old Friend," *News-Democrat* (July 11, 1963); "Shaker Festival Underway," *News-Democrat* (July 8, 1976). A 33 1/3 rpm lp recording of the pageant is in the holdings of the Shaker Museum at South Union, KY.

62. See, for example, "'Gentle Folk' Live Again in 'Shakertown Revisited,'" *Auburn News* (July 16, 1963).

63. George M. Chinn, director, Kentucky Historical Society, to Dr. Russell Miller, July 12, 1963; Collection of the Shaker Museum at South Union, KY.

64. Edward Deming Andrews to Barry Bingham, August 10, 1963, Andrews Archives, Box 18, Folder: Pleasant Hill (1) Correspondence, Pamphlets, Clippings; Winterthur Library.

65. Robyn L. Minor, "Shaker Festival," *Park City Daily News* (June 21, 1991).

66. Bertha Lindsay to Julia Neal, February 4, 1962, June 30, 1962, and November 13, 1962, Julia Neal Papers, Box 4, File 2, Western Kentucky University. See also Earl O. Anderson, "Shakers Dwindling But Impact Still Felt," *New Hampshire Sunday News* (Manchester) (September 24, 1961): 13.

67. Mildred Barker to Julia Neal, June 30, 1962, Julia Neal Papers, Box 4, File 2, Western Kentucky University.

68. William R. Bibber, "The Amazing Shakers," *Boston Sunday Herald* (September 20, 1964): 17.

69. Marguerite Melcher to Clarice Carr, February 17, 1957, collection of Mr. and Mrs. John Carr, Enfield, NH; Bertha Lindsay to Julia Neal, November 1, 1964, Julia Neal Papers, Box 4, File 2, Western Kentucky University; Robert Meader to Brother Thomas Whitaker, September 27, 1964, Francis J. Whitaker Papers, Box 1, Folder 8, Western Kentucky University; June Sprigg, *Simple Gifts: A Memoir of a Shaker Village* (New York, NY: Knopf, 1998), 23.

70. Anderson, 13. For reminiscences of living in the Shaker village by Darryl Thompson, Charles Thompson's son, see Linda Landry, *Classic New Hampshire: Preserving the Granite State in Changing Times* (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 2003), 150-154.

71. Earl O. Anderson, "NH Shakers Turn Village into a National Shrine," *New Hampshire Sunday News* (August 6, 1970): 29.

72. N. Morrison, "Shakers Open Museum of Old Craftsmanship in Canterbury," *Concord Monitor* (June 7, 1960); M.S. King, "Shaker Village [Canterbury, NH]," *Boston Sunday Globe Magazine* (September 4, 1960); Sprigg, 43.

73. Anderson, "Shakers Dwindling," 20.

74. David Strickler, "Last of Shakers Sure Faith Will Live On," *New Hampshire Sunday News* (April 17, 1966): 19.

75. Sprigg's *Simple Gifts* is a book-length exposition of her personal experience with this phenomenon.

76. Although visitors were welcomed to the village and encouraged to tour the museum set up in the meetinghouse, they were usually barred from entering the sisters' dwelling house. See Sprigg's glowing account of her 1972 tour of the dwelling house led by Sister Ethel Hudson in Sprigg, 139-147.

77. Jane O'Shea, "Canterbury Shaker Village is Ghost of Earlier Days," *Manchester Union Leader* (August 7, 1959): 7; Strickler, 13.

78. Stein, *Shaker Experience*, 353.

79. Jeanette Prosser, "The Shakers of Canterbury," *New Hampshire Profiles* (August 1960): 26-31.

80. Archeologist David R. Starbuck has long challenged the dominant interpretation of Canterbury. See David R. Starbuck, *Neither Plain nor Simple: New Perspectives on the Canterbury Shakers* (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 2004).

81. Miller, 19.

82. Sprigg, 9; Landry, 152.

83. Irene N. Ziegut, "Our Shaker Collection and How it Started," *Yankee* (April 1970): 127; Helen Meritt Upton, "Collecting Shaker," *Russell Sage Alumnae Quarterly* 34, no. 2 (winter 1964): 4-5; Charles and Helen Upton, "Living with Antiques," *Antiques* 90, no. 1 (July 1966): 85.

84. Betty Friedan, *The Femine Mystique* (New York, NY: Norton, 1963).

Rediscovering a Las Vegas Neighborhood's African American Roots

by Courtney Mooney

New Westside Homes Project Gets Under Way

Famed Architect Designs Homes for Westside Park

MONTE C

FIGURE 1
Articles appearing in the December 14, 1949 edition of the Las Vegas Review-Journal *announced the Westside Park subdivision.*

Survey and inventory of historic resources should be an integral part of every city's redevelopment process. This type of research is not only a valuable economic planning tool but also an exciting opportunity to unearth valuable gems, as was the case with a study of West Las Vegas, a historic, predominantly African American, area of Las Vegas, Nevada. The City of Las Vegas's Historic Preservation Plan calls for the ongoing documentation of historic neighborhoods and properties. Each year, the City of Las Vegas Planning and Development Department applies for grant money from the National Park Service's Historic Preservation Fund for survey and inventory through the State Historic Preservation Office. In 2002, the award funded the research of the "Historic Westside" area.

The rediscovery of the origins of the Berkley Square neighborhood in West Las Vegas, a post-World War II subdivision marketed to African Americans, began with a chance newspaper research find during this 2002 survey. (Figure 1) Two newspaper articles published in December 1949 announced the opening of a new subdivision named "Westside Park," with 155 tract houses designed by a "famed" African American architect, Paul Revere Williams.[1] Because the development site was outside the 2002 survey boundaries in an area now called Berkley Square, this information became a side note in the historic context statement.

In 2004, discussions about moving the La Concha Motel's mid-century, free-form concrete lobby again raised the name of architect Paul R. Williams. (Figure 2) Williams was well known for his movie-star homes and public buildings in Los Angeles, such as Frank Sinatra's Trousdale estate and the Los Angeles County Courthouse. With the potential connection to the West Las Vegas subdivision in mind, the City of Las Vegas Historic Preservation Commission began discussing Berkley Square as a possible survey area for the 2004 National Park Service grant.

Several issues complicated the decision to survey this area. The 1949 articles referred to a development called Westside Park, but the subdivision was now called Berkley Square, with county assessor information showing construction dates of 1954-55. What happened between 1949 and 1954? Were the Berkley Square homes actually designed by Williams? All the Historic Preservation Commission had to go by were documents describing a land sale and a current

photograph of a house that resembled the architect's sketch accompanying the 1949 articles. The Commission voted to include Berkley Square in the 2004 survey and hired a historic preservation consultant, Diana Painter of Painter Preservation and Planning, to document the neighborhood and solve the mystery.

Painter began by documenting and photographing all buildings within the neighborhood, providing a Nevada State Historic Resource Inventory Form for each. A historic context statement was prepared to help assess the importance of the properties within the contexts of Las Vegas history and mid-century residential design. In addition, research was conducted at the historical society, local libraries and museums, and the Environmental Design Library at the University of California at Berkeley. Painter also used information from a previous interview with Karen Hudson, Williams's granddaughter. From this research, she was able to stitch together compelling arguments for a probable link to the Los Angeles architect as well as for eligibility for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

FIGURE 2
This circa-1930s photograph is of architect Paul Revere Williams. (Courtesy of Paul R. Williams Collection)

Besides attracting a famous clientele and important public commissions, Williams was the first black architect to become a member of the American Institute of Architects and served on the California Housing Commission and the California Redevelopment Commission. He published two pattern books on small houses, *Small Home of Tomorrow* (1945) and *New Homes for Today* (1946).[2] By 1949, he had won three national competitions for small home design, and he would eventually design military housing and other housing stock for subdivisions. According to his granddaughter, the modernized ranch house became his specialty.

Williams's design for Berkley Square filled a desperate need for adequate housing in West Las Vegas. Platted by surveyor J.T. McWilliams in 1905, settlement began as a wayside for miners. It was hoped that the arrival of the railroad would bring prosperity, but these hopes were unrealized. The railroad company owned most of the land east of the completed tracks, as well as all of the water rights, effectively controlling development for decades.

During the 1930s, McWilliams's Townsite, now called "the Westside," had few permanent buildings, but blacks were free to own businesses and live on the east side of town. Subsequent segregation practices in Las Vegas forced most of the black families to relocate to the Westside. Well into the 1940s, the area lacked basic amenities such as sewer and paved streets, with sometimes two or more families living in small, one-room wood shacks. Low-income minorities and whites continued to find refuge here, with the black population having the strongest cultural presence. A community of churches, businesses, and night-clubs was formed using the residents' own resources and ingenuity. Adequate housing lagged far behind, however, especially during and after World War II,

FIGURE 3
This recent view shows a ranch house in the proposed Berkley Square historic district. (Courtesy of Diana Painter)

when many black soldiers returned home or residents lost their jobs at the local Air Force base or military industrial plants.

Westside Park/Berkley Square was the result of "four years of planning, designing and negotiating with government officials, by a group of local businessmen endeavoring to make the first real contribution to improvement of conditions on the city's Westside."[3] It was sorely needed in 1947, when the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) began discussions with the City of Las Vegas to develop a "new 2-bedroom project for colored people...with Federal Housing insured loans."[4] The property changed hands several times, but finally in 1954 with new owners, Edward A. Freeman and J.J. Byrnes, the subdivision was recorded as Berkley Square with 148 lots on 22 acres.

The new "Berkley Square" name came from Thomas L. Berkley, of Oakland, California. Berkley was a distinguished African American attorney, media owner, developer, civil rights advocate, and a frequent guest at the White House during the Kennedy and Johnson administrations. It was in his civil rights capacity that he became partial financier of Berkley Square. An article in the *Las Vegas Review Journal* from April 1954 stated that Berkley Square was "the first minority group subdivision to be approved for construction in the state of Nevada."[5]

Painter's report established Berkley Square's eligibility for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places as the first subdivision in Nevada built by and for African Americans. The subdivision contributed to improved living conditions for the community and represented the progress of local civil rights

activism. In addition, Berkley Square is significant for its association with attorney Berkley and architect Williams. The neighborhood of suburban one-story ranch houses also retains much of its architectural integrity.(Figure 3)

The City of Las Vegas Historic Preservation Commission will review the report and cooperate with the Neighborhood Services Department on an educational brochure for the residents of the area that describes the historic importance of Berkley Square and provides information on the local and National Registers. Should the Berkley Square neighborhood representatives be interested in pursuing designation, they can initiate the neighborhood plan process offered through the City's Neighborhood Services Department, a component of which can be a request to complete the listing process. The community has expressed much interest in its past, and the Historic Preservation Commission is excited about the prospect of designating this historically rich African American neighborhood.

Courtney Mooney is the Historic Preservation Officer and Urban Design Coordinator for the City of Las Vegas.

Notes

1. "New Westside Homes Project Gets Under Way," and "Famed Architect Designs Homes for Westside Park," *Las Vegas Review-Journal* (December 14, 1949).

2. See Painter Preservation and Planning, "Berkley Square Historic Resource Survey and Inventory" (August 2005), on file at the City of Las Vegas Planning and Development Department and Nevada State Historic Preservation Office.

3. "New Subdivision Work Underway," *Las Vegas Review-Journal* (April 26, 1954).

4. Ibid.

5. Ibid.

The National Cemetery Administration's Documentation Initiative

by Sara Amy Leach

One of three administrations within the Department of Veterans Affairs, the National Cemetery Administration (NCA) manages 122 national cemeteries and 33 soldiers' or government lots totaling 14,600 acres.[1](Figure 1) More than 75 percent of NCA's cemeteries, including many small sites of 10 acres or less, date from the Civil War or earlier. Mindful of its heritage and its mission to honor "veterans with final resting places in national shrines and lasting memorials," the NCA hired its first permanent historian in 2001 (it now has three) to coordinate research, collections management, outreach, and educational activities related to the cemeteries. For the new History Program staff, a comprehensive plan for surveying, monitoring, and interpreting historic resources in all NCA cemeteries was paramount.

The Memorial Inventory Project

With only an unconfirmed inventory of the buildings and structures in NCA's national cemeteries, the History Program staff began with a survey focusing on monuments and memorials (not to be confused with headstones). Launched in 2001, the Memorial Inventory Project (MIP)—a public outreach effort modeled after the Save Outdoor Sculpture! (SOS!) program but tailored to the veteran community—attracted responses from more than 3,000 potential volunteers, 372 of whom were eventually assigned to projects across the country. About 45 percent of these volunteers were veterans or active duty military.

By the time the project was completed in December 2004, volunteers had donated more than 3,400 work-hours identifying, measuring, photographing, and researching the monuments. They had recorded 780 memorials installed since the early 19th century at 128 national cemeteries or soldiers' lots, and had identified another 200 or so "landscape features," such as ornamental cannon and signage, which the NCA subsequently reassigned to non-memorial categories for tracking purposes.[2](Figure 2)

The hard copies of the survey documentation (forms, 35mm negatives, photographic prints, and other research materials) will remain in the offices of the History Program, which will capture similar information as new memorials are installed in cemeteries (an average of 35 have been donated annually to NCA cemeteries over the past 15 years). Currently, the NCA is verifying survey

FIGURE 1
Cypress Hills National Cemetery on Long Island, NY, consists of 3 separate parcels in Brooklyn containing more than 20,000 graves. The Jamaica Avenue Unit shown here features a 2-story vernacular lodge (1887). (Courtesy of the National Cemetery Administration)

FIGURE 2
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts Monument (1908), designed by sculptor Melzar Hunt Mosman, is one of several figurative memorials installed in New Bern National Cemetery in North Carolina. (Courtesy of the National Cemetery Administration)

information and preparing to launch a public version of its memorials database on its website. NCA will eventually provide data on approximately 60 figurative sculptures of bronze or stone to the Smithsonian American Art Museum for its SIRIS database. It is also considering an expansion of the MIP methodology to the identification and documentation of thousands of private headstones in NCA cemeteries.

Large-Format Photography

Just as the Memorial Inventory Project was drawing to a close, the NCA launched a second project to photograph all its national cemeteries. The historic black-and-white photographs, color snapshots, Kodachrome slides, instant Polaroids, and digital images already in the NCA's archives did not conform to a single technical or archival standard, and all of them posed unique technical challenges for preserving the history and evolution of the cemeteries. Recognizing the need for high-quality, large-format images appropriate for the archival documentation of cultural landscapes, the NCA launched a multi-year effort in October 2004 to photograph its national cemeteries according to the standards of the Heritage Documentation Programs of the National Park Service.[3]

Professional photographers contracted for the project are expected to complete approximately 27 NCA cemeteries per year. They are instructed to record the landscape and its recurrent elements—a keeper's lodge, administration building, rostrum, occasional chapels and columbaria, memorials, maintenance buildings, walls and gates, signage, and vegetation—as well as to make the essential panoramic views of private and government-provided headstones. When available, historic views are recreated in order to provide contemporary views suitable for then-and-now comparisons. All photos

FIGURE 3
This superintendent's lodge (1875) at Camp Nelson National Cemetery in Kentucky was typical of the lodges built at many Civil War-era national cemeteries after a design by Quartermaster General Montgomery Meigs. (Courtesy of the National Cemetery Administration)

FIGURE 4
This screen from the pilot GIS mapping of Alexandria National Cemetery shows an image of a headstone keyed to a mid-20th-century site plan.

are taken when the trees are leafed out so that the views record the effects of the plantings on the cemetery landscapes. The photographers are also photographing the elaborate memorials and other essential buildings, as well as architectural details where they survive.(Figure 3)

Depending upon the size of the cemetery and the quantity, age, and complexity of its components, the photographers are producing between 5 and 40 views at each site, averaging 20 per site. They are also making at least one large-format color transparency of each cemetery. The project overall is generating about 500 images annually. If current funding levels continue, NCA will have documented all its cemeteries and soldiers' lots, including the newest ones, within four years.

Although the photographs satisfy mandated National Historic Preservation Act Section 110 documentation requirements, the History Program staff plans to use them for exhibits, publications, and other forms of public outreach. The NCA is also donating a complete set of contact prints and negatives to the Historic American Landscapes Survey for its collection at the Library of Congress so that the public will have convenient access to this documentation.

GPS/GIS Mapping at Alexandria National Cemetery

Since the NCA has not yet migrated all of its real property information from paper to electronic media, GIS technology is of limited use currently in identifying the locations and boundaries of trees and headstones in NCA's national cemeteries. In an effort to start moving in that direction, the NCA has entered into an agreement with the National Park Service's Cultural Resource GIS (CRGIS) Facility to fund a pilot project at Alexandria (Virginia) National Cemetery. The project will result in the mapping of all cemetery features and the development of a GIS application for NCA.

Established in 1862 as part of the first group of national cemeteries authorized for the interment of Civil War soldiers, this 5-acre site is exemplary both architecturally and culturally.(Figure 4) The Victorian lodge, designed by General Montgomery Meigs, and the enclosure wall are made of dark red Seneca sandstone, a familiar building material in the region. Behind the lodge is a

standard-design "comfort station" (circa 1887) that, though much altered, may be the only one extant NCA-wide. The 4,092 graves at Alexandria National Cemetery include those of about 280 black soldiers of the United States Colored Troops, and the cemetery's only memorial marks the graves of men who died in pursuit of President Lincoln's assassin, John Wilkes Booth.

Historic records provide a glimpse of this landscape at benchmark times. The 19th- and 20th-century changes at the cemetery are recorded in site maps, construction drawings and photographs, and textual information such as Army inspection reports, ledgers, and newspapers. This data will be linked to modern-day operations data (burial scheduling, raising and realigning headstones), construction data (cemetery expansion, environment and historic compliance), financial information (capital asset management, budget), and statistical data (ranking, size) to demonstrate how GIS can help organize information for uses other than resource management and interpretation.

Perhaps the most exciting aspect of this third project is the mapping and documentation of every headstone in the cemetery. Building on the NCA's electronic Burial Operations Support System (BOSS, the equivalent of old paper Records of Interments), NCA and CRGIS will add spatial data, digital images of each headstone, and a transcription of the headstone inscription. Other fields will be made available for posting photographic portraits and genealogical and historical information. Eventually, researchers will be able to search the records for Alexandria National Cemetery by name, date of death, war period, military service, rank, and awards.

Sara Amy Leach is the senior historian at the National Cemetery Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs. She can be reached via email at sara.leach@nca.gov or by visiting http://www.cem.va.gov.

Notes

1. Besides NCA's 122 national cemeteries, the National Park Service has 14 affiliated with national parks associated with significant battles or persons; the Department of Defense manages two, Arlington National Cemetery and the cemetery at the U.S. Soldiers' and Airmen's Home in Washington, DC. As a complement to NCA's mission, the American Battlefield Monuments Commission, an independent agency, oversees 24 American cemeteries and monuments on foreign soil.

2. One of the challenges in classifying the monuments and memorials was in separating *private headstones* from *cenotaphs* and *memorials* in the absence of historical records illuminating early burials.

3. The National Park Service's Heritage Documentation Programs include the Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS), the Historic American Engineering Record (HAER), and the Historic American Landscapes Survey (HALS). All three programs follow the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines for Architectural and Engineering Documentation. See "The Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines for Architectural and Engineering Documentation," *Federal Register* 68, no. 139 (July 21, 2003): 43159-43162.

Heritage Documentation Programs Record Baltimore's Mount Vernon Place

by Martin Perschler

Baltimore's Mount Vernon Place is the result of nearly 200 years of effort by the citizens of Baltimore to create an appropriate setting for the city's Washington Monument, the first major public monument erected in the United States to honor the nation's first president.[1](Figure 1) The only known urban landscape to enjoy an architectural pedigree that includes Robert Mills (the nation's first native-born and trained architect), the Olmsteds, and the New York architectural firm of Carrere & Hastings (designers of the New York Public Library), Mount Vernon Place also plays an important commemorative role as a war memorial and an enduring symbol of Franco-American cooperation. In recognition of Mount Vernon's unique status in the cultural history of Baltimore and the United States, the National Park Service launched a multi-phase effort in 2003 to shed new light on this National Historic Landmark's storied past.

The combined Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) and Historic American Landscapes Survey (HALS) recording project began in January 2003 with a round of photo documentation of the four squares collectively known as Mount Vernon Place, as well as historical research on a number of neigh-

FIGURE 1
This 2003 bird's-eye view of Mount Vernon Place shows the Washington Monument with the west square in the foreground. (Photograph by Walter Smalling, Jr., courtesy of the National Park Service)

boring historic buildings. The buildings include the Peabody Institute and Conservatory (begun 1858), established by the 19th-century philanthropist George Peabody; the Walters Art Gallery (1905-1907), a museum building by the firm of Delano & Aldrich modeled after an Italian Baroque palace; the Mount Vernon Place Methodist Church (Dixon & Carson, 1873), a massive Gothic revival church of green serpentine stone; and several private townhouses dating from the mid to late 19th century. In the summer of 2003, a US/ICOMOS intern from Poland produced detailed existing conditions drawings and planting inventories of the four squares. A grant from the Maryland Historical Trust in 2004 helped offset the costs of a new round of photo documentation and a second summer project to create an interpretive drawing showing the evolution of Mount Vernon Place from 1812 to the present. The grant also helped cover the costs of a comprehensive site history of the four squares.

The site history project highlights significant periods in the evolution of Mount Vernon Place. The Mills period begins with the decision in 1814 to erect a monument to George Washington on land north of Baltimore donated by John Eager Howard.[2] The Olmsted period extends from the work of Frederick Law, Sr., in the mid 1870s to that of his son, Frederick Law, Jr. The Carrere & Hastings period runs from 1917—the year the city of Baltimore hired the firm to redesign the four squares—to the present day. All three phases are extremely well documented in correspondence, historic photographs, maps, site plans, and other materials preserved in local libraries and archives and at the National Park Service's Olmsted Center for Landscape Preservation in Brookline, Massachusetts. Whereas the surviving drawings and photos illustrate the various changes in grade, paving, plantings, and configurations of the squares over time, the correspondence, including that of Baltimore Mayor James H. Preston from 1911 to 1919 regarding the current design, offers insight into the myriad aesthetic, political, and financial considerations that shaped the design process.

After Howard's death in 1827, his heirs worked with architect Mills to build an attractive residential quarter on land the elder Howard had owned adjacent to the monument. The focal point of the new quarter—a cruciform arrangement of squares extending outward from the colossal triumphal column—served as the catalyst for the rapid development of the area into Baltimore's most fashionable residential district. The engagement of Olmsted, Sr., to improve the four squares signaled the beginning of an important intermediate period in the evolution of the site. Until the 1870s, iron fences and gates—in place by 1839—had restricted use and enjoyment of the Mount Vernon Place squares to neighboring residents. The removal of the fences, as well as the addition of gaslights, curved walks, and other embellishments resulted in a landscape more in keeping with the evolving democratic ideals of the 19th century.

FIGURE 2
This 2005 view of the west square from atop the base of the Washington Monument shows how the architect Thomas Hastings used balustrades, stairs, and changes in grade to set the four squares apart from the central plaza. (Photograph by James W. Rosenthal, courtesy of the National Park Service)

By 1917, however, architectural tastes and attitudes towards the symbolic role of the Washington Monument in civic life had changed. An advocate of Beaux-Arts architecture and City Beautiful planning principles, Preston found a kindred spirit in Thomas Hastings of the Carrere & Hastings firm, whom he hired to redesign the squares in a style more appropriate to their function as pendants to the monument.

Hastings's design for the squares called for simple lines, forms, and architectural elements in keeping with the monument's classical grandeur. In each square, he lowered the grade and introduced staircases, retaining walls, and balustrades made of the same white marble as the monument so as to re-establish a sense of hierarchy between the squares and the monument's central plaza—a plaza he likened to Paris's Place de la Concorde.[3](Figure 2) He also straightened paths, rearranged the bronze sculptures, and introduced elegant stairways and water basins evocative of those he might have studied or seen while a student at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts, France's premier school of architecture and the standard bearer of classical architectural design and city planning principles since the 17th century.

Mount Vernon Place's French connection extends well beyond the classical principles behind Hastings's design. Initiated in response to the United States' entry into World War I, the redesign of the four squares took place during a period of close diplomatic relations between the United States and France. Within two months of the U.S. declaration of war against Germany, French dignitaries, including the vice premier and the Marquis de Chambrun, a great grandson of the Marquis de Lafayette, took time off from their diplomatic mission in Washington to participate in a groundbreaking ceremony for a stat-

FIGURE 3
This 2005 view of the statue of the Marquis de Lafayette in the south square of Mount Vernon Place shows the pedestal bearing inscriptions written by President Woodrow Wilson and French President Raymond Poincaré. (Photograph by James W. Rosenthal, courtesy of the National Park Service)

ue of Lafayette in the shadow of Baltimore's Washington Monument.[4] The statue was eventually placed on a pedestal designed by Hastings bearing two inscriptions—one written by President Woodrow Wilson and the other by French President Raymond Poincaré—commemorating the enduring spirit of Franco-American cooperation over the centuries.(Figure 3) Translated, Poincaré's inscription reads—

In 1777 Lafayette, crossing the seas with French volunteers, came to bring brotherly help to the American people who were fighting for their national liberty. In 1917 France was fighting, in her turn, to defend her life and the liberty of the world. America, who had never forgotten Lafayette, crossed the seas to help France, and the world was saved.

French officials returned to Baltimore in 1924 to dedicate the completed statue and redesigned squares in the company of President Calvin Coolidge, who was given the seat of honor for the occasion—a Baltimore painted chair used by Lafayette in the city a century earlier during his farewell tour.

Largely unaltered since 1924, Mount Vernon Place survives as one of a handful of public squares in the United States where the architecture of the site continues to express the lofty ideals and cultural sentiments behind its creation as forcefully as when first conceived. Plans are underway to publish a book on Mount Vernon Place once the historical research and photo documentation are complete.

Martin Perschler is collections manager with the Heritage Documentation Programs (HABS/HAER/HALS) of the National Park Service and assistant editor of *CRM: The Journal of Heritage Stewardship*. He can be reached at martin_perschler@nps.gov.

Notes

1. Planning for Baltimore's Washington Monument began as early as December 1809 with a citizens' petition. Designed by the architect Robert Mills between 1813 and 1815, the monument was considered complete with the placement, in 1829, of the final block of sculptor Enrico Causici's statue of Washington. Plans for the Washington Monument in Washington, DC, which was also designed by Robert Mills, were just beginning to take shape in 1829. See, for instance, Pamela Scott, "Robert Mills and American Monuments," in *Robert Mills, Architect*, ed. John M. Bryan (Washington, DC: American Institute of Architects Press, 1989), 143-177.

2. Soldier and Maryland statesman John Eager Howard (1752-1827) played an important role in the Revolutionary War as an officer in the Continental Army. His leadership at the battle of Cowpens, South Carolina, earned him a Congressional silver medal. Over the course of his distinguished career, Howard served as Maryland governor, state senator, and United States senator. He also commanded the defense of Baltimore during the War of 1812. In 1824, he hosted the Marquis de Lafayette at his home, Belvidere, north of Baltimore.

3. Hastings described his design philosophy vis-à-vis the Mount Vernon Place squares in a letter to Baltimore architect Josias Pennington. See Thomas Hastings to Josias Pennington (December 23, 1918), Baltimore City Archives.

4. Having learned that the French war commissioners were going to be in Washington, DC, in May to ask the United States for military assistance in the war against Germany, Preston invited them up to Baltimore to break ground in Mount Vernon Place for a statue of the Marquis de Lafayette that had yet to be designed. Mount Vernon Place resident and former U.S. ambassador to Belgium, Theodore Marburg, reminded Preston a couple days later that the "fact that these gentlemen did break ground for the monument places an obligation upon our city and State" to follow through on its commitment to erect a statue. Meanwhile, Preston had established contact with Thomas Hastings regarding a City Beautiful plan for the city. The groundbreaking—and the pressure to make good on the commitment—acted as a catalyst for the comprehensive redesign of Mount Vernon Place. See Theodore Marburg to Mayor Preston (May 19, 1917), Baltimore City Archives; also "French Commission Will Ask For Army," and "The Visitors from France," *Washington Post* (April 25 and 26, 1917).

   The French soldier and statesman Marie Jean Paul Joseph Roche Yves Gilbert du Motier, the Marquis de Lafayette, served as an aide to George Washington during the Revolutionary War and played a critical leadership role in several battles against the British, most notably at Yorktown. His service in the cause of American independence led to a life-long friendship with Washington and celebrity status in the fledgling United States.

The Preservation Arts and Technology Curriculum at Brooklyn High School of the Arts

by Kate Burns Ottavino

The New Jersey Institute of Technology's Center for Architecture and Building Science Research (NJIT/CABSR) has developed a unique academic curriculum and preservation internship program for a preservation arts high school. Drawing on the inherently interdisciplinary nature of contemporary historic preservation practice, the innovative program introduces high school students to the myriad career opportunities available in preservation arts and crafts while at the same time providing a comprehensive, college preparatory academic education that meets state and local standards.

The curriculum and internship program have their roots in the 1993 World Monuments Fund symposium, "Employment Strategies for the Restoration Arts: Craft Training in the Service of Historic Preservation," which highlighted, among other things, the lack of national standards for the craft skills used in historic preservation, the limited number of training programs in the United States, and the demonstrated need for skilled restoration artisans.[1] Following up on the concept of a preservation high school introduced by New York City Council member Ken Fisher of Brooklyn, the New York City Department of Education (NYC/DOE), working with the NJIT/CABSR, prepared a model preservation-based college preparatory curriculum and an internship program for the New York City public schools in 1995. Two years later, the NYC/DOE launched a pilot program at Queens High School of Arts and Business, the ultimate goal of which was the eventual expansion of the model to a four-year Preservation Arts High School. The World Monuments Fund (WMF), the National Park Service's National Center for Preservation Technology and Training, and the National Endowment for the Humanities provided funding for the initial curriculum and internship development. With the closing of the Sarah J. Hale High School in Brooklyn in 1999, the Department of Education had a home for the new school, now called Brooklyn High School of the Arts, funded by the NYC/DOE and the WMF.

Program Plan and Methodology

All students enrolled in the Brooklyn High School of the Arts (BHSA) receive a preservation-based academic education that meets the New York City Department of Education's performance standards, New York State learning standards, and the New York State Regents standards for academic content. Preservation Arts is offered as one of four major areas at BHSA, along with

FIGURE 1
Ninth grade Preservation Arts students receive the recommended New York State Regents academic curriculum through interdisciplinary study of the Brooklyn Bridge. (Courtesy of the author)

Fine, Visual, and Performing Arts. The goal of the Preservation Arts and Technology program is to prepare high school students for higher education or work as preservation artisans.

Observation of current Career Technical Education teaching methods in New York public vocational schools indicated that vocational training was largely isolated from the traditional academic program. A more fully integrated humanities curriculum was required to make the academic and the applied Preservation Arts curriculum complementary. In an effort to create a curriculum that addressed both academic knowledge and applied preservation skills, the NJIT/CABSR researched the evolution of the building arts in the United States prior to World War II, when building crafts and skills were passed down from father to son in a manner similar to that of the European craft guilds. With the support of the WMF, the NJIT/CABSR visited the Compagnons du Devoir in France to study the European craft system, specifically the "tour" tradition in which artisans travel from city to city, apprenticing in different ateliers to learn their craft. Those aspects of the Compagnon model that could be integrated into a high school academic experience in the United States were adopted, such as internships.[2]

Preservation-Based Academic Curriculum

The preservation-based academic curriculum focuses on the creation, preservation, and interpretation of historic structures and their components. Working as a team, teachers in core academic subject areas such as history and social studies, English, math, and science, organize their lessons around a common architectural theme. The landmarks that are incorporated in the curriculum are selected based on how well they correspond with the periods and topics covered in the history class. As a result of this overlap, students and teachers find their work integrated, reapplied, and reinforced throughout the curriculum.

For example, the history of transportation and industrial development is taught through the Brooklyn Bridge and its historic context. The study of the bridge and the engineering principles behind it offers lessons in applied mathematics and science, including analyses of the natural forces, such as wind, waves, and erosion, that have informed or continue to inform the bridge's design, construction, and preservation.(Figure 1) Students gain a contextual understanding of the period in which the bridge was built by reading the major literary works of day, specifically the works of Whitman, Douglas, and Wharton. Historic preservation thus functions as the "bridge," figuratively speaking, that links seemingly disparate academic subjects across disciplines and illuminates their relevance to contemporary preservation practice.

Preservation Arts and Technology Curriculum

Students enrolled as Preservation Arts majors receive supplemental classroom and hands-on instruction.(Figure 2) In addition to the four-year preservation-based academic curriculum, the three-part Preservation Arts curriculum includes 9th- and 10th-grade Preservation Arts elective classes and 11th- and 12th-grade Preservation Arts and Technology classes. Students in the 9th- and 10th-grade Preservation Arts electives study Weeksville (the first free African American community in Brooklyn) and Green-Wood Cemetery to acquire the visual literacy, vocabulary, survey, and study skills necessary for understanding the philosophy and practice of historic preservation. The 11th- and 12th-grade classes concentrate on the materials and technologies used to construct historic buildings, the physical means by which they deteriorate, and how they are preserved.

FIGURE 2
Students Tiana Scott and Jessica Alonso design and create their own stained glass piece with instruction from the Brooklyn Stained Glass Conservation Center. (Courtesy of the author)

Preservation Arts and Technology students receive studio and fieldwork training that emphasizes the skills needed to become valuable historic preservation interns.(Figure 3) Internships with preservation organizations are sponsored by the Department of Education and take place primarily during the summer months. Over the course of the program, internships provide 540 hours of hands-on training in the preservation discipline of the student's choice. Internships offer an introduction to research, survey, and documentation of a structure; urban and architectural design; adaptive reuse; government and community participation; and conservation and replication of deteriorated components such as stone, stained glass, and plaster. Interns maintain a portfolio as part of their graduation assessment requirements.

FIGURE 3
An artisan and student intern collaborate on carving a floral bas-relief in stone. (Courtesy of the author)

Throughout the school year, preservation specialists and artisans visit classes and talk about and demonstrate their work as well as offer perspectives on their disciplines and the skills they acquired. Speakers and internship sponsors also act as reviewers for preservation arts assignments. Graduates will obtain a Preservation Arts and Technology diploma that fulfills the requirements for industry-endorsed Career Technical Education (CTE) high school diplomas in

New York State, like CTE course sequences in Nursing, Refrigeration, or Carpentry. The Association for Preservation Technology and its affiliate, the Preservation Trades Network, has endorsed the final assessment examination.

Professional Development

The success of the Preservation Arts curriculum depends in large part on interdisciplinary, professional development opportunities for teachers. Teachers may not have the background in architecture or historic preservation to appreciate, relate to, and integrate that information into a standard Regents curriculum. To facilitate an experiential learning process similar to that provided for students, teachers are encouraged to visit the students at their summer internships and learn about each landmark and its preservation issues through tours led by representatives of the NJIT/CABSR. A one-week professional development program helps teachers prepare as a team for the coming year. Each teacher prepares sample lesson plans, and the group designs an interdisciplinary project based on these shared curriculum ideas.

Teacher development continues throughout the academic year with regular sessions with NJIT/CABSR representatives. Architectural historians may work with history teachers or engineers with math teachers on practical academic content applications. The recommended time for professional development per teacher is five days during the summer and one to two hours weekly throughout the year in individual content area and interdisciplinary group sessions.

Current Results

The Preservation Arts curriculum has developed thus far in the context of a nascent high school environment. As the project has progressed, so has the understanding of the parameters needed for the program model to thrive, such as the identification of lead teachers who will help mentor other teachers, the creation of planning teams, and the provision of time during the school day for teacher preparation. Generally, teachers found the landmarks to be well chosen for academic course content coverage. They also felt that having preservation specialists involved in professional development and the classroom was invaluable.

Middle school recruitment has been essential in identifying potential preservation arts majors. Many students do not know what historic preservation is, but they respond favorably once introduced to it. Students interviewed after their first preservation arts class responded with the following sample commentaries—

When I came to this school I didn't know what preservation arts meant and now

only nine months later, I learned not only the meaning of the word, but also other things like names of things on buildings and history. I am glad I got an opportunity to learn how to preserve and find information.

You learn a lot of history and it not only benefits your grade it benefits you later on in life—like in college or applying for a job.

The preservation practitioners themselves have been stalwart. Every year there are more internship sponsors than students (many students go away for holidays or have summer school). Many internship hosts have been part of the program as speakers and sponsors every year, generously advising on how to improve the program and always encouraging and supporting "their" students. Every year at a fall internship gathering, students and their mentors come together to share their portfolio products and summer experiences. It is truly gratifying to see the obvious familiarity and respect with which they interact and how much the students have matured. Parents at these gatherings are particularly enthusiastic about their children's development.

The first anticipated graduating class of Preservation Arts majors is now in the 11th grade. Seventy-nine percent of them are performing above the class average. This trend bodes well for reports on their graduation rate and placement in June 2007. Though based in New York City, the Preservation Arts High School curriculum is envisioned as a nationwide program. As a national program, the curriculum content would respond to each locale's built environment but maintain standards that permit state and nationwide assessment of student performance in both the required academic areas and within the discipline of historic preservation.

Kate Burns Ottavino is director of preservation technology with the New Jersey Institute of Technology. She can be reached at (973) 596-3094 or delano@njit.edu. The Center's website is http://www.cabsr.org.

Notes

1. Patricia R. Bransford, Tara-Shelomith Krause, and Kate Burns Ottavino, *Sustainable Urban Preservation: Developing A Model Program For New York* (New York, NY: World Monuments Fund Report, 1997). This report indicated that most programs created to train preservation artisans failed because they were not central to the mission of the sponsoring organization or they were unable to incorporate the academic education necessary for a complete understanding, appreciation, and acquisition of preservation skills.

2. Ezra Ehrenkrantz, Mark Alan Hewitt, and Kate Burns Ottavino, *French American Student/Faculty Exchange Program in Preservation Crafts Training* (Newark, NJ: Center for Architecture & Building Science Research, New Jersey Institute of Technology, 1998).

Reviews

BOOKS

A Richer Heritage: Historic Preservation in the Twenty-First Century

Edited by Robert E. Stipe. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003; 592 pp., illustrations, tables, notes, index; cloth $49.95; paper $24.95.

A Richer Heritage aims to document the achievements following the enactment of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) in 1966, a watershed year in the history of historic preservation. This collection of essays succeeds as a survey of the preservation field's ever-broadening fronts of concern even though the quality of the essays is somewhat uneven: Some are excellent; others are pedestrian. As a work of critical scholarship, the volume falls short. But this was not really its purpose. Conceived as a sequel to *With Heritage So Rich*, *A Richer Heritage* succeeds amply.[1]

A Richer Heritage is a valuable state-of-the-field book, whether one is a preservation advocate, professional, scholar, or some combination thereof. The well-written chapters convey much useful information. But the volume also mirrors the flaws of the whole preservation field; it is weakly theorized, celebratory rather than reflective, and defensive rather than truly curious about why preservation does not get more public support.

Such criticism, though, is turned on its head by editor Robert Stipe's analysis and meditation titled, "Where Do We Go from Here?" All that is missing from the first 14 chapters are in these final 50 or so pages of Stipe's. He probes and cajoles the field with constructive criticism that is earnest and well informed. His challenging set of questions about how preservation relates to the rest of the society it serves (not as well as we think), and how this situation might be improved, should inspire debate among preservationists. This chapter distinguishes the book from many other standard, merely celebratory preservation collections.

The first section of the book—five chapters culminating in Thompson Mayes's superb essay on law and public policy—frame the institutional politics and policy-making of contemporary preservation efficiently and effectively. Other chapters are devoted to the most emergent issues in preservation including landscape preservation and social/ethnic issues. Both of these topics highlight the limits of preservation's traditional, artifact-centered thinking, and challenge those of us in the preservation field to deal with change (landscape change, social change, changing cultural politics) in ways that our materialist roots have not prepared us.

Genevieve P. Keller and J. Timothy Keller document the growth of "landscape preservation" by observing how landscapes have been treated like large-scale artifacts. But landscapes are not just a different set of objects to preserve; the real promise of landscape preservation is that it presents a different way of looking at places. The chapters by Antoinette J. Lee, Alan Downer, and Alan Jabbour speak to the changed and sometimes charged debates within preservation. Issues of ethnic representation and social equity are fully on the table, though not fully dealt with by any means. Predicting that "race and ethnicity will shape the cultural heritage programs of the United States in

the next century," Lee hopefully projects that the preservation establishment, which certainly has become more diverse in the last generation, will actually be diverse when those of us early in our careers are looking back in retirement.

The volume's absences are as much blind spots in the preservation field's vision of itself as elisions of this particular book. Generally absent is critical reflection on what preservation finds most difficult or has failed to do, the limits of the field, in general how it connects to bigger issues in American urbanism and society, and how it measures success (again, Stipe's final chapter is a notable exception). Like much that is published regarding preservation in the United States, the collection is unabashedly partial, celebratory, and uncritical ("America's Preservation Ethos: A Tribute to Enduring Ideals" is the title of the introduction). While useful for congratulation (of which much is due), the collection needs bolstering for teaching purposes. Specifically, where are the critical voices that believe in the power of the material past and ask insightful questions about what the field is not doing well, what the challenges are, and where the field should go next?

Indeed, the premise of the book, and many of the chapters, is troublingly anti-historical in that it presumes the existence of a set of timeless preservation ethics and principles, and it touts the ways in which the practice of preservation has become progressively "more mature." History with this frame of mind becomes a simple chronicle of preservation success stories (viz. Charles Hosmer), and obscures as much as it reveals about the field.

Described as "a textbook for historic preservation," *A Richer Heritage* can be useful for teaching at the university level but should not be employed without a critical eye. It is not so much a contribution of new scholarship as an appraisal of the state of affairs in the American preservation field. This volume will take its rightful place on the preservation bookshelf as a marker of its time—along with *With Heritage So Rich* and *Past Meets Future: Saving America's Historic Environments* and Charles Hosmer's multiple volumes of preservation history.[2] Editor Robert Stipe deserves praise for bringing out such a wide-ranging and timely volume of work in book form, and we in the preservation field must face up to the volume's implicit challenge to grow the capacity of our field to do critical research and create knowledge for evaluating—not just mapping—the preservation field's course.

In the end, Stipe's book will be most remembered, one hopes, for his own words in the last chapter—

A major step toward fulfilling the goals of the 1966 legislation is to recognize that times have changed and to accept that the preservation movement must change with them. It is perhaps time to question what we are doing, why we are doing it, and whether our current approach is the most effective use of limited resources.

Randall Mason
University of Pennsylvania

1. *With Heritage So Rich* (U.S. Conference of Mayors. New York, NY: Random House, 1966).

2. Antoinette J. Lee, ed., *Past Meets Future: Saving America's Historic Environments* (Washington, DC: Preservation Press, 1992). See also Charles B. Hosmer, Jr., *Presence of the Past: A History of the Preservation Movement in the United States Before Williamsburg* (New York, NY: Putnam, 1965); and idem, *Preservation Comes of Age: From Williamsburg to the National Trust, 1926-1949*, 2 vols. (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1981).

Anthropology Explored: The Best of Smithsonian AnthroNotes

Second Edition. Edited by Ruth Osterweis Selig, Marilyn R. London, and P. Ann Kaupp. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Books, 2004; 458 pp., illustrations, bibliographies, index; cloth $40.00; paper $17.95.

For a quarter century, the Smithsonian Institution's Anthropology Department has published "AnthroNotes," originally a teachers' newsletter to bring anthropology's research perspectives in each subdiscipline to a broad readership. An earlier compilation of "the best of Smithsonian AnthroNotes" appeared some years ago, but scientific advances have required significant revisions or new articles to bring readers up to date. In fact, two-thirds of the 36 articles in this volume have been revised. New topical subheadings provide fresh frameworks for updated chapters about human origins and variations, archeology, and cultural anthropology case studies.

In her concise introduction, Ruth Osterweis Selig clearly sets the tone by stating, "Human diversity, whether physical, cultural, or political, is among the most pressing issues in our shrinking world... Anthropology seeks to explain that diversity..." She outlines the volume's three sections with elemental questions: Who are we and where did we come from? How did the human species develop over time? How can we best understand human diversity? Because the book involved 45 authors, their articles are grouped in three collections of answers: "Investigating Our Origins and Variation," "Examining Our Archaeological Past," and "Exploring Many Cultures." About one-third of these authors have official connections with the Smithsonian.

The editors clearly believe that these basic questions about the long journey of human cultures and societies could only be answered by many storytellers with many viewpoints. Analogous to a complex musical score, the volume is a triad of themes, each with sub-themes, illustrating human harmony, dissidence, and rhythm.

In the "Origins and Variation" section, sub-themes cover verbal communication between humans and chimpanzees, new evidence of earliest human fossils, disease in ancient populations, ritual sacrifice among the Moche of Peru, race and ethnicity, and "stories bones tell," including forensic physical anthropology of "America's MIAs" from past wars. The second collection of articles spans more time and space, addressing ancient origins of agriculture, researching "first Americans," Vikings and African hunter-gatherers, Mayan cultural achievements, how Arctic peoples are impacted by global warming, and archeological understandings of African American lifeways. The final set of 13 essays is a kaleidoscope of cultural sub-themes: body art, repatriation by museums, Asia's storied Silk Road, cultural relativism, cultural change among Plains Indian tribes and Peruvian village women, the dilemma of refugees, and applied linguistics. Each piece is a concise narrative statement, sometimes in first person but often in a public speaker's tone, with asides to the reader.

The numerous and wonderful drawings by the late Robert L. Humphrey, a Washington University anthropologist, continue to add humor and graphic insights to the text. Throughout, the editors and authors have provided a consistent reader-friendly style, keeping to the original purpose of "AnthroNotes." Most articles include at the end an "update" and "further readings" as references. The volume can have classroom use in general anthropology or cultural anthropology courses, but would need an experienced instructor to provide understandable contexts for the diversity of subjects. Almost all participating authors are practicing professional anthropologists, representing the discipline's diverse subfields and specialties, which can be a formidable spectrum of interests.

Many—but certainly not all—cultural resource professionals have an academic anthropological background. For them, *Anthropology Explored* would be a valuable volume, particularly if concise, current summaries on particular subjects were

sought for instructional or training purposes. But for many other cultural resource colleagues, this volume would not directly apply to their work; they might find selected articles interesting, however. It is a well-produced, small "travelogue" volume that is truly "Anthropology Explored."

Roger E. Kelly
National Park Service (ret.)

Archaeobiology

By Kristin D. Sobolik. Archaeologist's Toolkit Vol. 5, Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press, 2003; 139 pp., photographs, tables, notes, index; cloth $69.00; paper $24.95.

Sobolik's goal in writing this book is to describe specialties of archeobiology in terms of their history, goals, and recovery and analytic techniques. Among these specialties are zooarcheology (the study of archeological faunal remains, including shell and bone) and archeobotany (the study of plant remains, including wood, seeds, pollen, and phytoliths). Along the way, Sobolik presents archeological site types, preservation factors, and case studies involving archeobiology.

From the outset, Sobolik emphasizes that there is no single, "right" way of undertaking archeobiological studies. She offers, instead, what she believes to be the "best and easiest ways" to interpret archeobiological remains, providing literature sources and diverse case studies largely, though not exclusively, drawn from projects she has worked on. This gives her readers an intimate portrait of the goals, processes, and results of projects. On this level, the book functions as a primer, which is its greatest strength.

On another level, however, the book pushes an agenda intended to persuade its readers that the future of archeobiology lies in its practitioners' abilities to insinuate themselves into the nascency of archeological cultural resource management (CRM) projects. Whether the reader agrees with Sobolik's argument, its inclusion does result in a book that tries to reach at least two distinct, and not necessarily compatible, audiences—archeologists and cultural resource managers. In the forward, the series editors suggest that "the book can stand alone as a reference work for archeologists in public agencies, private firms, and museums, and as a textbook and guidebook for classrooms and field settings." This implies that the book is for archeologists who seek general information on archeobiology. But elsewhere, Sobolik seems to be addressing those who want to hire archeobiologists to help manage cultural resources. At times, the book develops into a polemic chastising both archeologists and archeobiologists—the former for not giving due respect to archeobiologists, the latter for not striving for positions that would warrant that respect. She writes—

if the archaeobiologist wants to be treated as purely a technician rather than a scientist, he or she can keep accepting boxes of bone and bags of soil, along with a paycheck... If, however, the archaeobiologist would like to contribute to the understanding of peoples and environments...he or she should get involved in all stages of the recovery process.

The call of archeobiologists to arms is most strongly declaimed under a heading entitled "The Role of CRM in the Development and Future of Archaeobiology." Here Sobolik describes what archeobiologists should do and be, rather than what they do and are. Sobolik leaves the realm of instructor and enters that of advocate. She stresses CRM over non-CRM research as the future avenue for archeobiologists to pursue. Her reasoning is simple enough—there are more funded CRM projects. But she also suggests that analysis of plant and animal remains is "essential for any CRM project

and report," while non-CRM driven projects "do not legally need to recover, analyze, and interpret archaeobiological material." In actuality, neither type of project has such statutory requirements. Whether working on a CRM or pure research project, the principal investigator, not a statute or regulation, determines the need for archeobiological analyses; it is he or she who argues the merits of the decision with the funding or review agency. Reviewing agencies have conducted and accepted thousands of federally mandated Section 110 survey and Section 106 excavation projects and uncounted archeological mitigation projects, without requiring archeobiological analyses.

Sobolik's rallying cry does serve to highlight some of the problems archeologists face in teaming up on multidisciplinary projects and incorporating specialists (archeobiological or otherwise). One such problem is determining the appropriate role for the specialist. Sobolik argues that specialists need to be in on the ground floor of archeological projects if they are to provide archeologists with the full weight of their insight. However, many projects simply do not require the specialist's full weight. While the book does well to inform CRM project managers of the need to incorporate archeobiologists early and often, it would have benefited the reader to provide guidance under what conditions CRM projects do not need to entertain such involvement.

Continuing her advocacy, Sobolik encourages would-be archeobiologists to become "scientists" rather than technicians. "Anyone can put in the hard work to become a technical expert in archaeobiology, but to become an archaeobiological scientist involves using botanical or faunal remains to answer broader-ranging questions." This view might help archeobiologists in their individual career goals, but it does not serve archeology well. Arguably, archeology needs more trained technicians than what Sobolik terms scientists. Today it is nearly impossible to find a zooarcheological technician to analyze samples that a project archeologist might usefully employ in interpreting a site or addressing a research question. While Sobolik argues that archeologists need "biological experts," not mere technicians, to provide them with "potential insight and authority," the point of fact is that many archeologists, while not specialized in archeobiology, are certainly capable of interpreting the data the subdisciplines provide. Despite Sobolik's lament to the contrary, archeobiologists have succeeded so well in gaining respect and faculty positions over the last 20 years, that few technicians (that is to say, those guys decried as "accepting boxes of bones...along with a paycheck") remain either unassociated with such faculty or on the market for hire.

Although not her primary focus, the author's persistent advocacy for developing the business and discipline of archeobiology is the most fascinating aspect of the book—the issues raised deserve far more attention, but perhaps elsewhere. Most readers will likely gloss right over Sobolik's aggrandizing passages and concentrate on the instructional sections in the book. To supplement the book's contributions, readers may want to look at the various archeobiological subdisciplines on the web and in more detailed books such as Elizabeth J. Reitz and Elizabeth S. Wing's *Zooarchaeology* and Deborah M. Pearsall's *Paleoethnobotany: A Handbook of Procedures.*[1]

Michael Russo
National Park Service

1. Elizabeth J. Reitz and Elizabeth S. Wing, *Zooarchaeology* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1999); Deborah M. Pearsall, *Paleoethnobotany: A Handbook of Procedures* (San Diego, CA: Academic Press, 2001).

The Columbia Guide to American Indians of the Great Plains

By Loretta Fowler. New York: Columbia University Press, 2003; x + 283 pp., illustrations, maps, notes, bibliography, index; cloth $45.00.

This compact reference book is the third in the Columbia Guides to American Indian History and Culture Series, following volumes on the Southeast by Theda Perdue and Michael D. Green (2001) and on the Northeast by Kathleen J. Bragdon (2002).[1] Loretta Fowler offers general readers a sweeping and well-written survey of the cultures and histories of Plains Indians, continuing the tradition of excellence that marks this series.

Fowler organizes her volume into four parts. Part I, "History and Culture," contains five chapters and is the narrative heart of this work. Chapter 1 introduces the physical environments of the Plains, the archeological record, native migrations, and distinguishes the various regional and subsistence traditions of Plains peoples: Southern, Middle Missouri, and Upland Plains, village-dwelling riverine horticulturalists, and mobile Plains bison hunters. Fowler uses this model to organize the rest of her historical narrative and to generalize about the variety of native adaptations and contact experiences that are far from uniform and vary temporally, spatially, and culturally. Chapter 2 explores Plains cultures from European contact to 1803. Emphasizing exploration, trade, slavery, horses, and warfare, Fowler explores the dynamics between European and Indian nations while maintaining a focus on native-native interactions. This is one of the strengths of Fowler's overall approach—that she presents indigenous imperatives and actions on a par with the documentary evidence of Euro-American perspectives.

Chapters 3 through 5 are historic narratives of American expansion (1803-1870s), reservation life (1880s-1933), and Indian self-determination (1933-1990s). Fowler traces the impact of American traders, immigrants, and settlers, the displacement of tribes, and the treaties, land cessions, and reservations that followed. The chapter on reservation life and allotment is perhaps her strongest. Fowler eschews simple stories. She carefully distinguishes the experiences and responses of individuals and groups within tribes, and responses from different tribes, in crafting a more complex story of this period of assimilation and persistence. Here, and in the final chapter, she relies explicitly on the work of other ethnohistorians, synthesizing a coherent historical narrative about Plains Indian experiences in the 20th century.

Chapter 5 highlights policy events from the Indian Reorganization Act, to termination, to the self-determination of the 1970s, interweaving native stories of the impact of World War II, the emergence of pan-Indian political organizations, Indian law and the courts, and the rise of extractive resource economies and Indian gaming. With so much to cover, it is little wonder that this final chapter feels rushed—even frenetic—in highlighting so many significant events without great depth. But such is the constraint of broad surveys, and Fowler wisely keeps her focus on the big picture rather than lose her readers in the myriad details of every individual tribe, policy, and event.

Following a small collection of selected Plains photographs, Part II is a glossary of key people, places, and events—items highlighted in the preceding chapters. Part III is a chronology of key events, and Part IV contains lists of references for those looking for more information, including a discussion of disciplinary theories and methodologies used in studying American Indians, an annotated bibliography of primary sources and secondary scholarship, and selected literary, film, and Internet resources. All three parts are useful to cultural resource managers, educators, students, and refer-

ence, curatorial, and exhibition specialists looking for quick information, context, or a place to begin further reading and research.

While the Columbia Guides to American Indian History and Culture Series cannot rival the Smithsonian's massive multi-volume *Handbook of North American Indians* in terms of research information and depth, it offers general audiences a scholarly yet readable resource.[2] Academics and tribal members could point out any number of important events for inclusion, but Fowler synthesizes a large amount of current scholarship into a concise and graceful narrative, and she keeps it moving. This is no small feat given that she has to cover the cultures and histories of Plains Indians, Clovis to casinos, in 283 pages. If there is a weakness in her presentation, it is in the lack of explicit reference to oral traditions and American Indian explanations of who they were and how their worlds functioned, and the lack of American Indian voice in describing who they are and what it means to be a Plains Indian today. But that is likely a limitation of the series format and not Fowler's scholarship, which is, as always, superb. Fowler's *Columbia Guide to American Indians of the Great Plains* has already received universal praise and should become a standard and well-thumbed reference tool for educators and cultural resource managers across the country.

David Rich Lewis
Utah State University

1. Theda Perdue and Michael D. Green, *Columbia Guide to American Indians of the Southeast* (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 2001); Kathleen J. Bragdon, *Columbia Guide to American Indians of the Northeast* (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 2002).

2. William C. Sturtevant, general editor, *Handbook of North American Indians*, 20 vols. (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1978).

Marketing Heritage: Archaeology and the Consumption of the Past

Edited by Yorke Rowan and Uzi Baram. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press, 2004; 304 pp., photographs, notes, index; cloth $75.00; paper $27.95.

In Moab, Utah, reproductions of rock art panels grace the parking lots of motels, public garbage cans, and even the menu of a local diner, where a popular sandwich is named after the Hopi character, Kokopelli. From my perspective as an archeologist for the four national parks from which many of these images are appropriated, the time to debate the use of such resources to "brand" my tourist town has long passed. However, as the popularity of heritage tourism grows, so does the question of archeologists' and cultural resource managers' roles in the marketing of heritage. One needs only to look at this publication and the recent publications from the Society for American Archaeology to note that archeologists are realizing (if perhaps a bit belatedly) that they should start participating in this discussion.

By its own account, the book *Marketing Heritage* "constitutes one of the first systematic efforts to analyze this new global marketing of the past." This is no business school analysis or laundry list marketing plan, but, rather, a thought-provoking and wide-ranging analysis of the manifestation and implications of heritage tourism based on the traditions of anthropological theory and inquiry.

As the articles in the volume express, archeological remains are often used for political and nationalistic ends. This critique has been central to debates within the discipline. What the volume illuminates, however, is that today's global economy increasingly commodifies cultures and, by extension, cultural resources. These commodities are being bought and sold as tourist experiences in much of the developing world, as well as some communities within the western world, where tourism has become the basis of the economy.

Colonialism and the ultimately ambivalent "green revolution" of the recent past manipulated local economies in the developing world into producing goods that would be viable in first world markets. The remaining historical legacy of both is the highlighted disparity between nations, the creation of "winners and losers" based on western demand, the literal destruction of numerous archeological sites, and the "modernization" of traditional societies. As the world shifts towards post-industrial development and tourism services, globalism can be said to have many of the same negative consequences. Cultural change and destruction were once by-products of development schemes, but in today's global capitalistic world, culture and cultural resources are overtly manipulated to market heritage. And current marketing achieves not just nationalistic or political ends, but it caters to the tastes and desires of western tourists!

The authors do a tremendous job of presenting this primary thesis, and validate that it is, indeed, a global phenomenon. The book presents case studies from Greece, Ireland, England, Mexico, Cambodia, Germany, the United States, Israel, and Jordan. While most of the contributors have conducted archeological or historical research in their respective domains, they present the studies less as archeologists than as participant-observers in the culture of "tourists." This perspective is important. As many archeologists struggle with the heritage tourism phenomenon, this volume demonstrates that it is perhaps better grasped standing above the excavation unit looking in, rather than trying to view it from below.

The authors also demonstrate how archeological remains are appropriated to bestow legitimacy on increasingly homogenous cultures, how the arbiters of culture pick and choose historical sites and themes to market, and how the current political climate and the "war on terror" affects those countries, particularly in the Middle East, that have put all of their sherds in the tourism basket. When these historical icons, with their created nationalistic or capitalistic narratives, are too associated with power, they become vulnerable as terrorist and revolutionary targets. Additionally, the authors point out that the marketing of heritage sites has the unintended negative consequence of fueling the international illegal market in antiquities. Fortunately, the authors also discuss international law codified in UNESCO treaties, which is being used to combat the physical threats to archeological sites and objects, as well as the World Archeological Congress, which is addressing the threats to intellectual property and the rights of indigenous peoples.

Thus far, international heritage marketing forces have asked, as Kelli Ann Costa writes in her article on marketing archeological sites in Ireland, that archeology "be seen, not heard." Archeologists have been largely complicit in this arrangement by distancing themselves from popular culture in their quest for scientific objectivity. However, the authors challenge archeologists to avoid clinging to such an artificial dichotomy, and, rather, to participate in what contributing author Joan Gero describes as "engaged archaeology." This challenges archeologists not only to become advocates of sites and what they have to tell us, but also to work to ensure that the products of our endeavors are used in ways that respect the particularities of history and the modern descendants of those whom we study. Also useful, the volume points out, would be to develop methodologies for evaluating heritage marketing that include cultural as well as economic values. By daring to quote the French social theorist Jean Baudrillard rather than archeologist Lewis Binford, the authors of *Marketing Heritage* provide a significant contribution to popular discourse towards this end.

Melissa Memory
National Park Service

Tourism and Cultural Heritage in Southeast Asia

Edited by Malcolm Bradford and Ean Lee. Bangkok, Thailand: SEAMEO Regional Centre for Archaeology and Fine Arts, 2004; 105 pp., illustrations, photographs; $10.00.

This publication is a compendium of 10 papers from 4 regional seminars in Southeast Asia in 2002 and 2003. The seminars were held in Thailand, Cambodia, and Singapore under the sponsorship of the Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization and the Regional Centre for Archeology and Fine Arts. They were intended to present information on the effects of tourism on Southeast Asian society and culture and the measures and actions being taken in response to this phenomenon.

The papers are presented in three groups— "Living Cultures: Case Studies," "Heritage Management," and "Eco-Tourism"—and represent the experiences of five Southeast Asian countries. The experiences of Thailand, Brunei, the Philippines, Singapore, and Viet Nam are included. Papers representing other member states—Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, and Myanmar—may have added to the diversity and value of the publication.

Readers conversant with the current literature on tourism and cultural heritage will find familiar views and statements, albeit from an Asian perspective, in most of the papers. While the target audience for the publication is in Southeast Asia, much of the content is relevant and transposable to tourism and cultural heritage initiatives in the rest of the world. However, what make these papers particularly interesting are the specific and in-depth treatments of subjects unique to the individual countries. Of special interest are those papers dealing with countries that are in the earliest stages of modern tourism development, such as Brunei and Viet Nam.

Thailand is the subject of 4 of the 10 papers with a focus on the national government's post-1997 economic philosophy of a "sufficiency economy" and its relation and influence on both tourism development and the recognition, protection, and enhancement of cultural heritage. The detailed descriptions—objectives, methodology, process, subjects and outcomes—found in the case study of a sustainable tourism model for Phetchaburi Province are especially useful and highly transferable to similar initiatives outside of Thailand.

In Brunei, the country is coming to recognize the role of contemporary tourism, and the native population's economic role, in what is already a very wealthy country. Having recently developed its first national tourism master plan, the country is focusing on its unique heritage of the Kampong Ayer (The Water Villages), which were noted by the earliest western visitors in 1521. In pursuing modern housing for its population on dry land, the society faces the problem of preserving and maintaining an economic and modern life given its unique historic and cultural resources. The inventory of positive and negative impacts of tourism development related to these sites is of particular interest and relevance to many surviving cultural complexes, be they built over water or on dry land.

In Viet Nam, the national government enacted legislation in 2001 to protect both the tangible and intangible heritage of some 54 different ethnic groups. One paper presents an overview of the intended effects of the legislation and touches on the resultant challenges of implementing this legislation where there are many significant competing demands for government financing in a developing country.

A paper on the Philippines examines the process of the country coming to understand its own heritage and national identity in the postcolonial era. Of particular interest is the adoption in 1987 of a new national constitution that incorporates numerous specific responsibilities of, and authorizations for, the national government in the identification, pro-

tection, and interpretation of their national heritage. Using this legal foundation, the development of a national teacher education program in 2002 is presented in detail with a case study on its application in rural communities.

The chapter on Singapore explores the private, non-government role of the all-volunteer Singapore Heritage Society in a country where the national government is the major force in nearly all aspects of the country's pursuit of a "civil society." The paper details the society's founding in 1987, and its organization, advocacy, growth, and contributions to the preservation of man-made and natural heritage in this densely populated island city-state. Of particular interest is the future of historic cemeteries in the face of demands for additional public housing. The paper concludes with advocacy for the creation of a more effective and better-funded public-private Heritage Conservation Trust.

The two papers on eco-tourism cover familiar ground but are noteworthy for illustrating what has, and is, taking place in Southeast Asia as a direct result of the 1992 Rio Earth Summit.

Nearly all of the papers include comprehensive lists of additional published references and some include related Internet sites. While several of the papers refer to the lack of financial and human resources, none of them include specific information on project costs and the numbers of personnel involved. An appendix including the four complete seminar programs would have provided additional context for the selected papers.

Readers not intimately acquainted with the regional and national geography of Southeast Asia and these five countries would benefit from the inclusion of some simple maps. Likewise, for a subject that lends itself so well to accompanying illustrations, they are few in number and small in scale.

Following the devastation of the December 2004 tsunami, which particularly affected the western coastal tourist centers in Thailand, one waits with interest and concern for information on the new challenges facing those responsible for tourism and cultural heritage in this region of the world.

Russell V. Keune, FAIA
American Institute of Architects (ret.)

The New Town Square: Museums and Communities in Transition

By Robert R. Archibald. American Association for State and Local History book series. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press, 2004; vii + 224 pp., illustrations, notes, index; cloth $69.00; paper $24.95.

The Missouri Historical Society's director, Robert R. Archibald, is both concerned and optimistic. He is troubled that the forces of marketing, commerce, and land use are tearing apart the community cohesion, self-perception, and social interaction that infused the world of his youth, but he is convinced that the application of history can blunt these insidious assaults on the common good. These conflicting responses to change serve as connective tissue for *The New Town Square: Museums and Communities in Transition*, which presents edited versions of Archibald's recent lectures and addresses. Using a variety of approaches and examples, the museum administrator argues that a sense of community is dependent upon the respect of others and their differences, an understanding of our individual and collective pasts, the preservation of representative symbols of our history, and an awareness and appreciation of the natural environment.

Maintaining that "we must find new ways to nurture the civic 'we' instead of our current overemphasis on the individualistic and insular 'me,'" Archibald

calls for a renewed appreciation of town squares—of physical locales that project collective values steeped in history and geography. A sense of place, he asserts, is also intimately tied to social commitment. Places "are good if they connect people to each other and to the preceding generations that have walked that place and left their mark to be absorbed by those who inherit their place."

In many ways, these essays constitute a call to arms for public historians. Archibald seeks to embolden his professional colleagues in the power and importance of what they do, and *The New Town Square* is a work likely to be of considerable interest and utility to cultural resource managers. For historic preservationists, museum curators, re-enactors, public programmers, park rangers, and interpreters, it offers a model for examining the impact of the environment on how communities came to define themselves, that is, through how their citizens interacted, how they pursued their livelihoods, and how they developed their recreational preferences. This is best exemplified in the compelling and evocative accounts of his hometown of Ishpeming on Michigan's Upper Peninsula.

Archibald's writings are tethered strongly to his sense of social and environmental responsibility. "Those who forget the past, or who choose to ignore or obliterate it," he warns, "will behave as if there is no future." He urges that all professionals, not just historians, must "think with a consciousness of the past." But his essays dealing with a sense of place are among the book's most genuine and original—providing examples from the wide-open expanses of Montana to the cityscapes of St. Louis. These essays will benefit anyone seeking to write about a favorite locale, or hoping to develop exhibitions or programs that convey the virtues of a particular site. Archibald notes that "communities that are not environmentally sustainable are also communities where the relationships that provide a sense of connectedness, of belonging, of civility, of security are fractured." Place, he contends, is an important factor in culture because it contributes to community and diversity. "Human culture is inseparable from geographical place," he argues. "People create places, and places make people. And that's what makes a culture."

Jeffrey K. Stine
Smithsonian Institution

Recording Historic Structures

Second Edition. Edited by John A. Burns and the staff of the Historic American Buildings Survey, Historic American Engineering Record, and Historic American Landscapes Survey, National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, 2004; xiii + 306 pp., drawings, photographs, bibliography, index; cloth $65.00.

The 1980 amendments to the National Historic Preservation Act directed the Secretary of the Interior to develop "a uniform process and standards for documenting historic properties" for deposit in the Library of Congress. These standards were first issued as internal government publications, then later used as the basis of a book published in 1989 by the American Institute of Architects Press with extensive illustrations and examples. The work under review is a revised and expanded second edition, with a different publisher.

The first part, almost half the book, discusses three methods of recording information: compiling a history, taking photographs, and making measured drawings. The history chapter is a short primer on historical research. The only "standard" mentioned is a Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) outline of topics to include in a report. The photography chapter describes and illustrates what constitutes a good photograph and sets out technical requirements as to film size, type, processing,

and labeling. Brief mention is made of rectified photography, x-ray photography, and photogrammetry. The longest method chapter covers the making of measured drawings.

The second half of the book is devoted to "case studies" in recording. There are separate chapters for vernacular buildings, bridges, structural and mechanical systems, ships, monuments, industrial processes, and landscapes. The chapter on vernacular buildings also discusses the concept of using a survey of types over a region to help decide which examples to document fully.

This second edition is substantially revised and amended from the first. There are 60 more pages and 70 more drawings and photos. Even the page shape has changed: the new edition is slightly more square, which allows a different look to the layout. The drawings are toned nicely to enhance legibility, a pale peach in this edition, a pale yellow in the first.

The drawings are often considered the glory of the National Park Service's heritage documentation programs. The distinctive plans, elevations, sections, large-scale details, interpretive drawings, and landscape and ship documentation are often masterpieces of communication. Standards specify content, quality, materials, and presentation. But the beauty of the drawings lies in the artful use of varying line weights, clever layouts, and easy-to-read lettering.

Odd, then, that these matters are given little or no discussion. While there are plenty of illustrations (251 drawings and photographs), there is no discussion of differential line weight nor any drawing showing the effect when it is not used. There are no examples of poor layout to compare with the good, nor any discussion of what principles to apply. Lettering is only briefly discussed, in particular, with reference to the problem of legibility when the drawings are reduced. No comment is made on the unsatisfactory practice of writing whole paragraphs in ALL CAPS, which is seen in a drawing made as recently as 1992.

It turns out, then, that this work, beautifully illustrated as it is, is a primer on, and a celebration of, the process of recording, and not a complete "nuts and bolts" manual. Practitioners will still need to consult the seven existing HABS/HAER publications for nitty-gritty details of the process (except for *Ships*, all are available online at http://www.cr.nps.gov/habshaer/pubs/guide.htm).

Those who found the first edition useful will find the second edition an essential upgrade and improvement. Newcomers to recording historic buildings, structures, and landscapes will find this to be a well-illustrated introduction to the recording process.

Dan Riss
National Park Service (ret.)

Historic Sacred Places of Philadelphia

By Roger W. Moss. Photographs by Tom Crane. A Barra Foundation Book, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005; xiii + 314 pp., photographs, glossary, bibliography, index; cloth $34.95

Historic Sacred Places of Philadelphia is a celebration of the physical embodiment in architecture of William Penn's profound contribution to making freedom of worship the central policy of his colony of Pennsylvania. In his masterful introductory

essay, Roger W. Moss—distinguished author, historian, and executive director of the Athenaeum of Philadelphia—reminds us that Penn's stated toleration of religious diversity was a radical departure in the 18th century, "an intolerant age

of established, regulated, and subsidized religions." Pennsylvania was unique in the British Empire in extending religious tolerance to all, even allowing the Catholic Mass to be said in public at a time when it was still illegal to do so in London. "Pennsylvania enjoyed religious heterogeneity unknown elsewhere," Moss writes, "and Penn's 'holy experiment' bequeathed to modern America its antecedent for a pluralistic society."

Penn's provision of religious tolerance was an open invitation to members of all religious denominations to come to Pennsylvania. Although the earliest colonists were members of Penn's own religious community, the Religious Society of Friends (Quakers), they were soon outnumbered by the combination of Anglicans, Presbyterians, Baptists, Methodists, Lutherans, Jews, and Catholics who found their way to Philadelphia. Over time they and others established congregations, built, rebuilt, and built anew places to worship that followed the expansion of the city, engaging in that process many of Philadelphia's finest architects.

The companion volume to Roger Moss's *Historic Houses of Philadelphia*, *Historic Sacred Places* follows the same format as its predecessor. An introductory essay sets the context for descriptions of 50 sacred places that follow.[1] The introductory essay illustrates the breadth of religious diversity in Philadelphia by including historic photographs of sacred places no longer extant and current photographs of places of worship not included individually. Here we find the Mennonite Meetinghouse and the Germantown Church of the Brethren from the 18th century side-by-side with Frank Lloyd Wright's Beth Sholom Synagogue and the Swedenborgian Bryn Athyn Cathedral from the 20th century.

The 50 individual sacred places that follow are an outstanding selection from among the overwhelming number of religious places in Philadelphia. Roger Moss limited his selection to pre-1900 buildings that are reasonably accessible. Each is described in a text that is an impressive balance of thorough scholarship and seemingly effortless storytelling. Within a few pages, Moss manages to give a brief history of the congregation, a description of the building and its architectural history—including notable works of art or architectural features—and a few comments on its current function. Each description is illustrated with historic photographs that give a sense of the building's past or important events. My favorite is the historic photograph of John Notman's 5,500-ton St. Clement's Church being moved 40 feet west to accommodate a street widening—a feat not to be believed were it not for the photographic evidence.

However, the contemporary photographs by Tom Crane of each sacred place make this book a visual feast. The photographic documentation includes both exterior and interior views of each building, as well as architectural details and works of art ranging from Violet Oakley's *Life of Moses* at the Samuel S. Fleisher Art Memorial to Augustus Saint-Gaudens's winged figure from St. Stephen's Church, recently rescued from the auction block by the Philadelphia Museum of Art. But it is the interior photographs that make this book so extraordinary. Tom Crane has supplemented the often-limited natural and artificial lighting of sanctuaries and chapels with deftly placed (and well-hidden) special lighting to bring out architectural details, materials, and colors. The results are interiors more luminous in their architectural richness than often can be experienced in person. Crane also resists the temptation to show every building in full sun in summer. There is a strangely appropriately somber photograph of the Arch Street Meeting House in the rain, a beautiful photograph of Trinity Lutheran Church in the snow, and many others in fall or winter.

All this wealth of narrative and visual information is presented in the same outstanding graphic format designer Adrianne Onderdonk Dudden created for Moss's *Historic Houses*. I especially admire her decision to avoid making great photographs more

impressive by running them over double page spreads. The one place she does this, with admirable success, is for the endpapers where Crane's photograph of the interior of Mother Bethel Church positively glows. *Historic Houses* set a very high standard of scholarship, storytelling, photography, and graphic design. *Historic Sacred Places* not only maintains that standard, it exceeds it.

Roger Moss's intent is to inspire readers to visit these special places. He encourages this by including maps showing the location of each place described, as well as phone numbers and websites when they exist. For the scholarly minded there is an excellent bibliography for each sacred place, and every sacred place and architect mentioned in the book can be found on the comprehensive website, www.philadelphiabuildings.org, created by the Athenaeum in collaboration with four other institutions.

Although a book about architecture, the publication of *Historic Sacred Places* comes at a timely moment in our nation's history. It reminds us that tolerance of religious difference and the pluralistic society it created was perhaps the most important gift both William Penn and the United States gave to the world. In an era when religious differences appear to be at the heart of world affairs, it is good to remember that a society based on tolerance of differences is possible and is a necessary prerequisite to peace.

John Andrew Gallery
Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

1. See Roger W. Moss, *Historic Houses of Philadelphia* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1998).

Preserving Modern Landscape Architecture II: Making Postwar Landscapes Visible

Edited by Charles A. Birnbaum, with Jane Brown Gillette and Nancy Slade. Washington, DC: Spacemaker Press, 2004; 128 pp., photographs, drawings, plans, notes; paper $24.95.

There is little doubt that the modernist design canon has fallen on hard times in America. Here at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, for example, a recently completed campus master plan calls for the demolition of several structures, including the Humanities Building, designed in the 1960s by Harry Weese, an important modernist architect. Although Humanities serves as one of the best examples of architectural Brutalism in Wisconsin, local critics refer to it as "the building everyone loves to hate."

If this and better-known examples of architectural modernism are scorned, then what is the situation regarding modern landscape architecture? While preservationists are often able to rally public support for threatened buildings designed by such 20th-century master architects as Eero Saarinen, Louis Kahn, Philip Johnson, and Frank Lloyd Wright, the works of landscape architecture's modernist luminaries—Tommy Church, Hideo Sasaki, Garrett Eckbo, Dan Kiley, John O. Simonds, Lawrence Halprin, M. Paul Friedburg, and others—fail to generate the same attention and passion.

Landscape architect Charles Birnbaum wants to change this. In 1995 Birnbaum organized a New York City conference that addressed the theme, "Preserving Modern Landscape Architecture."[1] That conclave, more than anything else, demonstrated the vulnerability of many modernist landscapes throughout America. In 2002, the inde-

fatigable Birnbaum put together a second conference that highlighted a few recent successes in landscape preservation, even though most of the discussion bemoaned the continued lack of recognition and concern given to the modern era.

The proceedings of the second assembly, the subject of this review, were published in 2004. The volume begins with an introduction by Birnbaum, who notes the apparent lack of interest in preservation exhibited by contemporary landscape architects: only 200 of the American Society of Landscape Architects' 13,000 members belong to its historic preservation professional interest group. Following the introduction are 17 brief essays by practicing landscape architects, critics, and academics; 14 feature the United States, while 3 are devoted to Canadian, British, and Portuguese subjects.

Most of the articles written by or about landscape architects address projects and places that have been destroyed, modified drastically, or are under threat. The authors overwhelmingly decry the situation, noting that several of the projects were launched with much fanfare some decades ago. Mark Johnson's entire essay, for example, is devoted to Denver's Skyline Park, originally designed by Halprin, but under siege at the time of the conference. While these essays include no scholarly documentation or references, they do provide extremely meaningful information about places that the authors deeply understand and appreciate.

Each writer, either directly or indirectly, asks two interrelated questions: Why do people fail to appreciate modernist landscapes, and why are these sites constantly in danger? "The average person feels very little love for modern design generally," answers Paul Bennett in his survey of Friedberg's work; "this antipathy," he continues, "runs deepest in terms of landscape." Halprin notes that fine arts icons emerge only after a considerable period of time has elapsed, whereas various issues, usually commercial, often threaten landscape architecture with little more than short notice. "It is, therefore, important to formalize a process for preservation that can react as quickly as the attack," Halprin recommends.

Marc Treib and Richard Longstreth provide the most nuanced and scholarly interpretations of the modernist era. Treib writes about the urban work of Church, Eckbo, and Halprin from 1948 to 1968, a period when California landscape architects made the transition from residential gardens to the urban scene. The pedestrianized street or mall evolved during this period, with Halprin's designs for San Francisco's Ghirardelli Square and the Nicollet Mall in Minneapolis representing the optimistic idea that landscape design "can sufficiently counter, if not totally vanquish, the forces of economics and demographics." The fact that the designs implemented for such highly urban places as Ghirardelli Square and Nicollet Mall were subsequently modified and later totally discarded is a complex issue that, as Treib suggests, might be linked to their genesis in the garden and suburb.

Longstreth's concluding essay is appropriately entitled "The Last Landscape." He argues that no greater preservation challenge exists today than the one of protecting modern landscapes. "The last landscape frequently is cast as one of errors, functional and esthetic, before it has had the time to acquire a substantial past of its own," he writes. Included among Longstreth's examples are private gardens, museum gardens, public parks, urban malls and plazas, and even urban renewal projects. Greatest attention, however, is given to those places that reflect the significant landscape changes caused by post-war development practices in the United States—regional shopping malls, suburban corporate headquarters, and residential areas. Longstreth is the only author who mentions vernacular examples, specifically community gardens and motel landscapes. The preservation of modern environments, he asserts, can only be accomplished by adopting an integrative approach that relies heavily on the skills and approaches of

landscape architects and historians of landscape architecture.

Calls for immediate attention and action regarding modernist landscape architecture are timelier than ever, given the changes that have occurred since this book appeared. Death claimed landscape architects Dan Kiley in 2004 and John Simonds in 2005; and in Denver, a redesigned and reconfigured Skyline Park that reveals little of Halprin's initial design was dedicated in 2004.

Other than the lack of an index, this is a well-conceived and well-executed volume that will appeal to a wide range of readers. Those who already belong to the "preservation chorus" will acquire considerably more knowledge about familiar lost landscapes, whereas others who are just being introduced to landscape preservation may be motivated to join the movement.

Arnold R. Alanen
University of Wisconsin-Madison

1. See Charles A. Birnbaum, ed., *Preserving Modern Landscape Architecture: Papers from the Wave Hill-National Park Service Conference* (Cambridge, MA: Spacemaker Press, 1999).

Campus Heritage Preservation: Traditions, Prospects & Challenges

Edited by Elizabeth Lyon. Eugene: University of Oregon, School of Architecture & Allied Arts, 2003; 65 pp., notes, bibliography, participants list; free of charge.

The choice of a college is an important step in defining identity. As colleges become broadly diversified—even global—in their student body, the appearance of the campus becomes a principal aspect by which students make their selection. The preservation of historic buildings has long been one of the means by which established colleges represented their status—often signified by a building with "old" in its title, "Old Main," "Old West," etc. To those applicants attuned to traditional cultural markers, historic buildings validate their choice.

Preservation is an issue for most college campuses. Colleges have preserved by default, adapting old structures to new uses to save money, or, for purely emotional reasons, keeping buildings that tug at the heartstrings of alumni and provide access to their wallets. But there are also times when colleges trying to evolve beyond their origins are constrained by outsiders who use the tools of preservation to prevent their evolution. Unfortunately, preservationists often oppose changes inherent in the evolving culture of the late 20th and early 21st centuries.

As the 21st century begins, the old top-down cultural hierarchy has been transformed into a multidimensional "nobrow" culture (to borrow John Seabrook's 2000 title) that, rather than being based on a singular elite high culture model, is based in identity and subcultures that create a kaleidoscopic mainstream driven by media buzz.[1] The old "high culture" is but one subculture in the new order and as Seabrook demonstrates, the old unified elite culture has been replaced by popular culture. Elite college campuses are responding to this change by shifting from architecture that parroted the college's origins to a burst of original design that seeks to engage students attuned to the contemporary world of pop culture, television, and the Internet. As new becomes a magnet for students seeking to determine their own identity, it is reasonable to question the value of the old.

It is against this background that the Getty Grants Campus Heritage Initiative prompted the University of Oregon's 2002 symposium on college

planning and heritage. The symposium, in turn, produced the booklet, *Campus Heritage Preservation*. Coming at a time when the Getty was making its first round of Campus Heritage grants, it was useful to raise the broadest questions about how colleges should approach preservation issues on their campuses.[2] The conference brought together old lions of preservation, the Boston Globe's Pulitzer Prize winning architecture critic, Robert Campbell, and the chair of George Washington University's program in historic preservation, Richard Longstreth, to provide a cultural historical overview, as well as college presidents and other administrators to explain the impact of preservation on their institutions. College planners and outside consultants also spoke to an insider group of preservationists, college administrators, and foundation leaders. Notably there were no students on the list of attendees.

To meet the modest scale of the publication, papers were summarized to frame the larger arguments: Colleges have been major architectural patrons and their campuses therefore present significant architectural challenges; colleges are often multiple fiefdoms shaped to some extent by need as well as by opportunities donors present; modern planning incorporates outside forces ranging from alumni to community groups; buildings of the recent past are especially difficult problems that now risk demolition even as their significance is being re-evaluated; and finally, since the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, the preservation movement has developed tools and processes that can be utilized to resolve the larger issues. Of particular interest is preservation on historically black college campuses—though the choices of architecture being preserved on many of these campuses warrants discussion.

Lyon's concluding text was written to summarize the conference and it gives a clearer account of the issues than the individual essays provide. The brevity of the booklet makes it unsatisfying, but as a means of whetting the appetite for more study, it succeeds. Beyond the specific issues of college heritage there is a pressing need for a serious study of the cultural role of preservation. What better place than colleges with their intellectual and physical capital that can be applied to the task? The time has come to ask how preservation fits our contemporary world and how its role can evolve to meet the needs of the 21st century. This might become the basis for a broader Getty-led symposium with an appropriate publication.

George E. Thomas
CivicVisions, LP
University of Pennsylvania

1. John Seabrook, *NoBrow: The Culture of Marketing—The Marketing of Culture* (New York, NY: Knopf, 2000).

2. This reviewer's consulting firm, CivicVisions, directed two of the first round of Getty's Campus Heritage grants.

Building San Francisco's Parks, 1850-1930

By Terence Young. Baltimore, MD and London, UK: John Hopkins University Press, 2004; 270 pp., photographs, illustrations, tables, notes, index; cloth $45.00.

While horticultural history of the 1990s was comprised mostly of biographies of distinguished horticulturalists such as Andrew Jackson (A. J.) Downing (1815-1852) and Jens Jensen (1860-1951), more recent scholarship has focused on horticulture as a manifestation of values associated with the natural landscape. In *Building San Francisco's Parks, 1850-1930*, Terence Young takes advantage of his background as a horticulturist to interpret early undertakings in Golden Gate Park. Young demonstrates that a call for a park befitting a great city in 1865 implied certain types of plants and terrain, primarily determined by the precedent of Central Park and, more generally, the eastern landscape of the United States. The book emerged from Young's 1991 geography dissertation at the University of

California, Los Angeles, "Nature and Moral Order: The Cultural Significance of San Francisco's Parks, 1865-1925." In addition to the cultivation of non-native plants within parks, the book considers park design in terms of structural improvements within parks and the location of parks within the city.

Building San Francisco's Parks begins with an overview of park design in the United States during the mid-19th century. Young establishes the influential role Downing played in the creation of Central Park and how the park was subsequently viewed as epitomizing romanticist landscaping ideals in its large size, rustic design, and accessibility to an urban population. The introduction is appropriate for establishing how, while San Francisco was different from New York, Central Park served as a precedent to the extent that a dissimilar park proposal from Frederick Law Olmsted, one of Central Park's designers, was rejected.[1] Chapter 2 provides background on San Francisco's earlier private recreational parks and describes the events leading to the 1870 acquisition of the Outside Lands, a large, undeveloped area of shifting sand dunes west of the city, for Golden Gate Park. As the oldest and largest municipal park in San Francisco, Golden Gate Park suits Young's discussion of changing park design and is an appropriate focus for chapters 3 through 5. The chronological treatment of its development highlights the tenures of park superintendents William Hammond Hall (1871–1876) and John McLaren (1887–1943). Unfortunately, some 34 parks that were under municipal charge in 1910 receive only brief treatment in chapter 6, the final chapter.

Young frames his study as a shift in park design from a "romantic era" to a "rationalist era." The articulation of two distinct "eras" or "ideals" is not invoked to force a sequential transition or discrete break but is effectively used to demonstrate the motivation for changes in park design. Young describes the romantic attitude as based on a view of nature as an interrelated whole that includes people and God. An imbalance of nature and human production disrupts society, leading to the idea that cities are places of degradation and nature is restorative. The rationalist attitude is based on seeing people as distinct from nature, with parks serving to provide space for leisure activities such as enjoying the spectacle of plants or playing sports. In addition, Young identifies four persistent "virtues" expressed within advocacy for parks during both eras: public health, prosperity, democratic equality, and social coherence.

Young states his study is not a social history but an intellectual one focusing "almost exclusively on the relatively small number of park advocates and ideas, because they had the greatest control over San Francisco's parks." While he does detail the ideas of Michael H. de Young (1849-1925) and various park officials, the book would be better described as an intellectual history relayed through institutions rather than individuals. Young relies upon reports of the Park Commission, correspondence of the park superintendents and board members, and articles in various newspapers to determine the ideals that shaped park design. For instance, he compares the stances of three periodicals on the development of Golden Gate Park: the *Daily Morning Call*, *Daily Evening Bulletin*, and *California Horticulturist and Floral Magazine*. The first two targeted a general audience, while the *California Horticulturist* was the organ of the area's skeptical nursery and landscape gardening community. The result is an incisively interpreted and well-crafted discussion that relays the disdain with which the Outside Lands were viewed, the optimism and doubt about the ability to transform the selected "sand waste site," and the subsequent satisfaction (if not pride) about the transformed park just a few years later.

While not a social history, *Building San Francisco's Parks* does broach social issues as they related to structural improvements within the park and park access. The introduction of physical activities within Golden Gate Park in the 1890s caused some visitors discomfort because of the lack of visual

distinctions among women of different classes as they engaged in bicycling. A more intentional effort toward democratic equality was the William Sharon Playground, built with funds bequeathed by the U.S. senator from Nevada. The following excerpt of a poem written for the opening of the Sharon building in 1888 pronounces the playground as a place for children of all backgrounds—

Whether black or brown or yellow,
You are welcome, little fellow!
No policeman here to eye you as you pass,
Or to chase you with a club...

Published in the Park Commission materials, the poem implies that the sentiment of inclusiveness did not represent prevailing attitudes in the rest of the city. Though he provides the reader with references, Young's study does not detail the demographics of early San Francisco or delve into how different populations were perceived by park advocates, whom he presents in contemporary terms as "a relatively small band of native-born, white, middle-class males."

While suggesting that Golden Gate Park introduced distinct social interactions into the city, the strength of Young's study comes from his perceptive analysis of what values motivated certain aspects of park design. Written in a clear and fluid style, the book contains helpful schematic maps and abundant reproductions of period photographs. Apart from offering a slice of San Francisco's history, the book contributes a cogent examination of how landscapes are altered, land use conflicts persist, and changing expectations of nature impact park management.

Elizabeth A. Watson
CUNY Graduate Center

1. Olmsted's rejected 1866 park proposal featured open grounds, gardens, and a promenade set adjacent to and extending into developed San Francisco.

Rock Creek Park

By Gail Spilsbury. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003; 83 pp., illustrations, notes; cloth $24.95.

Gail Spilsbury aims to create a "visual commemoration" of Rock Creek Park by weaving in a brief contextual history to revive an appreciation of the legacy of Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr.'s vision for this now famous urban park. The visual quality of *Rock Creek Park* is impressive and is a worthy companion to diplomat and historian James Bryce's *The Nation's Capital* (1913), an illustrated text that paid tribute to the park. Bryce noted, "I know of no great city in Europe (except Constantinople) that has quite close, in its very environs, such beautiful scenery as has Washington in Rock Creek Park."[1] *Rock Creek Park*'s design and its layout of historic and contemporary photographs, paintings, maps, and measured drawings, all reproduced in black and white, evoke the sumptuous look and print quality of early 20th-century books. The illustrations in *Rock Creek Park* alone are a worthy homage to the Olmsted firm and their visionary plan for the Rock Creek valley, expressed generally in the 1902 McMillan Plan and later formalized in the 1918 Rock Creek Park master plan.

At its heart, this book is an unabashed tribute to the Olmsteds and a landscape philosophy that preserved and shaped Rock Creek Park. Three concise chapters highlight Rock Creek's evolution into a national park, the influence of the McMillan Plan of 1902, and the storied careers of the Olmsteds, renowned landscape architect Frederick Law Olmsted, son Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr., and stepson John Charles Olmsted, and their contributions to park and urban planning in the United States. A fourth chapter describes and excerpts key passages from the Olmsted firm's 1918 report. Appendices cover a park administration timeline, principal flora, notable bridges, and visitor information.

Spilsbury's historical narrative meets its intent of providing the reader with a "pleasurable glimpse" into the complex planning history of Washington, DC, underpinning the development of Rock Creek Park. The book provides source notes and an ample bibliography to pursue further study of those historical themes. Like many books related to the interpretation of historic places or environmental preserves, the intended audience is the general public. For park visitors or local residents who hike and bike in the park and know it well, this book is a handsome keepsake outlining the environmental history of Rock Creek Park and provides a passionate argument for the preservation of its natural beauty. For cultural resource professionals looking to find historical information on the built environment of Rock Creek Park—its historic bridges, buildings, roads, bridal paths, hiking trails, picnic areas, and golf course—the book's brevity will be a drawback as important themes are not explored.

For example, road improvements receive only scant mention. The core of the historic road network of Rock Creek Park, the first major program of park improvements, was in place before the 1918 report. They were a prominent component of Olmsted's park master plan. The study called for an arterial system of parkways that would follow the routes of the main tributaries of Rock Creek and Piney Branch and three major cross-valley thoroughfares (never built as planned). Regraded older existing roads and new roads were constructed under the direction of the Army Corps of Engineers. This road network determined the modern character of Rock Creek Park, and the preservation of Rock Creek Park hinges on retaining their alignment, width, scenic character, and control of traffic volume.

Rock Creek Park does achieve the stated goal of the author to share the 1918 Rock Creek Park Report with the public and to renew interest in the historic significance of Olmsted's long-range planning for the park. The report was an indispensable resource for a generation of park managers from 1921 to about 1950. Its definition of distinctive natural areas and its description of the ways recreational facilities should be carefully woven into the landscape guided park officials whenever major decisions were made. Gail Spilsbury underlines that the Olmsted plan remains invaluable today as a document of the park's environmental condition and demonstrates that this master plan provides historical evidence that much of the park's landscape retains its 19th- and early 20th-century character.

William B. Bushong
White House Historical Association

1. James Bryce, *The Nation's Capital* (Washington, DC: Committee of One Hundred on the Future Development of Washington, DC, 1913).

Lines on the Land: Writers, Art, and the National Parks

By Scott Herring. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2004; 216 pp., illustrations, notes, bibliography; cloth $49.50; paper $16.50.

Everyone comes to America's national parks with preconceptions, expectations, and downright prejudices. When Scott Herring arrived to work for the concessioner in Yellowstone one summer, it was in the guise of an English major steeped in Wordsworth and with Edward Abbey's *Desert Solitaire* in his duffel bag, bringing with him, by his own admission, all the mental baggage that implies. He ended up pumping gas and—inexplicably, since he had no aptitude for it—working as a mechanic at a gas station at Old Faithful. His listening point, the locus for his "national park experience," was a trailer bunkhouse in the nearby service area.

Well and duly hidden from tourists by a beautiful screen of trees, this anti-majestic landscape of sewage lagoons and diesel fumes is vividly described in the opening pages of this often-engaging book. To judge from its beginning, one might expect *Lines on the Land* to be another of those angry books that depends for its effect on criticizing the national parks, the more so since at the outset Herring declares (truly enough) that the literary stance vis-à-vis the parks has gone from celebration in the early days to disillusionment to, now, raw fury at what hordes of tourists and others have done to these places. This anger, rooted in a deep sense of aesthetic betrayal, is the central theme of the book.

Fortunately, Herring, who now teaches English at the University of California–Davis, is much too thoughtful to leave things at such a facile level. He does thoroughly chronicle the various permutations of disgust that mass tourism in the parks has elicited from writers over the past 40 to 50 years, a theme preeminently mastered by Abbey, whose work is treated at length. But more interesting are Herring's explorations of the ambiguous reactions of writers such as Jack Turner *(The Abstract Wild)*, Gary Snyder (*Turtle Island*), and Vladimir Nabokov (yes, the infamous *Lolita* touches upon, if only very tangentially, the parks). Although there are elements of "lit-crit" analysis at various junctures, Herring has the refreshing ability to step back from academic-speak and reconnect the important points at issue with real-life experience. This comes, I suspect, from his having actually grubbed around in Yellowstone for several seasons.

The primary thing I took away from the book (having myself once edited an anthology of writers' encounters with the national parks) is a renewed sense of how deeply the parks have embedded themselves in the American literary imagination. We are not surprised to find a Steinbeck engaging these places, but would we expect the poets and spouses Sylvia Plath and Ted Hughes to have had a life-changing experience in Yellowstone? Well, they did, and Herring lets us understand their rather morbid introspections through a lucid analysis that is grounded in a sense of sympathy for fellow human beings struggling to come to terms with a mythic, forbidding landscape dominated by other-than-human habitants.

There are two difficulties with *Lines on the Land*. First, like so many books that claim to be about "the parks," the writings and art Herring surveys are mostly about only a handful of the most famous western parks, preponderantly Yellowstone. Iconic, they are; representative of the diversity of the National Park System, they are not. In a place like Big Bend or Isle Royale or the topside of Mammoth Cave, among dozens of others, the "ideal park experience" combining solitude and great beauty—the antidote, in short, for the angry reaction that is the subject of the book—is there to be had for anyone willing to venture a hundred yards beyond the most heavily used areas of the front country. To his great credit, Herring realizes the basic truth of this, ending the book by declaring that, "the pleasure I take from parks has grown immensely stronger since I came to understand that they are not 'dying.'" He is right to warn us away from a kind of hyperbole that has become habitual in environmental writing. Old Faithful may be ground zero for the type of park experience most connoisseurs do not want to have, but the coast-to-coast diversity of the National Park System is precisely what provides the possibility for people to have an ideal park experience somewhere.

The second and more important shortcoming is the book's tendency toward diffuseness. Herring jumps from Muir to Abbey to Robert Pirsig (he of *Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance)* to Kipling to Vonnegut to Plath/Hughes to Rick Bass and after awhile it seems like we are skimming the surface of the stream by skipping from rock to slippery rock. The feeling of diffuseness is exacerbated by the uneven discussion of artists, which seems little more than a throw-in, far too small in proportion to the space given novelists and essayists. Early

on we get a section on Thomas Moran's Yellowstone paintings, but then, later, only a scattering of short analyses of Ansel Adams and some contemporary satirical photographers. Although focusing exclusively on writers would have deprived us of such things as Herring's analysis of the very witty parody photograph by Ted Orland that graces the cover, overall I think the book would have benefited from a more concentrated editorial approach.

Still, *Lines on the Land* is well worth taking time to read. If you do, you will be in the company of a competent and discerning guide to the changing cultural meanings that have been projected upon, and found in, America's national parks.

David Harmon
George Wright Society

An Architectural Guidebook to the National Parks: California, Oregon, Washington

An Architectural Guidebook to the National Parks: Arizona, New Mexico, Texas

By Harvey H. Kaiser. Layton, UT: Gibbs Smith, 2002 and 2003; paper $21.95 and $16.95.

Harvey H. Kaiser, scholar of the rustic architecture of the national parks and author of *Landmarks in the Landscape* and *Great Camps of the Adirondacks*, offers two regional guidebooks to national park architecture. These volumes, which he refers to as the "The Far West Book" and "The Southwest Book," serve as true guidebooks providing practical information on visiting and enjoying the architectural resources of 40 national parks (and 1 national forest site) in 6 states. Each section includes a map and driving directions, as well as the government website for each unit.

Kaiser begins by describing the natural setting of the park, and then he relates the cultural history from the earliest Native American groups associated with the land, through the period of territorial and colonial settlement, to the eventual development and conversion to national park status. Quotes from noted park creators and developers, historians, architects, and archeologists highlight the significance and beauty of the featured structures. Of particular interest are the numerous sidebars outlining influential people, events, and natural and cultural history associated with the parks and their architecture. Included in Kaiser's architectural descriptions of the historic structures is the history of preservation, rehabilitation, and reconstruction of these buildings by the National Park Service.

"The Far West Book" features the familiar big lodges of sites like Yosemite, Mount Rainier, and Olympic National Parks. These wilderness mansions, set ingeniously within natural landscapes, reflect integrity of design in form, structure, and materials. Kaiser also includes lesser-known remote destinations such as Manzanar National Historic Site and Lewis and Clark National Historical Park (formerly called Fort Clatsop National Memorial), as well as the urban parks of Cabrillo National Monument, Golden Gate National Recreation Area, and San Francisco Maritime National Historical Park. The architecture at Manzanar and Lewis and Clark, far from being monumental, is spare or even reconstructed. [*Editor's note: On October 3, 2005, a fire destroyed the replica of Fort Clatsop at Lewis and Clark National Historical Park. For more information go to: http://www.nps.gov/lewi.*] Kaiser acknowledges the significance of buildings of lesser design or authenticity that nevertheless contribute to powerful cultural landscapes. Kaiser also describes sites, buildings, and structures of importance in engineering and technology, such as the lighthouses at Cabrillo and Point Reyes National Seashore, the vessels of San Francisco Maritime, a suspension bridge at Mount Rainier, and artillery casements at Fort Point National Historic Site.

The format of "The Southwest Book" pays tribute to the Route 66 tourist experience with rounded page corners, informal title fonts, and maps with a hand-drawn quality. While the big lodges and the early 20th-century buildings by the architect Mary Elizabeth Jane Colter at Grand Canyon National Park are featured, the book is mostly given over to the smaller national parks and monuments that pepper the region. The national parks of the southwest tend to honor the remains of Native American villages, Spanish missions, and United States military forts. Kaiser describes not only these lonely and monumental structures of stone and adobe, but also the architecture that resulted from the sites becoming part of the National Park System. These buildings, designed by National Park Service architects, were the work of the Civilian Conservation Corps and the Works Progress Administration during the Great Depression, and represent a school of small-scale rustic design parallel to the grand timber and stone lodges constructed to the north. Many of these buildings are designated National Historic Landmarks, such as the Painted Desert Inn at Petrified Forest National Park, or contribute to National Historic Landmark districts, such as at Bandelier National Monument.

In these two books, Kaiser continues to revere the tradition of rustic design in its congruent use of local materials, harmonious setting and scale in the surrounding environment, and use of natural design elements and schemes. Still, the volumes are not limited to wilderness "parkitecture" but illustrate the diverse and eclectic selection of Victorian homes, abandoned mines, eccentric mansions, and archeological treasures found in our national parks. The regional guidebook format invites readers to plan trips of architectural discovery in our cities, the large parks of natural wonders, and small shrines to our nation's history.

Mary E. Slater
National Park Service

Appomattox Court House: Appomattox Court House National Historical Park, Virginia

National Park Handbook Series. Washington, DC: Division of Publications, National Park Service, U. S. Department of the Interior, 2002; 129 pp., illustrations, maps, index; paper $11.50.

This handsome little volume is so well done, it could almost substitute for an in-person tour of Appomattox Court House National Historical Park. The book is divided into four parts or chapters. The first three contain essays by leading scholars and focus on the events just prior to the Civil War, the last hours of the Army of Northern Virginia, and the efforts to piece the nation back together after the war. The essays are written for general readers and visitors who will also benefit from the fourth section, a guide to the park.

Although this is a handbook for Appomattox Court House National Historic Park, the compilers have sought to educate readers about the Civil War to place in context the momentous events that occurred in this sleepy village in April 1865. Three eminent historians provide this background, each telling part of the story. Written by Edward L. Ayers, the first essay is entitled "Slavery, Economics, and Constitutional Ideals" and focuses on the decades prior to the South's secession. Professor Ayers does an outstanding job in just a few pages, chronicling the significant events leading up to the war. Dismissing the possibility that the war began over constitutional ideals or competing economic interests, he turns his attention to the issue of slavery and maintains, as do most historians, that the causes of the Civil War turned on that issue. He asserts that the passionate debate over slavery, especially its extension into the territories.

engendered distrust and animosity. For both Northerners and Southerners, "[t]he Civil War began in expectation of easy victory over a detested enemy, a quick and satisfying ending to a long and frustrating argument." Ayers adds, however, that no one at the time realized how long the war would last or the suffering and devastation it would bring.

A timeline carries the story from 1861 to March 1865, just before the Appomattox campaign began. Gary W. Gallagher picks up the story in early 1865 in an essay entitled "An End and a New Beginning." He provides a good play-by-play account of Confederate General Robert E. Lee's attempt to break out of the siege at Petersburg, where his army had been for 10 months, and link up with the Rebel army in North Carolina under the command of General Joseph E. Johnston. As Union forces closed in on Lee's beleaguered and dwindling army near Appomattox Court House, Lee saw the handwriting on the wall and surrendered to avoid further bloodshed. Gallagher admits that Lee had in fact done little more than surrender one of several Confederate armies—

yet Lee and the Army of Northern Virginia loomed so large—as the Confederacy's primary national institution and the Union's principal enemy—that most people, North and South, believed its surrender marked the end of the war.

Gallagher praises the way the two accomplished commanders handled the surrender: "Grant and Lee might have stoked bitterness with a different handling of the surrender. They chose instead to craft an agreement with the best interests of their peoples firmly in mind." The generous handling of the events at Appomattox as well as the conduct of the leaders demonstrated to all Americans that the time for reconciliation had come.

David W. Blight wraps up the essays with his piece on the postwar era. He notes that the nation faced many challenges immediately after the war: reconstructing the Union; determining the political status of the freedmen; and caring for and protecting the former slaves in a South that was largely unrepentant. Blight covers the conflict between the President and Congress over Reconstruction policy, the emergence of the sharecropping system of labor, Southern Redemption, and the Lost Cause ideology, to which many Southerners today still adhere. He also comments on the meaning of Appomattox and reminds readers that it is an "important symbol of national reconciliation. It has been the peace begun there, and not the war ended, that Americans have most wanted to remember."

These three essays are well done and leave readers with a sound understanding of the park's historical significance. Interspersed among the book's pages are excellent illustrations, charts, and quotes, which add to what is being discussed in the text. The book also contains sidebars on little-known related topics, such as the role of African American soldiers in the campaign and the story of the Sweeney family of Appomattox Court House. These extras are nicely done and truly enhance the book.

The fourth part of the book is devoted to the village of Appomattox Court House, Virginia, encompassed in the park site. This section functions as a first-rate guide to the park; it contains high-quality photographs of the buildings (both original and reconstructed) and shows how the village looked at the time of Lee's surrender. Each photograph caption provides readers with interesting details about the buildings. A layout of the entire town is also provided, including the buildings that existed in 1865 but no longer stand. Much attention is devoted to the reconstructed McLean House where the surrender took place, but the reader is left wanting to know more about the house, particularly how it was completely rebuilt in the 1940s to look exactly as it did in 1865. The book concludes with a lengthy list of suggestions for further reading and a useful index.

This is a nifty little book. In fact, it would make an excellent teaching tool for secondary school teachers. The essays are straightforward and provide an easy-to-read summary of the major events that occurred during this critical period of American history. (Teachers would need to supplement the essays with additional information, however.) Furthermore, the outstanding drawings, superb illustrations, and fascinating quotes would certainly capture the interest of the pupils as well as other general readers. Indeed, *Appomattox Court House* would make a fine addition to the collection of anyone interested in the Civil War, for the events in April 1865 come to life on the pages of this impressive volume.

Kent T. Dollar
Tennessee Technological University

Landmarks of the American Revolution

By Gary B. Nash. American Landmarks Series, New York: Oxford University Press, in association with the National Register of Historic Places, National Park Service, the National Park Foundation, and the Gilder Lehrman Association, 2003; 160 pp., illustrations, bibliography, index; cloth $30.00.

This volume is one of the latest editions to the American Landmarks series. The stated intent of series general editor, James Oliver Horton, is to present an aspect of American history—in this case the American Revolution—using extant historic properties to illustrate the volumes, as "any historical event is much better understood with the context of its historical setting." At least a dozen of these volumes will be published covering diverse areas of American social, political, and military history.

As might be expected from such a well-known publisher and experts in this field, this volume is very well written and contains historical and contemporary illustrations that greatly enhance the text. The text is a fine example of what some scholars have called the "New American History." Instead of concentrating solely on traditional American historical figures and the battlefield events of the American Revolution, the author presents history from the point of view of diverse ethnic, social, and cultural backgrounds, often based on a multidisciplinary approach of oral and written history, archeology, and anthropology.

In this volume, the viewpoints of enslaved peoples, women, common soldiers, Native Americans, and British loyalists and their English compatriots who participated in the American Revolution are presented. One of the author's main strengths is not merely presenting a range of ideas and viewpoints, but offering readers information on the physical manifestations—homes, towns, battlefields, and sites—where people lived and worked.

The history of historic preservation is a relatively new field of study. The history presented in the text is impressive, detailing how following the American Revolution organizations, agencies, and individuals banded together to preserve properties for the future. The author keenly understands the importance of the present generation comprehending the commitment and purpose of past generations who preserved these landmarks of the American Revolution.

That being said, there are also some things missing. For example, some of the more significant battle and encampment sites managed and interpreted by the National Park Service were downplayed or not mentioned, such as Saratoga, Morristown, and Guilford Courthouse. From this reviewer's southeastern perspective, the book suffers from the omission of the viewpoints and historic properties representing slave-owning American patriots, British loyalists forced to relocate to St. Augustine, and the Spanish military contributions to the American cause on the Gulf Coast. Likewise, the

successful southern campaigns of the British forces at Savannah and Charleston, and the numerous small-scale engagements throughout the Carolinas were glossed over or omitted. Possibly the story of the American Revolution and its related historic places is so big it deserves a companion volume to the one being reviewed.

Finally, some of the historical properties were misidentified with regard to their level of National Historic Landmark or National Register of Historic Places status. For example, Robert Venturi's late 20th-century steel tubular frame of Ben Franklin's House in Philadelphia and the Marblehead Historic District in Massachusetts are not National Historic Landmarks. The page heading for the Fort Pulaski National Monument is misleading as this property is a massive Second System Coastal Defense Fort, located some miles downstream from Savannah, Georgia, while the text describes a stone monument in Monterey Square, in Savannah, dedicated by Marquis de Lafayette in 1825.

Who will use this volume? Students are undoubtedly the prime audience for this volume, as are museum and historic site visitors. Exposure to good writing on the subject of the American Revolution and the physical remains of the properties and places discussed in the text cannot fail to inspire the readers. At the same time, people involved in the new approach to American history and the history of historic preservation should find this volume of great interest.

Mark R. Barnes
National Park Service

Landmarks of American Women's History

By Page Putnam Miller. American Landmarks Series, New York: Oxford University Press in association with the National Register of Historic Places, National Park Service, the National Park Foundation, 2003; 144 pp., illustrations, bibliography, index; cloth $30.00.

James Oliver Horton, general editor of the American Landmarks Series, states in the introduction to *Landmarks of American Women's History*, "any historical event is much better understood within the context of its historical setting." It is upon this idea that the American Landmark Series is based. In this edition, author Page Putnam Miller chose historic places listed on the National Register of Historic Places that not only illustrate a particular event or person in American women's history, but also a broader subject. Arranged chronologically, the chapters cover the breadth of American women's history, from the pre-colonial period to the first half of the 20th century, as well as women's activities in such areas as religion and business.

Each chapter has a similar layout. A sidebar provides more detailed information about the focal site, including its location, website if available, and a significance statement. Each chapter concludes with a related historic places section. One of the most interesting features included in almost all the chapters is a section containing a primary source relating to the chapter's subject. Miller has chosen a wide variety of examples to show the richness of available resources to historians, including: written documents, such as a 1756 letter from an indentured servant living in Maryland to her father in London; biographies, like that of Nampeyo, a highly respected Hopi female potter; and graphics, such as the drawing of the Bryn Mawr College campus. The only disappointment of this feature is that archeological resources and objects are not included, although they do serve as illustrations in a few of the chapters. *Landmarks of American Women's*

History concludes with a timeline, a short reading list, and a good index.

Miller is ambitious in tackling such a wide range of subjects and in attempting to fulfill the dual purpose of illustrating both a specific event and extrapolating from that the larger context in which the event took place. Some chapters accomplish this more successfully than others, such as the chapter on the role of women in the reform movements of the Progressive Era. By the end of the 19th century, American society viewed women's work in charitable and social service organizations as acceptable since it was an extension of their roles in the private sphere of the home. The United Charities Building in New York City represents the increasing role of women in organized charitable activities at the turn of the 20th century and how that led to the development of the social sciences.

The chapter on the M. Carey Thomas Library at Bryn Mawr College in Pennsylvania successfully integrates discussion of a historic place and its contextual history. While society deemed it necessary for women to have some education in order to be better mothers and to fulfill the need for teachers, there were also attendant concerns about *over* educating women in the early 20th century. M. Carey Thomas, the feminist president of Bryn Mawr from 1894 to 1922, insisted on an open campus design like that at Oxford and Cambridge and a showcase library, reflecting her educational philosophy and her belief in the importance of research.

Other chapters are less successful, however, in drawing out the larger contextual themes that surround a particular historic place. In two chapters (Chapter 8, "Asilomar Conference Center: Breaking Professional Barriers" and Chapter 10, "Pewabic Pottery: Experimenting with Art Forms"), the analysis of the historic place never substantially reaches beyond its physical parameters to address the big picture. One chapter notes the illustrious career of Julia Morgan, who began designing the Asilomar Conference Center in Pacific Grove, California, in 1912 for the Young Women's Christian Association. Morgan was the first woman to graduate from the Ecole des Beaux-Arts, and the first woman to obtain a California architect's license. Miller, however, fails to extrapolate a more substantive discussion of women "breaking professional barriers" in the early 20th century. Instead, the reader is left with an interesting chapter on a significant woman, but with little sense of her relation to larger issues of American women's history. Similarly, the chapter on the Pewabic Pottery ceramic studio in Detroit, Michigan, and specifically potter Mary Chase Perry Stratton, provides a fascinating look at an innovative female artist. This narrow focus on one artist is not expanded to a larger discussion of women's roles in the arts in the 20th century.

The only major flaw of *Landmarks of American Women's History* is the seeming lack of methodology. Miller does not reveal how she chose the historic places included in the volume, leaving open questions as to why certain topics and groups of people were excluded. For example, why are no sites included that focus on enslaved, indentured, or immigrant women? Why is there not a chapter looking at mid-century America, particularly since such sites are increasingly considered "historic"? One reason may be that this is one of a series that also includes separate volumes on slavery and immigration, but a brief explanation in the preface would have been helpful.

Landmarks of American Women's History is an accessible introduction to the wide range of both sites and topics relevant to American women's history. It also serves as an exciting example of how preservation and public history professionals can integrate historic place with history, in the process making both more relevant to the public.

Justine Christianson
National Park Service

EXHIBITS

America on the Move

Smithsonian Institution, National Museum of American History, Behring Center, Washington, DC. Project Director: Steven Lubar; curators: Janet Davidson, Laura Hansen, Michael R. Harrison, Paula Johnson, Peter Liebhold, Bonnie Lilienfeld, Susan Tolbert, Roger White, and Bill Withuhn

Permanent exhibit

America on the Move is the result of a 3-year, $22 million redesign of the National Museum of American History's surface transportation exhibit.[1] From the museum's opening in 1964 through the 1990s, the Smithsonian's carriages, bicycles, and automobiles were displayed in series, suggesting a simple march of progress. The new exhibit places the vehicles in context, emphasizing their place in the American landscape and in the lives of the people who used them.

The exhibit displays the changes in surface transportation since the 1870s using 15 settings, each representing a specific place, time, and mode of transportation. For example, instead of placing a 1955 Ford station wagon in a line of family automobiles and a 1953 Schwinn child's bicycle in a procession of bicycles, the curators have put the two together in front of a wall-sized enlargement of an ad for homes in Park Forest, Illinois. Mannequins pose next to the vehicles, and in a typically witty touch, a replica 1950s television plays clips from *Leave it to Beaver*, completing the sketch of transportation's role in a postwar suburb. In each setting, centerpiece vehicles are surrounded by a wealth of smaller artifacts, photographs, models, video screens, and interactive displays, such as mock packing crates that open to reveal the variety of goods once shipped by train. Music, recorded conversations, and the chance to sit on a train station's waiting room bench or in a Chicago "L" car complete the immersion experience.

America on the Move's main theme is that transportation is bound up in broader decisions about the built environment. Artifacts tell much of the story: An explanation of the relationship between streetcar expansion and suburbanization is fleshed out with a lawn mower, while a 1939 Plymouth coupe appears next to a Maryland tourist cabin. The second theme is that changes in transportation were the products of choices by regular people. Particularly good is the section on the development of containerized shipping, in which goods are packed into standardized metal containers that can be shipped by sea, rail, or road, rather than requiring the difficult and dangerous work of loading individual bales and barrels by hand. The section explains the benefits to both shipping companies and longshoremen while acknowledging the longshoremen's sense of loss and the frustrations that led to the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union 130-day strike in 1971. Like the exhibit as a whole, this section combines video, models, text, and artifacts to tell a story far more effectively than any one medium.

The exhibit is not shy about transportation's darker side. The display of a 1927 North Carolina railroad station emphasizes the rigidity of Jim Crow, using the words of teacher and activist Charlotte

Visitors to America on the Move *can experience riding the Chicago Transit Authority "L" train, complete with sound and moving images. (Courtesy of National Museum of American History)*

Hawkins Brown. A 1939 Indiana school bus is joined by a display documenting the disappearance of the one-room schoolhouse, and the five vehicles displayed on a short stretch of interstate highway call to mind the ubiquitous traffic jam. On the other hand, the trope of progress is still visually dominant. With the exception of a 1929 Oakland sedan illustrating the Okie migration to California, the vehicles have been restored to showroom luster. The dangers of the automobile are represented in photographs and a copy of *Unsafe at Any Speed*, but none of the cars themselves are displayed as wrecks, and the carnage of streetcar and railroad accidents is ignored.

Even more obscure is the role of public policy. Admittedly, the process of passing a highway bill is not visually stimulating. However, more emphasis in the display texts and computer kiosks would have helped explain the decline of the railroads, or the reason why the 1977 Honda Civic on display got better mileage than almost any car on the market today. When the exhibit does address public policy, as in a display about the freeway revolt of the 1960s and 1970s, the treatments are balanced and visually appealing.

The most ironic silence is the lack of technical detail. Determined to avoid the rivet-counting, internalist approach of earlier exhibits, the curators have provided almost no explanation of what the vehicles were made of, how they worked, or how they performed. We get a display of early accessories—such as a 1915 car alarm—and a video gushing that computers are embedded throughout the transportation system. But the curators have not tried to explain the workings or social construction of key technologies such as transition curves, catalytic converters, air traffic control, or even minor doodads like the spotlight on that 1955 Ford.

Although the exhibit cannot tell every story, it tells its main story remarkably well. Whether visitors focus only on the largest artifacts or devote their time to the text or the interactive displays, all will absorb the basic thesis that transportation is about place. And all will sense that transportation is not the exclusive province of planners and engineers, but a part of our shared history and culture. Whether they get home on foot, by subway, taxi, car, or airplane, they will depart *America on the Move* with a greater understanding.

Zachary M. Schrag
George Mason University

1. The exhibit is accompanied by a book, Janet F. Davidson and Michael S. Sweeney, *On the Move: Transportation and the American Story* (Washington, DC: National Geographic, 2003); a DVD, *America on the Move* (New York, NY: A&E Television Networks, distributed by New Video, 2004); and a website, http://americanhistory.si.edu/onthemove/.

Archaeology and the Native Peoples of Tennessee

McClung Museum, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN; Exhibit design and fabrication: Design Craftsmen, Inc.; Architecture: Barber and McMurray, Inc.

Permanent exhibit

Utilizing multimedia and anchored by the Frank H. McClung Museum's collection of prehistoric and historic Native American artifacts, *Archaeology and the Native Peoples of Tennessee* is an effective presentation of the state's indigenous past. This exhibit builds upon the strength of the museum's collections in anthropology, archeology, and local history, while touching upon its other core collections in decorative arts and natural history. As the title indicates, the exhibit focuses on the native peoples of the region, including the pre-Columbian cultures in what later became Tennessee and the Cherokee, Creek, Chickasaw, Shawnee, and Yuchi tribes that had emerged by the 18th century.

A Smithsonian Institution affiliate, the McClung Museum is an integral part of the University of

The Archaeology and the Native Peoples of Tennessee *exhibit opens with a timeline of historic periods related to Native Americans in Tennessee history. (Courtesy of Design Craftsmen)*

The exhibit relates the significance of the white-tailed deer to Native Americans through interactive panels containing artifacts. (Courtesy of Design Craftsmen)

Tennessee. The University has been in the forefront of archeological research in the Southeast since the 1930s, and the exhibit reflects this leadership in its content. Each part of the exhibit is solidly grounded in current research and scholarship.

Archaeology and the Native Peoples of Tennessee is organized into five historical periods that are briefly introduced via a timeline at the exhibit entrance. This organizational scheme is appropriate for the topic, since American Indians (and their ancestors) were not organized into historic tribes until fairly recently, and scholars instead look at lifeways to conceptualize the region's past. The periods—Paleoindian, Archaic, Woodland, Mississippian, and Historic—are arranged in chronological order along the perimeter of a circular exhibit space. Five additional displays in the center of the space, geared primarily towards children and young adults, focus on general archeological topics such as site dating and tools and their uses, as well as on topics specific to the region, such as the importance of white-tailed deer to indigenous peoples in the eastern parts of North America.

Separate displays for each period focus on society, technology, subsistence, ritual, and art. Supplemental displays focus on particularly important developments, such as pottery use in the Woodland period. These displays take a number of innovative forms. Complementing some of the standard artifact cases and attractive wall displays by muralist Greg Harlin are clear-topped cases set into the floor showing artifacts and archeological features as if they were just uncovered in the field (such as a dog burial, a flint-knapping area where indigenous peoples made stone tools, and a food preparation site). Some of the displays are equipped with artifact drawers for those visitors who would like to see more examples of a type of artifact or learn more about a topic.

The artifacts themselves are astounding and range from Mississippian shell gorgets (exquisitely rendered shell decorations worn by men around their necks) to the Duck River Cache (one of the great examples of ceremonial flint knapping in the Americas) and the infamous Bat Creek Stone. Once thought to have ancient Hebrew written on its surface but now generally considered a 19th-century hoax, the stone serves as a point of departure for discussing the Moundbuilder Controversy and other efforts to sever historic Indian tribes from the great accomplishments of the pre-Columbian past.

Overall, the exhibit reflects the present state of the scholarship on the subject, including its strengths and weaknesses. For example, the exhibit's Mississippian historical period highlights the visually impressive, large-scale settlements, while giving scant attention to the many smaller Mississippian farmsteads in the region. It is hoped that as researchers turn to new and neglected topics in the future the permanent exhibit can be updated, thus continuing the strong link between research and interpretation.

The exhibit has some flaws. The dominance of the Cherokee in the Historic section, while understandable in East Tennessee, tends to obscure the role of other historic tribes in the state. It implies that the Cherokee were the physical and cultural descendants of Mississippian peoples, an argument that can also be made for other groups such as the Creek or Natchez. Acculturation and trade between European Americans and Indians are discussed primarily in the context of the deerskin trade, but no mention is made of the substantial early trade in Indian slaves. The accompanying film has similar problems in emphasis. It notes, for example, that the Cherokee was the only tribe living in the state without explaining that this was because the Cherokee and Chickasaw twice combined in the early 18th century to drive the Shawnee out of Middle Tennessee. Both the main exhibit and film tell the story of the Trail of Tears, but the larger impact of Indian removal on Tennessee and the United States is unexplored.

Overall, the exhibit is attractive and well designed. It incorporates recent historical and archeological scholarship and strongly reflects the institution's mission. It is also innovative and effective in communicating the historical themes of cultural change, interaction, and persistence. *Archaeology and the Native Peoples of Tennessee* contains much of value for both cultural resource professionals and the broader general public. For preservationists, the exhibit directly confronts the difficulty of interpreting artifacts from sites later destroyed by development, while providing a model for adding relevant context. For the public the exhibit provides a broad overview of the state's past cultures and their histories, enhanced by the fascinating objects these peoples created.

Joseph C. Douglas
Volunteer State Community College

Highway to the Past:
The Archaeology of Boston's Big Dig

Commonwealth Museum, Boston, MA. Curator: Anne-Eliza Lewis

On exhibit into 2006

Boston's recently completed "Big Dig" gained widespread notoriety as the most expensive U.S. highway project of all time. The Central Artery Project, as it is officially known, replaced elevated highways with new tunnels cutting through Boston's congested waterfront and a third harbor tunnel link with Logan Airport. Federal and state sponsored survey and data recovery work by archeologists from area institutions and cultural resources management firms took nearly a decade to complete. By virtue of its scale, methods, and results, archeology of the Big Dig will shape the future practice of urban historical archeology in New England.

Highway to the Past: The Archaeology of Boston's Big Dig, its companion booklet, and virtual exhibit highlight the results of nearly a decade of Big Dig archeological discoveries.[1] The story of Boston, including the formation of the Boston Harbor and the city's pre-colonial, colonial, and post-colonial past, is ably told through a narrative highlighting Big Dig sites. The result is a unique and broad perspective on the material lives of countless generations of Bostonians.

Highway to the Past places the artifacts and other archeological evidence unearthed during the Big Dig in their historical environmental and social contexts. The peopling of the Boston region is presented in the context of the formation of Boston Harbor itself between 4,000 and 10,000 years ago. The exhibit takes advantage of new geotechnical data and advances in digital mapping technology to depict the shifting shorelines of Massachusetts Bay, and it presents data on the flora and fauna of the area along with lithic and ceramic artifacts from Spectacle Island, which was capped with Big Dig landfill. During the colonial era, area inhabitants cut docks into existing marshes, built wharves along the shorelines, and tapped area tidal ponds for running gristmills. These examples of how our colonial ancestors modified the environment to address human needs are among the more memorable environmental messages of the exhibit.

In terms of social context, the exhibit uses archeological evidence to explore the formation of Boston's distinctive and somewhat insular neighborhoods. Charlestown and Boston, for instance, were once separate towns, and their identities have been shaped by their different historical trajectories. Founded by English Puritans a year before they were invited to settle Boston proper, Charlestown is represented by three colonial sites: the Town Dock, the Parker Harris Pottery, and the Three Cranes Tavern. Respectively, these sites illustrate the commercial, industrial, and consumer habits of a prosperous Massachusetts Bay community on the eve of the American Revolution. Spectacular examples of reconstructed imported and local ceramics dominate the exhibit cases and are complemented by examples of metal, bone, and glass artifacts.

Several colonial sites in Boston's North End were excavated and their original occupants identified through historical records. The most spectacular of them is also one of Boston's earliest: the Katherine Naylor privy. Katherine Naylor was born in 1630 in England and later became a North End resident. A privy dating to the last quarter of the 17th century

This mannequin sports 17th-century garb for the fashion display in the Highway to the Past *exhibit. (Courtesy of the Commonwealth Museum)*

was found at her house lot, containing artifacts reflecting the wealth of her merchant husband. Visitors can see well-preserved samples of the 250,000 seeds and more than 150 fragments of lace and shoes excavated from the site. The earliest known example of a wooden bowling ball was also discovered in the privy, and an explanation of the colonial version of bowling is featured in one exhibit case.

The North End site of John Carnes's 1730 workhouse returns the visitor to the theme of colonial manufacturing. Carnes was a metalworker specializing in pewter and brass. While only one pewter tankard attributed to him survives in museum collections, his site was littered with evidence of his tools and small decorative metal pieces. Thomas Cain's South Boston Flint Glassworks (1812-1827) and the American Glass Company (1847-1857) carry the exhibit's manufacturing theme into the 19th century.

Highway to the Past offers a unique archeological perspective on Boston's early inhabitants and fills a critical need for public access to archeological information. The exhibit includes interactive computer displays, a stratigraphy puzzle, general information on archeology, and even theater seating for group discussions and presentations. Exhibit captions tend to be lengthy and academic, which may discourage younger readers; however,

the elegant display of artifacts and visual information is sure to engage all.

Boston is rich in museums preserving and interpreting some facet of the city's past. However, only the Commonwealth Museum has succeeded in integrating material culture of common Bostonians into a remarkable story of environmental, social, and economic adaptation across centuries. This exhibit illustrates the value of federal and state historic preservation legislation, such as Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. The cost of the Big Dig was considerable, but the public and scientific value of Big Dig archeology is priceless.

Steven R. Pendery
National Park Service

1. An online version of the exhibit is available at http://www.sec.state.ma.us/mhc/mhcexh/musprv/prvidx.htm, as well as an exhibit catalog, *Highway to the Past: The Archaeology of Boston's Big Dig* (Boston, MA: Massachusetts Historical Commission, 2001).

Furniture in Maryland Life

Maryland Historical Society, Baltimore, MD. Curator: Jeannine A. Disviscour; Exhibition team: Erin Kimes, Nancy Davis, Paul Rubenson, Gregory R. Weidman, Charles Mack, Paula J. Bogert, and Lynn Springer Roberts

Permanent exhibit

With a high ceiling, lots of light, and a jumble of fancy tables, chairs, cabinets, and desks arranged on two terraced levels along parallel walls, a first-time visitor could be forgiven for mistaking the Dorothy Wagner Wallis Gallery of the Maryland Historical Society for some sort of furniture shrine. The large rectangular room seems like the perfect setting for a narrowly-focused exhibit on the design nuances of early Republic furniture, which is why it comes as a pleasant surprise to find that the society's permanent exhibit, *Furniture in Maryland Life*, attempts to address audiences beyond the aficionado. Indeed, rather than seeking a limited goal of portraying changing design or paying homage to famous upper-class Marylanders by placing their household items on display, the exhibit creators remind visitors of the common functions of furniture, past and present, and challenge them to "think about the furniture you use every day."

The exhibit promises to explore the manufacture, design, and function of furniture in Maryland from 1634 to the present. These three themes explicitly order the exhibit. Each major theme has a color designation, and each label carries a block of color, the theme title, and the subsection name in a header at the top to orient the reader. The usage theme is explained along the long north wall, with manufacturing arrayed along the south wall. Furniture design is explained in several freestanding displays in the center of the floor along the main axis of the room. The stories of manufacturing and design both move chronologically from west to east, but the displays in the usage section include artifacts from several time periods.

The exhibit attempts to be inclusive of the entire sweep of Maryland history from the organization of the colony in 1634 to the present day, but the display overwhelmingly focuses on furniture of the late 18th and early 19th centuries. The period before the 1710s is represented only by a laminated reproduction of an estate inventory and a handful of archeological objects. The 20th century also receives relatively scant attention. Even in the exhibit's chronological area of strength, the objects on display largely represent the wealthiest segments of society; though a few objects, such as a barstool with its original deerskin seat (ca. 1830-1860) and a painted chair owned by a manumitted slave provide welcome exceptions. Much of this slant can be attributed to the fact that lower-class households before the 20th century had very little furniture at all, and what they did own tended to

get used up rather than saved and placed in museum collections.

The curators of *Furniture in Maryland Life* work to tell a human story broader than that suggested by their largely upper-class artifacts. Some labels describe the makers of the items on display, from nearly unknown carpenters to successful manufacturers. Visitors learn about the role of German immigrants in Baltimore's furniture trade, Enrico Liberti, a 20th-century maker of Colonial Revival furniture whose workbench and tools are in the exhibit, and even the story of an enslaved man who had made a rush-bottomed chair on display. Other labels help visitors understand how historians interpret the past. For instance, one label explains that attributions are usually based on the proximity of a piece to local manufacturers, and that furniture makers are often known to historians only by the advertisements they placed in local newspapers. Many labels include appropriate visual evidence, such as historic advertisements, pictures from furniture design books, and portraits of owners and makers.

Curators attempted to balance the interests of a general audience with those of furniture enthusiasts, and neither group should be disappointed. Visitors interested in the decorative arts will appreciate the large number of beautiful pieces of furniture, as well as the paintings, silverware, and porcelain items used to augment the displays. Those design features that make Maryland furniture distinctive are described on individual labels. The largest panel in the exhibit, titled "What Makes it Maryland?" summarizes and compares the design elements of Maryland-made furniture dating from the 1760s to the 1860s, using pictures of pieces used elsewhere in the exhibit.

The exhibit text attempts to balance the interests of both audiences. For example, a side chair made in the period 1790-1810 is first described stylistically, as an example of distinctive Baltimore design. The label then relates that Peter Francis Corvaux, "a free Mulato boy 16 years old," may have worked on the chair because he served as an apprentice to the attributed maker.

Furniture in Maryland is the most recent incarnation of this exhibit. An earlier installment featured a catalog and book, Gregory R. Weidman's *Furniture in Maryland, 1740-1940*, which unfortunately is out of print.[1] The current exhibit has no catalog at this time. *Furniture in Maryland Life* is a worthy addition to the permanent exhibits of the Maryland Historical Society. Despite the chronological unevenness of the collection, the curators succeeded in creating a beautiful exhibit that should appeal to both the general public and specialists interested in furniture design.

Eric Nystrom
Johns Hopkins University

1. Gregory R. Weidman, *Furniture in Maryland, 1740-1940: The Collection of the Maryland Historical Society* (Baltimore: Maryland Historical Society, 1984).

Tales of the Territory: Minnesota 1849-1858

The Minnesota History Center, St. Paul, MN; Curator: Brian Horrigan

October 1999-March 2007

When Minnesota became a territory in 1849, military officer and acclaimed artist Captain Seth Eastman painted Minnesota's territorial seal. While Eastman's original design has since been altered, his initial watercolor depicts a white male farmer plowing the earth in the foreground, while in the background, an American Indian male on horseback rides full gallop away from the scene. Such was the romantic view of U.S. expansion and Indian removal held by many of Eastman's contemporaries: The "native" naturally and inevitably gives way to "progress." Of course, the portrayal of Indian removal as a vanishing act neatly glossed

over the reality of Manifest Destiny, the active participation of the Federal Government in its implementation, and the attempts by Native peoples to resist this inevitability. The Minnesota Historical Society's exhibit, *Tales of the Territory: Minnesota 1849-1858,* attempts to revise the historiographical inaccuracies by focusing largely, though not exclusively, on just such themes.

The exhibit space is arranged in a "V" shape with entrances at the outer points. Interactive stations and displays tell the complex story of U.S. expansion on the Upper Mississippi as it was understood by those who were settling or already living in the area at the time. Special attention is paid to the perspectives of the indigenous people who had already called Minnesota home for thousands of years but who, during the territorial decade, were increasingly persuaded to cede greater and greater portions of their homelands to the United States with promises of compensation in kind.

These "promises" are both literally and figuratively the crux of the exhibit: The interpretive station focusing on treaties is at the apex of the exhibit space. This station touches upon many of the treaties and agreements between the Federal Government and the indigenous nations residing in and around the Minnesota Territory before and after the territorial decade. The Treaty of 1851 and the accompanying "Trader's Paper" receives the most attention. The former is an agreement between the United States and the Wahpetunwan and Sisitunwan bands of Dakota ceding land to the United States in exchange for money, annuities, goods, a reservation of land, and lasting peace. The latter is a document that deflected the money and annuities into the hands of traders, "mixed bloods," and missionaries who made claim to it because of credit they had purportedly extended to the Dakota in years past.

Reproductions of the documents are presented in full with commentary provided by scholar Angela Cavender Wilson and Minnesota Historical Society Indian Advisory Committee member Joe Campbell. The commentary speaks to the Treaty's lasting consequences and tacitly reminds visitors that the Dakota have not vanished from Minnesota (both commentators are Dakota tribal members). Wilson's commentary contemplates the "pain and sense of loss" that the chiefs must have felt in signing the treaty "mixed with the relief of being assured food, goods, money, and a designated home set apart, one that would not be infringed upon by whites."

Significantly, the reserved homeland promised to the Dakota in Article 3 of the Treaty of 1851 was "stricken out" before the U.S. Government ratified the treaty, but after the Dakota had signed it. Frustrated with the broken promises of the United States and struggling with the desperate conditions of his people, Kaposia chief, Taoyeteduta (Little Crow) articulated his anger and disappointment to Washington in 1858, saying—

...we signed the treaties...and we were promised a great many things—now it appears the wind blows it all off. Now what have we? We have neither the land where our fathers' bones are bleached, nor have we anything. What shall we do?

These words of Taoyeteduta are given voice in a multimedia presentation, "The Pillar of Fire: Treaties and the Territory," that takes place in the People's Theatre—a small stage within the exhibit. The 10-minute audio-visual presentation features images projected on a screen, an atmospheric set, and dramatized excerpts "from speeches, books, newspaper accounts and letters from the period 1849-1861." Here, Dakota and English translations of Taoyeteduta and other Dakota leaders, as well as quotes from territorial notables such as Alexander Ramsey (the first territorial governor) are heard. Eastman's seal appears on the screen to illustrate the sentiment evoked by James Goodhue, the territory's first newspaper printer: "the red savage is vanishing and in their place a thousand farms and wavering wheat fields." The presentation effectively

demonstrates the extreme contrast between the worldviews of the treaty signers and the supporters. Of note is the creative use of a theatrical set featuring a Dakota tepee and a U.S. military A-frame canvas tent on either side of the projection screen. The sounds of crackling fires provide verisimilitude, and the dwellings alternately glow to signify the "camp" to which the speakers belong.

But it is not only the leaders who are given voice in *Tales of the Territory*. Indeed, throughout the exhibit, curator Brian Horrigan worked to include the voices of everyday Minnesotans. James Goodhue makes an appearance as an animated hologram next to the original press he used to print *The Minnesota Pioneer* in 1849. Interactive "travel stories" share the perspectives of a heterogeneous group of immigrants ranging from African American Emily Goodridge Grey to Irishwoman Mary Jane Hill Anderson. Most notably, mid-century Dakota child Maza Okiye Win—portrayed by Win's great, great, great granddaughter, Autumn Wilson—appears as a projection in a replica Dakota tepee. In her endearing presentation, Wilson draws on oral traditions as she laments the changes in her nation's culture. Overall, the use of "stories" in this exhibit offers preservationists a model for conceptualizing the many ways social history can be told. In *Tales*, the oral tradition, no less than the material object, is valued as worthy of collection, preservation, and innovative presentation.

This exhibit is one of several featured at the Minnesota History Center in downtown St. Paul. Overlooking the State Capitol, the Center is the hub of the Minnesota Historical Society, whose founding coincides with the designation of the Minnesota Territory in 1849. The Society's mission is to cultivate "among people an awareness of Minnesota history so they may draw strength and perspective from the past and find purpose for the future." In exploring "Minnesota 1849-1858" as a place of conflict and compromise rather than as a territory characterized by inevitable "progress" towards statehood, *Tales of the Territory* accomplishes the Society's broader mission, and its 1999 opening managed to *mark* the Sesquicentennial anniversaries of both the Territory and Society without unquestioningly *celebrating* them.

For all of its strengths, *Tales of the Territory* left this reviewer in the dark several times. The exhibit is dimly lit to protect the artifacts on display, and the motion-sensor lighting helping to illuminate the exhibit seemed slow to respond (and sometimes did not). Reproductions of the "Trader's Paper" and the Treaty of 1851 were difficult to read. Despite these drawbacks, this Sesquicentennial exhibit is both visually and intellectually engaging, and should be of interest to anyone seeking a model for presenting multiple and conflicting perspectives on a delicate topic. *Tales of the Territory: Minnesota 1849-1858* manages to capture the optimism of Minnesota's territorial settlers and the efforts of American Indians to preserve their culture equally well. Overall, by including multiple perspectives, and in working to correct historiographical deficiencies, this otherwise dimly lit exhibit is exceptionally illuminating.

Amy M. Tyson
University of Minnesota, Twin Cities

WEBSITES AND MULTIMEDIA

Texas Beyond History: The Virtual Museum of Texas' Cultural Heritage
http://www.texasbeyondhistory.net

Maintained by the Texas Archaeological Research Laboratory, University of Texas at Austin; accessed May 23, 2005; July 16, 2005; September 9, 2005.

The stated purpose of the *Texas Beyond History* website is "to interpret and share the results of archeological and historical research on the cultural heritage of Texas with the citizens of Texas and the world."[1] The Texas Archaeological Research

Laboratory (TARL) at the University of Texas at Austin is the primary website sponsor and content provider, with 12 other organizations contributing data or assistance. The consortium includes one nonprofit organization, one local cultural resources management firm, two volunteer groups, three academic departments, and five state and federal agencies.

The *Texas Beyond History* website is geared toward archeologists, historians, anthropologists, and, to a lesser extent, ethnographers and architectural historians. Although the website content might not be relevant to all heritage stewardship professionals, the website may prove helpful in other ways. For example, the site's layout, presentation of maps, engravings, historic and contemporary photographs, private and public documents, and artifacts may provide museum professionals with a conceptual framework for a similar online project.

The website offers assistance with teaching Texas heritage. Two sections include materials tailored to elementary school students and teachers. The "Kids" section includes links such as "Fantastic Facts," "Fun Stuff to Do," "Ask Dr. Dirt," "New Words," and "Cool Links." The "Teachers" section includes lesson plans, unit plans, teacher links, as well as an open-ended survey on the usefulness of the site for instructors. Despite its educational focus, "Cool Links" contains 19 links to governmental, academic, and professional websites that would appeal to anyone interested in the state's cultural resources. Topics in "Cool Links" include "Texas Archaeology," "Rock Art," "North American Archaeology," "General Archaeology," and "World Archaeology."

Texas Beyond History achieves its goal of interpreting and sharing the state's cultural heritage by focusing on the stories of the peoples who have settled the land. The "Special Exhibits" section of the website was of particular interest to this reviewer. Not only are the exhibits rotated like they would be at a physical museum, previous exhibits are archived with active links and dates that the exhibits premiered. Moreover, the addition of new exhibits, newly acquired historic documents, and recently recovered artifacts are announced with a special link on the homepage. These features allow website users to scan the site quickly for new contributions on subsequent visits.

"Special Exhibits" covers the history and prehistory of Texans and of those who have crossed the region. Virtual exhibits present the state's prehistoric treasures and discuss topics ranging from the contact period between local American Indians and Europeans, Spanish presidios and missions, and antebellum plantations, to German farmers, Mexican laborers, and 19th-century logging in East Texas. One of the site's four theme exhibits highlights the Caddo Nation, one of the state's indigenous populations, and presents prehistoric Caddoan life through artifacts and features, modern Caddoan life through profiles of tribal members, and modern and prehistoric aspects of the culture.

Elsewhere on the site, visitors can learn about the role of the Buffalo Soldiers—the U.S. Army, 9th Cavalry Troopers–on the Texas frontier. *Texas Beyond History* also highlights the descendants of the Jornada Mogollon who established pit houses and pueblo dwellings in the valley and foothills of the Hueco Mountains of far western Texas. These examples demonstrate the breadth of the Lone Star State's cultural legacy and the sizeable task of bringing this information to the Web.

The "About Texas Beyond History" section allows users to glean additional information about the virtual exhibits and the professionals responsible for disseminating facts and theories regarding Texas's cultural heritage.

The strengths of *Beyond Texas History* are in the presentation of the complex cultural heritage of Texas and the region. The text is easy to read and accessible without being parochial. When professional jargon is necessary, sidebars offer defini-

tions. The site is very colorful, well designed, and easy to navigate. The "Kids" section uses whimsical fonts and children-friendly terminology (e.g. "cool"). All images are in high resolution, making for sharp visuals, which is not always the case with websites.

Finally, the *Texas Beyond History* homepage includes a useful map of Texas marking the locations and names of select cultural resources. Dragging a cursor over each resource activates a preview of what lies beyond the hyperlink, and double clicking on that link takes the reader to detailed information on that resource. By presenting a modern map of Texas, readers not familiar with Texas and its geography can peruse the exhibits based on their area of interest.

Kenneth C. Kraft
U.S. Department of Agriculture

1. A list of the Texas Archaeological Research Laboratory's partners is available online at http://www.texasbeyondhistory.net/abouttbh/partners.html.

Los Adaes: Life at an Eighteenth-Century Spanish Outpost
http://www.crt.state.la.us/siteexplorer/

Los Adaes State Historic Site, Louisiana Office of State Parks; maintained by Louisiana Division of Archaeology; accessed August 27, 2005.

In every region of the United States there are historic sites dedicated to settlement. These sites, whether they are found in Massachusetts, South Carolina, Louisiana, Missouri, or California, all have similarities. But it is the regional flair and historical details that make them unique. The website for Los Adaes State Park in Louisiana does an excellent job in providing a regional view of a national past. Through its high-quality visuals, ease of navigation, and wealth of information, the website succeeds in creating an interesting and exciting experience for the online visitor.

Located in western Louisiana, Los Adaes has had a long and varied history. Archeological evidence shows that the cultural traditions of the Caddo Indians began over 1,000 years ago in an area that includes parts of modern day Louisiana, Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Texas. The name *adaes* is the Caddoan word for "place along a stream." Even today, descendants of the interaction of Caddoans and French and Spanish settlers, known as *Adaesena*, still influence the area.

According to the website, the Caddos were a powerful group that viewed both the French and Spanish as trading partners and peers. At the request of the local population, a Spanish mission was established in 1716. Two years later, a new mission and a presidio were built a few miles away. Los Adaes not only served as a religious and military center, but it was also the capital of the Province of Texas from 1729 to 1770. The settlement was short-lived, however; by 1773, the presidio and mission had closed.

Today, the Louisiana Office of State Parks manages the site as Los Adaes State Historic Site, a National Historic Landmark. While only 5 percent of the entire site has been excavated, archeological evidence has provided a wealth of information on the locations of several structures and the techniques used in their construction. Produced by the Louisiana Division of Archaeology, the website highlights artifacts and other archeological evidence in an online exhibit. Images of Caddoan pottery, French trade kettles, Spanish lead seals, and artifacts relating to religious, military, domestic, and agricultural life reinforce the significance and diversity of Los Adaes.

The website is divided into three sections. "At the Edge of an Empire" tells the story of colonial settlement. Those familiar with settlement patterns

in colonial North America will recognize the common elements of competing European countries, the interactions of settlers and Native Americans, and the establishment of trade routes. "Life on the Frontier" vividly portrays the variety of the colonial experience, including military, religious, domestic, agricultural, and economic activities. "Los Adaes Today" highlights the legacy of the Caddo Indians and the value of archeological research and historic site preservation.

The website's designers have skillfully combined content and a navigational system that does not overwhelm the reader. Pop-up windows containing images of artifacts and other illustrations enliven the text. The site serves the casual browser and the serious researcher equally well: The former can quickly and easily gain an understanding of the main points, and the latter will appreciate the involved discussion of the history of Los Adaes.

The website provides two options for viewing the online exhibit: a "multimedia" version and an "accessible" version. It is the multimedia version that makes the website such a success. As one explores "At the Edge of Empire," the background map moves and refocuses on a new area of the Southwest with each panel that comes into view. In "Los Adaes Today," users can listen to the oral history of *Adaesena* Rhonda Gauthier. High-resolution images can be magnified with clear and crisp detail. Overall, the multimedia components make *Los Adaes: Life at an Eighteenth-Century Spanish Outpost* a fun and informative website.

Joseph C. Avent III
South Carolina State Park Service

Florida Folklife Program
http://dhr.dos.state.fl.us/preservation/folklife/

Florida Folklife Program, Office of Cultural and Historical Programs, maintained by Florida Department of State; accessed August 25–September 2, 2005.

The Florida Folklife Program (FFP) is a component of the Florida Office of Cultural and Historical Programs. The FFP is responsible for documenting and presenting "folklife, folklore and the folk arts of the state," and it "coordinates a wide range of activities and projects designed to increase the awareness of Floridians and visitors alike about our traditional culture." The FFP excels in meeting this goal, recording and archiving more than 70 years of Floridian music, teaching schoolchildren about the traditional culture of Florida, and conducting a folklife apprenticeship program to ensure that traditional folk art and folkways are not lost.

Although difficult to find, the Florida Folklife Program website proves to be a diamond in the rough and complements the FFP's activities. The simple, straightforward design employs clean lines, easy-to-read fonts, fast-loading graphics, and a judicious use of color, all of which enable viewers to focus on the content. Simultaneously, it exploits the Web's multimedia capabilities to connect visitors to FFP's extensive audio archives of Floridian music and biographies of past Folk Heritage Award winners and folk-art masters and apprentices.

The growing list of folk artists who have died, as indicated by an asterisk in the FFP listings, emphasizes the importance of preserving and sharing this cultural legacy before it is too late. That is the goal of the Folklife Apprenticeship Program, which allows participants to spend up to nine months learning from master folk artists. The website describes the program and past apprenticeships, which have included learning fiddling techniques, Seminole basket making, and Cuban *guajiro* singing. Other features of the FFP website include

links to its Outreach Program Calendar, Folklife Days, and Folklife Education Programs. Extremely helpful are Florida State Education Standards links to FFP publications.

As good as this site is, there is room for improvement. Some online forms have formatting problems that could be easily rectified. Also, links to key related websites such as the Florida Bureau of Historic Preservation, the Museum of Florida History, and the Florida Folklore Society, do not function and are in need of repair. Finally, the Florida Folklife Program is buried beneath the administrative and bureaucratic taxonomy of the state's Internet portal. The Outreach Program Calendar and the Folklife Education Programs pages should be expanded to reach and benefit larger audiences.

Overall, the Florida Folklife Program website is highly informative and has the potential to become an excellent cultural resources management tool for Floridians and anyone looking to develop or improve similar programs in their own areas. Without programs such as the FFP working to preserve and pass on knowledge and expertise in a wide variety of folk arts, rich cultural resources will be lost.

Shara Forrister
Arizona State University

TeacherServe® from the National Humanities Center: An Interactive Curriculum Enrichment Service for Teachers
http://www.nhc.rtp.nc.us/tserve/tserve.htm

Maintained by the National Humanities Center; accessed September 1-19, 2005.

When asked to recall their experiences of studying history in school, most people recite the facts of a historical event or time period. A former student proudly reported that about 4,000 Cherokee died as a result of that Indian nation's removal west in the 1830s. Unfortunately, he could not explain the impact or the significance of the Trail of Tears. What did the loss of those people mean to the future of the Cherokee nation in its new home? How did the economic and social structures of Cherokee life adapt to compensate for the loss? Simple facts do not hold the answers about our past, but they can lead historians to the questions that define history and guide its interpretation. It is not in memorizing the facts, but in the interpretation of events defined by those facts that enables historians to contribute to the greater world around them.

How can teachers in the humanities engage students and bring history to life? Are there websites specifically developed to help teachers meet this challenge? *TeacherServe®* offers educators a promising interactive approach to curriculum enrichment.

Provided by the National Humanities Center, an independent research organization founded in 1978 by the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, *TeacherServe®* pledges to develop a series of "instructional guides on important topics in the humanities on the secondary level." The site currently presents two instructional guides: "Divining America: Religion and the National Culture;" and "Nature Transformed: The Environment in American History." "Divining America" focuses on the evolution and influence of religion on

American culture. "Nature Transformed" provides resources to help educators convey how Americans have thought about their physical surroundings and changed themselves or their environment to address their developing needs. Each guide is maintained by National Humanities Center staff and a panel of advisors from secondary and post-secondary educational institutions.

The instructional guides offer essays written by leading scholars that provide an overview of the topic, bibliographies, and links to outside websites for further research. The essays range from discussions of the biological and ecological exchange (called the "Columbian Exchange") that followed Christopher Columbus's "discovery" of the New World in 1492, to the efforts of early conservationists such as John Muir, a founding member and former president of the Sierra Club, and Wilderness Society founders Aldo Leopold and Robert Marshall.

After leading the reader through an overview of the topic, the authors suggest ways of incorporating the topic into classroom discussions with students and relating it to the issues of today. The site also offers question and answer forums where readers can communicate directly with the writers of the guides. This format dovetails nicely with the National Humanities Center's larger goal of linking the advancement of scholarship with the improvement of teaching in the humanities by providing a way for interpreters of history to interact with those teaching history in the classroom.

In an age of 24-hour news networks, students seldom have to struggle to visualize current events, a fact of contemporary life that makes it hard for teachers to create a compelling image of the past through words alone. To compensate, teachers often draw upon the work of historic preservationists and cultural resource managers to fill in the blanks. *TeacherServe*® provides a valuable service by including pictures, diagrams, and charts that teachers can pass on to their students for visual reference. These images are often drawn from the work of national and international historic preservation organizations and include links to websites for further research. Not only does this help teachers find the visuals they need to reinforce the concepts they are teaching, but it also promotes the work of organizations such as the Plymouth Colony Archive Project and the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation and brings them to the attention of future preservationists and scholars.

The nonprofit National Humanities Center depends on donor contributions for its livelihood and programming, so it is unclear how many guides will be produced. With only two instructional guides in place, the site cannot be described as comprehensive, but it offers an excellent model for bringing the work of historic preservationists and cultural resource managers to the attention of teachers.

Daniel Flaherty
Northern Virginia Community College

National Trust for Historic Preservation
http://www.nationaltrust.org

Maintained by the National Trust for Historic Preservation; accessed September 6-9, 2005

Established in 1949 by congressional legislation, the National Trust for Historic Preservation (the Trust) is the premier nonprofit preservation organization in the United States. The success of the Trust's mission—to provide leadership, education, advocacy, and resources to save America's diverse historic places and revitalize its communities—depends on its effectiveness in communicating its message to the public. Therefore, it is not surprising that the Trust has developed an indepth website to serve as its primary communication tool.

Over the past decade, the website has grown as an online resource for both the general public and preservation professionals. The website now offers a wealth of information on the programs offered by the Trust to assist homeowners, local preservation organizations, and cultural resource specialists. Redesigned in 2003, the improved navigation delineates the major sections of the website at the top of every page, with subsections accessible from additional navigation on the left. "Why Preserve?" is targeted at those new to the world of preservation and answers questions raised in subsections "What is Historic," "Who Benefits—and How," and "How Can I Help?" The "Historic Travel" section is aimed at the heritage traveler, with information on the Trust's Distinctive Destinations program, historic study tours, and a reservation system for its Historic Hotels program.

Several sections of the website are useful for both seasoned professionals and the casual visitor. One can join the Trust or renew a membership at "Get Involved," find local and state preservation groups, or get advice on planning an event for Preservation Month, an annual commemoration established by the Trust more than 30 years ago to encourage and spotlight grassroots preservation efforts. Preservation challenges faced by communities across the country are identified in "Issues and Initiatives." Guidance and resources are provided to help address each issue (such as chain drugstores, historic schools, housing, smart growth, and transportation).

"Get Involved" also includes an advocacy section with guidance for local preservation nonprofits on the legislative process, lobbying techniques and restrictions, and preservation policy developments. The Legislative Access Center (CapWiz) is an extremely useful online database of current preservation-related legislation, providing background information, action needed, and talking points for each piece of legislation. The database allows you to identify and email all of your federal, state, and local officials, local media, and to see how your federal representatives have voted on specific bills.

The Trust is not only an advocacy organization but also steward of 25 historic properties, including Montpelier (home of James Madison) and Woodlawn (designed by William Thornton). The "Historic Places" section highlights these properties and the building-specific programs offered by the Trust. This section is also home to the Trust's widely recognized "11 Most Endangered Historic Places" list and its Restore America campaign, and it includes information on the services offered by the Trust's Law Department—from in-house legal advice to conservation easements, with a convenient glossary of legal terminology.

The "Community Building" section covers the range of financial support, technical assistance, and strategic advocacy offered by the Trust to improve declining historic residential, commercial, and rural areas. The "Community Revitalization" department provides not just advice, but funding for local organizations to encourage preservation as an economic development tool. More than 20 case studies illustrate successful uses of the Trust's loan and equity financing programs. There is also information on the National Main Street Center approach to the revitalization of commercial districts, successfully adopted by more than 1,600 communities nationwide. The Center for Preservation Leadership offers resources for preservation professionals, including training and grants.

Unfortunately, some valuable sections of the website are not indexed under the major sections of the site and are accessible only from the homepage. One of those sections is the online version of the bi-monthly *Preservation* magazine. Also, daily and weekly preservation press events, posted online as a complement to the magazine since 2001 (an archive contains all past stories), are only accessible through the homepage.

Whereas most of the website is available to Trust members and the general public, National Trust Forum members can access a password-protected area that contains resources specifically tailored to preservation professionals. Forum membership offers additional publications beyond those included in the standard membership, along with discounts on conference registration and preservation books. Case studies and publications are searchable, as are all messages (1998 to present) posted on Forum-L, a listserv for discussing preservation issues and exchanging ideas and information.

Following the current trend in website design, the Trust's homepage includes a feature, usually on the most newsworthy campaign or timely issue. On the days this reviewer accessed the site, there was information on a new Hurricane Relief Fund to "support assessment teams, assist small businesses through our National Main Street Center and disperse critical grant monies to organizations on the ground in affected communities" in the wake of Hurricane Katrina.

Whether searching for historic travel destinations, information on an upcoming preservation conference, a preservation publication, or information on starting an easement program in your community, it is likely that the Trust's website will supply the tools needed to reach one's preservation goals.

Shannon Davis
National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers

Vernacular Architecture Forum
http://www.vernaculararchitectureforum.org

Accessed September 10, 2005; October 9, 2005

Architectural history has traditionally connected itself with the art history world, focusing on notable commissions and famous architects. Until recent decades, vernacular architecture was forgotten at best or, at worst, maligned as unworthy of study. In 1980, vernacular architecture started to receive the formal recognition it deserved with the establishment of the Vernacular Architecture Forum (VAF).

From the outset, VAF embraced an interdisciplinary approach, drawing on perspectives from history, art, historic preservation, and folklore studies. It also adopted a continental focus with an eye to including Canada, Mexico, and even the West Indies in its area of study. Its topics are just as broad, ranging from antebellum slave quarters to contemporary roadside architecture.

VAF's main vehicles for encouraging research and scholarship are its annual meeting, its quarterly newsletter, *Vernacular Architecture News*, and its peer-reviewed journal, *Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture*. It has also taken an active role in publishing books and technical literature like Thomas Carter and Elizabeth Cromley's *Invitation to Vernacular Architecture* to help raise public awareness of the subject.[1]

The VAF website serves as an introduction to the organization, with information on its governing board, publications, special programs, annual meeting, awards, and how to join. It also offers a bibliography of vernacular architecture, a link to a vernacular architecture email list, and a syllabus exchange. The "News and Updates" page consists primarily of announcements of related professional conferences and deadlines for award nominations.

Whereas the website helps connect people to VAF, it fails to connect people to vernacular architecture. Other than offering electronic copies of the last three issues of *Vernacular Architecture News*, the site provides little in the way of information on vernacular architecture itself. The site has only a handful of photographs or illustrations, and they are largely decorative. It says little about the

importance of studying and preserving vernacular architecture.

Given the increased importance of the Web and the challenges of maintaining professional organizations, VAF's website may one day shift from being a passive overview of the organization to an active communications tool. Architecture naturally lends itself to visual forms of communication, so more drawings and photographs would greatly enhance the site. Furthermore, while awards for preservation and scholarship should certainly be encouraged, devoting so much space to the organization's awards program suggests that the "award winning" topics are all that matter.

The VAF is a great organization, and the website is a good beginning. It will be interesting to see how it is developed in the future.

Jay M. Price
Wichita State University

1. Thomas Carter and Elizabeth Collins Cromley, *Invitation to Vernacular Architecture: A Guide to the Study of Ordinary Buildings and Landscapes* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2005).

The National Archives and Records Administration
http://www.archives.gov/

United States National Archives and Records Administration; accessed September 2, 2005

As archivists continue to embrace the digital revolution by employing electronic methods of document preservation, organization, and presentation, researchers proficient in traditional cataloging methods must master new technologies in order to access the past. The United States National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) website offers historians, archeologists, and others interested in heritage and heritage stewardship a starting point in understanding the advantages—and limitations—of Internet research.

First launched in 1996 and redesigned in 2005, the NARA website is federally funded and produced by the staff of the National Archives Policy and Communications Division. Charged with advancing the mission of the National Archives, the website serves the broad interests of an increasingly Internet-literate public, from genealogists and veterans to records managers and cultural resource professionals.

The NARA website includes resources relating to the nation's administrative, legislative, and cultural history, as well as more than 30 online exhibits that chart significant events and themes in U.S. history through documents, images, and photographs. It also features a series of lesson plans, "Teaching with Documents," demonstrating how primary sources might be used creatively in the classroom.

While the purpose of the NARA website is to offer tools and guides to help researchers at all levels locate documents in the archives, most professionals will find that searching, locating, and viewing digitized NARA records is no substitute for visiting one of NARA's regional branches or its two main depositories in Washington, DC, and College Park, Maryland.

Those unfamiliar with the National Archives and its collections, however, will find the NARA website especially helpful. Besides explaining the mission of the National Archives as the official depository for federal records, the website presents hundreds of online texts and finding aids describing the various types of government documents and their purposes and functions.

The NARA website also allows visitors to navigate through millions of records without first having to master the complicated system of how these records are arranged. In effect, two processes

(uncovering the organizational principles behind the archives and then identifying research material) have become one. Visitors can now access several online catalogs and search the archives by keyword, subject, or series, thereby allowing researchers to locate useful documents while simultaneously learning how the records are filed and arranged.

The Archival Research Catalog (ARC) is a good starting point for those interested in historic preservation or cultural resources. Containing descriptions of about 40 percent of NARA's holdings, ARC allows users to search thousands of digitized historical photographs, documents, and images by keyword, provenance, or record type. In its search results, however, ARC demonstrates the benefits and shortcomings of online research. While a keyword search might yield several records containing valuable information, any ARC search is bound to leave the researcher wondering about the remaining 60 percent of National Archives holdings that are, at present, unsearchable online. At best, ARC offers the serious researcher only a *sense* of what the National Archives contains and whether it is worth conducting a more exhaustive search in person.

By comparison, the Access to Archival Databases (AAD) contains information on more than 50 million electronic records and often provides research links to catalogs on other research-oriented websites containing digitized images. For example, a researcher interested in a particular historic structure or a collection of buildings in a specific region might use AAD to explore sites recorded by the National Park Service's Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS). Beginning with holdings in the National Archives, such a search would lead to the Library of Congress's American Memory website (http://memory.loc.gov/ammem/), where a more extensive collection of online photos and documents is available. If the NARA website offers anything to researchers that was not available before, it is this linking among websites that provides tremendous potential for locating, evaluating, and interpreting widely-dispersed records.

Two additional research services, the Microfilm Publications Catalog and the Archives Library Information Center (ALIC), allow users to browse microfilm and book holdings, as well as NARA's special collections and periodicals. Besides helping researchers locate specific information, the services offer those researchers who are unable to visit the National Archives the option of purchasing items online or emailing an ALIC librarian for assistance in obtaining copies. The NARA website also provides information on how to hire independent researchers who might be able to locate and photocopy specific documents.

The NARA website offers researchers new ways of locating and connecting archival material that bridge time and distance. For those with limited resources, a thorough exploration of NARA's online catalogs will increase the efficiency and productiveness of a future visit to the Archives and perhaps inspire the researcher to follow other fruitful avenues of inquiry.

However, the website's developers anticipated the greatest limitation to the NARA website in explaining that, because of the prohibitive cost of digitizing material, only a small percentage of National Archives records is available online. Thus, despite its thoughtful presentation and well-organized content for the everyday user, the NARA website leaves the professional researcher wanting more than what NARA has placed within his or her virtual grasp—more images, more documents, more substance.

Edward Maris-Wolf
College of William and Mary

Mälama ka 'Äina: To Care For The Land

Writers and producers: Phyllis Paul and Phil Wilson, Ohana Filmworks, 17 minutes; 25 minute version available on DVD, $19.99.'

The small Hawaiian island of Ni'ihau and much of Kekaha district on nearby Kaua'i were purchased by the Robinson family in 1864 from King Kauikeaouli. Today the lands are still owned by the Robinsons. In this film, Keith Robinson speaks of his family's historic responsibility as stewards who *mälama i ka 'äina*, take care of the land. Traditionally, the Hawaiian concept of *mälama 'äina* included taking care of the people who live on the land as well as the land itself. The Robinsons see themselves as good stewards of both. The film, *Mälama ka 'Äina: To Care For The Land*, shows the island of Ni'ihau as a relatively untouched oasis, where traditional Hawaiian practices are maintained and natural and cultural resources are preserved. Had the filmmakers looked more closely at the Ni'ihau Hawaiians' situation, however, they would have created a different impression.

For many years, the island of Ni'ihau was run by the Robinsons as a sheep ranch, providing Ni'ihau Hawaiians with free housing and a minimal wage in return for their labor. The island is famous for its isolation, enforced by the Robinson family; even state government officials have difficulty in making inspections. As a result of that isolation, the Ni'ihau Hawaiians preserve many features of traditional Hawaiian culture. They still speak Hawaiian as their first language, and they practice a traditional version of Hawaiian Congregationalism. An important source of income is the making of Ni'ihau shell leis from the tiny shells that wash up only on the beaches of Ni'ihau and Kaua'i.

By contrast, Hawaiians outside of Ni'ihau generally speak English as their first language. Most have left the Congregational church for newer evangelical churches. The majority do not depend on traditional crafts to make money.

Because of the social isolation of Ni'ihau, those who leave the island are poorly equipped to take advantage of opportunities for economic advancement. The lack of preparation of Ni'ihau Hawaiians to meet the demands of the outside world has become a significant problem today because the Robinson ranch on Ni'ihau is no longer economically viable. It is doubtful the Robinsons can afford to keep Ni'ihau as it is. Most of those who live there now get by on welfare payments, supplemented by subsistence fishing and the production of Ni'ihau shell leis. Increasingly, the marine resources of Ni'ihau are threatened by poachers who come to the island from Kaua'i to fish and gather the Ni'ihau shells for leis. Migration to Kaua'i, O'ahu, and even to the mainland is rampant.

This film offers only a glimpse of the rarely seen cultural landscape of Ni'ihau. Although it shows how Hawaiian culture has been preserved on the island, it focuses on the Robinson family as stewards of Ni'ihau and Kekaha. The viewer hears nothing about Ni'ihau Hawaiians' circumstances and concerns about the future, nor does the film adequately portray Ni'ihau as a community.

It is fascinating to see such rarely-caught scenes of the island and its people—footage of Keith Robinson planting endemic plants, Ni'ihau Hawaiians at church on Kaua'i and making Ni'ihau shell leis, Ni'ihau children at school on Kaua'i practicing hula—but the film hardly conveys a clear picture of the situation for the Ni'ihau people. The viewer never gets an overall picture of the island and its settlement. In fact, most of the footage in the film was taken on Kaua'i, something the film does not make clear. Nor does it explain the relationship between the Hawaiians living on Ni'ihau and those on Kaua'i.

The film briefly alludes to the uncertain future for Ni'ihau when a speaker questions whether the descendants of the Robinson family will carry on as stewards in the way that Keith has. There is no examination of the problematic future for Ni'ihau Hawaiians and their culture, a crucial omission in a film that purports to portray the Robinson regime as a success story in the preservation of Hawaiian culture. With a movement underway to return native Hawaiians to their traditional culture and language, *Mälama ka 'Äina* could be a useful resource for preservationists if only it were more balanced and broader in its scope.

Charles Langlas and Kehaulani Shintani
University of Hawai'i at Hilo

1. This review is based on the 17-minute version of the film provided by the producer.

Letters

Readers may submit letters to the editor (see contact information on the page facing the table of contents). Letters should include the writer's name, address, and daytime telephone number for confirmation. Letters may be edited for publication and not all letters will be published. If a letter pertains to an article or review, the editor may forward the letter to the author for reply.

Summer 2005 issue

Your summer issue is interesting and the Lowenthal article especially so, exceptionally well done. I plan to use it to stimulate a discussion at the next board retreat of our local Land Trust.

Bob Keller
Bellingham, WA

General Comments

I'm really impressed with the changes to *CRM* in recent years. The quality, content, and professionalism of the journal have increased substantially, in my opinion. Thanks!

Sam Tamburro
Historian
Cuyahoga Valley National Park

I just wanted to pass on that I enjoy the journal greatly. It has a wonderful and eclectic mix of articles that are all of interest.

Harold Skramstad
President (retired)
Henry Ford Museum and Greenfield Village

I don't want to miss a single copy! Huzzah for your team.

Tordis Isselhardt
Images from the Past
Bennington, VT

ON THE COVER

On October 15, 1924, President Calvin Coolidge exercised the authority granted by the Antiquities Act of 1906 to proclaim the Statue of Liberty a national monument. Sixty years later, in 1984, the National Park Service, the bi-national French-American Committee for the Restoration of the Statue of Liberty, and the private Statue of Liberty-Ellis Island Foundation began restoration of the statue in preparation for her 100th anniversary in 1986. A French team of sculptors and metalworkers reconstructed the statue's signature torch and flame in reaffirmation of Franco-American friendship as expressed in the Statue of Liberty itself—a gift to the people of the United States from the people of France in 1886. The statue was inscribed in the World Heritage List in 1984. (Jet Lowe, photographer, May 1984. Courtesy of the Historic American Engineering Record, National Park Service.)

Also from the National Park Service

Common Ground: Preserving Our Nation's Heritage

Award-winning quarterly magazine on trends and research in preservation, with news, features, and interviews with leadersin the field.

To subscribe or read the latest issue, go to www.cr.nps.gov/CommonGround

www.cr.nps.gov/CommonGround

Heritage News

Monthly e-newsletter with information on grants, laws, policies, and activities of interest to the heritage community.

Go to www.cr.nps.gov/HeritageNews to subscribe or read the latest issue.

www.cr.nps.gov/HeritageNews

National Park Service
U.S. Department of the Interior

CRM: The Journal of Heritage Stewardship
National Park Service
1849 C Street, NW (2286)
Washington, DC 20240-0001

EXPERIENCE YOUR AMERICA™