I. BACKGROUND

Cultural Heritage Needs Assessment: What and Why?
In the summer of 2002, the National Park Service launched a project with modest funding and an ambitious mission. The Cultural Heritage Needs Assessment is an effort to “gain a better understanding of what aspects of cultural heritage are important to minority cultures and what the federal government’s cultural programs could do to better address these aspects of heritage.” Antoinette Lee is project lead; this author is consultant. This report presents the findings of what was conceived as Phase I, carried out in about one year’s time.

That the United States is, has always been, and will continue to be a country of many cultures needs no demonstration. The concern behind this study was that the nation’s official heritage preservation programs had not fully measured up to the promise or the demands of this situation. Minority participation in heritage programs has been limited, and the picture of American history presented by officially designated sites understates the diversity of the nation’s actual history. Though this is admittedly difficult to measure, the National Register of Historic Places provides a valid yardstick. National Park Service policy states that the National Park Service will “present factual and balanced presentations of the many American cultures, heritages, and histories.” Yet out of over 76,000 properties currently listed on the National Register of Historic Places, a computer search turns up approximately 823 associated with African American heritage, 35 with Asian, and 12 with Hispanic. Only one of the Asian sites (a district in Ketchikan, Alaska) relates to Filipino American heritage. Taken together, sites identified as African American, Asian American, or Latino amount to slightly more than 1 per cent of the total. The nation’s preservation programs are not keeping up with the reality of racial and cultural diversity, now or in the past. What could be done to improve the situation?

Unlike some studies aimed at broadening program participation, this one did not start with the question, How can we bring more people into what we are already doing? In order to target scarce resources most effectively it detoured around the traditional review of existing programs (though, of course, awareness of those programs was assumed). Finally, it bypassed another standby, What are we doing wrong? Instead, it asked simply, What do people value? What would they like to conserve? How do they understand their heritage? What services do they want from government?

These are large and open-ended questions, and the Assessment was not expected to provide complete answers. It was expected to establish a basis and a direction for further work, and this report does that, by presenting information on values and priorities that, as expressed by
community advocates and experts, can provide a basis for developing heritage conservation policies. It proposes a number of actions that the federal government could take, as well as areas for further study. Its most important recommendation, however, is that the National Park Service follow this report with some form of action, whether or not this is accompanied by the further study and policy development that the subject undoubtedly deserves. The reasons for this are spelled out below.

But first, a note on methodology is in order.

**A Note on Methodology**

The Cultural Heritage Needs Assessment was inspired by the pioneering work that the National Park Service did in its 1990 report, *Keepers of the Treasures: Protecting Historic Properties and Cultural Traditions on Indian Lands.*\(^4\) Written by Patricia Parker, *Keepers of the Treasures* quickly became an authoritative description of tribal preservation needs as they might be addressed by the federal government, and it led to significant changes in federal programs, as its broad ideas influenced the preservation movement in general. Why not do the same for other groups outside the majority culture, for African Americans, Latino or Hispanic Americans, and Asian Americans?

That was the Assessment’s mandate. However, important differences between this project and its predecessor quickly became apparent. Unlike Indian tribes, African, Asian, and Hispanic Americans are not organized as coherent entities: they do not have official leaders, spokespersons, or lands, and the National Park Service could not treat with them as government to government. Furthermore, whereas one could assume that the constituents for preservation programs relating to tribal heritage would mostly be future tribal members, this assumption made no sense when extended to other groups outside the preservation mainstream. Changing immigration patterns make it difficult, in any event, to predict who future African, Asian, or Hispanic Americans will be. Finally, whereas the organizers of *Keepers of the Treasures* had a Congressional mandate and funds for a broadly researched study, the Assessment’s organizers had neither. We would have to find people who were willing to talk to us and whose voices were worth listening to. And we could not possibly talk to enough of them to create a statistically valid survey. Insights, suggestions, and judgments based on deep experience and commitment we could have; a full-dress survey we could not. The major vehicles for gathering information then would be individual meetings and telephone conversations, supplemented by group meetings. In the report that follows, the sources of all direct communications received by the author are identified in the text, published sources in the footnotes. All respondents (including some not quoted directly) are listed in the Appendix. Apart from a few government employees, consulted on particular policy issues, and a small number of Asian or Latino respondents who were neither Mexican nor Filipino American, all of the respondents were members of the specific groups being considered. They range from first-generation immigrants to the descendants of Spanish landowners; they include teachers, architects, poets, artists, archivists, museum professionals, students, dentists, heritage tourism operators, government officials, activists, film makers, anthropologists, historians, literary scholars, and professional preservationists; they span sixty or so years in age; and they live in California, the District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Mexico, New York, Texas, Virginia, Washington, and the Philippines.
AHA: African/Hispanic/Asian American

For the purposes of the Assessment, groups outside the mainstream of historic preservation activity were deemed to be principally three: African American, Latino or Hispanic American, and Asian American. As these groups were far too large and amorphous to grasp with any clarity – particularly given limited time and resources – a further decision was made to narrow the focus within each group. We would not attempt to study the impact of recent immigration from Africa or the Caribbean. This was a pragmatic decision that allowed the Assessment to focus on heritage issues relating to long-time African American communities but that prevented the study from gaining the benefit of a global perspective on African cultural heritage. In the field of African American music, John W. Franklin says one is practically "forced to look at international dynamics," and he argues that placing (for example) "the Maryland experience" in the larger picture of African history, culture, and migration, adds greatly to understanding it. This the Assessment could not attempt: it remains an important area for further study.

With regard to Hispanic heritage, it was decided to focus on the Mexican American experience; for Asian, on the Filipino American. These too were pragmatic decisions. They certainly did not imply a belief that (for example) Filipino Americans could "stand for" other Asian American groups. Quite the contrary, they reflected the realization that they could not, nor could Mexicans stand for Cubans: that given the limitations of time and resources, a study that purported to address "Asian" or "Latino" heritage would become a mere pretense, propped up by insupportable generalizations. Miguel Vasquez states that "there is no real 'Latino community.' Instead, there are many." Even categories like Filipino American mask a wide range of historical experiences and attitudes. "Filipinos are so diverse," sighs Angel Velasco Shaw, "our histories are so complicated..."

While any choice of national groups might have been equally legitimate in terms of the project’s central thrust, the three selected groups in fact have considerable importance to American history, and to its future. They were among the earliest immigrants to North America. Spain had, of course, arrived in North America more than a century before England, and from the Spanish point of view, what we now call the southwest was actually the northeast, a provincial extension of Mexico. Spanish settlement extended from California to Florida: before they became American, twenty states had had contact with Spain, and six took their names from the Spanish language. When U.S. colonists moved westward into these territories, they encountered not wilderness but a scattering of missions, presidios, and pueblos numbering close to 100,000 people. Well might artist Judith Baca point out, “We didn’t cross the border, the border crossed us”: Baca’s grandmother, a native of California, habitually referred to it as “El Mexico del Norte.” Some go even further: Antonia Castañeda argues that the blending of Mexican with native cultures has gone so far, and the cultural roots have burrowed so deep into the land, that “We are indigenous: the notion of arrival is not appropriate.” For her, the Mexican American heritage of the southwest is a mestizo culture. In any event, Mexican culture and history have created an important legacy across a very wide swath of what is now the United States.

The arrival of Filipinos in North America was connected with the southwest’s Spanish heritage. The Philippines too became Spanish colonies, and the first Filipinos to visit North America arrived aboard Spanish galleons – the so-called Manila galleons – as early as the sixteenth
century. Some certainly visited the area that would become California. During the eighteenth century a permanent Filipino settlement appears to have been made near New Orleans, though this has not been firmly established.7

African Americans, finally, arrived as slaves and as free people along with the earliest English settlers at the beginning of the sixteenth century: since then, their experiences have been interwoven into this country’s history in profound ways.

All three groups have had strikingly close relationships with the United States, though these have been anything but easy. There was the trans-Atlantic slave trade, in which some twelve million Africans were forcibly brought to the Americas (a surprisingly small percentage of them to the United States), followed by a centuries-long sequel of repression. There was the territorial aggression (or manifest destiny) against Mexico, followed by the making and breaking of promises concerning land grants and the practice of religion. There was the Spanish-American War, followed by the Philippine-American war – much longer and bloodier, though less well known to Americans – in which America reneged on its promise to liberate the islands; and which was followed in turn by a half century of colonial rule from Washington. The history of all three regions and of their peoples, in short, have been braided into America’s and cannot be disentangled. The history of those of their peoples who have come here and become Americans is America’s history.

Scope and Applicability of Findings
This report was written for the National Park Service’s historic preservation programs, but it is also applicable to State Historic Preservation Offices and local preservation non-profits and agencies. Some of its findings will also be helpful to program managers and scholars at the Smithsonian Institution, Library of Congress, and other heritage agencies.

While the report focuses specifically on African, Mexican, and Filipino American heritage conservation, convergences of opinion emerged in some areas, suggesting that some findings might have broad applicability. The author had then to decide how to present them. Setting forth each area separately would let ethnic, national, or racial perspectives emerge with a minimum of authorial framing. But readers would find it difficult to identify areas of substantial agreement – areas that seemed significant enough to justify a clear presentation. A thematic structure was accordingly chosen that would satisfy this need. The sources of all statements have, nevertheless, been scrupulously indicated.

Convergences of interest – for example around the importance of historic sites – are significant in and of themselves. They also suggest that some of the report’s findings may be valid beyond its tightly focused themes. This possibility must be put forward cautiously: without further research it cannot be assumed. Yet it is plausible enough to present readers with their own choice: whether to act on the basis of imperfect information or to wait until the data is complete...which could, of course, be a very long time. If the author may be permitted an opinion on this question, it would be that actions, even imperfect ones, are better than no actions; and that while further study would certainly be valuable, taking action to take advantage of opportunities that are clearly present, will be far more valuable.
II. Context

**A Primer on Immigration**

An important component of this country’s relationships with Mexico, the Philippines, and Africa has been immigration, and this has always been more complex than simply the movement of people from one place to another. African immigration to the U.S. was largely coerced. Filipino immigration was conditioned by what is often called the islands’ “special relationship” with the United States, deriving from their colonial status but also from the bravery of many Filipino soldiers who fought for the United States in World War II. With Mexico, the border lurched southwards and westwards, making United States residents of many Mexicans who had not moved an inch.

Today, immigration is changing this country in important ways and is affecting the position of these groups within American society as well. Filipinos are currently the largest Asian immigrant group, a fact that surprises many white Americans. Mexicans are the largest immigrant group, period, and the largest component of a broad Hispanic influx that may dramatically reshape American culture. “The United States is undergoing a Latinization,” writes Miami newsman Jorge Ramos, “and there is no turning back. It is an overwhelming, definitive, and irreversible phenomenon that is changing the face of America...”8 While some may regret, and others may welcome this change, the data do suggest that something important is happening. A historical atlas shows that virtually every part of the country has seen substantial percentage increases in Hispanic population during the past decade.9 In California, where Judith Baca has observed dramatic changes during the previous decade, “the Mexicanization of Los Angeles has completely transformed the city.” Nationally, Hispanics now appear to be the largest minority. As Ramos notes, their purchasing has almost doubled in the last decade, to almost $400 billion in 2000, or more than gross domestic product of Mexico. The radio stations in Los Angeles with the largest audiences broadcast in Spanish, and “in the United States, more tortillas are sold than bagels, and more hot salsa than ketchup.”10

It is important to understand what these statistics say and what they do not say. The proportion of foreign-born residents has been higher in the past: in 1870, 14 percent, in 1910, 14.7 percent. Today it is only 10.8 percent. But as recently as 1970 the figure was a mere 4.7 percent,11 so the change has been rapid and the perception of it vivid. And it has been different from the wave of a hundred years ago. Where ninety of every hundred immigrants came from Europe around 1900, today forty-five come from Latin America, twenty-six from Asia, twenty-three from Europe, and the remaining six from other regions.12 The United States has always been a nation of immigrants, but they have not come from as many parts of the globe as now. And the new flows may be upsetting traditional orders in more ways than one. For example, though the question of white-black relationships is anything but resolved, it is no longer possible to think of race as a binary matter of black and white. Even within the Hispanic world, traditional balances are tipping. At the beginning of the millennium roughly 800,000 Puerto Ricans lived in New York: they were still the city’s largest Hispanic group. But whereas in 1950 they had totaled 79 percent
of New York’s Latino population, in 2000 they accounted for only 37 percent: if Puerto Ricans were down, Dominicans and Mexicans were dramatically up.  

It is difficult to generalize about education and income levels among immigrants, except to say that stereotypes are often wrong. While many immigrants come here (as they always have) with little education and no money, the household income of immigrants from India in 1980 substantially exceeded the national median. Even among undocumented Mexican immigrants in 1990, estimates place illiteracy at between 3 and 10 percent, versus 22 percent for Mexico as a whole. Similarly, in contrast to the stereotype of undocumented Mexican immigrants as “impoverished peasants,” almost half originated in cities, while “white-collar and urban skilled and semi-skilled occupations employed between 35 and 60 percent,” as opposed to about 30 percent of the Mexican population as a whole.  

These figures, and the complex changes they suggest, are relevant to heritage conservation in several ways. First, they frame the experience of our times, which will be the responsibility of current and future conservationists to capture. Second, they point to a constituency for heritage conservation, now and especially in the future. Heritage conservation, after all, is only partly about the past: it is also about the future. And if heritage is to be conserved, it must be for the benefit of someone. Who will be the constituents for future heritage programs?  

While Americans of all races and geographic origins will surely benefit from programs to conserve diverse heritage, such programs should be of particular value to people who belong to the groups most directly affected. Who will those people be? This is no trivial question. While immigration statistics provide part of an answer, they also present some puzzles. For immigration itself is changing, and with it notions of residence and even citizenship. Scholars have coined the word “transnationalism” to refer to these complex and still only partially understood changes.  

A Transnational Excursion  
Judith Baca, a well-known Chicana artist, has worked with Los Angeles’s Mexican communities for over thirty years. In recent years she has noted a change. Mexicanos now outnumber Chicanos, two to six: whereas Chicanos have put down strong roots in Los Angeles, Mexicanos, recent immigrants, maintain networks of relationships with Mexico and have not developed such strong local roots.  

Baca is describing one aspect of transnationalism: the establishment of communities based on “sustained ties of persons, networks and organizations across the borders across multiple nation-states.” Whereas traditional options for immigrants were pretty much limited to settling into the new place or going back to the old, migrants now can also choose to continue making regular visits to their places of origin, sending remittances, keeping touch through phone calls and emails, carrying on cross-border business and financial dealings, and even maintaining civic and political engagements in their old communities. All of these are happening among today’s migrants, and they are creating new cultural situations on both sides of the border. John Silva points out that half of all tourism to the Philippines is Filipino immigrants to the United States – about a million of them each year. “In Mexico,” remarks Carlos Monsivais, “the border with the United States is everywhere, and economically and culturally speaking, all of us Mexicans live
along that border.” “Might Mexico one day become a nation of Chicanos?,” he asks.16 Our concern of course is with developments on the U.S. side of the border.

But where is the border, if people live significant parts of their lives and maintain thick economic and cultural relationships on both sides of it? And what will Mexican American (or Filipino American) cultural heritage look like, fifty years hence, on “our” side of it? Along with challenging traditional notions of migration, transnationalization is also challenging established understandings of ethnic heritage. Until recently, concepts of how ethnic culture develops have tended to follow one of two idealized models. First, assimilation: immigrants gradually blend into the mainstream until their cultural identity is submerged, perhaps to resurface in symbolic representations of ethnicity (St. Patrick’s Day parade) by later generations. Second, cultural pluralism: ethnic groups will retain the cultural characteristics of their countries of origins to a significant degree, coexisting as culturally distinct groups within the national borders of their new country. To these possibilities transnationalization adds a third, that “syncretist cultural practices and meanings” – mixed languages, new customs, intricately hyphenated identities – might emerge out of the experience of straddling a border.17

Most perplexingly, transnationalization is challenging accepted notions of national identity and even citizenship. National identity has been a sort of umbrella, big enough to shelter most aspects of a citizen’s life – economic transactions, cultural identity, family, social, and political commitments. But the lives of transnational migrants don’t fit under a single umbrella. Would two national-identity umbrellas, side by side, encompass them? Or should the two umbrellas become one? Should people be able to shelter under one umbrella for certain aspects of life, under another for others? Whatever the answer, it seems at least possible that the concept of Americanness will be less compelling as a description of identity for transnational migrants than it has been for most residents. And this raises a question: if national identity loses some of its force, will regional identity gain? Will some residents come to feel a stronger sense of affiliation to the hyphenated culture of their city or region – Los Angeles, Denver, New York, or Miami – than to the more distant abstraction of the nation-state?

It is not only low-income migrants who are stretching the bounds of national identity. A well-to-do Manhattanite might well choose to see a traveling exhibition in Amsterdam rather than take the subway to Brooklyn, and the international art venues frequented by cultural elites form a network of sites that, arguably, have more in common with each other with their own cities or regions. Internationalism at the top holds out the promise of enriching heritage practice through a rich network of professional contacts across borders. However, when considering the response of heritage conservation to the experiences of groups characterized by marginal social and economic positions, it is primarily internationalism throughout the rest of the social and economic spectrum that demands to be better understood.

If the answers to these questions are unknown to immigration experts, the questions themselves have hardly been asked by heritage conservation professionals. Yet they provide the context in which programs concerning Mexican American, Filipino American, or other hyphenated American history and culture will be enacted. Without venturing too far into the unknown, we can guess that many future constituents will maintain active ties to their homelands, and that federal programs may have to develop new ways of engaging them. We might hazard a further
guess that regional identity, for both the content and implementation of programs, may become quite useful, and that federal programs will have to be flexible enough to accommodate quite distinctive regional expressions of culture.

III. Heritage and Conservation

What Is Heritage, Anyhow?
Describe your symptoms to a group of medical specialists: the pharmacist will prescribe a pill, the surgeon an operation, and the psychiatrist counseling sessions. Something similar happens when you ask heritage specialists what is the highest conservation priority: the literary expert prescribes the written record, the preservationist historic sites, the head of a cultural tourism agency cultural tourism promotion...and so forth. The “data” contained in this report is admittedly biased, reflecting the perspectives of respondents (who were not chosen scientifically) as well as the way we asked questions. Rather than structure interviews around a definition of heritage, we left it open for respondents to interpret the concept in their own ways. “Heritage,” after all, has no exact meaning: it might refer to buildings, historic sites and places; collectible things such as books, manuscripts, photographs, artwork, and domestic artifacts; intangible goods such as music, dance, cuisine, stories, and traditions or folkways either old or young; recordings and other productions that lie somewhere between the solid and the insubstantial; and finally, most elusive, history: the created record of the past. The Assessment put all of this up for grabs. The validity of its findings stems not from scientific sampling but from the profound insights of its respondents, all of whom have dedicated themselves to preserving cultural heritage in some form, and all of whom speak from a standpoint within the national or racial/ethnic communities being studied.

As to what makes heritage ethnic, a basic premise of this study, as of many others, was that ethnic heritage is not just what immigrants bring with them: it is also how groups adapt to new conditions here. Dell Upton makes a useful distinction between the “architecture of memory” – features that derive from the country of origin – and “landscapes of experience” – features that register the experiences of an ethnic community here in this country. He argues that landscapes of experience are the more widespread and more important of the two. Nevertheless, much thinking about ethnic heritage has concentrated on visually striking manifestations of ethnicity – Chinese pagodas or German bank barns – which lie on the “memory” side of the equation. Such studies have generally focused on rural settings, because that is where ethnic traits can most easily be recognized, and perhaps too because these explorations owe much to the fields of vernacular architecture and cultural landscape studies. They have also favored European ethnic groups. Recent studies have begun to lift these restrictions. Turning to urban settings, one study identifies retail signs, food shops, and recreational structures such as Italian social clubs and German beer gardens as marks of ethnic heritage. And there has been greater interest in non-European groups. An entire book has been devoted to Filipino American design issues. And a particularly vibrant area of study – one with a long scholarly tradition all its own – has been the identification of Africanisms in American architecture and design.
These investigations offered something to the current study. But it was important to define heritage in ways that reflected as directly as possible respondents’ own priorities, and with the exception of Africanisms, visible manifestations of ethnicity were not generally high on the list of cultural productions identified by respondents as critically important.

One valuable insight into how heritage is perceived can be derived from the biographies of some of the field’s leaders. Chicana artist Judith Baca, founder and director of Los Angeles’ Social and Public Art Resources Council, recalls that she started as a “cultural worker” within the social justice movement of the 1960s and 70s. While painting murals with youths in the barrios she was also negotiating gang treaties. Nicolás Kanellos, founder of Arte Público Press and of the Recovery Project, recalls that the press was born “on the artistic fringe during the Hispanic Civil Rights Movement.” Frustrated that mainstream presses were not publishing Hispanic writers, Kanellos launched the Revista Chicana-Riqueña in 1972, which led in 1979 to the establishment of Arte Público Press as a national outlet for Hispanic literature. The name, says Kanellos, was intended to place the enterprise within the context of the public art movement that was producing important community expressions such as Judith Baca’s murals. Dorothy Cordova, founder of the Filipino American National Historical Society, also became involved with heritage during the 1970s, collecting Filipino American oral histories. She had already founded Filipino Youth Activities and would then found the Democracy Project for Asian Americans. During the same years Joan Maynard was founding Brooklyn’s Weeksville Society to preserve the neighborhood’s surviving African American sites: she saw a knowledge of history as essential to the ability of African American youths in a troubled neighborhood to survive. Stanley Lowe, a leading figure in the African American preservation movement and now a vice president of the National Trust for Historic Preservation, got his start in historic preservation by dumping garbage on the desk of Pittsburgh’s mayor: he was protesting the deterioration of the African American Manchester neighborhood. For Lowe, preserving Pittsburgh’s African American heritage was inseparable from the efforts of the city’s African Americans to secure decent homes and neighborhoods. For Baca, Kanellos, Cordova, Maynard, and Lowe, a firm belief in the importance of heritage was rooted in a passionate dedication to social improvement for their communities.

This linkage between heritage and social activism may well be a generational marker, at least in part. Yet it has not characterized the majority of white preservation leaders of the same generation. In this sense it represents a view of heritage characteristic of Mexican, Filipino, and African American practice. Moreover, the linkage has not disappeared. Many African American respondents, including those of a younger generation, continue to emphasize the importance of community development. Lynn Pono exemplifies it. The daughter of Filipino immigrants, Pono describes her sense of Filipino identity as a “learned heritage,” something she picked up from family and from other Filipino Americans in Skokie, Illinois, where she grew up. But the most important experience was joining a college study group that “did a really great job” teaching Filipino history. Since then she has sought outlets for both cultural and political expression, first in the Chicago area and then around New York, including joining Alianza Latina and working with both Cambodian and Filipino immigrants. Now she works as an arts professional in New York and is actively involved with two Filipino cultural groups.
Pono says she is not interested in issues of representation, by which she means the expectation that she should represent herself as a “Filipino artist” and, through her identity and work, exemplify some sort of Filipino-ness. Though informed by one’s identity, she believes, one should not be bound by it. Yet she, like many other Filipino respondents (as we shall see), is “always questioning Filipino identity and what it means”: “it should be changing,” she believes, but whatever it is, it absorbs a good deal of attention. So does the bigger question, which interests her very much, of “how Filipinos fit into the large thing called American heritage...what does it mean to be a Filipino in American society?” These are questions that do not absorb mainstream conservationists; on the contrary, they seem to represent viewpoints outside the mainstream. In fact, Pono believes her Filipino American perspective, rooted in the Philippines’ tangled, messy, multi-cultural, and multi-colonial history, gives her a distinctive and valuable vantage point from which to observe American society. She sees a potential for the Filipino community to be at the forefront of thinking about American identity. “The United States is basically a big experiment,” she says; thinking about cultural issues related to Filipino identity can “inform what American identity will become.”

Don’t Forget History
“History is important,” says Alan Bergano, a trustee of the Filipino American National Historical Society, “because it is the foundation of a people.” The importance of history as a mode of understanding heritage emerged with surprising strength from the Assessment. Surprising, at least, to a white researcher, perhaps because for many members of the majority history has become a sort of luxury good, a pleasant if vaguely defined part of heritage that can be pretty much taken for granted. For many respondents, on the contrary, history can never be taken for granted. It requires active definition and constant attention, because it shapes identity and describes relationships with the majority culture that, in turn, define life in crucial ways. Evidence of achievement must be unearthed, underlined, spotlit. Memories of discrimination and suffering must be maintained. And sometimes evidence of existence – of simple presence within the larger story – must be discovered and defended. For much of history lies lost, forgotten, or buried, and before it can become part of heritage it has to be rediscovered. For a long time the experience of slavery, now widely accepted as a crucial factor in American history, was in this category: something glossed over with little explanation, even excused as essentially benign or unimportant. Today some Filipinos are intent on rediscovering the historical experiences of immigrants from the Marcos era, while some African Americans are bringing back to light the history of urban churches and their pastors. The University of Houston is sponsoring a massive project, called “Recovering the U.S. Hispanic Literary Heritage,” that aims to rediscover, catalogue, and publish the rich and largely forgotten literary heritage of Hispanic Americans.

History, then, is a crucial part of heritage. It has little in common with the genteel appreciation of the “finer things” that the word heritage frequently connotes, or with the “souvenir history” that
Puerto Rican poet Martin Espada derides: the superficial and usually congratulatory commemoration of symbolic highlights in American history. It does not paint the past as “simpler times.” It is instead a relentless struggle to discover, uncover, rediscover, and recover facts about the national past that have been swept from public consciousness either because they are uncomfortable or because the evidence is ephemeral. For many respondents, history is what Antonia Castañeda calls “oppositional history”: history not only of groups that have sometimes had to fight for rights or recognition, but also history in opposition to stereotypes and social amnesia – history opposed to forgetting. Yet Asian American scholar John Kuo Wei Tchen stresses that the goal of pursuing history is not opposition but, rather, reconciliation, specifically racial reconciliation. Referring to lawyer and scholar Eric Yamamoto’s study of the subject, he underlines the importance of three steps toward reconciliation: recognition, redress, and finally reconciliation itself. It may be easiest to describe the process backwards, from the hoped-for goal of reconciliation where people of different races learn to accept one another as equals, to extend forgiveness for past wrongs, and to withdraw barriers to equal participation in society. This requires that redress be first provided: an active acknowledgment of wrongs and a commitment to correct them. This in turn rests on the first step – recognition – and the key to that, Tchen believes, lies in educating Americans about the real history of intergroup relationships. “In many places,” he remarks, “Asian Americans were literally run out of town, so they become to all appearances white places. These things need to be redressed and reconciled...it’s not enough to just sing praises of this country.” If Tchen’s comments sound adversarial, it is important to emphasize that his goal is to move beyond hostility. This requires dislodging people from fixed positions and stereotypes, and an honest appraisal of the facts is the best way to do so. In 1980, Tchen and others founded the Chinatown History Project in New York, later renamed the Museum of Chinese in the Americas: he explains that the project’s central goal was to achieve “recognition,” because “once you’ve established that, people are willing to be less dogmatically nationalist” – on either side of the question.

Confronting facts about slavery and discrimination causes discomfort for some white Americans. It also upsets some black Americans. Referring to slavery, Georgia preservationist Jeanne Cyriaque notes that “some African Americans feel it’s a part of the past that they want to forget”: they want to get past the slave cabins. William Davis, a New York architect, recalls the case of a southern town whose citizens wanted to commemorate their history, including the arrest in the 1960s of a couple whose crime had been to marry across racial lines. Some black legislators opposed the commemoration as being divisive and the sponsors backed off. “Sometimes,” Davis concludes, “history may still be too painful or controversial for people to want to commemorate.” Yet like Tchen, Davis believes that frankly addressing difficult historical subjects can lead to reconciliation and increased social harmony, and he looks to South Africa’s great experiment in truth and reconciliation as a model.

A sense of shame similarly keeps many Filipinos from knowing their own history, says Angel Shaw. Yet while it is well to keep in mind that remembering and forgetting history go on side by side, and that, in Davis’s words, attitudes to painful historical episodes “are not necessarily monolithic,” respondents to this study believed that shame and forgetting were obstacles to be overcome – not reinforced -- by looking forthrightly at history.
**Themes**

The themes of African, Mexican, and Filipino American history are richly diverse. Yet a few appear with significant persistence across all three. Manual labor – hard, low-paid work (often in sun-baked fields) – is one that takes in the experience of enslaved people as well as farm and cannery workers, nurses, cooks, and domestic workers. Episodes of persecution, prejudice, and exclusion also figure prominently. While the legacy of slavery and violence towards African Americans is fairly well known, the ubiquity of discrimination against Asian and Hispanic Americans is less so. A Filipino describes encountering a covenant, written in 1941, as part of the final sale packet for a house in Vallejo, California, purchased in 1994: “No person not entirely of the Caucasian race shall use or occupy the said land or any part thereof, except that persons of other races may act as servants to personnel of the Caucasian race actually occupying said land.”

Many Mexican Americans remember signs proclaiming, “No dogs, no Mexicans.” Despite these impediments, many Filipinos, Mexicans, and African Americans managed to do extraordinary things – found churches and businesses, lead unions, write books, be elected mayor or governor, defend America (or New York or Texas or Hawaii or the Philippines) – and these stories form a third prominent theme. A fourth, closely related both to achievement and exclusion, is the experience of struggle, often expressed in movements for justice that continue to inspire Americans, such as the Civil Rights movement and the United Farm Workers’ struggle for decent wages and working conditions. Finally, many people managed simply to survive, perhaps to marry, raise families, maintain friendships, cook, sing, wash clothes, pick asparagus or cotton, change bed pans, or tend sleeping cars. It is important to remember and understand their stories too, and to honor their experience.

These views of history influence many aspects of heritage conservation, from identifying and interpreting historic sites to collecting diaries or photographs. So does another theme that emerged with particular force.

**Invisible Man**

“I am an invisible man,” announces the black protagonist of Ralph Ellison’s famous novel: “I am invisible, understand, simply because people refuse to see me.” Though Ellison wrote *Invisible Man* over half a century ago, and specifically in response to the African American condition, respondents from all three groups identified invisibility as a defining part of their historical experience. A former director of New York’s Hispanic Society wrote that, “In the rest of the nation the existence of hispano culture in the Southwest was largely ignored until quite recently.” And he quoted a Mexican-American: “We are the best-kept secret in America.” That was in 1976. Meanwhile, on the other side of the continent, artist Judith Baca was working with Chicano youths in Los Angeles, and she recalls how much it meant to them to celebrate their presence and creativity through public artwork that was anything but reticent. Nevertheless, the landscape continues be be littered with what Angel Shaw calls “erasures of history.” In Los Angeles, the historic Merced Theater still stands, but guides do not tell visitors that it was a Spanish-language theater in the 1850s. “They erased that history,” comments Nicolás Kanellos.

The problem of invisibility may be particularly fraught for Filipino Americans. While Jack Tchen regards all Asian Americans as basically invisible, many Filipinos refer to themselves as the “invisible Asians,” and with some justification: an informal survey conducted among the author’s neighbors found not one who was aware that Filipinos are the largest Asian immigrant
group. The fact, moreover, seemed mystifying, because they lacked a clear image of Filipinos or the Philippines. As Angel Velasco Shaw put it, “They don’t know what to do with Filipinos, where to place us.” That may be because, as Shaw points out, Filipinos are “among most the most under-represented groups” in museum collections, monuments, sites, or other publicly visible acknowledgements of presence. Traveling through California, she is aware of the Filipino migrant laborers who once cultivated the fields around her, yet she sees no trace of them in the landscape: their history has become invisible. Shaw wants this heritage to be revealed, perhaps by putting up plaques, perhaps by teaching about it in the schools, but at all events through something that would proclaim: “There were labor camps. Right here.”

For many Filipino Americans, however, proclaiming one’s presence entails a certain anxiety. “Filipinos themselves don’t know their own histories,” comments Shaw, “and part of it is shame.” Roz Li speaks of an “identity crisis.” “Are we Asians or Americans?” Unlike, say, neighboring Thailand, the Philippines do not have a “pure culture. Ours,” she says, is “more like a ‘mutt’ culture,” the result of cycles of Chinese, Spanish, and American domination that have left many Filipinos asking: “Do we have our own heritage?” And if so, what is it? Because of this “identity crisis,” she says, and “because the Philippines have been under America so long, Filipinos think they’re very western. Then they come here and find out they’re not...they’re eastern.” Li’s entire experience has been defined by the tug of east and west, and that, she says, is typical. It can be extraordinarily tough on people. Other Asian groups, she thinks, have more realistic expectations. But “many Filipinos think they’re going to come over and instantly be part of the mainstream. Then when it doesn’t happen, they get disillusioned and bitter....” Bitter or not, the culture that immigrants bring with them is as diverse as Filipino history itself, divided by place of origin, date of arrival, class, form of work, place of settlement, politics, and so forth. As Angel Shaw remarks, “Filipinos are so diverse, our histories are so complicated.” And so the desire to be recognized brings questions about identity to the foreground.

Whatever doubts may exist regarding cultural identity, the urge to become visible provides a powerful impetus for heritage conservation. In 1991 intact eighteenth century African and African burials were found on the intended site of a new federal office building in Lower Manhattan. The massive public campaign that ensued failed to save the entirety of New York City’s African Burial Ground, yet it succeeded brilliantly at making African Americans visible within New York’s history. White as well as black New Yorkers developed an entirely new awareness of African Americans in early New York: they had become decisively present in New York’s history. Today, more than a decade later, thousands of people from all over the world continue to visit the site and participate in a range of educational programs and commemorative observances.

Mexican and Filipino heritage advocates understand the value of sites like the African Burial Ground – or like the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, Alabama, a National Historic Landmark that was the site of a pivotal confrontation of the Civil Rights movement. Would it not be wonderful, asked Refugio Rochin, if the sites of Mexican American struggles were marked in a similar way? “To be able to go to Selma and say I’ve crossed the bridge....We need opportunities for reflection like that.”
IV. EFFORTS, ACHIEVEMENTS, RECOGNITION

All Inequality Is Equal, Some More So Than Others
While African, Mexican, and Filipino Americans have all launched major heritage conservation programs, the responses of agencies outside these groups, and of the public at large, has been unequal. In general, African American issues have generated greater official interest. One cannot, for example, browse the web pages of the National Park Service without being alerted to a wide range of African American heritage issues. The same is not true with regard to Mexican or Filipino heritage, which continues to be, as it were, more invisible to society at large. This does not mean that African American heritage has been “done”: far from it. Even in Washington, D.C., notes John W. Franklin, important African American sites continue to be ignored or bulldozed. And despite all that has been done, it is indisputable that, as National Park Service consultant historian Michele Gates Moresi observes, “African Americans are not fully integrated into the professional field, not ‘mainstreamed,’ if you will.”

These are sensitive issues. One should not mistake the existence of programs as proof that a problem has been solved. At the same time, it would be wrong to allow one’s awareness of continuing needs to deny recognition to the successes that have been achieved. And clearly within the African American field, there have been many such successes.

Spotlighting African American Heritage
The growth of interest in African American heritage demonstrates how social militancy, political pressure, scholarly and professional interest, and official action can combine to produce impressive results. As early as 1941, Melville J. Herskovits’ *Myth of the Negro Past* set out to document the African past that was embedded in African American culture. During the 1950s, the Civil Rights movement encouraged growing interest among scholars and sparked new efforts to grapple with the issue of slavery. During the 1960s militant protests were directed at both universities and museums, and by the end of the decade, Afro-American studies were entering the curriculum, while a few major museums were beginning to address African American topics and audiences. Community museums were also opening: the Smithsonian’s Anacostia Museum in 1967, Brooklyn’s Weeksville Society in 1971. Scholarly and popular interest seemed to spur each other on: the life story of a black sharecropper became a national bestseller in 1974, Alex Haley’s fantastically successful *Roots* in 1976. Meanwhile, the academic field of material culture studies was opening up new approaches to African American heritage, particularly architecture and crafts, and by the 1990s readers could consult studies in which the full range of material production, from plantation houses to walking sticks, were analyzed in the context of social conditions, folklife, race relations, and the survival and evolution of cultural traditions.

The rediscovery of African American heritage also excited the historic preservation field, especially in the South, where several states launched official programs: the Black Heritage Council of the Alabama Historical Commission (founded in 1984), the Georgia Minority Heritage Coalition, and soon heritage councils and coalitions in Kentucky, Florida, South Carolina, and Louisiana. In 1984, Georgia’s State Historic Preservation Office published an important guide to historic black resources, and by the early 1990s guidebooks to African American heritage sites and newsletters on African American heritage preservation were available in Alabama, Tennessee, Florida, Georgia, and Kentucky. Meanwhile, historic houses and sites like Colonial Williamsburg began to put African Americans back into the historical
picture and to deal with subjects like slavery in a forthright way. Today, while many plantations continue to present an incomplete and biased picture from which slavery and, indeed, black people have been erased in favor of hoop skirts and family recipes, others -- such as the Cane River Creole National Historical Park and Evergreen Plantation, both in Louisiana -- present accurate and indeed fascinating accounts.

Progress was taking place in the north as well. The Weeksville Society was launched in Brooklyn in 1971. By the 1980s, Sturbridge Village was developing living history techniques related to African American history. New York’s State Historic Preservation Office released a handbook on identifying African American historic resources. The campaign to save New York City’s African Burial Ground and Audubon Ballroom (site of Malcolm X’s assassination) moved African American heritage issues to the foreground. Meanwhile, African American preservation movements developed in Pittsburgh, Indianapolis, and elsewhere.

Today, the National Register of Historic Places lists over eight hundred properties associated with African American history. National Historic Landmark Theme Studies have been carried out or authorized on Black Americans in United States History (1974), Racial Desegregation in Public Education (1998), and Civil Rights (2000). The U.S. Congress has authorized the National Park Service to carry out other major projects focused on African American heritage. For example, the Lower Mississippi Delta Development Commission (1988) led to plans for a Delta Region African-American heritage corridor, cultural center, and music heritage program emphasizing the blues (1994). A preservation and interpretation study of the Underground Railroad (1990) resulted in a travel itinerary of 59 National Register properties in 21 states, a number of National Historic Landmark designations, and a published interpretation guide for historians and site administrators. The Cane River National Heritage Area, Cane River Creole National Historical Park, Jean Lafitte NHP, and New Orleans Jazz NHP interpret aspects of the history of Louisiana’s creoles of color. The National Park Service has studied the Gullah-Geechee heritage of the Georgia and Florida coasts and has prepared a travel itinerary of National Register properties connected with the Civil Rights Movement. And in addition to the material available on its other websites, the National Park Service maintains an informative website specifically about African American heritage. Since 1995, grants have been made from the Historic Preservation Fund to the historically black colleges and universities for preserving historically significant buildings. In addition, the National Trust for Historic Preservation regularly highlights cultural diversity in its conferences – especially African American themes – and offers scholarships to attend them. Two states, Georgia and Alabama, have full-time African American heritage programs. State and national guides to African American historic sites are widely available. There are regular conferences on African American heritage topics. And according to architect Richard Dozier, most of the eight architecture schools among the Historically Black Colleges and Universities offer courses in historic preservation.

John W. Franklin offers a sharp corrective to anyone who might think that these achievements mean that the problem has been solved. In cities like Baltimore, Annapolis, or even Washington, D.C., he says, there is still “great resistance to telling the story.” Meanwhile, all over the country, African American communities continue to be destroyed by transit schemes and other forms of development. Geraldine Hobdy, former Louisiana State Historic Preservation Officer – the state’s first black SHPO and the nation’s second – offers another caveat to the picture of bustling
achievement. “There has sometimes been a need,” she says, “to create the appearance of helping a segment of the population for political reasons, or for reasons driven by tourism.” A state might “create some materials – beautiful posters – but it doesn’t necessarily go beyond that”; you might find “beautiful publications but no archives.” In Georgia, Hobdy credits SHPO Elizabeth Lyon with making sure “there were real programs, even if they were not always obvious to the general public.” But, she warns, you have to look beyond appearances to see whether genuine programs of lasting value are being created. Though much remains to be done, in many places such programs have been launched.

**Mexican and Filipino Heritage: Awaiting the Spotlight**

Neither Mexican nor Filipino American heritage has yet become visible to the general public, or been recognized by the historic preservation profession, in the way African American heritage has. True, public acknowledgment has not been completely lacking. In the winter of 2003, two exhibitions could be seen simultaneously in Washington. One, at the Smithsonian’s National Museum of American History, depicted Filipino American life in California during the 1940s and 50s; the other, across the Mall at the Smithsonian’s Arts and Industries Building, life in the traditionally Mexican American region of the Rio Grande Valley. In May, 2003, the National Trust for Historic Preservation named Little Manila, Stockton’s historic Filipino American neighborhood, to its annual list of 11 Most Endangered Historic Places – an unfortunate way to recognize a “cherished local landmark” that, in President Richard Moe’s words, provides “one of the few remaining sites that reminds us of the important role played by Filipino Americans in shaping our nation.” The Trust has also named a two-hundred-mile stretch of the Lower Rio Grande, associated with Mexican American heritage, to its 11 Most Endangered List. Yet such marks of recognition are the exception. Out of over 76,000 properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places, only 35 are listed as relating to Asian American heritage, 13 to Hispanic heritage; of the Asian American sites only one relates directly to Filipino history. The key word “Mexican” brings up only twenty-eight entries on the National Trust’s website, “Filipino” seven (almost all relating to Stockton’s Little Manila neighborhood). Out of approximately sixty National Historic Landmark Theme Studies, only two have ever been undertaken on Asian or Hispanic American themes: Spanish Exploration and Settlement (1959) and Japanese Americans in World War II (1991). Of twenty-three authorized National Heritage Areas, only one is located in the Spanish southwest and none directly relates to Hispanic or Filipino American heritage.

Geraldine Hobdy attributes the success of many African American heritage initiatives in part to the existence of a political incentive to help (or appear to help) African American constituents. Political strength is often connected with official support for heritage conservation. In 1994, for example, Florida’s state legislature recognized an important political constituency by authorizing funds for a “Florida Cuban Heritage Trail” (it later authorized trails for Jewish and women’s heritage). Effective heritage preservation comes from political leverage: the importance of the linkage can hardly be overstated.

Right now, growing Latino political power is laying the groundwork for recognition of Mexican American heritage – if Latino politicians and their constituents choose to use their leverage for this purpose. Given an expanding Filipino American population, similar leverage may be developed in the future. In the meantime, both Mexican and Filipino American groups have
launched impressive heritage conservation projects, within their communities, that will have
great importance for the future. While the following discussion cannot claim to be complete, it
does indicate the conservation priorities that respondents brought to the attention of the
Assessment.

V. PRIORITIES AND STRATEGIES

The Written Record: Filipino American Heritage, FANHS and the National
Pinoy Archive

The Filipino American National Historical Society,\textsuperscript{44} founded in 1982, has encouraged and
organized much of the energy that Filipino Americans have devoted to heritage conservation.
Based in Seattle, FANHS has twenty chapters around the country, including Alaska, Oregon,
Virginia, New York, the Midwest, New England, and New Mexico: there are seven chapters in
California. Active members include both professional and amateur historians. FANHS trustees
meet regularly to exchange information and strategize, and the organization hosts a national
conference every other year. Within the last few years, some younger scholars have begun to
challenge some of the assumptions about Filipino American history (and ethnic heritage in
general) on which FANHS was built. Yet even they continue to FANHS in high esteem for
having sustained a sense of community and purpose among heritage advocates, nurtured the
work of historians both professional and amateur, and overcome severe obstacles to create
scholarly resources of unique and irreplaceable value.

Filipino heritage advocate also hold its founders and leading spirits, Dorothy and Fred Cordova,
in great affection. John Kuo Wei Tchen, a highly respected scholar of Asian American history
who has mentored many younger Filipino scholars, calls the Cordovas the “grandparents or
godparents” of those younger scholars – some of whom continue to refer to them in Filipino
fashion as Auntie Dorothy and Uncle Fred. Their moral authority stems from a combination of
sources: an unshakeable belief in the importance of Filipino American heritage, an indomitable
will to protect it, personal warmth and generosity of spirit, and authenticity of experience. The
Cordovas have \textit{lived} Filipino American heritage. Dorothy Cordova’s father was a salmon
cannery contractor; Fred Cordova grew up in a family of migrant farmworkers in Stockton,
California, before moving to Seattle in 1946. And their dedication to heritage conservation is
legendary, reaching back at least thirty years.

In 1987, FANHS established the National Pinoy Archive in Seattle, and under Fred Cordova’s
leadership this repository has become an indispensable resource for the Filipino American
history. “It’s amazing what this man has achieved,” is the sober assessment of scholar Angel
Velasco Shaw. As John Silva sees it, FANHS went “hog-wild” to collect absolutely everything:
documents, letters, diaries, newspaper clippings, oral histories, photographs.... Indeed, Shaw
asserts, many Filipino American leaders “will want everything preserved” – and, she adds, “I
would agree with that.”

Dorothy Fujita-Rony distinguishes between two kinds of objects that can be collected: first,
things that reflect old-country traditions and accepted values; second, those that reflect the
community’s experience here. These things – oral histories, photographs, letters, posters, work
tools, diaries – are the most fragile and ephemeral. They also represent a contested terrain. Fujita-Rony says that in any marginalized or immigrant community, people will try to collect these things, and keeping them in the community will become politically important. Conversely, outside organizations that show a well-meaning interest in collecting the same objects may well be perceived not so much as wanting to collect as to “come in and take” things.

Many Filipino Americans respondents see the core of heritage as lying in the life experience of Filipino immigrants. “You have to have lived that life,” says Shaw, to fully understand what abstractions like farm work or racism really meant: most people simply would not believe what it was actually like. Alan Bergano says that “Filipino American history starts at home,” in understanding the experience of one’s parents. So it becomes enormously important to preserve the historical records of the Filipino American experience, and this is what the National Pinoy Archive has done. But the case for the importance of written (and spoken) records goes beyond this remarkable archive. Aimy Ko, a recent university graduate and first-generation immigrant, remembers that when she undertook a historical research project on her grandfather Maximo Manzón, who graduated from NYU Law School (but was not allowed to practice law in this county), she was able to go to her uncle for family stories. To whom, she asks, will future generations of students turn? And how will they place their family stories within the larger historical narrative? “It’s important,” she urges, “to have the documents available to students or to anyone who’s trying to locate themselves relative to their families and the past.”

Luis Francia emphasizes the centrality of one particular kind of document: community-based newspapers. These provided the “ways in which Filipinos and Filipino Americans communicated with each other,” and today they are indispensable both as cultural products of the Filipino community and records of its experiences. As Rick Bonus puts it, community newspapers are “fixtures” in Filipino American stores, beauty salons, and other community spaces. The newspaper are numerous, varied, and stem from many parts of the country: one published in New York, for instance, served as an outlet for immigrants opposed to the imposition of martial law in the 1970s. “It would be great,” says Francia, “if there were a whole set somewhere” – for example, at the Library of Congress. But not only there: another set should be lodged within a leading Filipino community-based organization.

The National Pinoy Archive deserves and needs financial support. FANHS board members place a high priority on securing the Archive’s future. Angel Shaw agrees: “Someone should give Fred Cordova money to preserve the archive,” she says. The tasks of collecting and conserving are simply outgrowing the resources of a community-based non-profit. So is the collection’s national importance. But cultural politics have to be considered too. While many Filipino American respondents would appreciate both the financial support and the professional expertise that federal agencies like the Library of Congress could bring, they want the collection to remain within the community, and they want Filipino American sensibilities to continue directing its course.

Important as FANHS is, Filipino American heritage studies are expanding in new directions. Whereas FANHS has emphasized the west coast experience, especially that of agricultural and fishery workers, some New York respondents believe that the experience of Filipino immigrants there – in which professionals, artists, and intellectuals have figured more prominently – also
merits exploration. Moreover, a new generation of well-trained and highly motivated young scholars is emerging. Their books and teaching are creating the kind of intellectual heft that has so effectively sustained African American heritage conservation efforts – though the gains in political influence and militancy that accompanied the development of Black Studies are so far lacking.46

The Written Record: Hispanic Heritage and the Recovery Project

Like Filipino respondents, many Mexican American respondents stressed the importance of written records for uncovering, preserving, and teaching history. Here too, amateur historians have done critically important work. Indeed, when it comes to finding important historical materials, Nicolás Kanellos credits amateur historians and genealogists with being “way ahead of the scholars.” And “there are thousands of them out there,” piecing together early land claims, genealogies, settlement records, stories, and local traditions. They meet nationally and are most numerous and active in the formerly Mexican southwest, including California and Texas. There are local preservation societies like Houston’s Tejano Association for Historical Preservation. And there are amateur journals of history and genealogy, like El Mesteño in south Texas and La Herencia in New Mexico.

Meanwhile, Kanellos’s own Recovery Project, based at the University of Houston, has established itself as an academic powerhouse, discovering, inventorying, and publishing important but long-forgotten Hispanic American texts. Known formally as “Recovering the U.S. Hispanic Literary Heritage,” the Recovery Project has made major steps towards preserving and making accessible a literary heritage that includes not only the “conventional literary genres” but also letters, diaries, oral lore and popular culture stemming from Cuban, Mexican, Puerto Rican, Spanish and other Hispanic Americans. Kanellos launched the Recovery Project in 1992 as an outgrowth of Arte Público Press, which he had founded in 1979 as a national non-profit publisher of Hispanic literature, and which he had moved to the University of Houston the following year. The Recovery Project’s on-line catalogue currently lists twenty-five volumes of poetry, stories, letters, novels, and other accounts, in addition to scholarly works on Hispanic literature, including a history of early Hispanic periodicals in the United States.47 But these publications offer no more than a glimpse into the vast database on Hispanic writing that Arte Público is compiling and digitizing for internet use. Calling newspapers and other periodicals the “primary cultural repository of Hispanic written thought,”48 Kanellos notes that the Recovery Project has already assembled bibliographic information on 1,700 Spanish-language periodicals before 1960 and digitized 350,000 articles: eventually it plans to digitize 700 books and 900 newspapers.

Gerald Poyo, a professor of history at St. Mary’s University in San Antonio, thinks the Recovery Project is having a major impact in redefining Hispanic history and culture, and he credits the project with bringing scholars together, nurturing their work, and enhancing their consciousness of an evolving field. Literary scholar Rosaura Sanchez believes the Recovery Project’s value extends beyond the universities. Before the Recovery Project, students and general readers had “only what scholars have written” about these priceless literary sources, and this remains largely true: “Why,” she asks, “should only the few be able to read those texts?” Making them available enriches and changes the public culture and makes it possible for teachers to tackle previously inaccessible historical subjects. After the Recovery Project published María Amparo Ruiz de
Burton’s long-unavailable novel of 1885, *The Squatter and the Don*, Sanchez notes, teachers began to use it in classes. Now it is “part of the Chicano canon.” Sanchez has a vision: someday, the diaries, novels, and newspapers of Hispanic North America will be so widely available “that anybody wanting to study this, all they have to do is go to their library and read it themselves.”

Kanellos too would like the Recovery Project’s books to be more widely available. The bookshops of museums and historic sites – including those of the Smithsonian and the National Park Service – would make ideal distribution points. Yet Kanellos is frustrated that so few have taken advantage of the opportunity, even where titles would be directly relevant. Nor is the Recovery Project the only source of publications that would extend the offerings available to visitors: many history and heritage societies and culturally specific museums also offer extensive lines of publications. Whether those of the Recovery Project or of other publishers, stocking more and better publications in their bookshops would be a relatively simple step that federal agencies could take to support the conservation of Mexican (and Filipino and African) American heritage.

**Museums**

Museums appeal to respondents for several reasons. They offer a way towards what Jack Tchen calls recognition. They also provide centralized collection and display points for artifacts advocates consider important to preserve. And of course they present opportunities to educate. Yet both the politics and the economics of museums are complex.

Some Filipino respondents identified the establishment of a major national Filipino-American museum and library as a high priority. Respondents in New York take inspiration from the Smithsonian Museum of the American Indian and its George Gustav Heye Center in New York, as well as from the city’s Museum of Chinese in the Americas. “We don’t have that,” comments Angel Shaw: “Filipinos are the last nationality without a museum.” While not strictly true, her statement suggests the strong appeal that the museum idea has for some members, at least, of a historically important and very populous group.

However clear in concept, the cultural politics of museums can be complex. Some FANHS chapters are raising funds for a museum in Stockton, California. Will it adequately present the experiences of east-coast Filipino American communities? How will it relate to the National Pinoy Archive in Seattle? Can the community sustain a top-notch museum? Some Filipino American respondents voiced a need for “someone of the caliber of the Smithsonian” to manage a museum and establish the most up-to-date “professional ways to preserve and document artifacts.” On the other hand, they recognize that a proposal to surrender community control to a federal agency would be highly controversial and, indeed, problematic since it might deprive Filipinos of the very voice they had worked so hard to gain. They admire the way tribal voices and interpretations come through at the American Indian museum. That of course owes something to the governmental standing of Indian tribes. Lacking this, ethnic or national immigrant groups might have more difficulty achieving this balance in a partnership with the federal government. But the question is worth posing: could a similar result be attained through some sort of partnership arrangement in which, perhaps, local collecting projects could “link up with the Smithsonian”? One way or another, a highly professional, national-scale repository for art, artifacts, documents, and oral histories is needed.
As an interim step, Luis Francia asks, “would the Smithsonian be willing to do an oral history project” on a national scale? Such a venture, as Francia sees it, would include interviews to illuminate “all different aspects of Filipino American experience” across the country and across generations. It would build on existing work but add to it and, as it were, fill in the gaps. Such a project could become “a seed bed for what a museum could be.”

Some Mexican American respondents identified museums as important components of heritage conservation, frequently in conjunction with historic sites. Both Nicolás Kanellos and Rosaura Sanchez emphasize the tremendous value of the collections held by missions, presidios and other historic sites, some of which contain priceless documents and other artifacts. All too often the potential of these collections is frustrated by inadequate funds for cataloguing, research, and conservation, sometimes putting fragile objects at great risk. Professional expertise may be in short supply as well. Control over interpretation frequently lies outside the community. And sometimes that is aimed more at gratifying (Anglo) tourists than at presenting history in an objective way. So museums represent both problems and opportunities. Again, the politics of culture and community are complex. Kanellos points out the value that a major national repository like the Library of Congress could bring to a partnership. Major collections of documents, he says, should either be lodged there or at their sites of origin: if the former, then the sites must have facsimiles, for such collections are invaluable teaching tools for historic sites.

Though the final repositories may remain unclear, Mexican and Filipino American heritage groups are assembling the historical evidence of their participation in American history with enormous vigor: books, manuscripts, letters, diaries, newspapers, restaurant menus, news clippings, photographs, land deeds, genealogies, oral histories, and so forth. This is a national service of inestimable value that will allow future citizens and scholars to know these chapters in American history. One way that government can participate in conserving Filipino and Mexican American heritage is to support this work by providing technical assistance and grants, and by using its considerable purchasing power to make the publications of non-governmental heritage organizations available to the public through its own museums and historic sites. This would, of course, benefit the larger public as well.

**Folkways**

- **Traditions and Folkways**

  A particular question for the Assessment was whether federal agencies should play an expanded role in protecting or interpreting folkways and traditions. No clear answer emerged, though the evidence suggests several constructive lines of action. For example, preserving the history of folkways would allow heritage agencies to take on many of the functions discussed above – collecting, curating, conserving, displaying historical evidence – while also photographing, filming, and recording it. And agencies outside the heritage field could do help support living cultural traditions by refraining from taking planning, development, or regulatory actions that harm them. The subject deserves further study.

Many respondents include folkways within their concepts of heritage. Jeanne Cyriaque notes that music provides an effective way to preserve that elusive “spirit of place,” particularly when significant buildings no longer exist: she appreciates groups like the Georgia Sea Island Singers
and the McIntosh County Shouters who continue to maintain traditional forms of music. Traditional ways of transmitting community experience from generation to generation are also valued. “Filipino American history starts at home,” says Alan Bergano: it is very family-oriented. However, beyond general stances like these, the picture becomes less clear. Take language. Here is Moses Spear Chief, of the Blackfeet Reservation, on the subject: “If it’s gone then their culture is gone ... Without the language, values are lost, your sense of belonging is gone.”49 This is a classic statement of the centrality of language to culture. Yet if the role and survival of languages is a key issue for many tribes, the issue was less clear-cut with respondents to this study. Some Filipino Americans regret the loss of language ability within the community. Roz Li says that second generation Filipino Americans typically lose their native language: “hardly any of the kids know how to speak it....They’re so afraid of being stigmatized...I think it’s very sad.” Jorge Ramos agrees with the premise that the “link between language and identity” is important: Latinos’ sense of identity, he asserts, “is intrinsically linked to where we came from and what language we speak.”50 But Spanish appears to be in no danger of disappearing. Quite the contrary, “Spanish is more alive than ever in the United States.” Nine out of ten Hispanics, according to Ramos, speak Spanish at home; the Spanish-language media flourish in a way that previous immigrant presses never did. And in contrast to earlier immigrant groups, “Hispanics have not had to lose their language or their culture in order to feel as if they have assimilated; in fact, many have taken a stand in defense of that culture.”51

Judith Baca agrees that “cultural retention is something the Mexican American community itself is quite committed to.” In contrast with the African or Filipino American diasporas, she points out, Mexican Americans are able to continually refresh not only their language but also their historical awareness and cultural production by movement across the border – that same border that had originally crossed them. Throughout the southwest they also draw on what Baca calls “land-based memory”: deep roots in places where Mexicans have lived continuously for as much as five hundred years. And many remain acutely aware of their ancestors’ loss of land following the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, no mere a historical curiosity but an obstacle to Mexican Americans seeking to maintain old ties to the land. Again, while traditions and folkways are important, government’s role in protecting them is neither simple nor clear.

◦ “I Don’t Like Turkeys”

Transnationalism is making everything still more complex. An anecdote told by Jorge Ramos reminds us that immigrants do not simply bring their traditions with them. A Mexican immigrant, Amelia, “was about to celebrate Thanksgiving Day here in the United States. She had just arrived in the United States, but she was very interested in the upcoming holiday and wanted to know what I was planning to do for San Guivi.

“I was about to celebrate Thanksgiving Day here in the United States. She had just arrived in the United States, but she was very interested in the upcoming holiday and wanted to know what I was planning to do for San Guivi.

“Yes, San Guivi, that saint that they pay tribute to here,” she replied. Amelia had assimilated this new holiday into the Catholic traditions that were familiar to her. In this context, she had interpreted Thanksgiving phonetically as San Guivi.52

A website, www.filipinoamericans.net, calls itself “A One-Stop Site for Filipino American History and Culture” and manages an on-line community forum called “The Filipino Forum.”53 This a good place to sample the concerns that some Filipino Americans express about retaining
their cultural heritage: it too suggests the flavor of transnationalism, of constant improvisation,
and of traditions that are not so much maintained as learned and, sometimes, reinvented.

Arranging weddings in the Philippines prompts many questions in the Filipino Forum. One
woman writes: “...I’m also getting married next year and wanted to have a somewhat traditional
Filipino wedding. So I’m interested to know what a Filipina gown looks like? And what is the
groom (me) supposed to wear? A Barong?” One helpful response refers the questioner to a
website, mybarong.com, which “provides pictures of barong tagalog, Filipina gowns, wedding
rituals, wedding accessories and other Filipino wedding traditions.” Clearly not all Filipino
Americans know the traditional customs, but some want to learn and follow them. This is shown
even more clearly in a posting concerning another important ritual:

“...Traditionally or maybe a religious calling, we Filipinos celebrate? (sorry, don’t know
what the proper word to use) the one year death of a family member. Am I right so far? Anyway,
that’s the reason I am writing....”

“I will be assisting my deceased brother’s wife in preparation for this ‘babang luksa’ and
I don’t have a clue on what we are suppose to do or what to present to our guests? I have not
attended this type of event and I don’t know what goes on except prayers. I appreciate any advice
on what needs to be done for this occasion. BTW, we are Tagalogs if this matters at all. I am
thinking maybe each region have different ways to doing it?”

How to celebrate American holidays like Thanksgiving prompts further questions. One writer
remembers: “in my neck of the woods...here in Little Manila town, my family had roast pork
(from the oven) not the lechon kind. Never really developed the acquired taste for turkey...maybe
next year, it’ll be lechon manok. Remember those, guys?? Thanksgiving never really became a
family tradition, only a tradition of four-day weekends which we all enjoy.” To which another
responds: “Never had lechon manok. How do you prepare and cook it? It will be a good sub for a
turkey. I don’t like turkeys.” And a third: “My family is not really much of a turkey eater either
but we have it for the Caucasian members of the family. What interesting though that my mother
did this year was to take a whole turkey to the Chinese Deli/Restaurant nearby and have the
Chinese cook there roast it for us....We almost always have the Honey Baked Ham...and the rest
of the food on the table are Filipino dishes. We look forward to this holiday to get everybody
together and catch up on everyone’s lives.”

O Folkways and Ethnography: Roles for Government

Anyone who believes that tradition is static might ponder these passages, as might those
considering government’s role in protecting folkways. Neither Mexican nor Filipino respondents
asked for or saw a clear role for government in helping to protect traditions that their
communities are actively managing. Two respondents offered cautions. Guadalupe San Miguel, a
historian with a wide knowledge of Mexican American musical traditions, noted that the
Smithsonian has “done wonderful work with some of the schools” in South Texas but questioned
whether the Institution’s efforts to preserve the conjunto music of that region were too narrowly
aimed at preserving a particular kind of music that had been popular in the 1950s. In fact, San
Miguel explains, conjunto continues to evolve like other aspects of a living culture. Was the
Smithsonian promoting an image of a “static culture,” creating “a stereotype of what Tejano
music is?” Dorothy Fujita-Rony cautions that Filipinos themselves are divided on what counts as
authentic Filipino folklore. Pilipino Cultural Nights emerged as major community events during
the 1970s and 80s, involving hundreds of students in dances, skits, and political commentary. They were “major avenues of cultural reclamation.” But, she says, some Filipinos argue that folk dances actually reflect 1950s-era government cultural policies more than they do genuine Filipino folk culture. And Filipinos differ on whether folklore should properly be about the home country or about the community’s experiences here.

While it may be difficult for government to support folkways, government can all too easily harm them. Regulations may be passed to outlaw cockfighting, restrict the selling of live chickens, or ban fishing from the pier or hunting in the forest. Government may condemn and redevelop downtown properties, displacing traditional African, Mexican, or Filipino communities; or it may allow the market to transfer land, water, and other resources from traditional communities to new owners. In New York City it has replaced Puerto Rican casitas with housing and other new construction. In the southwest it alienated land from Mexican owners, despite treaty obligations. Many (but not all) of these government actions are taken in pursuit of broad social objectives that policy-makers believe transcend the value of imperiled traditions. Frequently, however, the social value of those traditions is not considered in the political process, and few tools exist to help decision-makers measure it even if they want to.

A good first step towards rethinking government’s responsibilities to living cultural heritage would be to institute a broad review of government’s impact on the ability of communities to maintain their folkways. A second step would be to develop legal and policy tools with which decision-makers and the public could assess the impact of proposed actions on traditions and values that are at stake.

Another fruitful step would be to identify traditions that require buildings or other spaces, assess the threats against those spaces, and consider how they could be alleviated. Sociologist Ray Oldenburg has developed the concept of the “third place,” the place that is neither home nor work but that provides an invaluable setting for public socializing. Oldenburg’s third places can be restaurants, bars, retail shops, service establishments, or community centers, but to qualify, they must provide nor merely service but also a sense of place that nurtures community bonds.55 Most communities, perhaps all communities, have third places. A study of Filipino communities by Rick Bonus56 identifies three types of places where Filipino Americans typically articulate community identity in a public setting: the so-called Oriental stores, community centers, and sites of media, especially local newspaper offices. Shoppers at an Oriental store, for example, told Bonus that they offer not only products but also “story-telling and gossip”: they are places, they said, “where you can be comfortable, where you can be your own self, buy the best goods, find the kinds of things you cannot find anywhere else...where you can feel okay because you not only buy goods that you know, but you buy them with people you know.”57 In Oldenburg’s terms, Oriental stores are third places.

This author has considered the value of community gathering places as “story sites,” sites that embody traditions, and has discussed how communities can make use of the scant protections available under existing historic preservation and environmental laws.58 It would be useful to apply this line of thinking specifically to African American, Filipino, and Mexican communities. Oriental stores, Filipino American community centers, and local newspaper office appear to be “story sites.” Are they in need of protection? If so, what kind? What about comparable Mexican
American places? Are they threatened? And if so, by what – by economic forces, land use regulations, gentrification, changing customs? These issues need further clarification.

For a variety of reasons, historic preservation laws do not offer much assistance in preserving third places, story sites, or the traditions associated with them, though the concept of traditional cultural properties may ultimately prove useful. More promising at the moment may be the environmental laws, under which it may in some circumstances be possible to recognize cultural features like third places as elements of the environment on which the impact of proposed actions – projects undertaken, permitted, or funded by government – must at least be considered. The State of Hawaii has taken this line of reasoning somewhat further. The state legislature recently amended its environmental statute to require that environmental impact statements consider the effects of proposed actions on the “cultural practices of the community and State.” The same amendment also defined adverse impact on those practices as a “significant effect” calling for a full environmental impact statement. While the legislative record makes clear that these measures were undertaken specifically to protect Native Hawaiian culture (a goal explicitly recognized by the state constitution and by a series of legal decisions), the language appears to be general in scope. In effect, it creates a requirement to carry out a “Cultural Impact Statement” as part of the more traditional Environmental Impact Statement.

Wherever African, Mexican, or Filipino American communities qualify as “traditionally associated peoples,” the National Park Service already has its own useful vehicle, a Service-wide program, to understand and protect their traditions. And it has a policy direction to do so. The National Park Service defines traditionally associated peoples as neighbors of a unit within the National Park System, as well as “ethnic or occupational communities” that have been associated with it for two or more generations and whose interests in its resources began before its establishment. Traditionally associated peoples may include “African Americans, Hispanics, Chinese Americans, Euro-Americans,” or indeed anyone who has a “traditional association with a particular park.” The places or features within the park that have “traditional significance” to these groups are known as “park ethnographic resources.” National Park Service policies call on the agency to maintain an inventory of these resources, and to consult with traditionally associated peoples in matters regarding their stewardship and interpretation, listing in the National Register of Historic Places, designation as National Historic Landmarks, and plans or actions that might affect them. The Ethnography program helps the National Park Service meet this goal by “conducting ethnographic assessments, cultural affiliation studies, traditional resource use studies, ethnographic resources inventories, and other research efforts designed to provide managers with a baseline of information about cultural values attached to park lands and resources.” So far over 160 such studies have been completed or launched. National Park Service ethnographer Alexa Roberts sums it up thus: “It’s about the connections between people and their places, and making management decisions based on these connections...that’s what our program does.”

The concept of ethnographic resources and the practice of consulting with traditionally associated peoples have been widely applied in the context of Native peoples. But other communities also have strong ties to parks (or to places that predated the parks), and the National Park Service could use its ethnography program more vigorously to document and protect their heritage. Laura Gates, superintendent of the Cane River Creole National Historical Park,
describes how a painstaking process of community consultation with African Americans and
creoles of color deepened the staff’s interpretation of the site while acknowledging the local
communities’ strong feelings about it.  

It is hard to gauge the potential for ethnographic studies that have not yet been undertaken, but it
is probably considerable. Alexa Roberts emphasizes what a great asset the National Park
Service’s cultural anthropology program can be. “Take advantage of it!,” she urges her
colleagues. “If we’re going to talk about diversity, if we’re going to talk about partnerships, then
we just need to bite the bullet.” It has to be acknowledged that no respondents asked for applied
ethnographic studies, but Roberts has a plausible explanation: people don’t often say they want
to be studied. Then, too, few if any respondents were aware of the National Park Service’s
ethnographic programs or policy direction. Roberts sums up: “It’s up to the National Park
Service to recognize that we have a rigorous way to find out who are the traditionally associated
peoples, what their relationship to the park is, and how do their cultural values about park lands
and resources translate into decisions that we can take to manage those resources in a culturally
appropriate way.”

Folklore and Historic Preservation
While government’s role in protecting folkways remains somewhat murky, it is quite clear that
folklore can greatly enrich the nation’s historic preservation programs. In Florida, historic
preservation and folklife programs have been placed together within the state’s Bureau of
Historic Preservation, and according to Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer Barbara
Mattick, the merger has made preservation staff “more aware of what are the cultural aspects –
not just the architecture.” Eatonville exemplifies how the “challenge to think folk life in things”
can enhance historic preservation. Eatonville is the oldest and most intact example of a black
town established during the Reconstruction period. It was also the home of renowned folklorist
and author Zora Neale Hurston, and now of the annual Zora Neale Hurston Festival of the Arts
and Humanities, a community-launched event that has made the town a magnet for heritage
tourism. State preservationists had struggled for a decade or more to figure out how to
successfully nominate Eatonville – a place of unquestioned historical importance – to the
National Register of Historic Places. The problem was that few historic buildings survived.
Thanks to a government grant, a folklorist was able to visit Eatonville and document “games,
food, religious practices” and other non-architectural aspects of what made Eatonville
significant. That work is still going on; meanwhile, the town has been listed on the National
Register for its historical and architectural importance – thanks, in part, to the boost given by the
folklife documentation.

The State of Florida has also worked with local groups to carry out a historic marker program in
Eatonville. From a historic preservation perspective, again, “the problem with Eatonville was
that everything you’d want to talk about is no longer there.” Documenting folk life – including a
map of traditional pathways through the town – helped the project’s designers to create ten
wayside markers and a brochure that tell a satisfying story.

Folklorists may differ on what is the best administrative arrangement for their discipline. But
from Mattick’s point of view, having folklife in the department “adds substance” to historic
preservation. Descriptions of folkways provide a “reflection of the place” that goes beyond its
architecture—an approach, she believes, that has been particularly valuable to “the way we look at cemeteries, schools, and churches”—all important places of community memory.

Florida’s folklife program has involved Greeks, Seminoles, Polynesians, Hawaiians, Ukrainians, Japanese, Chinese, Haitians, and Cubans. They have created an impressive public representation of a truly diverse culture, one that encompasses Palestinian needlework, Hungarian embroidery, and African American quilts—not to mention Seminole canoes, Caribbean music, and a host of traditional skills that are less obviously ethnic, from surfboarding to fly-tying. They have worked hard to perpetuate some of these same skills. Yet according to Mattick, “African American is probably the area where there’s been this merging of historic preservation and folklife.” Why? In part because African Americans are Florida’s largest minority, “African American has been a major focus” of state historic preservation work, and the department has launched particularly vigorous efforts to reach out to and include African Americans in their work.

To include folklife as an integral part of a community’s history is to identify another constructive role that government can play. Emily Lawsin, a FANHS trustee from Michigan, urges the National Park Service to publish a brochure of important Filipino historical sites across the country; hers would be a different kind of brochure, because along with standard historical information it would feature oral histories about the sites. Many Mexican and Filipino American respondents place a strong emphasis on understanding the life experiences of ordinary people in the past, and conservation groups are already collecting newspapers, memorabilia, photographs, oral histories, and other sources with which to document those experiences. But documenting the historically evolving folkways of their respective communities may exceed the capacity of community-based (or even university-based) non-profit groups such as those that currently exist. The difficulty is not so much history’s breadth as the kind of documentation that would be required. To photograph and catalogue domestic interiors, create high-quality musical sound recordings, or identify and document community businesses—whether third places or simply examples of successful entrepreneurship—will demand substantial resources of money, equipment, technical skill, and organization. Federal and state agencies could provide these in ways that richly supplement and support the work of heritage conservationists and help to create invaluable historical resources for the future.

**Historic Places**
- **Site-Seeing: A Cure for Public Blindness**

  When the Cultural Heritage Needs Assessment was launched, its organizers hoped and perhaps expected that it would lead to novel findings. *Keepers of the Treasures*, after all, had pointed the way toward a heritage practice quite different from the norm as practiced by a largely European-based profession. Against the background of these expectations, the Assessment’s findings were indeed surprising...but in an unexpected way. No element of heritage conservation is more deeply rooted in historic preservation practice than historic places. Yet no element was so consistently demanded by respondents. Respondent after respondent emphasized the importance of historic places.

  Why are historic places so important? Historian James Horton, who has done much to bring African American issues (and professionals) to the forefront of historic preservation, has written that “it is much easier and much more meaningful to write about events that shaped history when
you can stand in the places where those events occurred. It is easier to understand the people of
distance when you can be in the spaces that they occupied, the spaces where they lived their
lives.\footnote{Jack Tchen points to a more compelling reason. Asian Americans, he argues, are
invisible to society at large. Public recognition for historic sites helps make them visible. It also
helps educate other Americans. In conversations with many respondents, historic places emerged
as the antidote most often prescribed for public invisibility.}

By their very nature, historic places are both public and, often, official. Designating one usually
involves some form of recognition, which may have little direct effect on the resource itself
(such as a listing on the State or National Register of Historic Places) or a very substantial effect
(such as federal acquisition and management as a National Historic Site). Regardless of the
degree of protection, the act of public recognition itself distinguished historic places from other
forms of heritage conservation. Unlike archival collections, for example, historic places exist
within a public space, where they can be visited by potentially unlimited numbers of people,
initiates and uninitiates alike. To designate a place, in short, is to recognize history in a very
public way: to administer a potent antidote to the invisibility (or public blindness) that continues
to characterize Mexican, Filipino, and even African American heritage. For Luis Francia, “it’s
important to have visible artifacts”: the artifact may be a historic place, monument, or marker,
but whatever it is, “it reminds people that at a certain time, and at this place, there were people
who lived here, achieved something, and contributed to society.” John Silva goes further: he
believes that creating a “visible heritage” would help build the cultural identity that, for Filipino
Americans, remains so confusing. Fred Cordova emphasizes that historic sites are a high priority
for FANHS.

If historic places are so important, why are there not more Mexican and Filipino American
heritage advocates involved in preserving them? Part of the answer relates to means and
opportunities. While it is relatively easy for private citizens to collect letters and photographs or
trace genealogies (though even this can stretch the financial resources of amateur groups), the
barriers to conserving historic places are steep. Acquiring one costs money; operating it costs
more. Although there are many large organizations that are well equipped to do both – state and
federal governments, for example – groups without political power find it difficult to persuade
them to acquire places they believe are important, or to manage them in appropriate ways. As for
preservation tools such as the National Register of Historic Places or local ordinances – measures
that help protect historic places even though they do not provide interpretation or public access –
the rules are complex and are not widely understood. Many respondents, even sophisticated ones,
did not know how to use them; some did not know they existed. Neither, of course, do most
citizens of European descent.

Without much ability to acquire or control historic places, one activity is frequently open to
heritage conservationists: fighting to save them when they are threatened. And they do so – with
tragic frequency, for many important sites lie in the way of redevelopment or disinvestment yet
lack the sort of immediate appeal that can gain the attention of decision-makers. Historic African
American neighborhoods in cities around the country have been destroyed by the combined
forces of disinvestment, highway or rail construction, and urban renewal. With virtually all of the
historic Manila towns razed, urges Jack Tchen, \textit{any} surviving remnants of Asian American
historical presence become crucially important to preserve. In fact, FANHS is currently working
with the National Trust for Historic Preservation and other groups to preserve the remnants of Stockton’s Little Manila neighborhood from a typically toxic combination of urban renewal, disinvestment, highway construction, followed by the coup-de-grace: strip-mall development. The case of Stockton has received some attention, but all too often, public ignorance of Mexican, African, or Filipino heritage causes important places to be threatened or even casually swept away before their significance can even be recognized. Though Rolando Romo can easily point out the center of Houston’s first Mexican community, that important spot now lies under the parked cars outside Minutemaid Stadium. Buildings associated with the history of migrant farm workers have also succumbed to demolition, as have the gravesites of important Mexican Americans like Lorenzo de Zavala. When powerful economic and political forces – politicians, developers, civic leaders – combine forces to demolish a historic place, it is hard enough even for politically well-connected and well-funded groups within the majority community to prevail: African, Mexican, and Filipino American advocates certainly do not find it any easier.

○ Places to See
The organizers of the Assessment did not attempt to carry out a historic places survey. There have been several such surveys, and many potential places have been identified, documented and await only official action to recognize them. The following paragraphs, however, will suggest some of the highlights of the many proposals that respondents are prepared to document, given the opportunity. They also provide a very rough and perhaps incomplete typology for places associated with Mexican, Filipino, and African American history.

Points of origin
Respondents from all three groups felt that more could be done to study and mark places where each group entered the country, or places that mark that group’s earliest experiences here. For Bradford Grant, Jamestown, Virginia, is “incredible – very rich historically: as one of the first sites where Africans were enslaved and brought to this country, the place is as significant for African Americans as for European Americans.” Isaac Johnson comments, “We are dealing with African Americans, but we’re leaving out some important factors because we’re not looking back at the beginnings, the 1700s”: he urges greater attention to southern cities, to free blacks, and to those early ministers whose “names were not as well-known as George Washington” but who played a crucial role in the early history of African Americans. For Filipinos, San Diego was an important point of origin: Ronald Buenaventura calls it the “gateway to Filipino American immigration.” Did Filipinos establish a permanent settlement near New Orleans in the mid-eighteenth century? Many scholars believe so, but John Kuo Wei Tchen regards the question as not quite settled. Resolving it, he says, “would be a major accomplishment” that “would have huge implications for the history of the U.S.” For Mexicans, whose history predates that of “Norteamericanos” throughout the southwest, the question of origin-points is different but no less important. Judith Baca, whose lineage is Tejano, believes that marking and interpreting the early Spanish land grants is crucially important. Rosaura Sanchez agrees: she would like to see the evidence of Mexican land-holdings around San Diego publicly identified. Imagine how instructive a drive up Interstate 5 would be, “when you see that and you see what’s happened.” For these and other respondents, the origin-points of Mexicans as later immigrants are also important, especially El Paso, which Baca calls the “Ellis Island of the Southwest.”

Routes of migration (and other trails)
As a way of seeing places, trails are appealing because they speak directly to the act of travelling, which has pleasurable connotations for many people and is the context in which historic places are often visited. For all three groups, moreover, trails can have special significance because of the historical importance of migration experiences, both to the United States and within it – sometimes toward enslavement, at other times toward freedom and opportunity (Underground Railroad), and on yet other occasions as expressions of struggle (Selma to Montgomery Civil Rights march, National Farm Workers’ Association march from Delano to Sacramento).

“How did Filipinos end up where they ended up?”, was a question that several respondents asked: the migration routes that took Filipinos from west-coast ports (and later New York) to virtually every part of the country would be fascinating to trace. Inspired by the Boston Freedom Trail and the Boston Black Heritage Trail that links fifteen African American places, Joan May Cordova, a FANHS trustee from Boston, imagines a map showing the routes of Filipino migration throughout the United States. Adélamar Alcántara adds that Filipino workers followed crops around the country: those seasonal migrations were an important aspect of the Filipino experience too and deserve to be marked. She would also like to trace Filipino migrations back to their points of origin in the Philippines. John W. Franklin offers a similar suggestion: thanks to recent research in Louisiana, the National Park Service has the opportunity to tell visitors where some of the state’s African American families came from. Trails are important to Mexican Americans as well. Judith Baca notes that even well-known trails like the Santa Fe trail could stand to be better marked. Moreover, the “migratory lines” that took Spanish or Mexican settlers into the northern parts of Spanish territory (and that later took Mexican immigrants into the southwest and beyond) have never been properly marked at all: the “major movements of the Mexican diaspora” should be presented for all to see. But there is more: because much of the United States was once part of Mexico, the story concerns the movement not only of peoples but also of national borders. The shifting locations of the U.S./Mexican border should be marked for all to see, as should the place where the all-important Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo was signed.

**Places of experience**

Asparagus fields in California, cotton fields in the south, salmon canneries in Alaska, sugar plantations in Hawaii, hospitals, military bases, tenements almost everywhere, downtown neighborhoods in many American cities, dance halls and union halls, Spanish land grants, a carrot warehouse in Grants, New Mexico...these are all places where Filipinos, Mexicans, and African Americans lived and worked in significant numbers. Each advocate has a personal list of important sites that convey the experience of ordinary immigrants. John Silva’s includes Filipino labor camps (Stockton, California), restaurants and hotels, military installations (the Presidio), Chinatowns (Los Angeles, San Francisco), pineapple plantations (Hawaii). For Angel Shaw, “going to the plantations is a very sad thing.” While Japanese plantation workers had families and slept in beds, Filipinos were bachelors and were housed in straw cots. Yet it is “very hard to get information on Filipino life at the plantations in Hawaii.” And the situation may be worsening: Linda Revilla, a FANHS trustee with roots in Hawaii, warns that Hawaii’s plantation heritage, so important to Filipinos, is rapidly disappearing. Judith Baca’s list would have included the ghetto on the other side of the tracks in La Junta, Colorado, had it not been torn down. Mexicans, she says, were forced to live there: they included service workers and military personnel. She laments “a place like that going unrecognized and unacknowledged.” Refugio
Rochin emphasizes the importance of the barrios: “they’re eye-opening,” he comments – to see them, to understand how many people lived there, to absorb the details of life (the outhouse, the cactus, the animals). “That kind of stuff is not being preserved as a walk-through exhibit,” he says; but it should be, and if it is not done soon the opportunity will vanish. Rochin also notes markets and plazas (including “quite a few” in the southern parts of Colorado), and of course the missions and presidios. Guadalupe San Miguel, an expert on the history of Latino music, emphasizes the dance halls of South Texas. Fred Cordova’s list includes churches and lodges; he would also like to see tours of Filipino businesses. Terri Torres, a FANHS trustee from Stockton, California, wants to mark the asparagus fields there with something that says, “this area, this field...Filipino farm workers were here, and they made possible the biggest industry out of Stockton.” Adélamar Alcântara wants to preserve the bunkhouses for Filipino farm workers in Grants, New Mexico, carrot capital of the United States.

Places like these offer extraordinary opportunities, in James Horton’s words, to “understand the people of history.” Because few decision-makers have recognized them as important historic sites, many of the buildings have been demolished. That makes telling the story harder – and preserving the remaining ones that much more important. But even without the buildings, the places are evocative and instructive.

**Places of suffering and struggle**

Many historic places associated with African American slavery are interpreted far better now than ten or twenty years ago, and this is helping the American public to accept and understand slavery as an episode of national history. Key places in the struggle against slavery and discrimination have also been memorialized, especially those connected with the Civil Rights movement. Places of Mexican and Filipino suffering and struggle, however, remain largely ignored. “We should be marking the hell out of places where Cesar Chavez worked,” says Judith Baca: starting with his home at Salsipuedes and the place of the famous United Farm Workers demonstration at Delano, California. Refugio Rochin agrees, adding the 250-mile route of Chavez’s march from Delano to the state capitol at Sacramento, as well as the places of other demonstrations and speeches, like one at Crystal City, Texas. Rolando Romo, founder and past president of Houston’s Tejano Association for Historical Preservation, also agrees, and he has organized a number of events commemorating Chavez, including a Cesar Chavez Hispanic Pride Parade and Celebration. Because Filipino and Mexican farm workers united behind Chavez, he has great importance to Filipinos as well. But there were other demonstrations, too: John Silva notes the important strike at Hanapepe in Hawaii, where twenty-five Filipinos were killed.

**Places of achievement**

How many visitors know that the White House cooks and stewards were traditionally Filipino? That represents an achievement in which John Silva and other Filipinos take pride. Guadalupe San Miguel wants to preserve and mark Ideal Records in Alice, Texas, a recording studio and dance hall that played an important role in the development of Tejano music in the 1940s. He is also working to commemorate the birthplace of General Zaragoza. Rolando Romo was moved to found the Tejano Association for Historical Preservation by the destruction of the house and graves of Lorenzo de Zavala, a pivotal figure in the formation of the Republic of Texas, and his family. Refugio Rochin notes the homes of Leo Carillo, a rancher who owned most of the land which became Santa Monica, and of California’s first and last Mexican governors (in Sonoma
and Whittier). Fred Cordova would like to see a directory showing where the “Filipino illustrious” are buried.

Many historians feel that moving beyond the preoccupation with prominent individuals and their accomplishments has allowed them to address big historical trends and to document the lives of ordinary people. But many heritage advocates continue to feel that it is important to celebrate both contribution and achievement, particularly against odds. Judith Baca says that making known the “contributions made to the United States by this group [Mexican Americans] would be a profound statement....To have this information publicly available would be a critically important acknowledgement of how much has been given to this country.” The website of the Tejano Association for Historical Preservation has a page listing 82 “Famous Tejanos & Tejanas in Texas History,” while the home page of Filipino Americans.net assures readers that “Filipino Americans quietly have made their indelible marks on America as politicians, doctors, judges, entrepreneurs, singers, professors, movie and television stars, etc. You name it, and there are many Filipino American achievers in every field of dream....” Sites of individual achievement remain important for heritage advocates.

**Places of interaction**

“Communities are typically studied,” in isolation, says Dorothy Fujita-Rony, “but it’s the interactions that produce some of the most interesting things in American culture.” John Kuo Wei Tchen agrees that interpreting the interactions among different ethnic groups can be revelatory. And these interactions have been far more pervasive than the public realizes. Where to do so? Fujita-Rony nominates New York City as a naval center, Chicago as a railroad hub. In Seattle, Filipinos shared a neighborhood in the Central District with African Americans. Refugio Rochin suggests that the markets and plazas of southwestern towns offer opportunities to understand the cultural blending of Hispanic and Native American.

Interactions have taken many forms, including intermarriage. Dorothy Cordova says that, in contrast to Japanese or Chinese, Filipinos are “a mixed-race people,” more likely to intermarry with others. Indeed the first Asian war brides in the United States, she says, were Filipino women who married “Buffalo soldiers” – African American soldiers posted to the west. Refugio Rochin notes that Filipinos and Mexican Americans often intermarried. In part this was because they worked side by side in the fields, but also because miscegenation laws prevented either from marrying whites, and the earlier generations of Filipino immigrants were predominantly male. Exploring these family relationships, believes Rochin, would be illuminating even to the descendants of these marriages, many of whom do not fully understand their own background. Then, too, John Silva notes that Filipinos in the northwest and Alaska frequently married Native Americans or Alaskan Natives, while Rosaura Sanchez and Antonia Castañeda point to the frequent intermarriages between Mexicans and Native Americans in the southwest.

In addition to intermarriage there were cultural blending, shared work, shared life experience, and shared struggle. Black Americans fought alongside Filipinos in World War II. Filipinos united with Mexican farm workers to make possible the successes of Cesar Chavez and the United Farm Workers. Filipinos and Mexicans “have been pitted against each other” so often, laments Angel Shaw, but the reality was different. Telling the story of Chavez and the Delano
march correctly would help build a bridge between the two groups. “Imagine a plaque,” she says, that presented their “complex and intertwining” cultural histories.

Sometimes, of course, interactions were neither consensual nor collegial. Rosaura Sanchez emphasizes the blending of languages, religions, and customs that took place between Hispanic and Indian, but she is also acutely aware of the suffering that Indians endured in the Spanish missions and presidios. And she wants this story told, fully and honestly, at the places.

Fujita-Rony notes growing interest in Asian-Latino interactions. Rochin emphasizes the importance of understanding Latino-African American relations. Alcántara notes that saving the Filipino bunkhouses at Grants means collaborating with Mexican Americans and Navajo. Places of interaction offer special opportunities for projects that build understanding among groups and that expand consciousness of American history and culture.

**Spiritual places**
The importance of churches in African American history and community life has been widely discussed and is often emphasized. For Mexican Americans, Refugio Rochin notes that cemeteries were also important. Many people don’t know, he says, that Anglo cemeteries were exclusive: Mexicans were buried in graveyards that were as segregated as the *barrios* in which they lived. Those cemeteries are “colorful, beautiful, and they’re visited by a lot of people.” He mentions important ones in Tempe and Tucson. Olivia Cadaval agrees, adding that cemeteries are “living spaces,” in which the stories of people and families who are connected continue to be played out. In preserving cemeteries, she advises, you should be “preserving the living connection.”

**Milestones of international relations**
Mexican and Filipino Americans may be more aware than most other Americans of the history of relationships between the United States and their countries of origin. A defining event in U.S. relations with the Philippines was the Philippine American War: it concluded the Spanish American War and opened a half century of colonial occupation of the Philippines. Jack Tchen would like to mark Angel Island and the Presidio, launching points for the Spanish American War, as historic places. The Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo was a milestone in U.S. relations with Mexico: for Judy Baca, the place where it was signed (in Mexico) is an important historic place, as are the shifting borders between the two nations.

**Place of education and of presentation**
Filipino, Mexican, and African American respondents identify two specific values that historic places can have. One is to educate. “Americans are just ignorant” of Asian American history, remarks Jack Tchen, “so we need to claim these places.” The other is to present the group publicly, both to group members themselves and to other Americans. The discussion of places above has generally focused on their educational value. Some – like the Mexican land grants, the White House, or New York’s African Burial Ground – also have great presentational significance.

Filipino respondents were most explicit in emphasizing the importance of what I am calling presentational places. These need not commemorate specific events; just as important is that they
occupy symbolically prominent positions. New York’s Central Park is one such place. Eric Gamalinda asks, “Why is there no José Rizal statue in the United States, outside Hawaii?” Describing him as “one of the few unifying factors that our fractious people have,” Gamalinda notes that this great of Philippine independence – executed by the Spanish in 1896 – visited New York, and that there once was a plaque on the hotel at which he stayed (off the corner of Madison Square). Gamalinda would like to see not merely a plaque but a statue – in Central Park. Great figures of many other nationalities are represented by monuments there, yet not Rizal, or indeed any other Filipino figure. Angel Shaw agrees that a statue in a public place like Central Park would go farther than a plaque; it is the kind of thing, she says, that “makes us visible.”

Despite being more interested in living culture than in memorializing history, Lynn Pono also sees the value in memorials. “It’s a corny thing to want a monument,” she says, “but it’s such a part of America....even vacations are organized around visiting them.” She thinks a traditional memorial might be “too commemorative,” but she would like to bring in artists “to create something that talks about the role of Filipinos in American history.” Her ideal monument is the Vietnam War Memorial that occupies a prominent place on Washington’s Mall. “Why,” she asks, “can’t memorials be more like that?”– moving in a sincere way, rather than “creating a false sense of national pride.” While Pono would like to update the traditional language of national memorials, in short, she is very much interested in having such a memorial.

Museums can also fulfill the presentational role of monuments and statues, and some respondents see the Museum of the Chinese in the Americas as doing this for the Chinese community, the Museum of the American Indian for Native peoples. FANHS is planning a national museum of Filipino American history in Stockton, California.

Icebergs: hidden meanings of historic places
Like the tips of icebergs, historic places are the visible protrusions of much more momentous things, and like icebergs historic places owe much of their impact not to their visible protrusions but to the great mass of meanings that float just beneath the surface. The word association is sometimes used to denote these meanings: historical narratives, moral examples, mental images, recollected sights, sounds, values, or abstractions that places may bring into the visitor’s mind. For Jeanne Cyriaque, an initiative to document and preserve the Rosenwald schools – schools built by a Jewish philanthropist to serve African American children in rural areas in the south – gains power and importance through the schools’ associations. Architecturally modest and often badly deteriorated, each of these unassuming buildings tells a larger story of African American striving and of community experience during the period after emancipation. Associations are present, and important, in many if not all of the places discussed in this report. But the importance of historic sites rests on larger understandings of heritage.

Places and communities
“Individual places are important,” says architect Richard Dozier, but many of the most significant speak to issues outside themselves. He recalls the founding of Brooklyn’s Weeksville Society in the 1970s: had Joan Maynard wanted to do nothing more than preserve some houses – houses that had survived from a nineteenth century free black community – it would have been relatively simple to do so. What made the challenge more difficult, and has made the rewards
correspondingly greater over the years, was her larger vision of how those houses could tell a broader historical story, and especially about how that story could become valuable to Weeksville’s modern-day African American neighbors.

Some of the larger issues that Dozier has in mind have to do with the experience of community. Because of pervasive racial segregation, he explains, the historically black colleges and universities became anchors for neighborhoods in which African Americans could find everything from housing through business services to nightlife. Later, as the rigid walls of segregation came down, African Americans “found they could get their photocopying done downtown...they could even live across town”: the tightly-knit, campus-centered communities broke apart, leaving little trace on the cityscape. Today, the campus buildings remain as important historic places in their own right, but also as clues to a different way of life that is important to remember and understand. The challenge Dozier puts to historic preservation, then, is to go beyond merely preserving the campus buildings to conveying their social context – to presenting something “more representative of the history.”

For Jeanne Cyriaque, African American Programs Coordinator for Georgia’s SHPO, maintaining historical awareness of community life is an important goal of preservation efforts. She notes that the heritage of African American communities like Harlem and Chicago’s Bronzeville has had national, even international, impact. But less famous places are important to remember too, and she lists a range of building types – churches, schools, meeting places, downtown business rows – that typically serve as “community landmarks.” What if these buildings do not survive, or do not show any evidence of African American presence? “When there are no built resources, we have to capture the spirit of place,” she says – meaning the consciousness that a vibrant community was once present at that spot. At Augusta’s Springfield Baptist Church, she explains that a community-based group erected a thirty-five-foot-high “Tower of Aspiration,” a public sculpture to “signify the many people who lived in the community.”

The problem of maintaining “spirit of place” without built resources is pressing, because for well over half a century African American neighborhoods have confronted powerful forces of destruction: railroads, interstate highways, mortgage redlining, abandonment of property, urban renewal. John W. Franklin would like to organize an exhibition on “all of the African American communities destroyed by highways...and now by metros.” Indeed the threats continue: new forces of commercial development and gentrification have joined the older ones. The Georgia and South Carolina coasts, for example, are home to historically important African American communities that in some cases have nurtured a sense of cultural continuity for almost two centuries. Yet their beachfront location has exposed settlements like St. Simon’s to the physical destruction of resort development for the affluent, coupled with the social disintegration of steeply rising land values. “When you build a $500,000 house next to a $50,000 house...well, you know what happens,” shrugs Jeanne Cyriaque. The situation at American Beach, Florida, a resort community developed by and for African Americans during the 1920s (when blacks were excluded from other beaches) is similar.

The most pervasive threats are directed at urban neighborhoods, particularly those located downtown. “There are so many African American communities that are endangered by development,” says Cyriaque. Sometimes a Wal-Mart is put “right there in the community.” Or it
might be a “business expansion”... or a “transportation issue – roads or a new train station – or a parking lot or a super-store dropped right into the community.” And as young professionals rediscover the advantages of downtown living (particularly where real estate values have been depressed by decades of disinvestment), African American neighborhoods have become targets of gentrification and displacement: they are “at the center of the city,” notes Cyriaque, “and now everyone wants to live there.” This is taking place not only in Atlanta but also in smaller cities like Macon, Savannah, and Columbus (Georgia).

Karl Webster Barnes, chairman of Georgia’s African American Historic Preservation Network, describes the situation in Atlanta’s West End neighborhood as typical of many threatened African American neighborhoods throughout Georgia. After decades of threats from road construction, public housing projects (whites-only), disinvestment, and suburban flight, the West End is now threatened by poor-quality residential and commercial development. Part of the neighborhood was designated as the West End Historic District in 1991, and it is listed on both State and National Registers. Yet the erosion of neighborhood character continues.

White neighborhoods have experienced similar problems. But whereas many white historic preservation activists might describe the problem primarily as a loss of neighborhood amenity or architectural quality, Barnes frames it as an issue of culture and history:

“All across Atlanta and Georgia, we are seeing a significant case of removal of cultural memory. Traditional African American neighborhoods are being systematically moved or removed from their historical locations adjacent to town centers. Historical African American neighborhoods are being marginalized and removed from their historical locations at a time when the region is developing strategies to increase heritage tourism. As preservationists, we can and must make a difference in our neighborhoods and stop the marginalization of African American memory from our cultural landscape.”

Community Commemoration and Community Development; with a Note on Community Cultural Development
The problem described by Cyriaque, Dozier, and Barnes can be addressed as an exercise either in community commemoration or community planning. Whereas the first accepts the loss of historic resources, the second aims to prevent it. Richard Dozier holds that preservation should attempt at least to “neutralize” the effects of gentrification on the community fabric of historic black neighborhoods. New York architect John Reddick argues that this community fabric is as valuable a historic resource as the buildings themselves. In place of market-driven gentrification, in which architecturally distinguished buildings are restored but community fabric is torn apart, he would like to see an alliance between historic preservation and community planning, in which historic housing stock is improved for the benefit of the existing community. Such efforts to make reinvestment in historic buildings an ally, rather than an enemy, of community conservation, have been tried in cities including Pittsburgh, Savannah, and Jackson, Mississippi. They are consistent with the attempts of African American preservation advocates like Joan Maynard and Stanley Lowe to root historic preservation within the larger struggle to maintain community in the face of social, political, and economic pressures – in short, within what architect William Davis calls community development, “which for black folk, especially in urban areas, is key.”
One potential line of action, then, aims to save sites and more: not only major landmarks but also a network of “community landmarks,” and not only community landmarks but also community itself. The other line of action aims to empower sites to represent themselves and more: to teach not only their own history but also to show how they related to a larger community context, and even how the experience of life within that community was shaped by larger historical forces. The concept of teaching is fundamental, and we return to it below. What is important to note here is that historic sites are expected to represent more than themselves. Embedded in cultural contexts, they must somehow explain those contexts, make them present for the visitor: never do sites “speak for themselves,” in any sense of the phrase.

It seems safe to say that the ways preservationists currently have of enabling places to do this leave room for improvement. Jeanne Cyriaque ticks off a few: historical markers, commemorative plaques, public artworks. Each of these can help a historic building to speak, or can speak in the absence of a historic building or artifact. Cyriaque describes an interesting example of the latter. Many locations along inlets or rivers on the Georgia coast were once used as baptismal sites. Today, though “you have the oral history about it,” there may be no physical evidence of this tradition. At Sandfly, by erecting a commemorative sculpture out of bricks taken from downtown Savannah (another place important to the black diaspora), community members were able to give physical presence to an important cultural experience preserved only in oral tradition.

Jack Tchen has a suggestion that may be relevant. He argues that “community cultural development” is an important vehicle by which immigrant or marginalized ethnic groups can create and express a cultural identity that draws on historical experience while also engaging current community issues. Community cultural development might also offer a vehicle for maintaining Cyriaque’s “spirit of place.” While it is difficult to define community cultural development in a sentence or two, Don Adams and Arlene Goldbard offer this description:

“In community cultural development work, community artists, singly or in teams, place their artistic and organizing skills at the service of the emancipation and development of an identified community....While there is great potential for individual learning and development within the scope of this work, it is community focused, aimed at groups rather than individuals, so that issues affecting individuals are always considered in relation to group awareness and group interests.”

If readers are unfamiliar with the field, that may be because, as Adams and Goldbard explain, it is “nearly invisible as a phenomenon” in this country.77 Nevertheless, it is globally important. In French-speaking countries it is known as animation socio-culturelle, community artists as animateurs – a good word that suggests the kind of impact artists can have involving community members in expressive work to address their history and shared experience. The nature of that work can cover a wide range, including visual arts such as murals (Judith Baca’s work with SPARC – Social and Public Art Resources Council – is an excellent example), radio, music, and theatrical performance, which may take place on streetcorners or buses as well as in theaters. Community cultural development work can provide an activist context in which to project historical awareness, using elements such as oral history and traditional crafts or activities. It could become a valuable tool not only for strengthening community bonds but also for
maintaining historical awareness of a community’s past, not least of all where key physical elements are lost or at risk.

La Memoria de Nuestra Tierra
Like African American respondents, many Mexican American respondents place historic places within a larger cultural context. They too face the challenge of important places that lack preservable buildings or other physical artifacts. In part this is because many historically important experiences did not produce monumental architecture: instead they took place in fields, factories, unassuming social clubs, religious shrines, or flimsy workers’ housing. But sometimes this is because a place’s importance lies not in what might have been built there but in the place itself, and in the knowledge of it that people carry within themselves. Judith Baca refers to this as land-based memory, or “la memoria de nuestra tierra,” which is the title she chose for a major mural at Denver’s International Airport. Except by Native Americans, Mexican Americans’ “depth of presence” in the land is unrivalled: as much as five hundred years in Moro County, for example. And, according to Baca, “People believe that memory resides in the land.” This is no mere figure of speech. Antonia Castañeda emphasizes the degree to which long-established Hispanic communities incorporated indigenous Native American cultural attributes, and Baca notes that intermarriage with Native Americans was common. The longevity of Mexican communities has meant not only a strong southwestern culture but distinctive regional cultures as well – traditions, stories, memories, music that relate to locally dominant activities, whether farming, ranching, or cutting railroad ties. Throughout the area, she says, there are “amazing stories of regional land memory.”

Land memory has more practical dimensions as well. In the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, the United States promised to honor existing Spanish land grants in the conquered territories. By and large, the United States failed to honor that promise, and a great deal of Spanish land (like Indian land) passed into Anglo hands through force, trickery, or the courts’ refusal to recognize the legitimacy of Spanish ownership. Much of that land had been communal: descendants of the communities continue to live on or near their ancestors’ land, and they have not forgotten history. “People live with this every day,” says Baca. The land grants should be marked, along with like the missions, presidios, and trails. Marking the grants would not only maintain the memory of deep presence in the land but also signify hope that ancient wrongs might be righted. But whether marked or not, the land grants are real, icebergs floating just beneath the horizon of public visibility, and they will continue to convey powerful messages to those who understand them.

A Larger Representation of Culture
Luis Francia, a Filipino American poet in New York City, believes in the importance of “visible artifacts” – sites or markers. Yet like other respondents, his vision focuses beyond the places, which in Francia’s view must always be “tied into the larger representation of Filipino heritage and culture.” Angel Shaw agrees that, as “representations of actual people and events,” sites should have plaques or other informational tools that build out the story. But representation is more than a metaphor: for Francia, it means the preservation of collections, documents, and oral histories. For Jack Tchen, designating places is a step towards education, which he views as the “real redress” not only to public misinformation but to a history of social exclusion.
Historic places can be linked with collecting activities in a general way, as items on a heritage preservation menu, or in more specific ways: places can be agents and repositories for collections, and they can use those collections to provide a “larger representation” of history and culture. Either way, respondents not only want more historic places, they also want more from them. The concept of education – of teaching – is crucial. Respondents want historic places to teach better history, and more of it.

Francia gives the example of the Filipino-American War, the bloody and extended conflict that emerged out of the United States’ victory over Spain in the Spanish-American War. One could visit a great many monuments to the Spanish American War, Francia remarks, without ever learning anything about the Filipino-American War, even that it happened. Though the dates inscribed on the tablets bracket the entire conflict, the inscriptions frequently do not mention the second phase, in which American soldiers fought to subdue the Filipinos they had ostensibly come to liberate. If they do mention it, they refer to it misleadingly as an “insurrection.” The error is not trivial: “Americans don’t want to acknowledge that the Philippines were colonies,” points out Angel Shaw, and she and other Filipino American scholars have devoted considerable attention to understanding the conflict and its aftermath. Correcting this omission would be more than symbolic: it would make it possible for all Americans to understand better the Filipino American historical experience and Filipino contributions to the United States. Fortunately, there has been some progress, and Shaw praises the Smithsonian Institution for relabeling the Filipino-American “insurrection” as a “war.” But identifying the errors and omissions in the history that historic places present can become a full-time job, and getting them corrected can be an exhausting struggle. Antonia Castañeda recalls her work two decades ago for the state of California. She identified a number of important places and suggested ways in which the stories told on official site markers could be improved; the work was published in an impressive volume. Yet her impression is that very little change has taken place.

Gerald Poyo notes that scholarly progress in research does not ensure that errors are corrected, or that vital new information is disseminated to the public. Since the 1980s, he explains, a new school of historical research has been “slowly transforming” the study of Texas history. Not long ago the diary of a Mexican soldier at the battle of the Alamo was discovered. If the author’s claims are honest, it provides the only eyewitness account of Davy Crockett’s death, and it flatly contradicts the legend of his heroic self-sacrifice. But questions about the “Alamo myth” do not easily get into textbooks that must be approved by Texas’s State Legislature. Changing the history told at places can be just as difficult: the chain must often stretch unbroken from university libraries through community non-profits to legislatures and government agency offices and on to the sites themselves.

An archaeologist once predicted that the most fruitful sites for unearthing new masterpieces of ancient Urartu culture would not be the mountains and fields of eastern Turkey but the basements of museums, where great heaps of misidentified objects awaited proper interpretation. In the same way, many existing historic places await proper interpretation to fulfill their potential for teaching history. Think of this as a sort of archaeological rediscovery. When Nicolás Kanellos notes that Spanish drama was presented at the Merced Theater in Los Angeles during the 1850s, he identifies the Merced as a site of Mexican American history: tour guides can now present it as such. When John Silva points out that Filipino sailors, visiting the west coast on
Mexican galleons, left statues or tabernacles at some California missions, he identifies these missions as places of Filipino American history: even if the artifacts are gone, curators can now develop interpretive signs or exhibits on the Filipino presence. But the missions present bigger challenges. Many of the Spanish missions of the southwest, notes Rosaura Sanchez, are preserved and celebrated; some even have small museums. Yet they are “mostly for tourists” and present a “quaint,” sanitized view of the past. San Diego’s Old Town, an early center of Hispanic settlement, is another example of how an emphasis on tourism can distort a place’s meaning: here, a genuinely important historic place’s potential for interpreting the region’s Mexican American heritage is hidden behind scented candles, “olde time” handcrafts, and expensive restaurant meals.

Part of this archeological work is recovering lost voices. “We know the official way” in which the 1904 St. Louis World’s Fair has been presented, Francia points out: its displays of Filipino natives, complete with spears and loinclothes, were famous and highly publicized. But “what did the people who were exhibited think?” Did they leave any records in this country – letters or diaries? Francia’s questions remind us that Filipinos were present in St. Louis not merely as exhibited objects but also as historical actors.

One of the quickest and most economical ways of creating new Mexican, Filipino, or African American historic places would be to acknowledge these groups’ role at historic places that already exist, starting with some very famous ones. About 1.3 million visitors tour the White House every year: how simple it would be, urges John Silva, to tell them about the White House’s long tradition of Filipino stewards. Beyond putting America’s “invisible Asians” in a new light for most visitors, this tidbit of information might encourage some visitors to ask why: the answer could open a window onto the role of Filipinos in the nation’s military, its hospitals, and in the kitchens of its ocean liners and naval ships. What about the more than 1.6 million visitors who tour Philadelphia’s Independence Hall and the Liberty Bell each year? At the urging of scholars, the National Park Service commendably plans to revise its interpretation to acknowledge the existence of slave quarters on the site of the Liberty Bell. What an extraordinary opportunity to discuss changing concepts of liberty in American history! And how much richer the story would be if it also included the leaders and intellectuals of Latin American independence movements who came to Philadelphia during the early nineteenth century, inspired by the city’s contribution to the cause of liberty. Finally, Faneuil Hall, one of Boston’s most popular tourist attractions: while many visitors correctly identify this colonial market as a site of Revolutionary War history, few know that, two centuries later, it hosted important anti-imperialist demonstrations against the Spanish-American War. This fact is nowhere mentioned in the interpretative material available to them. But, says FANHS trustee Joan May Cordova, “We want to correct that.”

If these three icons of American history can divulge such unexpected and important stories, how many other stories are awaiting rediscovery in the basements of historic sites across the country?

“The Past Has To Be A Performance”
Telling a good story isn’t good enough. “You have to have something for people to see” at historic sites, says Nicolás Kanellos: an intriguing array of things to grab the visitor’s attention, spin the story out, and create a memory. The best history museums have become quite
sophisticated at presenting complex stories, and many historic places can enrich their interpretations by presenting artifacts and documents in a more engaging way. Bookshops are important too. They give historic site managers a unique opportunity to put knowledge into the hands of visitors whose curiosity has been engaged. Yet Kanellos reports that in museum and historic-site bookshops across the country, “Hispanic presence is nil.” Indeed, a recent visit to the bookshop at Houston’s San Jacinto Battleground State Historical Park – place of the culminating battle in the Mexican-American War – suggests the dimensions of the problem. Even at a preeminently important historic place, one with a substantial museum that has made conscious efforts to present a Mexican point of view, one visited moreover by numerous Spanish-speaking tourists, the selection of books that could present a well-rounded picture of Mexican experience is largely absent. Similarly, a visit to the bookstore of a well-known National Park unit associated with the history of ranching and cowboys turned up little that could inform visitors on the important Mexican roots of cowboy culture. In another example, Kanellos points out that the Recovery Project has published an English translation of Cabeza de Vaca’s Relación, the account of the famous conquistador’s 1527 expedition: “it should be at all historical places” relating to the Spanish conquest, yet the Recovery Project has had great difficulty getting this and other books picked up by the managers of sites and museums, including the Smithsonian.

Rosaura Sanchez goes beyond the printed word. “Make the past real,” she urges, “so it’s not just something you read or something you touch...the past has to be a performance” – and not a “bland” performance but one that conveys the true complexity of the past, the anguish as well as the triumphs of history. “Have students play parts,” Sanchez suggests; have an Indian “talk frankly about what happened to us here.” Put it all on a compact disk or video for visitors to take home.

80 The Tomb of Unknown Places, with a Note on Heritage Tourism
A historic place lives through public knowledge of it, and respondents pointed out that public awareness of sites and collections is often low. The New York Public Library has an early flag from the Philippines; the Metropolitan Museum has Philippine grave markers, Muslim artifacts, and a statue of a rice god. John Silva believes many Filipino Americans would want to see these things if they knew they were there, yet neither institution has made any special efforts to tell them. If Silva, a museum consultant based in the Philippines, is right, many historic places and museums could expand their public by identifying and marketing themes of special interest to Filipino, Mexican, or African Americans. Programs like the National and State Registers of Historic Places and the National Historic Landmark program could also expand their constituency. In fact, the National Park Service has made a substantial effort, particularly through its internet presence, to market its properties, National Register listings, and studies to African American audiences. Silva urges the National Park Service to identify sites and stories of interest to Filipinos and get them known. Similarly, Virgilio Pilapil would like the National Park Service to publish a listing of what is of interest to Filipinos, with a map to help tourists visit the sites.

Heritage tourism is the way in which many visitors encounter historic sites, and it is growing. So, in particular, is African American heritage tourism. When Geraldine Hobdy took over as Louisiana’s first African American SHPO, she worked with the state tourism office to develop
an inventory of sites of interest to African Americans and to publicize them. Where there had been no market for African American heritage tourism, Thomas Eubanks, the state’s archaeologist, reports that Louisiana now leads the nation.

“Preservation in a lot of ways drives economic development, and community development too,” says Thomas Williams, once again situating preservation within the broader context of community development. What he means specifically, however, is heritage tourism. He recalls how he and others worked to install a market in Cairo, Georgia, birthplace of Jackie Robinson. Now, he says, “if you’re going to Tallahassee, sometimes you’ll detour to see the marker and the birthplace of Jackie Robinson, and while you’re there you’ll probably fill up on gas, buy some hamburgers.” African Americans, he remarks, can “tap into the history and use it as an economic development tool.” Sometimes those commemorated are less famous than Jackie Robinson, but the sites can still be important to local communities and meaningful to visitors. Thomasville, Georgia, is birthplace and burial place of Henry Flipper, West Point’s first black graduate (in 1877). “A lot of people come to Thomasville to study the Flipper family,” says Williams.

Printed and internet guidebooks, itineraries, and trails have helped disseminate information about many African American sites. Such publications hardly exist for Hispanic sites and are nonexistent for Filipino sites. Substantial gains can be made by disseminating information about existing resources.

Let us imagine now that every historic site not only presents a correct, complete, and engaging story but also markets it energetically; that heritage trails and guidebooks are abundant and widely publicized. Even in this ideal world, Rosaura Sanchez reminds us, many people will never see the sites, and no amount of publicity or outreach will ever change this. In San Diego, she points out, “there are kids in the barrios who have never even been downtown:” how, she asks, are you going to get them to a National Park Service site? The answer is that if the mountain will not go to Mohammed, Mohammed will have to go to the mountain: Sanchez urges the National Park Service and other cultural agencies to bring their riches to the schools, with traveling displays and even dramatic reenactments that teachers can perform with their students. Joan May Cordova is excited about the curricular possibilities of teaching with sites. To her goes the last word on the subject: historic places, she says, are “curriculum-friendly.”

VI. WHAT IS TO BE DONE?

If it does nothing else, this report should help preservationists and program managers assess the degree to which heritage programs continue to fall short of recognizing the nation’s culturally diverse history. This persistent diversity gap can be measured in underrepresented historical experiences, underserved constituencies...or unrealized opportunities. For the Assessment suggests the wealth of knowledge and energy that Mexican, Filipino, and African American communities are already committing to heritage conservation – with or without federal recognition. The opportunities for National Park Service initiatives and partnerships are enormous.
Probably everyone will agree that the federal government’s heritage programs should do the following:

- Create a public history that presents the experience of diverse groups in American society;
- Preserve the evidence of that history in places, documents, photographs, recordings, etc.;
- Present this history at places, museums, national parks, bookshops, websites, publications, and schools, and;
- Increase the diversity of experts in heritage conservation positions so as to reflect the diversity of American society and bring the insights of that diversity to its interpretation.

The question is how. The following sections distill the findings presented above into concrete steps. Many have been suggested before. Most can be adopted with little structural change to existing programs. A few will require such changes.

What should be done first? The single most important recommendation of this study is: something. This may appear evasive. It is not. Put another way: respondents are saying, enough talk – now we want action.

“Por Dinero Baile El Perro”

The National Park Service wins high marks from African American respondents for convening knowledgeable people to exchange ideas about African American heritage. Architect Richard Dozier particularly praises its 2001 conference on “African Reflections on the American Landscape.” Yet Dozier and William Davis are frustrated that the National Park Service has not yet advanced from talking to taking the logical next step, involving significant numbers of African American as professionals in the National Park Service’s preservation work. The Assessment was criticized, indeed (though never in less than a civil manner) because its consultant was less knowledgeable about African American preservation issues than many African American professionals in the field. “Why don’t they use people out here with experience?,” asked Dozier, frustrated with this project and with the slowness of the preservation machinery to absorb well-trained African Americans. He points out that there are eight schools of architecture among the Historically Black Colleges and Universities, several of which (Tuskegee, for example) teach historic preservation and regularly graduate architects and historians qualified to work for the National Register, Historic American Buildings Survey, or other branches of the National Park Service. The Service’s Cultural Resources Diversity Internship Program is appreciated as a means to bring young people into the field, but Dozier feels it is no substitute for hiring more well-trained African American professionals, particularly in light of the Service’s oft-expressed desire to be responsive to African American concerns. Dozier’s own concern is two-fold. He feels that African American professionals have earned the right to jobs and money. He also believes that the National Park Service needs their expertise to succeed in its African American heritage efforts. Dozier and other respondents feel that the National Park Service remains needlessly out of touch with the lively discourse that flourishes among African American professionals. They are tired of being asked their opinion: why doesn’t the National Park Service simply hire people who know? “There is a lot of frustration out here,” Dozier concludes, “because the money just doesn’t come” and, as a result, “the projects fail.”
Disillusionment with well-intentioned government fact-finding is widespread, and not only among African American respondents. It is coming not from ideological opponents of government but from those who know the good that government can accomplish but have grown tired of waiting and suspicious of promises. Nicolás Kanellos asks, “When do we begin to feel that the institution is ready to reform itself?...It keeps asking us to do these things....Everyone in this group” – he gestures towards a room full of seasoned Latino scholars and activists – “has had experiences with national, state, or local government – and they’ve been unsatisfactory.” Gerald Poyo agrees: “We’re tired of being asked again and again,” when few results seem to come from the seemingly endless consultations. Despite years of discussion, for example, he notes that “we couldn’t even get a curator of Latino history at the National Museum of American History.” Guadalupe San Miguel too is disillusioned with government consultations, and “tired of educating yet another Anglo.” Finally, Antonia Castañeda asks succinctly, “What is the National Park Service doing to educate itself?” (As a postscript, it might be noted that this author did not encounter similar frustrations among Filipino American respondents. Why? “Perhaps we haven’t been studied to death,” ventures Lynn Pono.)

Comments like these are not meant to be hostile. Many of these seasoned Hispanic activists have had little contact with the National Park Service. They keep an open mind about what the National Park Service may accomplish, and they do not blame it for their experiences with other branches of government. Indeed they are eager to work with the National Park Service toward common goals. Yet, Poyo warns, the National Park Service could “do more damage than good” if, like other agencies, it raises expectations and then fails to make good on them. Because of the history that precedes it, he cautions, the Service will have to demonstrate very clearly that it means to do more than talk. In fact, it will have to do something.

This is a bracing challenge, because a logical response to a study like this would be...another study. Or perhaps the formation of councils or advisory groups. In fact, Judith Baca believes it would be “really wonderful to put a think-tank together of great scholars” to advise the National Park Service on Hispanic heritage endeavors, and Baca would help to organize it. The great scholars are certainly out there, as are the great activists. But would they serve? Gerald Poyo has another suggestion for the National Park Service: before asking more questions, find some money – money with which to do something. Then put it on the table. As the proverb says: “Por dinero baile el perro.” The dog dances for money.

This leads directly to the first recommendation:

1. **Commit funds for a concrete project that can be launched without delay; then invite experts and community leaders to advise on shaping and carrying it out.**

Funds thus put on the table can have great strategic value for the National Park Service, by signaling that the agency is determined to move beyond consultation, and by initiating relationships of lasting benefit to the agency. They can also accomplish essential short-term goals. Of the many important goals that merit action, the one that the National Park Service is best positioned to undertake, decisively and immediately, is to shrink the diversity deficit in the National Register of Historic Places and in the historic places administered by the National Park
System. Respondents are troubled by this deficit, and many not only call for more (and better) historic sites but also eagerly volunteer their energy and expertise to identifying and documenting them. Hence this is an undertaking that will very clearly signal the agency’s seriousness.

Taking all of these considerations into account, then, we may elaborate this recommendation as follows:

- **Launch an ambitious program to identify new historic places and potential National Park units, improve the interpretation of existing places, and publicize and market new and old sites directly to minority communities themselves.**

Many of the components of this proposed program are described in greater detail under recommendations 3-6 below, which consider them as long-term goals. The program as a whole is described in Appendix A.

**Jobs**

Jobs and money – jobs in heritage conservation and money for projects – are sure-fire ways to do something. They are not necessarily the *same* thing. Jobs have long-term value for the profession. Money for projects brings immediate benefits and can also help build long-term relationships.

The debate over jobs calls upon agencies to broaden their hiring. The debate raises counter-questions. Does one really need to be black to appreciate black heritage? Are white people incapable of doing a good job? Actually, these questions are stalking horses. If asked, no respondent would answer yes to either of them. In fact, both Geraldine Hobdy and Jeanne Cyriaque – past and present government employees – give credit to white colleagues. What is said, however, is that if heritage agencies are genuinely committed to conserving the cultural heritage of groups outside the mainstream, then they need some black, Latino, or Asian American staff – more than they have now – to help them do it. As Guadalupe San Miguel explains, it can take a very long time to educate a non-Hispanic professional about cultural issues that members of the community have imbibed from birth. It would make sense, he argues, for the agency to hire a Mexican American who “knows the issues and has the contacts.”

Geraldine Hobdy points out that government jobs offer important opportunities to advocates for a culturally broader heritage practice, because “you have to be in the bureaucracy” to effect significant change in how it works. She reviews her own career as Louisiana’s first African American State Historic Preservation Officer. Her predecessor had been hostile to African American conservation issues, even to actions as simple as listing properties associated with African American history on the National Register. When Hobdy took over, there was an “explosion” of pent-up activity: listing National Register properties, appointing the first person of color to the state review board, incorporating archaeology into heritage programs (which benefited Asians and Cajuns as well), hosting partnerships with non-profits, working with the state’s tourism agency to build and serve a market for African American heritage tourism, then addressing a growing market for Latino heritage tourism. Hobdy had brought about significant changes by “being in the bureaucracy.”
There are plenty of well-trained and committed experts, not only in African American but also in Filipino, Mexican American, and other cultures. They are not necessarily trained in historic preservation. Yet their expertise in history and culture is transferable to the preservation field. Bringing more of them into the heritage preservation bureaucracy is a step that heritage agencies will need to take if they mean to make good on their pledge to address a multi-racial heritage.

The National Park Service has already blazed pathways to lead people of color into the heritage and environmental fields. The Cultural Resources Diversity Internship Program places summer interns within the National Park Service and with other federal agencies, state historic preservation offices, and non-profit organizations throughout the country. The internship is described as a “career exploration experience.” Launched in 1999, program director Toni Lee says the program has already served 65 students; some have already gone on to take jobs in the cultural resource field, while others are pursuing advanced degrees in law, environmental studies, public history, and historic preservation. Another pathway that could bring college students and recent graduates into the field is the National Park Service’s partnership with the Environmental Careers Organization. The ECO runs a Diversity Initiative, and the National Park Service could use this partnership to channel students of color into heritage projects, thereby giving them a start in the profession.

Internships like these provide solid benefits to young people and to the National Park Service. Yet they do not represent all that the National Park Service can or should do to open up the heritage professions. Richard Dozier points out that there is also a need to create opportunities for expert professionals who lack not education but opportunities to practice their craft. While internships will expand the cadre of experts, they do not guarantee that there will be jobs for them, nor do they enrich the heritage field with the wealth of expertise that already exists. These are needs that respondents identified, and they point to the second recommendation:

| 2. Use staff jobs, consultant appointments, and project contracts to increase the racial and ethnic diversity of the government’s heritage programs and tap the expertise that exists within diverse communities. |

**Federal Roles**

“What are the large projects, the effective policies, that will change values?” This, Geraldine Hobdy believes, is the question government should be asking itself. It is a good one, and the first two recommendations only begin to answer it. Looking beyond jobs and money, however, three other questions should be taken into account.

*What are people asking for?* Respondents most frequently asked government to act as a foundation, supporting citizen initiatives with grants of money or technical expertise. Such requests reveal genuine needs, but they also betray a lack of conviction that government can or will take bolder initiatives. “Our communities have been accustomed to going for project money and not looking beyond that,” comments Geraldine Hobdy. They underestimate government’s legitimate interest in the question, as well as its powers.
What is government’s stake in the matter? The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 states that “the spirit and direction of the Nation are founded upon and reflected in its historic heritage” and that “the preservation of this irreplaceable heritage is in the public interest so that its vital legacy of cultural, educational, aesthetic, inspirational, economic, and energy benefits will be maintained and enriched for future generations of Americans.” In fact, the nation has a powerful stake in seeing that its heritage is properly preserved and interpreted. Even if citizens were not calling upon it to help them preserve their heritage, government would have a compelling interest in doing so: in expanding the range of its historic sites, updating their interpretation, enhancing its collections, supporting historical scholarship, and supporting the efforts of community-based heritage associations.

What can government do better than anyone else?

Government can, of course, give money: the National Endowment for the Humanities, National Endowment for the Arts, state arts and humanities councils, and Institute of Museum and Library Services are very good at it, as are Save Americas Treasures, Colorado’s State Historical Fund, and other government grant programs. Their increased support would be very valuable. But giving money is not uniquely the role of the federal government. What national government uniquely can do is carry out heritage programs on a national scale. The National Park System, National Historic Landmark and National Register programs, Library of Congress and Smithsonian Institution have the capacity and the mandate to survey and protect cultural heritage – and to organize knowledge and public awareness of cultural heritage – on a national scale. Federal agencies need not do this work in isolation. They can form any number of regional or local partnerships. But federal agencies alone have the capacity to lead.

The following recommendations are grounded in what respondents said, while taking into account government’s stake in the issue and special capacity to address it. They make a conceptual leap from the topics covered in interviews – conserving Mexican, Filipino, and African American heritage – to the broad policy question that motivated this report – conserving the nation’s underrepresented (non-Native) heritage in general. This leap must be made with care, for views expressed by members of one racial or ethnic group do not necessarily represent those of another. Responses to the study did, however, reveal broad areas of agreement, and the recommendations flow out of these areas, while containing ample room for flexibility in responding to unknowns. While much, in short, remains to be learned, enough is already known to create practical programs and policies to address the problem.

Historic Sites

3. Correct the underrepresentation of racially/ethnically diverse history in the National Register by spearheading surveys of historic places and expanding or updating the ways existing sites are interpreted.

There can be little question that the National Register of Historic Places, as well as most if not all state registers and municipal landmark lists, fall short of presenting the full diversity of American history. Correcting this is more than a matter of serving one constituency or another: it is a matter of ensuring that the nation’s officially sanctioned presentations of its history are
accurate and meet the highest professional standards established by historians and heritage conservationists. It is also a matter of offering an interesting presentation to the American public – not any particular segment of that public, but all of it.

New surveys of sites of minority experience are needed. These can be national or regional: for example, Mexican American sites in the southwest or Filipino American sites on the west coast. They can be general in scope or thematically focused: for example, sites illustrative of the interconnections among groups.

The National Park Service can use the National Register or National Historic Landmarks programs for surveys. The National Register program, however, is largely carried out by states acting under a federal mandate: nominations are prepared by state agency staff or citizens (either volunteers or professionals), then forwarded upward from State Historic Preservation Offices. This inability to carry out surveys directly limits its usefulness, since it is unrealistic to expect ten, twenty, or fifty state agencies to collaborate on a regional or national project. However, the National Park Service might be able to use the National Register program to spearhead studies that could be carried out under its umbrella, and perhaps with its funding assistance.

The National Historic Landmarks program may offer a better vehicle. National Historic Landmarks are normally identified through theme studies that can be initiated by the National Park Service or mandated by Congress. They are frequently carried out in partnership with citizen groups and universities. Since the 1959 study of Spanish Exploration and Settlement there has been only one Theme Study on a Hispanic or Asian American subject: Japanese Americans in World War II. There could be no better time for further studies than the present.

Whatever the vehicle, the proposed surveys can and should go beyond the limits of traditional surveys. The National Park Service has many other valuable capacities on which to draw. For example, its Cultural Resources programs can add enhance the National Park Service’s excellent list of publications by preparing printed or electronic itineraries, brochures, or more substantial publications. Its cultural landscape programs can help analyze working landscapes associated with Mexican and Filipino migrant workers throughout the west and southwest. And Congress could authorize it to assess the possibility of heritage areas relating to Asian or Hispanic cultural themes, particularly in the west and southwest.

The National Park Service can also benefit by convening committees of experts and community leaders to advise on sites. Such consultation should become a two-way street, with respondents giving the National Park Service’s essential information on sites and the National Park Service providing expertise and support on local projects to enhance their value – leaflets, guides, curricular material, plaques, public art projects, websites, and so forth. The value of such consultation could be greatly enhanced were the National Park Service to partner with the national endowments and the Institute of Museum and Library Services (and the SHPOS with the appropriate state arts and humanities councils) to direct grant funding towards projects that exploit the teaching potential of sites.

Beyond designating sites, the National Park Service and state historic preservation offices can do more to use them for teaching American history. And while supporting local initiatives, they
should also use their own powers, accompanying new surveys with guidebooks and curricular material.

In order to realize the full potential of historic sites, the National Park Service should also accompany new surveys with creation of an archive or database of historical materials relating to them. This could be undertaken in partnership with the Smithsonian Institution or Library of Congress, as well as with not-for-profit organizations based in the Mexican, Filipino, or African American communities.

The final step in realizing the full value of surveys will be to publish and distribute handbooks for identifying Mexican and Filipino American historical places, on the model of the excellent guides that already exist for African American places. These handbooks, however, should go beyond identifying and assessing places to provide guidance on how to create plaques, markers, public art, guidebooks, and curricular materials to interpret them – and on how to obtain the protection of local preservation ordinances for them. In this way, the National Park Service will place the necessary tools in the hands of communities so that they can continue and build on the work it has spearheaded.

4. Provide National Register guidance that is more responsive to sites of importance in Mexican, Filipino, African American, and other diverse heritages.

While much can be accomplished within existing National Register standards, some rethinking will be needed if the National Register is to recognize the full range of important Mexican, Filipino, and African American historic sites. This is a normal process that healthy programs undergo as changing circumstances prompt their application to new areas. Confronted with the need to better recognize Native American sites, the National Register was enriched with a useful new concept of traditional cultural properties. A similar rethinking is called for now.

What is needed appears to be a shift in emphasis from what one might call “objectness” to “placefulness.” Many respondents described the strong sense of connection they felt to historical places – places inhabited by the people of the past, places where things had happened. Where buildings survive to bear witness to the past, they want to see those buildings preserved. But whether it is Jeanne Cyriaque’s “spirit of place” or Angel Shaw’s sense that “there were labor camps: right here,” respondents feel that certain places are hallowed by historical presence even if their historic structures may have entirely disappeared. In any case, buildings associated with field work, life in the barrios, and other important aspects of Mexican, Filipino, and African American historic experience, are inherently less likely to survive intact than (for example) art museums, Beaux Arts city halls, and well-to-do-neighborhoods: such buildings include union halls, social clubs, street-front churches, bunkhouses, roadside shrines, tenements, mobile homes, and factories. Standards that heavily emphasize the physical integrity of historic structures make it difficult to recognize working-class and immigrant history. While they are valuable tools for weighing the relative merits of many kinds of buildings, their use must be guided by larger objectives, such as the National Park Service’s policy of providing “factual and balanced presentations of the many American cultures, heritages, and histories.” Their application should also reflect the real condition of resources that are available for those presentations. What is
needed now is guidance, similar to that provided for traditional cultural properties in National Register of Historic Places guidance, to direct applicants and National Register staff in evaluating the merits of sites associated with working-class and immigrant history. Another way to look at this is to say that we need to develop better ways to recognize place, even where standard histories are hard to construct, or where buildings may have been damaged or demolished. 89

- Modify the interpretation of National Register criteria to better recognize the history of manual labor, especially field work.
- Develop better ways of recognizing and protecting sites that lack significant historic structures.
- Extend the concept of traditional cultural places more broadly to non-Indian sites.

The National Park System

| 5. | Realize the potential of existing National Park units to present Filipino, Mexican, African American, and other diverse heritages. |

One of the quickest ways to create new Mexican, Filipino, or African American historic sites (as noted above) would be to interpret these groups’ role at existing historic sites. The White House, Philadelphia’s Independence Hall, and Boston’s Faneuil Hall have already been mentioned, and a thorough survey of National Park Service units would undoubtedly reveal many more sites at which these (and other) groups played significant but unrecognized roles. Similar surveys of historic sites administered by states and not-for-profits would be equally fruitful, because the problem of historical erasure, noted by many respondents, has been pervasive.

In addition to the sites themselves, archives, libraries, and museums contain artifacts whose significance for the heritage of minority groups often continues to go unrecognized. During a recent visit to a well-known museum of folk art, for example, a group of Filipino American heritage experts were able to identify several wood carvings of Christian subjects, previously believed by museum staff to be Latin American, as rare Filipino artifacts. They were also able to explain the provenance and use of other Filipino objects that had puzzled curators. A survey of books, manuscripts, photographs, artwork, and other artifacts in collections belonging to the National Park Service (as well as other federal and state repositories) would unearth many objects that could be helpful in presenting Filipino, Mexican, African American, and other diverse heritages.

Bookshops are another existing resources that the National Park Service can exploit to greater effect. The bookshops at many historic sites, operated both by the National Park Service and by other agencies, could do more to offer publications that present Mexican, Filipino, African American, and other diverse experiences and perspectives.
Existing park system units also present opportunities to expand the use of applied ethnography to identify traditionally associated peoples, represent their points of view in park interpretation, and reflect their interests with regard to park management.

These opportunities would be substantial even if they were limited to historic places. But they are not. As Paul Espinosa points out, any property managed by the National Park Service may have “great potential” for explaining important themes in national history and culture, because even though not explicitly organized around historical themes, it may have important cultural associations. And, notes Boris Hidalgo, parks are popular places that the public holds in high esteem. While a core group of visitors motivated by an interest in history can be counted upon to visit historic sites, a much broader public visits park: they therefore offer great educational opportunities.

It is hard to say how many opportunities for public education await discovery within the National Park System’s 388 units, but surely they are considerable. Still, to realize their potential, the National Park Service will need to do more than identify them: it will also have to interpret, publicize, and market them. Ranger-based programs, internet and print publications, curricular materials, plaques and wayside markers, exhibitions, news coverage, and focused informational campaigns designed to reach highly interested groups are all useful vehicles. Many of these can be undertaken in partnership with national or local ethnic organizations.

---

**6. Establish new National Park units where they can provide heritage along with other services to underserved communities.**

To propose new park system units goes beyond the bounds of this study. However, identification of potential new units should be part of the survey process described above. Respondents identified two areas of significant opportunity for new parks. South Texas is an important area for Mexican American heritage, yet Boris Hidalgo points out that in the vast triangle that lies between San Antonio, Brownsville, and Del Rio there are no National Park units. Hidalgo, a Houston lawyer who grew up in this area, believes it offers significant opportunities for park creation, particularly in the area of El Sal del Rey. New parks there could recognize Mexican American heritage while providing badly needed recreational opportunities to an underserved population. Unlike South Texas, Hawaii has eight National Park units, yet none is associated with the experience of Filipino (and Japanese) plantation workers. Linda Revilla points out that the evidence of this heritage is rapidly disappearing: a new park unit could salvage some representation of it before it is too late.

---

**Heritage Programs and Research**

**7. Devise programs that will expand awareness of racially/ethnically diverse history beyond the stereotypes.**
Public presentation of African American heritage emphasizes narratives of enslavement and liberation. A secondary point of emphasis is on cultural achievements, especially in music (Delta blues, Louis Armstrong). Public presentation of Asian American heritage focuses on the internment camps of World War II and ethnic enclaves such as Chinatowns. These themes are not wrong, but they are incomplete. They miss broad areas of historical experience and fail to convey to Americans the centrality of these groups’ experiences within American history. Americans can have a more complete and more satisfying historical picture, and the National Park Service is in the best position to lead the way, both through its presentation of heritage in its own programs and through its ability to encourage scholarship. In moving public perception beyond limited stereotypes, attention to areas such as these (all proposed by respondents) would be strategically effective: interactions among ethnic or racial groups; early African American history, including the experience of free Blacks and the accomplishments of religious leaders; African American urban experience, especially after the Civil War; the early Filipino presence (with a specific need to resolve definitively the question of New Orleans’ eighteenth-century Manila Town); the history of Filipino Americans outside the west coast; Filipino heritage in general. In summary:

- Emphasize themes of interchange and interconnection among ethnic groups;
- Emphasize themes that expand public awareness of ethnic or racial groups;
- Carry out further studies to identify important themes in the historic experience of other underrepresented ethnic or racial groups.

**Support for Citizen Initiatives**

8. Support non-governmental heritage conservation efforts with financial grants, technical expertise, and partnership opportunities.

While the federal government can and should do more to preserve minority heritage, it should not do everything. Some things should be done by communities, with federal encouragement and support.

What is the “best way to maximize partnership with the federal government?” asks Geraldine Hobdy. Sometimes, she warns, federal agencies want to take over projects, rather than support them, and when that happens, citizen initiatives can suffer. While community-based projects are often desperately starved for funds and technical expertise, they may embody deep local knowledge that makes their continuance at community level very valuable. Besides, maintaining community control over how heritage is defined and presented may be politically essential to the project’s success. On the other hand, many important conservation projects require resources that far outstrip those available to citizen-based groups. For example, as noted above, the cost of documenting the music, domestic arts, cultural life, literary expression, business activities, and community organization of evolving immigrant communities. In this as in many other instances, it is simply unreasonable to think that citizen groups can, without significant aid, create the kind of legacy that future citizens may wish for. For these reasons, financial and technical support to local groups should play an important part in federal heritage conservation programs, as should...
partnership opportunities, including co-sponsored publications, traveling exhibitions, or collaboration on website design and cataloguing projects.

Respondents noted a wide range of endeavors in which federal support would be appreciated. Assistance in acquiring, cataloguing, conserving, and providing electronic access to collections (including archives, libraries, and museums) would be a sound federal investment in the nation’s history that could continue to pay dividends literally for centuries. Aid to documentation and publication projects, local historic and preservation societies, documentary films, historical research, folklore and oral history projects, and community cultural development efforts also promise large rewards.

In this arena, the National Park Service need not and indeed cannot bear the major burden. The National Endowment for the Arts, National Endowment for the Humanities, Institute for Museum and Library Services, Smithsonian Institution, and Library of Congress, as well as state preservation offices, historical societies, and arts and humanities councils all have important roles to play. What the National Park Service can do is set a policy direction towards the preservation of minority heritage and take the lead in creating programmatic vehicles for collaboration, both among funding agencies and with citizen-based groups.

**Governmental Partnerships for the Future**

9. Seek increased integration between historic preservation practice and other dimensions of heritage conservation such as collecting and folkways.

Placing the core work of historic preservationists – the conservation and interpretation of historic places – in the context of other aspects of conservation will allow preservationists to make more informed decisions in every realm of their practice. Many site managers already do this, harnessing applied ethnography and oral history as well as sophisticated approaches to collections and exhibits. In other areas of historic preservation practice this kind of integration is less widespread.

A note of caution is required here. Jeanne Cyriaque, who works for a state historic preservation office, supports the integration of folkways into historic preservation as long as it does not drain resources away from core preservation programs. Franklin Odo, of the Smithsonian Institution, agrees: while it is good to think about intangibles, “for the National Park Service to not put full effort into identifying places where things happened” would be a mistake. Integrating historic preservation practice with related disciplines should be a way to produce better decisions and better public presentations, not to cut the pie into ever-smaller slices.

10. Study the negative impacts of market and government forces on the folkways of minority communities and consider developing new tools to mitigate them.

The impact of the real estate market and of government programs like urban renewal, highway construction, and public housing, on African American, Mexican, and Filipino neighborhoods
has in many instances been devastating. Many other government actions, including code enforcement, also affect folkways. Indeed, the forces at work dwarf the mechanisms available to heritage conservationists or, for that matter, affected communities. Yet until conservationists and their constituents become more effective “players” in the land use game, their ability to protect heritage, either of the built or of the performative variety, will be significantly limited. This remains a long-term, and difficult, problem. But a good first step towards addressing it, as suggested above, would be to take stock very broadly of government’s and the market’s impacts on folkways. This assessment could lead to the development of legal and policy tools to help decision-makers and the public assess the impact of proposed actions on folkways. It would also help conservation advocates consider what positive measures might help protect them from market and government forces.

At the same time, certain potentially useful tools already exist in embryo and should be developed. The National Environmental Policy Act and some state environmental laws, or “little NEPAs,” recognize certain cultural dimensions of the environment, including community character, as potentially deserving of protection. These statutes should be closely studied to determine how far their protection might extend into the realm of folkways and place-based traditions. A survey of “third places” (in Oldenburg’s terminology) or “story sites” (in this author’s) might lead to the identification of many of them as environmental assets under these statutes, and this in turn could lead both to their protection and to test cases that could help establish the laws’ applicability to cultural elements of the environment. At the same time, Hawaii’s innovative requirement of a Cultural Impact Statement deserves further study: could it be emulated elsewhere? And finally, the National Park Service’s ethnography program offers many opportunities for documenting and protecting the folkways of minority communities.

11.

**Build a transnational heritage practice.**

Transnationalism threatens traditional nation-state heritage programs with irrelevance at some time in the future, because the historical experience of people who cross borders can only be fully preserved by programs that also cross borders. Similarly, it seems likely that constituencies that straddle borders will best be served by programs that straddle them. Transnationalism can help to revitalize heritage practice, as it is reshaping heritage itself, if it stimulates the development of such border-crossing programs. Already advantages are apparent: research on early land grants and genealogies in the southwest requires consultation of sources in Mexico as well as the United States: a joint governmental initiative could improve access to these sources.

As transnational migrants begin to compile a heritage at least partly in this country, the incentives to think transnationally about heritage conservation may well grow. It is not too early to begin thinking about the possibilities. “Sending” and “receiving” localities could work together to document the history of those whose allegiance they share. Such partnerships could work at the level of local, state, or national government. One program already exists within the Department of the Interior that could form the basis for federal heritage partnerships: the Department of the Interior’s International Technical Assistance Program. While proximity suggests Mexico as the obvious place to start, transnational work is equally applicable to the Philippines, the Caribbean, Africa, and so forth.
Postscript: A Note to Elected Officials and Their Constituents
The United States has a representative form of government, and National Park Service officials will be among the first to point out that its heritage conservation initiatives respond to the will of Congress, the peoples’ representatives. They too have an important role to play in heritage conservation. While few, if any, of the proposals in this report are new, it is hoped that putting them on paper will show elected officials and their constituents that programs to protect the underrepresented parts of the national story are no vague dream but a constructive and practical possibility. A wide range of meaningful initiatives is entirely feasible – not in a distant, imaginary future, but here and now.
Appendix A: Proposal for An Historic Places Initiative

As the next step towards closing the diversity gap, this report proposes that the National Park Service launch a broad program to identify and preserve new historic sites and to improve, interpret, and market existing ones. Such an initiative represents a constructive way to do something right away, put money on the table, and use the information solicited by the Cultural Heritage Needs Assessment. It would offer an ideal subject of collaboration with experts and community leaders and would send a clear signal that the agency is committed to moving beyond the status quo. Its inherent and immediate value would be substantial; even greater would be the long-term value of the working relationships it could help build between preservation agencies and community leaders and experts.

As a thematic focus for such a project, the National Park Service (and its community partners) should consider adopting the interactions among ethnic or racial groups in American history. This theme presents a number of advantages. Many respondents expressed interest in it. Addressing it would, by definition, address the experiences of multiple groups. Its relevance is not limited to any particular region of the country. It would expand the public’s awareness of cultural diversity beyond existing stereotypes. And it would have broad public appeal.

Whatever theme is chosen, the proposed historic places initiative will call for rethinking some interpretations of the National Register criteria, particularly the integrity guidelines. The challenge is that many important historical experiences neither produced nor took place in the kinds of buildings that typically survive unaltered. Instead, they took place in open fields, barrios, labor camps, union halls, social clubs, street-front churches, bunkhouses, tenements, lightly built cabins, mobile homes, factories, and docks. Where such buildings have survived, respondents want to preserve them. But even where they have disappeared or been altered, many report feeling a strong sense of connection to the places where people had lived and struggled. Whether it is Jeanne Cyriaque’s “spirit of place” or Angel Shaw’s sense that “there were labor camps: right here,” respondents feel that these places are hallowed by historical presence. National Register criteria that emphasize the presence and integrity of historic structures make it difficult, and sometimes impossible, to honor this consciousness of place and history; in fact, they carry an unintended bias against working-class and immigrant history. To correct this, ways must be found to recognize places and the historical connections that people feel to them.

To realize its full potential, the historic places initiative will also have to involve community groups and non-governmental experts as full partners. This will require moving beyond standbys of community involvement like advisory or review committees: partners should have a real voice from the outset. For this reason the initiative’s components can best be identified in terms of the resources the National Park Service can bring to the table. First, the National Park Service can offer its unique ability to conduct a theme studies for potential National Historic Landmarks and potential additions to the National Park System, and opportunities for improving the interpretation and marketing of existing sites. It can also engage its Cultural Resources programs to publish itineraries, brochures, or books; the National Heritage Areas Program to study the potential for heritage areas relating to Asian or Hispanic cultural themes; the Cultural Landscape...
program to analyze working landscapes; and the Applied Ethnography program to document community attachment to places. In addition to its own resources, the National Park Service can bring in the National Endowment for the Humanities, National Endowment for the Arts, and Institute for Museum and Library Services (as well as state historic preservation offices, arts, and humanities councils) to fund curricular materials, publications, websites, public art, or markers to create historical awareness around some of the identified sites. And it can partner with the Smithsonian Institution or Library of Congress to create an archive or database of related historical and ethnographic materials. Whatever its components, the project should address the full potential of historic places to instruct and engage. It should culminate, finally, in the publication of handbooks for identifying historic sites relating to Mexican American, Filipino American, and other diverse cultural heritages. These can be modeled on the excellent guides that exist for African American sites, but they should also include guidelines for creating plaques, public art, guidebooks, and curricular materials, and for securing local landmark protection. In this way, the National Park Service can give communities the tools to continue the work – provide the fishing rod as well as the fish.
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Paul Espinosa, Producer-writer-director, Espinosa Productions, San Diego, CA (Mexican American heritage)

Thomas Hales Eubanks, State Archaeologist and Director, Louisiana Division of Archaeology, Baton Rouge, LA (archaeology and interpretation of historic sites)

Luis H. Francia, poet and author, Adjunct Professor, Asian/Pacific/American Studies Program and Institute, New York University (Filipino American heritage)

John W. Franklin, Program Manager, Center for Folklife and Cultural Heritage, Smithsonian Institution (African American heritage)

Dorothy Fujita-Rony, Professor, Department of Asian American Studies, University of California at Irvine (Asian American heritage)

Eric Gamalinda, author, poet, and journalist, Visiting Professor, Asian/Pacific/American Studies Program and Institute, New York University (African American heritage)

Laura Gates, Superintendent, Cane River Creole National Historical Park, Natchitoches, LA, National Park Service (applied ethnography and park interpretation)

Bradford C. Grant, Chairperson, Department of Architecture, Hampton University, School of Architecture, Hampton, VA (African American heritage)

John R. Gupman, Park Ranger (Interpretation), Cane River Creole National Historical Park, National Park Service, Natchitoches, LA (park interpretation)

Felicity Heywood, Museums Journal, London, UK (race issues in site interpretation)

Boris A. Hidalgo, Partner, Thompson & Knight, LLP, Attorneys and Counselors, Houston, and chair of board of trustees, Arte Público Press (Mexican American heritage)
Gerri Hobdy, former Louisiana State Historic Preservation Officer, Baton Rouge, LA

Isaac Johnson, Springfield Village Park Foundation, Augusta, GA (African American heritage)

Nicolás Kanellos, Founder and Director, Arte Público Press, University of Houston, and Professor, Department of Modern and Classical Languages, University of Houston (Mexican American heritage)

Aimy Manzón Ko, alumna, Asian/Pacific/American Studies Program and Institute, New York University (Filipino American heritage)

Emily P. Lawsin, Lecturer, University of Michigan, Program in American Culture, and FANHS trustee, Detroit, MI (Filipino American heritage)

Roz Li, architect, Li/Saltzman Architects, New York (Filipino American heritage)

Barbara Mattick, Deputy Florida State Historic Preservation Officer, Tallahassee, FL (folklore and historic preservation)

Michèle Gates Moresi, consultant historian, National Park Service, Diversity & Special Projects, National Center for Cultural Resources, Washington, D.C. (African American heritage, NPS programs)

Franklin Odo, Director, Asian Pacific American Studies Program, Smithsonian Institution (Asian American heritage)

Dr. Virgilio R. Pilapil, retired physician, past president and FANHS trustee, Springfield, IL (Filipino American heritage)

Lynn Pono, Coordinator of Youth and Family Programs, Bronx Museum of the Arts, New York (Filipino American heritage)

Gerald E. Poyo, Professor of U.S. Latino and Latin American History, St. Mary’s University, San Antonio (Latino heritage)

John T. Reddick, architect, President, The Cityscape Institute, New York, NY (African American heritage)

Linda Revilla, educational consultant, lecturer, California State University at Sacramento, and FANHS trustee, Sacramento, CA (Filipino American heritage)

Alexa Roberts, Superintendent, Sand Creek Massacre National Historic Site, National Park Service (applied ethnography)

Refugio I. Rochin, Associate Director, Inter-University Program for Latino Research, University of Notre Dame (Latino heritage)
Rolando M. Romo, Manager, Houston Metropolitan Research Center; founder and past president, Tejano Association for Historical Preservation (Mexican American heritage)

Rosaura Sanchez, Professor, Department of Literature, University of California at San Diego (Mexican American heritage)

Guadalupe San Miguel, Professor of History, University of Houston (Mexican American heritage)

Angel Velasco Shaw, Professor, Asian/Pacific/American Studies Program and Institute, New York University; also documentary film and video artist and community activist (Filipino American heritage)

John L. Silva, consultant to the National Museum of the Philippines and founder/director, Bakás Pilipinas: Philippine Historic Preservation Society, Manila, Philippines (Filipino American heritage)

John Kuo Wei Tchen, Professor and Founding Director, Asian/Pacific/American Studies Program and Institute, New York University; and founder of Museum of Chinese in the Americas (Asian American heritage)

Maria T. Torres, home teacher and president, Stockton FANHS chapter, Stockton, CA (Filipino American heritage)

Lynn Wilder, Cajun Pride Tours, New Orleans (African American heritage)

Thomas Williams, -------------- Kennesaw, GA (African American heritage)

Sherrill D. Wilson, Director, Office of Public Education and Interpretation of the African Burial Ground, New York, NY
Notes


3 http://www.cr.nps.gov/nr/research/index.htm (consulted July 2003). The numbers for Asian and Hispanic would be slightly higher if one included properties in Micronesia, Guam, the Marshall Island, and Puerto Rico, or Native Hawaiian properties in Hawaii. A more impressionistic (and slightly more encouraging) yardstick is provided by the project list of Save America’s Treasures, a national program founded by the White House Millenium Council and the National Trust for Historic Preservation in 1998 “to focus public attention on the importance of our national heritage and the need to save our treasures at risk.” Out of over five hundred projects listed in November 2002, approximately 35 could be identified as bearing specifically and primarily on some aspect of cultural heritage distinct from the mainstream (of course many other projects touch on one aspect or another of diverse heritage). Of these, about seventeen relate to African American heritage, thirteen to Hispanic American, and two to Asian American. One can further characterize the sites. Of the African American sites, many relate to plantation slavery: they are, of course, in the South. In addition, there are sites relating to famous African Americans (Paul Lawrence Dunbar, Paul Robeson, Louis Armstrong, Harriet Tubman). There are a few Civil Rights movement sites. And there are at least two African American neighborhoods or clusters of buildings associated with urban community life: the Jackson Ward NHL in Richmond, VA, and the Weeksville Society in Brooklyn, NY. Of the Hispanic American sites, many relate to the Spanish colonization of California and the southwest, though there are also the “Hispanic Cultural Landscape of the Purgatoire and Apishapa” in Colorado and Ybor City (founded by a Cuban immigrant) in Florida. Both of the Asian American sites are Japanese World War II internment camps. See the National Trust for Historic Preservation’s website, at www.nthp.org/save%20america’s%20tremures/projall2.htm (consulted November 2002).


7 The author was unable to consult the most comprehensive treatment of this subject, contained in Marina Espina, Filipinos in Louisiana, New Orleans, A.F. Laborde, 1988. Some scholars, however, dispute the claim.


10 Ramos, *op. cit.*, p. 156.


17 Faist, *op. cit.*, p. 211.


23 “Poetry and the Burden of History: An Interview with Martin Espada,” published on the website of the University of Illinois’s Department of English at: www.english.uiuc.edu/maps/poets/a_f/espada/interview.htm. I am grateful to my daughter Emily Kaufman for this reference.


Information on the African Burial Ground can be obtained from the Office of Public Education and Interpretation in New York City, or through its website, www.africanburialground.com/ABG_OPEI.htm, which also lists upcoming events at the site.


For museums’ responses to African American issues, see James Oliver Horton and Spencer R. Crew, "Afro-Americans and Museums: Towards a Policy of Inclusion" in Leon and Rosenzweig, eds., *op. cit.*


37 “Our Shared History: Celebrating African American History and Culture,”

38 The first was “Through My Father’s Eyes: The Filipino American Photographs of Ricardo
Ocreto Alvarado (1914-1976).” There was no catalogue; however, as of this writing, the exhibit
can still be seen online at http://apa.si.edu. The second was “El Rio.” See Olivia Cadaval and
Cynthia Vidaurri, El Rio, Smithsonian Institution, Center for Folklife and Cultural Heritage,
2003.

39 National Trust for Historic Preservation website:
http://www.nationaltrust.org/news/docs/20030529_11most_littlemanila.html (consulted July
2003). See also the newsletter of the National Trust’s western office, at

40 “Los Caminos del Rio”: see the National Trust’s website,
identified stretches from Laredo to Brownsville. Earlier, in 1999, First Lady Hilary Rodham
Clinton had led a trip to the southwest, organized by Save America’s Treasures, a partnership
between the National Trust and the White House Millenium Council, whose purpose had been
been to draw public attention to the plight of historically and culturally important sites in
Arizona, New Mexico, and Colorado. See http://saveamericastreasures.org/release051399.htm
(consulted July 2003).


42 See the National Park Service’s Heritage Areas website: http://www.cr.nps.gov/heritageareas/
(consulted 7/03). See also “Regional Heritage Areas: Connecting People to Places and History,”

43 Florida Department of State, Florida Cuban Heritage Trail, nd; Florida Jewish Heritage Trail,
2000; Florida Women’s Heritage Trail, 2001. The Cuban Heritage Trail publication is undated:
information about the date of funding comes from the preface.

44 The FANHS website is at www.fanhs-national.org. Many of the individual chapters have their
own websites.

Bonus discusses the importance of community newspapers, and of the places where they are
published, at some length.

46 Young scholars who are producing important new work include Angel Velasco Shaw (New
York University), Dorothy Fujita-Rony (University of California at Irvine), and Cathy Choy
(University of Minnesota).


www.filipinoamericans.net.

*Ibid.* All quotations are verbatim.


For the application of environmental laws to third places or story sites, see *ibid*. The amendment, adopted as Act 50 of the 2000 legislative session, can be found on the State of Hawaii’s website: see www.capitol.hawaii.gov/session2000/acts/Act050_HB2895_HD1.htm. (consulted in November, 2003). Some background to the legislation can be found on the website of Kohanaiki ‘Ohana, a non-profit organization dedicated to preserving Native Hawaiian culture: see www.kohanaiki.org.

See Emogene Bevitt (comp.), “National Park Service Policies Regarding Native Americans, Park-Associated Communities, Public Participation, and Community Relations,” January, 2003, a useful compilation of relevant policies from *National Park Service Management Policies 2001*. The major legislative sources of the National Park Service’s responsibilities to traditionally associated peoples are set forth in sec. 5.3.5.3.

*Ibid.*, sec. 5.3.5.3 “Ethnographic Resources.”

*Ibid.*, sec. 5.1.3.1, 5.2.1-2.
Michael J. Evans, Alexa Roberts, and Peggy Nelson, “Ethnographic Landscapes,” *CRM* vol. 24, no. 5, 2001, p. 55. For the role of ethnography within the NPS, readers should consult this entire issue of *CRM*, subtitled “People and Places: The Ethnographic Connection.” See also the NPS’s Archaeology and Ethnography Program website, at www.cr.nps.gov/aad


Rolando M. Romo, “The Founding of the Tejano Association for Historical Preservation,” unpublished paper.

[www.tejanoahp.org](http://www.tejanoahp.org) (consulted July 2003).


Don Adams and Arlene Goldbard, Creative Community: The Art of Cultural Development, New York, Rockefeller Foundation, 2001, p. 61. This is a basic text for community cultural development that includes further bibliography. See also Art in the Public Interest’s website: www.apionline.org.

Adams and Goldbard, op. cit., p. 4.


See Five Views, op. cit.


There is a growing literature on teaching with historic places. The National Register of Historic Places (National Park Service) maintains a list of publications on the subject. See also, int. al., Charles S. White and Kathleen Hunter, Teaching With Historic Places: A Curriculum Framework for Professional Training and Development of Teachers, Preservationists, and Museum and Site Interpreters, Washington, D.C., National Trust for Historic Preservation, 1995, and Creative Teaching with Historic Places, a special issue of CRM, vol.23, no. 8, 2000 (published by the National Park Service). Those interested in the subject may also find it useful to consult the even more substantial literature on environmental or place-based education.


in the Historic Sites of 1935. The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 expresses a public interest in cultural as well as natural aspects of the environment.

87 36 CFR 60.1 (b); see also 36 CFR 60.6.


90 Members of the public may also wish to consider the merits of National Heritage Area designations to protect, interpret, and enhance the economic viability of certain areas whose cultural landscapes have been shaped by and associated with particular groups. The National Park System Advisory Board recently wrote that “the diverse ethnic groups and nationalities that worked the farms and factories of a growing nation have also created cultural landscapes worthy of preservation. These special places...bind residents together...Visitors looking for authenticity in America treasure them.” (National Park System Advisory Board, Rethinking the National Parks for the 21st Century: quotation from NPS website, www.nps.gov/policy/report.htm (consulted October 2003).

91 See Adams and Goldbard, op. cit., for a discussion of funding needs for community cultural development.