

READING #1

FUNDAMENTAL CONCEPTS OF CULTURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT, Chapter 1 Excerpts (NPS Director's Order No. 28: Cultural Resource Management Guideline)

A. Introduction

1. The Cultural Connection

Cultural resources may be cherished for their beauty or utility or a host of other reasons. But it is the ability to connect one generation to another that gives them their most valued attribute: an inherent capacity to mold and reinforce our identities as social creatures. Of course, the shaping and guiding of human lives involves much more than cultural resources; it embraces the entire cultural system into which each person is born and within which each must grow and work, love and die. Cultural resources are both a part of and representative of these systems. In concert with lesson plan and sacred ritual, recreational play and family vacation, cultural resources bring people together with the values and ideas that are necessary for success in contemporary society.

Cultural resources constitute a unique medium through which all people, regardless of background, can see themselves and the rest of the world from a new point of view. Access to cultural resources means that people can learn not only about their own immediate ancestors but about other traditions as well. New citizens can discover for themselves how earlier immigrants became Americans; descendants of African, Asian, and European ancestors can discover unexpected commonalities; and all of us can come to better appreciate the great saga of Native American history. Such an exchange offers every American a place of importance in the history of our country as well as an opportunity to meet others and be met in a spirit of mutual tolerance, appreciation, and respect.

A primary responsibility of the National Park Service is to identify, protect, and share the cultural resources under its jurisdiction. The work inherent in this endeavor is varied and challenging. First, there must be systematic, open-minded study by archeologists, historians, and other specialists to locate resources and to discover or substantiate their significance. Second, considerable thought must be given to the problem of simultaneously protecting park resources and making them available to the public. Third, appropriate treatment programs and protective measures must be put into effect.

This chapter will provide an overview of these management activities and explore the nature of cultural resources. Much of the discussion is focused on the physical aspects of resources: on the empirical link between the substance of a resource and its historical or ethnographic associations, on threats that could cause a resource to

degrade or deteriorate, on defining and allowing appropriate use and enjoyment of the resource. Important as these issues are, they are but support for a larger concern: to enhance individual lives within the framework of a culturally diverse American society. As such, cultural resources are not valuable in and of themselves; they are to be treasured for the connections they provide between people and cultural traditions, between people and the world at large.

2. Parks and Cultural Resources

American history is well represented in the national park system. Although political and military themes have predominated, the parks' historical associations range from aboriginal settlement of the Western Hemisphere to the initiation of powered flight; they stretch from European exploration of the New World to the struggle for voting rights; they encompass the serenity of a poet's garden and the sweeping grandeur of a ridge-top parkway. Many park resources are the physical remains of this heritage. They are clay pots buried deep in the earth and brick forts guarding harbor entrances, quill-penned script on yellow parchment and smoke-belching locomotives, fragrant gardens and streets lined with tall wooden houses. These resources are unmistakable evidence of earlier lives—a common inheritance from past generations with whom we have shared this land.

The National Park Service is also steward of places, objects, and records important in perpetuating specific ethnic traditions. Such resources include vision quest sites and evangelical churches, feathered headdresses and hand-forged farm tools, oral histories and salmon-filled rivers. When used by their associated ethnic groups, these types of resources help underpin entire cultural systems. Resource management sensitive to the rights and interests of these groups, especially Native Americans, can help perpetuate if not strengthen traditional activities such as subsistence, language use, religious practice, and aesthetic expression. In this context, cultural resource management extends beyond concern with tangible resources to recognition and accommodation of cultural processes.

This connection between parks and cultural resources is well established in federal law. The act of 1916 by which Congress created the National Park Service clearly mandated the bureau to allow for public enjoyment of cultural resources while ensuring their protection. Over the years the federal government has enhanced and supported this role through repeated affirmation that cultural resources are a matter of national interest. Building on the 1906 Antiquities Act and the Historic Sites Act of 1935, this message was clearly spelled out in the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 and its amendments, it was reiterated in the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979, and it was reinforced by the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990. Although each of these acts has its own focus and orientation, collectively they require a comprehensive, multicultural approach to managing cultural resources in national parks.

3. Cultural Resource Management

The physical attributes of cultural resources are, with few exceptions, nonrenewable. Once the historic fabric of a monument is gone, nothing can bring back its authenticity; once the objects in an archeological site are disturbed, nothing can recover the information that might have been gained through analysis of their spatial relationships. The primary concern of cultural resource management, therefore, is to minimize the loss or degradation of culturally significant material. Closely related issues include compatibility between cultural resources and new development; consideration of visitor needs, especially those of special populations; incorporation of sustainable design principles in resource protection strategies; and support for the interpretation of park resources, both natural and cultural.

Straightforward as these concerns are, translating them into a management program is anything but simple. Contributing to this complexity are a legally mandated review process, staff trained in diverse academic disciplines, limited funds, and a shortage of trained personnel. In spite of these conditions, cultural resource management can be largely understood in terms of three basic questions that must be asked about all cultural resources. How is a cultural resource identified and what makes a resource significant? What should be done to properly care for a cultural resource? How do cultural resources fit into the overall scheme of park management?

In the past, these questions have usually been answered in the context of specific academic disciplines, such as architecture or museology. But when park managers and cultural resource specialists talk about cultural resource issues or when NPS staff meet with state historic preservation officers, their discussions would undoubtedly benefit from a common understanding of the program as a whole. The discussion in this chapter provides such an overview by linking cultural resource management with park operations and by presenting the full range of cultural resources in terms of their common denominators.

B. Types of Cultural Resources

1. Notes on Resource Categorization

The National Historic Preservation Act recognizes five property types: districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects. As called for in the act, these categories are used in the National Register of Historic Places, the preeminent reference for properties worthy of preservation in the United States. To focus attention on management requirements within these property types, the NPS *Management Policies* categorizes cultural resources as archeological resources, cultural landscapes, structures, museum objects, and ethnographic resources.

Resource categories are useful because they help organize cultural resources into a manageable number of groups based on common attributes. On the other hand, categorization may obscure the interdisciplinary nature of many cultural resources. An early farmhouse, for example, may be filled with 19th-century furniture, form the centerpiece of a vernacular landscape, and occupy the site of a prehistoric burial mound. In addition to this type of overlap, cultural resources might also embrace more than one category or classification system. A stone ax can be both an archeological resource and a museum object, just as a fence may be viewed as a discrete structure, the extension of a building, and part of a landscape. Taken a step further, historic districts can be formed by various combinations of cultural landscapes, structures, and ethnographic and archeological resources.

2. NPS Resource Types

Archeological resources are the remains of past human activity and records documenting the scientific analysis of these remains. Archeological resources include stratified layers of household debris and the weathered pages of a field notebook, laboratory records of pollen analysis and museum cases of polychrome pottery. Archeological features are typically buried but may extend above ground; they are commonly associated with prehistoric peoples but may be products of more contemporary society. What matters most about an archeological resource is its potential to describe and explain human behavior. Archeological resources have shed light on family organization and dietary patterns, they have helped us understand the spread of ideas over time and the development of settlements from place to place.

Cultural landscapes are settings we have created in the natural world. They reveal fundamental ties between people and the land—ties based on our need to grow food, give form to our settlements, meet requirements for recreation, and find suitable places to bury our dead. Landscapes are intertwined patterns of things both natural and constructed: plants and fences, watercourses and buildings. They range from formal gardens to cattle ranches, from cemeteries and pilgrimage routes to village squares. They are special places: expressions of human manipulation and adaptation of the land.

Structures are material assemblies that extend the limits of human capability. Without them we are restricted to temperate climates, the distances we can walk, and the loads we can carry. With them we can live where we choose, cross the continent in hours, and hurl a spacecraft at the moon. Structures are buildings that keep us warm in winter's worst blizzard and bridges that keep us safe over raging rivers; they are locomotives that carry us over vast prairies and monuments to extend our memories. They are temple mounds and fishing vessels, auto factories and bronze statues—elaborations of our productive ability and artistic sensitivity.

Museum Objects are manifestations and records of behavior and ideas that span the breadth of human experience and depth of natural history. They are evidence of

technical development and scientific observation, of personal expression and curiosity about the past, of common enterprise and daily habits. Museum objects range from a butterfly collection to the woven fragments of a prehistoric sandal. They include the walking cane of an American president, a blacksmith's tools, and the field notes of a marine biologist. They encompass fossilized dinosaur bones and business journals, household furnishings and love letters bound with a faded ribbon. They are invaluable—samples and fragments of the world through time and the multitude of life therein.

Ethnographic resources are basic expressions of human culture and the basis for continuity of cultural systems. A cultural system encompasses both the tangible and the intangible. It includes traditional arts and native languages, religious beliefs and subsistence activities. Some of these traditions are supported by ethnographic resources: special places in the natural world, structures with historic associations, and natural materials. An ethnographic resource might be a riverbank used as a Pueblo ceremonial site or a schoolhouse associated with Hispanic education, sea grass needed to make baskets in an African-American tradition or a 19th-century sample of carved ivory from Alaska. Management of ethnographic resources acknowledges that culturally diverse groups have their own ways of viewing the world and a right to maintain their traditions.

C. The Nature of Cultural Resources

1. Significance

An idea common to all cultural resources is the concept of significance. To be significant, a cultural resource must have important historical, cultural, scientific, or technological associations and it must manifest those associations in its physical substance. Put another way, the significance of cultural resources is based on two interrelated qualities. A cultural resource consists of a number of physical, chemical, or biological features; at the same time, it consists of ideas, events, and relationships. This duality is evident in cultural resources as small as a penny or as large as the Statue of Liberty. Fashioned from copper, both share common material properties. Shaped into symbols—one of economic value, the other of a fundamental human right—both also serve as expressions of ideas.

The physical and social dimensions of a cultural resource are inseparably interwoven. For a resource to be significant, its meaning must be indelibly fixed in form and fabric. The flag on Abraham Lincoln's box at Ford's Theatre epitomizes this relationship. Immediately after shooting the president, John Wilkes Booth jumped to the stage, catching his spur in a flag hung in front of the box. The material ripped, and so it remains—a small detail in the story of Lincoln's life, but tangible evidence of the horror of his death.

2. Associations

Regardless of type, every cultural resource must have a place in the history or prehistory of the United States, or it must have value for a particular ethnic group. This tie between a resource and its cultural context is its association. Associations commonly fall into one of four areas. Resources may be linked to historic events or noteworthy people; they may be embodiments of technical accomplishment, design, or workmanship; they may be sources of information important in historical or archeological research; or they may be important in the cultural system of an ethnic group. The context for these associations may be national in scale or focus on regional and local affairs.

Associations tie the rustic hotels of Yellowstone to the great craft revival of the early 20th century. They fix Casa Grande in a prehistoric network of desert canals, trade routes, and migration patterns. They frame the remains of Andersonville Prison in rules of honorable conduct that were shattered by the Civil War and relate the Blue Ridge Parkway to the development of an automobile-oriented society. Associations are integral to the significance of cultural resources because they define why each resource should be preserved and, by extension, what characteristics of each resource are most important.

Time provides a vantage point from which the associations of a cultural resource can be assessed in the broad course of human experience. Time is important as well because it provides a frame of reference for specific associations. A battlefield is important for the time in which the battle was fought—and perhaps also for what it reveals about later commemorative attitudes and practices. Although the home of a president is significant for the time of his occupancy, it might also be noteworthy for other distinguished occupants, for its architectural style or landscape setting. A resource may have more than one period of significance because it has more than one association, but every association must have a defined point or period in time.

As mentioned earlier, ethnographic resources are not limited to things commonly thought of as cultural resources, nor are ethnographic associations limited to past people and events. For ethnographic resources, associations are links to living traditions. For example, in ethnographic terms a grove of trees or a distant mountain peak might be considered worthy of preservation for social or religious associations when tied to the ongoing cultural practices and beliefs of a specific ethnic group. An archeological site significant for its scientific value may also be an ethnographic resource for its place in the mythology of a nearby pueblo.

3. Integrity

Although a cultural resource must have relevant associations, a cultural resource does not consist solely of those associations. In themselves, cultural resources are not a revolutionary engineering concept or a pattern of crop rotation, a landmark court case or the skills of a master craftsman. Cultural resources are physical entities with qualities such as mass, color, and texture, some of which express

historical or cultural associations. Integrity addresses the degree to which behavior and ideas are manifested in the form and substance of a resource. A cultural resource has integrity if it retains material attributes associated with its social values.

Integrity has many attributes. It is the material aspect of a resource and the ways in which materials were put together; it is the relationship between different parts of a resource and the aesthetic qualities that resulted; it is the exact geographic location of a resource and the nature of its setting. Integrity may be hidden under coats of paint, aged by weather, or chipped away by rodents; but it is capable of being sensed—it can be recognized, described, and verified. Integrity is the past revealed in physical form.

Although all cultural resources must have integrity, the nature of integrity varies from resource to resource. For a noteworthy landscape, integrity may be a matter of spatial organization, plant types, and paving materials. In a writer's study, integrity may be found in the mementos and books displayed on a shelf or in the contents of a desk drawer. Buried remains of towns and villages retain integrity in the association between potsherds and pollen deposits, post holes and parched corn. For an architectural masterpiece, the quality of design is essential; for a traditional building type, workmanship may be most important.

Integrity is not the same as condition. The condition of a resource is defined in terms of deterioration; integrity is defined in terms of correspondence with associations in the past. Condition is a matter of rot and rust; integrity is a matter of age and authenticity. All physical things have a condition; they do not all have historical integrity. On the other hand, all things with historical integrity also have a condition. The condition of a resource during its period of significance is part of its integrity.

4. A Living Legacy

The cultural environment is the nursery in which each generation is nurtured and socialized; it is the workshop in which each generation elaborates on its received tradition; and in the end, it is the legacy that each generation passes on to its descendants. As we emerge from childhood, each of us becomes part of a group tradition and each accepts the burdens of social responsibility. As we learn about these traditions, we are shaped by them; as we live these traditions, we give them new expression. Each cultural resource is a symbol: a tangible reminder of values and ideas; a spark to touch our spirits and to fire our imagination. Cultural resources provide a path by which we can discover our own humanity: the magic of birth, the mystery of death, and all the wonder of living that lies between.

The cultural resources in our parks are an invitation to see our country, our neighbors, and ourselves in a new light. They are a challenge to commonplace ideas about human nature, ethnic characteristics, and national identity. They hint and tease and provoke. What makes this nation special? What are the broad patterns and singular events that shaped this country? Who were the leaders and the

innovators—the ones who pushed back the boundaries of what could be? And what is the character of its people: the original inhabitants and those who came later from all parts of the world—people who differed in language, faith, custom, dress, and color? What can we learn from them?

Although the primary function of cultural resource management is to preserve, protect, and conserve the material aspects of cultural resources, the primary value of those resources is to enliven, enrich, and inform. In this era of rapid and continuous change, cultural resources provide essential points of orientation and inspiration. Cultural resources help provide a setting in which cultural diversity is viable and individual potential can be realized; they help bring us together in a spirit of appreciation for the past in order to better meet the challenges of tomorrow.

READING #2

MILESTONES IN THE HISTORY OF FEDERAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION LAW

2000 Congress amends National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) to incorporate Executive Order 13006, requiring agencies to give priority to using historic buildings in downtown historic districts to meet mission needs.

1990s President issues Executive Orders 13006 and 13007, which deals with access to sacred sites by Native American religious practitioners, and directs agencies to respect and avoid adversely affecting the physical integrity of Indian sacred sites on Federal lands. The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (1990) is enacted, establishing Federal responsibilities toward Native American graves, sacred items, and other artifacts. Congress amends NHPA, clarifying agency responsibilities and emphasizing increased participation by Indian tribes and Native Hawaiian groups.

1980s Congress enacts major amendments to NHPA, clarifying the roles of State Historic Preservation officers and giving Certified Local Governments a preservation role. Congress also enacts the Abandoned Shipwreck Act, providing for the management of historic shipwrecks.

1970s Congress amends the Tax Code to provide tax incentives for rehabilitating revenue-producing historic buildings. Congress enacts the Archaeological Resources Protection Act (1979) to provide protection of archeological sites on federal and Indian land, the American Indian Religious Freedom Act (1978) declaring Federal policy for protection of the rights of Native Americans to practice

traditional religions, and the Archeological and Historic Preservation Act (1974), enhancing protection of places with archeological research value.

1971 President issues Executive Order 11593, directing agencies to identify and nominate and manage impacts on historic properties eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, including previously undiscovered properties.

1969 Congress enacts the National Environmental Policy Act, requiring that Federal planning consider impacts on the environment, including historic and cultural aspects of the Nation's heritage.

1966 Congress enacts the National Historic Preservation Act, creating the National Register of Historic Places and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, providing for Federal-State partnership in identifying and managing historic properties, and requiring agencies to consider the effects of their actions on historic resources.

1935 Congress enacts the Historic Sites Act, authorizing the National Park Service to identify, document, and promote the preservation of historic resources.

1906 Congress enacts the Antiquities Act, prohibiting excavation of antiquities from public lands without a permit from the Secretary of the Interior, Agriculture, or War.

READING #3

French, Roderick S. "On Preserving America: Some Philosophical Observations," pp. 182-192. Preservation: Toward An Ethic in the 1980s (National Trust for Historic Preservation. Washington, DC: The Preservation Press, 1980.

On Preserving America: Some Philosophical Observations

Perhaps the most effective expression of Jean-Paul Sartre's relentless vision of absurdity of human existence is to be found in his philosophical novel with the engaging title, *Nausea*. The central figure of the story is a historian who becomes increasingly alienated from his vocation as a result of insights into the indifference of the universe to human aspirations. He clings to a neurotic survival routine in the relative safety of a city. Near the end of the book he confides:

*I am afraid of cities. But you mustn't leave them. If you go too far you come up against the vegetation belt. Vegetation has crawled for miles toward the cities. It is waiting. Once the city is dead, the vegetation will cover it, will climb over the stones, grip them, search the, make them burst with its long black pincers; it will blind the holes and let its green paws hang over everything. You must stay in the cities as long as they are alive; you must never penetrate alone this great mass of hair waiting at the gates; you must let it undulate the crack all by itself. In the cities, if you know how to take care of yourself, and choose the times when all the beasts are sleeping in their holes and digesting, behind the heaps of organic debris, you rarely come across anything more than minerals, the least frightening of all existents. (Sartre, *Nausea*).*

I cite this passage from Sartre not for its implied view of suburbia but because it suggests a philosophical perspective on historic preservation in which the more elite projects and ordinary home maintenance can be seen to have a fundamental affinity. The architecturally elegant, showcase restoration projects and weekend exertions of Henry Homeowner simply represent different ways of paying one's "dues" to the ongoing enterprise of civilization. Sartre's bleak view seems confirmed by the fatigue and indebtedness of all of us who try to maintain our own residences against the ravages of nature.

The admittedly provocative citation from Sartre was chosen in part to force consideration of the proposition that the work of philosopher may have some relevance for those engaged in preserving the built environment. At a time when preservationists are turning more and more to such practical professions as law and economics, it may seem out of step, if not regressive, to ask your attention for the thoughts of an academic humanist. The utility of the humanist is not commonly a first principle in the thinking of modern policymakers.

Of course all of us who make our lives—and our livings—in the humanities remember a time when humanists were prominent and indispensable figures in public life. I have in mind the Italian city-states during the Renaissance. At that time, humanist scholars handled state correspondence, represented their sovereigns on diplomatic missions and wrote orations and poetry to celebrate great civic occasions. But, alas, in the 16th century this class of scholars began a long decline into disgrace and neglect. Their ambition and poor judgment were responsible, in part, but they were also the victims of deep social changes.

The rise of the middle class and the democratic revolutions of the 18th century further displaced humanists from positions of influence. And then industrialization and technology placed a premium on a set of new skills. Those who persisted in studying the humanities were forced to the margins of public life. Their places have been taken by new cadres of professionals, people trained in the specialized knowledge of the modern world.

The Danger of Expertise

This brief excursion into history was made in order to arrive at my first point regarding the future of the preservation movement. As I read the literature of the movement, there appears to be a growing desire for "expertise," for uniform standards, measurable data, certified practitioners, etc. This trend is entirely understandable and in some ways to be commended. And as the movement seeks a larger and larger share of public money, the requirements of accountability will become more insistent.

I wish simply to point out a danger in this trend. There is a high price to be paid for professionalism. The preservation movement needs engineers, lawyers, economists and other technicians of contemporary society but not to the exclusion of the generalists, those who we might call the "professional amateurs." Preservation is a humanistic movement, inspired by basic human motives. Its core constituency

and leadership must remain people who can speak to one another and to all parties—and not merely in the language of numbers and dollars. In the words of the Charter of Machu Picchu, the 198 manifesto of architectural and planning principles sponsored by Universidad Nacional Fedenco Villareal in Lima, Peru, “the spirit of tolerance and understanding in human communications is a primary element of urban life.” Those who have been trained in the humanities have been educated to have an imaginative understanding of the life experiences of those who live, temporally and culturally, far beyond the bounds of their own life. Nothing is more critical for the preservation of urban civilization than this capacity to understand and respect the meaning of artifacts and historical associations that are valued by members of cultural groups other than one’s own.

A recurrent theme in recent preservation discussions is the longing for deliverance by experts, and the related fear that “excessive public involvement” will interfere with the work of “the professionals.” I recognize this longing. It is the ‘dream of Rationality that has animated the prideful achievements of disasters of Western civilization since the Renaissance.

Quite clearly one motivation behind our modern love affair with “expertise” is the desire to escape from the burden of the range of choices required of us. There is a utopian promise implicit in the vision of a world divided into ever-narrower specialties presided over by every-better-trained experts. This dream of the rational division and management of human affairs is an old one.

The utopian scheme that comes first to the minds of all of us, no doubt, would be that of Plato’s ideal Republic, so eloquently sketched and justified in the dialogue of that title. Plato’s advocacy was so seductive and seemingly irrefutable because he proposed that supreme authority be vested in an elite constituted by experts, not in technological fields, but experts in the art of living the good life. Who could wish for more benevolent governance? But, as you will remember, this rule by the enlightened and virtuous turned out to imply a totalitarian state with every citizen’s existence thoroughly regimented.

I suspect, however that the utopianism that circulates in our blood is not the ethical-religious vision of Plato. It is, rather, that of the father of the modern scientific enterprise, Sir Francis Bacon. Bacon called for a fully subsidized scientific community set apart to perfect the theories and inventions that would enable mankind to recover that life of effortless abundance that, according to the Book of Genesis, we enjoyed in our original condition. At one stroke, Bacon linked the instrument of modern empiricism to the realization of our most ancient longings. In our present trouble we may sometimes forget the glorious optimism with which our modern age began.

The best minds coming out of the Renaissance were convinced that all things were possible, if only we could find the right method. And they believed the method was to be found in the mathematical sciences. Bacon’s contemporary and co-constructor of the plan of modernism, Descartes, wrote an ingenuous little manifesto for the new way of doing things, entitled appropriately, *Discourse on Method*. There is the famous passage in which he recounts almost offhandedly how one day he

shut himself up in a warm room and invented modern philosophy from scratch. What you may not remember is that the heart of his inspiration was the conclusion that the method of reasoning employed in the mathematical sciences could be applied to all facets of life with comparable results in terms of certainty and efficiency. There is a straight line running from Descartes's overheated meditations and the modern cost-benefit calculus.

In the present context, it is striking to see that in the course of outlining the rules of a rigorous methodology, Descartes, in this most formative of modern documents, takes his first illustrations from the field of city planning. His preferences should come as no surprise.

*I remained all day alone in a warm room. There I had plenty of leisure to examine my ideas. One of the first that occurred to me was that frequently there is less perfection in a work produced by several persons than in one produced by a single hand...Similarly, those ancient towns which were originally nothing but hamlets, and in the course of time have become great cities, are ordinarily very badly arranged compared to one of the symmetrical metropolitan districts which a city planner had laid out on an open plain according to his own designs...when we observe how the streets are crooked and uneven, one would rather suppose that chance and not decisions of rational men had so arranged them. (Descartes, *Philosophical Essays: Discourse on Method*)*

What Bacon and Descartes articulated were not merely the rules for the doing of good science, but what they regarded as the necessary rules for the building of the good society. In their view the model for all fields of endeavor was to be derived from the mathematical sciences. Following their advice has led to the spectacular achievements of the specialized disciplines such as economics, physics, psychology and the rest. But those achievements have been purchased at a heavy price.

It is as if a treaty has been negotiated at the beginning of the modern era whereby each set of specialists agreed not to ask certain questions. Otherwise they could never have gone forward. If, for example, the physicist were to ask the questions that the psychologist asks, he could never get on with the business of physics. The same is true of all the disciplines of knowledge. Their brilliant products require the rigorous exclusion of data regarded by their respective disciplines as irrelevant. The net result is that we are left in a fragmented condition of narrow excellences unable to communicate with one another.

To say this much is merely to open the door on an immense problem. All that can be done at the moment is to point out that the preservation movement has walked right into the midst of these very sophisticated difficulties. The warning from those who arrived at these perplexities somewhat earlier would be that one must always be aware of the number of other decisions one is making when one adopts a methodology. In my view, the study of human problems—and preservation is a profoundly human concern—must always be a multidisciplinary study. I will close this section with an extract from John Dewey's humanistic correction of the legacy of Bacon and Descartes.

There is no kind of inquiry which has a monopoly on the honorable title of knowledge. The engineer, the artist, the historian, the man of affairs attain

knowledge in the degree they employ methods that enable them to solve the problems which develop in the subject matter they are concerned with.

In fact, the painter may know colors as well as the physicist; the poet may know stars, rain and clouds as well as the meteorologist; the statesman, educator and dramatist may know human nature as truly as the professional psychologist; the farmer may know soils and plants as truly as the botanist and mineralogist. (Dewey, *Quest for Certainty*)

Value of the Humanist

Only humanists were left out of that treaty. Humanists ask the questions others do not ask. Or rather, humanists ask as a matter of professional training those questions that others ask on in their private moments. Humanists begin and end with those questions that other disciplines have agreed not to raise. Little questions such as, Why are we doing this? Or, What would you like to see happen?

These last, of course, are questions of value. And they are at the heart of the preservation movement. By continuing to be a broadly humanistic movement, preservation can make valuable and wide-ranging contributions to the last 20th-century America. But to do so it must democratize its aims.

What kind of broad contributions to American life could be expected from a more democratic preservation movement? For one thing, one preservation debate could help clarify our understanding of the public interest or common good.

We in the United States have an acute need to counter the drift of what is being called the “me generation.” The public seems to be fragmented into smaller and smaller units of interest. It is as if we were determined to fulfill an observation made by Alexis de Tocqueville, the French analyst of American life in the 1830’s. In his classic study of our civilization, de Tocqueville carefully explained to his European readers that American “individualism” was not the same thing as egoism but was always in danger of sliding into selfishness. It is the opinion of many that we have slid.

This is one reason why the debates in every community as to what to preserve, and why, should be made more public, not less. All important decision making should not be given over to “experts.” Increased expertise should be balanced with broader public participation in procedures and processed. The very exercise can contribute to the search for a persuasive, authoritative notion of public interest. To be effective, the renewed sense of public interest must reflect the population diversity and cultural pluralism of the nation.

A rich, meaningful life for humankind requires a continuity of layers of material and social culture. The preservation movement has made that point most eloquently. But the material basis for that sense of continuity must be preserved for all segments of society in a democracy.

Although the health and success of the preservation movement require the stimulation of more and more debates at the local level, we should beware of the

dogmatic localists who admonish us to reduce our efforts at the national level. In the 1980's, the argument regarding the meaning of America may well become more acute, even nastier than it was in the 1960's. If that comes about, any movement truly interested in constructive changes in the organization and quality of public life that does not have strong national institutions, clearly stated national policies and an able and imaginative national leadership will surely lose the arguments as to what kind of country we are and wish to become. As just one emphasis of policy, the stress of local initiatives and local constituencies is no doubt politically smart. As an overriding policy, I am convinced that it would prove self-destructive for the preservation movement.

Beyond these judgments as to political strategy, emphasis on localism raises challenging questions of political philosophy. Can there be national policy guidelines for historic preservation that are more than mere generalities or must we allow a patchwork of local standards? Perhaps the most useful national "policy" is one that mandates a process that allows for the continuous modifications of standards as they result of an ongoing dialectic of legitimate national, regional and local interests. It is the impossibility of resolving the issue of standards once and for all in a pluralistic, dynamic democracy that makes it mandatory to have a national policy that assures that the dialectic is allowed to have full play.

But we can press even harder on the questions of the ultimate authority of local standards. I suppose that if the people of Chicago want to tear down all structures less than 50 stories high, we must, however reluctantly, allow them the right to do so. And if the folks in a certain Vermont town decide that they want a McDonald's on the village green, there are limits to our right to stop them.

In the end, local communities have strong rights, but in the meantime we have the obligation to try to convince them that they might live to regret such an innovation—however much the whole world loves a Big Mac. There must be limits to localism just as there are limits to individualism in American society. At the least, we owe one another the obligation to argue about the appropriateness of our significant public behaviors. Particularly is this true when the scope of local decisions is far broader than local interests perceive them to be. I will mention just two considerations that seem to me to seriously qualify unlimited local prerogative in preservation matters.

The first is what is commonly termed our obligations to future generations. I will have more to say about this later. It is not an easy concept to handle politically, but it is an understandable notion and one that puts some real limits on the rights of the present generations to irreparably modify the human landscape.

The second qualification is perhaps less grand and more readily comprehensible. I have in mind the demographic fact of the almost incessant mobility of Americans in the latter half of the 20th century. I believe that this imposes on us a responsibility to one another to retain important vestiges of local history in order to keep them available for new residents in a neighborhood or new citizens of an urban community. How else will these newcomers find those points of contact with the continuity of human settlement and human endeavor that are critical to the

development of personality and the stability of society? Upon adequate reflection, very few local decisions are merely local decisions.

The City of Cultural Diversity

It need not be emphasized that preservation is a delicate task. The one thing preservation must not do is block the normal processes of change by turning dynamic, living cities into static museums. The survival power of cities is correlated with the preservations of cultural diversity. The greater the heterogeneity of an urban community's usable past, the greater the potential richness and strength available to its citizens today. All insightful statements on urban civilization, from Jane Jacobs's *Death and Life of Great American Cities* (Random House, 1961) to the new Charter of Machu Picchu, identify diversity as they key to vitality and viability of city life.

The suburban movement of the past 100 years provides a lesson on this point. As if orchestrated by a master plan, suburbanization produced carefully differentiated enclaves scattered throughout every metropolitan regions. This left society so divided by socioeconomic factors and political jurisdictions that we were morally and politically handicapped in responding to the forces of social change that confronted all cities in the 1960s. Even if we had had the will to act collectively to meet the environmental, inter-racial and intergenerational challenges of that decade, we lacked the necessary social knowledge and the political instrumentalities to do so.

There is a genuine danger that the current back-to-the-city movement will merely reproduce that error. It could happen that the ideal suburb, as understood a generation ago, and the ideal restored urban neighborhood in 1980 will have two things in common: isolation and sterility. What a hollow victory it will be if preservation succeeds in restoring everything about our cities except their livingness. I assume that it now has been conclusively demonstrated to the satisfaction of even the most die-hard disciple of Adam Smith that, left to itself, the market will not foster this diversity. We must have deliberate and tough public policies if that is our objective.

This constitutes a clear test of the democratic heart of preservation. Learning the values that make a democracy work must come through significant common experiences. Preservation can either reinvigorate our sense of belonging to the same community with shared goals or contribute to further fragmentation into homogenized units.

Preservation and Future Generations

Another broad area of public life in which preservation can make a distinctive contribution is in strengthening our sense of obligation to future generations. This will represent a revolutionary reorientation in American attitudes, but it is one that must come about rapidly. The great achievement of the American experiment in the 18th century was the creation of a civic society whose processes of government were

responsive to the needs of “the living generation.” Two centuries later the demands of the present generation are of such magnitude and press so relentlessly on the government for unfettered satisfaction as to raise widespread concern that we soon may exhaust the material basis of the American way of life.

We all remember Thomas Jefferson’s ringing assertion that the earth belongs to the living. What Mr. Jefferson actually said was that “the earth belongs *in usufruct* to the living.” “*Usufruct*” is not exactly a household word in most settings, but among preservationists it ought to be a sacred term. Holding something usufruct means using and enjoying the benefits of something that belongs to another—in this case to the human species.

I know that it sounds un-American to some, but I believe that we must generalize the habit of mind required by the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969. We must learn to evaluate the impact of our major initiatives before acting.

Once again de Tocqueville supplies the text that is needed. Writing 150 years ago, de Tocqueville expressed his amazement at this “happy republic” that had the “luxury” of making “reparable mistakes.” That luxury has vanished. We must rehabilitate one of the restraints on individual initiative articulated by the father of our doctrine of private property, John Locke. It was, said Locke, an obligation of each appropriator of the stock of the earth to leave “enough and as good” for others.

Given the present economic and environmental conditions, preservation is no longer a matter of taste but a mandatory expression of basic social responsibility. Urban conservation in particular should be seen not as a private endeavor in behalf of one’s heirs but as the maintenance of a legacy for the species.

This relates to another concern on which Thomas Jefferson took the wise position but failed to convince his countrymen. Already in 1784 Jefferson was lamenting the “unhappy prejudice” in the new nation against building houses of brick or stone. He wanted to eradicate this prejudice, he said, otherwise every half century our country would become a tabula rasa on which it would be necessary to build anew. On the other hand, “when buildings are of durable materials, every new edifice is an actual and permanent acquisition to the state, adding to its value as well as to its ornament.” The growing sentiment against the notion of throwaway cities would suggest that we have at last matured to Jefferson’s perspective. The custodians of the past are in fact guardians of the future.

Transforming Values

The great potential contribution of preservation to American life is not in the saving of structures per se but in the transformation of the values by which we live. The challenging questions confronting the preservation movement are sensibility questions. There is a line from Thoreau that makes the point. On learning that a dam was to be constructed across the Concord River, Thoreau ‘asked: “Who hears the fishes when they cry?” That was not sentimentality. It stemmed from a sincere sensibility.

We can readily develop the variations of Thoreau's question to be addressed to historic preservationists. Who remembers our anonymous ancestors? Who cares for those who will always have to live in housing owned by someone else, assuming they can find and afford any decent shelter? Who feels the terror of future generations who may be born into a world in which the material basis of a good life has long since been exhausted? If the preservation movement grapples with the issues implied by these questions, it need not be uncomfortable in a democracy. A legitimate claim to broader public support requires that it do so.