

Cultural Resources Management

CRM Bulletin

A National Park Service Technical Bulletin

Vol. 2, No. 4

December 1979

RECREATION AND THE HISTORICAL PARK

Dr. Harry A Butowsky

During the past year, the author visited a number of historical parks to gather material concerning how these parks were maintaining the historic scene and how they were coping with recreational use.

The parks visited for this survey were: Manassas National Battlefield Park, Harpers Ferry National Historical Park, Richmond National Battlefield Park, Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania National Military Park, Gettysburg National Military Park, Antietam National Battlefield Site, Colonial Battlefield Park, George Washington Birthplace National Historical Site, Valley Forge National Historical Park, Stones River National Battlefield, Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park, Kennesaw Mountain National Military Park, Morristown National Battlefield Park, and the Sandy Hook Unit (Fort Hancock) of the Gateway National Recreational Area.

The parks were situated in four regions of the National Park System. They were selected for their significant historical resources, heavy recreational use, large areas of open space and nearby urban centers. During the course of this survey, a variety of recreational activities were reported in these historical parks: jogging, picnicking, camping, kite flying, model airplane flying, baseball, softball, soccer, volleyball, frisbee throwing, marathon races, bike-a-thons, walk-a-thons, band and orchestra concerts, sun bathing, antique car shows, car polishing and repair, cross-country skiing, weddings and baptisms.

Given the wide variety of activities involved, the issue under question was how these activities conformed with the purposes for which these parks were established.

The Historic Sites Act of 1935 declared that the effort to preserve historic properties of national significance for public use, inspiration, and benefit was a matter of national policy. It mandated that properties be made available for a specific form of public use (recreation). Traditionally, this public use has been the visiting of a historic area and viewing its cultural resources. But confusion over compatible and non-compatible recreation and use made necessary a distinction between the two.

Compatible recreation and use conforms to the significance and the purpose for which the park was established, does not damage the resource, and has minimal lasting and adverse impact on the historic character of the park as well as the park experience of other visitors. Non-compatible recreation and use includes any type of activity that provides for the establishment of permanent recreational facilities, consumes the resources, and disrupts the historic scene. These activities are especially damaging when established on a continual basis, as a precedent for future non-compatible recreational use. Such variable factors as the location, time, and numbers of individuals involved must all be considered in determining whether recreation is compatible or not. Each manager must judge an activity on its own merits and consider the nature of the resource and mission of the park before deciding what is compatible and what is non-compatible. Park superintendents agree that establishment of permanent recreational facilities such as campgrounds, tennis courts, ball fields and pavilions are grossly non-compatible.

Some forms of recreational activities such as band concerts or marathons which are not consumptive of park resources but disrupt the historic scene or disturb the historic ambiance of the park are also noncompatible. The decision concerning what is compatible

and non-compatible must be made with due consideration of park resources. Thus, a concert featuring classical music or rock music at a Civil War site might be viewed as non-compatible, while another concert featuring Civil War songs might be used as part of the interpretive program of the park and actually enhance the appreciation of its resources.

Temporary activities such as kite flying, jogging, picnicking, sun bathing, and frisbee throwing can be tolerated in some historical parks, provided they are unorganized activities segregated from the historic scene. Again, some of these activities may not be compatible with the mission and resources of one park, but may be tolerated in another. Park superintendents have attempted to cope with different types of recreation by zoning certain areas of lesser historical significance for recreational use. The opinion of park superintendents on this matter can be summed up by one individual who wrote:

"Pragmatism suggests that we select and cheerfully sponsor or assist with certain activities which are non-consumptive of the resources and non-disruptive to the appreciation and understanding of our cultural resources by the visitor. Park superintendents agree that in the past, the National Park Service has supported maintenance activities that have contributed to non-compatible recreational activities. Fields in historic units of the System have been mowed too often, which has encouraged excessive recreational pursuits in well-kept, grassy areas.

But this attitude toward mowing has changed, especially in light of the current energy crisis. The general policy now is to limit field mowing to once or twice a season to prevent the return of forests in what were historically open fields. This policy has come under criticism by citizens in local communities even though wild, unmowed fields are a historically accurate phenomenon.

Many parks maintain acreage in fee leasing and special use permits distributed to farmers interested in growing crops. This has two advantages. Historic farm scenery is maintained, and park resources are released for other activities. Fee leasing of acreage also requires little or no expenditure of park funds or manpower to maintain these areas. Park superintendents do not feel that modern mowing machinery is an intrusion on the historic scene. The machines do their work quickly and are soon out of the fields. Gettysburg has recently used a horse-drawn mower, which of course, is more compatible with the historical scene.

The present recreational use of the national historical parks creates serious challenges to their preservation and future enjoyment. Large numbers of people with increasing amounts of leisure time are visiting these parks, encouraged, in many instances, by the National Park Service's regular and special programs, such as the Year of the Visitor and the Urban Initiative. But public use in itself is not the issue the issue is adverse use that results in excessive wear and destruction of historic fabric, destruction of historic ambiance and character, and the degrading of national treasures. The capacity of a park to accommodate visitors is of ten less related to numbers of people than to what these people do in and to the parks. What the Service encourages or permits visitors to do in a park is a statement to visitors concerning what that park really stands for. In permitting and promoting recreation in the historical parks, the Service must carefully consider the reasons why these parks were established, as well as how they are intended to function, along with the fragility of the resources entrusted to them. Historic resources, unlike natural resources, cannot be recreated; once lost, they are lost forever. Any views or comments on this subject should be addressed to the editor, CRM BULLETIN.

LOCKING UP HISTORIC STRUCTURES IN THE NATIONAL REGISTER?

F. Ross Holland
Asst. Director, Cultural Resources

The other day a copy of a response to a visitor's inquiry came across my desk. It was a very good letter, strongly supportive of cultural resources in natural parks. But one statement in it disturbed me. It stated that since a property was on the National Register, the National Park Service was committed to preserve it. Probably no other myth pervades the Park Service as extensively. The only structures we must preserve are those designated by Congress.

Being on the National Register means simply that the structure is significant and that this significance has to be considered when park policy affects it. If a park plans the construction of a road and the proposed route goes through a historic log cabin, the park is obligated to determine if there is not a feasible alternative route or if some other mitigating action will save the structure. But if there is no prudent, reasonable alternative, then the structure may have to be removed. Before making a decision, however, the factor of historic significance has to be cranked into the equation. If President William Henry Harrison had been born in the cabin, the significance factor would be of greater importance than it would with the domicile of a sheepherder.

I know this example is simplistic and that the problems faced by a superintendent in preserving structures are more complex and less clear-cut. But, nevertheless, just because a structure is on the National Register does not make it sacrosanct and inviolable.

The bottom line is, if you want to take down a structure that is on the National Register, you must have a good and supportable reason. Under the legislative requirements of Section 106 of the Historic Preservation Act, the Advisory Council review all actions that affect any historic structures. The people involved in this work at the Council are not unreasonable. If a park comes to them with good reasons for removing a structure, they will support it.

The National Register is not a jail where all the historical properties are locked-up." It is a planning tool to provide proper information to make informed decisions and to insure that historical properties are given adequate consideration when actions affecting them are undertaken.

THE LOWELL EXPERIMENT

Bronwyn King

Successful Boston businessmen who had operated textile mills at Waltham, Massachusetts found an ideal site for expansion at Pawtucket Falls on the Merrimack River in 1822. The 30-foot waterfall, along with the Pawtucket Canal which skirted it, formed the basis of a 5.6-mile system of power canals. What was at that time an innovative, corporate, entrepreneurial undertaking, ultimately resulted in the construction of ten major mill complexes and the founding of Lowell, Massachusetts.

Today, with a population of nearly 100,000, Lowell is the object of a cooperative revitalization effort, focusing on its role in the Industrial Revolution, as this is interpreted through an urban cultural park concept. A large preservation district has been established which encompasses the entire canal system, large portions of the historic industrial sites, the central business district, and characteristic residential areas. The district is administered by a 15-member Commission comprised of local, state, and federal representatives.

The Division of Cultural Resources, NARO, has assumed responsibility for the Lowell Cultural Resources Inventory which will provide a data base for preservation planning activities on approximately 1,000 properties in the district. The inventory is being conducted through a contract with Shepley, Bullfinch, Richardson, and Abbott of Boston and is headed by a project supervisor with a staff of six experienced preservationists/architectural historians. All mapping and clerical support services will be provided by the contractor.

The Inventory will scrutinize and amass historical, architectural, archeological, and aesthetic information on each property. Individual files will detail the history of each property's use, previous and current ownership, current tax and zoning status, surrounding land use, and archeological data. It will provide a professional judgment on the condition of the structure's historic fabric, its setting, and its visual importance to the area. Archeological sites, particularly industrial sites, which are abundant in Lowell are receiving attention. An architectural description accompanies each property, as well as a current photograph and copies of any historic views yielded by documentary research.

At a mid-point in the project, when the field data form and preliminary documentary research on each site was complete, an evaluation took place. Two hundred and seventy properties were selected for in-depth study. The group includes 60 structures that survive from the significant 1822-to-1845 period, examples of representative and distinctive vernacular building types, the seven extant mill complexes, many late 19th century commercial, government, and institutional structures, sites with great potential for archeology, and several significant residential areas. Once complete, this effort will produce extensive reports on a broad cross-section of Lowell's building stock.

A report on the Inventory will accompany the property files and recording forms, explaining its methodology and presenting an overview of Lowell and the preservation district. In addition, an archeological and physiographic report will complement the historical account of land use and city development. A detailed analysis of the industrial district will identify specific features and account for their significance.

This Inventory is an ambitious undertaking, considering the breadth of information and the intensity of the research work. This Inventory is expected to greatly assist the work of urban revitalization and interpretation of the American Industrial Revolution.

REMOTE SENSING AT GRAN QUIVIRA

James I. Ebert

An updated park interpretive program for Gran Quivira National Monument is being developed by the Monument staff, with the cooperation of the Remote Sensing Division of the Southwest Cultural Resources Center, National Park Service. Remote sensing, the analysis and measurement of data collected by aerial photography and other distant recording devices, will provide illustrative material for trail guides and interpretive lectures, while illuminating the lives of Gran Quivira's Indian and Spanish past.

Remote sensing efforts to elucidate the past began in 1978 with the taking of black-and-white and color transparency aerial photographs over the Monument's 611 acres. Control points marked with white plastic sheeting to insure visibility on the photographs were laid out, before the imagery was flown at 1:3000 and 1:6000 scale. This allowed accurate mapping of the Monument's topography through the use of stereoscopic plotting or photogrammetry. While useful for all in-park planning, photogrammetric maps are especially valuable for monitoring natural or cultural changes in the environment which may threaten cultural resources. Since the 1978 flight, the data has been used in vegetation, soil, vertebrate, and geologic surveys. Another overflight is planned for the near future which will concentrate on the village itself, picturing the house mounds and excavated structures at a large scale. Stereoscopic interpretation performed in the Albuquerque Remote Sensing laboratory will allow the definition of walls and the precise plotting of the mounds.

These data will be compared with historical information and archeological evidence already collected. Traces of the roadways which connected Las Humanas with surrounding villages and with salt extraction sites are expected to provide information on trade and communications as well.

Enlarged portions of the aerial photographs will be used as illustrative material for Gran Quivira's new trail guide, soon to be published by the Southwestern Parks Monuments Association. In addition, monoscopic and stereoscopic photos will be used in the course of tours and museum presentations at the Monument. Remote sensing methods, coupled with historic, archeological, and natural history research, will provide a link between the scientist and the public at Gran Quivira National Monument.

It is expected that through utilization and intensive development of the graphic materials forthcoming from remote sensing data, both visitors and researchers will be able to accurately conceptualize the massive Pueblo de las Humanas in a spatial and temporal perspective which has not been previously possible. Remote sensing data will be of major importance in communicating to visitors the primary interpretive thematic approach of culture change within an environmental framework. Expanded, in-depth site interpretation based upon non-destructive techniques is of critical importance to area management.

NOMENCLATURE USED IN THE NATIONAL PARKS

Dr. Harry A. Butowsky

In the years since the founding of the National Park Service in 1916, the number and variety of names used to designate various parks has grown to include a total of 21 different titles. The distinctions between National Battlefield, National Battlefield Park, and National Historic Site, etc., have become blurred with the passage of time. In a recent request from the Congress, the National Park Service was asked to redefine the terms used to designate our historical parks and to provide some historical background concerning the history and development of each. A summary of the findings of this report is presented below.

National Park

The term National Park was first used to name Yellowstone National Park, established in 1872. The term is used primarily to define a natural area of outstanding grandeur or merit which expresses in the best way the particular class or kind of exhibit it represents. At many times in the past, the term National Park has been used for historic and prehistoric parks in addition to natural parks. Both Chickamauga and Chattanooga, and Gettysburg were originally established as national parks before they were redesignated national military parks. Mesa Verde, all archeological area, is even today a National Park. There are presently 39 national parks in the system.

National Military Park

The term National Military Park was used by the War Department to designate four Civil War battlefields --Shiloh, Vicksburg, Gettysburg and Chickamauga and Chattanooga--that were established as parks after 1890. These battles were considered by the War Department to be of exceptional political and military importance and interest, that had far-reaching effects, that were worthy of preservation for detailed military study, and that were suitable to serve as memorials to the armies engaged.

The term National Military Park had a specific management context to the War Department. National Military Parks were large areas that covered thousands of acres of ground. They were marked and improved to indicate the lines of battle between the two armies. They were heavily monumented and served as lasting memorials to the men who fought there. They were designed for the student of military history and the historian who came to the park to study the battle. Due to the heavy expense of establishing the national military park and the cost of maintaining them, the War Department recommended that only a few of them be created. At the present time, there are 11 national military parks in the National Park System.

National Battlefield Site

The term National Battlefield Site was first use by the War Department to designate Antietam (established in 1890). Antietam was considered as important as the first four military parks: however, it was placed in a different management category and therefore required a different name. A national battlefield site required less acreage than a national military park. In 1890, Antietam contained about five miles of improved roads and avenues along which most of the monuments and markers for the battle's participating units were erected. In this method of marking battlefields, there was less freedom for locating

monuments and markers than when greater land areas were acquired. As with the military park, this method of marking a battlefield gave very satisfactory results for historical and professional military study, but at a much smaller expense for land maintenance. The purpose of a national military park and a national battlefield site was identical since both had battle lines clearly available for study by the professional military men, by historians, and by an interested public. Since only the roads and avenues leading to the monuments and markers were purchased, Antietam was established at only a fraction of the cost of a Gettysburg or a Vicksburg. At the present time there is only one National Battlefield Site (Brices Cross Roads, *Mississippi*) in the National Park System.

National Battlefield Park

This term came into use after the National Park Service's acquisition of the military parks from the War Department, in the government reorganization of 1933. While the terms Military Park and Battlefield Site were not abandoned, the National Park Service felt a need to evolve and use its own name for future military parks. National Battlefield Park was chosen as the most *appropriate* term, because "battlefield" described the historical importance area, and the term park implied public use. This public use was strictly defined and related to the purpose for which the park was established. The military parks had been established to preserve the resource and serve as memorials to the men engaged in the battle. In encouraging greater public use of the parks, the National Park Service was not encouraging superficial recreational demands such as swimming, fishing, and camping. The National Park Service understood recreation in the historical parks to be a gratification of a healthy intellectual curiosity concerning the history of the event the park commemorated. Recreation in a historical park was the natural result of using the park for the purpose for which it was established.

National Battlefield

The term National Battlefield evolved in 1957 as a result of a study requested by Director Conrad L. Wirth to simplify the many names of the parks. The report recommended that all previous titles--Military Parks, Battlefield Sites, and Battlefield Parks--be changed to the title of National Battlefield. The term was defined as a battlefield of national significance preserved in part, or in its entirety, for the inspiration and benefit of the people. The recommendations of the report were accepted by the Director, and over the years, the names of many Military Parks and Battlefield Sites have been changed to battlefields. At the present time, there are nine national battlefields in the National Park System.

National Monument

National Monuments derive from the Antiquities Act of 1906. The Antiquities Act gave the President discretionary power to set aside lands containing historic landmarks, historic or prehistoric structures, and other objects of historic or scientific interest. Thus, in order to qualify as a national monument, a piece of land must possess something of archeological, historical, or scientific value. The law also requires that the area reserved be no larger than that needed to preserve the object of interest. A National Monument is usually smaller than a National Park, and it lacks the diversity of attractions. At the present time, there are 92 National Monuments in the National Park System. Of these, forty-six were set aside to protect historic sites and/or natural sites which contain significant cultural resources.

National Historic Site

The term National Historic Site comes directly from the Historic Sites Act of 1935. When such sites are established, the enabling legislation usually contains a direct quote from the act that states... it is a national policy to preserve for public use historic sites, buildings and objects of national significance for the inspiration and benefit of the people of the United States..." Since 1935, National Historic Site has been the most common term used by Congress in authorizing new historical areas in the National Park System. Presently, there are 59 national historic sites.

National Historical Park

The term National Historical Park is defined by the National Park Service as an area that is larger and more complex than a National Historic Site. The origins of the term predate the Historic Sites Act of 1935 and can be traced to the very early years of the National Park Service. When the Service was created in 1916, it had a double mandate from both the Antiquities Act of 1906 and the enabling Act of 1916 to conserve and protect the scenery and the natural historic objects of the parks. The National Park Service interpreted this to mean it had a historic preservation mission as well one as protecting natural resources. The National Historical Park was the National Park Service's attempt at meeting its responsibilities in historic preservation. The Army had its National Military Parks and the Park Service had the National Parks devoted to the conservation of the natural world. The National Historical Park was to be equivalent to the National Park and the National Military Park, and was designed to preserve historical areas. Unlike National Monuments which proved to be cumbersome to declare and fund, the National Historical Park had the approval of Congress and would preserve outstanding historical sites.

The first such park, Morristown National Historical Park, was established in 1933. As a management category, the National Historical Park has evolved into a unit that administers outstanding historical resources of greater physical extent and complexity than a National Historic Site. Eleven national historical parks are now in the Park System.

National Memorials

National Memorials predate the founding of the National Park Service. The first memorial in our history was authorized by the Continental Congress during the Revolutionary War. It honored General Richard Montgomery who was killed on December 31, 1775 during an assault on the heights of Quebec. The Continental Congress and subsequent congresses of the United States continued to authorize memorials to many other important Americans and foreigners prominent in American history.

After 1933, the National Park Service was assigned the national memorial function. The National Memorial designation is most often used for areas that are primarily commemorative. Memorials need not be associated with sites or structures historically associated with their subjects. For example, the home of Abraham Lincoln in Springfield, Illinois, is a National Historic Site, but the Lincoln Memorial in the District of Columbia is a National Memorial. At the present time, there are 22 national memorials in the National Park system.

National Cemetery

The National Cemeteries of the Park System are closely related to the National Military Parks. The Battle of Gettysburg was hardly over when Governor Andrew Y. Curtin of Pennsylvania traveled to the battlefield to assist in its preparations for receiving the dead. The State of Pennsylvania asked William Saunders to lay out the grounds. The work was quickly completed, and on November 19, 1863, President Lincoln was invited to dedicate the cemetery. Gettysburg National Cemetery became the official property of the Nation on May 1, 1872.

The events that followed the battle of Gettysburg were repeated on many of the other battlefields of the Civil War. These national cemeteries, in many cases, provided the

nucleus for the establishment of the National Military Parks. In the reorganization of 1933, 11 national cemeteries were added to the National Park System. At the present time, national cemeteries are administered in conjunction with associated National Park System units and are not counted separately.

RECONSTRUCTIONS-- EXPENSIVE, LIFE-SIZE TOYS?

Richard Sellers and Dwight Pitcaithley

The 1916 Organic Act mandates the National Park Service to preserve its cultural resources. The Act states that the Service is to leave its resources “unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.” Nevertheless, there is no mandate to recreate vanished historic structures. Traditionally, the Service has supported the reconstruction of numerous historic structures it believed necessary to interpret its various sites. However, there are numerous philosophical, economic, and practical reasons why reconstructions of vanished structures should not be attempted by the National Park Service.

Perhaps the most obvious drawback is that such structures are not historic. Reconstructions, while they may be accurate, are never authentic. They are modern copies of the past, and lack the innate quality of being historic structures. Because they reflect modern values and perceptions, because they are built with modern techniques, and because they possess no structural link to the past, reconstructions are marked with an absence of historic integrity.

Reconstructions are usually erected as props for the interpretation of a site. The perceived need for a reconstruction implies that the site's authentic resources, entrusted to the National Park Service by Congress or the President, are inadequate in and of themselves.

The belief that we can “improve” a historic site through the introduction of nonhistoric elements runs counter to our commitment to leave our nationally significant resources unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations. In fact, reconstructions frequently necessitate the destruction of original material, especially foundations. Such insensitivity to original historic fabric, regardless of condition or appearance, is due in large part to the absence of a strong commitment (throughout all levels of Park Service management) to the preservation of our cultural resources, an attitude was thoroughly attested to during the January 1979 Harpers Ferry Conference on Historic Preservation.

At best, reconstructed buildings only illustrate how the past may have looked, not how it did look. Reconstructions are plagued, on the one hand, by insufficient data to allow a truly accurate reproduction, and, on the other, by the almost unavoidable desire to beautify what was not always a beautiful past. As a result, the Park Service misleads the public in their effort to understand past life styles. The contemplation of ruins, foundations, and other incomplete structural remnants from the past, when assisted by historic photographs, drawings, scale models, accounts from contemporary diaries, journals, and newspapers, can usually evoke a much more accurate sense of the past than reconstructions which often stray from the truth in their efforts to pander to modern aesthetic tastes and sensibilities.

Their costs include planning, extensive research, and the reconstruction itself. Added to this are the costs of furnishing a newly built structure, which involves planning, extensive research, and acquisition of the furniture or the making of period pieces. These objects must be served and, therefore, must compete with many significant objects already in the Service's possession for which very limited curatorial funds exist.

To the expense of reconstruction interpretation, maintenance, and, in some cases, site development. Most of these costs are ongoing and, in time, can amount to huge expenditures. A large and complex reconstruction will require additional interpretive staff to explain the site to the public. The structure also has to be maintained, thus requiring an increased maintenance workload. A newly built structure may also attract more visitors and, therefore, create pressure for additional site development such as increased land acquisition, a larger visitor center, expanded maintenance facilities, and additional parking facilities.

All of this absorbs funds which could better be used for the preservation of authentic historic sites, for the conservation of our 10,000,000 historic objects that are in dire need of professional attention, and for critically needed research that would enable us to understand better the truly historic resources that are under our control. As long as the Service has original cultural resources which are in need of preservation, the expenditure of funds for reconstructions and associated activities (totaling approximately \$14,000,000 in the current five-year program) could be considered in direct conflict with the spirit and intent of the Organic Act.

Without question, the issue of National Park Service involvement with reconstructions is frequently political in nature. In several instances, the Service is obligated to administer sites which were reconstructed by a separate private or public organization. More often, the Service is "encouraged" to erect a "new" historic structure under local political pressure.

Seldom, however, do Park Service representatives make articulate sustained, and persuasive arguments against proposed reconstructions. Although reconstructions should be considered only when "all prudent and feasible alternatives to reconstruction have been considered" (Management Policies V-17), proposals to reproduce a historic structure are regularly introduced and accepted with little, if any, consideration of the alternatives.

The gradual accretion of reconstructions under Park Service management tends to detract from the Service's truly significant and authentic cultural resources. Reconstructions regardless of ownership, are not unique. Any private or public organization can erect a "historic structure." Indeed, reconstructed historic villages are proliferating across the United States. As a commercial enterprise, history can be, and indeed is, big business. As these reconstructions increase, the distinction between authentic survivors of the past and imitations of the past becomes less clear. The Park Service's collection of unique, original, and nationally significant structures becomes confused and watered down by the continued addition of non-unique, nonhistoric reconstructions.

While the "Williamsburg syndrome" constituted the popular approach to historic preservation for several decades following 1927, the preservation community at large, both in the United States and in Europe, has grown to recognize the inadvisability of recreating our structural past. Organizations ranging from the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and the Restoration of Cultural Property in Rome, Italy, and the Society for the Preservation of New England Antiquities have long acknowledged that reconstructions are in reality the "projection of fantasy into objects of the past." The authors of With Heritage So Rich, the report of the Special Committee on Historic Preservation, which presented the philosophical foundations upon which the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 was based, summed up professional preservationists' attitudes toward reconstructions by labeling them "expensive life-size toys, manufactured for children of all ages who have forgotten how to read." The report goes on to observe that "They may be effective instruments of education, amusement, propaganda or some kind of special pleading, but they have precious little to do with history, and absolutely nothing to do with historic preservation."

In short, with its continued interest in reconstruction, the National Park Service has not kept pace with changing trends in historic preservation philosophy--a philosophy that has become more sophisticated in approach, more sensitive to and appreciative of original historic fabric, and increasingly more in tune with the original intent of the 1916 Organic Act to preserve nationally significant cultural resources.