

## CRM

Volume 15: No. 1

### NPS and HBCU: Preserving Our Heritage Cecil McKithan

The Black experience in the United States has been largely shaped by two contrasting environments. The first was the Southern staple-producing farm and plantation on which the vast majority of pre-20th century Blacks worked and lived.

The second was the urban ghetto, predominantly a 20th century creation, which grew primarily as a consequence of the migration of rural Blacks to the cities of the South and North.

Thus, Black life and culture matured within the context of a subordinate status whose manifestations were primarily the plantation and the ghetto. Within the confines of these environs, Blacks not only assimilated the culture of the dominant class but developed a distinct subculture. On the one hand, egalitarian values of the American democratic creed were adopted as well as middle class values regarding wealth and upward mobility. On the other hand, democracy and economic opportunity were more of a myth than a reality. As a result, many Blacks have been looked upon and have looked upon themselves as a separate ethnic group within society. Ethnocentrism was a key element in the creation and maintenance of a heritage rich in symbolism and achievement. An understanding of these symbolisms and achievements is essential to a total understanding of our Nation's Historically Black Colleges and Universities Program development.

Black cultural resources have been among the most threatened due in part to a lack of control over the immediate environment. Many communities have been vulnerable to development pressures. Moreover, the significance of Black resources has often gone unrecognized and the need to protect them nonexistent. Once the significance of these resources was recognized, preserving them proved to be another problem. Usually, inadequate funding was the major problem, although years of neglect impaired the character of many buildings to such a degree that major rehabilitation efforts would not produce buildings with a high degree of historical integrity.

Although funding is still a major problem, interest in preserving these cultural resources has increased tremendously. On September 10, 1991, the Secretary of the Interior, Manual Lujan, announced a precedent setting project aimed at the preservation of select buildings on Historically Black College and University campuses. The project is being launched with support from the American Gas Association.

Many of the historic structures that physically attest to the contribution that these schools have made in educating this Nation's citizens are at risk of being lost forever. The concern for the preservation of these structures lead many HBCU presidents to appeal to the Office of Historically Black Colleges and Universities for help. This appeal for help was the beginning for the project recently announced by the Secretary of the Interior.

The project began with a survey of the most historic and endangered structures on HBCU campuses. Initially, 144 buildings were identified as candidates for preservation. Through a careful evaluation process, that number was reduced to 12. A Department of the Interior/Private Sector Field Assessment Team, headed by the National Park Service, inspected each of the 12 buildings and ranked them in priority order in terms of significance and threatened status. In order for the evaluation to be thorough and consistent, the Field

Assessment Team used the following criteria to make their decision:

1. Historical Significance

2. Architectural Integrity

3. Threat

During the course of the field assessments, it was determined that one of the buildings had been damaged to such a degree as to no longer have any architectural integrity, thus eliminating it from the process. The final rankings are as follows:

1. Gaines Hall, Morris Brown College, Atlanta, GA
2. Leonard Hall, Shaw University, Raleigh, NC
3. Hill Hall, Savannah State College, Savannah, GA
4. St. Agnes Hall, St. Augustine College, Raleigh, NC
5. The Mansion, Tougaloo College, Tougaloo, MS
6. White Hall, Bethune-Cookman College, Daytona Beach, FL
7. Graves Hall, Morehouse College, Atlanta, GA  
Howard Hall, Howard University, Washington,
  
9. Virginia Hall, Hampton University, Hampton, VA
10. Packard Hall, Spelman College, Atlanta, GA
11. Loockerman Hall, Delaware State College, Dover, DE

The next step in the project is for the National Park Service to have "condition assessments" completed on each of the structures. These assessments will pinpoint the problems with the buildings, make recommendations for the proper corrective active and provide cost estimates for the rehabilitation of the buildings. Three on-site field assessments have been completed and the final reports will be available shortly. It is planned that all of the assessments be completed by July 31,1992. Concurrently, other Interior agencies are moving forward with plans to marshal resources to support this effort.

The Secretary's announcement has resulted in a flurry of activity regarding this project. Inquiries have ranged from why was my building omitted to how can I get involved. Although this project is limited to the schools listed above, the National Park Service has an ongoing program to provide technical assistance to Historically Black Colleges and Universities. This assistance has ranged from providing technical advice about preservation techniques, getting districts listed on the National Register of Historic Places and the development campus management plans.

A typical American approach to problems is that they are permitted to go unattended until they reach crisis proportions. Once the problems have reached a crisis state, attempts are made to solve them. Unfortunately, this is true for many resources on the Historically Black College and University campuses. However, all is not lost and help is on the way.

Cecil McKithan is chief of the National Register Programs Division, Southeast Regional Office, National Park Service.

## HABS/HAER and HBCU

John A. Burns

The Historic American Buildings Survey/Historic American Engineering Record (HABS/HAER) has been actively working to increase minority participation in the field of historic preservation through a number of means, including outreach, training and educational opportunities, and recruiting for summer documentation jobs.

In the summer of 1988, when HABS/HAER launched its largest recording season to date, someone asked, "How many of those 130 professors, graduate students and architectural students are minorities?" In fact, very few were. This was the beginning of the HABS/HAER minority hiring program. We decided to begin with the Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU), since the National Park Service already had a program with these schools and because this decision allowed us to focus our efforts. If successful, the plan was to broaden our efforts to other minorities.

In the autumn of 1988, HABS/HAER chief Robert Kapsch contacted the heads of the HBCU departments of architecture. For those that were interested, HABS/HAER sent speakers to those schools to explain the HABS/HAER program and to tell the students of the summer jobs opportunities. In several cases, over 100 students attended these sessions, and they seemed quite interested in HABS/HAER. In the case of Howard University, we held a job fair at the HABS/HAER exhibit at the National Building Museum in Washington, DC. We believed that these efforts would substantially increase the number of applications we received from students at HBCUs. Unfortunately, this increase did not occur. We did not receive any applications from students attending HBCUs for the 1989 HABS/HAER recording season. Obviously, we were doing something wrong. We concluded that we needed to educate the students about historic preservation in general and HABS/HAER in particular before we could interest them in our summer jobs.

The approach developed for increasing minority student participation focused on the development of HABS/HAER measured drawing courses at select HBCU schools of architecture. Where HABS/HAER measured drawing courses do exist (e.g., University of Virginia, Texas A&M University, Auburn University), students who have gone through a measured drawing course have much better delineation skills than a student who has not, thus making them significantly more competitive for HABS/HAER employment.

HABS/HAER entered into a cooperative agreement with the National Trust for Historic Preservation to sponsor measured drawing courses in 1990 at two select historically black schools of architecture, Tuskegee University and Hampton University. Acting dean Major Holland of Tuskegee and John Spencer, head of architecture at Hampton, were very supportive of these pilot efforts, both undertaken in the spring of 1990. Kimberly E. Harden, AIA, the instructor who introduced the successful HABS measured drawings course at Auburn University, was selected to teach at Tuskegee. Scott M. Spence, AIA, of Colonial Williamsburg was selected to teach at Hampton. Both are HABS alumni several times over and both are registered architects who specialize in historic buildings. In addition, HABS/HAER staff visited both schools to participate in the training and to recruit summer job applicants. Diane Maddex was the original program manager for the National Trust. Since her departure from the Trust, the program is being managed by Greg Coble and Karen Peil.

Seven students enrolled in the first course at Tuskegee. Two were subsequently employed by HABS/HAER—the first Tuskegee students to be employed by HABS/HAER in over 10 years. Tuskegee thought this course was very successful and wanted to continue the effort. The first Hampton measured drawings course had six students enrolled, one of whom subsequently applied for HABS/HAER summer employment. Hampton officials thought the course was successful, although no students were employed by HABS/HAER, and wished to continue.

In 1991, HABS/HAER extended the HBCU measured drawings program to the School of Architecture at Howard University in cooperation with its dean, Henry G. Robinson III, FAIA, with the course being taught by Edward D. Dunson, Jr., AIA. Four students enrolled in the course the first time it was offered, although word is spreading among the students according to Howard officials, who expect a higher enrollment in 1992. Under a separate cooperative agreement with Howard University, HABS/HAER is also funding two architectural interns who work 20 hours a week in the HABS/HAER office in addition to continuing their studies.

The National Trust initiative and Howard University interns were not the only efforts to recruit minorities. Both the Charles E. Peterson Prize and the HABS/HAER summer jobs programs were promoted at the historically black schools with architecture curricula. This was in addition to our routine recruiting efforts at every architecture school. These efforts resulted in increased employment of minority student architects by HABS/HAER, the most in over a decade (although not all were from the targeted HBCUs).

In addition to the training provided to the students, and the skills evident when they become summer employees, HABS/HAER is beginning to benefit from the measured drawings being produced in these classes and submitted to HABS under the Charles E. Peterson Prize. The Peterson Prize is an annual competition sponsored by HABS and The Athenaeum of Philadelphia for students to produce HABS measured drawings, with cash prizes and certificates for the top three winners and honorable mention certificates for the best of the other entries.

Students at Tuskegee University have produced measured drawings of the Band Cottage and Rockefeller Hall Bath House on their National Historic Landmark campus. The Rockefeller Hall Bath House drawings were entered in the 1991 Peterson Prize. They also won an Honorable Mention in the Walter Burkhardt Competition, an Alabama competition modeled on the Peterson Prize. At Howard University, students are at work documenting Howard Hall, the oldest building on the Howard campus, constructed in 1869. They hope to complete the drawings in the Spring semester and enter them in the 1992 Peterson Prize. Hampton University students have been measuring and drawing Ft. Wool, part of the Hampton Museum System. Hampton University was also the first HBCU school to have an entry in the Peterson Prize, winning Second Place in 1986 with measured drawings of the Adam Thoroughgood House, a National Historic Landmark that is one of the earliest brick houses in the country.

Funding for continuing these initiatives is not certain since HABS/HAER can only maintain such cooperative activities if it is well funded with project funds (which are provided by outside organizations for specific HABS/ HAER recording projects). Despite these limitations, the effort is successful and has produced positive results that we hope will have a long-term impact.

John A. Burns, AIA, is deputy chief, HABS/HAER Division, National Park Service.

Teaching with Historic Places:  
Heritage Education and the National Register of Historic Places

Beth M. Boland

Several articles focusing on the educational values of historic sites have appeared in recent issues of CRM. These essays reflect the high priority the National Park Service places on the importance of education in ensuring public understanding and appreciation of the power and immediacy with which cultural resources convey lessons about our past. Support for preserving these irreplaceable resources is rooted in this appreciation. Another illustration of the Park Service's commitment to education is the creation of instructional materials about historic places and the lessons they can teach us.

Over the past two years, the National Park Service and the National Trust for Historic Preservation have joined together to launch an ambitious education program based on properties listed in the National Register of Historic Places. National Register files and a computerized database contain information on over 58,000 historic places significant in America's history, architecture, archeology, engineering and culture. Located throughout the country and its associated territories, these properties reflect nearly every facet of our past. Many of these resources are related to aspects of our history not well represented in textbooks, and are especially rich in information on community history.

In March of 1991, a group of educators, including curriculum specialists, school administrators, classroom teachers, national organization leaders, and others met to advise the Park Service and the Trust on the most effective ways to make information about these historic places accessible and useful to history and social studies teachers. Recommendations from this group have been invaluable, and have shaped the course of the projects described below. The group's next gathering will occur in early 1992.

At the heart of the educational program initiated by the Park Service and the Trust is a collection of educational materials entitled "Teaching with Historic Places." Modeled on learning packages created by the Education Branch of the National Archives that focus on primary documents, the program consists of two series, each with its own format. One is a series of short lesson plans, and another is a series of more complex teaching kits containing instructional materials related to specific historic themes.

National Register properties are tangible places, and can illustrate to students that historic people and events lived and occurred in real and identifiable times and locations. Those that exist in the students' own community relate directly to their lives. The purpose of both the lesson plans and the teaching kits is to assist elementary and secondary school teachers to enhance class instruction of history and social studies. The idea behind "heritage education" is not to introduce new topics into the curriculum, but to help teachers excite their students about subjects already taught by using historic places and the information about them as primary source materials.

The first set of seven short lesson plans on historic places, written by Fay Metcalf, education consultant and former executive director of the National Commission on Social Studies in the Schools, is near completion. The places selected-Knife River Indian Villages (ND), San Antonio Missions (TX), Georgetown County Rice Plantations (SC), Johnstown Flood Site, Finnish Log Cabins (ID), Roadside Architecture (several states), and Attu Battlefield (AK)-illustrate the cultural, geographic, thematic, and chronological diversity of historic resources listed in the National Register. Each lesson plan includes both information on the property(ies) taken from National Register documentation and other sources, and also activities and exercises focusing on the knowledge and skills that students can acquire from studying the property.

To be useful, these lesson plans must reach classroom teachers. This will be accomplished in several ways. The first seven will be published and sold as a set by the National Trust, which also will publish others when they are ready. Also, the National

Council for the Social Studies plans to run the lessons as a periodic series in its journal, *Social Education*.

In addition to publication, the lesson plans will be introduced in workshops designed to guide teachers in using the lessons effectively and to encourage them to create their own. The first of these workshops took place in Washington, DC on November 21-22, 1991, immediately preceding the annual meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies. Ten teachers from all over the country participated enthusiastically. For two days, they familiarized themselves with National Register properties in their students' communities, discussed the prototype lesson plans and how to adapt them to their own teaching styles and needs, and began developing objectives and outlines for lesson plans on specific historic places.

In 1992 and 1993, the National Park Service and the National Trust will conduct additional workshops. Some will continue to be offered to classroom teachers, and others will be designed for National Park educators and interpreters. In each, participants will create their own lesson plans, aided by direction and advice from course leaders. As many as possible of the completed lesson plans will be published as part of the ongoing series.

A second project, an educational kit structured around the theme of Americans at work, also is underway. Entitled, "American Work; American Workplaces," the kit will contain approximately eight lesson plans similar in content and format to the short lesson plans; a chart explaining how the selected properties fit into U S history and social studies curricula; information on adapting lessons to, or creating new ones for, a given community; instructions for obtaining information on additional National Register properties; and a discussion of the National Register program. This kit is being authored by Rita Koman, an American history and government teacher and curriculum specialist, and John Patrick, director of the ERIC1 Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education. As with the short lesson plans, the National Trust will publish the final product, which is scheduled for spring 1993.

Other National Trust publications further encourage development and use of educational materials on historic properties. In October, 1990, the Trust published the preliminary edition of a Heritage Education Resource Guide, a compilation of information on education programs available through museums, historic sites, government organizations, consulting firms, and other sources. Information on these programs also was entered into a computerized database. The guide includes information on approximately 50 National Park Service programs.

The first four issues of "Old School: The National Trust for Historic Preservation Heritage Education Newsletter" appeared in 1991. Each issue focused on a particular theme and included short essays on educational programs and possibilities relating to historic places. The issues on cultural diversity, geography, and science and technology each included an article on the ways in which a selected National Register property could be used to enhance classroom teaching of that issue's theme.

Together the lesson plans, workshops, kits and other publications are intended as the foundation of a continuing commitment to education. The goals of the program are to: 1) publicize the richness and diversity of resources listed in the National Register of Historic Places; 2) illustrate how historic places can instruct us about American history, geography, and culture; 3) show how historic places provide a tangible link between past events and abstract historical concepts and the lives of students today; 4) enrich traditional classroom teaching; 5) foster in students an awareness of and appreciation for the values of the nation's cultural resources; and 6) make students and teachers aware of the wealth of information available from the National Park Service about historic properties.

Beth Boland is a historian in the National Register of Historic Places, Interagency Resources Division, National Park Service.

Agate Fossil Beds National Monument and The Cook Collection  
An Original High Plains History

Reid Miller

A party of English gentlemen arrived here yesterday, and in a few days will ~ leave for the Yellowstone country /~ under the guidance of J.H. Cook.

The party will combine business and pleasure, and guided by Mr. Cook, cannot fail to have a most enjoyable time, and one free from those annoyances attending a tour in a strange country without the assistance of some reliable person familiar with the routes to be traversed."

By 1882, when that story appeared in a Cheyenne, Wyoming Territory newspaper, James Henry Cook was skilled at hunting, tracking, and signing, and was learning the Lakota tongue - qualities that served him well on many occasions, in remote and sometimes tense encounters with the plains Indians. Then 25, Cook had already experienced the rigors of long-distance cattle drives, up from Texas to the Dakotas. He had seen a man die in a stampede, and had saved another man from drowning at a river ford. He had, indeed, escaped a brush country ambush with an arrow firmly embedded in one leg. Eight years earlier, Cook had first met Red Cloud, the Oglala leader who had refused to sign the treaty of 1866 at Fort Laramie. Their friendship lasted the rest of their lives, and resulted in many visits by Red Cloud and his people to Cook's Nebraska settlement along the upper Niobrara River. (See Cook, J.H., "Fifty Years on the Old Frontier", c.1923 by Yale University Press).

Best suited (in terms of European immigrant economics) to livestock production, northwest Nebraska proved in the 1990 census to be one of the least populated regions in the country: on average, fewer than one person per square mile lives in Sioux County, and most of them reside at the north and south ends. Agate Fossil Beds National Monument is right in the middle. It is still 25 miles to the nearest town, Harrison, just as it was in 1887 when James Cook and the one love of his life, Kate Graham, purchased and settled on her father's homestead. The home that they built became the Agate Springs Ranch.

Today, Agate Fossil Beds National Monument encompasses 2,270 acres along either side of the river that brought livestock ranchers to this isolated region of the high plains, more than a century ago. At "East Agate" (as it was known to the Cook family), the wooden cabin built in 1908 by James and Kate Cook's son, Harold, stands in simple dignity as a site on the National Register of Historic Places. The cabin was Harold Cook's basic homestead development, and firmly established him as the rightful owner of the nearby Fossil Hills. The quarries there, resulting from nearly twenty years of intensive excavation, are the site of the primary resource of the monument - a high concentration of mammal fossils, entombed in carbonate mud and silty sandstone, at the bottom of a shallow Miocene water hole.

Visitors to the ranch headquarters house, which will celebrate its one hundredth year in 1993, have included a wide variety of dignitaries, outlaws, scientists, poets, historians, and Native Americans - as well as family and friends of the Cooks and Grahams. National Park Service Director George Hartzog, Lon Garrison and Inger Garrison had lunch on the lawn with Margaret Crozier Cook, (Harold Cook's widow) in 1963 - in the same spot where James Cook posed for photographs with John Neihardt, the Poet Laureate of Nebraska, years before. (Mr. Garrison was Midwest Regional Director when Agate Fossil Beds National Monument was authorized, on June 5, 1965).

The story of the Cook family members and their role in Nebraska and national history is many-faceted. At once romantic, adventurous, amusing, poignant, tragic, it is an account of the force of character that formed a broader lifestyle - one that endures in the Great Plains today. Through the several components of the museum collections of Agate Fossil Beds National Monument, commonly referred to as the Cook Collection, researchers and interpreters of western American history can today access a wealth of first person accounts that span 80 years of cross-cultural relations, livestock ranching, and scientific discovery.

A simple listing of the personal qualities of James, Kate, and Harold Cook reveals why this reference collection exists today. First, and most important for researchers, is the fact that the family loved to write. Scores of pocket diaries, thousands of pages of correspondence, dozens of manuscripts, financial records, and notes on Lakota words and phrases, comprise the Cook Papers.

Second, if it was worth writing down, to the Cook family it was worth saving Guest registers, daily logs, field notes of geological and archeological site work, maps of historic sites - all were retained for future  
| reference.

(See Berke, D., "They Don't Write Letters From the Heart Like They Used To", in CRM Bulletin, Volume 9: No.1, February 1986).

Third, an abiding sense of self-reliance and personal integrity opened doors, and earned the family the respect of persons from all walks of life. When the Oregon Trail Museum at Scotts Bluff National Monument was under construction in 1934-35, Harold J. Cook was the Custodian - in essence, the Superintendent. He commissioned his aging father to solicit authentic artifacts from the elder Cook's Sioux acquaintances on the Pine Ridge Reservation, in the process of creating museum exhibits of timeless value. The resulting correspondence is still with us today, including the written replies and exhibit pieces sent by the Native Americans involved.

Finally, the family lived during times when still photography was growing rapidly in popularity, and their enthusiasm for recording on film the everyday, as well as the special events of their lives, ran as deeply as it did for the written word.

To study the various elements of the Cook Collection is to feel a sense of responsibility for the family members as individuals. There are very private letters, poetry, even a detailed account of a dream by Kate Graham Cook, who eventually suffered a mental collapse - all are within reach of qualified historians who can demonstrate a legitimate research interest, and are indexed for ease of location.

But care must be taken in the interpretation of such items, not only out of respect for past generations of the family, but in deference to living descendants as well. There is a continuum of personalities that is very much a factor in understanding the collection today, both in terms of content, as well as its administrative history. Dorothy Cook Meade, the second of four daughters of Harold J. and Eleanor Barbour Cook, was born in 1913. She played with Sioux children at the ranch for many carefree summers of her youth, and has recently authored two publications about her family's role in history. Park staff routinely discuss with her the details of such diverse topics as the character of scientists who worked with her father, to the names of horses given to her grandfather as an act of friendship, by Sioux elders.

Mrs. Meade and her husband, paleontologist Grayson Meade, today operate the historic Post Office at their Agate Springs Ranch as a gift shop - thus providing a special form of living history to complement the national monument visitor center, just three miles down-river. Items offered for sale at the shop include craft work of the present-day Red Cloud family, with whom the Meades maintain frequent contact.

The overriding quality of the Cook Collection is that, due to its extensive, complex nature, no single element stands alone in depicting a moment in time, from eighty years of history. Briefly, the Cook Collection encompasses two sub-collections. "Cook I" includes a northern Plains Indian artifact collection of nearly 500 items, most of which were given to the family as gifts by their makers; additionally, there is a research library of approximately 7,000 volumes, mostly technical reports in paleontology, geology, and archeology. Other Cook family memorabilia, (some having significant historical value to other parks), rounds out Cook I.

"Cook II" includes the paleontological, geological, and archeological specimens collected by the family over two generations; 92 linear feet of correspondence and various other documents that make up the Cook Papers; and in excess of 6,000 photographic

images, mostly prints for which no negative exists in the collection, simply referred to as the Cook Photos.

Cook I items were placed on loan to the National Park Service by Harold Cook's widow, following his death in 1962. Her intention was borne out when the monument was authorized - the collection had a convincing influence on congress, and is specifically mentioned in Public Law 89-33 as a fundamental cultural resource of the site. Cook II artifacts also became the personal property of Margaret Crozier Cook upon Harold's passing; she willed these items to the National Park Service, and today they provide the thread that binds all elements of both sub-collections together.

In July, 1991 a very special dream of many people within and outside the National Park Service began to take on the dimensions of a permanent museum facility at Agate Fossil Beds National Monument. Designed by Midwest Regional Office architects Mike Fees and Trung-son Nguyen, the building will replace the visitor contact trailer placed in service on-site, in 1969. Construction is progressing toward a July, 1992 completion date, and it is a matter of some pride in these parts that private and corporate donations were largely responsible for this dream coming true.

Exhibit planning is underway, with themes defined to tell the story of historic excavations in the Fossil Hills, as well as present-day investigations into the Miocene environment, such as the recent careful exposure of 19 million year old large carnivore dens near the ancient water hole. Dr. Robert M. Hunt, Jr., Curator of Vertebrate Paleontology at the University of Nebraska, is working closely with Harpers Ferry Center staff to accomplish the casting and acquisition of rare fossil skeletons for exhibit.

Thanks to the capable support of Midwest Regional Curator Carol Kohan, and that of her predecessor John Hunter, the Cook Collection is destined to enjoy ample curatorial, exhibit, and storage and study space in the new facility. Recent meetings of park and Regional Office staff to update the park's Resource Management Plan have focused on the many aspects of cataloging, conservation treatment, and exhibit maintenance, necessary for all elements of the Cook Collection.

Significant steps toward preservation of the various sub-collections include an agreement with the National Archives and Records Administration in Denver, which has resulted in the Cook Papers being photographed on microfilm. And, in September 1991, Museum Technician Audrey Barnhart completed work that began in January, by seeing a total of 5,200 photographs committed to microfiche, for ease of reference by researchers. The nearly 7,000 volumes in the Harold J. Cook Research Library are undergoing systematic examination and filing in appropriate acid-free folders by Volunteer Gail Hill. The library will be indexed in a key-word retrieval system as time and funding allow.

Since April, 1988, there has been no greater satisfaction for those involved in securing the future of the resources of Agate Fossil Beds National Monument, than the very sense of teamwork that has grown from these combined efforts. As we move toward a future that will test our resolve as an agency, it is reward enough at that, and somehow I think that James H. Cook would agree.

Reid Miller is a Park Ranger at Agate Fossil Beds National Monument. As a native Nebraskan, he holds an extra measure of devotion to the Cook family I history.

Historic Resources Study:  
Fort Raleigh National Historic Site  
Context-based Evaluations of Historic Structures at a Complex National Park Service  
Property

William Chapman

Since April 1990, the University of Georgia's School of Environmental Design has been conducting historic resources studies (HRSs) for units of the National Park System in North Carolina (Fort Raleigh, Cape Lookout, Cape Hatteras, Wright Brothers, and the Blue Ridge Parkway), Florida (Castle San Marco, Matanzas, Cape Canaveral, Fort Caroline, Gulf Islands), Georgia (Fort Frederica, Fort Pulaski, Cumberland Island), and Mississippi (Gulf Islands and Natchez and the Natchez Trace). Mandated by Section 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, which requires that Federal agencies inventory and evaluate the significance of all historic properties within their jurisdiction, the HRSs also involve the updating of the List of Classified Structures (LCS) and the revision of any existing National Register nominations.

The HRS project has also provided an opportunity to apply the more-recently formulated context-based approach for evaluating the significance of historic properties to a diverse collection of National Park Service-owned resources through the Southeast. Implicit in historic preservation planning efforts from an early period, the concept of identifying significant historical themes or "contexts" as a means of making evaluations was first formally codified in the Resource Protection Planning Process (RP3) model developed by the Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service in the late 1970s (Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service [1979]). Described most recently in National Register Bulletin 15, the context approach identifies various "patterns, themes, or trends in history," ([1990]:7) in order to assess the relative significance of historic properties and ultimately determine their eligibility for listing in the National Register. This process as applied in HRSs also gives the agency, in this case the National Park Service, an opportunity to identify and define its own management responsibilities for specific properties, and most importantly, to reconsider its interpretive and custodial roles vis-à-vis the contexts identified or developed for each park.

The Fort Raleigh National Historic Site, on Roanoke Island, NC, has presented an ideal test-case for a context-based historic resources study. First established as a National Park Service property in 1941, the Fort Raleigh site represents a complex amalgam of older and more recent features and facilities, reflective of the site's own rich local history. The original Fort Raleigh, which has been the focus of the National Park Service's interpretive program, was built in 1585, under the supervision of Ralph Lane, a professional soldier on Richard Grenville's expedition to explore and establish a military colony in North America. This fort, a fairly conventional earthwork construction, consisting of a square central form modified by bastions, formed the centerpiece for a small colony, which was dubbed the "Cittie of Raleigh [Raleigh]" after the principal sponsor of the expedition, Sir Walter Raleigh (Stick 1983). Abandoned the following year, the fort and village were reoccupied in 1587 by a new colony, also sponsored by Raleigh-as well as by Queen Elizabeth and other investors-and under the direction of the famous chronicler and artist John White. This second colony was also unsuccessful and was abandoned around 1590, though the precise fate of the colonists still remains a mystery (Kupperman 1984). It was this second colony, which became known as the "Lost Colony," which has given rise to a long-standing series of legends and tales centering on the possible fate of the colonists, and especially, of Virginia Dare, Governor White's grandchild and the first child born to English-speaking parents in North America.

For over two centuries after its abandonment the site lay in ruins, gradually eroding and reverting to "nature." Roanoke Island itself was eventually resettled, beginning in the 18th century, by emigrants from Virginia (Dunbar 1958) but the fort site itself remained relatively undisturbed, and was incorporated into the wood lot of a small homestead owned in the 19th

century by the Dough family. The historian and traveler John Lawson mentioned visiting "the Ruins of a Fort" in 1701 (cited in Powell 1965:19). James Monroe later visited the site during his tour of the southern states in 1819; and enough of the fort remained for General Ambrose Burnside to declare the area off-limits to souvenir hunters during the area's occupation by Federal troops in the 1860s. Luckily there were no major threats to the site, but also no concerted efforts at preservation.

During the late 19th century a number of patriotic North Carolinians attempted to focus the Nation's attention on the site and to give fresh emphasis to the Raleigh colony's significance in the history of early English settlement in North America. The Virginia Dare Memorial Association, formed by amateur historian Sallie Southall Cotten, and the Roanoke Colony Memorial Association, founded by a group of expatriate North Carolinians in Baltimore, eventually raised local consciousness and sufficient money to purchase the site of the fort and village. In 1894 the Roanoke Colony Memorial Association purchased the fort property from the Dough family, adding an inscribed granite monument marking the site, placing granite markers along the then still-visible perimeter walls, and eventually providing a protective split rail fence around the site.

Protected from further encroachment, including a proposed highway, the site experienced a new level of development pressure in the 1930s, this time from enthusiastic interpreters. The Roanoke Colony Memorial Association had generally maintained the site, and in 1930 had provided two masonry gate posts and the entrance of the property. But interpretation had been kept to a minimum. The new impetus came from local conservationist, artist, and real estate developer Frank Stick. Originally from New Jersey, Stick recognized the unique appeal of the Fort Raleigh site, both as a cultural legacy of national significance and as a potential tourist attraction. Supported by local businessmen and politicians, Stick helped secure Federal support, beginning in 1934, for a reconstruction of the fort and village using Works Progress Administration Funds, Transient Service labor and eventually CCC enrollees (Stick 1958: 245-50). Stick was assisted by a local nurseryman and amateur Elizabethan scholar Albert Quentin Bell. Together Stick and Bell supervised the construction of a squared-log blockhouse, located at the center of the fort, a log palisade, set into the reconstructed earthen parapet wall, and a recreated village, consisting of several juniper log cottages and a log chapel-all intended to represent an Elizabethan-era settlement. The plan called as well for a small museum and an interpretive staff of local residents dressed in Elizabethan costumes. As a final gesture, the stone gates were disguised by log towers, intended, again, to suggest a pioneer colony.

The Fort Raleigh site throughout this period became the focus not only of historical interest but of related theatrical interest as well. Beginning in the 1910s, the site had become the location for occasional plays and pageants revolving around the history of the "Lost Colony." These events typically were staged on August 18, the anniversary of Virginia Dare's birth. A five-reel educational film was made on-site in 1920, and in 1934 a major celebration, including a fair, fireworks displays, speeches, and a dramatic production was held at the site. This show was followed in 1937 by a new, more professional production written by the Pulitzer Prize-winning playwright, Paul Green, and held in a new outdoor theater designed by Albert Quentin Bell and built in the dunes just north of the by-then reconstructed fort and village. Entitled "The Lost Colony," Green's play was credited with introducing a new form of dramatic production, combining verse, narration, song, and drama in order to weave a story around historic events (Stick 1958:249). Attended by Franklin D. Roosevelt and Eleanor Roosevelt in its first season, "The Lost Colony" production became an annual event, interrupted for four years by the Second World War, but in continuous performance each summer since that time.

"The Lost Colony" production coincided with a shift in ownership for the site. Transferred from the Roanoke Colony Memorial Association to the State of North Carolina in 1934, the Fort Raleigh site was finally conveyed to the National Park Service in 1941. The National Park Service assumed responsibility for "The Lost Colony" theater, through a special use agreement and the drama's production company, the Roanoke Island Historical

Association. In 1950, the Service made a similar agreement with the Garden Club of North Carolina, Inc. to allow for the construction of a commemorative Elizabethan garden on a 10-acre site adjacent to the theater. Embellished with a collection of 162 statues and pieces of garden furniture donated by John Hay Whitney, the garden included both formal and informal elements and was intended to convey a sense of "the kind of garden a successful colonist might have built on Roanoke Island had the colonization succeeded" (History of the Elizabethan Gardens n.d:n.p.). The garden was completed for a formal opening by 1960, and with several minor additions since that time, continues to be operated on the site.

While the Elizabethan Gardens were a largely fanciful recreation of 16th-century ideals, the National Park Service took a more rigorous approach to the fort and village. Under the direction of NPS archeologist J.C. Harrington, the Service began a careful investigation of the site beginning in 1946 (Harrington 1984). In 1950, the fort was reconstructed in accordance with Harrington's findings. Features such as the palisade and blockhouse were removed, as was the whole of the recreated village; historical research by the British historian David Quinn and others had shown that log construction would not have been used at this period (Quinn 1955; Quinn and Quinn 1982). While it was decided that the village would not be reconstructed, given the lack of specific evidence, the newer interpretation was applied to the theater sets during their reconstruction in 1960-62, following extensive damage by Hurricane Donna. The present sets and supporting structures represent half-timbered buildings typical of the 16th-century period. This set remains substantially unchanged today.

The present Fort Raleigh National represents, as this short history demonstrates, a rich layering of both historic and commemorative significance. The obvious context for interpretation, set out in the National Park Service outline of historic themes History and Prehistory in the National Park System (1987) is "English Exploration and Settlement, Settlement of the Carolinas." However, the site is also significant for its complex commemorative history, beginning in the 1890s with the first restoration of the fort and ending with the construction of the Elizabethan Gardens in the 1950s and the reconstruction of the outdoor drama theater in 1960-62. There are tangentially-related contexts as well, including the history of settlement on the Outer Banks-the site was part of a subsistence farm during the 19th century and included a small family cemetery-and governmental activities of the 1930s through the 1960s. The latter contexts are represented by a gravesite for 19 Transient Service laborers-these workers were employed mainly on dune stabilization projects at Cape Hatteras but also worked at Fort Raleigh for which the National Park Service has responsibility- and the several reconstructions of the fort and theater.

In all, a total of seven contexts have been developed for the site, focusing on six specific properties: the fort itself, the Dough cemetery, the Roanoke Colony Granite Memorial, the Transient Workers Service grave sites, the theater, and the gardens. The contexts range from "Early English Exploration and Settlement, 1585-1590," through "The Lost Colony production and the Outdoor Drama in America, 1918-1962." More recent ending dates have been established in order to properly include properties of recognizable historic significance, despite the fact many features date from a relatively modern period. Criteria Consideration G, "Properties That Have Achieved Significance within the Past Fifty Years," and F, "Commemorative Properties," have also been applied (National Register Bulletin 15) as a means of justification.

The context-based approach is not without its problems-as many who have worked with "contexts" can attest. There are continuing misunderstandings about what a context is. Is it, for example, merely an interpretive theme, such as "Early English Exploration and Settlement" or is it a more in-depth and circumspect history of real events and processes that may have converged upon a single site or collection of properties? In the case of the Fort Raleigh National Historic Site, the context-based approach has helped to underline the complex nature of the site; and, it is hoped, will help in the future to adjust both the management and interpretive programs for the National Park Service so that more recent commemorative history can be recognized more fully as well.

## References Cited

- Dunbar, Gary S. 1958. *Historical Geography of the North Carolina Outer Banks*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.
- Harrington, J.C. 1984. *Archaeology and the Enigma of Fort Raleigh*. Raleigh: North Carolina Department of Cultural Resources.
- Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service [1979] *Resource Protection Planning Process*. Preservation Planning Series. Washington, DC: Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service, U.S. Department of the Interior.
- Kupperman, Karen D. 1984. *Roanoke, The Abandoned Colony*. New York: Rowman and Allenheld.
- National Park Service. 1987. *History and Prehistory in the National Park System and the National Historic Landmarks Program*. Washington, DC: National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior.
- National Park Service. 1990. *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*. National Register Bulletin 15. Washington, DC: National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior.
- Powell, William S. 1965. *Paradise Preserved: A History of the Roanoke Island Historical Association*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Quinn, David. 1955. *The Roanoke Voyages, 1584-1590*. London: Hakuyt Society.
- Quinn, David and Alison M. Quinn, eds. 1982. *The First Colonists: Documents on the Planting of the First English Settlements in North America, 1584-1590*. Raleigh: Division of Archives and History, North Carolina and Department of Cultural Resources.
- Stick, David. 1958. *The Outer Banks of North Carolina*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Stick, David. 1983. *Roanoke Island, The Beginnings of English America*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- William Chapman is an associate professor at the School of Environmental Design, The University of Georgia.

## Considering Reconstruction as an Educational Tool

Rodd L. Wheaton

The question of reconstruction has always centered around the issue of being accurate and authentic, but what has been consistently ignored is that the National Park Service is challenged to provide, particularly at our historic sites, education in the form of interpretation. Therefore, it is incumbent on the Service to provide, as deemed appropriate, reconstructed resources that meet the interpretative needs of the park visitor, not solely the preservation concerns of cultural resource specialists. These works are for the enjoyment of the visitor and to be instructive of past lifeways and the purpose for a park's establishment. Indeed, chief historian Ed Bearss recently wrote of Fort Union Trading Post after visiting the site, that "as an interpretative feature, the reconstruction of Fort Union is in a class by itself, a masterpiece. What was an important archeological site before 1985, has become a world class educational site."

However, reconstructions remain a difficult undertaking. First, some sites are so ephemeral and were so single-purposed that they were very short lived, which was the story at Bent's Old Fort and Fort Union Trading Post. But, since these were nationally significant moments in history, we at the National Park Service often have been given the challenge to reconstruct that moment. That challenge has and will center around how to make temporary structures permanent and resolve long-range maintenance management problems as well as be accurate and authentic.

Second, preservation of foundation ruins is not necessarily the most desirable in terms of visitor satisfaction. While architects and others can visualize a three-dimensional structure from a two-dimensional form, the average person cannot make the transition and experience the scale, texture, and continuity. Further, at Bent's Old Fort the full-size floor plan on the ground was also so severely eroded that it would have to have been reconstructed to interpret.

Third, we often do not have a choice as to whether or not to reconstruct. In 1978, Congress did not ask "Should we reconstruct Fort Union Trading Post?"; they asked "Could we reconstruct?" The Rocky Mountain Region provided a "Reconstruction Analysis" and said yes we could, but only partially. This has worked at Fort Union where original archeological sites remain within the enceinte of the palisade and hearth stones were reused as appropriate in recreated spaces. Excavated artifacts also became the basis for museum interpretation. However, at Bent's Old Fort, the structure is monolithic and it would have been exceedingly difficult to only partially reconstruct though the excavated artifacts are to be used as part of the proposed museum.

As a fourth consideration, looking at alternatives to reconstruction is also part of this process, but is not always successful. Ghost buildings are an interesting concept. This works at Franklin Court in Philadelphia, but the visitor probably identifies most with the below grade "Disney-esque" exhibit hall. A ghost kitchen behind the Bourgeois House at Fort Union is fortunately now hidden within the palisade walls which mask its jarring intrusion and keeps visitors from thinking it is a picnic pavilion. Like other ghost buildings, the kitchen has scale but lacks texture and has a very transparent continuity.

Alternatives, besides interpreting the two-dimensional foundations, can also include the construction of a visitor center with, or without, a large scale model. While this is a desirable alternative in any case, in our experience this is not a suitable substitute for an actual reconstruction for those who are legislating funding. A visitor center is not as exciting as the replica of the real thing and, to date, the Service has made little effort to thwart this mind set. In addition, the construction of a visitor center on or near the historical site can endanger archeological sites such as at Cahokia Mounds in Illinois. Conversely, a center too far away from the site assures that the visitor may not actually visit the resource.

Fifth, we can consider constructing off site. This concept conflicts with the desire to be accurate and authentic. The park visitor has a desire to walk on hallowed ground; they want

to walk the actual site. A reconstructed structure in view of the original site becomes an ambiguous interpretive story; and a reconstructed structure too far removed loses its impact and psychologically becomes fiction no matter how authentic or accurate. It is also a concern that land forms may have been a factor in original site location which would be lost by off site reconstruction.

As a sixth note, an aspect of reconstruction is that we are also providing a tangible means of preserving a culture. The reconstruction of Bent's Old Fort has much to say about the influences of Hispanic architecture on Anglo traders. The assimilation of cultures is readily apparent. The French and Anglo frontiers on the upper Missouri are equally revealed at Fort Union Trading Post. These cultural traditions, which cannot necessarily be interpreted with a foundation or a detailed visitor center exhibit, are an important part of simply experiencing the story. In addition, the research gleaned from the archeological excavations has benefited that interpretive story.

In conclusion, in order to insure that reconstructions are accurate and authentic, it is imperative to be just that-accurate and authentic. The reconstruction must be documented to the visitor as well as to the cultural resource professional.

This must include the knowns, the assumptions, and the unknowns. It is the intent at Fort Union to document for the future that while the dimensions of the 1851 Bourgeois House are from the archeological investigations and the facade is from an 1866 photograph, the detailing of the doors and windows are from the 1849 Old Bedlam at Fort Laramie and the 1865 Ranchhouse at Grant-Kohrs. Should additional historical documentation turn up in the future, these details which are assumptions, can be corrected or those details that were omitted from the reconstruction as unknowns can be added. Reconstructions are for the visitors and their education about our past national history. It is incumbent on the National Park Service to consider the best possible opportunities for that interpretation.

## The Case Against Reconstruction

Barry Mackintosh

My personal experience with reconstructions goes back to the beginning of my National Park Service career. I began work as a park historian in 1965 at Fort Caroline National Memorial, which commemorates a 1564 French settlement that prompted Spain to found St. Augustine a year later. Before I arrived, the local congressman had prevailed upon the Service to reconstruct the earthen fort for the quadricentennial of Fort Caroline in 1964. The fort site had been lost to the St. Johns River long before, so the replica was executed on riprapped fill at the river's edge. Major compromises were made with what was known about the original: the reconstruction was smaller and contained none of the buildings that had been present. The difficulty of maintaining an earthen parapet forced the substitution of cinder-block, which remained visible despite efforts to cultivate a grassy veneer from sod layered between the blocks. After heavy rains, portions of the sloping ramparts would slump down into the moat. The reconstruction was such an obvious fake that no one could mistake it for the original-perhaps its only virtue.

My next assignment sent me to Booker T. Washington National Monument in Virginia. Because nothing remained of the tobacco farm where Washington had been born in slavery, the Service had reconstructed his supposed birthplace cabin and a log tobacco barn. Just before I arrived it was decided to build more structures of a "typical" sort and develop a complete living historical farm. While conducting research for this project, I concluded that Washington had probably not been born or lived in the cabin that had been reconstructed. I also became concerned that the picturesque log structures and farming activities were receiving more attention than Washington himself-the subject that the park had been established to commemorate.

As might be guessed, I left these assignments with negative feelings about reconstructions. Clearly, those at Fort Caroline and Booker T. Washington violate the criteria that the Service has developed for such things. They are not essential to permit public understanding of the cultural associations of their parks. They were not based on sufficient data to permit reconstruction on original sites with minimal conjecture. And the farm buildings at Booker T. Washington flout the present rule against "generalized representations of typical structures."

At the same time, some reconstructions in the national park system seem to me worthy. I think particularly of Appomattox Court House National Historical Park, where the Service has reconstructed the McLean House and the courthouse. The McLean House, site of Lee's surrender to Grant, is the village's historical centerpiece. The courthouse, its physical centerpiece, was reconstructed to house the park's visitor center, obviating a modern intrusion on the historic landscape. Both reconstructions were based on ample evidence.

What helps justify the Appomattox reconstructions, I think, is that they are not stand-alone attractions; rather, they fill key gaps in a historic complex, like the Capitol and Governor's Palace at Colonial Williamsburg. Most of the village's other structures are original, so visitors can still feel that they are among authentic historic surroundings. Considering the complex as a whole, what has been done is not reconstruction but restoration (defined in part as the replacement of missing elements).

But how often is reconstruction truly "essential to permit public understanding of the cultural associations of a park established for that purpose," as the Service's first reconstruction criterion requires? This test can be met only in historical parks so lacking in historical ingredients or integrity that no other interpretive media-models, diagrams, films, or whatever-can serve to convey their stories to the public. No such parks should have been established to begin with, because they would not meet the requisite level of integrity.

In reality, some such parks do get established through the political process, sometimes with reconstruction in mind at the outset. Once the goal of reconstruction is accepted, attention turns to whether there is sufficient historical and archeological evidence to do the

job accurately. Regardless of how complete the record is, a good deal of conjecture is usually required to translate the outline found on the ground and whatever pictorial and written descriptions exist into a full-scale three-dimensional structure.

Sometimes sufficient accuracy can be achieved. But even when this and the other reconstruction criteria can be met, there remain three fundamental arguments against reconstruction in the national park system.

The first relates to the Service's role and image as a public institution. The Service is basically in the preservation business. It is also in the interpretation business, but it is supposed to be interpreting original, genuine things that it is preserving, not its own handiwork. People can go elsewhere-to theme parks, frontier villages, and Hollywood productions-for recreations of history. To the extent that the Service gets into the re-creation business, it risks diluting its special role as custodian of the authentic.

The second has to do with how people feel about and interact with historic places. Speaking personally, I know that I get more sense of communion with the past from a real remnant of a historic structure, even if only a foundation outline, than from a modern rendition of it. As Albert Good, a Service architect in the 1930s, eloquently put it, "the faint shadow of the genuine often makes more intelligent appeal to the imagination than the crass and visionary replica."

The third has to do with priorities. With all of the research and hand work that goes into them, reconstructions are typically very expensive. Once built, they have to be maintained in perpetuity. Meanwhile, the parks contain numerous original historic structures that are badly in need of preservation treatment. How can the Service justify spending millions to recreate vanished structures while so many of the genuine old structures it is charged with preserving are crumbling?

When I came to Washington in 1970 to work for Chief Historian Robert M. Utley, I received much valuable on-the-job training in good writing and proper word usage. Among the distinctions Bob impressed upon his staff was that between "accurate" and "authentic." A reconstruction, like a modern copy of an old painting, could conceivably be accurate. But it could never be authentic-the genuine article. To me, and I suspect to many others, this distinction is of more than semantic importance.

## The Columbian Quincentenary: Caribbean Style

Ralph B. Johnson

The Greater Caribbean region-which includes the islands known as the West Indies and the Caribbean coastal areas of North, Central and South America-still provides perhaps the most diverse examples of the "new culture" forged as the result of Columbian explorations. The region is heir to Spanish, British, French, Dutch, and Danish influences. It is ironic that the African slaves imported by these European nations inherited many of these Caribbean lands as independence was finally gained from their colonial masters. In response to this most exciting phenomenon, the College of Architecture at the University of Florida has for the past 10 years participated in a program designed to highlight, protect, and promote the cultural values and rich architectural heritage of the region and to undertake a variety of programs commemorating the Columbian Quincentenary. This program known as Plan CARIMOS for CARIBbean MONuments and Sites (paralleling the name of ICOMOS, the International Council of Monuments and Sites) was initiated at a conference in Gainesville, Florida in 1982, which was attended by representatives of the Organization of American States (OAS) and of universities and governments from the region. In 1985, an OAS resolution was adopted by that institution's General Assembly which expressed its commitment to designating three monuments or historical sites in each Greater Caribbean member state IS "Monuments of the Caribbean." The OAS entrusted CARIMOS with the responsibility of carrying out the necessary activities in support of this resolution. Plan CARIMOS is guided by the following general objectives according to the project coordinator, Eugenio Perez Montas of the Universidad Nacional Pedro Henriquez Urena in Santo Domingo:

- to identify and investigate the Caribbean monumental heritage within a framework of cultural development;
- to determine whether unifying characteristics exist, as well as the origins and reciprocal influences among the most noteworthy historical centers of the area:
- to publish these results with the intent that the governments of the region may establish conservation and preservation policies;
- to train the human resources indispensable for the work of preservation; and to promote voluntary groups that may participate in the process and interchange of experiences between the different countries; and,
- to proceed with the implementation of basic work on the identified sites in the principal historic centers, so they may serve as models in the development of a conservationist policy with the overall goal of economic and social development.

Since the inception of Plan CARIMOS, the College of Architecture at the University of Florida has been its primary educational and research center, using its experience, strengths and resources in these areas through its "Preservation Institute: Caribbean" (PI:C) program under the direction of Professor George Scheffer. According to Professor Scheffer, PI:C is intended to preserve not only the architecture or the "tangible evidence of the cultural development," but also the traditions and cultures of the region.

The program consists of three successive courses, each lasting eight weeks. The first course, an introduction and overview of the field, is conducted at the University of Florida campus in Gainesville. Preservationists and guest lecturers from fields related to preservation including archeologists, historians, architects, conservators, and lawyers come to Gainesville from the Caribbean area and the United States to share their experiences and knowledge with the students. This summer, one of the first lectures was by Dr. Kathleen Deagan, a University of Florida professor noted for her current archeological work in La Navidad, Haiti- considered the first settlement of Columbus in the Western Hemisphere-and La Isabela, Dominican Republic, the second settlement of Columbus. Dr. Deagan also

collaborated with Dr. Jane Landers, a history professor at the University of Florida, in a recent project which involved the rediscovery of Gracia Real de Santa Teresa de Mose, a free Black town in colonial Florida. This first course will be the first to welcome newly appointed Dr. John Lombardi, president of the University of Florida and noted Latin American scholar, as a lecturer. These are only a few of the many prominent lecturers who are making important contributions to the PI:C Plan CARIMOS program.

The more advanced and practice-oriented second and third courses involve actual documentation, restoration, design, and planning projects-with focuses ranging from individual historic structures to historic districts in large urban areas. These courses are given at changing locations throughout the Caribbean in cooperation with affiliated universities in the region. In the past, these locations have included San Juan and San German in Puerto Rico; Santo Domingo in the Dominican Republic;

Antigua, Guatemala; San Jose and Puerto Limon in Costa Rica; and the Lesser Antilles islands of Antigua, Grenada, Trinidad and Tobago. In the summer of 1990, PI:C courses were held in Xalapa and Veracruz in Mexico; and in the summer of 1991, PI:C students were in Key West, Florida. Sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth century La Florida was very much a part of the New World Spanish Empire.

With scholarships and partial funding from OAS, the Kress Foundation, the Skaggs Foundation, the University of Florida, and many dedicated PI:C alumni, the bi-lingual program has graduated over 350 students from nearly every nation in the Caribbean and the United States-a remarkable record.

Students-both professional and amateur-come with backgrounds including anthropology, archeology, architecture, museology, government administration, and history. Sara Castillo, for example, is a lawyer from Costa Rica and is the legal advisor for ICOMOS in that country. For the past three years, Ms. Castillo has helped to develop the pending bill in her country for the legal protection of the built environment, lobbying Costa Rican congress and sensitizing local politicians to a new way of thing about their heritage.

Ms. Castillo is excited about PI:C and the relationships she is developing with others who, as they are discovering, share common roots and linkages never before realized. Ms. Castillo's team consisted of an elementary school art teacher from Jamaica; an architect and a musician with the Junkanoo Festival in the Bahamas; and several University of Florida students with their own international roots from Kenya, Hong Kong, Jamaica, and Mexico.

In preparation for the Columbian Quincentenary in Santo Domingo, many of the preservation architects that are responsible for the reconstruction of the historic Colonial Zone are PI:C graduates. This is perhaps one of the most important sites to the Quincentenary because it is the location of the Alcazar de Colon, built in 1509 for Columbus' son Diego and his wife, the niece of Queen Isabel and King Ferdinand. The Alcazar served as the official seat of the Spanish crown for six decades. This is also the location of the first cathedral in the new world and the Casas Reales which served as a residence for the Governors and Captains General and the seat of the Royal Audiencia, the colonial institution that governed the West Indies.

This bringing together of peoples from the Caribbean for a common cultural preservation experience is the real success of CARIMOS and PI:C. The participants learn about each other's countries and something about collaboration and care. They also carry home a greater understanding of the intertwining of their nations' origins and histories.

This cadre of caring individuals is the growing nucleus of professionals and concerned citizens dedicated to developing a public understanding and appreciation of the past. They become the teachers, the "keepers of the national heritage."

Ralph Johnson is assistant dean and director of the Research and Education Center for Architectural Preservation, College of Architecture, University of Florida.

# Preservation Resources

## Publications

### Upcoming National Register Bulletins

Patty Sackett Chrisman

Four new National Register bulletins will be available during fiscal year 1992. National Register bulletins are produced by the National Register of Historic Places, Interagency Resources Division, National Park Service, as guidance for citizens, professionals, and federal and state agencies involved in writing National Register of Historic Places nominations. The new bulletins cover a broad range of topics including historical archeology, historic battlefields, cemeteries and burial places, and historic mining sites.

The scope of these bulletins illustrates an increasingly comprehensive appreciation for our cultural heritage. It also reflects a need for guidance in identifying and registering resources, particularly those threatened by development or environmental hazards. Each of the bulletins is unique in its subject matter and how it relates to a specific theme or type of resource, but all of the new bulletins discuss the National Register criteria and give examples of how to apply the criteria to the resource.

National Register Bulletin 36: Evaluating and Registering Historical Archeology Sites and Districts, written by Jan Townsend, archeologist, National Register of Historic Places, and Dr. John Knoerl, director, Cultural Resources Geographic Information Systems Facility, deals specifically with the challenges of registering historical archeological resources as opposed to prehistoric. Historical archeology is defined as the physical evidence that post-dates contact between the American Indians and the Europeans in the New World. This date varies necessarily from region to region. The bulletin describes how to identify historical archeological properties through archival research and field survey, and the importance of evaluating the data. A checklist for completing the nomination form, and a selected bibliography, are included.

A growing interest in Civil War sites has stimulated a move to document and preserve historic battlefields from all eras of our history. National Register Bulletin 40: Evaluating and Documenting America's Historic Battlefields, written by Patrick Andrus, historian, National Register of Historic Places, with assistance from John Knoerl and Dale Floyd, historian American Battlefield Protection Program, provides instructions for identifying, evaluating and registering historic battlefields. Guidance is provided on developing historic contexts and conducting research and survey. A glossary of terms and extensive bibliography will be particularly helpful.

Increased scholarship in funerary art, landscape design, social history, and cultural diversity, coupled with increasing threats to monuments and markers due to abandonment, theft, vandalism and environmental hazards, has resulted in an increased awareness of the significance of cemeteries and burial places. These resources represent in a very visual manner, themes and customs important in our history. National Register Bulletin 41: How to Evaluate and Nominate Cemeteries and Burial Places, written by Elisabeth Walton Potter, National Register coordinator with the Oregon State Historic Preservation Office, with Beth M. Boland, historian, National Register of Historic Places, Washington Office, provides guidance on how to evaluate and nominate historic cemeteries and burial places. National Register criteria considerations are dealt with in detail. The bulletin also includes a

description of selected trends that influenced American burial customs and cemetery design. A glossary of terms, and a bibliography, enhances the publication's use.

National Register Bulletin 42: Evaluating and Nominating Historic Mining Sites, written by Bruce Noble, historian, Preservation Planning Branch, Interagency Resources Division, Washington, and Bob Spude, chief, National Preservation Programs Branch, Rocky Mountain Regional Office, does not focus specifically on mining camps and their architecture, but rather on the identification and registration of the frequently over-looked mining sites and industrial tracts, including iron works, precious metal mills, dredges, and associated outbuildings. As one of the world's leading producers of precious metals, mining has had a significant impact on settlement in the United States. This bulletin provides guidance for documenting historic mining sites and evaluating their significance-a challenging task when many of the sites were constructed for temporary use.

For information on these upcoming National Register bulletins, please contact the National Register of Historic Places, Interagency Resources Division, National Park Service, P.O. Box 37127, Washington, DC 20013-7127; 202-3439500.

Patty Sackett Chrisman is a historian, National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers.

## Special Issue on Preservation Technology

Landsat remote sensing photography locates a prehistoric road system; geographic information systems map it.

Archeological sites are identified and stabilized without excavation. Documentary sources become artifacts in themselves. When history meets high technology, traditional methodologies are transformed and preservation technology is born.

A special issue of *The Public Historian* on preservation technology (Vol. 13, No. 3) is still available for \$8.00 from *The Public Historian*, University of California Press, Berkeley, CA 94720.

### Briefs, Guidelines Available

Complete sets of Preservation Briefs are now available in two separate packages-Nos. 1-14 for \$9.00 (GPO stock number: 024-005-01026-2) and Nos. 15-23 for \$5.00 (024-005-01085-8).

In addition, the following new Preservation Briefs have been printed: No. 24-Heating, Ventilating, & Cooling Historic Buildings: Problems & Recommended Approaches (024-00501090-4); No. 25-The Preservation of Historic Signs (024-005-01086-6); No. 26-The Preservation & Repair of Historic Log Buildings (024-005-01087-4); and No. 27-The Maintenance & Repair of Architectural Cast Iron (024-00501088-2).

Preservation Briefs are short, illustrated essays in bulletin-form intended to build general preservation awareness on broad issues. Every Brief is carefully researched and written by NPS preservation professionals or by guest authors from the field with one goal in mind-to assist historic property owners, architects, contractors, and managers in recognizing and resolving common preservation and repair problems prior to work.

A special edition of *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards & Illustrated Guidelines* (024-005-01091-2) costs \$8.00 per copy. Designed to enhance overall understanding of basic preservation principles, this guide book includes the revised 1990 Standards for Rehabilitation together with the familiar "recommended" and "not recommended" approaches and treatments. The new book contains over 200 photographs and drawings that emphasize repair over replacement and limited rather than wholesale change to accommodate new uses.

To order any of the above, send your request with a check or money order directly to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402-9325. Make your check payable to "Sup. Docs" and include each stock number and title. All prices include postage and handling.

## Washington Report

Capitol Contact  
Bruce Craig

(Guest columnist is J. Charles Swift, NPCA Cultural Resources Management Intern)

### Legislative Update: St. Croix, Virgin Islands National Historical Park and Ecological Reserve

In November 1991, the House passed H.R. 2927, Ron DeLugo's (Delegate, Virgin Islands) legislation to protect Salt River Bay in the U.S. Virgin Islands as a unit of the National Park System. The bill's Senate counterpart, S.1495, introduced by Bennett Johnston (D Louisiana) is ready for floor action in the upcoming session.

Salt River Bay is known primarily as the only definitively identified landing site of Christopher Columbus in U.S. territory. Its importance as a natural area, however, perhaps transcends this historical association. Salt River Bay provides a thriving habitat for some 28 threatened species, including three species of endangered sea turtles. The area has been inhabited for nearly 4,000 years and contains pre-historic and historic multi-cultural resources, ranging from the island's earliest inhabitants to the legacy of European colonization.

If enacted, the legislation would create a cooperative agreement between the Government of the Virgin Islands and the National Park Service to administer and preserve the park resources. The legislation has enjoyed bipartisan support and has been enthusiastically endorsed by several environmental and preservation organizations.

### New Area Proposal: Marsh-Billings National Historical Park

On November 26, 1991, Representative Bernard Sanders (I-Vermont) and Senators James Jeffords (R-Vermont) on behalf of himself and Senator Patrick Leahy (D-Vermont), introduced legislation (H.R. 4030 and S. 2079, respectively) seeking to establish the Marsh-Billings National Historical Park in Vermont. While the Appalachian Trail runs through Vermont, the proposed park would be Vermont's first individual unit in the national park system.

The proposed historical park would consist of the Laurance and Mary Rockefeller estate near Woodstock, VT. The estate enjoys National Historic Landmark designation because of its association with two early environmental advocates, George Perkins Marsh and Frederick Billings, the grandfather of Mary Rockefeller.

George Perkins Marsh was born on the estate in 1801 and lived in the "Mansion," as the main house is known, after its construction in 1805. A diplomat and author, Marsh published his most important work, *Man and Nature*, in 1864. In it, Marsh proposed the idea that the total environment (or ecology) is altered by human activity. Unwise land use could damage the environment, but enlightened land use could conserve and even repair the land. It was this philosophy that led Marsh to begin to reforest the barren areas of Mount Tom located on the estate.

Frederick Billings, a native of Woodstock who had made his fortune in California, bought the property in 1869 and completed Marsh's project. Mount Tom had been clear cut in the early 1800s, a practice which subjects land to rapid erosion and downstream flooding. The Marsh/Billings reforestation project became a model for similar ventures, and Billings, who was also president of the Northern Pacific Railroad, played a leading role on the newly created Vermont Forestry Commission. Billings also instituted scientific farming and applied progressive land management techniques to the estate, following the precepts of George Perkins Marsh.

The Rockefellers have agreed to donate the 531-acre estate to the Federal Government, and establish an endowment of \$7.5 million dollars to provide funds for the maintenance of the park. The Rockefellers will also establish another endowment of \$650,000 dollars; the dividends to be used to compensate the Town of Woodstock for anticipated lost property tax revenues arising out of the fee and less than fee acquisitions. In addition to the 531-acre estate, scenic easements were obtained on other property owned by the Rockefellers in order to protect scenic viewsheds.

If you would like more information on any of the legislation discussed above, drop a note to us at our new address: NPCA, 1776 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Suite 200, Washington, DC 20036. For those of you with rolodexes, note our new phone number: 202-223-6722; fax: 202-659-0650.

#### NPCA Announcements

An updated version of "Recommended Readings on the National Park Service: Its History and Mission" is now available from NPCA. This list was originally compiled by Bruce Craig for the Stephen T. Mather Training Center in 1986. Prepared in consultation with NPS Bureau Historian Barry Mackintosh and Harpers Ferry Librarian David Nathanson, the updated list highlights major publications available that relate to the evolution of the national park system.

#### Presidential Sites Workshop

NPCA, in cooperation with the National Park Service, the Presidential Libraries/National Archives and several additional institutions, is planning a national symposium on "Interpreting and Preserving Presidential Properties" for the fall of 1992 or spring of 1993. Individuals and institutions interested in receiving additional information should write: Cultural Resources Program Manager, NPCA, 1776 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Suite 200, Washington, DC 20036.

## NPS Stresses Planning for the 1990s

Susan L. Henry

The decade of the 1980s witnessed profound land-use changes affecting this country's historic and cultural resources—from the intense development boom on both coasts and the redistribution of population from the "rust belt" to the "sun belt," to the collapse of the farm economy in the Midwest. There is growing realization that historic preservation must routinely become a major player in land-use decision-making if the movement is to deal effectively with the increasingly sophisticated and complex land-use pressures that will be facing historic and cultural resources in the 1990s.

Historic preservation planning approaches promoted by the National Park Service have not adequately enabled State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPOs) to play a pivotal role in making or influencing decisions about how land is used. The Secretary of the Interior's "Standards for Preservation Planning" have only been partly implemented. While Standard I, on developing historic contexts, and Standard II, on developing goals and priorities, are fairly well understood Standard III, on the integration of historic preservation with the planning efforts of others, is understood inadequately or not at all.

To address this nationwide need, the National Park Service is placing renewed emphasis in the 1990s on historic preservation planning in order to better empower the national historic preservation program in the land-use planning arena. The NPS has embarked upon a 10-year initiative to provide guidance and technical assistance to help SHPOs ensure that historic and cultural preservation concerns are effectively incorporated into the broader land-use planning and decision-making processes at the Federal, state, and local levels. A key feature of this initiative is the revision of the current approach to historic preservation planning into one that stresses a public planning process, a state historic preservation plan that addresses statewide needs, active public involvement in the process and plan implementation activities, and the use of historic contexts as special planning studies. In addition, NPS, in consultation with the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers, is currently revising its administrative procedures and program requirements, which are expected to be in place by August 1993.

A major component of these efforts is a multi-year cooperative agreement between the NPS and the American Planning Association (APA), which was designed to build professional planning approaches into the preservation planning program. The APA and NPS held two successful planning workshops for NPS and Eastern SHPO staff last summer. In 1992, the APA and NPS will conduct two more planning workshops for Midwestern and Western SHPO staff. In addition, NPS will be preparing a multi-author publication on "Preservation Planning Strategies" for state and local audiences.

For further information, contact Susan L. Henry, Interagency Resources Division (413), National Park Service, P.O. Box 37127, Washington, DC 20013-7127; 202343-9505.

## National Archeological Survey Initiative

Michele C. Aubry

### Background

The national park system consists of 358 nationally significant cultural, natural and recreational areas covering about 80 million acres of land in 49 States, American Samoa, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. These areas contain a diversity of prehistoric and historic archeological resources. About 53,000 archeological sites are known to be present on national park system lands, while an additional 364,000 to 389,000 sites are thought to be present. The National Park Service (NPS) conserves, protects and manages archeological resources under its stewardship for appropriate public enjoyment and for long-term scientific research. In 1971, the NPS established systemwide standards requiring that archeological resources on park lands be located, recorded and evaluated, and that qualified properties be entered into the National Register of Historic Places. A significant majority of past and current surveys in park areas, however, are conducted solely in connection with compliance related development projects or park operational activities. As a result, by the end of fiscal year 1990, less than 2% of national park system lands had been systematically surveyed to inventory park archeological resources. In addition, about 82% of national park system lands had not received any level of survey. Lack of information about the location, characteristics and significance of archeological resources on national park system lands seriously impairs the NPS' ability to effectively carry out its park planning, park operations, resources Status management, interpretation, and law enforcement responsibilities.

With this in mind, the National Archeological Survey Initiative was established in 1991.

### Systemwide Archeological Inventory Program

Under the Initiative, the NPS will implement a long-term, systemwide archeological inventory and evaluation program. The goal of the program is to systematically locate, evaluate and document to National Register standards the archeological resources on national park system lands over a period of 20 years. The primary objectives of the systemwide archeological inventory program are to:

(1) acquire information about the nature and extent of the majority of scientifically valuable archeological resources on park lands and (2) document those resources, including nominating qualified properties for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.

To accomplish these objectives, regionwide archeological survey plans will be developed and implemented by each of the NPS' regional offices. It is anticipated that each regionwide survey plan would describe the status of archeological inventory studies for each 1992 No.1 park area in the region, estimate funding needs to complete inventory studies within a 20 year period, and contain a schedule to complete inventory activities at the park level. Specific instructions and guidance about development of regionwide plans will be provided in the systemwide archeological inventory program document currently under development.

The 10 regionwide plans will be linked together through a systemwide, multiyear budget initiative. Using the cost estimates and schedules contained in the regionwide plans, the budget initiative will define the field operating base and annual project funding required to achieve the objectives of the systemwide archeological inventory program.

Development and implementation of a systemwide archeological inventory program will enable the NPS to more effectively carry out its park planning, park operations, resources management, interpretation, and law enforcement responsibilities. In addition, it will

partially fulfill the inventory and survey requirements contained in the amended National Historic Preservation Act, Executive Order 11593 and the amended Archaeological Resources Protection Act.

#### Status

A Servicewide NASI Task Force has been established to draft the systemwide archeological inventory plan. The drafted document will be sent for concurrent review to NPS offices, the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the Historic Preservation Officers of Federal land management agencies and Indian tribes with lands contiguous to national park areas, and national professional archeological societies and Native American organizations. Distribution of the initial draft plan for review is scheduled for January 1992.

For further information about the Initiative, contact the author, Anthropology Division, National Park Service, P.O. Box 37127, Washington, DC 20013-7127; telephone FTS/commercial 202-343-1879, FAX FTS/commercial 202343-5260.

Michele Aubry is a senior archeologist and NASI Task Force leader Anthropology Division.

## Interior Museum Property Project

In July 1990 the Office of Inspector General issued an audit report that found inadequate accountability, preservation and protection for museum property at most of the 26 activities reviewed in various bureaus within the Department of the Interior. To address these findings, the Department has asked the National Park Service to coordinate a Departmentwide project to develop policies and procedures for management of museum property. A task force formed in April 1991, with representatives from all bureaus, has developed interim standards for management of museum property, which were issued by the Department on September 9, 1991. Bureaus were asked to complete the first-ever survey of the size and location of museum property collections throughout the Department by December 2, 1991. The efforts of the task force will culminate in 1993 with the issuance of Departmentwide policies and procedures and the development of bureau cost estimates and plans to bring their museum property holdings up to Departmental standards.

The task force includes expertise from a wide variety of disciplines including property management, museum property management, archeology, geology, and biology.

### Department of the Interior Checklist for Documentation, Preservation and Protection of Museum Property (Checklist)

The draft Department of the Interior (DOI) Checklist for Documentation, Preservation and Protection of Museum Property (Checklist) will be distributed in January 1992 to all DOI units responsible for property that meets the working definition for "museum property," or that might qualify as museum property. The draft checklist is a comprehensive document designed to assist units in doing a self-assessment of documentation, preservation and protection of DOI museum property. The responses to the checklist will provide baseline data to bureaus and unit managers to facilitate management of DOI museum property. The checklist was reviewed by the bureau field areas in July 1991. Field areas will complete the checklist and bureaus will submit them to the Department by April 15, 1992. This data will be refined and staffing and cost estimates for correction of identified deficiencies will be incorporated prior to using the data for developing Bureauwide long-range plans for management of museum property in 1993.

### Environmental Monitoring Kits

Environmental Monitoring Kits will be available this fall. The kits are for monitoring relative humidity, temperature, and light conditions in areas where museum property is exhibited or stored. The kits contain a digital monitor for relative humidity and temperature, an ultraviolet light monitor and a digital lux meter for light readings. Each kit is packed in a case suitable for carrying or shipping. The kits will be available through each bureau's property management representative on the Interior Museum Property (IMP) Task Force.

## Update on Geographic Information Systems in NPS

John Knoerl

To cope with the phenomenal growth in recent years in the use of Geographic Information Systems (GIS) within the national park system, the GIS function within the NPS underwent a major organizational change in 1991. Historically, the GIS Division (under the NPS Associate Director for Natural Resources) has served parks one-on-one, assisting with database development and providing user support. In a memo from the Associate Director last June, the function of the GIS Division was changed to a guidance and coordination role, focusing on policy, planning, and research and evaluation of hardware, software, and data technologies. GIS technical support centers are being established and/or strengthened in regional offices, parks, and cooperative park study units to do actual GIS projects and technical assistance.

Dramatic evidence of the growth of GIS in NPS was provided by the 1991 NPS GIS Users Meeting in Denver, November 18-22, attended by nearly 200 people representing 120 NPS units and all regions. Much of the time spent in plenary sessions dealt with policy issues and the changes in the GIS Division role: this was the first large-scale meeting of GIS users in the NPS since the reorganization of the GIS Division was announced. Workshops were given on global positioning systems, position description and classification, data sources, hardware, electric power, GRASS, cave GIS, and networking. Posters and materials from 54 parks were on display, including a demonstration of the use of CAD for small-scale historic landscape management by Frederick Law Olmsted National Historic Site. Dinosaur National Monument had a display of an innovative use of GIS to map and analyze dinosaur bones (using data from the Automated National Catalog System), which had obvious implications for use by archeologists to analyze artifact location on sites. The IRD Cultural Resources GIS Facility had a display on using GIS to assess the integrity of Civil War battlefields in Virginia's Shenandoah Valley. Colonial National Historic Park won the award for Most Multi-disciplinary and tied for Best Use in Decision-Making.

Attendees were very interested in the issue of standards, including both technology standards and data standards. Dissatisfaction with the current database management software standard (Dbase III Plus) is extensive, and there is interest in a new database management standard for both DOS and UNIX environments. Attendees also expressed particular interest in the activities of the GIS Division in representing the NPS on the Department of the Interior Geographic Data Committee (IGDC), and on the Federal Geographic Data Committee (FGDC), where work on Department-wide and government-wide coordination and standards is taking place. The GIS Division has formed a National Park Service Geographic Data Committee (NPSGDC) as a forum for discussion of GIS issues within the Service. The Interagency Resources Division's Cultural Resources GIS Facility represents cultural resources on the NPSGDC.

Many people at the meeting noted the difficulties of hiring and retaining GIS technical personnel. This appears to be one of the major problems the Service faces in implementing GIS effectively. To deal with this problem, the GIS Division is developing a generic GIS position description for use by parks. A formal paper was released by the GIS Division on this issue. Another difficulty with GIS implementation is the space required for GIS workstations and equipment, which at an average of 200 square feet of space is well above the average space allotment for staff in technician positions. Phil Wundra, Chief of the GIS Division, is chairing an ad hoc task force of the Federal Geographic Data Committee to look into GIS personnel issues at a government-wide level.

As the GIS Division assumes more of its new Servicewide policy and planning responsibilities, it will be working to incorporate the concerns and issues of other program areas (besides natural resources) within the park system. Within this context, the Interagency Resources Division's Cultural Resources GIS Facility and the Rocky Mountain Regional Office agreed to conduct a joint GIS workshop for cultural resources in the region.

The objective will be to provide historians, archeologists, and other cultural resource staff with a basis for appreciating GIS uses in cultural resources management, and so that they can meaningfully participate in developing park and regional GIS plans. If the workshop is successful, similar workshops could be held in other regions.

Contact John Knoerl, Cultural Resources GIS Facility, NPS, 202/FTS 343-2239.

## Archeology and the Conservation Ethic: A Call for Some Re-thinking and Re-education

David H. Dutton

As a Council staff archeologist reviewing projects for the southeast region of the United States over the past two years, I have witnessed a disturbing monotony in archeologists' and agencies' treatment of archeological properties. This is that "data recovery" is overwhelmingly chosen as the preferred form of project mitigation at the expense of other forms of treatment. While there are numerous factors contributing to the final selection of a mitigation option when an archeological site is threatened by disturbance, perhaps the three that most frequently contribute to inappropriate or poorly conceived data recovery are (1) shared misunderstandings about the purpose of the Federal preservation legislation, (2) a lack of creativity about how to mitigate the effects of projects on archeological sites, and (3) an archeological conservation ethic that perhaps gives first priority to preserving the information from each individual site rather than dovetailing it into a broader context.

Today, much of the archeological research in the country is carried out under the provisions of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (NHPA). With respect to archeological sites, Section 106 of the NHPA, as implemented by the regulations of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (Council) "Protection of Historic Properties" (36 CFR Part 800), provides for a number of treatment alternatives for archeological properties that include avoidance, long-term management, and data recovery. Although site preservation and long-term management have in theory long been preferred options, data recovery is generally the alternative of choice. The reasons for this are varied; late consideration has left planners with no other alternatives, and in some cases avoidance options are just not practical. The Council itself, in attempting to accommodate agencies' requirements to expedite review of projects affecting archeological sites, has perhaps encouraged this trend, particularly in the past 15 years.

### The Purpose of the National Historic Preservation Act

The intent of the NHPA is to foster respect for, and consideration of, historic properties in the Federal planning process. The NHPA has long recognized a number of benefits associated with the preservation of historic properties. Among these is to help us understand and know our past, to inspire future generations, as a way to recognize and commemorate past events and persons, and to provide a sense of roots and identity. As such, the NHPA's primary function is to "use measures, including financial assistance, to foster conditions under which our modern society and our prehistoric and historic resources can exist in productive harmony and fulfill the social, economic, and other requirements of present and future generations" (NHPA, Section 2, 16 U.S.C. 470-1). Thus, there is a strong public policy mandate focused on stewardship of resources and their values. The Council's regulations provide Federal agencies with a five-step process enabling them to satisfy their obligations under one section of the NHPA, the so-called "take into account" planning standard of Section 106.

### The Creativity Dilemma

Unfortunately, several inherent weaknesses in the national historic preservation program do little to foster creativity in determining appropriate treatment for the protection and enhancement of our Nation's historic and archeological resources. A lack of communication and truly effective partnerships among Federal agencies (including the Advisory Council), State Historic Preservation Officers, local governments, and the private sector is resulting in preservation efforts that are reactive rather than proactive and fall far short of achieving the goals of the NHPA. Second, there is a reliance on "tried and true" treatment options, and it's hard to go wrong in calling for the excavation of a threatened

archeological site in view of our general professional agreement about the irreplaceable, nonrenewable nature of archeological resources and the information they contain.

### The Context of Conservation Ethics

While it is clearly recognized that the preservation of archeological resources should be the preferred alternative, the archeological profession, as a whole, has done little to encourage or foster creative approaches to archeological site

preservation and management. In part, the problem is our own inability as archeologists to accept the notion that the long-term preservation of archeological sites is the preferred treatment alternative. As archeologists, we are trained to dig sites, not preserve them. This is reflected in the fact that there is no single body of literature focusing on long-term preservation of archeological properties, nondestructive information gathering, and various management and interpretive options. Indeed, few graduate programs in archeology offer a course, or even a segment of a course, on archeological planning and management in this vein. The fact is that excavation is easier, it seems to advance research goals, and that's what we know how to do best-so we promote it as the only way to ensure preservation of a site's information. Furthermore, under the Council's regulations, most strict archeological projects are carried out under a "determination of no adverse effect," i.e., the project will not have a deleterious impact to the archeological site when preceded by data recovery. So, in a sense, one is rewarded for conducting data recovery. Why worry about long-term preservation when you can get ready agreement from Federal and state reviewers, and make everyone happy?

While there is a whole host of other factors contributing to the decision about treatment of an archeological property, redirection of already limited Federal Letters funding is going to force archeologists to either develop more creative mitigation options, or cut back on the general quality of their work. With the shrinking economy, Federal agencies will no longer have the luxury of supporting wholesale data recovery of archeological properties to "solve" their problems with archeological resources. Agencies will be looking to reduce such expenditures and focus on the "real" project costs that result in a product: a building, a flood control system, a timber harvest. As such, the current trend to excavate sites with minimal consideration of such issues as data redundancy, regional research context or sampling efficiency will inevitably result in a dilution of research results or the loss of truly important archeological sites at the expense of more marginal research. The focus of most data recovery plans subject to Section 106 review is on site specific, or very localized, mitigation and as such, most projects have completely lost sight of the larger picture. Contractors and SHPOs rarely consult their State Historic Preservation Plans, if in fact they exist, and if they do, only lip service is paid to the priorities they set. Therefore, many archeologists operate under the assumption that every archeological site which is determined eligible for the National Register is either worth saving or excavating simply because it is eligible for the National Register. It is now more important than ever to take a fresh look at how we treat archeological properties. What we save and how we save it, whether it be through preservation or excavation, will be questions that we all need to thoroughly consider and discuss. The reality is that not all sites need to be preserved, not all sites need to be excavated, and we have yet to figure out how to make those judgments consistently or well.

The Council has been planning to revise its handbook, "Treatment of Archaeological Properties," for some time. In an effort to address some of the above issues, we actively solicit your thoughts and suggestions on that publication or other ways we might pursue our collective goals. Please write to: Executive Director, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, The Old Post Office Building, 1100 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, #809, Washington, DC 20004.

David Dutton is a staff archeologist for the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, Eastern Office of Project Review, Washington, DC.

Dear Editor:

I read with interest the article "Archeology of World War II POW Camps" by Jake Hoffman (Vol. 14, No. 8).

Prior to my joining the NPS staff of the Curatorial Services Division, I had the opportunity to serve for six years as the museum curator at the U.S. Army Transportation Museum. The museum is located at Fort Eustis, VA, approximately 12 miles southeast of Historic Williamsburg.

It was while working at the transportation museum that I had several opportunities to meet and talk with former German prisoners of war, individuals who had returned to the United States and made a pilgrimage to the post they once called home. Friendly, and happy to be visiting Fort Eustis, they eagerly talked of their days of internment in the then remote area of the Virginia peninsula. Often mere teenagers, not as old as my own son, they were plucked from civilian life and placed in the ranks of the German army. They were thankful for the refined living conditions, improved health services, and wholesome food they received while under American military control.

Although there are practically no physical remains at Fort Eustis to remind us of the temporary occupation of the post by the "enemy," there are a few photographs, several letters and a diary or two which help us understand the importance of life in America to them. Members of the museum staff formed friendships with some of these visitors and were even able to put them in contact with other POWs who were at Fort Eustis as well. Anyone interested in additional material about the POWs there should contact Ms. Barbara Bower, Director, U.S. Army Transportation Museum, Besson Memorial Hall, Bldg. 300, Attn.: ATZF-PTM, Fort Eustis, VA 23604.

Allan L. Montgomery  
Staff Curator