THE NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES

AND AFRICAN-AMERICAN HERITAGE

by

HEATHER LYNN MCDONALD

(Under the Direction of Wayde Brown)

ABSTRACT

This thesis examines the effectiveness of the National Register of Historic Places (National Register) in addressing African-American resources and the ways in which it can be modified to enhance the effectiveness of the National Register process for the preservation of African-American resources at a local level. The National Register is an important preservation mechanism in the United States since most listings in the register are of local significance and many municipalities use the National Register criteria as the basis for local designation. Although the National Register provides a solid foundation in preservation efforts, some aspects of the process limit the types of resources included in the register especially when resources are related to minority cultural groups. As part of this thesis, the existing framework of the nomination and eligibility processes of the National Register will be examined for potential weaknesses that place limitations on the inclusion of African-American resources, and will also examine potential modifications to the National Register process.

INDEX WORDS: National Register of Historic Places, African-American, Minorities, National Park Service, Local preservation, Designation, Integrity, Intangible heritage

THE NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES AND AFRICAN-AMERICAN HERITAGE

by

HEATHER LYNN MCDONALD

B.A., The University of Mary Washington, 2004

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2009

THE NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES

AND AFRICAN-AMERICAN HERITAGE

by

HEATHER LYNN MCDONALD

Major Professor: Wayde Brown

Committee: John C. Waters
Alfie Vick
Jeanne Cyriaque

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
May 2009

"Our picture of the past is no longer just a spotlight focused on a few people. The lights on the stage are coming up and those people that have been on the stage all the time are in the light… and we see how many there are, how diverse they are, and how greatly they have contributed to American civilization."

~ David McCullough
1991 National Preservation Conference
San Francisco, California

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis would not have been possible without the support of many people. I wish to express my gratitude to my advisor, Wayde Brown, who offered invaluable assistance, support and guidance throughout the process. Deepest gratitude is also due to the members of the reading committee, John C. Waters, Alfie Vick, and Jeanne Cyriaque, whose knowledge and insight contributed to the success of this project.

I would also like to extend my sincerest appreciation to my friends and family for their continual support in my scholastic endeavors and all other aspects of my life. Special thanks to my mom and brother for keeping me grounded and for their unconditional love and support as I pursue my passion.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF FIGURES

Page

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

"If it can be said that there is a new awakening of interest in the preservation of our cultural and architectural heritage, it must be added that never was the need for it greater."

~ Special Committee on Historic Preservation, 1966[1]

The main objective of this thesis is to answer the questions, "how effective is the National Register of Historic Places in addressing African-American needs and how can it be modified to enhance the effectiveness of the National Register process for the preservation of African-American resources at a local level?" This topic reflects the changing environment of American society. As a multi-cultural American society evolves, the preservation movement must address the different pasts of our diverse cultures, and ensure the preservation of resources representing every facet of American society.

Mechanisms developed for the evaluation and preservation of resources in 1966[2], and which remain the most common methods in use today, can not be expected to meet the current preservation challenges arising from these changes in American society. Although mechanisms such as the National Register of Historic Places provide a solid foundation for historic preservation in the United States, they were created at a time when preservation theory was influenced greatly by various European philosophies, and focused on European-American resources.

Preservation theory and practice in Europe especially Britain focused on the importance of the age and historic fabric of a resource as well as the architectural merit of landmarks and

[1] *With Heritage So Rich*, eds. Albert Rains and Laurance G. Henderson, "Findings and Recommendations" (New York: Random House Inc., 1966), 203.

[2] The *National Historic Preservation Act of 1966* provided the framework for various preservation mechanisms including the National Register of Historic Places.

monumental buildings. These are important factors to consider, however they place limitations on the types of resources considered for preservation. For instance, within the parameters of the various European philosophies, the language and folk ways of the Gullah/Geechee people would not be deemed a resource worthy of preservation. However, as evident by the designation of the Gullah/Geechee Cultural Heritage Corridor with the passage of the *National Heritage Act* in 2006, language and folk ways are important in illustrating the heritage of this unique cultural group.[3] Intangible heritage is one of many different aspects of culture that has emerged in recent years as a resource to be preserved.

As American society continues to evolve, the preservation movement, and more importantly, preservation mechanisms need also to evolve. This thesis concentrates on the National Register of Historic Places (National Register). In the United States, the National Register is often the first step in the preservation process, sets the criteria that define what is worth preserving, and plays a significant role in preservation at the local level. A detailed re-examination of the National Register for historic resources of all types and cultures is not feasible within the parameters of this thesis; rather this thesis will focus on African-Americans, a group that has, since the establishment of the National Register, gained a greater voice in American society, and whose cultural heritage is a significant aspect of the social and built environments of the United States.

Consideration of the thesis question requires an understanding of the existing framework of the National Register. The second chapter illustrates the evolution of preservation thought and practice in the United States by discussing the important phases of the preservation movement from its origin in the nineteenth century to the 1966 passage of the *National Historic Preserva-*

[3] United States Congressman James E. Clyburn, "Gullah-Geechee Cultural Heritage Corridor. Available from http://clyburn.house.gov/district-gullah.cfm; Internet; Accessed 05 February 2009.

tion Act, and the creation of the National Register. The next chapter provides a context for the preservation of African-American resources in the United States and discusses how the National Register and other preservation mechanisms have been utilized in preserving African-American resources.

Chapter Four discusses the current framework of the National Register and identifies weaknesses with regard to the preservation of African-American resources, including the complexity of the National Register nomination process, and the limitations of the National Register in addressing intangible heritage as well as non-architecturally significant resources that lack integrity. Chapter Five presents three case studies, each considering how specific communities have remedied problems associated with the National Register. Lastly, the thesis analyzes these case studies and proposes modifications to the National Register, which will help to increase the number of African-American resources included on the National Register and, consequentially, enhance the preservation of African-American resources at the local level.

CHAPTER 2

EVOLUTION OF THE PRESERVATION MOVEMENT IN THE UNITED STATES

There is a need in every generation to study the past, to absorb its spirit, to preserve its messages.

~ Christopher Tunnard AIA[4]

An understanding of the parameters of the National Register requires an understanding of the context in which it was developed. Although the National Register was created as part of the federal legislation under the *National Historic Preservation Act* in 1966, the basis of this preservation tool was the experiences and ideas of those individuals, organizations, and communities involved in the movement since the early-nineteenth century.

Historic preservation in the United States emerged in the early 1800s with the concept of preserving buildings of significant historical value. Throughout the hundred years leading up to 1966, American preservation philosophy would develop in scope and influence and can be distinguished by five phases: 1) Associative and Historical Value; 2) Architectural and Artistic Value; 3) Area Preservation (outdoor museum and zoning control); 4) Citizen Activism and lastly 5) National Preservation Policy.

In the first phase of Associative and Historical Value, early preservation efforts concentrated on the preservation of buildings that had important associations with historic individuals and events. One of the first efforts was the 1816 saving of Independence Hall in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania from demolition.[5] The significance of the building did not lie in its aesthetic value

[4] Christopher Tunnard, "Landmarks of Beauty and History," in *With Heritage So Rich*, eds. Albert Rains and Laurance G. Henderson, (New York: Random House Inc., 1966), 29.
[5] Norman Tyler, Ilene R. Tyler and Ted J. Ligibel, *Historic Preservation: An Introduction to its History, Principles and Practices* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1999), 33.

but rather as the place of two events important to the history of the United States, the adoption of the Declaration of Independence and the signing of the Constitution of the United States. Another notable early preservation effort was the formation of the Mount Vernon Ladies Association of the Union in 1853 to save the deteriorating Mount Vernon, President George Washington's homestead.[6] Once again, aesthetic value was not the main concern.

From these early preservation efforts several trends emerged that symbolized preservation throughout the nineteenth century and the early-twentieth century. These trends included the prominent role of women in preservation efforts, financial support primarily from private individuals, the preservation of individual landmark buildings especially significant for patriotic reasons, and the conversion of preserved buildings into museums.[7]

Coinciding with the early preservation efforts in the United States was the emergence of two competing preservation philosophies in Europe. William Morris and John Ruskin in Britain and E.E. Viollet-le-Duc in France, developed very specific philosophies on the cultural value of buildings and the art of conservation. These philosophies would not enter American preservation thought until the second and third phases of the movement.

The second phase began in the early-twentieth century with the introduction of architectural and artistic value. Preservation efforts were still geared towards individual buildings; however, people began to see the importance of architectural significance and uniqueness and the need to preserve buildings illustrating earlier periods of history.[8] The most notable example of this phase is the incorporation of the Society for the Preservation of New England Antiquities

[6] Ibid.
[7] Ibid., 34.
[8] Walter Muir Whitehill, "Promoted to Glory" in *With Heritage So Rich*, eds. Albert Rains and Laurance G. Henderson, (New York: Random House Inc., 1966), 41.

(SPNEA) in 1910.[9] William Sumner Appleton, founder of SPNEA, believed in the architectural value of buildings independent of their historical association with an important person or event. Additionally, Appleton valued buildings from earlier time periods as they represented the craftsmanship of previous generations.[10] This was evident in one of Appleton's first preservation project, the c. 1670 Swett-Illsley house – a building built almost two and a half centuries before.[11]

Appleton's beliefs were based on the teachings of John Ruskin and William Morris, authors of the "anti-scrape philosophy" of preservation in Europe. Appleton often corresponded with the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings, an organization formed by William Morris.[12] Appleton echoed their sentiments through the work of SPNEA in which he employed the principle of, "the preservation of every scrap of the old that can possibly be preserved."[13] Ruskin and Morris viewed old buildings as "ancient monuments of art" and due to the "glory of its age" a building has historical significance.[14] From their beliefs, the anti-scrape philosophy of conservation formed in which the patina of a building should be maintained and all of the changes of a building throughout its life contribute to its artistic and architectural value.

During this phase of the preservation movement, the introduction of Ruskin and Morris' philosophy played a significant role in re-defining the standards for determining what deemed a building worthy of preservation and how a building should be preserved. Ruskin's famous quote,

---

[9] SPNEA is today known as Historic New England. Maggie Redern, "Three Old Houses cast their spell on America's First Preservationist, William Sumner Appleton," *Historic New England Magazine* (Spring 2001): 2.
[10] James Lindgren, *Preserving Historic New England Preservation, Progressivism, and the Remaking of Memory* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 72.
[11] Ibid., 76-77.
[12] Ibid., 134.
[13] Ibid., 141.
[14] First quote was written by William Morris in his "Manifesto of the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings" in 1877 and the second quote written by John Ruskin in "The Lamp of Memory" from his book, *Seven Lamps of Architecture.* The Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings, *The Manifesto,* Available from http://www.spab.org.uk/html/what-is-spab/the-manifesto/; Internet; accessed 10 January 2009. Sir John Summerson, "Ruskin, Morris, and the "Anti-Scrape" Philosophy" in *Historic Preservation Today.* (Charlottesville: The University Press of Virginia, 1966), 23.

"do not let us talk then of restoration. The thing is a Lie from beginning to end," portrays the value of historic buildings for their historical and architectural significance as well as for their age.[15] Furthermore, the proper standard for preserving a historic building relied on maintaining its patina through the preservation of its historic fabric and physical integrity.

As the preservation movement continued in the twentieth century, the third phase introduced the concept of preserving an entire area or community into America's preservation philosophy. This concept was first implemented in the late 1920s with the establishment of Colonial Williamsburg. Colonial Williamsburg was the brain-child of John D. Rockefeller, Jr. and William A.R. Goodwin, who planned to restore an entire community to a particular time period, and which involved the restoration, removal and reconstruction of buildings. The end result of the project was the creation of an outdoor museum to teach Americans, and Rockefeller valued it for "the lesson it teaches of the patriotism, high purpose, and unselfish devotion of our forefathers to the common good."[16] Although considered an outdoor museum, Colonial Williamsburg may be considered the first historic district in the country as it preserved multiple buildings that contributed to the historical and architectural significance of an entire city or community. However as similar to other early preservation efforts, Colonial Williamsburg did not recognize the African American heritage of the community.

In addition, the Colonial Williamsburg project established on a large scale a different concept on the conservation treatment of historic buildings. Colonial Williamsburg chose to restore and reconstruct buildings to a certain time period rather than honoring the patina of a building and the larger historic district, the very basis of Ruskin and Morris' anti-scrape philosophy.

---

[15] John Ruskin, *The Seven Lamps of Architecture*, Vol. 5 of The Complete Works of John Ruskin, LL.D. (New York:B Bryan, Taylor & Company, 1894), 185.

[16] *Readings in Historic Preservation: Why? What? How?*, eds. Normand Williams Jr., Edmund H. Kellogg, and Frank B. Gilbert (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Center for Urban Policy Research, 1983), 40.

At the same time the anti-scrape philosophy was establishing roots in America, the philosophy of Frenchman, Viollet-le-Duc, was also appearing in preservation projects such as Colonial Williamsburg and the early project of the restoration of Fort Ticonderoga, New York in 1909, which was undertaken by British architect, Alfred Bossom.[17]

Viollet-le-Duc, like his contemporaries Ruskin and Morris, believed in the artistic and architectural merit of old buildings. However, he believed in the restoration and reconstruction of a building. Rather than valuing the patina of a building, Viollet-le-Duc valued the design intent of all professions involved in its creation.[18] To him a building was an ensemble in which everything pertaining to a building from the foundation stones to furniture contributed to its artistic value and furthermore, the style of the building pertained to previous periods of architectural styles.[19] All the parts contributed to the whole and by understanding the ensemble an individual can understand the design intent of a building. In turn, the understanding of the design intent can enable the reconstruction and restoration of a ruin. As Viollet-le-Duc explained, "to restore an edifice means neither to maintain it, nor to repair it, nor to rebuild it; it means to reestablish it in a finished state, which may in fact never have actually existed at any given time."[20] It is at this point where Viollet-le-Duc's philosophy differs drastically from that of Ruskin and Morris. Whereas Ruskin and Morris would leave a ruin alone, Viollet-le-Duc would rebuild it based on what he believed was the original architect's design intent. Although Viollet-le-Duc's philosophy was not widely accepted in Europe, it did influence preservation philosophy in the United States.

---

[17] Fort Ticonderoga National Historic Landmark. *Fort Ticonderoga History: 19th Century,* Available from http://www.fort-ticonderoga.org/history/19th-century.htm; Internet; accessed 10 January 2009.; *Cultural Landscapes,* ed. Richard Longstreth, (Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 2008), 6.

[18] Jacques DuPont, "Viollet-le-Duc and Restoration in France" in *Historic Preservation Today.* (Charlottesville: The University Press of Virginia, 1966), 11.

[19] Ibid.

[20] Eugene –Emmanuel Viollet-le-Duc, *The Foundations of Architecture, Selections from the Dictionnaire raisonne,* trans. Kenneth D. Whitehead (New York: George Braziller, Inc., 1990), 195.

Although not every aspect of Viollet-le-Duc's philosophy would be incorporated in the later phases of the preservation movement, his beliefs influenced the creation of several treatments for historic buildings including the acceptance of restorations and reconstructions. Unlike its European counterparts, the United States accommodated the two competing preservation philosophies. However, the United States did establish a hierarchy in which the anti-scrape philosophy of Ruskin and Morris is the preferred treatment as evident by the exclusion of reconstructed buildings on the National Register; and preservation as the first treatment established under the *Secretary of the Interior's Treatment for Historic Properties* and reconstruction the last.

The concept of preserving an area or district was further developed in the 1931 through the establishment of a historic district with regulatory control in Charleston, South Carolina.[21] The city of Charleston created the historic district to counteract the dismantling of many Charleston homes by outsiders since the city recognized that the destruction of individual homes was destroying the architectural beauty of the entire area. In order to facilitate the preservation of the historic district, city planners and citizens developed a historic zoning ordinance with a board of architectural review that had the authority to review exterior changes to buildings within the district.[22] Although the zoning ordinance and review board had no legal basis, the community support allowed the regulatory historic district to function. Many cities including New Orleans, Louisiana (1936), San Antonio, Texas (1939), Winston-Salem, North Carolina (1948) and Georgetown, Washington D.C. (1950) followed suit and established their own regulatory districts.[23]

These early regulatory districts laid the groundwork for the important 1954 Supreme Court decision in *Berman vs. Parker*, which ruled that a city "has as much right to be beautiful as

[21]Diane Lea, "America's Preservation Ethos" in *A Richer Heritage*. ed. Robert E. Stipe, (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2003), 7.
[22] Norman Tyler, Ilene R. Tyler and Ted J. Ligibel, *Historic Preservation: An Introduction to its History, Principles and Practices* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1999), 33.
[23] Ibid., 39-40.

it has to be safe and clean."[24] Their decision formed the basis for the acceptance of historic districts with regulatory controls as a legitimate function of local governments.[25] With the adoption of the Charleston historic district and the Supreme Court decision, preservation thought evolved to incorporate the protection of areas with an emphasis on protecting the "harmonious exterior relationship of buildings to one another, without necessary regard to the practical use of their interiors."[26] Additionally, these two events shifted the responsibility of preservation from the private sector of individual property owners to the public sector. The events instigated the involvement of citizens and government in the preservation process, hence phase number four and five of the preservation movement.

The last two phases of the preservation movement coincided with one another as citizen activism (Phase 4) initiated national policy on preservation (Phase 5) throughout the twentieth century. With the existence of several preservation tools such as house and outdoor museums, revolving funds, and historic districts, citizens had the ability to conduct preservation efforts in their communities and as described in *Historic Preservation Today*, "they [citizens] were awakened to the importance of historic preservation and in doing so they are giving the movement strong new impetus and broader scope."[27]

At this moment in the preservation movement, people sought to preserve a wider heritage of history and architecture and a movement once supported primarily by historians now extended into the work of planners, architects, realtors, landscape architects, writers, lawyers and bankers and "all citizens concerned with maintaining the character and integrity of their surroundings."[28]

---

[24]Walter Muir Whitehill, "The Right of Cities to be Beautiful" in *With Heritage So Rich*, eds. Albert Rains and Laurance G. Henderson, (New York: Random House Inc., 1966), 45.
[25] Ibid.
[26] Ibid.
[27] "A Report on Principles and Guidelines for Historic Preservation in the United States" in *Historic Preservation Today*. (Charlottesville: The University Press of Virginia, 1966), 244.
[28] Ibid.

As citizens became more aware of preservation, they realized their efforts at the local level were not enough to stop federal programs such as urban renewal and the interstate highway system of the 1950 - 60s from destroying the historic fabric and character of communities across the country. Due to the high destruction rate of historic buildings and districts from these federal programs, it became obvious that a national preservation policy was needed to connect the efforts of the federal government with the private sector.

Prior to the twentieth century, preservation efforts mainly resided in the private sector, and the federal government had minimum involvement. Earlier federal preservation efforts primarily focused on the preservation of land and natural features such as Yellowstone National Park (1872) and Civil War battlefields like the Chickamauga Battlefield in Georgia (1890).[29] The first federal action for the preservation of buildings occurred in 1889 with the Congressional designation of the Casa Grande ruin in Arizona as a National Monument and it set the precedent for allocating funding for preservation of a site.[30]

Other important federal actions were undertaken in the early-twentieth century, beginning with the passage of the *Antiquities Act* of 1906. The act transferred responsibility of preservation efforts to the President by giving him the authority to designate landmarks, structures and objects of historic or scientific interest located on federal lands as well as establishing penalties for destroying federally-owned sites.[31] 1916 saw the creation of the National Park Service within the Department of the Interior to administer the national parks including historical sites like James-

[29] National Park Service, *Yellowstone National Park*, 04 December 2008, Available from http://www.nps.gov/yell/; Internet; accessed 10 January 2009.; National Park Service, *Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park*, 10 January 2009, Available from http://www.nps.gov/chch/index.htm; Internet; accessed 10 January 2009.
[30] Alan Downer, "Native Americans and Historic Preservation" in *A Richer Heritage*. ed. Robert E. Stipe, (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2003), 408.
[31] National Park Service, *Antiquities Act of 1906*, Available from http://www.nps.gov/history/local-law/anti1906.htm; Internet; accessed 10 January 2009.

town and Yorktown.[32] The National Park Service would later emerge as the key office responsible for the administration of federal preservation programs. The last major federal action prior to the 1960s was the adoption of the 1935 *Historic Sites and Buildings Act.* The act was signed into law to create "a national policy to preserve for public use historic sites, buildings and objects of national significance for the inspiration and benefit of the people of the United States."[33] The act provided the Secretary of the Interior and in turn the National Park Service with the following responsibilities:

- Collect and preserve historic data such as drawings, plans, photographs;
- Survey historic and archaeological sites, buildings and objects that possess exceptional value of commemorating or illustrating the history of the United States;
- Investigations and research related to historic resources;
- Acquire properties of historical significance;
- Contract and cooperate with States, municipal subdivisions, corporations, associations, or individuals, to protect, preserve, maintain, or operate any historic or archaeological building, site, object;
- Restore, reconstruct, rehabilitate, preserve, and maintain historic or prehistoric sites, buildings, objects, and properties of national historical or archaeological significance;
- Erect markers or monuments to commemorate historic or prehistoric places and events of national historical or archaeological significance;

[32] Norman Tyler, Ilene R. Tyler and Ted J. Ligibel, *Historic Preservation: An Introduction to its History, Principles and Practices* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1999), 35.
[33] National Park Service, *Historic Sites and Building Act of 1935*, Available from http://www.nps.gov/history/local-law/FHPL_HistSites.pdf; Internet; accessed 10 January 2009.

- Operate and manage historic and archaeological sites, buildings, and properties acquired; and
- Develop educational programs.

Although the *Historic Sites and Buildings Act* was considered a national preservation policy, it did not include the preservation efforts of the private sector. Therefore, in the 1960s citizens pushed for legislation that would incorporate the principles of the *Historic Sites and Buildings Act* and strengthen the relationship between federal and private efforts.

A series of important events occurred, leading to the creation of a new national policy in 1966, and that also influenced the thought behind the framework of the legislation. First, in September 1963 a group of citizens met in Williamsburg, Virginia for a three-day seminar with the purpose to "review the history of American preservation (including its European background), to analyze its philosophical basis, examine its present effectiveness, and to discuss ideal ways to shape its future."[34]

The seminar was sponsored by the National Trust for Historic Preservation (a quasi-pubic organization formed in 1949 with the main objective of connecting the preservation efforts of the federal government with the efforts of the private sector) and Colonial Williamsburg.[35] The proceedings of the seminar produced several areas of concern and included the following: the federal government should be more involved in preservation efforts similar to Europe; there is a lack of basic information such as architectural histories and handbooks on preservation techniques and the practice of rehabilitation, and historic districts are significant aspects of preservation.[36]

[34] "Preface" in *Historic Preservation Today* (Charlottesville: The University Press of Virginia, 1966), v.
[35] Norman Tyler, Ilene R. Tyler and Ted J. Ligibel, *Historic Preservation: An Introduction to its History, Principles and Practices* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1999), 42.
[36] "Preface" in *Historic Preservation Today* (Charlottesville: The University Press of Virginia, 1966), vi.

Overall, the seminar initiated the examination of the past, present and future preservation movement of the United States.

The second event occurred at an international level in 1964 with the adoption of the *Venice Charter, International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites.* This charter, drafted by an international committee, developed principles to recognize the common responsibility to safeguard historic monuments and sites for future generations and "hand them on in the full richness of their authenticity."[37] With the adoption of the charter, guiding principles for preservation were agreed upon on an international basis. Those guiding principles including but were not limited to: the utilization of historic buildings for a social purpose; the importance of the preservation of historic fabric; and the differentiation of new and old.[38] Perhaps the most important aspect of the charter, was the notion that "each country being responsible for applying a plan with the framework of its own culture and traditions".[39] It should be noted that the charter was developed by a specific group know as the International Congress of Architects and Technicians of Historic Monuments. Though there was no American participation or representation, the charter influenced preservation philosophy in the United States through its guiding principles.[40]

Within the same year of the Venice Charter, the United States formed the Special Committee on Historic Preservation consisting of individuals employed at all levels of government.[41] The committee, consisting of members of the United States Conference of Mayors, investigated the different aspects of preservation and published their findings in 1966 in a report

[37] ICOMOS, *Venice Charter*, 12 January 1996, Available from http://www.icomos.org/venice_charter.html; Internet; accessed 10 January 2009.
[38] Ibid.
[39] Ibid.
[40] Ibid.
[41] "Preface" in *Historic Preservation Today* (Charlottesville: The University Press of Virginia, 1966), xv.

titled, *With Heritage So Rich.*[42] The report primarily outlined the heritage that had been lost and proposed solutions to ensure the protection and preservation of our heritage for future generations. The solutions were dependent upon an increased role in preservation by the federal government and included the following:

1. Creation of a National Register accompanied by a comprehensive survey of buildings, sites, structures, districts, and objects historically and architecturally significant;
2. Partnerships between federal, state and local governments to handle preservation activities including the establishment of a national advisory council and the designation of preservation officers in every state; and
3. Financial incentives for preservation.[43]

As Fowler explains in *A Richer Heritage,* "the authors of *With Heritage So Rich* proposed a federal leadership role embodied in a series of innovative measures that formed the essential framework of today's program."[44] The findings of the Special Committee on Historic Preservation along with the 1963 seminar in Williamsburg and the creation of the Venice Charter facilitated the creation of the framework for our current national preservation policy.

The preservation movement in the United States reached a new stage with the adoption of the *National Historic Preservation Act* signed into law by President Lyndon B. Johnson on October 15, 1966. The act greatly altered the structure of preservation programs and efforts as well as the way preservation is thought of, and who is involved in the preservation process.[45]

---

[42] Ibid.
[43] "Recommendations" in *With Heritage So Rich,* eds. Albert Rains and Laurance G. Henderson, (New York: Random House Inc., 1966), 208 – 211.
[44] John M. Fowler, "The Federal Preservation Program" in *A Richer Heritage*. ed. Robert E. Stipe, (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2003), 35.
[45] Norman Tyler, Ilene R. Tyler and Ted J. Ligibel, *Historic Preservation: An Introduction to its History, Principles and Practices* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1999), 50.

The *National Historic Preservation Act* included the solutions presented in *With Heritage So Rich* and expanded upon the partnerships between federal, state, tribal and local governments and the private sector, as well as the various programs that help facilitate preservation activities at all levels of government. In essence, the act established preservation as an integral part of society and ensured the preservation of resources with national, state and local significance for the enjoyment of future generations. Below is a summation of the major provisions in the *National Historic Preservation Act*:

- Creation of the National Register;
- Encouraged locally regulated historic districts;
- Authorized enabling legislation to fund preservation efforts;
- Establishment of State Historic Preservation Offices and decentralization of preservation movement through the transfer of funding and responsibility for preservation activities to the states;
- Establishment of Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and creates a liaison with other federal programs;
- Creates a system of federal review and mitigation of damage by Federal actions, commonly referred to as Section 106 Review; and
- Defined federal preservation programs that would rely on voluntary cooperation of private owners of historic properties.

Since its adoption the *National Historic Preservation Act* has been amended several times to accommodate changes in preservation practice, including a 1980 amendment to strengthen the partnership with local governments through the creation of certified local governments, and the

establishment of the Section 110 duties of federal agencies requiring the survey and identification of historic resources.

The *National Historic Preservation Act* continues today to operate as the national preservation policy by providing a framework for federal, state and local preservation activities. The basis of the framework is one in which the federal government provides the overall superstructure of preservation programs, funding and financial incentives, and primarily ensures consistency of preservation theory and practice. State governments encourage, advise and assist local preservation efforts, and more importantly, provide a link between localities and the federal government. The local government is where actual preservation and protection occurs through regulations and the creation of legal ordinances.[46] As a note, legal ordinances are adopted under State enabling legislation which allows local governments to exercise the State's 'authority' for protection of historic resources. Ultimately the authority remains at the State level, where the State can decide to keep that authority or, in the majority of cases, pass the authority on to local governments.

Perhaps the most significant contribution of the *National Historic Preservation Act* was the establishment of the National Register. Just as the previous phases of the preservation movement influenced the *National Historic Preservation Act* legislation, the major elements of the National Register stem from the evolution of preservation theory in the United States and Europe. For instance, inclusion on the National Register is based on the historical and architectural value of a resource as well as its historic fabric and physical integrity; thus, the National Register is ultimately an accumulation of the experiences and ideas of past preservationists in Europe and America in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The end result is a list that until the twenty-

[46] Ibid., 54-55.

first century addressed the Euro-centric history of the United States rather than accommodating the diversity of the ‘actual history’ of the United States.

CHAPTER 3

PRESERVATION OF AFRICAN-AMERICAN HERITAGE

"*Preservation and interpretation of the Nation's ethnic roots reminds us that cultural diversity was and remains a significant factor in our national experience."*

~ Antoinette Lee[47]

In conjunction with the development of a broad preservation movement in the United States, a more specialized preservation movement developed to preserve the heritage and historic resources of a particular cultural group. Preservation of African-American resources emerged in the 1960s. The social and political environments of the times, expressed by the Civil Rights Movement, contributed to the heightened awareness of African-American resources. Developments in historical research, and interpretation and the uniting of cultural groups interested in their heritage allowed the movement to evolve.[48]

Prior to the 1960s, the heritage of minority groups comprised a small and barely visible part of the overall preservation movement as the majority of early preservation projects focused on the European heritage of the United States.[49] African-Americans emerged as leaders for the preservation of resources associated with minority groups in the 1960s due to their greater involvement in the politics of the nation.[50] Through the early efforts of the African-American preservation movement, both the private and public sectors recognized the importance of the preservation of African-American historic resources but also the preservation of the cultural diversity

[47] Antoinette J. Lee, "Cultural Diversity and Historic Preservation," CRM, 15 (1992): 2.
[48] Ibid., 1.
[49] Antoinette J. Lee, "Discovering Old Cultures in the New World: Role of Ethnicity" in *The American Mosaic, Preserving a Nation's Heritage.* ed. Robert E. Stipe and Antoinette J. Lee, (Washington, D.C.: US/ICOMOS, 1987), 188.
[50] Antoinette J. Lee, "The Social and Ethnic Dimensions of Historic Preservation" in *A Richer Heritage*. ed. Robert E. Stipe, (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2003), 396.

of the United States. Similar to the broader preservation movement in the United States, the African-American preservation movement is marked by key events, individuals and organizations that assisted in the development of preservation thought and programs associated with African-American heritage.

The first event significant to the preservation of African-American resources occurred in the early 1900s with the Congressional allocation of $100,000 for the construction of a 'Negro Building' at the Jamestown Exposition of 1907.[51] The building was designed by African-American architect, and graduate of the Tuskegee Institute, W. Sydney Pittman.[52] The exhibition also included a sculpture of Africans landing at Jamestown.[53] The significance of this action goes beyond the walls of the 'Negro Building'.

The Jamestown Expo was the celebration of the 300th anniversary of the first permanent English settlement in the New World, a settlement that included white Europeans and Africans. Prior to 1907 the Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities, a non-profit organization in charge of the Jamestown settlement, refused to recognize the African heritage of Jamestown and their guidelines mirrored the Jim Crow segregation of the times in which "negro excursions or picnic parties are not admitted."[54] The organization went even further by clearly stating that Jamestown was a "shrine for white America" in their explanation for denying the request by J.M. Gandy, President of Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute in Petersburg, for a monument on Jamestown to honor the first black immigrants.[55] Therefore, the construction of a 'Negro Building' at the Jamestown Expo, and indeed a sculpture depicting the arrival of the first black

[51] James M. Lindgren, *Preserving the Old Dominion* (Charlottesville: The University of Virginia Press, 1993), 124.
[52] Ibid.
[53] Ibid.
[54] Ibid., 110.
[55] Ibid.

immigrants was a significant step towards the recognition of African-American heritage in the United States.

The next several decades saw little development in the preservation of African-American resources. The federal government through the National Park Service led early efforts with the acquisition of several important African-American sites. In 1943, the National Park Service added the first property associated with African-American history to the national park system with the creation of the George Washington Carver National Monument in Diamond, Missouri.[56] The national monument marks the birthplace of a significant African-American educator and agricultural researcher responsible for the creation of 325 agricultural products including peanuts and sweet potatoes.[57] The National Park Service acquired another property in 1956 establishing the Booker T. Washington National Monument in Hardy, Virginia.[58] The monument honors the birthplace of Booker T. Washington, the founder and first principal of the Tuskegee Institute.[59] The final acquisition prior to 1966 was the Frederick Douglas home in Washington, D.C. in 1962 as a national historic site.[60] The site differed from the earlier acquisitions as it was located in a major urban area and afforded the National Park Service with an opportunity to educate the public on African-American history.[61]

---

[56]Antoinette J. Lee, "The Social and Ethnic Dimensions of Historic Preservation" in *A Richer Heritage*. ed. Robert E. Stipe, (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2003), 386.; Antoinette J. Lee, "Discovering Old Cultures in the New World: Role of Ethnicity" in *The American Mosaic, Preserving a Nation's Heritage.* ed. Robert E. Stipe and Antoinette J. Lee, (Washington, D.C.: US/ICOMOS, 1987), 192.

[57] Iowa State University, *The Legacy of George Washington Carver*, 01 March 2007, Available from http://www.lib.iastate.edu/spcl/gwc/bio.html ; Internet; accessed 20 January 2009.

[58] Antoinette J. Lee, "The Social and Ethnic Dimensions of Historic Preservation" in *A Richer Heritage*. ed. Robert E. Stipe, (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2003), 386.

[59] Tuskegee Institute is one of the first African-American colleges in the United States established in 1881. Tuskegee University, *History of Tuskegee University*, 2009, Available from http://www.tuskegee.edu/Global/story.asp?S=1070392; Internet; accessed 20 January 2009.

[60]Antoinette J. Lee, "Discovering Old Cultures in the New World: Role of Ethnicity" in *The American Mosaic, Preserving a Nation's Heritage.* ed. Robert E. Stipe and Antoinette J. Lee, (Washington, D.C.: US/ICOMOS, 1987), 192.

[61] Ibid.

The National Park Service continued throughout the twentieth century to identify important sites in African-American history and bestow their highest designations as well as assume management of these sites. In 1972 the National Park Service funded a survey of historic sites associated with African-American history with the objective of increasing the number of National Historic Landmarks related to African-American history.[62] The survey resulted in the addition of 85 properties representing important residences, schools, community buildings and neighborhoods.[63] The Dexter Avenue Baptist Church in Montgomery, Alabama associated with the civil rights efforts of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. was one building added due to the survey.[64] In 1974 the National Park Service acquired the Tuskegee Institute National Historic Site and even more importantly Congress authorized funding for the restoration of the George Washington Carver museum, 'The Oaks' (home of Booker T. Washington), 'Grey Columns' (President's home) and several buildings located on the historic campus.[65] As a professor of architecture at Tuskegee proclaimed, "[the acquisition was] a giant step toward bringing black contributions into the mainstream of the nation's preservation movement."[66]

Through the early efforts of the National Park Service, the American public was exposed to African-American heritage, and the Civil Rights movement further facilitated the recognition of African-American contributions in all aspects of American society. In 1976 America celebrated its bicentennial affording an opportunity for the country to celebrate its diverse character. The bicentennial acted as the kick-off event for the preservation African-American resources in the private sector as numerous exhibits and local history studies were developed.[67] Also, in 1976

[62] Ibid.
[63] Ibid.
[64] Ibid.
[65] Ibid.
[66] Ibid.
[67] Antoinette J. Lee, *Past Meets Future: Saving America's Historic Environments* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1993), 94.

Alex Haley's book *Roots* was published, subsequently a television series, which stirred interest in African-American genealogy and local history.[68] After 1976, the preservation of African-American resources was increasingly initiated not by the federal government but by citizens eager to explore their heritage.

A notable example of an effort undertaken by private individuals occurred prior to the 1970s in a neighborhood of Brooklyn, New York. This section of Brooklyn was once the home of a thriving, self sufficient early-nineteenth century African-American community called Weeksville. However, due to the construction of new roads and buildings little remained from the original community by the 1950s. In the 1960s, James Hurley conducted a workshop on Brooklyn neighborhoods with the Pratt Neighborhood College, focused on Weeksville.[69] The group found little information, but Hurley continued his research by enlisting the aid of a pilot, Joseph Haynes, to search for signs of the original community from the air.[70] From the air, they discovered an "oddly situated lane with four run-down wood frame houses set back from the street and behind an overgrown yard."[71] Their discovery yielded the only existing remnants of the Weeksville community and initiated a grassroots effort to save the buildings from a bulldozer driven by urban renewal.

With a race against time, the neighborhood rallied together with the purpose of preserving the four buildings to "educate and instill a sense of continuity of culture to those who lived in the neighborhood."[72] The neighborhood was successful in saving the buildings from demolition

---

[68] Antoinette J. Lee, "The Social and Ethnic Dimensions of Historic Preservation" in *A Richer Heritage*. ed. Robert E. Stipe, (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2003), 386.
[69] Weeksville Heritage Center, *Historic Weeksville*, Available from http://www.weeksvillesociety.org/node/3; Internet; accessed 20 January 2009.
[70] Ibid.
[71] Ibid.
[72] Antoinette J. Lee, "Discovering Old Cultures in the New World: Role of Ethnicity" in *The American Mosaic, Preserving a Nation's Heritage.* ed. Robert E. Stipe and Antoinette J. Lee, (Washington, D.C.: US/ICOMOS, 1987), 190.

and with community labor and money rehabilitated the buildings into house museums "furnished to interpret Black life as it was in the mid-1800s, early 1900s and early 1930s."[73] The residents also established the Society for the Preservation of Weeksville and Bedford-Stuyvesant History in 1968, which is today referred to as the Weeksville Heritage Center. The Society's mission was "to preserve the historic fabric of the neighborhood" and since the 1970s the organization has expanded to include programs in education, research and historic preservation.[74] Additionally, the efforts of the residents led to the designation of the four houses, known as the Hunterfly Road Houses, as New York City landmarks in 1970 and inclusion on the National Register in 1971 and 1972.[75]

Throughout the later half of the twentieth century, the private and public sector continued to preserve African-American heritage through the creation of non-profit organizations, the development of black heritage trails and the establishment of African-American museums, study centers and institutes. For instance, in Los Angeles, California citizens developed a nonprofit organization, Power of Place, which created an exhibit in a parking garage on the site of the home of Billy Mason, a former African-American slave who sued for her freedom in 1856.[76] Other nonprofits formed on a more national and regional basis such as the African American Museum Association (1978), the National Association for African American Historic Preservation (1995) and at a regional level the Southeast Regional African American Preservation Alliance (1995). In addition to the creation of nonprofits, groups joined together to voice their concerns within the

[73] Weeksville Heritage Center, *Historic Weeksville*, Available from http://www.weeksvillesociety.org/node/3; Internet; accessed 20 January 2009.
[74] Ibid.; Antoinette J. Lee, "Discovering Old Cultures in the New World: Role of Ethnicity" in *The American Mosaic, Preserving a Nation's Heritage.* ed. Robert E. Stipe and Antoinette J. Lee, (Washington, D.C.: US/ICOMOS, 1987), 190.
[75] Weeksville Heritage Center, *Historic Weeksville*, Available from http://www.weeksvillesociety.org/node/3; Internet; accessed 20 January 2009.
[76] Diane Lea, "America's Preservation Ethos: A Tribute to Enduring Ideals" in *A Richer Heritage*. ed. Robert E. Stipe, (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2003), 16.

mainstream preservation field. For example, annual meetings of the Conference on Historic Preservation and the Minority Community were held from 1979 to 1982 to address the following topics: the preservation of African-American churches, economic development, housing strategies, rehabilitation techniques and oral history.[77]

As the importance of African-American culture and history emerged in the mainstream preservation field, existing historic sites began to re-interpret their histories to include African-American contributions. For example, the National Park Service integrated information about slavery in their interpretations at their Civil War battlefields. Perhaps the most significant re-interpretation occurred at Colonial Williamsburg. In the mid-1980s, Colonial Williamsburg invested in research and interpretive planning to incorporate the story of slavery into their depiction of a nineteenth century city. They started with the reconstruction of slave quarters at Carter's Grove depicting slave life with African-American interpreters.[78] Over the years, Colonial Williamsburg integrated all aspects of African-American life into their interpretation of the city and even held its first re-enactment of a slave auction in 1994.[79]

Along with the private sector, the federal government continued their efforts in the 1980s and 1990s with the establishment of preservation programs and a continuation of survey efforts. For instance, in 1990 Congress directed the National Park Service to study the best way to commemorate and interpret the Underground Railroad.[80] From the study, the committee discovered that in order to properly protect and interpret the Underground Railroad, partnerships must be

---

[77]Antoinette J. Lee, "Discovering Old Cultures in the New World: Role of Ethnicity" in *The American Mosaic, Preserving a Nation's Heritage.* ed. Robert E. Stipe and Antoinette J. Lee, (Washington, D.C.: US/ICOMOS, 1987), 198.

[78]Antoinette J. Lee, "The Social and Ethnic Dimensions of Historic Preservation" in *A Richer Heritage*. ed. Robert E. Stipe, (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2003), 400.

[79] Cary Carson, "Colonial Williamsburg and the Practice of Interpretive Planning in American History Museum, *Public Historian*, 20, no. 3 (1998), 11.

[80] National Park Service, *Underground Railroad: Special Resources Study*, 12 February 1998, Available from http://www.nps.gov/undergroundrr/ugsum.htm ; Internet; accessed 23 January 2009.

formed between federal, state, and local governments as well as involvement from the private sector.[81] As a result of the study findings, the *National Underground Railroad Network to Freedom Act* of 1998 was established to direct the National Park Service to develop, "a program that tells the story of resistance against the institution of slavery in the United States through escape and flight."[82] The program is not centralized and relies on partnerships and the involvement of various governments and organizations.[83] The role of the National Park Service is to coordinate preservation and educational efforts nationwide "to integrate local historical sites, museums, and interpretive programs associated with the Underground Railroad into a mosaic of community, regional, and national stories."[84]

Additionally, in the 1980s government agencies including the National Park Service and the individual State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPO) as well as private organizations increased survey efforts through a number of architectural surveys and survey publications associated with African-American sites. Survey manuals like Carole Merritt's *Historic Black Resources: A Handbook for the Identification, Documentation, and Evaluation of Historic African-American Properties in Georgia* (1984) developed by the Georgia SHPO facilitated the survey process and surveys of African-American sites became more commonplace like the social institutions of the black community of Columbia, Missouri or the ethnic and racial minority settlement of Arkansas.[85] Furthermore, SHPOs realized a need to increase minority involvement in preservation in order to increase the number of National Register listings and ensure the docu-

---

[81] Ibid.
[82] National Park Service, *National Underground Railroad: Network to Freedom*, Available from http://www.nps.gov/history/ugrr/about.htm; Internet; accessed 23 January 2009.
[83] National Archives, *Underground Railroad Education and Preservation Initiative*, Available from http://clinton4.nara.gov/textonly/Initiatives/OneAmerica/Practices/pp_19980901.4521.html; Internet, accessed 23 January 2009.
[84] National Park Service, *National Underground Railroad: Network to Freedom*, Available from http://www.nps.gov/history/ugrr/about.htm; Internet; accessed 23 January 2009.
[85] Antoinette J. Lee, "The Social and Ethnic Dimensions of Historic Preservation" in *A Richer Heritage*. ed. Robert E. Stipe, (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2003), 389.

mentation of significant African-American sites. In order to facilitate minority involvement, several SHPOs formed affiliated statewide volunteer organizations in the 1980s like the Black Heritage Council of Alabama and the Minority Heritage Preservation Committee, today known as the Georgia African American Historic Preservation Network (GAAHPN).[86] These organizations assist the SHPOs with promoting the preservation of African-American resources through research and documentation of African-American sites as well as educational programs and preservation initiatives.

Although the preservation of African-American resources is a movement originating in the early-twentieth century, the efforts of the public and private sectors have enabled the preservation of African-American resources to be a frontrunner in the broader preservation movement. At the beginning of the broader preservation movement, the preservation field concentrated on European heritage as evident by the 1966 publication, *With Heritage So Rich*, which largely ignored historic resources significant to minority cultural groups.[87] However, today the field recognizes the cultural diversity of the United States and in the words of Antoinette Lee, "preservationists are more concerned with ensuring that cultural groups enunciate what resources are important to them, how the resources should be protected and who should be empowered with the management of the resources."[88]

[86] Ibid.
[87] Ibid. African-Americans and other minority cultural groups are barely mentioned throughout the text and in the Table of Contents.
[88] Antoinette J Lee, "Cultural Diversity and Historic Preservation," CRM, 15 (1992): 1.

CHAPTER 4

NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES AND

AFRICAN-AMERICAN HERITAGE

"America's historic places embody our unique spirit, character and identity."
- National Park Service, 2002[89]

Framework of the National Register

The establishment of the National Register was authorized under the *National Historic Preservation Act* of 1966 as part of a national preservation program designed to coordinate and support public and private efforts to identify, evaluate and protect historic resources. The National Register acts as the cornerstone for the national preservation program defining the scope of the nation's heritage and establishing criteria for evaluating historic resources. It is the principal step in the preservation process, providing a means to systematically locate, document and evaluate historic resources. The National Register is administered by the National Park Service under the Secretary of the Interior. Initially the register was compiled from several preexisting lists of historic places developed by the National Park Service, most notably the National Historic Landmarks designated under the *Historic Sites Act* of 1935.[90] As governed by Section 101 (a)(1)(A) of the *National Historic Preservation Act*, the Secretary of the Interior is directed "to expand and maintain a National Register of Historic Places composed of districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects significant in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineer-

[89] *National Register Bulletin 15 How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation,* rev., (Washington D.C.: National Park Service, 1995), 1.
[90] Thomas King, *Cultural Resource Laws & Practice.* 3d ed., (New York: Alta Mira Press, 2008), 87.

ing, and culture".[91] Thus, a partnership between all levels of government and the private sector is formed to nominate properties of local, state and national significance to the register.

The nomination process to the national register is a methodical procedure that promotes consistency in preservation efforts throughout the nation. The nomination process occurs in five steps:

1) *Preparation of a nomination,* which can be prepared by anyone including local citizens, non-profit organizations, State Historic Preservation Offices, or federal agencies. Majority of nominations are then submitted to the State Historic Preservation Office, however tribal properties are submitted to the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer.
2) *Review of nomination by a state review board,* which is composed of professionals in fields related to preservation such as American history, architectural history, and archeology. The state review board makes a recommendation to the State Historic Preservation Officer either to approve or disapprove the nomination.
3) *Public comment period* notifies property owners and local authorities and afford them the opportunity to comment on the nomination. As a note this usually occurs at the same time as the state review of the nomination.
4) *Review of nomination by the National Park Service,* only if the State Historic Preservation Office recommends approving the nomination.
5) *Approval or disapproval by the National Park Service.* If approved, property is included on the National Register.

[91] Advisory Council for Historic Preservation, *National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended through 2006,* Available from http://www.achp.gov/docs/nhpa%202008-final.pdf; Internet; accessed 28 January 2009.

For the most part, the nomination process occurs at the state and federal government levels, but the process may incorporate the private sector in the first step through engagement of consultants; and in the second and third steps, with appointments of professionals and sometimes local citizens to state review boards, and with a required public comment period. However the decision to officially designate to the National Register is under federal government authority through government officials with the National Park Service.

In addition to the procedure for nominating a property, there is another process for determining if a property is eligible for the National Register. First and foremost, the property must be a tangible resource, in the form of a district, site, building, structure or object that is at least fifty years old. Secondly, the property must possess significance in American history, architecture, archeology, engineering, and culture at the national, state or local level. As part of its significance, the property has to meet at least one of the four National Register Criteria for Evaluation. The four criteria are as follows:

1) *Criterion A.* Properties associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or
2) *Criterion B.* Properties associated with the lives of significant persons in our past; or
3) *Criterion C.* Properties that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
4) *Criterion D.* Properties that have yielded or may be likely to yield, information important in history or prehistory.

The most important factor in determining the significance of a property is to consider the property within its historic context; only in this way can a property be properly judged and evaluated. As defined by the National Park Service, historic contexts "are those patterns or trends in history by which a specific occurrence, property, or site is understood and its meaning (ultimately its significance) within history or prehistory is made clear."[92] The concept of historic context is based on the perception that history does not occur in a vacuum but as part of larger trends and patterns.[93] Therefore, historic contexts address the following five areas:

1) The *area of significance* (local, state or national) that the facet of prehistory or history of the property represents;
2) The *significance of the property* and whether or not the facet of prehistory or history is significant;
3) If the type of property is relevant and important in *illustrating the historic context;*
4) *How the property illustrates* the facet of prehistory or history; and
5) The *physical features* of the property are intact to convey the facet of prehistory or history with which it is associated.

Overall, these five areas assists in establishing the theme of the significance (i.e. American history, architecture, archaeology), the place or location of the significance (i.e. level of significance such as national, state or local), and the period of significance for a property – all essential factors in determining the significance of a property as related to the Criteria for Evaluation.

One type of property that is fairly new to the National Register is a traditional cultural property (TCP), which places emphasis on a property's cultural significance. TCPs appeared in the 1980 amendments to the *National Historic Preservation Act* of 1966 directing the Secretary

[92] *National Register Bulletin 15 How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation,* rev., (Washington D.C.: National Park Service, 1995), 7.
[93] Ibid.

of the Interior, together with the American Folklife Center at the Library of Congress, to study means of "preserving and conserving the intangible elements of our cultural heritage such as arts, skills, folklife, and folkways. . ." and recommending ways to "preserve, conserve, and encourage the continuation of the diverse traditional prehistoric, historic, ethnic, and folk cultural traditions that underlie and are a living expression of our American heritage."[94] One means of preservation was the inclusion of TCPs on the National Register.

> For the purposes of the National Register, the National Park Service defines a TCP as:
>
> one that is eligible for inclusion in the National Register because of its association with cultural practices or beliefs of a living community that (a) are rooted in that community's history, and (b) are important in maintaining the continuing cultural identity of the community.[95]

In general, the creation of TCPs recognizes the value of intangible heritage only when associated with a tangible resource. The *National Register Bulletin #38 Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Traditional Cultural Properties*, points out that: "it should be clearly recognized at the outset that the National Register does not include intangible resources themselves. The entity evaluated must be a tangible property--that is, a district, site, building, structure, or object."[96] Additionally, the TCP must meet at least one of the four Criteria for Evaluation discussed above. An example of a TCP is the Tahquitz Canyon in southern California, which is associated with the spirit Tahquitz, who according to traditions of the Cahuilla tribe is a powerful shaman that descends from a cave in the canyon in the form of a blue comet to devour people's souls.[97] The Tahquitz Canyon is also where the Cahuilla people believe their ancestors emerged from a lower

---

[94] Patricia L. Parker and Thomas F. King, *National Register Bulletin 38 Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Traditional Cultural Properties*, National Park Service, Available from http://www.nps.gov/history/nr/publications/bulletins/nrb38/nrb38%20introduction.htm ; Internet; accessed 10 February 2009.
[95] Ibid.
[96] Ibid.
[97] Thomas King, *Cultural Resource Laws & Practice.* 3d ed., (New York: Alta Mira Press, 2008), 91.

world.[98] For these reasons, the Tahquitz Canyon is an important intangible resource for the Cahuilla tribe. Due to the significant intangible associations of the canyon as well as the tangible resources including rock art, house pits, foundations, irrigation ditches, dams, reservoirs, trails, and food preparation areas, the canyon is a traditional cultural property that represents the Cahuilla tribe's settlement and heritage.[99]

The final factor in eligibility is integrity. Integrity, according to the National Park Service, "is the ability of a property to convey its significance."[100] The evaluation of integrity is one part of the National Register process that can be a subjective judgment, but to make the decision more objective the National Park Service recognizes seven qualities that help define integrity. The seven qualities are as follows: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. In order to retain integrity a property should possess several of the aspects, but not necessarily all. However the *National Register Bulletin #15 How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation* states, "Because feeling and association depend on individual perceptions, their retention alone is never sufficient to support eligibility of a property for the National Register."[101] The qualities focus primarily on a property's physical features and the retention of its historic fabric. In general, the rule of thumb for integrity is usually posed in the question, "would someone from the property's period of significance recognize it?" If the answer is yes, the property has integrity.

Through the nomination and eligibility processes, the National Park Service continues to strive to expand and maintain "the official list of the Nation's historic places worthy of preserva-

[98] Thomas F. King, *Places that Count, Traditional Cultural Properties in Cultural Resources Management.* (Maryland: Alta Mira Press, 2003), 141.
[99] California Preservation Foundation, *Mobile Workshop- Tahquitz Canyon: "Walk in the Footsteps of Our Ancestors,* Available from http://www.californiapreservation.org/PDFs/2009_LocalCharacterTrack.pdf.; Internet; Accessed 01 March 2009.
[100] *National Register Bulletin 15 How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation,* rev., (Washington D.C.: National Park Service, 1995), 44.
[101] Ibid., 45.

tion."[102] The list includes a vast number of resources as well as a wide range of properties, such as all historic areas contained in the National Park System, all National Historic Landmarks and national, state and local properties.[103] Although its intention's were to create "a more comprehensive catalog of the nation's heritage", and while it is a broad list, the National Register has fallen short in regard to properties illustrating and interpreting the diverse culture of the United States.[104] In the 2004 *Cultural Heritage Needs Assessment: Phase I*, the National Park Service recognized this shortfall by stating, "minority participation in heritage programs has been limited, and the picture of American history presented by officially designated sites understates the diversity of the nation's actual history."[105]

Diversifying the National Register

"Historic preservation must represent every community."[106] These words were spoken by United States Representative John Lewis in 1993 as he defended his sponsorship of the *African-American History Landmark Theme Study Act* in Congress.[107] He continued, "I believe that the National Park Service lacked adequate minority representation in its programs and historic

[102] *The National Register of Historic Places* (Washington, D.C.: National Park Service), 1.
[103] Ibid.
[104] John M. Fowler, "The Federal Preservation Program" in *A Richer Heritage*. ed. Robert E. Stipe, (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2003), 396.
[105] Ned Kaufman, *Cultural Heritage Needs Assessment: Phase I.* draft (Washington, D.C.: National Park Service, 2004), 1.
[106] John Lewis, "Keeping Our African-American Heritage Alive," *Historic Preservation Forum* (January/February 1993): 1.
[107] John Lewis is an African-American serving as a U.S. Representative of Georgia's Fifth Congressional District since 1986. The African American History Landmark Theme Study Act was introduced in Senate in 1991 directing the Secretary of the Interior to "prepare a national historic landmark theme study on African American history" with the purpose of identifying "the key sites in the history and experience of Americans who trace their origins to Africa so that all Americans will gain a better understanding of American history." Library of Congress, *African American History Landmark Theme Study Act*, Available from http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/z?c102:S.639.IS; Internet; Accessed 19 February 2009.

sites."[108] Six years prior to his statement, there were 47, 000 entries in the National Register and only 1,260 of those were significant to ethnic groups – a mere 2.6% of National Register properties.[109] The 1980s census shows approximately 38 million people represented an ethnic group, composing 16.8% of the United States population.[110] The low ratio of National Register properties as related to the ethnic population of the United States provides a sound argument for Lewis' comment in 1993, and illustrates the National Register's lack of diversity.

The National Park Service recognized the need to diversify the national preservation program as evident by numerous thematic studies and cultural assessments related to minority groups developed in the past few decades. African-Americans have been the predominant cultural group of the National Park Service's efforts with eight thematic studies associated with African-American history conducted as part of the National Historic Landmarks program. The earliest study was conducted in 1974 with the *Black Americans in the United States;*, most recent, *American Civil Rights, Voting Rights* prepared in 2007. Through the National Historic Landmarks thematic studies, the National Park Service has been able to identify resources that are nationally significant in African-American history. Even though the National Historic Landmarks program is a separate entity from the National Register, all National Historic Landmarks are included in the National Register. Therefore the thematic studies have had a direct impact on the increase of properties associated with African-American history included on the register.

---

[108] John Lewis, "Keeping Our African-American Heritage Alive," *Historic Preservation Forum* (January/February 1993): 1.

[109] Antoinette J. Lee, "Discovering Old Cultures in the New World: Role of Ethnicity" in *The American Mosaic, Preserving a Nation's Heritage.* ed. Robert E. Stipe and Antoinette J. Lee, (Washington, D.C.: US/ICOMOS, 1987), 192. As a note, the 1980s United States Census shows that 16.8% of the population represented an ethnic group (38,174,183 people).

[110] Census Bureau, *Race and Hispanic Origin, for the United States, Regions, Divisions, and States: 1980*, 28 August 2008. Available from http://www.census.gov/population/www/documentation/twps0056/tabA-03.pdf; Internet; Accessed 4 February 2009.

Although the National Park Service has made efforts towards diversifying the register through surveys and research, the problem remains. Eleven years after Mr. Lewis' comment, a computer search of national register properties presented 823 resources out of 76,000 properties associated with African-Americans, one percent of all National Register properties in 2004.[111] As the number of national register properties increased, the lower level of properties representing minorities remained constant. Furthermore, an assessment of African American National Historic Landmarks published in 2008 determined that the current National Historic Landmarks reflect "a limited range of events, ideas, themes and significant individuals" and "the evaluated themes and existing National Historic Landmarks do not sufficiently represent recent scholarship in African American history."[112] The under-representation of African-American resources reoccurs in spite of National Park Service efforts to develop new programs such as the Cultural Resources Diversity Initiative in 1998, and the support of thematic studies throughout the last twenty years. However, as evident by the National Historic Landmark assessment discussed above, research and documentation alone may not be the answer, but rather modifications to the framework of the National Register may be needed.

Shortcomings of the National Register in the Preservation of African-American Resources

In this thesis, two aspects of the National Register are considered: 1) the nomination process and 2) the eligibility process. The nomination process is the intent to have the resource placed on the National Register; and the eligibility process determines if a resource is eligible for inclusion on the register, with reference to criteria for significance and integrity. In reviewing these processes, it becomes apparent that there are deficiencies in each process that place limita-

[111] Ned Kaufman, *Cultural Heritage Needs Assessment: Phase I.* draft (Washington, D.C.: National Park Service, 2004), 1. African-American resources are the predominant group as 33 properties are associated with Asian-Americans and 12 for Hispanic.
[112] *African American NHL Assessment Study.* (Washington D.C.: National Park Service, 2008), 2.

tions on the inclusion of resources significant to African-Americans. A weakness of the nomination process is that it is too complex, often making it difficult for the public to become engaged. Another weakness in the eligibility process is the criteria for evaluation and integrity; existing criteria do not allow for the recognition of intangible heritage, when it is not attached to a tangible resource as well as non-architecturally significant resources that lack integrity.

The deficiency of the nomination process is summed up by Thomas King, "the Register has become something that only professionals can understand, only specialists can influence."[113] Due to the bureaucratic nature of the process, it has become specialized to the point that only preservationists can decipher the process. *The Cultural Heritage Needs Assessment*: *Phase I* conducted in 2004 by the National Park Service explains it further by stating:

> As for preservation tools such as the National Register of Historic Places or local ordinances – measures that help protect historic places even though they do not provide interpretation or public access – the rules are complex and are not widely understood. Many respondents, even sophisticated ones, did not know how to use them; some did not know they existed. Neither, of course, do most citizens of European descent.[114]

The complexity of the nomination process causes the public to disengage from the process, which results in nominations that are rarely initiated and/or implemented by local citizens or community groups. This is problematic primarily because the National Register was not designed for preservationists, but rather for the American people. It should be a tool that allows all Americans to determine the resources they believe are significant in illustrating and interpreting their heritage and the heritage of the nation as a whole. Even though the complexity of the nomination process creates problems in general preservation activities related to the register, it is particularly inadequate in addressing resources associated with African-Americans.

---

[113] Thomas King, *Cultural Resource Laws & Practice.* 3d ed., (New York: Alta Mira Press, 2008), 106.
[114] Ned Kaufman, *Cultural Heritage Needs Assessment: Phase I.* draft (Washington, D.C.: National Park Service, 2004), 28.

It is generally considered that most people engaged in preservation in the United States are Caucasian with a European heritage. Although there are no statistics on the race and cultural backgrounds of preservationists, National Park Service consultant Michele Gates Moresi in 2004 observed, "African Americans are not fully integrated into the professional field, not 'main-streamed' if you will."[115] This is also evident with the establishment of the National Park Service Cultural Diversity Program in 1998 to "increase the number of individuals representing all the nation's cultural and ethnic groups in professional jobs in this field, as historians, archeologists, historical architects, ethnographers, historical landscape architects, and curators."[116] Since the majority of preservationists do not represent the African-American cultural group, it is difficult for them to determine what resources are significant for their association with African-American history and culture. As eighteenth century philosopher David Hume states,

> a thousand different sentiments, excited by the same object, are all right; because no sentiment represents what is really in the object…Beauty is no quality in things themselves: it exists merely in the mind which contemplates them; and each mind perceives a different beauty.[117]

As related to preservation, only the cultural group in which the resource was created and cultivated can truly perceive its historical significance (beauty). For example, Robert Weyeneth in his article, "The Architecture of Racial Segregation: The Challenges of Preserving the Problematic Past," coins the term 'invisibility'.[118] Invisibility is the inability to recognize something even when it is extant; he gives the example of signage from the Jim Crow era. A sign originally depicting the 'colored entrance' to a building today is transformed into an emergency exit sign. If a person was not familiar with the Jim Crow era, they might not have noticed the original signage.

---

[115] Ibid., 14.
[116] National Park Service, Cultural Resources Diversity Program, Available from http://www.nps.gov/history/crdi/description/prgm.htm; Internet; Accessed 6 February 2009.
[117] David Hume,"Of the Standard of Taste," in *Of the Standard of Taste and Other Essays*, ed. John Lenz (Indianapolis, IN: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc, 1965), 6.
[118] Robert R. Weyeneth, "The Architecture of Racial Segregation: The Challenges of Preserving the Problematic Past." *Public Historian* 27, no. 4 (Fall 2005): 39.

Weyenth explains that invisibility is "rooted in the age of the observer and the specifics of a locality" and continues by stating that "not being alive in a community at the time handicaps one's eyes for the traces."[119] These principles of invisibility can be applied to the nomination process of the National Register in which preservationists not of African-American descendant may not recognize the traces of African-American heritage. Therefore, due to the lack of representation of African-Americans in the preservation field, the nomination process must involve the active participation of people from this cultural group to ensure their heritage is properly understood and reflected on the National Register.

The Raleigh Historic Districts Commission, comprised of local citizens in Raleigh, North Carolina, recognized that only a handful of its 70 local historic landmarks were designated for their African-American significance in 1984.[120] The commission was concerned by this fact because African-Americans represented 27% of the city's population. In order to create a more balance representation of the community's diverse heritage, the commission developed partnerships with African-American community leaders throughout the 1980s and 1990s and ensured that their commission would have at least three minority representatives. As a result, oral histories of residents and an architectural survey identified and documented eight traditionally African-American communities.[121] Through their efforts, the nomination process was returned to the citizenry as they solicited the input of African-American community members as to what resources they valued and what resources should be nominated to the National Register.

The other deficiency of the National Register pertains to the eligibility process in which a strong emphasis is placed on tangible resources and the retention of historic fabric. Although the

[119] Ibid.
[120] Dan Becker, "Reflecting Community Diversity at the Local Level," *Forum Journal* (Spring 2004): 28.
[121] National Park Service, *Raleigh: A Capital City, A National Register of Historic Places Travel Itinerary,* Available from http://www.nps.gov/nr/travel/raleigh/preservation.htm; Internet; accessed 23 February 2009.

theory behind this emphasis is deeply rooted in our preservation movement, and it does enable a more objective approach to eligibility, it places limitations on the inclusion of resources significant to African-Americans. The limitations appear in two categories: first is intangible heritage that may not be connected to a tangible resource. For instance, the Gullah/Geechee Cultural Heritage Corridor, comprised of the coastal regions of South Carolina, North Carolina, Georgia and Florida, focuses on the preservation of the Gullah/Geechee culture. The tangible resources are not the most significant aspect of the Gullah/Geechee culture, but rather the intangible resources such as their language, folklore, arts, crafts and music.[122] If these intangible resources are not associated with a tangible resource, they will not be eligible for inclusion on the National Register since the existing framework does not accommodate stand-alone intangible resources. Another example not related specifically to the African-Americans, but still relevant, is a situation in the Marshall Islands; in the indigenous culture, a coral head sticking out in the lagoon "has a far greater spiritual and historical importance than any building the foreigners call 'historical', primarily because of its connections to the group's oral traditions.[123] In this case, the intangible resources have more value to the cultural group than tangible resources.

The second category pertains to the physical integrity of a resource. There are two important aspects to this category – the cultural layering of a building, and the value of the building to the community. Cultural layering refers to the continued use of a building throughout different time periods and different users/occupants. It is best described as "just as each successive occupant leaves an imprint on a house, people responding to their personal needs and to society's

[122] "Telling the World Our Unique Heritage." Gullah/Geechee Cultural Heritage Corridor, Cultural Management Plan Posters. Gullah/Geechee Cultural Heritage Corridor Commission.
[123] Antoinette J. Lee, "Cultural Diversity in Historic Preservation." *Historic Preservation Forum* 6, no.4 (July/August 1992): 37.

demands, apply layer upon layer to the fabric of the built environment."[124] Cultural layering relates to African-American resources because the cultural group traditionally used existing material culture and remodeled buildings to meet their needs.[125] Antoinette Lee presents two scenarios: first, a building erected for an affluent owner, and later subdivided and altered for worker housing; second, worker housing upgraded by subsequent owners. Lee asks the following questions, for the first scenario, "would destruction of the later, inferior finishes be an improper, culturally biased decision?"; and for the second scenario, "would retention of later finishes 'whitewash' the history of the site as interpreted to the public?"[126] Therefore, a resource might have been altered over time but the modifications are just as important as the original historic fabric in illustrating the history and cultural value of a property.

The second aspect relates to the significance of the resource as identified by the community and cultural group. Most African-American buildings do not represent high architectural styles but rather are more vernacular in their building forms and architectural details.[127] Thus, the buildings for the most part are not nominated to the National Register for their architectural significance under Criterion C, but for their association with an important event or person or their ability to yield information. For example, the 'Underground Railroad' is a significant event in African-American heritage, and many of the sites associated with this event are vernacular and have experienced modifications over the years. In one case in Oswego County, New York, the Orson Ames house was turned down for inclusion on the National Register in 1987 due to lack

[124] National Trust for Historic Preservation in the United States. *America's Forgotten Architecture.* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1976), 37.
[125] Antoinette J. Lee, "Discovering Old Cultures in the New World: Role of Ethnicity" in *The American Mosaic, Preserving a Nation's Heritage.* ed. Robert E. Stipe and Antoinette J. Lee, (Washington, D.C.: US/ICOMOS, 1987), 186.
[126] Antoinette J. Lee, "Cultural Diversity in Historic Preservation." *Historic Preservation Forum* 6, no.4 (July/August 1992): 35.
[127] Antoinette J. Lee, "Discovering Old Cultures in the New World: Role of Ethnicity" in *The American Mosaic, Preserving a Nation's Heritage.* ed. Robert E. Stipe and Antoinette J. Lee, (Washington, D.C.: US/ICOMOS, 1987), 202.

of integrity.[128] The house was significant for its association with Orson Ames, a member of Mexico Township's first Vigilance Committee, organized to help fugitives escape to Canada, and he is most famous for sheltering fugitive slave, Jerry McHenry (a vigilante group freed him from a jail in Syracuse, New York).[129] Over the years the house underwent modifications including a new front porch, front dormer and vinyl siding, creating a post 1955 appearance (**Figure 5 and 6** in Appendix B).[130] It is clear that the house lacked two of the seven qualities of integrity – materials and workmanship. However, the house retained integrity of location, setting, design, feeling and association. As evident by the denial of the nomination, a heavy emphasis for eligibility was placed on the retention of the house's physical fabric. In the case of the Orson Ames house the physical fabric of the building did not play a crucial role in the value of the resource. The value of the Orson Ames house is not in the architectural design of the building, but for its historical evidence as an icon of an important person and event in African-American history. For resources like the Orson Ames that are not significant for their architecture, emphasis of the seven qualities of integrity should be related to the value of the resource and its ability to convey an important event or person.[131] Judith Wellman explains it best with her statement,

> As we consider National Register listing for underground railroad sites, integrity alone cannot override the importance of the two other criteria –association with an event of national importance (Criterion A) and the value of these sites as evidence

[128] Judith Wellman, "The Underground Railroad and the National Register of Historic Places: Historical Importance vs. Architectural Integrity." *Public Historian,* 24, no.1 (Winter 2002): 26.
[129] Oswego State University of New York, *Orson Ames, Oswego County New York Freedom Trail-Underground Railroad*, Available from http://www.oswego.edu/ugrr/ames.html; Internet; Accessed 5 February 2009.
[130] Judith Wellman, "The Underground Railroad and the National Register of Historic Places: Historical Importance vs. Architectural Integrity." *Public Historian,* 24, no.1 (Winter 2002): 26.
[131] This discussion on integrity is rooted in the philosophies of John Ruskin, William Morris and E.E. Viollet-le-Duc. Ruskin and Morris stressed the patina of a building and viewed modifications as contributing to the building's artistic and architectural value. On the other hand, E.E. Viollet-le-Duc suggested the rebuilding of a building to make it look 'whole' again including the removal of previous additions to give the building an appearance from a certain time period. The current National Register Criteria for Integrity combine these two philosophies with accepting modifications if part of a building's period of significance (patina – Ruskin and Morris) and not allowing for modifications that would alter the original design intent of the building ('whole' design – Viollet-le-Duc). For further information on these philosophies please consult pages 5 – 9 of Chapter 2 "Evolution of the Preservation Movement in the United States."

> (Criterion D), defined in the broadest sense. To demand total integrity – an impossibility to any case- would be to exclude sites absolutely essential to the underground railroad story.[132]

Since the creation of the National Register in 1966, the existing frameworks of the nomination and eligibility processes have undergone minimal changes. The processes do work as evident by the increasing number of properties included in the register, and they serve their function of providing objectiveness and consistency in the National Register process. However, there are some aspects of the process that limit the types of resources included in the register. As a result the National Register does not fully represent the cultural diversity of the nation, specifically the full range of resources associated with African-American heritage. The exclusionary aspects of the register procedure is problematic, especially since the National Register aims to define the scope of the nation's heritage and the criteria for determining what is worthy of preservation. Nonetheless, several State Historic Preservation Offices and communities have discovered ways within the existing national register procedure to overcome the deficiencies of the nomination and eligibility processes of the National Register. Three such cases are discussed in further detail in the next chapter.

[132] Ibid., 28-29.

CHAPTER 5

CASE STUDIES

Georgia African American Historic Preservation Network, Georgia

In the late 1970s, staff members of the Georgia State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) realized they need to create a more "culturally-diverse preservation program and network."[133] Their efforts began with the co-sponsorship of a national conference on African-American historic resources and the nomination of significant sites to the National Register such as the Martin Luther King, Jr. Historic District in Atlanta (1974) and the Victorian District in Savannah (1974).[134] To further facilitate their efforts, the Georgia SHPO published a contextual study on African-American resources, *Historic Black Resources: A Handbook for the Identification, Documentation, and Evaluation of Historic African American Properties in Georgia,* written by Carole Merritt in 1984. The study proved highly beneficial in providing a better understanding of historic African-American places for the determination of their National Register eligibility. Former Georgia SHPO staff member, Leslie Sharp, claimed, "Before the *Historic Black Resources* context was developed, our office was not even able to comment on African American historic places because of a lack of understanding."[135]

As the Georgia SHPO continued its efforts in the preservation of African-American resources it became concerned with the impact of Federal projects on African-American resources

[133] Karen Easter, "Of the People or By the People?" *CRM* 15, no. 7 (1992): 27.
[134] Ibid.
[135] Gail Dubrow, "Finding Her Place: Integrating Women's History into Historic Preservation in Georgia" in *Restoring Women's History Through Historic Preservation.* ed. Gail Lee Dubrow and Jennifer B. Goodman (Maryland: John Hopkins University Press, 2002), 277.

and soon realized that often there were no local advocates for the preservation of African-American resources resulting in the destruction of significant resources and communities. Karen Easter with the Georgia SHPO in the 1990s and staff member of the Minority Historic Preservation Committee 1991 – 1992, stated,

> Few of Georgia's local elected officials, community development specialists, local preservationists, or black residents had a full understanding of the historical or architectural significance of shotgun houses, black churches, schools, or commercial buildings, with the exception perhaps of those with national significance. Furthermore, when we looked around at statewide historic preservation conferences and meetings, there were no or few African Americans present.[136]

In order to encourage the preservation of African-American resources and engage community members the Georgia SHPO took a proactive approach in the creation of the Minority Historic Preservation Committee in 1990.[137] The committee was the outcome of a one-day meeting held by then-State Historic Preservation Officer, Elizabeth Lyon, and her staff on African-American issues in Georgia. At the meeting, members of the Alabama Black Heritage Council, (formed in 1984 by the Alabama Historical Commission to promote the preservation of African-American resources) addressed the crowd of fifty people and discussed "how important it has been to have an organization to serve as a bridge between the state and local people, many of whom were uncertain how a state agency would receive them."[138]

The Minority Historic Preservation Committee, appointed by the Georgia National Register Review Board, held its first meeting in January 1990 in which they developed four long-term goals to guide their activities:

1. Foster participation of minority groups and individuals in the statewide historic preservation movement;

[136] Karen Easter, "Of the People or By the People?" *CRM* 15, no. 7 (1992): 27.
[137] Ibid.
[138] Ibid., 27- 28.

2. Increase public awareness of Georgia's black history both statewide and in local communities, and promote the preservation of properties associated with its history;
3. Increase interaction at the local and statewide levels among organizations, institutions, and individuals interested in and working with minority preservation and local governments and local preservation organizations; and
4. Assure the inclusion of black resources in the state's coordinated planning at all levels. Especially work to assure that these resources are taken into account in all phases of local planning.[139]

One of their first actions was the creation of a series of four posters illustrating black churches, houses, community landmarks and schools listed on the National Register to promote awareness of significant African-American resources. Through the efforts of the committee, interest in the preservation of African-American resources increased across the state resulting in the need for the creation of another group – the Minority Preservation Network.

The Minority Preservation Network began as a list of all people interested in issues associated with the preservation of African-American resources. Members of the network received a monthly newsletter from the Georgia SHPO, special mailings and an invitation to attend the Network's annual one-day meeting.[140] In 1992, the Network included over 200 people including state and local elected officials, corporate executives, preservation professionals, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) leaders, community activists, teachers and citizens; all connected by the common interest of preserving their heritage.[141]

Today, the Minority Historic Preservation Committee and the Minority Preservation Network are combined and referred to as the Georgia African American Historic Preservation

[139] Ibid., 28.
[140] Ibid.
[141] Ibid.

Network (GAAHPN) and has over 2, 600 members.[142] In 2000 the importance of the network was recognized by the Georgia legislature with the appointment of a full-time position for African-American programs with the Georgia SHPO. The staff member works closely with the GAAHPN Steering Committee to plan and implement ways to carry out their objectives of:

1. Foster participation of Georgia's African-American communities in the statewide historic preservation movement;
2. Increase the use of historic preservation as a tool to stabilize historic African-American communities by promoting economic development, neighborhood conservation, and heritage tourism;
3. Develop a comprehensive program to train and educate African-Americans about historic preservation tools and techniques; and
4. Seek funding for the protection of historic African-American communities.[143]

Additionally, GAAHPN publishes a quarterly publication, *Reflections*, which highlights resources listed in the Georgia and National Registers of Historic Places as well as provides historic preservation information and technical assistance.

The creation of an African-American preservation network can be attributed to the expansion of the National Register nominations for African-American historic resources, which in turn played a key role in preserving Georgia's historic African-American resources. As Richard Cloues, Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer, explains "the National Register has helped document the history of Georgia's African Americans and the historic properties associated with

[142] About GAAHPN," *Reflections* VII, no. 4 (March 2008): 8.
[143] Jeanne Cyriaque, *GA AAHPN: Preserving Georgia's African American Heritage Program Fact Sheet*, September 2005, Georgia Historic Preservation Office, Available from http://www.gashpo.org/assets/documents/GAAHPN_fs.pdf; Internet; Accessed 20 February 2009.

them."[144] He continues, "they [resources] serve as physical links to a past that too often has been ignored, misinterpreted, even devalued. They present undeniable evidence of the presence and accomplishments of African Americans in Georgia."[145]

In Georgia, African-American resources represent approximately 10% of the state's 1,800 National Register listings in 2001.[146] A query of National Register listings in February 2009 for the area of significance, "ethnic heritage-black" showed 105 properties in Georgia.[147] The listings are diverse representing entire communities, residential neighborhoods, commercial districts and buildings and significant individual buildings such as schools, churches, fraternal lodges and houses ranging from slave cabins to shotguns to mansions. The large number and broad range of National Register listings can be attributed to connecting the state historic preservation office with residents interested in preserving African-American resources. Karen Easter believes the greatest benefit was

> the growing cultural pride within the African American population of Georgia because of their awareness of the accomplishments of their ancestors, and their commitment to preserve the physical resources that attest to those achievements, for generations to come.[148]

Georgia's experiences have demonstrated the need to go beyond talking about cultural diversity and "give people of various backgrounds the opportunity to provide leadership in preserving and

[144] Richard Cloues, "Preserving the Legacy, Georgia's Historic African American Resources," *CRM* 17, no. 2 (1994).
[145] Ibid.
[146] Gretchen Kinnard, "The National Register of Historic Places," *Reflections* II, no. 1 (December 2001): 6. The number of National Register properties associated with African-American resources is difficult to calculate for several reasons including resources may not solely be associated with African-American heritage (ex. Historic district with white and African-American resources) and African-American resources may not be listed under the area of significance "ethnic heritage – black" (ex. Plantations with slave cabins). Therefore it is hard to accurately interpret the number of African-American properties on the National Register.
[147] Same note as above. Gretchen Brock, "African American Resources in Georgia on the National Register of Historic Places," Email Correspondence with Heather McDonald (20 February 2009).
[148] Karen Easter, "Of the People or By the People?" *CRM* 15, no. 7 (1992): 29.

thereby embracing their own cultural heritage."[149] Through the creation of an African-American preservation network, states can actively involve African-Americans in the National Register process to ensure their heritage is represented.

Eatonville Historic District, Florida

The existing framework of the National Register does not allow for the inclusion of resources solely significant for their association with intangible heritage. Therefore, a case study pertaining only to intangible heritage on the National Register is non-existent. However, the case of the Eatonville Historic District in Florida demonstrates the importance of intangible heritage in the evaluation of the significance of African-American resources for their inclusion on the National Register.

Eatonville, Florida is the oldest African-American incorporated municipality in the United States and represents the most intact example of an African-American community of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. By this statement alone it could be assumed that the town is a significant resource and should be included on the National Register. This was not the case as it took almost a decade for preservationists to figure out how to successfully nominate the community to the National Register.

During the later half of the nineteenth century, African-American settlements were established across the country and between 1864 and 1900 there were approximately 400 settlements, and in 1920 about 1200.[150] In 1998 less than twelve of these settlements survived in the United States but one was the Town of Eatonville.[151] The Town of Eatonville was established officially

[149] Ibid.
[150] Alice M. Grant, Tina Bucuvalas and Carl Shiver, "Eatonville Historic District National Register Nomination." May 1997. Section 8, 1. Florida Division of Historical Resources, Eatonville Survey File.
[151] Ibid.

in 1887 by a unanimous vote of 27 men of African descent, all of whom resided within the boundaries of the proposed town.[152] Citizens of the town built homes and community buildings, such as churches, meeting hall and the Robert Hungerford Industrial School.[153] The community continued to strive throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and remains an independent African-American municipality today.[154]

Like many African-American communities, post-World War II development destroyed a substantial amount of the historic fabric of the community, leaving only a handful of historic buildings extant. In the early 1990s another development proposal planned to further destroy the Eatonville community. Due to its location between Winter Park and Orlando, the county commissioners proposed to expand the existing two-lane highway that runs through the middle of the community into a five-lane boulevard.[155] Recognizing the historical significance of their community, residents of Eatonville responded with "Preserve the Eatonville community!" and pursued a nomination to the National Register as a historic district.

The nomination process began prior to the 1990s with a nomination submitted to the Florida Division of Historical Resources (the office of the State Historic Preservation Office) in 1979. Then-staff member, Robin Strassburger explains in a memo that the nomination showed no structures from the original community existed, but she did state "we realize that the historical value of the site is worthy of notice."[156] Strassburger contacted the National Register office in

[152] Ibid, Section 8, 4.
[153] Ibid.
[154] N.Y. Nathiri, "Heritage and History in Eatonville, Florida," *Historic Preservation Forum* (January/February 1993), 31. For this thesis, an independent African-American municipality is defined as a community that has broken away from another community to become its own municipality in which it is governed by African-Americans (ex. African-American mayor, city council members, etc.).
[155] Ibid., 32.
[156] Robin Strassburger, "Eatonville File – Status," Memo to Eatonville File from Robin Strassburger, 04 December 1979, Florida Division of Historical Resources, Eatonville Survey File. See Appendix A for photographs of examples of historic buildings in Eatonville.

Washington D.C. but received no definite answer if they would review a nomination with no extant resources. In the end, she recommended that a National Register designation not be pursued.

The designation issue resurfaced in 1989 when a survey of Eatonville revealed a lack of surviving buildings but recommended the town be designated to the National Register as a cultural landscape.[157] Due to the results of the 1989 survey, Mayor of Eatonville and resident, N.Y. Nathiri, pursued another National Register nomination. However, once again, the Florida SHPO decided the community lacked integrity for inclusion on the National Register. In a letter dated June 5, 1992 to the Mayor of Eatonville, George Percy, Director of the Florida Division of Historical Resources explained that:

> Nearly all the late 19th and early 20th century buildings and structures associated with the establishment and historic development of Eatonville as a black community have been lost. For this reason, we feel that the community lacks the integrity in terms of concentration of historic resources, necessary for National Register eligibility as a district.[158]

It appeared at this point that designation to the National Register was a hopeless endeavor for the Town of Eatonville as N.Y. Nathiri said in 1993:

> the reality is that whereas we view Eatonville as a national treasure that represents a precious aspect of our county's social and cultural history –because we don't have many old buildings standing in Eatonville – evidently Eatonville is not considered by some to be a preservation priority.[159]

An important turning point for the Town of Eatonville occurred with the incorporation of a folklife program in the Florida Division of Historical Resources. The term folklife, as defined in the Florida Statues, Section 267.021 is as follows:

---

[157] Ibid; Bill Thurston, "Eatonville," Memo to Suzanne Walker, 20 April 1993. Florida Division of Historical Resources, Eatonville Survey File.
[158] George W. Percy, letter to Mayor Harry Bing, 17 June 1992, Florida Division of Historical Resources, Eatonville Survey File.
[159] N.Y. Nathiri, "Heritage and History in Eatonville, Florida," *Historic Preservation Forum* (January/February 1993), 33.

> traditional expressive culture shared within the various groups in Florida: familial, ethnic, occupational, religious, and regional. Expressive culture includes a wide range of creative and symbolic forms such as custom, belief, technical skill, language, literature, art, architecture, music, play, dance, drama, ritual, pageantry, and handicraft, which forms are generally learned orally, by imitation, or in performance, and are maintained or perpetuated without formal instruction or institutional direction.[160]

According to Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer, Barbara Mattick, the folklife program enabled their staff to be "more aware of what are the cultural aspects – not just architecture" and further provides a "reflection of place."[161]

Although the Town of Eatonville lacked tangible resources it was rich in intangible heritage as it was home to a renowned early-twentieth century folklorist and author Zora Neale Hurston (**Figure 1 -4** in Appendix A for examples of Eatonville's tangible resources). Through her work the folkways of Eatonville were documented and passed on from one generation to the next especially since Eatonville always retained its identity as an African-American community. For instance, Eatonville demonstrates cultural continuity through the time-honored religious traditions such as gospel singing services, covered dish suppers, and evening prayer meetings.[162] Additionally, Eatonville continues food traditions with the evidence of lemon and banana trees in yards and vacant spaces.[163]

With the implementation of a folklife program, the state's folklorist, Tina Bucuvalas, helped to prepare a new nomination for Eatonville in 1997 incorporating the community's intangible heritage through the use of oral history interviews of Eatonville residents.[164] Based on

---

[160] Florida Division of Historical Resources, *Florida Folklife Program,* 2009, Available from http://www.flheritage.com/preservation/folklife/; Internet; Accessed 17 February 2009.
[161] Ned Kaufman, *Cultural Heritage Needs Assessment: Phase I.* draft (Washington, D.C.: National Park Service, 2004), 26.
[162] "Cultural Significance," no date, Florida Division of Historical Resources, Eatonville Survey File.
[163] Ibid.
[164] Alice M. Grant, Tina Bucuvalas and Carl Shiver, "Eatonville Historic District National Register Nomination." May 1997, Section 11, 1. Florida Division of Historical Resources, Eatonville Survey File.

the folklife documentation collected by Bucuvalas, the Florida Division of Historical Resources concluded that Eatonville was "a significant cultural center where African American traditions have been passed from one generation to another" and "the Eatonville Historic District eminently represents the aspects of cultural significance discussed in Bulletin 38 [*Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Traditional Cultural Properties*] as being worthy of listing in the National Register of Historic Places."[165] The National Register office of the National Park Service disagreed with the claim of Eatonville as a traditional cultural property due to the lack of sufficient documentation and ultimately the Florida Division of Historical Resources dropped the discussion of a traditional cultural property from the nomination.

Even though Eatonville was not considered a traditional cultural property, the inclusion of the folklife documentation in the nomination helped make "a good case for the significance of Eatonville as the first, or certainly one of the first, incorporated black towns in the United States and one that has been continuously self-governing since its establishment."[166] After a very long process, the Eatonville Historic District was successfully nominated to the National Register in 1998 under Criterion A for its significance in ethnic heritage, community planning and development and for its intangible heritage associated with social history and literature as well as Criterion B for its association with Zora Neale Hurston.[167]

Intangible heritage is an important aspect to African-American resources and communities. Eatonville is an example of an African-American community that lacked a sufficient amount of tangible resources; however, their intangible heritage was just as important as its tangible her-

[165] George Percy, letter to Keeper of the National Register Carol D. Shull, 01 September 1997, Florida Division of Historical Resources, Eatonville Survey File.
[166] Marilyn Harper, "Reviewer Comments Eatonville Historic District, Orange County Florida," 18 November 1997. Florida Division of Historical Resources, Eatonville Survey File.
[167] Alice M. Grant, Tina Bucuvalas and Carl Shiver, "Eatonville Historic District National Register Nomination," May 1997, Section 8, 1, Florida Division of Historical Resources, Eatonville Survey File.

itage and was an important factor in the successful nomination of the town to the National Register.

Orson Ames House, New York

The Orson Ames House is located at 3339 Main Street in the Oswego County village of Mexico, New York. Built in the 1830s, the building was home to abolitionist Orson Ames. Ames' abolitionist career began in 1835 when he signed the first anti-slavery petition sent from Oswego County.[168] He continued his career throughout the early half of the nineteenth century by volunteering with the Vigilance Committee for the Town of Mexico to help fugitive escape from slavery.[169] Ames most significant act for the Underground Railroad occurred in 1851. In 1851, fugitive slave William "Jerry" McHenry was imprisoned in Syracuse, New York under the Fugitive Slave Law. McHenry was rescued by free blacks and other abolitionists and taken to Orson Ames' house. Ames protected McHenry for one night where afterwards he was moved to another location before escaping to Canada.[170]

The Orson Ames House played a significant role in an important event of the Underground Railroad in central New York. Additionally, the house is the only surviving property that is identified with the McHenry rescue. Due to its significance with the Underground Railroad, the Orson Ames House was nominated to the National Register in 1987. However, the nomination was denied by the National Park Service for lack of integrity (**Figure 6** in Appendix B).[171]

The house is a single story frame building with a twentieth century garage and shed located at the rear of the property. Over the years the house underwent extensive alterations includ-

[168] Helen Breitbeck, "Orson Ames National Register Nomination," 2000, Section 8, 1.
[169] Ibid.
[170] Ibid.
[171] Judith Wellman, "The Underground Railroad and the National Register of Historic Places: Historical Importance vs. Architectural Integrity." *Public Historian*, 24, no.1 (Winter 2002): 26.

ing a ca. 1930 addition of attic story wall dormers and a sitting porch on the front elevation (**Figure 6** in Appendix B). Furthermore, the kitchen ell was rebuilt in the 1960s and the original clapboard exterior was covered with vinyl siding. Lastly, the original window sashes were replaced with modern windows. Due to the alterations the building lacked integrity of materials and workmanship – two of the seven qualities of integrity for the National Register. Even with the alterations, the building retained integrity of location, design, setting, feeling and association. However, as viewed by the National Park Service the building did not retain sufficient integrity to be included on the National Register.

After the nomination attempt, a Multiple Property Documentation (MPD) form was developed for the Underground Railroad sites in Central New York in 2000, which altered the fate of the Orson Ames House. The MPD, titled *Historic Resources Relating to the Freedom Trail, Abolitionism, and African American Life in Central New York, 1820 – 1870*, was beneficial for the Orson Ames House because it established an overall historic context for Underground Railroad sites as well as defined areas of significance and criteria to assess integrity.

In regards to the historic context, the MPD mentions the McHenry rescue and specifically the Orson Ames house in the prologue of its statement of historic contexts (Section E of the form). The information provided by this section gives substantial documentation for the significance of the Ames house in relation to the Underground Railroad experience in the region of Central New York. Perhaps the most significant outcome of the MPD, was the statement:

> in terms of integrity, superficial or reversible changes should not jeopardize nomination to the National Register. All of these sites deserve primary consideration as historical evidence rather than as art forms. We should make every effort to include well-documented Underground Railroad sites on the National Register, even when their integrity has been compromised, much as we would when we confront "intrusions" in an historic district.[172]

[172] Milton Sernett and Judith Wellman, "Multiple Property Nomination, Historic Resources Related to the Freedom Trail, Abolitionism, and African American Life in Central New York, 1820-1870," 2000, Section F, 2.

The MPD provided further guidance for the treatment of integrity as it pertained to the National Register Criteria for Evaluation. The Orson Ames house, under the direction of the MPD, was significant under Criterion A for its association with events that made significant contributions to the broad patterns of our history. Integrity under this criterion should consider the following:

> These buildings are most important not for their architectural design but for their value as historical evidence. They document the cultural values, economic status, and regional roots of people involved in a major national movement. Thus, as long as standing buildings retain enough of their historic features to suggest their original construction and use, they should be considered eligible for National Register nomination.[173]

Furthermore, the MPD through its registration requirements stressed special considerations for vernacular buildings regarding integrity by placing higher importance on the qualities of location, design, setting, feeling and association than on materials and workmanship. For instance, the guidance under the materials quality states, "should retain many of the original materials, even if hidden under contemporary roof and siding. Original interior features are desirable but not necessary."[174] The guidance for workmanship explains:

> Most of these buildings will not be distinguished by unusual workmanship. Their value as physical structures lies, rather, in their typicality. Evidence of typical nineteenth century construction techniques (post-and-beam construction, dealed walls, or cisterns, for example) is often buried beneath exterior siding. Evidence of such workmanship, if it exists, is important. *Its lack of easy visibility should not, however, prevent nomination.*[175]

Additionally, the integrity guidance allows for alterations that are reversible including replace-

[173] Ibid., 5.
[174] Ibid.
[175] Ibid.

ment of paned windows with one large picture window, the addition of vinyl siding to a building and the rotation of a building on its original lot.[176]

Through the efforts of the MPD, the Orson Ames House was re-nominated to the National Register in 2001 based on the significance of the building to the Underground Railroad and the new guidance outlined for the evaluation of integrity. The new National Register nomination stressed the significance of the property to ethnic heritage and social history for its strong associations with the Underground Railroad and more importantly the Jerry McHenry rescue. The nomination cites the MPD by stating, "Under Section H of the MPDF [MPD], documentation for the Ames property meets the highest standards of reliability and rates five. The Ames House is one of only a small number of way stations so clearly documented."[177] The nomination proceeded with stating the alterations to the building but in accordance with the guidance provided by the MPD, focused primarily on the retention of integrity of location, setting, feeling and association and the reversibility of the alterations. In the end, the Orson Ames House was successfully included on the National Register in 2001.

The modifications to the evaluation of integrity developed in the MPD assisted in the successful nomination of the Orson Ames House to the National Register. The modifications pertained to properties valued as historical evidence rather than for their architectural/design value. In these cases, the MPD suggests integrity should be evaluated with higher emphasis placed on the integrity of location, setting, feeling and association, and the reversibility of past alterations. The Orson Ames House is an example of an African-American resource whose significance goes

[176] Ibid.
[177] The rating system was created in the MPD to recognize sites that can be reliably identified as oppose to sites that need further research and documentation. Helen Breitbeck, "Orson Ames National Register Nomination," 2000, Section 8, 2.

beyond its architectural value and its lack of physical integrity should not prevent its nomination to the National Register.

CHAPTER 6

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

As the mosaic of the nation's people becomes more diverse, we are on the threshold of even greater opportunities to connect historic preservation to broader social, economic, and cultural objectives that truly represent our full national heritage.

- Elizabeth A. Lyon and Frederick C. Williamson[178]

Traditionally the United States has embraced people from different countries, races and religions. Cultural diversity is an important aspect of the United States and it is what makes our heritage unique. American heritage is not composed of the values and traditions of one particular group, but rather the merging of cultural values and traditions associated with numerous cultural groups that live within the borders of the United States. The preservation field must recognize the cultural diversity of the nation since "as diverse as American culture is, so too is the diversity of historic properties that express this rich cultural legacy."[179] Unfortunately in past years, the nation's preservation programs have not fully captured the diversity of American heritage, specifically with the official designation of historic sites.[180] In 2004 only slightly more than one percent of designated sites were associated with the minority groups such as African-Americans, Asian-American, and Latinos.[181]

The designation of historic sites is a vital part of the preservation process in which mechanisms such as the National Register and the National Historic Landmarks establish criteria for

[178] Elizabeth A. Lyon and Frederick C. Williamson, "The Preservation Movement Rediscovers America," in *African American Historic Places*, ed. Beth L. Savage and Carol Shull, (New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1994).
[179] Advisory Council for Historic Preservation, *The National Historic Preservation Program: Overview*, Available from http://www.achp.gov/overview.html; Internet; accessed 24 February 2009.
[180] Ibid.
[181] Ibid.

evaluating historic resources. Additionally, the National Register plays an important role in preservation at the local level since most listings in the register are of local significance and many municipalities use the National Register criteria as the basis for local designation.[182] Due to the significance of the National Register in the preservation process, it is imperative for the National Register to recognize historic resources of various cultural groups. In reviewing the existing framework of the National Register as it relates to the representation of the African-Americans, three weaknesses emerged that placed limitations on the inclusion of African-American resources. The first weakness is that the nomination process is too complex, making it difficult for the public to become engaged in the process. The other two weaknesses are related to eligibility, and the criteria for evaluation and integrity. The existing criteria for evaluation and integrity do not allow for the recognition of intangible heritage, when it is not attached to a tangible resource. Lastly, the criteria for integrity do not recognize important non-architecturally significant tangible resources that lack physical integrity.

As the case studies demonstrated, preservationists and communities have identified ways to work within the existing framework of the National Register to overcome these weaknesses for African-American resources. For instance, preservationists utilized a Multiple Properties Documentation study to refine the criteria for integrity for sites significant to the Underground Railroad to allow the designation of sites that have exterior alterations and loss of historic fabric. Even though the weaknesses can be overcome in some cases, eventually modifications to the nomination and eligibility processes of the National Register will have to be made to ensure the National Register is effectively recognizing and preserving sites significant to African-American heritage. Based on the research for this thesis and the case studies presented several modifica-

[182] Carol D. Shull, "Using the National Register of Historic Places, Getting the Most for Our Money," *CRM* 17, no. 2 (1994): 4.

tions can be made to the framework of the National Register in regards to increasing public engagement in the process and broadening the criteria for evaluation and integrity.

Modifications to Nomination Process

Increasing public engagement in the process is a must since only members of a particular cultural group can determine what they deem as a significant resource in illustrating and interpreting their heritage. The complexity of the current nomination process often requires preservation professionals to handle the survey, evaluation and documentation of resources for nomination to the National Register. This can be problematic because "in the early twenty-first century, the composition of the historic preservation field is predominantly European American" and Antoinette Lee continues by explaining that, "many diverse individuals and organizations perceive that their cultural heritage is being underestimated by the 'professional elite' who have little, if any, experience with diverse cultures."[183]

Another perception held by minority groups is the belief that historic preservation efforts are "delivered" to them since they usually do not actively participate in the process.[184] To overcome these perceptions the nomination process of the National Register needs to be returned to local citizens and communities and afford them the opportunity to participate in the process. An obvious solution is increasing diversity amongst the preservation profession. Gaudalupe San Miguel, professor of history at the University of Houston, explains the need for diverse professionals in regards to Hispanic cultural resources, "it can take a very long time to educate a non-Hispanic professionals about cultural issues that members of the community have imbibed from

[183] Antoinette J. Lee, "The Social and Ethnic Dimensions of Historic Preservation" in *A Richer Heritage*. ed. Robert E. Stipe, (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2003), 397.
[184] "Cultural and Ethnic Diversity in Historic Preservation." ed. Elizabeth Lyon, *NTHP Information Series*, 65 (1992): 12.

birth. It would make sense for the agency to hire a Mexican American who knows the issues and has the contacts."[185] Minority-culture preservationists better understand "what 'history' and 'culture' mean" to their particular cultural group.[186] For example, a common occurrence amongst historic district nominations is the exclusion of African-American resources simply because the surveyor was not knowledgeable that one particular street was traditionally the African-American commercial district. The buildings might have been nominated due to their architectural significance but no mention of their association with the African-American community is included in the nomination. Very few states recognize the need for a full-time staff member in the State Historic Preservation Office dedicated to the resources of African-Americans. Georgia is an exception to this statement and in 2000, Georgia created a position for an African-American programs coordinator to oversee preservation projects to ensure African-American resources are protected and preserved and provide technical assistance for anyone interested in African-American heritage.[187] One aspect of the position is leading "the research initiative to survey, document and list in the National Register of Historic Places these endangered historic African American resources."[188] The creation of a staff position dedicated to the resources of a particular cultural group allows the evaluation and documentation of resources that might have been overlooked by a preservation professional not familiar with the culture of the group as well as provides a connection between the State Historic Preservation Office and members of a cultural group.

---

[185] Ned Kaufman, *Cultural Heritage Needs Assessment: Phase I.* draft (Washington, D.C.: National Park Service, 2004), 45.
[186] Antoinette J. Lee, "Cultural Diversity in Historic Preservation," *Historic Preservation Forum* 6, no.4 (July/August 1992): 33.
[187] Georgia State Historic Preservation Office, *African American Programs, Program & Contact Information.* Available from http://www.gashpo.org/content/displaycontent.asp?txtDocument=50; Internet, Accessed 25 February 2009.
[188] Georgia State Historic Preservation Office, *Staff Directory.* Available from http://www.gashpo.org/content/displaycontent.asp?txtDocument=26; Internet, Accessed 25 February 2009.

The diversity of the preservation profession has been an on-going challenge and more cultural and ethnic groups are entering the profession, thanks inpart to the National Park Service's Cultural Resources Diversity Program. However in general the field continues to be dominated by European-Americans; therefore, a solution is needed to go beyond increasing the number of diverse preservation professionals and create a way to increase the participation of African-Americans in the nomination process. One way is the creation of commissions, councils or preservation networks of individuals and organizations interested in African-American heritage that serve an advisory role within the structure of State Historic Preservation Offices. The State Historic Preservation Office plays an important role in the nomination process as the majority of nominations must be submitted through their office and based on the recommendations of the state review board they decide if it should be forwarded to the National Park Service. The creation of commissions afford African-Americans the opportunity to take an active role in the nomination of their resources since they can advise the State Historic Preservation Office as to what resources should be nominated and why. For instance, the South Carolina African American Heritage Commission formed in 1993 has the mission:

> to identity and promote the preservation of historic sites, structures, buildings and culture of the African American experience in South Carolina and to assist and enhance the efforts of the South Carolina Department of Archives and History [State Historic Preservation Office].[189]

There are no formal statistics as to whether or not the establishment of commissions increases the number of African-American resources nominated to the National Register. However, the book, *African American Historic Places*, published in 1994, displays a list of African-American historic places divided by state, and the states of Alabama, Georgia and South Carolina had a

[189] Originally referred to as the South Carolina African American Heritage Council. *South Carolina African American Heritage Commission,* Available from http://www.state.sc.us/scdah/afamer/hpaahcommission.htm; Internet; Accessed 25 February 2009.

significantly larger number of sites on the National Register than other states and all three states at the time had an African-American heritage commission or council established.[190] It can be assumed that the establishment of the heritage commissions assisted in the nomination of more African-American resources in those states.

The National Register was created as a tool for the American people to recognize significant resources associated with our heritage. The nomination process must recognize all American people, which means the involvement of members of diverse cultures in the process. Ultimately, the National Register nomination process should bring together minority community members and preservation professionals to work towards the common goal of defining and preserving our heritage for future generations.

Modifications to Eligibility Process

The existing framework of the eligibility process places a strong emphasis on tangible resources and the retention of historic fabric, which limits the inclusion of African-American resources in the National Register. African-American resources excluded from the register include intangible resources such as language, religious traditions, food ways, music, and art and crafts, and tangible resources that over the years have lost their historic fabric but still retain their historical significance for their association with an important event, person, or potential to yield information.

Intangible heritage is a complex issue that has been debated for decades in the preservation field internationally and in the United States. In the United States, intangible heritage is referred to as American folklife and defined as:

[190] Alabama had 49 sites, Georgia had 61 and South Carolina had 70. *African American Historic Places,* ed. Beth L. Savage, (New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1994).

> the traditional expressive culture shared within the various groups in the United States: familial, ethnic, occupational, religious, regional; expressive culture includes a wide range of creative and symbolic forms such as custom, belief, technical skill, language, literature, art, architecture, music, play, dance, drama, ritual, pageantry, handicraft; these expressions are mainly learned orally, by imitation, or in performance, and are generally maintained without benefit of formal instruction or institutional direction.[191]

In general, there are two approaches to the preservation of intangible heritage. The first approach is the marriage between tangible and intangible resources, in which "intangible heritage provide[s] the larger framework within which tangible heritage could take its shape and significance."[192] Arjun Appadurai, contemporary social-cultural anthropologist, explains it further:

> Intangible heritage because of its very nature as a map through which humanity interprets, selects, reproduces and disseminates cultural heritage was an important partner of tangible heritage. More important it is a tool through which the tangible heritage could be defined and expressed transforming inert landscapes of objects and monuments turning them into living archives of cultural values.[193]

For instance, in the case study of Eatonville, Florida the intangible heritage enhanced the interpretation of the historic buildings. As solely tangible resources, the buildings were viewed as common building forms found throughout the United States and did not necessarily merit historical significance. However, with the addition of their intangible heritage the buildings came to represent the expressive culture of the African-American community, and presented a case for historical significance.

The other approach to intangible heritage is the separation of intangible from tangible. This approach is more difficult because majority of cases will involve the joining of intangible and tangible. However, in some cases intangible resources are not associated with such tangible

[191] Library of Congress. *American Folklife Preservation Act*, Available from http://www.loc.gov/folklife/public_law.html; Internet; Accessed 26 February 2009.
[192] Dawson Munjeri, "Tangible and Intangible Heritage: from difference to convergence," *Museum International* 56, no. 1-2, (May 2004).
[193] Ibid.

resources as sites and buildings. Antoinette Lee explains, "some preservationists also view intangibles as resources that can be appreciated quite apart from physical places because they are as compelling a reflection of culture as tangible resources."[194] For instance, the significant intangible resources of the Gullah/Geechee culture like language and food ways are not necessarily associated with one particular building or site along the southeastern coast of the United States. Furthermore, the intangible resources illustrate the culture of the Gullah/Geechee people more than their buildings. Another example, not associated with African-American resources but a similar situation to the Gullah/Geechee, is the oral heritage of the Zapara People in Ecuador and Peru. The Zapara people live in part of the Amazon jungle and have an elaborate oral culture and heritage expressed through their myths, rituals, artistic practices and language.[195] In this case, the intangible resource of language is independently significant in illustrating the heritage of the Zapara people and for the most part it is not associated with tangible resources. The significance of the oral heritage of the Zapara people was recognized with its inclusion on the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization "Intangible Heritage List" in 2008.[196]

The United States implements the approach of a marriage between tangible and intangible resources in the treatment of intangible heritage. This is evident within the existing framework of the National Register since only intangible resources associated with a tangible resource are allowed to be included in the register. Generally these resources are referred to as Traditional Cultural Properties and the *National Register Bulletin 38 Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Traditional Cultural Properties*, states under the "Determining Eligibility" section that:

---

[194] Antoinette J. Lee, "Cultural Diversity in Historic Preservation," *Historic Preservation Forum* 6, no.4 (July/August 1992): 33.
[195] UNESCO, *The Oral Heritage and Cultural Manifestations of the Zapara People*, Available from http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/index.php?RL=30; Internet; Accessed 26 February 2009.
[196] Ibid.

> There is naturally a dynamic relationship between tangible and intangible traditional cultural resources, and the beliefs or practices associated with a traditional cultural property are of central importance in defining its significance. However, it should be clearly recognized at the outset that the National Register *does not* include intangible resources themselves. The entity evaluated *must* be a tangible property--that is, a district, site, building, structure, or object.[197]

This approach to intangible heritage is problematic in the preservation of African-American resources especially in cases where significant buildings no longer exist but the "underlying 'spirit' of a cultural group" remains.[198] For example, African-American traditional forms of music still performed by groups such as the Georgia Sea Island Singers and the McIntosh County Shouters in Georgia represent the spirit of African-American communities.[199] Another example is language in the case of American Indians, of which Chief Moses Spear of the American Indian Blackfeet Nation comments, "If it's [language] gone then their culture is gone…Without the language, values are lost, your sense of belonging is gone."[200] Such resources should be recognized by the National Register for their significance in illustrating the traditional beliefs or practices of a cultural group.

In order to capture intangible heritage independent from tangible resources on the National Register, the existing criteria for evaluation should be expanded to broaden the scope of the register. Currently, the criteria for evaluation recognize three types of values including associative, design and information. The criteria for evaluation should be expanded with the addition of a fourth value associated with the social or spiritual value of a resource. The idea of including

---

[197] Patricia L. Parker and Thomas F. King, *National Register Bulletin 38 Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Traditional Cultural Properties*, National Park Service, Available from http://www.nps.gov/history/nr/publications/bulletins/nrb38/nrb38%20introduction.htm ; Internet; accessed 10 February 2009.

[198] In Richard Kurin's article he describes intangible heritage as the "underlying spirit of a cultural group" since it forms the foundation of a culture. Richard Kurin, "Intangible Cultural Heritage in the 2003 UNESCO Convention," *Museum International* (2004).

[199] Ned Kaufman, *Cultural Heritage Needs Assessment: Phase I.* draft (Washington, D.C.: National Park Service, 2004), 28.

[200] Ibid, 22.

social or spiritual value in the recognition of historic places appears in the *Burra Charter* of Australia, revised in 1999. The *Burra Charter* is the nationally accepted standard for the preservation of cultural resources and provides basic guidelines and procedures that should be followed in the preservation of historic places in Australia.[201] Due to the large indigenous population in Australia, the country realized the need to recognize the intangible heritage of the Aboriginal culture and included the social and spiritual value of a place in their national standard. Article 24 "Retaining associations and meanings" of the *Burra Charter* states "significant meanings, including spiritual values, of a place should be respected."[202] Additionally, *Guidelines to the Burra Charter: Cultural Significance* defines cultural significance as "aesthetic, historic, scientific or social value for past, present or future generations" and continues "social value embraces the qualities for which a place has become a focus of spiritual, political, national or other cultural sentiment to a majority or minority group."[203] A similar type of social value should be incorporated into the criteria for evaluation for the National Register to enhance the recognition of intangible heritage.

The 2003 the *Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage* created by the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) to protect intangible cultural heritage globally developed additional requirements to ensure the authenticity of an intangible resource in illustrating the heritage of a living community of people:

1. Cultural group regards the resource as a tradition and it is meaningful to the group;
2. The resource is shared within and symbolically identified with a cultural group;

---

[201] Environmental Protection Agency, Queensland Government, *Burra Charter*, Available from http://www.epa.qld.gov.au/cultural_heritage/owning_a_heritage_place/guidelines/burra_charter/; Internet, Accessed 26 February 2009.
[202] Australia ICOMOS, *Burra Charter*, Available from http://www.icomos.org/australia/burra.html; Internet; Accessed 26 February 2009.
[203] Ibid.

3. Traditionally the resource has been socially transmitted from one generation to the next.[204]

These requirements should also be incorporated into the criteria for evaluation and integrity for the National Register for intangible resources associated with social or spiritual values.

Additionally, the concept for Traditional Cultural Properties should be extended to include intangible resources not associated with tangible resources and sites of diverse cultural groups including African-Americans. Although, the *National Bulletin 38* for Traditional Cultural Properties includes all cultural groups and even lists a broad range of examples of properties, the general census is that Traditional Cultural Properties primarily apply to only American Indian sites. In the 2004 *Cultural Heritage Needs Assessment: Phase I* prepared by the National Park Service, the report states a need for guidance similar to Traditional Cultural Properties to assist in the evaluation of sites associated with minority groups.[205] Specifically, it lists a recommendation to "extend the concept of traditional cultural places more broadly to non-Indian sites."[206]

In conjunction with modifications to the criteria for evaluation, the existing criteria for integrity should be modified to include more intangible resources and tangible resources that are significant but have lost historic fabric. The existing qualities of integrity for the National Register include location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association; which place a strong emphasis on the physical qualities of a resource. Also the retention of the qualities of feeling and association alone is not sufficient for eligibility for the register. The strong emphasis on physical qualities makes it difficult to recognize and include resources significant to di-

[204]Richard Kurin, "Intangible Cultural Heritage in the 2003 UNESCO Convention," *Museum International* (2004); Patricia L. Parker and Thomas F. King, *National Register Bulletin 38 Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Traditional Cultural Properties*, National Park Service, Available from http://www.nps.gov/history/nr/publications/bulletins/nrb38/nrb38%20introduction.htm ; Internet; accessed 10 February 2009.
[205] Ned Kaufman, *Cultural Heritage Needs Assessment: Phase I.* draft (Washington, D.C.: National Park Service, 2004), 50.
[206] Ibid.

verse cultural groups since historical associations are placed second to architectural integrity.[207] For instance, the majority of resources significant to African-Americans are valuable for their associations with an important event or person not as architectural icons. Judith Wellman explains, "Strict definitions of integrity have often excluded historically important sites relating to economically, politically, or socially marginalized Americans. This has certainly been true for African Americans."[208] She continues,

> Although African Americans were centrally involved in American life, much of the architectural and material culture that would document their experience has disappeared, and much of what remains will not meet the criteria for integrity, as they have so far been applied.[209]

The importance of placing historical associations first when dealing with African-American resources can best be explained in Ned Kaufman's comparison of historic places to icebergs. In his comparison, he claims,

> Like the tips of icebergs, historic places are the visible protrusions of much more momentous things, and like icebergs historic places owe much of their impact not to their visible protrusions but to the great mass of meanings that float just beneath the surface.[210]

Placing this in context with the case study of the Orson Ames House in New York, the visual protrusions of the house left nothing of historical value, but the meanings beneath the surface as an Underground Railroad shelter for the fugitive Jerry McHenry had significant historical value. Kaufman's metaphor can also be applied to intangible resources, for example in the form of the "spirit of place." Jeanne Cyriaque, African-American Programs Coordinator for the Georgia

---

[207] Ibid., 49.; Antoinette J. Lee, "Discovering Old Cultures in the New World: Role of Ethnicity" in *The American Mosaic, Preserving a Nation's Heritage.* ed. Robert E. Stipe and Antoinette J. Lee, (Washington, D.C.: US/ICOMOS, 1987), 202.
[208] Judith Wellman, "The Underground Railroad and the National Register of Historic Places: Historical Importance vs. Architectural Integrity." *Public Historian,* 24, no.1 (Winter 2002): 23.
[209] Ibid., 23-24.
[210] Ned Kaufman, *Cultural Heritage Needs Assessment: Phase I.* draft (Washington, D.C.: National Park Service, 2004), 34.

State Historic Preservation Office, defines a "spirit of place" as the strong sense of connection people feel to a historical place even when historic structures or visual protrusions no longer exist.[211] The notion of "it happened right here" can provide strong feelings and associations to a place for a particular cultural group. Once again the historical value of a place is not defined solely by its physical attributes but by its associations. Another example, not specific to African-Americans but applies, is the Grand Shrine of Ise in Japan. Around 690 A.D. a custom known as *shikinen zotai* began, which involved the renewal of the shrine every twenty years.[212] The whole building is reconstructed by traditionally trained craftsmen using techniques that have been passed down from one generation to the other, but the building lacks integrity of material. Is the shrine still significant in illustrating the heritage of the Japanese culture even though it does not retain its original historic fabric? The answer to the Japanese people is 'yes' since the principal value of the Grand Shrine of Ise does not lie in its physical attributes but rather in the traditional practice of *shikinen zotai*.

The example of the Grand Shrine of Ise brings up several other issues concerning the criteria for integrity. First and foremost, cultures are dynamic; therefore, cultural resources continue to be actively used by society. For the most part, the existing criteria for integrity do not accommodate the dynamic nature of cultural resources specifically historic buildings. Case in point is the Orson Ames House in New York, in which the house underwent modifications as previous owners needed additional space but the house was denied nomination to the register due to lack of integrity. *The Declaration of San Antonio,* a document produced by members of the International Council of Monuments and Sites National Committee in 1996, addresses the integrity of dynamic cultural sites when it states "This constant adaptation to human need can actively con-

[211] Ibid., 49.
[212] Richard Kurin, "Intangible Cultural Heritage in the 2003 UNESCO Convention," *Museum International* (2004).

tribute to maintaining the continuum among the past, present and future life of our communities."[213] The document continues, "Some physical changes associated with maintaining the traditional patterns of communal use of the heritage site do not necessarily diminish its significance and may actually enhance it."[214] This concept should be integrated into the current framework of the criteria for integrity.

The other issue is the simple fact, according to the *NARA Document on Authenticity,* that "all cultures and societies are rooted in the particular forms and means of tangible and intangible expression which constitute their heritage and these should be respected."[215] In regards to integrity, only the members of a particular cultural group can truly determine if a resource – either tangible or intangible – retains sufficient integrity to justify eligibility to the National Register. Similar to the identification of historic resources, only members of a cultural group can fully understand the value of their resources and the essential physical features that must be retained in order for the resources' significance to be conveyed. For example, in the case of Mount Shasta, an extinct volcano in California and a place of spiritual meaning to several American Indian Tribes, the Forest Service determined the lower slopes of the mountain were not eligible for the register but the tribes felt the entire mountain was eligible. The decision of integrity was referred to the Keeper of the National Register and he determined that the lower slopes lost integrity since they had been transformed from forest primeval to timber plantations.[216] The slopes might have lost their physical attributes but to the tribes the spirit of the mountain was still being conveyed and

[213] ICOMOS, *Declaration of San Antonio,* Available from http://www.icomos.org/docs/san_antonio.html; Internet, Accessed 26 February 2009.
[214] Ibid.
[215] ICOMOS, *Nara Document on Authenticity*, Available from http://www.international.icomos.org/naradoc_eng.htm; Internet; Accessed 26 February 2009.
[216] Thomas King, *Cultural Resource Laws & Practice*, 3d ed., (New York: Alta Mira Press, 2008), 95.

had value to them. As Thomas King explains, "I do not believe that it is your business or mine to impose our judgment on places valued by other people."[217]

The issues associated with the criteria for integrity could be addressed in multiple ways. First, for resources not significant for their design and architectural value (Criterion C), the concept of criteria for integrity should be expanded to place less emphasis on the retention of historic fabric and more emphasis on the associations and meanings of the resource. Judith Wellman suggests viewing integrity as a continuum rather than as a yes/no variable.[218] In doing so, physical qualities of integrity do not carry more weight than the intangible qualities of feeling and association. Therefore integrity can be assessed based on the value of the resource. For example, the Orson Ames House is valued for its association with the Underground Railroad (an important event) and its integrity should be assessed on the qualities of location, setting, feeling and association since those are most important in conveying its significance. However, if the Orson Ames House was significant as an example of a rare style of architecture the building's integrity should be determined using the qualities of design, workmanship, and materials. The concept of a continuum allows the criteria for integrity to be more flexible and the decision to accept or reject the resource is based on various criteria rather than on one or two integrity criteria alone. Secondly, guidance for the criteria for integrity should accommodate cosmetic and reversible changes when it applies to resources not significant for their design and architectural value. Since cultural resources are dynamic and changing to accommodate the needs of society, resources are going to experience modifications that could impact their integrity. In cases where the modifications could be reversible such as the addition of vinyl siding or the installation of modern windows, exceptions should be allowed in the criteria for integrity. Lastly, members of a cultural group

[217] Ibid.
[218] Judith Wellman, "The Underground Railroad and the National Register of Historic Places: Historical Importance vs. Architectural Integrity." *Public Historian*, 24, no.1 (Winter 2002): 25.

should play an active role in the decision of whether or not the integrity of a resource has been compromised. The concept of integrity for Traditional Cultural Properties addresses this when it says that: "The integrity of a traditional cultural property must be considered with reference to the views of traditional practitioners; if its integrity has not been lost in their eyes, it probably has sufficient integrity to justify further evaluation."[219] This statement should be integrated into the concept for the criteria for integrity of all resources especially for resources associated with African-Americans.

The National Register is an important mechanism for the evaluation and preservation of historic resources in the United States. Although the National Register provides a solid foundation for historic preservation, its existing framework has inherent weaknesses within the nomination and eligibility processes that limit the inclusion of resources significant to African-Americans. As American society continues to evolve into a nation of more diverse cultures, the preservation movement must evolve as well to ensure the preservation of a diverse cultural heritage for future generations. One hopes that a new awakening in preservation philosophy and practice will emerge, ensuring the preservation movement continues to evolve with the changes in American society and that it captures ***all*** of the historic resources that tell the complete story of America.

[219] Patricia L. Parker and Thomas F. King, *National Register Bulletin 38 Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Traditional Cultural Properties*, National Park Service, Available from http://www.nps.gov/history/nr/publications/bulletins/nrb38/nrb38%20introduction.htm ; Internet; accessed 10 February 2009.

Summary of Modifications

Nomination Process

1. Increase the number of African-American preservation professionals
2. Create staff positions in State Historic Preservation Offices for African-American programs to concentrate on the survey, evaluation and documentation of African-American resources and public participation in the nomination process.
3. Establish committees, task forces and/or networks of individuals and organizations interested in African-American heritage

Eligibility Process

4. Expand scope of the National Register to include intangible resources independent of tangible resources
5. Develop a new criteria for evaluation to include a social or spiritual value
6. Expand the concept of Traditional Cultural Properties to include more cultural groups
7. Broadened the concept of the criteria for integrity to be a continuum rather than a yes/no variable
8. Qualities of integrity should be based on the historical value of the resource rather than emphasis on the retention of historic fabric, when the resource's significance is not for its design or architectural value
9. Guidance for the criteria of integrity should include exceptions to allow cosmetic and reversible changes to a resource, when its significance is not for its design or architectural value
10. Actively involve members of a cultural group in the determination of integrity

Recommendations beyond the National Register

1. Increase funding to the National Park Service, State Historic Preservation Offices, Certified Local Governments and other organizations for projects and programs related to the identification, evaluation, documentation and preservation of resources associated with diverse cultural groups.
2. Increase funding to such programs as the National Historic Landmarks to assist in recognizing significant resources associated with diverse cultural groups.
3. Increase training opportunities on cultural diversity to educate preservation professionals in various positions (i.e. State Historic Preservation Office employees, local historic district commission members) as well as members of diverse cultural groups and the general public on the importance of preserving resources associated with diverse cultural groups.
4. Involve members of cultural groups in more preservation programs including but not limited to: National Historic Landmark designations, interpretations of historic sites, workshops and conferences.
5. Examine the expansion of the curriculum of preservation-degree programs (undergraduate, certificates and graduate) to include coursework dealing with cultural diversity.
6. Develop methods to increase involvement of members of diverse cultural groups in the preservation profession with close examination of the curriculum of preservation-degree program and attendance at preservation workshops and conferences.

Areas of Further Study

Based on the research and findings of this thesis, the following areas are in need of further study to increase the efficiency of the National Register of Historic Places as a tool for the recognition of the diverse cultural heritage of the United States. First the demographic composition of the preservation field in terms of race, gender, and age should be examined as well as the participation of members of diverse cultural groups in the preservation field either as preservation professionals or interested parties in the preservation of their culture. An examination of these two areas will hopefully provide a better understanding of the types of people engaged in preservation and reveal gaps in knowledge and understanding within the preservation field of certain historic resources pertaining to various cultural groups.

Another area for further study is the examination of the impact and feasibility of incorporating intangible heritage and the "spirit of place" as stand-alone resources in the National Register. Intangible heritage is a very complex issue and an in-depth review should be undertaken prior to any action occurs to modify the National Register. Also related to intangible heritage is a need for an examination of expanding the guidance for Traditional Cultural Properties to include more non-American Indian sites and allow for the inclusion of properties significant to other cultural groups.

Lastly, studies should be conducted similar to this thesis on the effectiveness of the National Register to capture the heritage of other diverse cultures in the United States such as Hispanics/Latinos, Asian-Americans, and women. Although similarities will probably appear, the uniqueness of the resources may reveal additional weaknesses and other modifications needed to the National Register to fully capture all the historical resources that pertain to a cultural group.

REFERENCES

About GAAHPN." *Reflections* VII. no. 4 March 2008.

Advisory Council for Historic Preservation. *National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended through 2006.* Available from http://www.achp.gov/docs/nhpa%202008-final.pdf; Internet; Accessed 28 January 2009.

_____. *The National Historic Preservation Program: Overview*. Available from http://www.achp.gov/overview.html; Internet; accessed 24 February 2009.

African American Historic Places, ed. Beth L. Savage and Carol Shull. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1994.

African American NHL Assessment Study. Washington D.C.: National Park Service, 2008.

A Richer Heritage. ed. Robert E. Stipe. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2003.

Australia ICOMOS, *Burra Charter*, Available from http://www.icomos.org/australia/burra.html; Internet; Accessed 26 February 2009.

Becker, Dan. "Reflecting Community Diversity at the Local Level." *Forum Journal* (Spring 2004).

Breitbeck, Helen. "Orson Ames National Register Nomination." 2000.

Brock, Gretchen. "African American Resources in Georgia on the National Register of Historic Places." Email Correspondence with Heather McDonald (20 February 2009).

California Preservation Foundation. *Mobile Workshop- Tahquitz Canyon: "Walk in the Foot steps of Our Ancestors.* Available from http://www.californiapreservation.org/PDFs/2009_LocalCharacterTrack.pdf.; Internet; Accessed 01 March 2009.

Carson, Cary. "Colonial Williamsburg and the Practice of Interpretive Planning in American History Museum. *Public Historian*. 20, no. 3 (1998), 11 - 51.

Cloues, Richard. "Preserving the Legacy, Georgia's Historic African American Resources." *CRM* 17. no. 2 (1994).

"Cultural and Ethnic Diversity in Historic Preservation." ed. Elizabeth Lyon, *NTHP Information Series*, 65 1992.

Cultural Landscapes. ed. Richard Longstreth. Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 2008.

"Cultural Significance." no date. Florida Division of Historical Resources, Eatonville Survey File.

Cyriaque, Jeanne. *GA AAHPN: Preserving Georgia's African American Heritage Program Fact Sheet.* September 2005. Georgia Historic Preservation Office, Program Fact Sheet. Available from http://www.gashpo.org/assets/documents/GAAHPN_fs.pdf; Internet; Accessed 20 February 2009.

Dubrow, Gail. "Finding Her Place: Integrating Women's History into Historic Preservation in Georgia." *Restoring Women's History Through Historic Preservation.* ed. Gail Lee Dubrow and Jennifer B. Goodman. Maryland: John Hopkins University Press, 2002.

Easter, Karen."Of the People or By the People?" *CRM* 15. no. 7 1992.

Environmental Protection Agency, Queensland Government, *Burra Charter.* Available from http://www.epa.qld.gov.au/cultural_heritage/owning_a_heritage_place/guidelines/burra_charter/; Internet; Accessed 26 February 2009.

Florida Division of Historical Resources. *Florida Folklife Program.* 2009. Available from http://www.flheritage.com/preservation/folklife/; Internet; Accessed 17 February 2009.

Fort Ticonderoga National Historic Landmark. *Fort Ticonderoga History: 19th Century*, available from http://www.fort-ticonderoga.org/history/19th-century.htm; Internet; Accessed 10 January 2009.

Georgia State Historic Preservation Office. *African American Programs, Program & Contact Information*. Available from http://www.gashpo.org/content/displaycontent.asp?txtDocument=50; Internet; Accessed 25 February 2009.

_____. *Staff Directory.* Available from http://www.gashpo.org/content/displaycontent.asp?txtDocument=26; Internet; Accessed 25 February 2009.

Grant, Alice M., Tina Bucuvalas and Carl Shiver. "Eatonville Historic District National Register Nomination." May 1997. Florida Division of Historical Resources, Eatonville Survey File.

Harper, Marilyn. "Reviewer Comments Eatonville Historic District, Orange County Florida." 18 November 1997. Florida Division of Historical Resources, Eatonville Survey File.

Historic Preservation Today. Charlottesville: The University Press of Virginia, 1966.

Hume, David. "Of the Standard of Taste," in *Of the Standard of Taste and Other Essays,* ed. John Lenz. Indianapolis, IN: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc, 1965.

ICOMOS. *Declaration of San Antonio,* Available from http://www.icomos.org/docs/san_antonio.html; Internet; Accessed 26 February 2009.

_____. *Nara Document on Authenticity,* Available from http://www.international.icomos.org/naradoc_eng.htm; Internet; Accessed 26 February 2009.

_____. *Venice Charter*.12 January 1996, Available from http://www.icomos.org/venice_charter.html; Internet; Accessed 10 January 2009.

Iowa State University. *The Legacy of George Washington Carver*. 01 March 2007, Available from http://www.lib.iastate.edu/spcl/gwc/bio.html; Internet; Accessed 20 January 2009.

Kaufman, Ned. *Cultural Heritage Needs Assessment: Phase I.* draft. Washington, D.C.: National Park Service, 2004.

King, Thomas. *Cultural Resource Laws & Practice.* 3d ed. New York: Alta Mira Press, 2008.

_____. *Places that Count, Traditional Cultural Properties in Cultural Resources Management.* Maryland: Alta Mira Press, 2003.

Kinnard, Gretchen. "The National Register of Historic Places." *Reflections* II. no. 1 December 2001.

Kurin, Richard. "Intangible Cultural Heritage in the 2003 UNESCO Convention." *Museum International* (2004).

Lee, Antoinette J. "Cultural Diversity and Historic Preservation." *CRM*, 15. (1992).

_____. "Cultural Diversity in Historic Preservation." *Historic Preservation Forum* 6, no.4. (July/August 1992).

_____. *Past Meets Future: Saving America's Historic Environments.* New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1993.

Lewis, John. "Keeping Our African-American Heritage Alive." *Historic Preservation Forum.* (January/February 1993).

Library of Congress. *African American History Landmark Theme Study Act.* Available from http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/z?c102:S.639.IS; Internet; Accessed 19 February 2009.

_____. *American Folklife Preservation Act*, Available from http://www.loc.gov/folklife/public_law.html; Internet; Accessed 26 February 2009.

Lindgren, James. *Preserving Historic New England Preservation, Progressivism, and the Remaking of Memory.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.

_____. *Preserving the Old Dominion.* Charlottesville: The University of Virginia Press, 1993.

Munjeri, Dawson. "Tangible and Intangible Heritage: from difference to convergence." *Museum International* 56, no. 1-2 (May 2004).

Nathiri, N.Y., "Heritage and History in Eatonville, Florida." *Historic Preservation Forum.* (January/February 1993).

National Archives. *Underground Railroad Education and Preservation Initiative*. Available from http://clinton4.nara.gov/textonly/Initiatives/OneAmerica/Practices/pp_19980901.4521.html; Internet; Accessed 23 January 2009.

National Register Bulletin 15 How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation, rev. Washington D.C.: National Park Service, 1995.

The National Register of Historic Places. Washington, D.C.: National Park Service.

National Park Service. *Antiquities Act of 1906*. available from http://www.nps.gov/history/local-law/anti1906.htm; Internet; Accessed 10 January 2009.

_____. *Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park*. 10 January 2009, Available from http://www.nps.gov/chch/index.htm; Internet; Accessed 10 January 2009.

_____. *Cultural Resources Diversity Program.* Available from http://www.nps.gov/history/crdi/description/prgm.htm; Internet; Accessed 6 February 2009.

_____. *Historic Sites and Building Act of 1935*. Available from http://www.nps.gov/history/local-law/FHPL_HistSites.pdf; Internet; Accessed 10 January 2009.

_____. *National Underground Railroad: Network to Freedom*. Available from http://www.nps.gov/history/ugrr/about.htm; Internet; Accessed 23 January 2009

_____. *Raleigh: A Capital City, A National Register of Historic Places Travel Itinerary*. Available from http://www.nps.gov/nr/travel/raleigh/preservation.htm; Internet; Accessed 23 February 2009.

_____. *Underground Railroad: Special Resources Study*. 12 February 1998, available from http://www.nps.gov/undergroundrr/ugsum.htm; Internet; Accessed 23 January 2009

_____. *Yellowstone National Park*. 04 December 2008, available from http://www.nps.gov/yell/; Internet; Accessed 10 January 2009.

National Trust for Historic Preservation in the United States. *America's Forgotten Architecture.* New York: Pantheon Books, 1976.

Oswego County New York Freedom Trail-Underground Railroad. *Orson Ames*. Oswego State University of New York. Available from http://www.oswego.edu/ugrr/ames.html; Internet; Accessed 5 February 2009.

Parker, Patricia L. and Thomas F. King, *National Register Bulletin 38 Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Traditional Cultural* Properties, National Park Service, Available from http://www.nps.gov/history/nr/publications/bulletins/nrb38/nrb38%20introduction.htm; Internet; accessed 10 February 2009

Percy, George. letter to Keeper of the National Register Carol D. Shull. 01 September 1997. Florida Division of Historical Resources, Eatonville Survey File.

_____. letter to Mayor Harry Bing. 17 June 1992. Florida Division of Historical Resources, Eatonville Survey File.

Race and Hispanic Origin, for the United States, Regions, Divisions, and States: 1980. Census Bureau. 28 August 2008. Available from http://www.census.gov/population/www/documentation/twps0056/tabA-03.pdf; Internet; Accessed 4 February 2009.

Readings in Historic Preservation: Why? What? How?. eds. Normand Williams Jr., Edmund H. Kellogg, and Frank B. Gilbert. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Center for Urban Policy Research, 1983.

Redern, Maggie. "Three Old Houses cast their spell on America's First Preservationist, William Sumner Appleton." *Historic New England Magazine* (Spring 2001).

Ruskin, John. *The Seven Lamps of Architecture*. Vol. 5 of The Complete Works of John Ruskin, LL.D. New York: B Bryan, Taylor & Company, 1894.

Sernett, Milton and Judith Wellman. "Multiple Property Nomination, Historic Resources Related to the Freedom Trail, Abolitionism, and African American Life in Central New York, 1820-1870." 2000.

Shull, Carol D. "Using the National Register of Historic Places, Getting the Most for Our Money." *CRM* 17. no. 2 1994.

South Carolina African American Heritage Commission, Available from http://www.state.sc.us/scdah/afamer/hpaahcommission.htm; Internet; Accessed 25 February 2009.

Strassburger, Robin. "Eatonville File – Status." Memo to Eatonville File from Robin Strassburger. 04 December 1979. Florida Division of Historical Resources, Eatonville Survey File.

"Telling the World Our Unique Heritage." Gullah/Geechee Cultural Heritage Corridor, Cultural Management Plan Posters. Gullah/Geechee Cultural Heritage Corridor Commission.

The American Mosaic, Preserving a Nation's Heritage. ed. Robert E. Stipe and Antoinette J. Lee. Washington, D.C.: US/ICOMOS, 1987.

The Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings. *The Manifesto.* Available from http://www.spab.org.uk/html/what-is-spab/the-manifesto/; Internet; accessed 10 January 2009.

Thurston, Bill. "Eatonville." Memo to Suzanne Walker. 20 April 1993. Florida Division of Historical Resources, Eatonville Survey File.

Tuskegee University. *History of Tuskegee University*. 2009, Available from http://www.tuskegee.edu/Global/story.asp?S=1070392; Internet; Accessed 20 January 2009.

Tyler, Norman Ilene R. Tyler and Ted J. Ligibel. *Historic Preservation: An Introduction to its History, Principles and Practices.* New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1999.

UNESCO. *The Oral Heritage and Cultural Manifestations of the Zapara People*. Available from http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/index.php?RL=30; Internet; Accessed 26 February 2009.

United States Conference of Mayors, Special Committee on Historic Preservation. *With Heritage So Rich*, eds. Albert Rains and Laurance G. Henderson. New York: Random House Inc., 1966.

United States Congressman James E. Clyburn. "Gullah-Geechee Cultural Heritage Corridor. Available from http://clyburn.house.gov/district-gullah.cfm; Internet; Accessed 05 February 2009.

Viollet-le-Duc, Eugene –Emmanuel. *The Foundations of Architecture, Selections from the Dictionnaire raisonne.* trans. Kenneth D. Whitehead. New York: George Braziller, Inc., 1990.

Weeksville Heritage Center. *Historic Weeksville.* Available from http://www.weeksvillesociety.org/node/3; Internet; Accessed 20 January 2009

Wellman, Judith. “The Underground Railroad and the National Register of Historic Places: Historical Importance vs. Architectural Integrity.” *Public Historian,* 24, no.1 (Winter 2002).

Weyeneth, Robert R. “The Architecture of Racial Segregation: The Challenges of Preserving the Problematic Past.” *Public Historian* 27, no. 4 (Fall 2005).

APPENDIX A

PHOTOGRAPHS OF EATONVILLE HISTORIC DISTRICT, FLORIDA

Figure 1: Example of a contributing residential building in the historic district (Photo courtesy of Florida Department of State, Division of Historical Resources, Bureau of Historic Preservation, Florida Master Site File)

Figure 2: Example of typical contributing buildings in historic district (Photo courtesy of Florida Department of State, Division of Historical Resources, Bureau of Historic Preservation, Florida Master Site File)

Figure 3: Another example of a contributing building in the historic district (Photo courtesy of Florida Department of State, Division of Historical Resources, Bureau of Historic Preservation, Florida Master Site File)

Figure 4: Example of a contributing commercial building in the historic district (Photo courtesy of Florida Department of State, Division of Historical Resources, Bureau of Historic Preservation, Florida Master Site File)

APPENDIX B

PHOTOGRAPHS OF ORSON AMES HOUSE, NEW YORK

Figure 5: Historic photograph of Ames house, date unknown
(Photo courtesy of Oswego State University of New York;
http://www.oswego.edu/ugrr/ames.html)

Figure 6: Photograph of Ames house with alterations, 1999
(Photo courtesy of Oswego State University of New York;
http://www.oswego.edu/ugrr/ames.html)