

# CRM Bulletin

Volume 9:No.1 Cultural Resources Management

• A National Park Service Technical Bulletin February 1986

## **National Historic Preservation Act—A Retrospective**

**Jerry L. Rogers**

Looking back, it is hard to believe that federally-sponsored destruction of our nation's cultural heritage was the order of the day only twenty years ago. It was not that the government opposed cultural resources; it simply did not recognize them, beyond the historical units of the National Park System and the National Historic Landmarks. America was on a public-funded development binge.

Interstate highways were plowing through where land could be bought for less, usually older neighborhoods and parklands. Using urban renewal funds, cities were busily leveling the buildings and districts that distinguished them from all other cities, assembling lands into larger parcels, and urging developers to put up redundant and undistinguished new buildings. River and harbor improvements and water impoundments destroyed or inundated countless archeological sites, rescuing data from a haphazardly selected few. The tax code of the United States encouraged the destruction of historic buildings by rewarding the construction of new ones on their sites. There were no state historic preservation officers, only a few feeble state historic site surveys, and a handful of local historic district commissions. These were unevenly run, without generally accepted standards and guidelines and with few answers to be found in the almost non-existent technical literature. The strongest state and local entities were powerless before the federal juggernaut. Within the central government, even the National Park Service encountered difficulty, defending history against powerful and excessively funded development agencies.

October 15, 1966 when the National Historic Preservation Act became law, was the turning point. The significant parts of the Act were conceived in the National Trust for Historic Preservation, which itself had been conceived in the National Park Service. The new law provided for a National Register, to include properties significant on a national, state, or local scale, and authorized an Advisory Council on Historic Preservation to comment on undertakings that affected registered properties.

To expand the National Register beyond the 800 or so nationally significant entities that had been identified earlier, the National Park Service chose a decentralized approach. The Service would rely, to the greatest possible degree, upon citizens who knew and loved historic properties. It would develop a network of state historic preservation programs to educate, guide, and serve the citizen movement, and to perform—although voluntarily as sovereign entities—almost as though they were extensions of the National Park Service. As the concept of this unique federal/state partnership grew, it became clear that evolution would be its hallmark. As preservation strength and professionalism grew in states, local governments, and the private sector, the National Park Service would constantly modify its own role to perform the essential functions the rest of the partnership could not perform for itself.

The concept has stood the test of time. Today, there are 45,000 entries in the National Register, encompassing a far greater number of individual properties. There are state historic preservation offices in 57 states and similar jurisdictions. Each year federal agencies use this network to consider their impacts upon historic properties approximately 40,000 times. Federally sponsored archeological data recovery is so far-reaching that

coordination has become more important than encouragement. Under a system of tax incentives, the federal government has approved over 14,000 rehabilitation proposals encompassing work valued at more than \$9.3 billion. In 1968, Dr. Ernest Allen Connally, Chief of the Park Service's Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation, mused that the program had the potential to become a humane form of urban renewal. It has done that, and more. And it has done it without building a huge bureaucracy. The Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation in 1967 budgeted approximately 1~0 positions, while in fiscal year 1986, the National Register Programs servicewide only budgeted approximately 192 positions. State programs, which also were only being called into existence in 1967, now employ over 800 positions.

The opportunity of this twentieth anniversary must be used to the fullest. We need to take stock of our achievements and to celebrate our champions, but even more, we need to keep the evolution going. This is a time to re-examine precepts and practices. During this year, we will review the National Register Criteria for Evaluation, the Secretary's Standards for Rehabilitation, our division of labor, responsibility, and authority with the states, and our funding mechanisms, just to name a few. We will try to improve archeological program coordination first within the Department of the Interior and then throughout the executive branch of government. We will attempt to forge firmer, friendlier, more effective, and symbiotic relationships between parks and state historic preservation offices. We will seek out forums in which achievements can be recounted and in which ideas for improvement can be heard.

Throughout the year, CRM BULLETIN will publish articles on the forces leading up to the National Historic Preservation Act, and the events, decisions, individuals, and groups that have shaped the Act's results. Dr. Connally leads off with an analysis of the background to the Act. You are in for a treat.

The author is Associate Director, Cultural Resources, WASO.

# **They Don't Write Letters From the Heart Like They Used To**

**Debra Berke**

I hope you will have the strength to get through your examinations in a satisfactory manner to yourself, and then on the heels of the ordeal, pull off the lecture in such a creditable manner that the audience will "Rise as one man," and shower you with kind words, I am proud of you for the efforts you have made, but remember one thing my boy that robust health is about the best asset on earth.

This passage occurs in a January 25, 1909 letter written by the rural Nebraskan ranch owner, James Cook, to his son attending college in "the great city" of New York. The two corresponded almost daily, and in their letters, their closeness and mutual openness are clearly illustrated. How different Cook's letters are from those we write in 1986. Today we rely on the telephone to communicate matters of personal concern. It is usually business-related issues that are committed to paper. With this in mind, one has to wonder what written clues to our lifestyles and personalities will be unearthed 100 years from now? Will there be the same degree of human involvement illustrated by the Cook correspondence?

In 1968, Agate Fossil Beds National Monument received 120 cubic feet of papers from the Cook family attic, dating from 1856 to 1967. Included in the donation were 72 cardboard grocery boxes, containing miscellaneous papers ranging from canceled checks, family correspondence, and newspaper clippings to thank-you notes, trade catalogs, and lists of Lakota Indian words. No one really knew what level of significance to attribute to the papers—either for research or park information. However, the Cooks had discovered the fossils which Agate Fossil Beds preserves, and had owned the ranch which became part of the national monument... so some significance was assumed.

To deal with the huge donation, Park Superintendent Jerry Banta, along with John Hunter, Regional Curator, Midwest Regional Office, and David Nathanson, Chief Librarian, Harpers Ferry Center, arranged for the papers to be organized, indexed, and put in proper storage condition. In 1982, a Scope of Work statement was written; and in 1983 a contract to complete the project was granted to the University of South Dakota at Vermillion.

Once at the university, the contents of each box of papers was separated into correspondence piles and noncorrespondence items like bank statements, legal documents, printed materials, and newspaper clippings. Large tables and three rooms physically separated the materials. Correspondence was handled first so that workers could gain familiarity with the Cook family members, each piece being read, sorted, and stacked into alphabetical piles, and topical information on each item entered into a computer. According to Karen Zimmerman, one of the archivists working with the collection, the job was sometimes overwhelming: "At first I didn't want to throw out anything because I did not know if it would be relevant. But after working with the collection I was able to identify handwriting and make sense out of scraps of paper, like notes of hay measurements or pages from an unidentified manuscript." In addition to organizing the papers, all clips, rubber bands, and staples were removed, and then the documents were put in various sized acid-free archival boxes.

It took one principal investigator, one work study student, and occasional volunteers approximately two years to complete the work. In mid-1985 the collection came to Scotts Bluff National Monument, whose superintendent also oversees Agate Fossil Beds National Monument; 121 document boxes are temporarily stored in the park's library. The National Park Service also received a report prepared by the University of South Dakota containing

biographical sketches of Cook family members, a document inventory, a topical index of correspondence, and an assessment of the collection's significance.

Gradually, what had been a haphazard group of papers became an organized wealth of information. The collection now conforms to general archival standards and has computerized finding aids, making the collection ripe for research. The Park Service is pleased to find that information on a variety of subjects is contained in the papers.

A western Nebraska ranching family, the Cooks shared their interests in ethnology, paleontology, history, and literature. In so doing, they developed both a passion for letter writing, and a collection of politically, scientifically, and artistically minded friends. As a cowboy in Texas, a rancher in New Mexico, and a scout in the U.S. Military campaign against Geronimo (prior to setting up his Agate Springs Ranch in 1887), James Cook maintained a 35-year friendship with Chief Red Cloud, one of the last great Sioux warriors. Cook's son, Harold, became intrigued with paleontology when, at five years old, he helped remove a fossil near the ranch. Harold spent most of his life at the ranch while continuing his lifelong paleontological research, and authored over 62 publications. The correspondence of him and his father with the luminaries of the day offer new insights on the activities and attitudes of this historical period. As Park Superintendent Jerry Banta observes: "There are hundreds of stories in the papers. Every topic that you chase down turns out to be interesting. Once you start reading it's hard to stop." For instance, the collection contains a letter from Clarence Darrow saying that he would like to visit the Cook ranch once the "case is through in Tennessee." There is also a letter from the photographer William Henry Jackson remarking that, "It is so much easier and entertaining to roll off spool after spool of film in the camera than it is to follow through with the finished print." Some of the topics covered by the correspondence include: ranching, the history of science, Nebraska politics, and the establishment of local historic sites and parks. The financial records, letters from employees, trade catalogs, supply lists, and land records contain a storehouse of information on rural ranching. A scholar easily could analyze trends in greeting card styles from the huge collection of cards saved by the family, some of them Christmas cards with a ranching theme. The correspondence between scientists and the Cooks also sheds light on the history of paleontology. Many of the letters claim that Harold actually discovered Folsom Man. The huge collection of colorful correspondence from western writers, historians, cowboys, and cowboy lovers records their opinions and activities. This section from a 1920 letter by The Bozeman Trail author, E. A. Brininstool, on the subject of a common friend shows the character of some of these people.

Wouldn't it be a queer arrangement of affairs if they should put down a well on his land and he should make a strike!! Gee, I can see him going around in a new store suit, a big Stetson, a celluloid collar and flaming tie, in his ten-cylinder Sedan. Well, here's hoping the picture comes true.

Another significant topic covered in the papers is Sioux Indian life in the early 19th century. Contained in the collection are at least two Lakota-English dictionaries in progress and over 600 letters to the Cook family from Indians, one of which is an 1891 petition signed by Indian Chiefs requesting the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to appoint James Cook as Agent on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation. The other letters often reminisce over old times, request advice or employment, describe problems on the reservation, discuss visits to the Agate Ranch, or just express feelings of friendship for the Cooks. Many relatives of the correspondents are still living today in the Plains area. Karen Zimmerman, the University of South Dakota contractor, had an interesting experience. One day in the library she saw a man with the words "Big Bat" beaded on his belt, and asked him if he was related to Baptiste Pourier (Big Bat), writer of 10 letters to Cook from 1917 to 1928. Sure enough, Pourier turned out to be the man's grandfather, though this latter day descendant had no idea that such letters existed or knew about any of the events described in the letters. Agate Fossil Beds' multi-faceted collection of papers will ultimately be housed in a protective repository where park staff and researchers will have access to them.

For the time being, however, they will be stored at Scotts Bluff National Monument in the park library. The park is currently examining them for references to items in their museum collection. For example, Museum Technician Audrey Barnhart found a letter describing a muslin shirt specially made by the Sioux Indians for James Cook. Previously, this shirt was thought to be Red Cloud's Ghost Dance shirt. After the park has sufficient time to evaluate the collection, they will make a decision on where it should be deposited—either in an archive built at Agate Fossil Beds or placed on loan at a university or research center.

The Cook family letters preserve the personalities, feelings, and life events of that generation. We can see Harold banging away at the typewriter, capitalizing and underlining words for emphasis... or the anguish of a father writing daily to his son at college about his mother's mental collapse. Even day-to-day events are preserved. A note from James H. Red Cloud at the South Dakota Pine Ridge Indian Reservation tells that his two boys have been away too long with the family car; could Harold tell them to come home if he sees them in Gering, Nebraska?

The author is a Staff Curator with the WASO Preservation Assistance Division, Curatorial Services Branch. Her research trip to examine the Cook papers was partially financed by a National Endowment for the Humanities Travel to Collections Grant.

# Cleaning Up the Bronze in the National Park Service

Nicolas F. Veloz

At summer's end, children of several National Park Service (NPS) employees were able to ask, "What did you do at summer camp, Daddy?" And these same employees were able to respond with stories about Camp Washem-Waxem, held at Valley Forge National Historical Park in July and August.

Camp Washem-Waxem was the idea of Henry Magaziner and Reed Engle of the Mid-Atlantic Regional Office. With the assistance of Valley Forge NHP Superintendent Wallace Elms and his staff, they organized two three-week training sessions providing "hands-on" experience to regional employees in the preservation of outdoor bronze statuary. NPS Director William Penn Mott, Jr., heartily endorsed and encouraged the project when he wrote: "The Region and the Park are to be commended for undertaking this innovative and cost-effective approach to insuring the preservation of this nationally significant ensemble of bronze statuary."

The first session began July 8. An introductory slide show outlined general concepts and treatments to be employed through the summer, including ground walnut shells as an air-driven abrasive, corrosion inhibitors, and synthetic waxes. The first statue treated was that of Baron Frederick von Steuben, a Prussian officer who volunteered his services to the Continental Army during the Revolutionary War. The statue had been moved at least once in its history, and coated with an unknown material sometime in the past. The coating had failed in large areas, allowing the elements to attack the bronze. Finely ground walnut shells in a commercial sandblaster at a very unconventional 20 pounds per square inch pressure (psi) cleaned the statue. Standard abrasive cleaning methods usually employ pressures in the range of 100-150 psi.

Following the cleaning, the statue was washed, treated with Benzotriazole (BTA), a corrosion inhibitor, and waxed with a mixture of synthetic waxes applied with one-inch brushes after the statue had been heated to about 175 degrees Fahrenheit with propane torches. Various portions of these procedures are described in Volume 7, Number 2 (1984) of the CRM BULLETIN.

In addition to the von Steuben statue, work continued at the New Jersey Monument, as well as at several bronze plaques placed throughout the park to indicate troop locations and encampments. The summer clean-up emphasized providing a preservation treatment to protect the statues from exposure to the elements, and thereby increase their longevity. A pleasant by-product was the dramatic difference in the statuary as the work progressed. Local citizens stopped by to comment, and all the area papers carried the story.

At the end of the three weeks, participants received training certificates from Superintendent Elms, as well as "ribbons" in the form of bright red suspenders. (Actually, the suspenders were awarded "as per custom" upon completion of the first statue, and became a symbol of accomplishment and pride throughout the remainder of the course. )

The second three-week session continued the work of the first at the Pennsylvania Memorial, and culminated with the General Anthony Wayne equestrian statue. As before, various plaques were included, for example, those on the Pennsylvania Memorial.

Sometime prior to NPS acquisition of the park, several plaques had been stripped to bare metal, then painted. At the time of the workshop, peeling paint exposed either bright metal or an oxidized surface. Once completely removed, it left the plaques with a splotchy, uneven appearance. The decision was made to repatinate them. Statues and plaques routinely receive patinas at the foundry as the final step in the fabrication process. Patinas are applied to metals through chemical reactions between selected chemicals and the metal itself. Patrick Strezlec of the Johnson Atelier in Mercerville, New Jersey instructed both sessions in the reapplication of an appropriate patina.

One of the highlights of the summer was an "open house" held for NPS employees from other parks, professional conservators, museum staff, and others from the northeastern United States. Approximately 75 people heard Hugh Miller, Chief Historical Architect of the Park Service, speak about NPS preservation philosophy applied to statuary. He stressed preservation as the preferred treatment of historical resources, and said restoration is not mandated or required, and is often not desirable in the treatment of outdoor monuments. He also used this opportunity to release and discuss the new NPS guidelines for outdoor sculpture, now in NPS-28, Release No. 3, August 1985. John Bond, Associate Regional Director for Cultural Resources, Mid-Atlantic Region, and Superintendent Elms spoke on the work accomplished at Valley Forge. A slide presentation, along with demonstrations of the various techniques performed by the trainees, put the actual work in context. All of these activities emphasized Hugh Miller's earlier remarks and stressed resource preservation rather than restoration, a philosophy so ably stated by John Ruskin: "Take proper care of your monuments and you will not need to restore them."

The author is CRM Specialist, George Washington Memorial Parkway. He instructed the 6-week training session, and has been performing preservation maintenance on statuary in the Metropolitan Washington area since 1978.

Joan Marshall-Dutcher, Research Historian, Valley Forge NHP, served as park coordinator and organized much of the park's support and the open house. In attendance at the first session were Duane Taylor, Maintenance Worker, and Preston James, Museum Specialist, Valley Forge NHP; and Ray Larson, Painter, Independence NHP. The second session included Tom Schiller, Buildings and Utilities Foreman, Ft. McHenry NM&HS; Bob Holt, Maintenance Mechanic, Colonial NHP; Bob Voorhees, Exhibits Specialist, Gettysburg NMP; and Duane Taylor of Valley Forge. Joe Rogers, Objects Conservator, the Nelson Atkins Art Museum, Kansas City, Missouri attended the last week, and Henry Lie, Conservator, Harvard University Art Museums, also attended a portion of the session.

# **Popular Perception of Industrial History**

## **Theme of 1985 Lowell Conference**

**Robert Weible**

Attended by 200 people from numerous universities and a host of historical institutions, the 6th annual Lowell Conference on Industrial History focused on the public's understanding of its industrial heritage. It also explored the ways in which museums, historic sites, community-based historical programs, corporate public relations efforts, and films determine our popular perceptions of the industrial past.

One very central goal of the meeting was to redefine the term "public history" from simply "history was practiced outside the classroom" (a definition that principally serves the employment needs of historians) to "history for the public." The conference program consequently examined the relationship historians of the Industrial Revolution have with the public, a relationship that assumes historians have a mission and responsibility to work with the public in building historical programs that: 1) help people understand the meaning of their heritage and 2) demonstrate their individual contributions as makers of their own history.

Clement M. Silvestro (Museum of Our National Heritage) chaired the meeting's first panel on museum interpretations of the Industrial Revolution. Papers were presented by Mary H. Blewett (University of Lowell), who analyzed the application of the new social history to New England textile history museums; Jacqueline A. Hinsley (Hagley Museum and Library), who described the evolution of the Hagley Museum, one of the country's most prominent industrial museums; and Nicholas Westbrook (Minnesota Historical Society), who surveyed and analyzed industrial museums in Great Britain.

Lowell National Historical Park and its ambitious development plans provided material for the day's second session, while the following morning began with a diverse sampling of historical programs from different parts of the country. Represented were the American Labor Museum in Paterson, New Jersey; Discovery Hall Museum in South Bend, Indiana; and the North Carolina Humanities Committee. Loretta A. Ryan (Calhoun School, NYC) provided an insightful analysis of the role local historical concerns played in Lowell's recent revitalization, while Robert Asher (University of Connecticut) focused on the interrelationship of technology and social change in each of the four papers. Michael Wallace (John Jay College) provided commentary that many regarded as a high point of the conference. Wallace acknowledged that museums and historic sites have made meaningful social history available to the public for over a decade, but that much work remains to be done, particularly in relating local history to larger national and international issues.

Papers that examined the historical roles played by industrialists and inventors covered textile magnate Nathan Appleton (author Michael Folsom), and inventor Eli Whitney (authors Frances Robb and Michael Workman). The authors confronted the heroic mythologies that surround people like Appleton and Whitney in the popular mind, as well as the implications of using the new social history as the basis for debunking such myths.

The next session focused on the effect of corporate public relations efforts on popular attitudes towards industrial development. Papers by Helena Wright (Smithsonian Institution) on artworks commissioned by early textile manufacturers, Pamela W. Lurito (Chamberlayne Junior College) on images of progress in 19th century advertisements; and Patrick J. Furlong (Indiana University at South Bend) on employee images created by the Studebaker Company in their advertising programs, all provided the basis for the skillful commentary of Richard S. Tedlow (Harvard Business School).

Film and filmmaking served as the focal point of the next day's opening sessions. Among other things, the panel of historian-filmmakers discussed Dougherty's film on



Pittsburgh steelworkers, "People and Power: The Struggle Continues," which was shown to conference attendees the previous evening. Papers examining pre-World War I Hollywood portrayals of American workers were offered next by Francis G. Couvares (Amherst College) and Daniel J. Citrom (Mt. Holyoke College). Francis R. Walsh (University of Lowell) spoke on labor films from 1935 to 1954.

The meeting concluded in a session chaired by Paul Marion (Lowell Historic Preservation Commission) with a look at three recent industrial history exhibits from northern New England: "Vermont Workers, Vermont Resources" (Vermont Labor History Society); "Made in Maine" (Maine State Museum); and "Mill on Main Street: Reflections on Industrial New Hampshire" (Plymouth State College).

The proceedings from the 1985 conference will be published during 1986 by the Museum of American Textile History and Boston University, two of the Lowell Conference sponsors. Other sponsors are Lowell National Historical Park, the University of Lowell, and the Lowell Historic Preservation Commission.

The 1986 Lowell Conference is scheduled for October 30 to November 1. Its theme will be "Politics and Industrialization." Anyone seeking further information or wishing to submit a proposal to the program committee should do so by writing to the Lowell Conference on Industrial History, 169 Merrimack Street, Lowell, MA 01852. The deadline for proposals is March 31, 1986.

The author is Conference Chairman, Lowell National Historical Park.

# Origins of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966

Ernest Allen Connally

Last year marked the fiftieth anniversary of the Historic Sites Act of 1935. That enactment was a major milestone in the progress of preservation in this country, and the accomplishments flowing from it were recognized in a Joint Resolution of Congress signed by President Reagan on October 1, 1985. The 1935 statute confirmed the role of the National Park Service as the federal government's central agency for historic preservation. The Service was consciously given that responsibility in addition to its other, better known functions. For the Act was a consequence of the initiative taken as early as 1930 by Director Horace M. Albright to move into the historical field. It was a follow-up to President Franklin D. Roosevelt's 1933 order reorganizing the executive branch, which consolidated the administration of federally-owned historic sites, monuments, and battlefields in the National Park Service.

Now, entering the year 1986, we approach another important milestone: the twentieth anniversary of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. That law vastly increased the scope of historic preservation as public policy and correspondingly broadened the duties of the National Park Service, while offering it unprecedented opportunity.

## ***Public Policy***

The 1966 legislation chronologically supplements that of 1935, which remains in force. The later statute is thus most readily understood with reference to the earlier one. The Act of 1935 aims "to provide for the preservation of historic American sites, buildings, objects, and antiquities of national significance...for the inspiration and benefit of the American people." The Act of 1966 purposes "to establish a program for the preservation of additional historic properties throughout the Nation...as a living part of our community life and development..." Clearly, the enlarged federal responsibility that came with the Act of 1966 was meant to extend beyond properties of national significance to include those important at the state and community level. Historic buildings were now to be preserved and restored not only for their educational value as museum exhibits, but also for their continued practical use and lasting importance in our daily lives. Broadly conceived, the new program applied to every square inch under the flag. Such a comprehensive federal policy eventuated in response to the drastically changed conditions and multiple threats to the nation's heritage that arose in the post-war decades.

## ***First Steps***

A basic responsibility of the National Park Service under the Act of 1935, and one that continues, is the mandate to "survey historic and archeological sites, buildings, and objects for the purpose of determining which possess exceptional value as commemorating or illustrating the history of the United States." The administrative mechanism created to carry out this assignment was the National Survey of Historic Sites and Buildings (in short, the Historic Sites Survey), which became operational in summer 1936, employing a thematic method.

From the beginning, it was recognized that a broad net would have to be cast to sift out the properties bearing national significance. Therefore, on recommendation of the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites Buildings and Monuments (called into being by terms of the Act), a policy was adopted with respect to properties not identified for federal attention; it would be the function of the National Park Service to encourage state and local governments, and other agencies, to undertake the protection and

interpretation of those properties endowed with significance less than national. In this early scheme can be seen a tentative prefiguration of the federal-state cooperation that has characterized the expansion of the National Register of Historic Places since the Act of 1966. Unfortunately, the pioneering process that looked towards the compilation of a national inventory of historic sites and buildings was cut short by the attack on Pearl Harbor. In 1942, the Historic Sites Survey was suspended, as was the Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS), which had been established since 1933. Its headquarters quickly moved to Chicago; the National Park Service was reduced to caretaker status for the duration of the war.

### ***The National Trust***

With the cessation of hostilities, and release of pent-up demand for housing and other new construction, it was quickly realized that the National Park Service would be unable to bear the whole burden of protecting a national patrimony under accelerating threat. Congressional committees refused to authorize appropriations for the acquisition of historic properties that were important primarily for cultural or aesthetic values. A critical case was Hampton, an architecturally significant estate near Towson, Maryland, that was at risk of destruction for subdivision housing. It was rescued by Ailsa Bruce Mellon and the Avalon Foundation, who bought it and gave it to the reluctant United States.

It was recognized in various quarters that there was a need for an organization with the independence of a private corporation to supplement the role of the National Park Service to receive gifts, and hold properties that could not be appropriately or practicably administered by the government. Consequently, owing to the efforts of various leaders, notably including Ronald F. Lee (1904-1972) of the National Park Service, the National Trust for Historic Preservation was chartered by Congress in 1949 "to further the policy enunciated in the Act of August 21, 1935...and to facilitate public participation in the preservation of sites, buildings, and objects of national significance or interest..."

### ***Mission 66***

In the first post-war decade the National Park Service was preoccupied with the deterioration and inadequacy of its facilities, neglected during wartime and then subjected to the demands of a rolling tide of visitors swelling from 22 million in 1946 to 54 million in 1954. In those years, budgets remained essentially stationary while federal spending priorities were directed to rearmament as a result of the Cold War and military intervention in Korea. At last, in 1956, with the endorsement of President Eisenhower, Director Conrad L. Wirth launched his 10-year development program to bring the National Park System up to standard by 1966, the fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the National Park Service. Famous as Mission 66, the program included the restoration of historic structures in the System and made possible the resumption of HABS, some limited work for which had been done by the offices of design and construction since 1951. The Historic Sites Survey was also reactivated in 1957. Its first fruits were the 92 properties that Secretary Fred Seaton announced as National Historic Landmarks in October 1960.

By that date, however, preservation in the United States was in a state of crisis brought on by pervasive new development in the private sector and, especially, by such massive public works as water impoundment, urban renewal, and highway construction. The speed and scale at which both landscape and townscape were being reshaped were wholly unprecedented.

### ***Water Impoundment***

As soon as the war was over, the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation activated plans to create a vast system of reservoirs across the country. From the Susquehanna to the Columbia, on streams large and small, dams would be built to convert

river valleys into a series of lakes. In the Missouri River Basin, covering a third of the 48 states, 108 dams (more later) were authorized. The largest lake to be impounded stretched a length of 308 miles at high water. While provisions had been made to relocate highways, railroads, cemeteries, and whole towns, and to compensate farmers for lost bottom land, thousands of ancient sites, typically located along river banks and adjacent bluffs, were ignored.

Alerted to the dimensions and urgency of the threat, leaders of the archeological profession, chiefly J. O. Brew and Frederick Johnson, seized the initiative that resulted in the Inter-Agency Archaeological Salvage Program. Relying on the authority of the Act of 1935, the National Park Service and the Smithsonian Institution, collaborators in archeological work in the thirties, entered a formal agreement in summer 1945 to effect the program, beginning before construction started the following year. With financial support from the American Council of Learned Societies, the independent Committee for the Recovery of Archaeological Remains (CRAR) was formed to advise the National Park Service on planning and programming, and otherwise to encourage an appropriate public policy. The program was given its own statutory authority in the Reservoir Salvage Act of 1960 (amended in 1974). By the mid-sixties, more than 500 reservoir areas having been surveyed and thousands of sites located, the program had demonstrated the virtues of government agencies cooperating with professional bodies and learned institutions, which did most of the field work. The Inter-Agency Archaeological Salvage Program represented the first major coordination of archeologists and historians with construction engineers.

### ***Urban Renewal***

Urban Renewal grew out of the New Deal's slum clearance and low-cost housing programs administered under the Department of the Interior by the U.S. Housing Authority, established in 1937. From this origin evolved the Housing and Home Finance Agency (1947) and eventually the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), created in 1965. Continued during the war for defense housing, the program emerged as urban renewal under the Housing Act of 1949, which provided for large-scale clearance and private rebuilding. These dual aspects of the program were greatly stepped up by the Housing Acts of 1954, 1957, and 1959, provoking a rising chorus of outrage at the indiscriminate destruction of so many congenial neighborhoods and distinguished old buildings.

Although urban renewal acquired a bad name, it was born out of respectable conception. Its basic premise accorded with advanced architectural thought of the pre-war years. Eliel Saarinen's *The City* (1943), for instance, regarded the urban body as a living organism, the diseased tissue of which could be recognized as slums. The cure for diseased tissue was surgical removal.

In application of the theory, the federal government provided local authorities with matching financial assistance (typically two-thirds federal) to purchase and clear decayed areas. The vacant land was then offered to developers at reduced prices. This was an extraordinary departure from the historical norm of undertaking large-scale urban demolition only to make way for specific new projects already planned.

Urban renewal also involved unprecedented invocation of the power of eminent domain, previously used only as last resort to acquire private property for specific public purposes, such as schools or roads. In urban renewal, the condemned real estate did not remain in public ownership but was conveyed back into private hands. Inevitably, the constitutionality of such a practice was challenged, by a property-owner in the Southwest Urban Renewal Area in Washington, D.C., in the famous case of *Berman versus Parker*, which reached the Supreme Court.

The epochal decision handed down in 1954 affirmed the legitimacy of urban renewal. Written by Associate Justice William O. Douglas, it stated:

The concept of the public welfare is broad and inclusive. The values it represents are spiritual as well as physical, aesthetic as well as monetary. It is within the power of the legislature to determine that a community should be beautiful as well as healthy, spacious as well as clean.

While validating urban renewal, that principal also eased the constitutional concern inhibiting many states from passing laws enabling municipalities to create landmark commissions and historic districts, the number of which leapt forward after 1954. Before World War II only four cities in this country had such controls. The premier was Charleston, South Carolina, with its ordinance of 1931, which introduced the term historic district into our preservation and planning vocabularies. By the time the Act of 1966 went into force, approximately 70 cities had such ordinances (and the number has increased enormously since then). This was a singularly important development in the post-war years. It reflected a desire of cities to avoid the excesses of urban renewal and, particularly, to check unrestrained private development that could disrupt the scale, intimacy, and charm of settled, familiar places. Another development of lasting consequence was the provision in the Housing Act of 1954 that permitted use of urban renewal funds for the renovation of old housing, and for planning that could incorporate the retention of historic buildings rather than clean-slate clearance. Thus, the Urban Renewal Administration (within the old housing agency) was given a strongly-financed preservation opportunity in the urban context, that stage for critical social issues and high emotions. The prospects were sufficiently attractive that, in the legislative ferment of the sixties, HUD became a contender along with Interior for the lead role in preservation. But historic preservation under the Urban Renewal Administration was distinctly subsidiary to the main mission and interests of the agency, which moreover lacked the controlling discipline, standards, and experience of a professional preservation service.

Nevertheless, there was the possibility of good results, depending on capable control and professionalism at the municipal level. How preservation, rehabilitation, and renewal could be satisfactorily accomplished in a historic urban area was demonstrated in Providence, Rhode Island, in the College Hill Study of 1957-59. (It was financed from a combination of local sources, with two-thirds of the cost provided by the Urban Renewal Administration.) In the implementation phase, following the zoning of a historic district in 1960, some 300 old houses were kept and rehabilitated for continued occupancy.

### ***Highway Construction***

In retrospect, it can be seen that a new era of environmental impact had dawned with the advent of the automobile. As early as 1893 an office was established in the Department of Agriculture to study methods of road construction and management. From it evolved the Public Roads Administration, which was later reconstituted as the Bureau of Public Roads (1949), located in the Department of Commerce and eventually transformed into the Federal Highway Administration (1966), a component of the new Department of Transportation. The expanding federal career in highway building was inaugurated by President Wilson's signature on the Federal-Aid Road Act of 1916, which cast the basic pattern for federal-state cooperation. Washington offered 50% of the cost of approved projects to states that would establish highway departments to receive funds and conform to certain standards.

Among successive enactments to keep pace with the quickening mobility of the American people, the Federal Highway Act of 1934 started the continuous process of highway planning. About the same time, a study for other purposes revealed that in the United States there were more automobiles than bathtubs, a fact that scandalized those committed to sanitary social progress. But you can't go to town in a bathtub, and the network that continued to grow, with relief funding from the Federal Works Administration, can be interpreted as a response to popular desires. Finally, in wartime, the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 authorized the enormous National System of Interstate

and Defense Highways, which was revised and initiated by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, approved by President Eisenhower.

When construction began in 1956 the interstate system had grown from the originally intended maximum of 40,000 to 41,000 miles of superhighways, linking all cities with populations of 300,000 or more. To be completed in 1972 at a cost of \$41 billion, it became the largest public works project in the history of the world. The right-of-way would take a million and a half acres. And the new system was superimposed on the existing national highway network of 800,000 miles built by the states with federal aid on the 50-50 funding basis (now usually 75% federal in the continuing program).

The interstate system was financed by the independent Highway Trust Fund, created for that purpose and drawing its revenues from certain excise taxes (on motor fuel, tires, trucks, buses). The federal government paid 90% of the construction cost and the states 10%. That feature proved irresistible to states and large cities, which were able to stretch the length to 42,500 miles and distort the purpose. Even in Hawaii there is now an interstate highway. And urban freeways were built as part of the interstate system.

As roads of such overwhelming dimension ripped into urban fabric—shattering modest neighborhoods, violating parks, and destroying old buildings—the number of horror stories mounted. As damage rose to disaster proportions in the sixties, public reaction brought a halt to some freeways that were simply left unfinished. In spite of expenditures that have exceeded \$175 billion, the system still lacks 1000 miles or more of the most expensive sections to construct. But the urban belts and freeways had long since created new patterns of development, strengthening the centrifugal force of urban renewal's clearance and thus hastening the transformation of many central districts into urban wastelands.

### ***The Reaction***

Notwithstanding their worthy intentions, the big public works programs were increasingly viewed as an overt assault on the inherited environment. And since the projects were federally supported, the threats they posed to historic structures prompted a stream of urgent pleas to Washington. The only sure remedy available to Congress or the Department of the Interior, however, was governmental ownership or control, under authority of the Act of 1935. But that involved the due deliberation and discriminating comparison inherent in judging national significance; the process was never meant for emergencies. Furthermore, since it was doubtful that many of the endangered properties were truly significant to the nation as a whole, it had become evident that an additional mechanism was needed to protect the kind of locally valuable properties that were so often sacrificed. Speaking in New York in 1961, Secretary Stewart L. Udall reported that since 1950, an average of some 70 properties per year had been proposed by states, cities or private associations for inclusion in the National Park System. He opined:

Clearly, the federal government cannot undertake historical preservation on such a scale...this enormous undertaking must be a joint venture in which Federal, State, and local agencies—as well as patriotic private individuals and organizations—work as partners.

For it was true, federal agencies were not the sole cause of the distress. The nation's architectural heritage was also under bombardment by the wrecking balls of others, bringing down such notable edifices as Detroit's City Hall, the National Presbyterian Church in Washington, Frank Lloyd Wright's internationally important Larkin Building in Buffalo, and the Harrall-Wheeler House in Bridgeport, Connecticut. This last was a Gothic Revival masterpiece by Alexander Jackson Davis, demolished in 1958 (for a parking lot) despite a mayoral campaign promise to the contrary and a fund pledged to preserve it. The cynicism of this publicized event made it a rallying symbol.

When it became known that the General Services Administration intended to tear down such massive monuments of nineteenth-century public architecture as the old State, War, and Navy Building (now the Old Executive Office Building) in Washington, the U.S. Post Office and Courthouse in Saint Louis, and the U.S. Mint in San Francisco (all eventually saved and kept in federal use), the clear voice of protest rose from Congress itself. Over and above the individual proposals for additions to the National Park System, more than 30 bills for the broader protection of historic lands, buildings, and works of art were introduced between 1959 and 1965. Characteristic of the lot were the legislative proposals in 1959 by Representatives James C. Wright, Jr. of Texas and Frank Thompson, Jr. of New Jersey.

The Wright bill required the Administrator of General Services to save historic buildings and works of art owned by the United States and to restore them as necessary. Citing Morristown National Historical Park as well as the federal buildings in Washington and San Francisco, the Thompson bill had a purpose that would seem unnecessary to protect federal property from federal projects. The fact that such legislation was deemed necessary suggests the level of frustration felt all around. Clearly, it was time to put brakes on the federal bulldozer. (This is the first of two articles on the National Historic Preservation Act. Part II will appear in the April CRM BULLETIN.)

The author is Chief Appeals Officer for historic preservation certifications. Formerly Associate Director, he guided the Service's preservation programs for many years and served two terms as Secretary General of ICOMOS.

# Cultural Resource Planners Testing New Methods

Theodore Pochter

## Background

It's common knowledge that before doing anything important you have to have a plan. Individuals plan for housing purchases and for the management of their businesses. So why not develop a way to improve your ability to do these things—a plan to improve planning?

In 1983, the National Park Service (NPS) embarked on an effort to improve its cultural resources planning approach. This need was recently reaffirmed by Director Mott in his 12-Point Plan, and further supported by Secretary Hodel in his response to the Plan. The Secretary pointed out that "in order to make sound resource management decisions we need objective information that permits resources to be evaluated for their level of significance, condition, and degree of exposure to existing or potentially adverse activities." The Director has encouraged NPS staff to manage the National Park System by approaching problems creatively. With these charges in mind, cultural resource planners are now increasing their efforts to seek improved ways to manage NPS cultural resources.

Current Park Service resource management is based on annual park resource management plans, in which superintendents identify specific problems to be tackled each year. This, of course, is an appropriate element of planning, but it is only one part of the equation. All three levels of NPS management have resource planning responsibilities: (1) parks manage individual properties and their attendant problems; (2) regions, although concerned with specific properties, are primarily concerned with programmatic issues on a region-wide scale; and (3) the Washington Office (WASO) sets appropriate resource management policies and priorities for the System as a whole.

There are also performance guidelines the NPS must follow in its resource management activities. These are found in the Secretary's Standards for Archeology and Historic Preservation, in Section 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act, in the management policies of NPS-28, and in the planning policies of NPS-2. The Standards provide the minimal guidance for conducting various preservation activities, including planning, identification, evaluation, registration, documentation and treatment of historic and archeological properties. Furthermore, to effectively conform to Section 110 management requirements, NPS managers must have an efficient method to coordinate their planning options and strategies. In short, the Service needs a planning process that enables managers to deal with properties individually, or in aggregates, and can be used as a tool for periodically setting priorities for programs and specific projects. Such a planning process places greater attention on selected cultural resource issues and seeks, through the budget process, to correct Servicewide deficiencies.

## The Management Environment

Cultural resource planning is often practiced by specialists who are not trained planners. Therefore, guidance and procedures necessary to accomplish resource objectives must be broadly exposed so that their application will be understood and practiced throughout the Service. The three basic cultural resource management issues are:

- What are the resources?
- How important are they?
- How will they be treated?

These are the basic needs a planning process must meet at the park, regional and system levels. However, other questions that should be asked require managers to delve even more comprehensively into the existing information base. Often these questions are those that historians, archeologists, architects, and curators ask in their role as cultural



resource managers and planners, and that yield information likely to be quite different in content than those normally addressed in day-to-day decision-making.

### **Description of the Proposed Process**

The Interagency Resources Division (IRD) of WASO is testing such a resource planning process for the use of regions and parks. The aim of this planning process is to compile credible and complete information on the identification, evaluation and protection of cultural resources in an easy-to-use format and one which will form the basis of management and funding decisions. To begin, the process uses a set of related data bases that are derived from the List of Classified Structures (LCS), the proposed Cultural Sites Inventory (CSI), the National Catalog of Museum Objects (now under development), and other inventories being considered for development. A computer program called PROFILE, to be available for use during fiscal year 1987, will be the linchpin of the process. Because parks, regions, and WASO manage cultural resources at different levels of detail, the PROFILE computer program is designed to allow varying degrees of specificity, depending on the needs of the user. Parks can assess very specific information on individual resources (this may also be done manually for preparation of planning documents), while regions may choose to summarize data by park units, property types, or condition. The WASO staff can compile even broader summaries based on regional or Servicewide issues. In this way, all three levels of management may use the process in special data collection efforts while improving the coherence of resource planning and policy development. The flowchart illustrates how the process should work.

### **Field Testing**

In 1984, IRD began to test various comprehensive planning methodologies for use at the park level. Four parks participated in the project: the Frederick Douglass Home, Death Valley NM, Gateway NRA, and Gulf Islands NS. At the same time, the Southeast Regional Office began to develop a regionally-based resource planning process. Different approaches were used in each of the five projects, although all were based on resource planning principles expressed in the Secretary's Standards for Archeology and Historic Preservation.

In the park tests, the process consisted of the following steps:

1) establish the historic context of the resources, 2) evaluate the status and condition of the resources, and 3) formulate goals and priorities based on the resource evaluations.

A summary approach was used in the Southeast Region (SER), where planners gathered data from all 53 parks, then summarized it by historic theme, and used it to assist in setting broad regional resource management objectives. Once both studies were completed, the results were analyzed and comments were solicited from participating park and regional personnel.

### **Technical Review**

Field testing the various methods proved valuable in organizing information for cultural resources planning. However, questions that surfaced during the pilot studies remained, thus requiring comprehensive review and analysis. A group of cultural resource specialists and managers from parks, regions and the Washington office met for a two-day technical review of the proposed process. This group addressed a series of issues, and identified some necessary modifications. The panel's recommendations included:

1) A new approach to cultural resource planning should not duplicate other resource planning activities and inventories.

During the pilot projects, each participating park and region prepared an inventory of its resources, with regard to theme, significance, condition, documentation and adverse impacts. Park inventories evaluated each resource individually, while, as noted earlier, SER prepared a summary or "representational" inventory which consisted of an evaluation of groups of resources associated with each theme. Since much of the information gathered

in the planning inventory was already in the LCS, Cultural Resources Bibliography (CRBIB), and other cultural resource inventories, preparing yet another for planning purposes only was viewed as a time-consuming and duplicative exercise. In response to this criterion, a computer program for downloading this information is now being tested as part of the LCS enhancement project.

2) A regional approach to planning should include all types of cultural resources and have the ability to adequately pinpoint specific problems.

The early pilot projects were biased toward architectural and standing structures. This has been corrected by revising some of the PROFILE data fields so that all cultural resources are included in the planning process, whether they are historic or prehistoric properties, archeological sites, landscapes, or museum objects. Although PROFILE currently can accept direct transfers of information only from the LCS, a method for transfer of information from the proposed CSI (archeological resources) and the National Catalog (museum objects) is now being developed.

The review panel also felt that the summary inventory developed in the Southeast Region analysis was too broadly-based to be of practical use to regional planners, and suggested that the process use "resource specific" information already available from the LCS and other resource inventories as well as the parks. Using PROFILE, a region may, for example, obtain either a summary chart or an itemized listing of all resources which are of national significance, in poor condition, and threatened by erosion. The following illustrates how PROFILE aggregates park cultural resources data at a regional level.

Information on specific cultural resources can be aggregated and analyzed, using any possible combination of variables in the data base (property type, theme, significance, condition, documentation, impacts, and current and historic function). In this way, regional managers may quickly ascertain their most pressing resource problems, as well as their magnitude and location, devise resource objectives that fit with regional and servicewide program emphases, choose which resource objectives must be addressed in the current funding cycle, review the parks' submission of 10-237s and 10-238s, then direct funds from various NPS sources to meet identified needs and objectives.

3) New planning methods should be well integrated into the existing NPS planning process.

During the pilot projects, there was a misconception that the proposed process would introduce a new layer of planning into the NPS cultural resources planning system already outlined in NPS-2, thus requiring additional reports and documents from parks and regions. This is not the case. What the proposed method provides is a tool (PROFILE) that enables managers at any management level of the Service to select pertinent pieces of information from the LCS, CRBIB, and other resource inventories, and formulate customized information profiles to gain a more complete picture of the actual status of resources. The result is the incorporation of more realistic and better coordinated goals and priorities incorporated into the existing framework of park resource management plans and regional decision-making.

### **Future Schedule**

Planning methodology is now being refined and coordinated with existing NPS cultural inventories to ensure that data contained in those sources are usable for planning purposes. Four regions are currently involved in the pilot LCS enhancement project which incorporates these revisions. Upon completion of the LCS pilot, at least one of those regions will test the regional planning process by downloading inventory information from the enhanced LCS, then use PROFILE to analyze the data to identify patterns of resource needs and problems. An assessment of the results will occur after the completion of the test, and additional modifications will be made if necessary. Further testing and review will occur throughout fiscal year 1986 in conjunction with the LCS enhancement project.

Once this planning process has been thoroughly tested, analyzed and refined for use by parks, regions and the Washington Office, it will be included in the NPS-28 Technical Supplement, and a Servicewide implementation schedule will be developed.

The author is a preservation planner in the Survey and Planning Branch, Interagency Resources Division, Washington Office.

# **Treasures of Denmark**

## **Mesa Verde Curator Participates in International Exchange Program**

**Allen Bohnert**

When Mesa Verde National Park became a world heritage site in 1978, the designation brought with it responsibilities of an international nature. In a continuing effort to honor these, the park, region, and Washington Office supported my application to the American Association of Museums' (AAM) International Partnerships Among Museums Program. This resulted in an exchange of professionals between Mesa Verde and the Haderslev Museum, a 98-year old county museum located in Haderslev, Denmark.

The Haderslev Museum serves as the primary repository for all archeological material unearthed in the county of Sonderjylland, roughly the size of Mesa Verde or approximately 52,000 acres. It also functions as the history museum for the city of Haderslev, possesses the largest cart/wagon collection in Denmark, and maintains an open-air exhibit consisting of ten structures dating from the 16th to the 19th centuries. A new building, housing the collections, laboratories, offices, and exhibits, opened in 1977.

A six-week residency at the Haderslev Museum effectively illustrated the role of the Danish conservator as spokesperson for the "needs of objects," and the importance of this role to the proper functioning of the institution. An enlightened conservator's input was visible in the museum's operation, particularly in regard to the changing exhibit program, as well as plans to rehabilitate permanent exhibits, storage of collections, use of collections for research or educational programs, and object treatment. Also, it was interesting to observe the direct role of the conservator in virtually all activities related to the collection and its use. For practical and philosophical reasons, the museum no longer automatically restores reconstructable archeological ceramics, nor does it completely conserve all metals, making exceptions only after a specific need has been identified.

In addition to the foregoing activities, the conservator also stipulates the mounting techniques for all objects going on exhibit. If the object is a fragmentary vessel, the pieces are placed on a supportive form matching the vessel's interior shape, rather than infilling all missing areas of the ceramic itself. Another mounting technique uses a piece of Velcro, properly adhered to the object, which can be pressed against the opposing piece of Velcro on the exhibit panel. The Velcro permits easy final placement or removal of the object, is not visible, and precludes the need to mount the object directly on the exhibit panel. This technique is obviously not suited for all types of materials, but appeared to work well for many archeological artifacts. Indeed, when objects go on exhibit, care goes into the over-all design, but paramount consideration goes first toward mitigating the effects of agents of deterioration.

Another issue concerned human remains. The exhibition and mere possession of human remains is a sensitive issue in the United States, and of increased concern to the museum community. The Danes, on the other hand, do not object to museums exhibiting or holding the remains of their ancestors, at least the somewhat distant ones.

Supervising all archeological work in Southern Jutland is also part of the Haderslev's responsibility. The procedures followed for handling or transporting objects, as well as the materials used for labels, and the quality of the paper that records were kept on, revealed the conservator's guidance at on-going excavations. Labels were printed on Syntosil 100. This is a 100% synthetic 'paper' and is not subject to the problems one has with cellulosic paper in the field under less-than-ideal conditions. It was also informative to learn about the problems the museum staff has experienced using lacquer, especially a cellulose nitrate-

base lacquer, for marking objects. They now use an acrylic paint, and this is the material recommended in a manual being compiled for Danish museums by Lizzi Thamdrup, Chief Conservator for the Haderslev Museum and the AAM's Danish conservator to Mesa Verde.

One of the many differences between the two countries that was emphasized by the exchange is the greater comprehensiveness of Danish preservation law when compared to its counterpart in the United States. Denmark's protective attitude toward antiquities dates to A.D. 1281. At that time, a law was passed declaring all rare objects (Danefae) the property of the crown. The law has since been revised. Now all Danefae automatically becomes the property of the National Museum. In fact, anyone who finds a "rare object" is required to report it to the nearest museum. Danefae includes all gold and silver objects, and any other unique object with important implications for research. Under Danish law, it is illegal to disturb prehistoric material, "even on private land." Denmark may not be able to preserve all of its cultural heritage, but it certainly has the legislative mandates and the support of its citizens to protect and document as much of it as possible, both on public and on private land.

In addition to the education available at the Haderslev Museum, a portion of the exchange cycle involved visiting museums other than the host institution. This provided an opportunity for discussions with museum educators, conservators, and curators, as well as a chance to directly observe the successes and failures of various approaches to museum management. I had the pleasure of visiting nearly all the major museums in Denmark, and observed a tremendous amount of staff energy and highly professional standards in virtually every institution.

Particularly impressive was the research on fumigation methods at the Aarhus Natural History Museum and The Danish National Museum-Brede, including freezing techniques at Aarhus, and experiments with fungicides and insecticides at the National Museum. One of the more non-traditional institutions turned out to be the Historical Archeological Research Center at Lejre, with its 'living experiments' based on life during the Iron Age and Stone Age, conducted to further the understanding and interpretation of archeological data from these time periods. Visitors participate in these experiments, and school groups regularly take part in either one day or week-long programs. The Haderslev Museum also has an active educational program that includes local schools and communities. The need for local support frequently seems to provide impetus for programming, especially in such areas as environmental education, understanding life in the past, and changing exhibits. However, excessive public support (such as from banks and corporations) remains a concern, for fear that it may lead to overcommercialism in the museums and the loss of control over exhibits.

Finally, in addition to the professional growth the program offered me as a curator, it also provided Mesa Verde National Park with certain "spin-off" benefits. Denmark's proximity to Finland made it possible to visit the National Museum of Finland, where material removed by Gustav Nordenskiöld from prehistoric sites now part of Mesa Verde have been subsequently curated. The Nordenskiöld material was excavated in 1891. It is a park resource that is just now being fully documented. A previously unknown portion of the Nordenskiöld collection was found at the new Ethnographic Museum in Stockholm. These institutions were visited in addition to the exchange. Although Denmark and the American Southwest have different environments, Danish conservation is far more than 'water-logged wood' and 'Bog People.' Both areas have preservation problems and curatorial concerns in common which the AAM's exchange program allowed its participants to discover. Yet even more importantly, the program enabled two museum professionals from different parts of the world to learn from each other. It provided a means for the intensive and mutually beneficial exchange of ideas, technical information, and planning data related to museum operations. It was an invaluable experience that offered professional as well as personal growth.

The author is Museum Curator at Mesa Verde National Park. He can be reached at the park Research Center with questions concerning the AAM exchange program.

Special thanks to Thomas L. Davies and Independence National Historical Park for photographs accompanying Dr. Wallace's article, CRM Bulletin, Vol. 8, no. 6.