

ICOMOS: A quarter of a century
Symposium sub-theme
«Achievements and future prospects»

Prepared by US/ICOMOS

Historic Background:

Reflecting the desire to promote international cooperation and understanding, major developments in the creation of international organizations took place after both World Wars I and II. After World War I the League of Nations established the International Institute for Intellectual Cooperation (IIIC) in Paris, France, which included the International Museums Office (IMO). Achievements of IMO included the publication of *Museographie* and the 1931 adoption of the *Athens Charter*.

Following World War II, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) was founded as a successor to the IIIC. Many existing Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO), such as the International Council of Museums (ICOM) and the International Federation of Landscape Architects (IFLA), rapidly sought affiliation with UNESCO and contributed to its formative period.

When an NGO did not exist, UNESCO consultative committees were established to advise on program development. Thus, UNESCO approved the creation of «The International Committee on Monuments, Artistic and Historical Sites and Archeological Excavations». Its members were leading experts who suggested projects that could be undertaken by the then Museums and Monuments Division.

This Committee recommended the establishment of «The International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property» (ICCROM), in Rome in 1959. As the Division's projects developed, the International Committee also recommended, and UNESCO approved in 1965, the creation of a new NGO. It would be known as the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS). With the creation of ICOMOS, the UNESCO International Committee ceased to exist.

UNESCO carried out negotiations with the French authorities as, logically, it would be important to have ICOMOS in Paris. ICOMOS could then work closely with UNESCO to create an international

documentation center for both UNESCO and the world's conservation specialists. The French Government invited ICOMOS to have its headquarters in Paris and provided suitable accommodation.

ICOMOS was among the limited number of NGOs assigned Category «A» consultative status by UNESCO. It received an annual subvention and a contract to establish and operate the UNESCO/ICOMOS International Documentation Centre.

UNESCO's Museums and Monuments Division (now known as the Cultural Heritage Division) had sponsored a series of international seminars on conservation subjects. After its creation, ICOMOS could and did involve far greater numbers of professional and other interested persons in less formal programs. In addition to general meetings, specialized international committees were created in architectural photogrammetry, training, conservation of wooden, masonry and earthen structures, and other similar subjects. These committees attracted many other specialists in addition to architects and historians to join ICOMOS and helped to strengthen its interdisciplinary approach to conservation.

From the perspective of US/ICOMOS and that of many other national committees, a principal contribution of ICOMOS has been to mutual understanding and further cooperation. It provided a forum for all of the disciplines involved in the conservation of the world's material cultural heritage. Within ICOMOS, there are specialists who, among themselves, reflect differences that are sometimes profound. These include differences in professional practice, in materials and methods for the construction, maintenance and conservation of monuments and sites, in terms of technology and technological sophistication, political perspectives on the role and significance of monuments, in terms of the priority assigned to monuments and their preservation as a consideration in establishing economic priorities, and differences of sensitivity to a variety of environmental concerns, to name a few.

ICOMOS Objectives and Programs:

Objectives: The ICOMOS Statutes identify six:

1. to bring together conservation specialists from all over the world and serve as a forum for professional dialogue and exchange;
2. to collect, evaluate and diffuse information on conservation principles, techniques and policies;
3. to cooperate with national and international authorities on the establishment of documentation centres specializing in conservation;

4. to work for the adoption and implementation of international conventions on the conservation and enhancement of architectural heritage;
5. to participate in the organization of training programs for conservation specialists on a worldwide scale;
6. to put the expertise of highly qualified professionals and specialists at the service of the international community.

In its first quarter century, ICOMOS has achieved the greatest success in meeting objectives 1, 2, 4 and 5. While important achievements have been made, comparatively less success has been made in meeting objectives 3 and 6. It is the view of US/ICOMOS that these six objectives, while still valid, should be reviewed and revised as appropriate to reflect the international conservation needs of the next 25 years.

Program: The ICOMOS program has historically derived and evolved from the six goals. We have examined the most recent ICOMOS programs in terms of their achievements and future prospects.

A. Strengthen its presence worldwide by encouraging the creation and growth of ICOMOS National and International Committees.

Achievements: While having created a network of worldwide national committees, the total number is only 60 committees and at various times there have been more. Since 1972, more than 106 countries have ratified the World Heritage Convention. ICOMOS is still largely Eurocentric. Of eight General Assemblies, only one has been held outside of Europe.

The International Committees have created valuable networks to give ICOMOS members increased access to one another. Admittedly, the International Committees have been idiosyncratic in their operations, uneven when viewed as a whole and perhaps less than energetic when it comes to achieving their full potential. They have provided their members a medium for exchange and interaction and, through them, have on occasion made the results of that interaction available to the wider audience of ICOMOS members, from an international perspective.

Future Prospects: Assist in the creation of additional National Committees and seek to increase the participation of their membership in the international program. This is especially needed in Africa,

Asia, the Middle East and much of Central and South America. Explore whether established National Committees could sponsor the establishment of another in a Third World country, including financing some of the international travel of their representatives for fuller participation within the organization.

Encourage National Committees to broaden their own membership. Do this by encouraging the active participation of younger professionals and reaching out to related public and private national, state and local organizations.

Widen the participation in the system of International Committees. US/ICOMOS, inspired by the Canadian example, is establishing national specialized committees. Such National Committees should work as counterparts to the International Committees. It is anticipated that this will be a means through which the participation of U.S. specialists in international cooperative efforts will be encouraged. It is expected that this will attract new members for US/ICOMOS and therefore ICOMOS. A similar approach among other National Committees may strengthen the overall ICOMOS program.

The performance of the International Committees should be strengthened by the adoption of more defined program, operating and reporting requirements. The Chairmen should have fixed terms of office.

B. Extend the influence of the Venice Charter by creating flexible doctrinal texts for specific sectors of architectural heritage.

Achievements: The Venice Charter's basic principles have contributed to the development of international standards in conservation. This Charter has had a major influence on national charters and standards. It has made a valuable contribution to professional practice. While those who sponsored the Charter could not foresee all of the developments that have taken place since it was written, ICOMOS has prepared and adopted charters on archeological heritage management, cultural tourism, historic gardens and historic towns to supplement it.

Future Prospects: Once such charters are adopted, they need to be made known and their application should be encouraged by National Committees. ICOMOS should do more in relating its charters to the international conventions and recommendations adopted by UNESCO. A master list of subject areas in need of the application of

such charters should be developed and a schedule set for their preparation. The subjects should not be limited only to «architectural heritage» but also include subjects such as cultural landscapes, conservation economics, national planning and conservation, etc.

C. Define adaptable management techniques for cultural properties.

Achievements: While occasional articles in various ICOMOS publications have made contributions, the international community still awaits the publication and distribution of the ICOMOS/ICCROM cultural property management manual which has been several years in production.

Future Prospects: Expedite the publication and distribution of the manual currently in production.

D. Develop training programs on a multilateral basis involving the collaboration of National and International Committees.

Achievements: Much has been, and continues to be, done in the conduct of training programs. This has been an initiative largely in the domain of National and/or International committees. The exchange of urban specialists in historic quarters under the Helsinki Accords was a particularly notable effort by the Secretariat.

Future Prospects: The comprehensive list of ICOMOS seminars and meetings conducted in the first 15 years needs to be updated to reflect the first 25 years.

The activity presently supported by National and International Committees should continue. Increased attention should be given to planning for the publication and distribution of the results and findings of more of these programs.

ICOMOS needs to develop a prioritized list of subjects that are in need of specialized symposia and/or training programs. National and International Committees should then be encouraged to make commitments to undertake the sponsorship of these symposia and/or training programs. Among the subjects US/ICOMOS would suggest for consideration are:

1. environmental pollution and its effect on the cultural heritage;
2. application of new technology such as computers to the conservation of cultural heritage;
3. financing of cultural heritage projects;
4. national conservation legislation and law.

F. Enrich the ICOMOS international documentation centre in Paris and set up video and slide libraries devoted to architectural heritage.

Achievements: After an initial development of the UNESCO/ICOMOS Documentation Centre and moves to cooperate with the UNESCO/ICOM Documentation Centre and ICCROM, the Centre has entered a static phase. Because ICOMOS lacks the resources to transform it into a 21st-century Centre, the existing Centre has been put on hold.

Future Prospects: It should be possible to find special financial support for the development of this program. An International Committee should be formed on the subject of documentation centres for conservation and it should serve as the special advisor for the UNESCO/ICOMOS Documentation Centre. US/ICOMOS would endeavor to make available to the committee the services of a qualified expert to assist in its work.

Of assistance to the user would be the terminology on conservation, which was initiated some years ago. It should be completed and issued in four languages as originally planned.

F. Organize and manage expert missions at the request of heritage administrations and legal entities which judge necessary the intervention of a consultant for a particular conservation questions.

Achievements: This program goal has not been met for a variety of reasons — i.e. competing interests in seeking the contracts for such missions and the lack of a marketing strategy to secure such mission contracts.

Future Prospects: While the intent of this goal might be reviewed in light of actual experience, there can be no question that ICOMOS must compile, publish and maintain an annotated international directory of all the individuals and organizations that constitute its membership. Having such a directory available to the ever-growing number of public and private, international, regional, national and local conservation organizations and agencies would be a valuable reference work.

ICOMOS should be more active, rather than reactive, in prioritizing and seeking appropriate contracts from a range of international organizations — UNESCO, the United Nations Development Program, the World Bank, etc. Such contracts could use the services of known ICOMOS experts.

G. Play a vital role in counselling UNESCO on those cultural properties to be included on the World Heritage List and in monitoring the properties already listed.

Achievements: ICOMOS provides the systematic scholarly review of all nominated cultural property for the World Heritage Committee. It provides, under contract, consultants to aid States, Party to the Convention, to prepare cultural property nominations. ICOMOS serves as the permanent repository for all documents pertaining to cultural property on the World Heritage List.

Future Prospects: ICOMOS should continue to recommend to the World Heritage Committee subject areas that merit international or regional thematic investigation. National committees should be encouraged to develop public awareness and youth education programs associated with both the Convention and the List.

H. Reach specialists by means of wide distribution of the quarterly journal, *ICOMOS Information*, and through publication of the proceedings of symposia on conservation.

Achievements: ICOMOS has developed and maintained, in varying forms, an international publication program. However, the recent trend has been toward a decrease in both the number and frequency of publications. In part this can be attributed to the rising cost of printing and postage. Especially missed are the publications of special symposia and an ICOMOS membership directory.

Future Prospects: Of prime importance is the stabilization of *ICOMOS Information*. It is an informative and attractive publication which is vital in securing and keeping members. No ICOMOS publication that is a benefit of membership has been regularly received by the membership. This includes the earlier two versions of *Monumentum* and now *ICOMOS Information*. This program goal cannot be met when its main communication vehicle is not produced and distributed on a reliable schedule.

The ICOMOS publication program should be reviewed in light of the many publications now being produced by other organizations in the field of historic preservation. ICOMOS should explore ways of placing selected articles in many of these publications in order to become better known. One area that might receive more attention is in the production of digests, indexes and special occasional papers.

The need for a descriptive directory of the full ICOMOS membership is paramount.

I. Awaken public interest in conservation by encouraging media coverage and the celebration of International Day for Monuments and Sites.

Achievements: Activity in this program area has been primarily the responsibility of the National Committees. The Secretariat has succeeded in having this event included in the UNESCO official calendar and has conducted an event in Paris annually.

Future Prospects: Based on experience, US/ICOMOS has found it more productive and useful to relate the program to properties on the World Heritage List. The U.S. National Trust for Historic Preservation also coordinates an annual «Historic Preservation Week» each May which has a changing theme.

Some Additional Future Considerations

Financial Realities — ICOMOS has throughout its history struggled for financial resources and support for the Paris international operations. The struggle has largely been characterized by requests to national committees for more funds. The question should be asked, where (beyond governments and ministries of culture) has ICOMOS sought to find and develop corporate support and other new financial resources whose assets can be brought to bear on the multitudinous threats to the very existence of monuments? Such opportunities are not available to every National Committee but they are available to international ICOMOS and they should be acted upon.

Membership — A study should be done to learn why people and organizations become members, what they are seeking in membership, what inducements might persuade others to become members, and how members can be encouraged to become active and committed to the organization once they join.

There is a need for more energetic efforts to identify and increase the level of benefits to individual members as an inducement to membership. Benefits for sponsorship — by architectural firms, contractors, corporations, producers of the materials of conservation, tourist organizations, financial institutions — are a new concept to much of ICOMOS and might well be explored.

More should be done to capitalize on those sections of the ICOMOS statutes that encourage membership by interested or supportive individuals and groups. ICOMOS membership is not limited to specialists. Without compromising the nature of the organization, it

is possible to identify and involve individuals and organizations other than specialists, the talented amateurs and the interested supporters who are or could be supportive of ICOMOS and its objectives.

Leadership — ICOMOS needs to be vigilant in encouraging and facilitating the participation, at all levels of the organization, by newer and younger members. The nomination and elective process should be maintained to allow a range of new members to regularly serve the voluntary needs of the organization as members or officers of its National Committees, International Committees, the Advisory Committee and the Bureau. Likewise, it needs to retain the interest, support and active participation of its senior members to provide both international perspective and an institutional memory.

The permanent Secretariat professional staff should be constituted of professionals who have prior work experience in the subject areas represented by the ICOMOS Objectives.

The ICOMOS Triennial Plan — The three-year plan adopted at each General Assembly needs to assume a more direct and effective role within the entire ICOMOS family. It should have a more dynamic role as an educational tool with related constituencies. The plan should reflect, in a much more direct and coherent manner, those Objectives to be emphasized, incorporate the program-related resolutions of the General Assembly and set forth the key goals of all the International Committees for this three-year period. Among the more recent General Assembly resolutions that should be included are:

- The Effects of Acid Rain on the Architectural Heritage.
- The Expansion of Photogrammetric Archives.
- The Development of Historic Woodlands and Forest Reserves;
- A Charter for the Conservation of Villages and Rural Landscapes.

In addition to serving as the basis for the allocation of the fiscal and personnel resources, it should be used as an index for both International and National Committees to support and assist in fundraising and/or provision of in-kind services. It should be used to explain to related organizations, potential donors and project contractors what ICOMOS is doing to protect the world's cultural heritage.

Conclusions

US/ICOMOS believes that ICOMOS has been successful in attaining the objective to create a forum where people interested in the conservation of the cultural heritage can meet, exchange information and carry out projects of mutual concern.

It has not been as successful in realizing some of its other objectives. However, there are many among its membership who would be interested in revitalizing these objectives and their related programs. There are also new programs which have been suggested which could also profit from international cooperation and development.

US/ICOMOS looks forward to the coming decades for an expansion of ICOMOS and is prepared to take part in realizing this objective.

Throughout ICOMOS — at the international level, at the international special committee level and at the national level — there is a need for a strong, focused and clear message. The future of the organization at every level depends on the development and communication of this message.

Acknowledgments — This paper was prepared with contributions by Ann Webster Smith, Elliott Carroll, Ernest A. Connally, Hiroshi Daifuku, Robert Garvey, Robert E. Stipe, Paul N. Perrot, Terry B. Morton, W. Brown Morton III, Russell V. Keune and Ellen Delage.

ICOMOS. A quarter of a century Achievements and future prospects:

Prepared by US/ICOMOS

Summary

In order to understand what ICOMOS has achieved, it is important to understand its origins. Thus, this paper reviews the events that led to the establishment of ICOMOS. Its establishment is ascribed to the example of ICOM, the profession and the need to have the kind of leadership that an organization similar to ICOMOS could provide to UNESCO. The character of ICOMOS is primarily non-governmental and, at the same time, it also provides an advisory role to UNESCO and to national and international governmental organizations. This effort was part of the widespread movement to develop international organizations, at different levels, following World War II.

The ICOMOS role of providing an international forum for programs dedicated to the conservation of the cultural heritage has been successful. In these forums specialists and interested institutions could take part in projects leading to the exchange of information, cooperation in research and the diffusion of higher standards. ICOMOS has brought together many people from different backgrounds and traditions. Together with UNESCO, ICCROM and other international organizations, ICOMOS has been an important element in stimulating a worldwide appreciation of man's cultural heritage, and the need for programs for their preservation and interpretation. The paper is divided into three parts:

I. Historic Background. a summary is presented of the development of international programs leading to the conservation of the cultural heritage. Factors that led to the establishment of ICOMOS as a Non-Governmental Organization, having Category «A» consultative status with UNESCO, are reviewed.

II. ICOMOS Objectives and Programs. Based on its statutes, ICOMOS has six objectives. These objectives and the programs which implement them are reviewed from the perspective of past achievements and future prospects.

III. Additional Future Considerations. Suggestions are made on a review of both the objectives and programs. These include subjects such as the need to raise extra-budgetary funds, membership, leadership and the triennial program.

**ICOMOS: un quart de siècle
de réalisations et perspectives d'avenir**
Préparé par US/ICOMOS

Résumé

Pour bien comprendre l'œuvre de l'ICOMOS, il est important de comprendre ses origines. Cet exposé examine donc les événements ayant conduit à établir l'ICOMOS. Il s'agit de l'exemple de l'ICOM, de la profession et de la nécessité pour l'UNESCO d'être guidé par une organisation telle que l'ICOMOS. L'ICOMOS est une organisation de type essentiellement non-gouvernemental, qui joue par ailleurs un rôle consultatif auprès de l'UNESCO et d'organismes gouvernementaux nationaux et internationaux. Les efforts ayant conduit à établir l'ICOMOS s'insèrent dans le cadre du mouvement général, au lendemain de la Seconde Guerre mondiale, en faveur de la création d'organisations internationales à différents niveaux.

L'œuvre de l'ICOMOS, qui est chargé d'assurer un forum international pour les programmes consacrés à la conservation de l'héritage culturel, a été couronnée de succès. Ces forums permettent aux spécialistes et aux institutions intéressées de prendre part à des projets favorisant l'échange d'informations, la coopération en matière de recherche et la diffusion de normes plus rigoureuses. L'ICOMOS a organisé la rencontre de bien des personnes de différentes origines et traditions culturelles. Avec l'UNESCO, l'ICCROM et d'autres organisations internationales, l'ICOMOS a joué un rôle important en stimulant une appréciation mondiale du patrimoine culturel de l'humanité ainsi que de la nécessité de mettre en œuvre des programmes pour la conservation et l'interprétation de ce patrimoine. Cet exposé se divise en trois parties:

I. Contexte historique. Nous faisons l'historique des programmes internationaux conduisant à la conservation du patrimoine culturel. Nous examinons les facteurs ayant conduit à établir l'ICOMOS en tant qu'organisation non-gouvernementale jouissant d'un statut consultatif de la catégorie «A» auprès de l'UNESCO.

II. Les objectifs et programmes de l'ICOMOS. Aux termes de ses statuts, l'ICOMOS a six objectifs. Ces objectifs et les programmes permettant de les mettre en œuvre sont examinés du point de vue des réalisations acquises et des perspectives d'avenir.

III. Autres considérations pour l'avenir. Nous présentons des suggestions pour un examen ultérieur des objectifs et des programmes. Il s'agit de questions touchant à la nécessité dans laquelle l'ICOMOS se trouve de réunir des fonds extra-budgétaires ainsi qu'à ses membres, sa direction et son programme triennal.

**ICOMOS: A quarter of a century
symposium sub-theme the Venice Charter**

*Prepared by US/ICOMOS
Robert E. Stipe, sub-theme chair*

This paper summarizes the U.S. position *vis à vis* the Venice Charter, beginning with its adoption in 1964, and describes its current relevance to national, state and local programs of historic preservation in the United States.

The United States Delegation to Venice, 1964

The United States delegation to the 1964 Venice meeting at which the Charter was proposed included the intellectual and professional leadership of the American preservation movement of the day. The delegation did not support adoption of the Charter at the Venice meeting. One reason was that the proposed charter was available only at the last minute, was only in French, and there was little opportunity to examine it before voting. There was objection to the Charter's flat prohibition regarding reconstruction. Proposals to amend the document prior to its approval were not permitted. ⁽¹⁾

The Charter was seen by the delegation as dealing principally with the preservation of stone buildings, common in Europe, but a topic of less interest in the United States, where construction is primarily of wood and other materials. The concerns giving rise to the Charter were primarily European. «The Conference was held following a decade of reconstruction after World War II. Most of the structures damaged by bombs and the battles which took place were made to work out standards which would try to unify what had been accomplished so far. It was inevitable that in the need for housing and reconstruction, the priorities for recovery and the shortage of trained architects/restorers in the face of the amount of work required, that compromises had been made. The sometimes contradictory elements found in the Venice Charter were probably attempts at justification of previous work.» ⁽²⁾

⁽¹⁾ Report of Charles W. Porter, III, Chief Historian, US National Park Service to the Director of the National Park Service.

⁽²⁾ Hiroshi Daifuku «The Venice Charter: Notes on Its Origins», April 1989. Unpublished memorandum.

Charles E. Peterson, a delegate, recalls that, as a statement of principles, the Charter did not contain much that was new to our practice at the time, except for the explicit prohibition of reconstruction, for which our delegates thought exceptions should be made in appropriate circumstances. As Charles Porter was adopted in principle only, National Park Service, the Charter was adopted in principle only, with Raymond Lemaire of Belgium and Piero Gazzola of Italy given leave to tidy it up later. Peterson and Porter agree that few, if any, of the delegates had read or even had an opportunity to read the document with care. ⁽³⁾

The Charter itself is little known throughout the broader American preservation community. It has never been disseminated on a national scale, although it has emerged as a subject of conversation or discussion at one or more meetings of the Association for Preservation Technology, the National Trust for Historic Preservation or the American Institute of Architects. Of those individuals who are familiar with the document, many probably perceive it as a historical document primarily relevant to European preservationists.

However, the Charter has not been irrelevant to our preservation practice. As a statement of historic preservation philosophy or doctrine it would, with minor exceptions, be widely accepted today. The principles of the Charter are embedded in American preservation practice, and it was important in the formulation of the rules and principles that guide that practice.

The United States Preservation System

To understand the extent to which our historic preservation practice follows the Charter's language and precepts, and the manner and extent to which the Charter is interpreted and implemented in this country, requires a knowledge of the allocation of public and private responsibility for preservation in the United States and of our federal system.

Historic preservation in the United States is divided between the public and private sectors of the economy, operates within the complex federal-state-local government system of overlapping and

divided responsibilities, and builds upon a philosophical base that is tied to uniquely American social, economic and political conditions. In addition to heeding political and economic realities affecting preservation, the starting point for understanding our practice is to recognize the ways in which government power is distributed among the layers of government.

Within this system, the growth and the strength of historic preservation — federal, state and local — is a direct result of conceptual, fiscal and technical leadership provided by the federal preservation establishment: the U.S. National Park Service.

The United States is a federal union of sovereign states. Taxation of real estate is a power of each state. Since World War I the federal government has levied direct taxes on personal and corporate income. Some of these vast sums are returned to state and local governments, and to individuals and nonprofit organizations for programs deemed to be in the national interest, including historic preservation. By imposing conditions on the use of these funds, the federal government exercises extensive influence over state and local activities. Since 1976, this has also been accomplished indirectly through favorable tax treatment of certain preservation activities. This «power of the purse» of the national government, whether used directly through grants and loans, or indirectly as tax subsidies, is now extensively employed as the means to manage historic preservation programs. The 50 states and their local governments also use their taxing and spending authority as fiscal incentives for preservation, but the effect is less because state and local taxes are significantly lower.

Where the national government relies principally on fiscal incentives for historic preservation, the states rely more heavily on their inherent power to regulate private property — a basic power of sovereign governments not surrendered to the federal government in 1787. This power exercised by the 50 states is commonly delegated down to local governments. It is now extensively used for historic preservation purposes, principally in the form of historic district and «landmark» (classified monument) regulations.

Our preservation system operates predominantly in private capital markets, where preservation decisions turn strongly on the return from private investment. While government preservation policies (federal, state or local, singly or in combination) can strongly influence profit or loss through grants, favorable terms on loans, or tax concessions, in the end it is in almost every case up to the

⁽³⁾ Letter, Charles E. Peterson to Robert E. Stipe, September 1, 1989. See also note 3 above.

individual owner of an historic property whether it is to be preserved or not.

Our principal listing and registration system is the National Register of Historic Places, maintained by the Secretary of the Interior through the National Park Service. It contains approximately 55,000 entries, including districts (which are about 13% of all entries), and protects an estimated 800,000 properties. The National Register contains buildings, structures, sites, districts and objects of national, state and local significance. With federal encouragement, some states also maintain their own registers, established according to their individual laws. These laws may establish standards for registration and protection unique to a given state, perhaps limited to properties of local or statewide significance. Inclusion in a state register may qualify a property for state financial assistance (grants, loans or tax relief); require special environmental review procedures when resources are threatened by state government projects; or, in some cases, subject the owner to specified state-level regulations regarding change or demolition.

An estimated 3,000 local governments in the United States now maintain local registries of individual buildings and/or districts. Listing as part of such a local scheme may qualify the property for special local grants, tax relief or environmental review. However, the consequences of local listing will vary from state to state. The most common effect is the regulatory impact on the property owner, who must undergo a special process of plan review before the property may be altered, added to, demolished or moved, with failure to observe this process leading to criminal and civil penalties. As a preservation method, it has been authorized in all 50 states, and has been approved by state courts and the U.S. Supreme Court as not, in principle, in violation of constitutional guarantees of private property, unless unreasonably applied or unless it presents the owner with an unconscionable economic burden. Within our federal system, it is possible for the same building to be listed in one, two or all three of the above systems, and be subject to the strictures or benefits of each or all of them.

While great strides have been made during the last two decades in bringing both fiscal and regulatory measures to bear on preservation, our record is less good than in many other countries when it comes to using government land-use planning for historic preservation.

Historic preservation through acquisition is permitted at all levels of government. But the direct protection of historic properties by national, state and local government through public ownership as a

museum or interpretive center, although numbering in the tens of thousands throughout the country, tends to be limited to a few properties of special importance.

The important point is that many, if not all, of the Charter's principles have been widely incorporated into almost all of our many-layered preservation systems.

Most property in the United States is privately owned. Thus, most historic preservation projects are essentially private sector endeavors, and these are carried out only when the owner's economic expectations are met. Thus, government's role in our system is one stressing, through economic and regulatory approaches, incentives for various levels or forms of preservation and disincentives for demolition. This approach has limits. They are that:

1. regulatory approaches may not be legally or economically confiscatory;
2. planning activities supportive of preservation may not and cannot be viewed politically as unnecessary impediments to the development process;
3. both direct and indirect fiscal measures for preservation at any level must respect other governmental priorities and accept that these will almost always be higher than the preservation of cultural resources.

The Venice Charter and the United States Preservation System

The significance of the Charter to our preservation practice arises from the indirect influence of the document and its principles on the basic «rules» of our practice. These are embodied in what is called the Secretary's Standards. The Secretary being equivalent to Minister in other countries. Lacking a Department of Culture, our national program for preservation comes under the National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior.

In the National Preservation Act of 1966, Congress enlarged the national policy to recognize and preserve historic properties. The Act provided for a greatly expanded National Register of Historic Places and created a system by which matching federal grants for preservation work, called «acquisition and development grants», would be channeled through the states for the preservation of properties listed in the National Register. This new system created several new documents. The first was the *National Register Criteria*, an official way for determining the eligibility of individual buildings, structures, sites,

districts and objects for inclusion in the National Register. A second was *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Preservation Projects*, which defined what is and is not acceptable preservation practice. A third document, *Definitions for Historic Preservation Project Treatments*, spelled out the nature of different types of preservation projects. These delineated seven specific types of treatment, listed in order of the severity of intervention for historic preservation: acquisition, protection, stabilization, preservation, rehabilitation, restoration and reconstruction.

The need for federal standards was generated by a number of events of the early to mid — 1970s — the availability in 1971 of the first federal matching grants for historic preservation projects, the 1974 creation by Congress of an emergency home assistance program for rehabilitating existing housing stock, and the 1976 passage by Congress of the Tax Reform Acts, providing special income tax benefits for the rehabilitation of properties on the National Register. While all of these new federal initiatives provided substantial preservation opportunities, they also carried with them the danger that, without a uniform set of standards and definitions for guidance in executing individual projects, actions could be taken that would harm rather than help the physical fabric of significant buildings ⁽⁴⁾.

The principal sources of guidance in preparing the Secretary's Standards were documents of the Historic Resources Committee of the American Institute of Architects; the National Park Service Management Policies and the Venice Charter itself. The last played an especially significant part in establishing the new national preservation philosophy.

The Secretary's Standards consist of eight general standards applicable to all treatments undertaken on historic properties listed in the National Register regardless of the nature of the preservation work. These are supplemented by 2 to 5 additional standards for each type of intervention or preservation project. Further advice is provided in the form of a set of «Guidelines» for each of the types or levels of project, and these are set forth describing various practices as «Recommended» or «Not Recommended». Additional advice is provided by the National Park Service through technical briefs, special bulletins, published case studies on specific topics or subjects, and direct access to experts on its professional staff.

⁽⁴⁾ Gary L. Hume, «The Development of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards», «Preservation News», National Trust for Historic Preservation, October 1986.

The Secretary's Standards were first published in 1978. While remaining under constant scrutiny since that time, they have been changed in only minor aspects. They have been applied to more than 7,000 federally subsidized acquisition and development projects, and as of 1988, to more than 20,000 rehabilitation undertakings known as «Tax Act» projects. The latter have by now generated more than \$13 billion worth of preservation work. Adherence to the Standards is obligatory in cases where federal benefits are involved.

The majority of projects have been for rehabilitation. Restoration-reconstruction projects have been mostly limited to a relatively small number of important historic properties under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service.

Not only are the Secretary's Standards the guiding principles applied to all federal programs, they are generally accepted as the central document of preservation philosophy and practice in the U.S. While each state is free to adopt its own standards of performance, several have adopted the federal standards for their own projects. Similarly, while under no obligation or pressure to do so, many local governments have done so as well.

A weakness of our situation is that The Secretary's Standards can be ignored; states or local authorities may not require its application and many architectural schools do not give courses in preservation. This is compounded by the fact that a national standard for qualifying restoration architects has been under discussion but has not yet been adopted.

The Charter and the Standards Compared

There is a widespread convergence between the principles of the Charter and the Standards. The Standards strongly urge the re-use of historic buildings for their original or a compatible use. Conjecture is not allowed when re-integrating the missing parts of a building. Historic buildings must be preserved in perpetuity. The Standards recognize that changes to a building during its lifetime take on an important historical significance of their own. They urge the protection of archeological sites and they recognize the dual historic and aesthetic character of buildings.

The Charter is essentially a general statement of philosophy which does not require any tie to the realities of political or economic life. The Standards, on the other hand, describe both a process and goals. If there are occasional pressures from the development community at the entry level of enforcement (the state historic preservation offices)

to accept marginal standards of compliance in rehabilitation projects, enforcement of the Standards in fact becomes increasingly strict as appeals are taken from state to regional, to national appellate levels within the National Park Service.

The Standards recognize that the search for perfection cannot outpace political reality, that no two buildings are alike, and that in the real world there is a need for breathing room in application to individual cases. Indeed, it is established ICOMOS doctrine that while «it is essential that the principles guiding preservation and restoration... should be agreed and laid down on an international basis... each country (is responsible) for applying the plan within the framework of its own culture and traditions».

An Assessment

Discussion on the usefulness of the Venice Charter today reflects the changes which have been taking place throughout the world: industrialization, urban population growth, widespread mobility (including the growth of tourism). A concomitant problem has been the question of the renovation of historic centers and with it the problem of gentrification. These factors make the literal interpretation of all of the Charter's Articles difficult today in many countries of the world, including the United States.

Notwithstanding the widespread acceptance of the general philosophy delineated in the Charter, literal implementation of all its Articles in the U.S. would be difficult today. It is perhaps inevitable that a younger nation, still seeking to describe its roots and to define its essential character, will look to the associative value of history as the preeminent value in historic preservation. In the U.S., «historic» preservation is the common term; «architectural preservation» would be a less widely understood phenomenon. We are seeing an emerging interest in «cultural resource» and «heritage» preservation, providing a special relevance within the movement to the field of American Studies, and a new focus on preservation of the intangible cultural heritage, vernacular architecture, historical and «cultural» landscapes, the contributions of ethnic and native populations, and even such phenomena as commercial and industrial archeology. The Charter, with an apparent emphasis on monuments and buildings, would now be viewed by many as much too limiting in time and scope.

If a contemporary version of the Charter were to be proposed it should be a modern philosophy that recognizes — perhaps even emphasizes — the social utility of historic preservation in dealing with such

problems as poverty and economic development. It would have to acknowledge the value of existing neighborhoods, even those not so architecturally distinguished. While many preservationists continue to value fine buildings as the essence of our heritage, contemporary political realities suggest that this is no longer an entirely useful foundation on which to base programs requiring political approbation or funding. The broader array of conservation building techniques and materials, including those of a substitute nature which have become widely available, would have to be recognized.

A modern Charter, to be meaningful to a nation having a federal system, needs to acknowledge the limited control of central governments. It needs to recognize that nations covering a large territory make a uniform prescription for preservation, even one essentially philosophical in intent, difficult. Accommodation must be sought with respect to established preservation techniques, including the moving of buildings.

Such a charter would need to recognize the opportunities for innovation and experimentation presented by a mixed economy dominated by private property. There would have to be recognition of the potential conflicts presented by the concept of economic enterprise zones, by the domestic potential of debt/equity swaps as a cultural preservation tool, and by exploration of the limits of public intrusion into private property rights in the name of historic preservation. It needs to explore the potential for greater participation in cultural preservation on the part of private enterprise. It would deal with the gentrification issue, and the relevance of historic preservation in fulfilling such basic human needs as housing, jobs and a better quality of life. Such an approach is not antithetical to the traditional view of the importance of preserving the best of our artistic forms and traditions. It is merely a broadened perspective more appropriate for our contemporary society.

From our perspective, there are indeed significant general elements of the Charter that are appropriate for contemporary application in the United States. However, the Charter omits many important topics at its present level of generality, and is not too coherent. Our preference is thus in accord with established ICOMOS policies, which are to acknowledge the Venice Charter as a historic document which should not be revised. We would prefer to see the adoption by US/ICOMOS of a detailed charter or of charters aimed at specific problems and issues, rather than a single, general charter, too general to be applied to meeting the needs of different architectural, political

and economic situations, as well as widely differing architectural techniques and building materials. The Secretary's Standards would be a useful starting point, perhaps supplemented by our adaptations of ICOMOS charters for historic towns, gardens, archeology, tourism and the like.

Acknowledgement

This paper was prepared in October 1989 by Robert E. Stipe. The assistance of Ernest Allen Connally, Hiroshi Daifuku, Gary L. Hume, Russell V. Keune, Mrs. Terry B. Morton and Charles E. Peterson is greatly appreciated.

Appendix

The Venice Charter (US/ICOMOS)

The Secretary of the Interior's

Standards for historic preservation projects

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Preservation Projects are used by state historic preservation offices, the National Park Service and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation to evaluate proposals for work on properties listed in the National Register of Historic Places: as the basis for advising other Federal agencies under Section 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act, and for evaluating reuse proposals submitted with State and local government applications for the transfer of federally-owned surplus properties listed in the National Register.

These Standards are the program regulations used to determine whether a rehabilitation project for a certified historic structure qualifies as a «certified rehabilitation», pursuant to federal tax laws.

Definitions for Historic Preservation Project Treatments

The following definitions are provided for treatments that may be undertaken on historic properties listed in the National Register of Historic Places.

Acquisition

Is defined as the act or process of acquiring fee title or interest other than fee title of real property (including the acquisition of development rights or remainder interest).

Protection

Is defined as the act or process of applying measures designed to affect the physical condition of a property by defending or guarding it from deterioration, loss or attack, or to cover or shield the property

from danger or injury. In the case of buildings and structures, such treatment is generally of a temporary nature and anticipates future historic preservation treatment; in the case of archeological sites, the protective measures may be temporary or permanent.

Stabilization

Is defined as the act or process of applying measures designed to reestablish a weather resistant enclosure and the structural stability of an unsafe or deteriorated property while maintaining the essential form as it exists at present.

Preservation

Is defined as the act or process of applying measures to sustain the existing form, integrity and material of a building or structure and the existing form and vegetative cover of a site. It may include initial stabilization work, where necessary, as well as ongoing maintenance of the historic building materials.

Rehabilitation

Is defined as the act or process of returning a property to a state of utility through repair or alteration which makes possible an efficient contemporary use while preserving those portions or features of the property which are significant to its historical, architectural and cultural values.

Restoration

Is defined as the act or process of accurately recovering the form and details of a property and its setting as it appeared at a particular period of time by means of the removal of later work or by the replacement of missing work.

Reconstruction

Is defined as the act or process of reproducing by new construction the exact form and detail of a vanished building, structure or object, or a part thereof, as it appeared at a specific period of time.

General standards for historic preservation projects

The following general standards apply to all treatments undertaken on historic properties listed in the National Register.

1. Every reasonable effort shall be made to provide a compatible use for a property that requires minimal alteration of the building, structure or site and its environment, or to use a property for its originally intended purpose.

2. The distinguishing original qualities or character of a building, structure or site and its environment shall not be destroyed. The removal or alteration of any historic material or distinctive architectural features should be avoided when possible.
3. All buildings, structures, and sites shall be recognized as products of their own time. Alterations which have no historical basis and which seek to create an earlier appearance shall be discouraged.
4. Changes which may have taken place in the course of time are evidence of the history and development of a building, structure or site and its environment. These changes may have acquired significance in their own right, and this significance shall be recognized and respected.
5. Distinctive stylistic features or examples of skilled craftsmanship which characterize a building, structure or site shall be treated with sensitivity.
6. Deteriorated architectural features shall be repaired rather than replaced, whenever possible. In the event replacement is necessary, the new material should match the material being replaced in composition, design, color, texture and other visual qualities. Repair or replacement of missing architectural features should be based on accurate duplications of features, substantiated by historical physical or pictorial evidence rather than on conjectural designs or the availability of different architectural elements from other buildings or structures.
7. The surface cleaning of structures shall be undertaken with the gentlest means possible. Sand-blasting and other cleaning methods that will damage the historic building materials shall not be undertaken.
8. Every reasonable effort shall be made to protect and preserve archeological resources affected by, or adjacent to, any acquisition, protection, stabilization, preservation, rehabilitation, restoration or reconstruction project.

Specific standards for Historic Preservation Projects

The following specific standards for each treatment are to be used in conjunction with the eight general standards and, in each case, begin with number 9. For example, in evaluating acquisition projects include the eight general standards plus the four specific standards listed under Standards for Acquisition.

Standards for Acquisition

9. Careful consideration shall be given to the type and extent of property rights which are required to assure the preservation of the historic resource. The preservation objectives shall determine the exact property rights to be acquired.
10. Properties shall be acquired in fee simple when absolute ownership is required to insure their preservation.
11. The purchase of less-than-fee-simple interests, such as open space or facade easement, shall be undertaken when a limited interest achieves the preservation objective.
12. Every reasonable effort shall be made to acquire sufficient property with the historic resource to protect its historical, archeological, architectural or cultural significance.

Standards for Protection

9. Before applying protective measures which are generally of a temporary nature and imply future historic preservation work, an analysis of the actual or anticipated treatments to the property shall be made.
10. Protection shall safeguard the physical condition or environment of a property or archeological site from further deterioration or damage caused by weather or other natural, animal or human intrusions.
11. If any historic material or architectural features are removed, they shall be properly recorded and, if possible, stored for future study or reuse.

Standards for Stabilization

9. Stabilization shall reestablish the structural stability of a property through the reinforcement of loadbearing members or by arresting material deterioration leading to structural failure. Stabilization shall also reestablish weather resistant conditions for a property.
10. Stabilization shall be accomplished in such a manner that it detracts as little as possible from the property's appearance. When reinforcement is required to reestablish structural stability, such work shall be concealed wherever possible so as not to intrude upon or detract from the aesthetic and historical quality of the property, except where concealment would result in the alteration or destruction of historically significant material or spaces.

Standards for Preservation

9. Preservation shall maintain the existing form, integrity, and materials or a building structure or site. Substantial reconstruction or restoration of lost features generally are not included in a preservation undertaking.
10. Preservation shall include techniques of arresting or retarding the deterioration of a property through a program of ongoing maintenance.

Standards for Rehabilitation

9. Contemporary design for alterations and additions to existing properties shall not be discouraged when such alterations and additions do not destroy significant historic, architectural or cultural material and such design is compatible with the size, scale, color, material and character of the property, neighborhood or environment.
10. Wherever possible, new additions or alterations to structures shall be done in such a manner that if such additions or alterations were to be removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the structure would be unimpaired.

Standards for Restoration

9. Every reasonable effort shall be made to use a property for its originally intended purpose or to provide a compatible use that will require minimum alteration to the property and its environment.
10. Reinforcement required for structural stability or the installation of protective or code required mechanical systems shall be concealed whenever possible so as not to intrude or detract from the property's aesthetic and historical qualities, except where concealment would result in the alteration or destruction of historically significant materials or spaces.
11. When archeological resources must be disturbed by restoration work, recovery of archeological material shall be undertaken in conformance with current professional practices.

Standards for Reconstruction

9. Reconstruction of a part or all of a property shall be undertaken only when such work is essential to reproduce a significant missing feature in a historic district or scene, and when a contemporary design solution is not acceptable.

10. Reconstruction of all or a part of a historic property shall be appropriate when the reconstruction is essential for understanding and interpreting the value of an historic district, or when no other building, structure, object or landscape feature with the same associative value has survived and sufficient historical documentation exists to insure an accurate reproduction of the original.

11. The reproduction of missing elements accomplished with new materials shall duplicate the composition, design, color, texture and other visual qualities of the missing element. Reconstruction of missing architectural features shall be based upon accurate duplication of original features substantiated by historical, physical or pictorial evidence rather than upon conjectural designs or the availability of different architectural features from other buildings.

12. Reconstruction of a building or structure on an original site shall be preceded by a thorough archeological investigation to locate and identify all subsurface features and artifacts.

13. Reconstruction shall include measures to preserve any remaining original fabric, including foundation, subsurface and ancillary elements. The reconstruction of missing elements and features shall be done in such a manner that the essential form and integrity of the original surviving features are unimpaired.

Summary

Prepared by US/ICOMOS

Understanding the relevance of the Venice Charter to our current historic preservation policies and practice requires a basic understanding of our preservation system. In the United States, preservation takes place within a federal-state-local governmental system, led and supported by the federal government, and in which national inventory, registration and implementation programs may exist side-by-side with state and local programs. Preservation must meet the profit expectations of private owners of historic buildings and of investors operating in private capital markets. It must acknowledge political realities which tend to place higher priorities on other programs. National preservation incentives are based largely on financial inducements provided through federal income tax subsidies. State and local preservation programs tend to be dominated by approaches which rely heavily on the uncompensated regulation of private property.

The United States did not support adoption of the Venice Charter in 1964 for a variety of reasons, but the principles of the Charter, with minor exceptions specifically appropriate to our situation, are firmly embedded in our preservation practice through federal policies contained in *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Preservation*. These incorporate and reflect the basic principles of the Charter and prescribe acceptable preservation practices for acquisition, protection, stabilization, preservation, rehabilitation, restoration and reconstruction work. They have governed 20,000 projects representing more than \$13 billion worth of preservation work since 1971.

US/ICOMOS does not believe the Venice Charter needs to be rewritten. A modern version of the Charter suitable for the United States would have to acknowledge the nation's contemporary social, economic and political bases for preservation, while continuing to support the more traditional rationales and practices with respect to physical intervention regarding historic properties. A doctrinal statement, perhaps based on the Secretary's Standards, describing and reconciling the current realities of our preservation philosophy and technique, would be adequate for its purposes.

Résumé

Pour bien comprendre le rôle de la Charte de Venise dans nos politiques et pratiques actuelles en matière de préservation historique, il est nécessaire de comprendre l'organisation de la préservation historique aux Etats-Unis. En effet, la préservation se situe dans le contexte d'une organisation politique de type fédéral, dans laquelle les programmes nationaux d'inventorisation et d'enregistrement des monuments historiques et de réalisation des projets de préservation historique peuvent coexister parallèlement aux programmes des états, des comtés et des municipalités. La préservation doit répondre aux attentes financières des propriétaires d'immeubles historiques et des investisseurs opérant sur les marchés de capitaux privés. La préservation doit reconnaître les réalités politiques qui ont tendance à accorder une priorité plus élevée à d'autres programmes. Au niveau national, l'encouragement de la préservation repose essentiellement sur des incitations fiscales (allègement des impôts fédéraux sur les revenus). Les programmes de préservation des Etats, des comtés et des municipalités ont tendance à réglementer la préservation historique des biens immobiliers privés sans faire intervenir les incitations financières.

En 1964, les Etats-Unis n'ont pas soutenu, pour des raisons diverses, l'adoption de la Charte de Venise. Cependant, les principes de la Charte (sauf quelques exceptions mineures dues spécifiquement à la situation américaine) sont solidement ancrés dans notre pratique de la préservation historique, grâce aux politiques fédérales réunies dans le manuel officiel de la préservation historique du Département américain de l'Intérieur (*The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Preservation*). Ces normes englobent et reflètent les principes de base de la Charte de Venise. Elles prescrivent les pratiques acceptables régissant l'acquisition, la protection, la stabilisation, la préservation, la réhabilitation, la restauration et la reconstruction de monuments historiques. Depuis 1971, ces normes ont gouverné 20.000 projets de préservation historique représentant des travaux d'une valeur de plus de 13 milliards de dollars.

US/ICOMOS n'est pas convaincu qu'il soit nécessaire de récrire la Charte de Venise. Pour bien faire, une version moderne de la Charte adaptée aux Etats-Unis devrait faire ressortir les réalités sociales,

économiques et politiques constituant les bases contemporaines de la préservation dans notre pays, tout en continuant de reconnaître les justifications et pratiques ayant traditionnellement régi l'intervention en matière d'immeubles historiques. Les Etats-Unis se contenteraient volontiers d'une déclaration de doctrine, basée éventuellement sur « *The Secretary's Standards* », qui décrirait et réconcilierait les réalités actuelles de notre philosophie et de nos techniques en matière de préservation historique.

ICOMOS: A Quarter of a Century Symposium sub-theme Experience and Education

*Prepared by US/ICOMOS
Hugh C. Miller, FAIA, Sub-Theme Chair*

As late as the 1970s, those who worked in the historic preservation field in the United States fell into several broad professional categories: historians, architects, archeologists, craft specialists or artisans as well as specialists in research laboratories. These specialties had developed since the early part of the 20th century and endured through the first decade following passage of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966.

Many of these preservation pioneers worked for the Federal government, primarily in the National Park Service. They also worked for state and local government and in the private sector in historical societies, museums and historic house museums. For these individuals, application of their formal education in history, architecture, anthropology and archeology provided access to these new preservation careers. It may be noted that in the United States new world archeology is found as a specialized area of study in Anthropology while much of old world archeology would be found in fine arts or historical studies departments. For them, continuing education consisted of on-the-job training, travel and professional exchange. Little was available in the way of structured short courses or training programs.

Meeting the Challenge of the Expanded Preservation Field

Today, the requirements of professional work are far more complex due to the evolving nature of the field. Historic preservation embraces a larger variety of subject areas, methods and skills than it did as recently as a decade ago. The preservation field now includes folklore, historical geography, rural history and historic landscape (natural and manmade) and cultural anthropology. For diagnosing and recording the ills of historic properties, instruments of increasing sophistication are available. Preservationists are required to be knowledgeable about personnel administration, fundraising and possess computer skills.

The administrative processes associated with preservation work, most notably those tied to governmental programs, have grown in sophistication. Many of the federal government laws can be mirrored

at the state level although, unfortunately, this is not universal. For example some states have laws which provide for environmental review, historic preservation grants and increased planning controls. Through regulations that implement state laws, historic preservation ordinances and practice in the localities are influenced. The pervasiveness of historic preservation at all levels of government requires multi-disciplined professional expertise in both the public and private sectors.

The types of organizations that employ preservationists have increased, including federal, state and local government agencies; a range of professional associations: local non-profit organizations; profit making corporations; firms and related businesses. Preservationists are even in the employ of real estate developers and banks. Historic preservation activities can be found in communities of nearly all sizes, even villages where a small historic core of buildings form a remarkable survival.

The definition of «preservation» has affected the nature of professional work and thus of education offerings. Where preservation once required the accurate period restoration of a historic property according to the best available documentation, preservation now addresses other treatments. Most properties now are «rehabilitated» according to the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings*. These federal government standards and guidelines serve as the basis for state and local regulatory activities and for numerous training programs.

The growing complexity of the field has meant that the process of education continues throughout a lifetime. At no one point has a preservation professional completed his or her education. The rapidity with which the field is evolving requires that professionals have access to educational programs and other methods in which to keep current. In fact, in the United States an individual may pursue formal educational opportunities up to and after retirement.

Preservation Education as Part of the U.S. Educational System

Unlike other countries in which «education» is strictly defined by university-base curricula, the United States offers a variety of locales for educational opportunities. These include structured programs addressed at a group of participants. They also include «information exchange», whether through printed matter or the high-technology devices of computers and their data bases.

Preservation education as a formal endeavor began in the 1960s at the University of Virginia in Charlottesville, at Columbia University in New York City and at Cornell University in Ithaca, New York. At their respective architecture or planning schools, historic preservation courses were offered as adjuncts to the regular professional curriculum. These courses grew out of the perspectives of faculty members, Frederick D. Nichols at Virginia, Stephen W. Jacobs at Cornell University and James Marston Fitch at Columbia University.

The early efforts at Virginia, Cornell and Columbia were the seeds of an explosion in educational offerings at other universities and colleges during the 1970s and 1980s. There are now over three dozen preservation degree programs in the United States. Most often, the offerings are at the graduate level, either through a graduate degree program in historic preservation or a graduate degree program in a related professional field, such as architecture, planning, history or landscape architecture, with a specialization in historic preservation. Now several universities and colleges offer preservation programs and courses at the undergraduate level. While some universities have an endowed chair for historic preservation or related subjects, the problems of faculty who teach preservation and do not receive tenure (an appointment for an indefinite period) are endemic, particularly in colleges of architecture.

In the United States, partially in reaction to new construction in the fifties and sixties when contemporary designs reflected the influence of Bauhaus «functional» architecture, there has been growing interest in the decorative designs found in 18th through early 20th century buildings. Due to erosion and other effects on the fabric of these buildings, inevitably there has been growing interest in problems of restoration and the adaptation of older buildings to meet contemporary needs. At its extreme, this has resulted in what has been called «facadism». On the other hand examples of restoration and adaptation of such historic buildings as Union Station and the Library of Congress in Washington, D.C., are comparable to the best in such work found in other countries of the world.

With the exception of archeologists which have a certification program, the need for the certification of architect restorers, technicians, craftsmen and other specialists concerned with conservation and restoration, has unfortunately not taken place. This has resulted in a lack of focus in training programs. An example of an admired program is found in the medical profession in the United States which requires not only an academic degree but also two to three years of

practical experience as interns and state and national examinations in the fields of specialization.

With few exceptions, university programs have only one or two full-time faculty. They are dependent on adjunct professors and visiting lecturers who are preservation practitioners into the classrooms but there is often a lack of continuity of course offerings and sometimes a disparity of content and information between the varied guest lecturers. However, the growing literature in preservation is augmenting the experience and skill of the resident faculty and providing a basis for analytical or critical discussions with lecturers.

Continuing Education by Universities and Other Institutions

Thus universities and colleges offer a common locale for preservation education. In addition to their regular degree programs, they may offer special courses intended for an adult or professional audience beyond the regularly enrolled graduate students. These institutions of higher education or training opportunities, many of them task-oriented, such as seminars, conferences, workshops, short courses, summer institutes and internships.

Examples include the long-running Nantucket Summer Institute sponsored by the University of Florida. It offers not only the advantages of the ready laboratory situation of Nantucket Island, but also interchange between students and faculty from throughout the nation. Academic credits are offered to students, but the real value is the experience acquired from the mix of university students, young professionals and experienced professionals who are documenting and recording historic structures. The preservation Institute: Caribbean also sponsored by the University of Florida, is typical of university programs organized to provide field experience in preservation courses outside the United States with multinational participation. Internships, such as those offered through US/ICOMOS, provide opportunities for domestic and foreign students to participate in work/study opportunities under the supervision of experienced professionals.

Just as common in the educational field are professional, advocacy and similar organizations that offer educational programs. While these organizations may not carry the prestige of a university or college-sponsored program or cannot grant degrees or educational credits, they nonetheless fill gaps in educational offerings through specialized subject matter, timeliness and experienced speakers.

Although these courses often are narrowly focused for a small audience and sometimes not repeated, they are the mainstay of preservation education for the adult population. These courses offer a high degree of experience and information about general and highly technical preservation subjects.

The Association for Preservation Technology (APT) was organized in 1968 to meet the technology, pathology and scientific needs of preservation professionals in the United States and Canada. The goals of APT were to provide a forum and a means to exchange information. The *APT Bulletin* has become a standard source of technical information and the training courses offered before annual meetings usually are fully booked. Continuing education credits are often given by cooperating institutions.

Professional and trade organizations, such as the American Institute of Architects, the American Planning Association, the American Association for State and Local History and the Society for American Archeology, offer a variety of educational opportunities and continuing education credit in their specialization, as applied to preservationists. Membership organizations, as varied as the National Trust for Historic Preservation, the National Association of Corrosion Engineers and the Pacific Area Travel Association are involved in audience-directed educational programs, usually without credit.

Government agencies at the national, state and local levels also provide educational opportunities, frequently in conjunction with non-profit and professional organizations. These training programs offered to government employees and others usually are structured to meet some specific aspect of job-related preservation work. As with the other adult continuing education programs, there is a concentration of experience and information exchanged in a very short time frame. Unfortunately, almost none of these courses have a structured sequel or fit into broader programs for individual development of preservation knowledge, skills and abilities.

An exception to this is the *Skills Development Plan for Historical Architects in the National Park Service* that was developed as a structured self-help guide for a series of study projects to meet the specific needs of individual development in preservation. This structured plan and program is dependent upon self-motivation. It brings the best aspects of mentors, peer reviews and use of the existing references to provide experience for continuing preservation education. Unfortunately, though an award-winning model, only a few people have made the dedication of time to use it since its inception in 1986.

Several organizations are entirely devoted to preservation education objectives. Since 1977, the RESTORE program in New York City, supported by the International Union of Bricklayers and Allied Craftsmen, has been training contractors and craftsmen to undertake restoration projects and thus ensures a continuous stream of crafts specialists into the preservation job market. This program provides a concentration of preservation philosophy, technology and hands — on application for the repair, cleaning and pointing of masonry in fifteen, three hour evening and weekend courses. The experienced teachers in this program also offer technical short courses of one or five days' length usually to design professionals and building owners. Today, RESTORE offers a full service training and information program with its courses, published guides, video tapes, reference library — all forming a technical clearing house based on experience acquired from actual preservation work. This has been a very successful program but, unfortunately, the RESTORE model has not been expanded to other locations or to other trades.

There are numerous other private, non-profit, programs for preservation education. The Campbell Center for Historic Preservation Studies in Mount Carroll, Illinois, founded in 1979, offers architectural and object conservation short courses on a former college campus. Located in the National Building Museum in Washington, D.C., the National Preservation Institute also offers short courses to employees of government agencies and private organizations whose work in the arts and humanities may address historic preservation concerns. These courses are presented from the practical experiences of the visiting instructors. They are often very specialized subjects and open to anyone willing to take the time and pay the fee. As a result, these courses are sometimes canceled due to low enrollment. The problem of this type of non-profit educational organization is probably a function of publicity rather than lack of interest.

Information Exchange

Aside from formal audience-based programs, preservation education also includes various vehicles of information exchange. Most preservation organizations provide publications for their membership. There is now an ever expanding flow of books, newsletters and other printed material. These common benefits of organizational membership have the advantage of being timely and cost effective in terms of reaching the greatest number of individuals for the funds invested. Through its pervasiveness, this literature reaches the broadest possible audience and, through its availability in reference libraries,

reaches a readership beyond the regular membership. Federal, state and local government preservation organizations also publish technical information and program guidelines that expand the knowledge base of both the generalist and the specialist in preservation.

There is also a growing press beyond university and organization publishers that significantly adds to this knowledge base. Several major book publishers offer preservation titles in their catalogues. There are also private publishers of professional journals, such as *Progressive Architecture*, *American Archeology* and *Landscape Journal* that regularly carry articles or whole issues related to preservation. This literature puts preservation information in easy reach of the professions and the general reader.

In addition to publications, preservation organizations and users increasingly are offering education programs through videotapes and film. This medium offers the advantages of recorded motion and flexibility in scheduling. It overcomes concerns about travel, housing and faculty costs. However, it does not provide for a personal dialogue between speaker and student, and content does not always meet the needs of specific students. The production costs can be high relative to use and the product is difficult to correct or update.

The overwhelming use of computers in the business and organizational world has made an impact on preservation education as well. Computers provide for the efficient preparation of curriculum and other educational materials and allow for the storage and retrieval of lists of information, such as registrants and faculty. In addition, computers allow for the storage of «data bases» of information. These data bases duplicate the kinds of information found in libraries, but available to those unable to visit the physical facilities.

Challenges Facing the Preservation Education Field in the U.S.

Unlike courses in literature and history, historic preservation cannot be studied efficiently in the abstract. It is an «applied» subject, necessitating a close tie between theory and practice. Both sides of the educational equation are symbiotic: the theoretical side of the field is fast evolving because of the accumulation of practical work experience. Work-like experiences as part of an educational program improve through the expansion of the field's theoretical base.

Traditionally, universities and colleges have been the source of theoretical study while non-academic organizations have been the center of applied knowledge. This sharp demarcation between theory and

practice has now blurred. Universities and colleges now offer the occasion for applied and practical applications of theoretical knowledge. Today, non-academic organizations, such as historic house museums and historical societies, reflect theoretical advances in historical research and interpretation.

Endeavors in preservation education in the United States have strength through their flexibility, spontaneity and variety. Educational offerings covering a wide range of subject matter, location and time commitment are available to every preservation professional. Government agencies and private organizations offer these programs in response to need, availability of experts as instructors and proximity to appropriate laboratory experiences.

Today, experience acquired in preservation is a major part of preservation education in the United States. The knowledge base and the delivery systems are at hand. Work is now being done to formalize a curriculum for public primary and secondary education and for technical studies to be offered as continuing education, with or without a certificate.

With all this education and training opportunity for preservation in the United States, perhaps the missing piece is the opportunity for preservationists to «fine tune» their skills or generalists (such as architects and related design professionals) to make mid-career corrections and enter preservation. Many Americans have taken courses offered by ICCROM in the fields of restoration architecture, and in general preservation as well as the UNESCO/ICOMOS and government of Italy courses in the preservation of stone and the government of Norway's course in wood. Others have taken the conservation course offered by York University in England. Such technical courses, offered on a regular basis with a set curriculum, in a blend of lectures, laboratory and field work by a permanent staff of resident and visiting faculty, would meet many of the needs of the United States. A spoken need exists in the United States for a technical course of a year's duration, more or less like York or ICCROM, to be offered on a regular basis, with a set curriculum, in a mix of lectures, laboratory and field work by a permanent staff of resident and visiting faculty. Regional centers of ICCROM are suggested models, but the commitment of people, facilities and funds seem to be too hard to obtain.

Another spoken need for structured, supervised internships may be less difficult to do. Funding and the matching of interns and mentors are possible but to make it work, the credentials of the experience

must have importance in the job market. Today, it is possible for young graduates to get jobs in preservation at an entry level without a depth of experience. This will change only as expectations and standards of the client group in preservation are raised. Securing of requisite experience then will be achievable.

The pervasiveness of preservation education offerings entails some problems, however. There is no coordination of programs at the national, regional, state and local levels, resulting in the potential duplication or surplus of programs. The «need» for an educational program is never an exact measurement. A program may be offered in direct response to a perceived need in the field or it may be offered in order to create a need for the information.

As preservation organizations and agencies seek to control costs, the financial feasibility of sending staff to established formal educational programs in distant locations may come into question. Organizations may rely on locally-available courses and may need a centralized source for curriculum advice and quality control. New ways to coordinate educational programs, through consortia of universities and colleges, may address the problem of program duplication.

The challenge of education and experience in the historic preservation field in the United States is unique to its own educational system. Much in the same way that it has been an article of faith that general education ought to be available to the largest possible audience, preservation also is seen as a subject worthy of the broadest potential educational audience. Today in the United States, for nearly every desired length of schedule and subject matter within the historic preservation field, there is an available educational program.

Acknowledgements

This paper was prepared in September 1989 by Hugh C. Miller, FAIA, Chair of this sub-theme task group, assisted by Antoinette J. Lee and members of the US/ICOMOS Training Committee, who have broad experience and knowledge of preservation education in the United States. Special thanks are extended to Jan C. K. Anderson, Mary B. Dierickx, James Marston Fitch, Carter L. Hudgins, Murray Howard, Thomas F. King, Richard W. Longstreth, William J. Murtagh, John N. Pearce, F. Blair Reeves and Michael A. Tomlan, who prepared responses to specific questions in a very short time frame and shared their published and unpublished works.

Summary

Prepared by US/ICOMOS

Since the passage of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, the education community of the United States has responded to the expanded preservation universe that involves an increased range of subject areas, methods and skills. The complexity of the field requires credentialed professionals who have a working knowledge of historic preservation. In response there has been a slow expansion of university sponsored graduate and undergraduate courses and degree programs for many of the professional disciplines required. In addition, institutions of higher learning offer continuing education and training programs for preservationists. While these courses may not be in the mainstream of academic endeavors, they meet the requirements of the preservation constituency and provide accredited programs organized by experienced faculty. The quality of these programs for preservation specialists usually depends on adjunct professionals or visiting lecturers who are practicing in the field.

Professional and preservation organizations as well as private or non-profit groups offer training through courses, workshops and seminars. Often utilizing the resources of nearby universities, these organizations provide a knowledge base that contributes to the published reference material for preservation education endeavors. The preservation programs of federal, state and local organizations are active contributors to preservation education with their own training programs and technical information publications. Currently, there also are active programs to develop preservation curriculum for the public schools for use by teachers in primary and secondary schools.

All the ingredients are present for providing professional experience in educational settings. The challenge is to provide a realistic number of experienced instructors and a comprehensive curriculum for use by diverse audiences in all geographic regions. This paper considers possibilities for achieving a broader education program by examining the successes and limitations of preservation education during the past 25 years.

Résumé

Préparé par US/ICOMOS

Depuis le passage en 1966 de notre législation nationale sur la préservation historique («National Historic Preservation Act of 1966»), les établissements d'éducation aux Etats-Unis ont fait face à un élargissement du domaine de la préservation, qui s'est trouvé couvrir bien davantage de sujets d'études, de méthodes et de techniques. La préservation est un domaine complexe, qui nécessite des professionnels de l'enseignement possédant par ailleurs une connaissance pratique de la préservation historique. En réponse, l'éventail des cours et programmes d'études universitaires et post-universitaires a été progressivement élargi de manière à inclure les nombreuses disciplines professionnelles nécessaires. Par ailleurs, un certain nombre d'instituts d'études supérieures offrent des programmes d'éducation permanente et de formation continue à l'intention des conservateurs. Bien que ces programmes ne comptent pas parmi les disciplines fondamentales enseignées par les universités classiques, ils répondent aux besoins des conservateurs et constituent des programmes agréés exposés par des professeurs qualifiés. La qualité de ces programmes pour les spécialistes de la préservation dépend souvent de la participation de professeurs adjoints ou de conférenciers extérieurs qui se trouvent être des praticiens de la préservation.

Toutes sortes d'organisations — professionnelles, de préservation, privées et sans but lucratif — offrent des cours et séminaires de formation. Mettant souvent à profit les ressources d'universités voisines, ces organisations offrent des connaissances pratiques qui s'ajoutent à la masse des matériels didactiques existant en matière de préservation historique. Les services administratifs de préservation historique à tous les niveaux du gouvernement américain — fédéral, Etats de la fédération américaine, et local (comtés, municipalités) — contribuent activement à la vulgarisation de la préservation grâce à leurs propres programmes de formation et publications techniques. Par ailleurs, on s'occupe activement à l'heure actuelle de mettre au point un programme d'études de préservation historique à l'usage des écoles publiques primaires et secondaires.

Il existe tous les éléments nécessaires pour assurer l'enseignement pratique de la préservation historique dans des établissements appropriés. Le défi consiste à recruter un nombre suffisant d'enseignants expérimentés et à formuler un programme d'études suffisamment approfondi et adapté à des audiences diverses dans toutes les régions des Etats-Unis. Cet exposé examine les possibilités de réalisation d'un programme plus large d'enseignement de la préservation historique, en passant en revue les réussites et les entraves vécues pendant ces 25 dernières années.