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ABSTRACT:

This thesis investigates the cultural process of architectural preservation. It offers an explanation of how various societies use preservation differently. Alois Riegel's theories of preservation are explored. Three key preservation Societies in Western Culture are presented - Roman Empire, Italian Renaissance and 19th c. Western Europe, who have developed what can be seen as a legacy of preservation uses which have remained operative over many centuries.

Our present American Preservation age has contributed to this legacy in a profoundly different way, and has altered the very boundaries of Preservation motives and actions.

I hypothesize that the three previous preservation societies shared a common set of motives which developed additively over time. This additive process has been broken by our discovering that the concept "past" could be treated as a transferable entity - something that could be extracted from genuine architecture and transfused into new and recycled places. This new perspective has revolutionized the way we manipulate our past built forms. It has also altered our response to "the original" vs. "the facsimile" in the built world. The result is that now we find both the genuine and the replica versions of the past equally gratifying. This has to do with the shift from an elite perspective to a mass culture perspective.

The consequences of these new uses of our present preservation mentality are still forming.

My goals in this thesis are to:
1. Establish a concept of the nature of a preservation mentality.
2. Offer a theory as to how preservation motives are a result of cultural sensibility.
3. Investigate the connection between preservation motives and preservation actions.
4. To explore how our present American preservation culture has diverged so radically from traditional uses of preservation, based on the above as a framework.
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Every image of the past that is not recognized by the present as one of its own concerns threatens to disappear irretrievably.

Walter Benjamin
Introduction

Architectural preservation is a cultural process. It has as much to do with societal attitudes and motives as it does with architectural styles and restoration techniques. It is a mental journey into the physical past, the purpose of which is to retrieve what the present day culture finds fulfilling. Not every culture finds this retrieval process an operative one, nor do all cultures allow it to become a significant force in shaping their memories of the past, or enhancing their present built world.

Today, American culture has taken full advantage of the preservation process in order to retrieve from the past both conceptual and physical reminders which have transformed how we perceive our built landscape, and transformed the built landscape itself.

Cultures like our own which find gratification in using preservation have had a variety of motives. These motives have developed over the course of Western history, where at various points a Preservation Age has developed and contributed a new use for preservation. For example, at various points in time, preservation becomes not a tertiary consideration for some societies, but a primary consideration. These may be defined as Preservation Societies, or Preservation Ages. Today, we in America have become the latest Preservation Society to contribute a lively chapter to the preservation legacy of previous cultures. The past preservation societies used past architecture to promote patriotic nationalism, inspire contemporary artists, and give justification to human meaning by linking the past to the present as lasting tangible tributes to ourselves.

What our culture has contributed to this legacy is profoundly
different from what was contributed by the past preservation societies, and has altered the very boundaries of preservation motives and actions.

The new boundaries include places which appear historic, which evoke history or which alter history, but are not necessarily the pure and unadulterated thing itself. A major conclusion of this thesis is that we are revolutionizing the concept "preservation", largely a result of a mass culture, which is as involved in the preservation process as those traditionally responsible -- political leaders, architects, intellectuals and professional preservationists.

This discovery of finding "The Past" to be a transferrable entity, which can be extracted from the genuine places and transfused into new places or old places is a radical addition to the preservation mentality. It has inspired a new set of "uses" which have served contemporary social, emotional and intellectual interests.

My goals in this thesis are the following:

1. To discover what cultural attitudes are necessary in order for preservation mentality to become operable in a culture.

2. To theorize how Preservation Societies use preservation differently, and yet form a cumulative legacy of motives which is transferrable.

3. To analyze how our current American preoccupation with preservation diverges so powerfully from the preservation legacy which preceded us.

4. To trace how preservation motives are translated into actions, and influence the following decisions: what gets preserved, how should sites get preserved, and who will participate in the preservation process.
I have three main hypotheses to explore:

1. The following model diagrams the process of preservation, which includes one fixed component -- societal attitude or mentality; and three variable components -- preservation motives or uses, preservation action, and the cultural context of taste and sensibility.

Each Preservation Society follows this process. There is much congruence amongst Preservation Societies at the preservation mentality stage, and much variance at the other two stages, due to differing cultural contexts.

2. The Preservation Societies in Western culture participate in an additive pattern of recycled preservation motives. This theory is based on the ideas of Alois Reigl. Each Preservation Society incorporates the previous motives and adds a new use to this cumulative "palette" of motives.

3. Today's American culture is a Preservation Society which has made drastic changes in the previously mentioned additive pattern of motives. Because of our particular relationship to what is "genuine" in our built world, we have come to the point where we can preserve the meaning of the past, without necessarily preserving the original objects. This is consistent with the nature of our information/technology era. We find gratification in both adapting genuine places and re-creating
historic replicas. We have removed the symbolic content from the objects and still found the results to be evocative. This represents a major shift in using preservation. I will focus on how this shift developed and how it is expressed through our preservation motives and actions today.
Part 1 -- The Nature of a Preservation Mentality

I have posited that Preservation Societies only develop as a result of a societal acceptance of a preservation mentality. Accepting this preservation mentality and producing the motives and actions to express this mentality is what distinguishes Preservation Societies from other societies who participate in preservation also. The following five criteria constitute the basis for a preservation mentality.

1. It is not the act of preservation alone which differentiates preservation societies from other societies, because many societies maintain their built environment but it is the significance they attach to the act which determines their standing. A society must consider the built world to be a viable transmitter of symbolic messages. They must conceive of the material world as an appropriate source for these messages.

2. A linear acceptance of time must be honored, where past people and events are meaningful to present life, but are distinguished from present experience. Therefore, the notions of "past" and "present" are separate operable notions for preservation societies, and the built world is a context to express this.

3. A preservation society must have the luxury to be powerful enough to maintain a settlement in one place over time in order to sustain these remnants of the past, and want to stay in one place over a long period of time. Nomadic cultures cannot be preservation societies using built forms to keep the past alive but can use movable objects in the same way -- like preserving costumes, jewelry, trinkets, etc.

4. A desire to use one's material culture as a way of reifying human identity is the focus of preservation societies vs. other cul-
tures who find a similar gratification through non-material forms of expression -- religion, meditation, etc.

5. A preservation society looks to the Past vs. the Future for new inspiration and for the familiar. The past holds cultural, intellectual and emotional nourishment for preservation societies. Many cultures find similar inspirations from the future -- from progress. Some cultures alternate between the future and the past for their source of inspiration, and it is these retrievals into the past that signify a preservation society has developed. In some cultures like our own, both the past and the future become simultaneous sources of inspiration. We can maintain a preservation mentality simultaneous to a progressive mentality. These dually motivated societies can be considered preservation societies in addition.

The combination of all five factors serve as a basis for a societal preservation mentality to emerge. This appears to be a constant element regardless of the variety of motives and actions which develop in each particular preservation society. Sometimes isolated examples of preservation motives and actions exist but without the societal nurturing of such a preservation mentality these isolated episodes do not become a significant force. For example, in the early 19th c. America had the economic and military strength to sustain its built past, and placed much attention on the material culture, believed in a linear history, and found satisfaction in human expression through built forms. However, Americans had not yet accepted their own past as a source of inspiration and looked instead to progress and to European culture for cultural guidance.

Following the argument presented thus far, there are three kinds
of societies in terms of their relationship to preservation -- those who don't preserve or maintain built forms for any reasons; those who do preserve built forms for functional daily use or for religious use only; and those who preserve built forms as a conscious choice of including the memory of the past for reasons other than functional and religious for present day culture. From this last category of societies only a small number have emerged who, because of their inclusion of all five factors of preservation mentality mentioned above, warrant the label of Preservation Societies in Western history. (See Fig. 1.)

In addition to exhibiting a preservation mentality like the one I outlined above, another criterion for what constitutes a preservation society has to do with the motives which instigate their preservation activities. Alois Reigl, a turn-of-the-century art historian whose theories about preservation include the analysis of these unique cultures who embrace preservation as a major cultural force, posits that what makes these preservation societies distinct from others is that each contributes a new motive or use to the legacy of preservation motives and each makes a significant mark on their cultural context with these new and previously developed uses. For example, Reigl considered the Roman Empire to be the first Preservation Society in Western history which significantly used unintentionally created monuments.
to commemorate past heroes or events.

The next Preservation Society to emerge was the Italian Renaissance, who not only used preservation to commemorate heroes and past events, but added a new appreciation of the built past as a source of intellectual and aesthetic inspiration for their present culture. This came from a renewed interest in the significance of a particular period of history -- classical antiquity, and its relationship to the life of Renaissance people.

In this way, each preservation society adds to a growing palette of preservation purposes, while continuing to apply the ones previously developed. This ability to contribute a new use is what distinguishes preservation societies from other cultures who preserve, without conscious effort.

This section has defined what a preservation society is, and focused on the preservation mentality component of the preservation model I will offer in the next section.
Part 2 -- Framework for Analyzing Preservation Societies

In this section I will outline the preservation process unique to preservation societies. It will explain how preservation mentality, motives and actions fit together. In this section, I will also discuss the most relevant theories of Alois Reigl. They serve as the basis for the "motive" component of this model, and also have been useful in setting up a framework for understanding how the previous preservation uses are linked together. Reigl has served as a stepping stone for me, in order to develop a theory about how the past preservation legacy is being transformed today by our American use of preservation.

A. A Model of the Preservation Process

The previous section defined what makes a preservation society, that is an age which adds a new preservation purpose. I will diagram the process these societies follow. It has four components. The first is Preservation Mentality. (See Fig. 2.) This is the societal position which must be present in order for a society to find the act of preserving a solution for its motives. It necessitates certain conceptual frameworks which the society must accept, in addition to certain traits concerning a society's relation to their material culture -- the luxury to sustain it, etc.

STAGE 1 PRESERVATION MENTALITY

Fig. 2
The next component is the development of Preservation Motives. (See Fig. 3.) The motives themselves, without being put in a preservation context, are neutral. They can be satisfied by many actions which also include non-architectural preservation actions. For example, the motive to promulgate national patriotism can be satisfied in many ways; political leaders can give speeches, promote patriotic literature, and establish national holidays which all have nothing to do with preserving architecture. However, if a society has a preservation mentality conceptually in place, then its motive for increasing patriotism may be served by preserving past architecture by using its commemorative property or its ability to express historic content. In this way societal motives are satisfied by one or a number of preservation purposes.

For that society, the motive, say patriotism, becomes conceptually embedded into the way people perceive preservation so motives and purposes emerge. The "signifier," a building, becomes the "signified," the patriotic ideal. A place deemed a monument for patriotic reasons will become a patriotic monument to that culture. When, if a culture loses the impetus for that motive, the monument might lose its meaning, or its meaning might change to suit society's new motive or use designated for it.

The third component of the model is the particular actions which
have been taken to operationalize the preservation motives. (See Fig. 4.)

Preservation actions include the actual buildings and places which are preserved; the policies which determine what gets saved and how it will be restored; and the determination of who gets involved in the preservation process. This is the operational level of preservation in which the previous two levels converge. The simplest "act" of preservation, conscious or unconscious, is rooted in some kind of attitudinal and motivational base.

In order to understand what preservation means to a culture, one cannot exclude the analysis of any of the components. Much preservation literature only deals with the last component -- action -- without revealing the human energies which made these acts take place.

The way I have set up the model infers that the process is what remains constant, but the input from each preservation society makes the outcome variable. Therefore, the mentality -- level 1 -- remains most constant but the particular motives and actions taken by each preservation age are variable according to the fourth component -- the cultural context. (See Fig. 5.) I envision this component as the "sea" of cultural tastes and sensibilities whose waves are constantly in motion. Each time a society engages in the preservation process
the particular condition of the "sea" at that point will determine which motives and actions will surface.

![Diagram of STAGE 1: MENTALITY, STAGE 2: MOTIVES, STAGE 3: ACTIONS]

The factors of the cultural context that most often effect the preservation process are: a) ideas concerning the definition and value of history; b) the value of individual expression; c) aesthetic taste; d) accepted power structure; e) the role of material culture in society; and f) the level of social psychological receptiveness to deriving emotional/psychological comfort from our built surroundings.

I have not mentioned the role of the individual in this model. This is not to say that individual taste is inconsequential, but I view it as interchangeable with societal taste. Individuals can help determine societal taste and society helps determine individual taste. I do not find it useful to dwell further on this individual/societal relationship but it should be understood that I have implicitly included individual taste within my definition of cultural context.

What is more relevant to my thesis is how cultural taste changes over time, so that the role of preservation comes to mean something different for each preservation society. For example, consider the concept "monument" as it has played a crucial role in preservation activity through time. Preservation societies have been referred to as "Cults of Monuments" by Alois Reigl, a Viennese art historian, who
wrote and thought about preservation at the turn of the century. His term "Cult of Monuments" is instrumental in showing how the vocabulary of preservation has evolved over time, and corresponds to the changing meaning of preservation.

*Cult* suggests a strong attachment, almost a kind of irrational fascination on the part of the participants. If one can put aside the contemporary association of the word used in reference to counter-culture groups, and focus on the level of attachment that the word signifies, then I think it becomes instrumental in describing the fervor expressed by these cultures who gave preservation activity a priority in their society. The term *monument* is a different story. The word monument originates from the Latin "monue," a verb meaning to draw attention to, to warn, and "moneo," meaning to remind. Finally, "monumenti" was to mean tangible things of the past which were valued for the present. Notice the neutral tone of the definitions, compared to our usage of the word today. Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary (1980) says: "1. a burial vault, 2. a written legal document or record, 3. a lasting evidence or reminder of someone or something notable, 4. a memorial stone or building erected in remembrance of a person or event."¹ Today's usage of the word is full of explicit meanings, like the mention of something or someone "notable," or the reference to "burial vaults." This is no longer a word neutral of value judgement or association. As today's culture has put an associational value to the word, so also has each past culture who coined the word, by having it signify a particular set of objects, which came to serve as monuments. Hence, the concept "monument" has been the dynamic force. Its meaning changes for each new culture. This kind of cultural change over time,
the dynamic nature of "monument"
meaning corresponds to the major theme of this thesis -- how the concept of architectural preservation has a changing meaning for each culture that embraces it. One cannot presuppose that its meaning for one culture is the same for another. In order to understand this meaning one has to identify a culture's intellectual, emotional and aesthetic sensibilities, which produce conscious motivations to preserve.

The Roman Empire was the first culture to use the word monumenti. As such, it began a long history of giving shape to the concept "monument." Because of the particular kinds of tangible things they felt should be valued from the past -- commemorative markers, temples and civic places -- "monument" as a label was no longer a neutral concept. The Roman leaders' choices of what was worthy of preserving became incorporated into the word "monument" itself, as the concept "monument" became embedded into those kinds of objects. The word and the category of objects valued took on new significances.

"Monument" technically could have included any object or built form in culture that the decision-makers thought was worth saving -- houses of famous people, houses of ordinary people, workplaces, pathways, etc., but because those who made decisions valued places for their political symbolism, or national cultural importance for the most part, these were to become architectural objects which began to define the meaning of the word "monument." It should be remembered that this decision of what to value was also influenced by the general mental set of the time having to do with attitudes towards history, architecture and the individual's role in society.
Later Cults of Monuments upheld similar value judgements, and labeled similar objects of monuments -- palaces, cathedrals -- which were added to the Roman definition. Some time later even more categories were added -- famous people's houses, and places valued for their beauty and for their age, even natural features and landscapes. Each of these new categories represents different cultural values, and reflects new attitudes about the concepts of history, role of individual in society, and the role of art.

Our present culture inherited the word "monument" from past generations that placed most of their emphasis on objects which expressed a national heritage based on famous and powerful people, battlefields, and aesthetically pleasing sites. Until the recent surge in preservation activity, the concern for preserving American heritage excluded places of historic importance for minority races, places which hold regional or local meaning, places of work, urban design elements like street patterns, height of buildings, etc., and even whole districts which retained deep physical and social significance. Now that what is valued from the past has changed, the word "monument" as we have come to know it no longer applies. It carries with it too much of the singular architectural nature and the monumentalizing of elite taste. Our current age has altered not only the motives handed down to us from the preceding preservationists, but also the boundary delineating what constitutes present day "monuments." We still save places and built forms to signify a past time for present and future society. And we, as every culture, will instill a value judgement upon whatever we deem is worthy of conscious intervention. For us the word "monument" has outlived its use. This shift from monuments to "anti-monuments"
represents the larger shift from earlier preservation uses to 20th c. preservation uses.

B. Reigl's Contribution

Much of the American preservation literature deals with the third layer of the model -- the action model. Much is written about the chronological account of preservation activities, and restoration solutions. Recently the literature also includes what social effects these activities are having on the poor, who are being displaced from older sections of cities as the infrastructure is renovated, and on the urban populations because residential and commercial renovations are changing the structure of cities. Often neglected issues are the motives for this new activity and how these motives are changing our vision of the past and our use of the present built environment.

There is one literary source which approaches the topic of preservation with those issues in mind, and becomes the one which has been most instrumental in providing a starting point in this thesis. This source is an essay entitled "The Cult of Monuments," written in 1903 by the Austrian art historian, Alois Reigl. Reigl's interest was in the role that art played in different cultures, and he was much taken with the idea that the human unconscious will dictated much of our interaction with art, which included architecture.

Though Reigl's ideas in the essay are meant to serve a different purpose than the one in which I am involved, the main thrust of his argument has been very instrumental to me. It has been especially intriguing to build upon his theories because they were written in 1903, and it has helped me to speculate on what has happened since 1903 to cause such a major shift in preservation orientation.
Reigl's essay was a response to the Austrian Government's request for help in formulating a national preservation policy. What he offered is a far cry from what we today would consider an appropriate answer, as his essay reads more like a philosophic treatise than a prescription for an operational policy. Despite the disparity between his response and the request, Reigl offers a refreshing approach to how cultures have used preservation and how these uses are carried on across geographic and cultural boundaries to form a continual preservation legacy. This theoretical construct provides a frame for the argument — that our present use of preservation is a radical departure from the previous uses.

Most of Reigl's theories contribute to the middle level of the model of the preservation process described previously — the motive/use component. (See Fig. 6.)

![Cultural Context Diagram](image)

The following is a synopsis of the motives of Reigl I found most useful to this analysis.

1. **Preservation Values**

Reigl applied a rational argument to describe the relationship between a culture's response to designating monuments in their built world and the objective properties of the built world itself. He described the built world as a series of objects that manifested three
distinct properties due to their metaphysical nature. People selectively responded to these constant properties, choosing only some properties and only some objects to respond to, depending on the cultural taste. These responses are what fueled a culture's particular motives to designate monuments and go through the preservation process.

He referred to these universal properties of built objects as "values." I have interpreted his meaning of value to be object-centered and neutral; not subject-centered and judgemental. The "subjective" enters into which "value" we choose to respond to.

Reigl discusses three 'values' of built objects which elicit human responses for preservation.

For example, take a chair. (See Fig. 7.) The chair has these three distinct properties merely because it is an object existing in space having been created at a finite moment, because it is capable of lasting over a certain period of time and so becomes associated with people and events of that time, and whose physical properties will become altered over the passage of time. Regardless of its shape, location, or cultural significance, Reigl views any chair as having the following values or properties.

a) Commemorative Value

The chair has the ability of reminding us about someone who sat in it often, say a grandfather, or it can evoke a memory of a place where it was kept or an event with which it was associated. In this way the chair in itself is not the prime importance, but it is the memories it elicits for us which is the focus. Preserving the chair helps to preserve the memory of person or event which we want to remember and choosing the chair, instead of, say, the grandfather's
Fig. 7. - A chair for example contains the 3 properties of commemoration, history and age.
boots, allows us to remember him in the way we want to remember. Every object has commemorative value whether we choose to save it or not. Commemorative monuments can be either intentionally created or unintentionally created.

b) A second property is **historic value**. Any object like a chair has a finite beginning and is associated with this particular point in history. The historic content of the chair is what the chair can tell us about the culture that lived during that period. Built objects like chairs and buildings can express intellectual, artistic and social information about the culture who created it. This "value" of the object has more to do with the intrinsic properties of the object than with what or who the object reminds us of, as described in the commemorative property of objects.

This historic property and the commemorative property can be simultaneously appreciated by the same culture in one object or building, or be noted in different sets of buildings. The physical condition of objects valued for commemorative "value" is less crucial than the physical condition of objects valued for their "historic" use. (See Figs. 8 and 9.) A gravestone is a commemorative marker and though it might show signs of deterioration its meaning is not lessened. If the Parthenon deteriorates beyond a certain point, it will lose much of its historic significance and instead become a pile of marble commemorating a civilization. Historic property is what motivates art historians, archaeologists, and many other preservation-minded people.

c) The third property is the **physicality of age**. The chair besides having commemorative and historic properties also has the ability to show signs of physical age over time. We conceive of this
Fig. 8 - Gravestone - commemorative value

Fig. 9 - The Parthenon - historic value
passage of time by perceptual cues -- peeling paint, faded colors, worn textures, and a general awareness that the overall effect is different than its original effect. This property elicits a more complex response, partly conceptual, partly perceptual, and partly emotional.

These three properties of objects including built forms are the dominant ones which Reigl saw as the basis for our motives to preserve architecture as monuments up through the 19th c. He believed that which properties to which we responded were determined by each culture's taste and sensibility.

This theory is analogous to the psychological theory of unconscious selective perception, where people perceive in the world only what they unconsciously wish to perceive, or what they expect to perceive due to past experience or future projection. This applies to how we come to value the past built world. We selectively perceive from older objects only those properties which matter to us.

This process operates on a personal level and a cultural level. If we do not believe that historical knowledge is relevant to present day culture, then we will ignore the historic property of a building and perhaps only be motivated to save it for what it commemorates or because its physical property of age is so appealing to us; i.e., as in a ruined castle. Similarly, if we do not find the presence of physical signs of age appealing we might restore a monument so as to increase its historic expression and diminish its physical signs of age. (See Figs. 10 and 11.)

Reigl posits that preservation societies will choose one property over the others and use this prevailing one as the basis for its motives to preserve. We Americans tend to favor the historic value
Fig. 10 - Castle in ruins - represents age value.

Fig. 11 - Paul Revere's House - represents historical value.
over the value of age.

Reigl believed there was a one-to-one correspondence between each successive preservation society and the emergence of a "value" to serve as a motive for preservation activity.

He believed that the Roman Empire was the first society to respond so significantly to the commemorative "value," that the Italian Renaissance responded in a similar way to the historic "value," and that the 19th c. Europe culture was the first to respond to the physical aging properties of architecture deemed to be monuments.

2. Evolutionary Pattern of Preservation Motives Through History

Reigl found that an evolutionary pattern of preservation motives accrued over time which connected the three Preservation Societies together, despite their other differences. He believed that response to the commemorative property was the base line response in preservation societies, and was developed first in the Roman Empire. Only from this base line could the next property -- "historic" -- be discovered. Therefore a society must first show evidence of appreciating the commemorative expression of built forms before they could appreciate the historic expression. This additive pattern was witnessed in the Italian Renaissance period. The next successive motive -- appreciation of the physical signs of age -- was rooted in an appreciation for historic meaning, and the 19th c. Europeans were the first Western culture to respond favorably to this third property. Therefore they had supported simultaneous responses for the commemorative, the historic and the physical signs of age. The following pattern of motives emerges:
Roman Empire developed A (A)

Italian Renaissance retained A; developed B (A B)

19th c. Europe retained A, B; developed C (A B C)

-- commemorative -- A
-- historic -- B
-- physical signs of age -- C

Each perservation society participated in the re-cycling of the previously established motives, while adding a new motive to the "palette." Each society used these motives for different reasons, and preserved different styles and categories of places to satisfy their cultural taste. Reigl, therefore, separates what are the pre-determined elements in preservation -- the properties of the built forms which motivate us to preserve from what are the variable elements -- the uses and actions for preservation. He puts great faith in the role of the unconscious will in determining what will trigger our responses and facilitate our preservation decision.

The following section explores how each of the three Cults of Monuments, Reigl noted, developed within this pattern of preservation uses.
Part 3 - The Cults of the Monuments.

1. Roman Empire

Up through the Roman Empire, 27 B.C. to 375 A.D., virtually all monuments were created intentionally and used commemoratively. Reigl felt that this was the Age of the Commemorative value. They were mostly valued for present rememberance; effort was not necessarily made to preserve these monuments for future generations. There is evidence to support this, as many intentional monuments were left to decay on their own, even during peaceful times of the Roman Empire.

The major motive for commemorative monuments was national patriotism. The Roman Emperors were the first in Western history to instigate policies to safeguard the objects valued as monuments. At this same time, one begins to note that the role of art, which would include architecture and monuments, played an increasingly important role in society, especially as it relates to promoting this patriotic nationalism. Reigl noted, "We encounter an undeniable cult of art for arts-sake at the beginning of the Roman Empire". ²

Other sources believed there was other preservation motives operating during this period. "For the true keepers of the past, from classical Antiquity onward, have often represented the most conservative interests of their society. Their motives were neither pietistic or patriotic, and they employed art and architecture to buttress the institutions of church and state." ³ This refers to the use of temples and civic masterpieces, like the Colosseum and Baths, which were unintentionally created monuments (See fig. 12.) They became symbols of the very institutions which were honored by those in power - pagan temple and state. When they were added to the
Fig. 12 - the Colosseum
category of monument for their commemorative value, they signified the first unintentionally created objects to be designated monument status. Here is where Reigl and other sources diverge. Both agree that the Roman monuments were commemorative and created patriotic nationalism, but others said the Roman Emperors were able to conceive of unintentionally created built forms as vehicles of patriotic memory, by the act of designating them as monuments. This is the first documented culture to exhibit this use of past architecture which was not created as a monument.

One of the motives for perceiving these buildings as monuments was that much pillage occurred from within the Empire in addition to pillage from outside. One magistrate felt it necessary to impose a heavy fine to anyone caught destroying these designated monuments, because stoncutters were using places like the Colosseum as a quarry, and stealing stones for new building projects. The Emperors were reacting to a "positive" destruction for purposes of development, and a "negative" destruction from invaders, and both reasons instigated a need to instill commemorative value as a public response.

One important element of the Roman Empire which set them apart from other cultures of the time was their chance to establish a continuing development of infrastructure of long-lasting quality, over a long period of time, which allowed them to established ties to their spatial surroundings and witness the passing of generations of people in one place over time. This kind of setting has been noted as one crucial backdrop for a culture to develop a preservation mentality.

After the Roman Empire had been split between East and West, and the Christian Emperors had became the powerful authority of state by 500 A.D., another form of unintentional commemorative value developed.
When the Christian culture had been vying for the central power, there had been much destruction of Roman monuments. When the Christian culture became clearly the dominant one, those in power, like the Emperor Theodoric and later Popes, no longer felt the need to destroy the infrastructure - the temples, civic places, and palaces which had become physical reminders of the glory of the Roman Empire. Now that much of the Roman public, especially the elite, had converted to Christianity, the climate of the culture had become less polarized and a kind of hybridized culture developed. There were probably two motives for this further preservation mentality. One was the confidence on the part of the Christian Conquerors mentioned above. The second was that the newly established Christian Empire was lacking an architectural style of their own, and felt an impressive architectural setting would reinforce their new stability of power. So they borrowed what was left of the Roman built world and assimilated it to suit their needs. Some buildings were left standing and turned into churches, and others into secular buildings. Some were taken apart and incorporated into other structures. (See fig. 13.) in 408, a Pope made a written decree to preserve what was left of Pagan temples, and have them be considered as public monuments, for their artistic merit. While this preservation for art-sake was the explicit motive, there were two implicit benefits operating. For the Christian leaders, these monuments were symbols of a great civilization and to be identified with them was a hope that the Christian Empire would be considered as an extension of the great Roman Empire legacy by the public. The classical architectural vocabulary which they borrowed piecemeal and incorporated in new buildings acted as a physical reminder that
Fig. 13 - Old section of Split, showing Roman architectural elements mixed with later infrastructure.
the Roman spirit was being embedded into this new culture. This was a new use of the commemorative property of monuments. Simultaneous to this usage of monuments on the part of the oppressors, another dimension of the commemorative was materializing for the converted Christians. They were witnessing their own culture through someone else's eyes for the first time as it became assimilated to suit this new Christian culture, and for the first time they did not take their built world as something that would last forever and be constantly rejuvenated at their will.

Perhaps the discovery of the "other" in their midst gave them a first wave of appreciating the power of their monuments as a way of keeping the memory of their past alive, now that their past was something different from their present. Hence commemorative value was mutually fulfilling to the pagan-turned Christian element of society, as well as the Christian invaders. This mutual appreciation helped establish the first true Age of preservation based on commemorative qualities.

**In Between**

Between the 6th c. and the 13th c. preservation did not play a major role in European cultures. One reason might have been the fact that during the Middle Ages, there was less emphasis placed on the material world than in the Roman and early Christian Empires. There was a continuous use of intentional commemorative monuments, grave markers, etc., and probably isolated examples of the unintentional commemorative monuments. But, at no other time during this in-between period is there evidence of a culture deriving such significance from their past architectural environment until the 15th c. Italian Re-
naissance.

2. The Italian Renaissance

"For the first time people began to recognize earlier stages of their own artistic, cultural and political activities in the works and events that lay a thousand years past...Thus the past acquired a present-day value for modern life and work." 4

Reigl makes this observation about 15th c. Italian culture. He considers this to be the first culture to exhibit a concern for the historical property of built forms. Contrary to Reigl, I believe that the Roman/Christian Empire exhibited a variation, though less developed, of appreciating historic value when they began to cherish their architectural heritage of the past when their culture became more alive in memory than in the present. The difference is that this was not a conscious full-fledged intellectual movement, but a kind of intuitive response.

Many changes in the 15th c. realms of intellect, art and religion precipitated the appreciation for history.

In 1443 Alberti and the reigning Pope Eugene 4 traveled to Rome and studied the remains of the art and architecture of Antiquity. Here, Alberti contributed to the newly developed skill of measured drawings. Their interest in these monuments was a combination of what these monuments reminded them of, or their commemorative property, but also an interest in the objects themselves - for their aesthetic and intellectual content. This interest in the object's worth was the beginning of architectural preservation for history-sake.
In 1447 Pope Nicholas 5 was the first of the Renaissance Popes to dedicate himself to the restoration of ancient Rome. Alberti's *De Re Aedification* is one of the first written sources, published in 1483, to commit to writing the value of monuments for what they can teach us. "I have examined all the buildings of antiquity that might be in the least important to see if anything was to be learned from them. I have been tireless in seeking out, examining, measuring, and drawing everything possible so as to master all that man's labor and intelligence offers in these monuments." He also speaks of preserving these structures untouched as opposed to what he calls restoration, which probably meant liberal intervention. "We shall now deal with those edifices that can rarely be improved by restoration, beginning with those of a public nature." And later, "The ancients' practice of paying groups of men out of State funds to provide for the care and maintenance of public monuments seems to me to be highly recommendable." 

These ideas of valuing the past were to become part of a new cultural revolution which involved many intellectual, religious and aesthetic concerns, some of which we take for granted today. The major cultural contributions were first in the intellectual realm and then followed in the aesthetic realm, but both of these kinds of changes were a result of a shift in religious belief. Up until the 15th c., Christians were taught to focus on the salvation in the hereafter, and that only God's creations were significant. The 15th c. shift in belief represented a theocentric attitude, where a new emphasis was placed on one's role in one's salvation on earth. This also involved the appreciation of man's creations as well. Both of these concepts gave people the freedom to be legitimately concerned
with their own history and nature of existence on earth. A growth in the interest of Humanism followed. Philosophy, history, archeology— all the social sciences became conscious intellectual pursuits for the first time. The concept of a linear historic evolution became an idea in good currency, which made the concept of periodization possible. From all of this new thinking came a concern for one's own cultural history, and so for the 15th c. Italians, the search quickly landed on the impressive periods of classical antiquity. A kind of cultural chauvinism followed, where other cultures were studied at this time but valued as inferior to classical antiquity.

There was also a delineation of which part of classical antiquity to value. The buildings of the elite or famous were considered monuments, and not the vernacular buildings. This preference for elitist structures in the study of art history and historic preservation might be seen as gaining a stronghold during this period.

"This bias in favor of upper-class, urbane, and permanent arti-
facts has persisted in art history and archeology up until the very recent past."8 This interest in cultural history leads to the preservation motives which triggered the second great Cult of Monuments.

Besides the intellectual interest in the past, a new interest in aesthetics also fueled the preservation activity. A canonical interpretation of art became accepted during this time which reinforced the intellectual pursuit of history. It was believed that art was a pursuit to achieve the ideal, which in truth was unattainable. However, the pursuit was a worthy one. It was believed at this time that classical art had come closest to this ideal, and so should be valued by present cultural standards. In some ways it was like discovering the path to cultural salvation. Here, perhaps for the
first significant episode in Western culture, the historical value of monuments becomes the inspiration for the development of new architecture. If this seems like a familiar use of monuments, it is because we presently are using the past in search of inspiration for the present. Today, as in the Post-modern movement, we incorporate past imagery in order to bring some connection of our part culture to today's culture. Perhaps the 15th c. Italians and the 20th c. Americans both felt a similar dissatisfaction with their recent architectural past and so looked into the past as a reaction. (See figs. 14 and 15.)

The Renaissance period's use of "the historical" role of monuments was different from the Roman period's use because the motives no longer focused on a national patriotism. This new interest in monuments was part of a larger interest in the role of man in creating his own destiny and becoming more self-aware of his past creations so as to apply this knowledge to shape the world a little bit more consciously. These monuments' value went beyond the symbolic level. "Although in early Renaissance times, and again in the epoch of Jefferson, the French Revolution, antique idioms were put to progressive or even revolutionary uses, they served quite other interests too."9 These other interest were the intellectual and aesthetic inspirations and are what motivated the preservationists during this period.

This surge of Humanism produced the development of historic documentation, art history, art and architectural literature, beginnings of urban design as an aesthetic design, and the art of collecting. This art of collecting art and architectural elements began in the private and elite circles, and would later lead to the
Fig. 14 - Johnson’s American Telephone and Telegraph Corporate Headquarters, 1978

Fig. 15 - Palladio’s 16th c. Villa Rotonda.
development of museums. It is true that the interest in the past was restricted to one period in history - the classical - but it did serve as a basis for the reification of one's present identity. A monument became an expression of an entire culture and its presence inspired new architecture. This selective reference to the past was a new experience, compared to the then normative approach of a society conserving what was left to them from their recent past. This sets the wheels in motion for a long tradition of historic inspiration and later revivalism, which is a similarly motivated use of the past. The new question would become which period of history would be the source of current inspiration? This would become the dilemma of succeeding preservation ages.

In the Renaissance time, because of their canonical belief in art, the choice was rather limited, but it was a choice. For later Preservation Ages, like the 19th c, and our own, this choice of what to preserve becomes more complicated as our culture takes on more pluralistic sensibilities.

In Between

After the Renaissance, there is little mention of any extensive preservation activity until the 19th c. Many of the disciplines which had surfaced during the Renaissance, like archeology, art history, cultural anthropology, and historiography, gained recognition which would again serve as the springboards for the next cult of monuments to come.

By the 18th c. Enlightenment period, the concept of a linear history had been refined and given a more rational systemized structure. The scope of cultural development was much more expanded.
Renaissance times where only selective linear connections were made; i.e. classical antiquity and Italian Renaissance. This historic concept rested on the fact that everything had its role in the evolution of time, so all objects were important, at least theoretically. This opened up the scope of potential monuments, as many periods of history were valued and many cultural origins were examined.

The 18th c. was a period where past attitudes of art were being questioned and new attitudes were brewing. The canonical belief of art which held to be an unattainable ideal was still accepted but it no longer held that classical antiquity was the only period of art to value. The growing interest in Oriental, Egyptian, and more recently Gothic art and architecture represents an intermediary stage of the change in beliefs about art. A canonical belief was still held but it was possible that any number of periods and styles of art might come close to the ideal. Reigl says of this 18th c. time, "No body of preservation laws emerged during this period because ancient monuments lost their canonical significance which had lead Renaissance Popes to protect them, but at the same time, non-antique art had not yet gained the authority which would demand its protection." 10

Though there is no record of a conscious preservation attitude materializing during the 18th c. There were many events that conditioned the next preservation mentality, which would play a significant role in society.

During the 18th c. the interest in art history and archeology instigated the development of connoisseurship. Many people became collectors of the documentation of the past, such as engravings, literature, as well as collections of the art and architecture themselves. First private collections were hoarded, and later the first
generation of public art galleries were created. Some of the first were the Ufizzi, the Luxembourg Palace's gallery, and the Louvre. This interest in art collecting resulted in much looting of Antique and Gothic architectural sites. This was a new kind of anti-preservation activity that was ironically an offshoot of a preservation mentality. However, there was no respect for preserving these monuments in their natural context. The same disregard for context had existed during the Roman-Christian Empire, where parts of ruined buildings had been salvaged. But these architectural elements had been incorporated back into the urban fabric, and so in a sense was re-cycled for the same "use" as before. During the 18th c. a new value was placed on these objects - a kind of art-history value, whose main motives was aesthetic and historical, and so context or "use" in the practical sense was not a consideration.

Another form of intentional destruction was due to the Industrial Revolution. The impact of this industrialization of society effected all aspects of life, and is still doing so, but it also had a major impact in creating a strong anti-preservation mentality in the name of progress. Many older sectors of cities were destroyed to accomodate the new workplaces and residential sections needed for the increase in production and population. (See fig. 16.) Besides this destruction of the material environment of the past, there was the destruction of a valuing of the past. The ability to mass produce replicas played a crucial role in society's relationship to the original, or the authentic. I will discuss in a later section of the paper how this alteration in the production of objects would drastically change 19th c. and 20th c. attachments to the authentic, especially in America.
Fig. 16 - Assebket Woolen Mills built in 1859, which replaced a large older section of Maynard, MA.
Another kind of intentional destruction became fuel for a renewed preservation mentality. The French Revolution is an example of a conscious anti-preservation movement which was as much involved with denoting meaning to monuments as preservationists did. The only difference was that the symbolic meaning these palaces and national monuments held was counter to the Revolutionaries' aims, so destruction meant a kind of destruction of the oppressors who they represented. In some ways the logic was that if one could destroy the commemorative value these monuments evoked, then the political dominance of the elite might be diminished. There is also an unconscious belief operating that if the material culture of a period is destroyed, that chapter in history will become less significant in the future. A more recent example of this is the old Town Square in Warsaw. (See figs. 17 and 18.) After World War 2, preservationists insisted on re-creating the old Square despite their dire economic condition, as a way to keep alive a history they cherished. The French post-Revolutionaries' destruction was a systematic program, and in fact did succeed in destroying many monuments of the previous culture in power.

The various factors which caused the anti-preservation actions during the 18th c. seemed to act as a catalyst upon the growing interest in past art and architecture, and so this reaction lead to the next Cult of Monuments.

3. 19th c. Europe

19th c. Europe, especially France and then England, was probably the most active Preservation Age of all the Preservation Ages thus far.
Figs. 17,18 - Old Square in Warsaw - before and after shots of pre and post - restoration after World War 2.
Many intellectual, aesthetic and political trends coincided to produce a period where history was given a more established role in cultural development, and directly effected the importance of monuments in society. Just as the canonical relief in art had grown to include other cultures, the study of history had taken on a broader meaning. Historic knowledge of any period became a legitimate concern. Because history was then witnessed as a system, then all past objects had potentially an equal meaning in representing a missing link to the whole. This concept of history altered the role of the preservation-minded. They now had to consider what to choose from, as they could not save everything. Because the concept of history was so important, this is the period where people became very interested in choosing how things should be preserved. Attitudes of restoration began to reflect different preservation motives. After the 18th c. period of anti-preservation, many people believed it was time for government to take an active role in safeguarding the architectural monuments.

Reigl attributes this period as the one where history value was in its most developed form. He speaks of the preservationists' attitude of this time concerning monuments. "We are interested in their original uncorrupted appearance as they emerged from the hands of their maker, and to which we seek by whatever means to restore them." The meaning of history, approached as a system, lent a different climate to preservation attitudes in 19th c. from the Renaissance meaning of history. The Renaissance was the first to find history a source of knowledge and aesthetic "truth", as far as monuments were concerned, but this was a very limited scope of pursuit as only the classical period was valued. The 19th c. intel-
lectuals valued history for its own sake — as a model to understand the nature of existence. Marx, Hegel, and many other 19th c. thinkers wrote about the value of understanding each moment in history as it relates to another. With this wide open scope of history, each potential monument was important as a documentation of its period, as well as how it fit into the bigger scope of historical evolution. Therefore the "moment" was best expressed not as a decaying building, but as the building appeared at its creation.

A short review of France and England's involvement in preservation activity during the 19th c. will show how historic motives instigated preservation activities and how the new value of physical age became a legitimate concern.

**France**

The first organized action taken to safeguard France's monuments came in late 1790's as a reaction to the post-Revolutionaries' systematic destruction of art and architecture of the nobles. Abbé Gregoire was one of the first to stress the value of monuments which were of non-antique origin. He favored Gothic monuments, and influenced others to appreciate their commemorative and historic properties. Though these attempts to institutionalize the preserving of monuments began in the 1790's, it wasn't until the 1830's that those in government positions carried on the early attempts at creating a national preservation policy. The Inspector General Vitet, who had been an archeologist, created the Commission des Monuments Historiques. He was most concerned with monuments from the Middle Ages, which were in a sense the earliest monuments which gave the 19th c. French a sense of personal history — a connection to the past. Historic churches and palaces were noted for a combination
of properties; the commemorative, as they instilled national pride, and the historic, as they revealed evidence to past architectural construction, artistic taste and life style. (See fig. 19.)

Vezelay is an example of the thoroughly French monuments that were restored.

Much of contemporary literature, like Victor Hugo and Balzac, lauded the significance of past French culture — especially the Gothic. This might have been a reaction to the priority previously given to classical architecture. French Gothic became a style that appealed to the general taste of the 19th c. public and evoked a totally different spirit of culture of the past.

One of France's most important contributions to preservation was to take official responsibility of restoring some of these monuments. Under public demand, Vitet and others began a program of documentation of all places deemed worthy of monument value, and hired professional architects to restore the most valuable ones.

Very few monuments at this time had been restored by professional architects, and so there was really no such thing as established restoration techniques. Instead, those individuals who became responsible for the nation's architectural treasures developed their own techniques, and made serious design decisions based upon their own ideas concerning the value of monuments.

There are few individuals in history who personally effected as much change in preservation attitude and restoration as Viollet-le-Duc. He was twenty-six years old when he accepted the responsibility for preserving the church at Vezelay. He was an architect but had no practical experience in restoration, though he had studied
Fig. 19 - Church of La Madeleine de Vézelay - restored by Viollet-le-Duc.
old construction methods. He took responsibility for the project, and became an instant leader in restoration techniques. He later dedicated his career to preservation and wrote a great deal of literature on the topic. He is a perfect example of one who valued the historical above all other meanings of monuments. He believed that architecture was a material expression of a culture, and that one could better understand humanity by studying the history of architecture. He saw the successive development of styles as an evolutionary process, where each style corresponded to a culture's place in this evolutionary process of history.

Besides his historic interest in architecture, he was also interested in its aesthetic content. He believed that form and decoration were of equal importance, and inseparable. Others at the time believed form to be the important root of design, and decoration a superficial application. This belief explains his fastidiousness to restoring the decorative elements on historic sites, even if he had to re-create them.

The following are the tenets of Violett-le-Duc's preservation philosophy:

1. It was important to know the date of a building, so that restoration could be done according to the construction and style of the period.

2. Documentation of the building was important, especially for portions of the building which might be altered by restoration.

3. It was important to note regional differences in style and construction, and use them when possible.

4. The ultimate decision of restoration rested upon the notion of bringing back the original appearance of the monument; therefore,
any subsequent changes or additions to the original creation were to be removed.

These tenets formed the basis of Viollet-le-Duc's preservation philosophy, and became accepted by others as well. The fourth tenet reflects the underlying motive of historical knowledge as a reason to preserve monuments during this period. Each of these monuments were valued for their particular link in history, but they were thought of as finite independent links. What happened to that monument in the form of alternations was a degradation of its "wholeness" in terms of its aesthetic and historic value. History, then, was a series of frozen moments represented by these monuments and brought back to their "new" state.

Viollet-le-Duc not only restored monuments to their original state, but also completed ruined buildings based on his conjecture of that period when there was no documentation. This is perhaps the most controversial aspect of Viollet-le-Duc's preservation policy. There are many examples of restoration where he added architectural elements that were based on pure speculation. He replaced old materials with new ones without differentiating new and old. 19th c. preservationists were strongly motivated by an historic value but they were not as particular about authenticity. It seems ironic to us that they could not accept original later additions to monuments which had genuine historic significance, but could accept artificial intervention during restoration as long as it was in the original style.

One reason for Viollet-le-Duc's justification of this was because the French Government would only fund restoration projects that could be re-used. Otherwise the building might be left to ruin. Viollet-le-Duc had to rely on speculation in some cases in order for the building
to be completed for re-use. While he is harshly criticized by 20th c. preservationists for his lack of aesthetic sensibility, he was actually motivated by a heartfelt desire to save the building at any cost. Jacques Dupont, the Inspector General des Monuments, in France today said, "Viollet-le-Duc confessed it to be a slippery slope, not to restore a building exactly, and one could take it only at the risk of otherwise losing the building entirely." Knowing this kind of motive might not change one's aesthetic judgement of Viollet-le-Duc's work, but it can help to explain why some of the decisions were made. (See fig. 20.) A counter-response to these restoration theories developed, especially in England, which would lead to the attachment to the age property of old buildings.

England

In the 1840's a strong opposition developed in England in reaction to the "Viollet-le-Duc" treatment of monuments. Note that the opposition was not necessarily focused on what should be preserved, but on how they should be preserved. 19th c. appreciation for Gothic had become widespread in England as well as France where they could boast examples of Gothic and earlier medieval styles as part of their own cultural heritage. John Ruskin was one of the strongest opponents to what he called the Scrape Movement. The Scrape Movement got its name from the Viollet-le-Duc kind of restoration, where the surface of buildings were actually scraped to reveal their original color. The emphasis was on making the monument look new and complete.

Ruskin's attitude towards preservation was perhaps more extreme than many preservationists of his time. He says, "It is no question of expediency or feeling whether we shall preserve the buildings of
past time or not. We have no right whatever to touch them.13

Ruskin's motivation to preserve monuments added a new dimension to the "palette" of values exhibited thus far - commemorative and historic. He felt that the mere material existence of architecture as it progressed in time, or showed signs of age, was the true state of its being, and in allowing this natural process to exist was in fact enhancing the man-made creation. The perceiver who noted a building as an aging entity was given an emotional and aesthetic experience which Ruskin felt expressed the real beauty of architecture. Sir John Summerson says of Ruskin and his attachment to age value, "He has found that he cannot separate the mere intellectual certainty that they (monuments) are old, from the emotions induced by the presence of the buildings themselves - emotions which lead him to call them beautiful.14 (See fig. 21.)

Ruskin believed the property of physical age was one of the main properties of all architecture, both old and new. His appreciation for age influenced both how he felt restoration should be done, as well as how one thought about designing new architecture.

To appreciate the rift that was developing between the Viollet-le-Duc camp and the Ruskin camp, one can compare two quotes of Reigl's, as he describes in the first one the 19th c. attitudes of those who cherish historic value vs. those who cherish age value above all in the second quote.

"The more faithfully a monument's original state is preserved, the greater its historical value: disfiguration and decay detract from it."15 and,

"The cult of age value condemns not only every willful destruction of monuments as a desecration of all-consuming nature but in principle
Fig. 20 - St. Albans Cathedral, England - before and after Lord Grimthorpe's 19th c. restoration - in Viollet-le-Duc's style.

Fig. 21 - Fountain's Abbey, Yorkshire. Ruskin favored places like this for their age value.
also every effort at conservation, as restoration is an equally unjustified interference with nature."

Those like Viollet-le-Duc, who honored historic property above all else were forced by their convictions to intervene in drastic ways of restoring, so that a total form, a frozen perfect moment in history, could be witnessed for the benefit of the present culture.

Conversely, Ruskin and others, who valued signs of physical age above all else, felt that these elements of incompleteness, faded colors, worn materials were the very physical properties that evoked the emotional/aesthetic response in us which "triggers in the beholder a sense of the life cycle." 17

Ruskin and others, like William Morris, represented a new breed of history-motivated preservationists whose interpretation of a linear history and whose values of aging as a witness to this explain why Reigl felt this period was characterized by an age motive.

This motive of age "manifests itself immediately through visual perception, and appeals directly to our emotions", said Reigl. 18 Ruskin indeed places great emphasis on the emotional content of these monuments. He speaks of this emotional content in universal terms, as a quality of built forms that all of humanity in some unconscious way is drawn towards. Reigl also emphasizes this universal nature of age value when he says, "Age value lays a claim to mass appear". 19 Ruskin's notion of "pathetic fallacy" 20 might be in part the underlying reason for why he feels humans have such an emotional reaction to monuments, which reveal their age. It is as if we see our own mortality in the aging building, or the ruin and we unconsciously feel both empathy and sadness.
Reigl discusses those who value age content above historical content of monuments (probably a reference to Ruskin who he never mentions by name) as being fundamentally correct in rejecting the "restoring back" school of restoration. However he brings up the irony of their position, where no intervention in preserving monuments will ultimately lead to their total decay. He notes that a monument's picturesque-ness will increase over time until it becomes so ruined as to be unidentifiable. Somehow the physical age admirers have to find an appropriate level of intervention if they want the monument to last over time.

In 1877, William Morris, influenced by Ruskin's anti-Scrape attitudes, began the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings. The restoration techniques found appropriate was to only replace "old with new" if necessary, to leave new material blank and un-sculpted, and to differentiate between old and new materials. Morris represented a shift in attitude about history in the treatment of architectural preservation. Instead of seeing history as a string of isolated crystalized moments - expressed by the many "restored back" monuments - he believed in history as a more dynamic developmental process. Therefore, a building's course over time represented this process, and all its alternations or additions were appreciated.

"A building was a long drawn out event in time, and in that very fact lay its essential value to the present." 21

This was a profound shift in intellectual belief that radically effected how people thought about restoration of monuments. The irony is that even when preservationists like Viollet-le-Duc thought
they were preserving the "original" style they often added so much subjective content to what this "original" state was like that their restoration work comes to be read as another layer of cultural input - the very thing they hoped to avoid. As we shall see in the 20th c., this belief of history as process rather than crystalized moments is still an issues that splits the preservationists into different camps. Our preservation society has gone even further in separating these two schools of thought. Morris' position integrated the historical and the age properties in a way that made restoration viable, while allowing the age to be expressed.

In 1882, the first national policy, the Ancient Monuments Protection Act was initiated to safeguard prehistoric earthworks and monuments, like Stonehenge. In 1900 another Protection Act included the protection of Medieval monuments. Like France, England chose nationally significant buildings and sites to be given the distinction of monuments. At first only medieval places and earlier sites were given this distinction. Only in the 20th c. was there enough chronological distance for preservationists to consider 17th, 18th, and 19th c. buildings as valuable as well.

By the end of the 19th c. preservation had become a prominent element in culture context. The justification for preservation was no longer an issue. Instead, conflict was focused on how to preserve. Reigl saw this dilemma stemming from the contradictory nature of motives that had become operational and had accrued over time. Commemorative, historical, and age values all held legitimate places in current preservation philosophy and yet they caused resistance to each other, in terms of restoration philosophy. Reigl's following comment, meant for the 19th c. is still relevant today in our late
20th c. Age of Preservation.

"Although both age and historical value are commemorative, they diverge radically on the issue of how to preserve a monument. How can we resolve this conflict? And if we cannot reconcile the two, which shall we sacrifice?"

The following diagram (See fig. 22.) illustrates the linear evolution of the additive pattern of preservation motives used by the main preservation societies in Western history.

The next preservation society to emerge is mid-20th c. American culture. I have not included 20th c. Europe in my analysis so I cannot say if they are exhibiting or continuing their 19th c. preservation actions, or are similarly motivated by a new fourth motive as American culture is.

In Between

As a basis for comparison I will review briefly the "warm up" period for a preservation society which would develop in America in the mid-20th c.
The first generation of preservationists had to fight against a strong current of opposition from future-oriented thinkers, or those who found European material culture far superior to our own. The fight was strong enough to save some of the monuments which we consider to be national landmarks.

In the earlier 19th c. there are documented examples of failed attempts to preserve our national landmarks. Ben Franklin's house was demolished in 1812, even though there were efforts to preserve it. Part of the opposition was due to the progressive attitude of market values, as the site was in the middle of a section of Philadelphia which was becoming a high market value area, and speculators were more powerful than preservationists. Also there was no organized concern about the safeguarding of historic sites at the time.

A little later, individuals from the literary world spoke out for a re-evaluation of our American heritage. Walt Whitman spoke out with this sentiment by the mid-century, and perhaps these writers influenced the country's sentiment towards architectural preservation. Instead of looking to Europe for our cultural sources we should look to our cultural heritage. This sentiment seemed to catch on, but remained a minority interest and only developed in the private sector.

By the 1840's and 1850's, private historic societies were developing in many states. Usually the members' interest developed because of the deterioration of a particular building that was valued for its association with a nationally recognized hero or event. One historian says of the 19th c. American Preservationists, "So there were scattered votes against the abandonment of important buildings that had been damaged. But there were no advocates for buildings
that were simply old or beautiful."\textsuperscript{23}

She notes that the documented examples of early 19th c. campaigns to save buildings which were either valued for their aesthetics, their age or their association with people who were not of national concern usually failed. In 1847, Deerfield, Massachusetts citizens tried to save the oldest house in town, a 1704 structure, but couldn't find enough support. In 1863, the Hancock House in Boston, known for its beauty, was demolished despite local attempts to save it.

19th c. United States used preservation to commemorate a past person or event as a symbol of patriotic reverence. The focus, like previous Cults of Monuments, was on a single landmark of national importance. America's earliest motives of preservation can be likened to the earliest Western Preservation Society - the late Roman Empire.

In 1853, the nation's first private preservation society was organized, the Mount Vernon Ladies Association - to save Washington's birthplace. (See fig. 23.) There was some interest in the historical content of these first projects, but not in the intellectual vein of the 19th c. Europeans, nor for the pursuit of aesthetic knowledge as the Italian Renaissance. Instead the interest in saving Mount Vernon was to keep alive the memory of a great man through the resurrection of his material surroundings. One historian said, "The visitor to such sacred precincts might be infused by some mysterious process of osmosis, with the patriotic virtues of former inhabitants."\textsuperscript{24} This comment implies the kind of "cultish" attachment to these isolated monuments of the 19th c., which shows the history value was more spiritually commemorative than scholarly.

Later, in the 20th c., our interest in how Washington lived would
Fig. 23 - Mt. Vernon
not be just because he was famous, but because we were curious about how 18th c. people lived, and because it was a beautiful estate. At this time art-historical content became a legitimate motive for American preservationists, as it had in 19th c. Europe. One interesting distinction that still exists presently is that our main focus with history is with the factual rather than the aesthetic.

19th c. preservation activity in America was not strong enough to represent a preservation society as was the case in Europe at the same time. The properties of physical age did not seem to be acknowledged at all. We were more interested in revivalism as a way to instill some historic imagery into our built environment, as a mixture of old and new to us, than valuing our early architecture as it aged, or copying those styles for our new buildings. When we did exhibit preservation tendencies they seemed to be motivated by the commemorative, and the historical, by local groups whose personal allegiance to these famous men and sites, helped them to become the symbols of our national heritage.

Walter Muir Whitehall affirms the dominance of these motives for 19th c. preservation activities or as he calls the "first phase of United States preservation action". He said the first phase of United States preservation action was, "concerned with associative values of buildings; the second was quite as much concerned with their inherent architectural significance, irrespective of what had or had not taken place within the walls".25

This second phase, the late 19th c. and the early 20th c., was more directed to the preservation of architecture as artifact, regardless of its owner's fame. By the 1920's and 1930's a mania for museum houses and period rooms in museums
caused much destruction of historic houses, as it had in the mid-19th c. Europe. Pieces of Federal and Georgian style architecture were displayed as pieces of art.

By early 20th c., American styles, especially Colonial, were considered valuable and many restorations were done by private historical societies.

In 1926, Rockefeller funded the restoration of Colonial Williamsburg. By then, the commemorative and the art-historical content of past places had become appreciated by a growing audience. A mixture of selective value judgements of what was considered "beautiful" and "historically significant" was used to determine what parts of Williamsburg to save, and how to restore it. (See fig. 24.) For example, though historical appreciation had come to mean that people were interested in the lifestyles of a past culture, not all aspects of that culture were considered important enough to save. The slave quarters and the poor sections of town were not portrayed, even though they were part of the original village. This selective "remembering" is not unusual. It still goes on today. We still select either how we want to remember something or what appeals to our aesthetic taste. I think we are more willing to reveal these other aspects of an historic event or period today than the earlier part of the century.

These open-air historic museums became popular and others were created, like Sturbridge Village and Strawberry Banke. (See fig. 25.)

By the 1930's, the federal government became involved in the safeguarding of our national heritage. Building surveys were done to document historic buildings and the first legislation to protect
Fig. 24 - A street in Colonial Williamsburg - before and after restoration.
Fig. 25: Old Sturbridge Village Museum
landmarks and districts was enacted. The first historic district was the Vieux Carre in New Orleans in the 1930's.

Despite the interest in preservation in the 19th c. and the early 20th c., the preference for the future-oriented and the revival of other cultures besides our own, kept preservation in the background until the mid-20th c.
Part 4 - Beyond Reigl

The last section discussed how the cultures which have been considered preservation societies or cults of monuments used preservation.

It outlined the evoluntional theory of preservation motives which Reigl offered. It also briefly discussed the cultural contents of the periods "in-between" preservation societies which did not support a preservation mentality, motives or actions.

This historic analysis has served two purposes. It sets up a theoretical groundwork by illustrating the pattern of preservation uses which I hypothesize are being greatly altered by our current American preservation society. It also sets up a substantive groundwork by showing the different uses preservation has served, so that one can better appreciate how our current preservation society has continued re-cycling these motives of commemorative, historic and age, and how we have redefined these motives and shifted our actions in favor of a new fourth motive for preservation.

Harold Bloom, the literary critic, describes an intriguing process that writers find themselves going through, as they develop their own literary style. In Anxiety of Influence Bloom says that writers often become enraptured in another's style and form a mentor-student relationship. This represents the first stage of the process, where the mentor's style is accepted and even imitated. The student identifies so much of himself in this "other" that a kind of unconscious father/son or mother/daughter link is formed. After the student has consumed this other's style, a second stage occurs, where, in order to separate the "other" from oneself, a kind of overthrowing of the mentor occurs; or, as Bloom calls it, "a mis-reading". This
mis-reading forces one to distill that which one valued from the
mentor, and reject that which has become superfluous to one's own
style. In this reaction to overthrow comes one's own sense of
creative energies. Inspiration and not imitation has occurred. To
Bloom the evolution of a personal writing style is a series of mis-
readings.26

This process is a good analogy to the incorporation of Reigl's
theories into my model of the preservation process. Finding very
little else of its type in preservation literature I was inspired by
Reigl for his interest in the uses of preservation and I used his
ideas to help construct a theory about our own 20th c. preservation
cultures.

To summarize, I find the following ideas of Reigl's most useful
to our time.

1. The acceptance of an unconscious level of mental activity
where a culture responds to the commemorative, historical and age
properties of monuments.

2. The belief that these unconscious activities are influenced
by the contemporary culture's tastes and sensibilities concerning
things such as historical belief systems, aesthetic beliefs, the
significance of the individual in society, and political framework
that directs our conscious motives to preservation.

3. The belief that there is a thread that weaves the Cults of
Monuments together over time, and serves as a kind of evolutonal
legacy. This legacy is made up of both the previous preservation
societies' efforts and the present preservation society's uses.

Putting what I have distilled from Reigl aside, the following
is a brief explanation of where Reigl's theories fail to explain modern circumstances, which lead me to go beyond them in developing the main thrust of this thesis.

1. Reigl concentrates on the unconscious, the pre-determined, and the objective reality of preservation motives. Though I believe these are all integral aspects and occur in varying degrees in all three layers of my model, I believe that the aspects of the conscious, the variable nature of cultural taste and the subjective will are all equally relevant properties in all three levels of the preservation process.

2. Reigl does not ground his motivational analysis in a preservation mentality, which I consider necessary in order for preservation motives to develop. He ignores the importance of political and social structures of power and the role economics plays. He refers to the "kunstwollen" - the cultural will or taste, as a key factor in determining preservation motives, but does not fully develop how this actually operates on a practical level; i.e., what gets preserved, and who preserves, all as a result of these motives.

3. I accept the theory of a cumulative evolutionary pattern of preservation uses, which implies that each preservation age is an extension of the last one and will add something new for future ones. This is extremely useful but I think Reigl placed too much emphasis on a one-to-one correspondence between each preservation cult and one dominant preservation value. I would agree that each cult produced a new way of perceiving past architecture in the form of a
new preservation value, but the previous preservation motives are still very much operative in each successive preservation age. In fact they get re-interpreted so they will be as satisfying to the cultural taste as are the newly developed ones. (See Fig. 26).

For example, Reigl believed that the Cult of Monuments during the Roman Empire only placed importance on the commemorative from intentionally created monuments only. I agree with other sources who consider the late Roman Empire/transitional Christian Empire to exhibit attachment to unintentionally created monuments as well, like the Colosseum and the pagan temples. This doesn't mean that intentional monuments, like grave markers or commemorative columns like the column of Trajan, became less important during this period.

The 19th c. is the most exceptional case to Reigl's one-to-one correspondence theory. It was indeed the period when age value was first appreciated, but it shared equal attention to a 19th c. brand of historical value. In fact, the 19th c. preservation societies represented the first full-blown appreciation of historical value. Not just one historic period was honored; all historic periods were deemed to have a legitimate place in the evolution of contemporary
culture.

Contrary to a priority of historical value, which disregarded the natural and human adaptations which befell older architecture, the appreciation of age value emerged and celebrated these signs of the natural process and human use. Both history and age were given much attention during this period, and their importance is still felt today, especially in Europe.

4. The appreciation of age as a motive for valuing the past built forms is an important one because it represents a major shift in thought between pre-20th c. cultures and our own culture. Because age elicits a complexity of responses, a brief discussion might begin to explain the nature of the divergence from previous uses of preservation and today's uses.

Reigl's definition places our response to physical age as a purely perceptual act which appeals to our visual and motional senses. Anyone who sees the ruined castle has the same capacity to experience this sensation. This definition of age value suggests that it elicits a psychological response. Sensual messages are transmitted unconsciously to our brain, where they meet up with our intellectual realm. Messages are sent back in the form of our conscious responses of pleasure or a less specific sensation of nostalgia towards the monument. Reigl said of this appreciation, "Age value manifests itself immediately through visual perception and appeals directly to our motions." 27

This definition ignores the role of our intellectual experience which I believe these responses are influenced by. Our perceptions are not solely responsible for our emotional responses. Our perceptions
also incorporate our conceptual knowledge. Our knowledge about history and architectural styles, and our expectations of what these will be like both play roles in how we might respond to the property of a place. Reigl himself hints at this intellectual dimension to our response to age value, when he says that our knowledge of art history plays a factor in how we are moved by the age value of a place. He said we would react disfavorably to a new building that shows premature signs of age or decay, and that we would react positively to a building which shows signs of age because it is old. Without saying so, Reigl believed the perceived age of a building is really what dictates our response to age value example.

Following this argument then, if it is the perceived age of a place that triggers our response to age value, then the genuineness of a place is of less importance than Reigl believed. He felt that people would not respond to age value in replicas. This is where our 20th c. preservation mentality begins to diverg so drastically. Because of our particular relationship to the quantity of "originals" and facsimiles in our material culture and of related factors, we have found it possible to respond to age value in the replica as well as the genuine. We have broken the link of perceptive response and the aesthetic impulse to the genuine, and let our intellect insert a new link, where just the perception of age, of past artistic style moves us and allows us similar age value responses. This notion implies an acceptance of making the concept "age" as operational as the physical properties of aging. We can be moved by Disneyland re-creations, as well as genuine places like St. Marks Square in Venice. The Acropolis is part genuine and part replica, and does not seem to lessen our response
to it. We also appreciate the total replica. (See Fig. 27 and 28.)

Age value has come to mean more than physical deterioration. It also includes our general attraction to places that give us the impression of age or of the past. Instead of the object itself being the focus, the message that is translated to us becomes the focus. This is the major argument for how the present American preservation age has appropriated history.

As long as we conceptually believe a place is rooted in the past, it has the capacity to appeal to mass culture today. I will continue this discussion of the new "use" of age value as it diverges from Reigl's definition later, but I contend that this is a turning point in our present preservation policy.

5. The last point to discuss concerning Reigl is how he predicted the 20th c. would use preservation. Given that he had experienced only three years of the 20th c., one must admire his insight. He accurately predicted the nature of the fourth preservation motive which would join the previous three as the most significant ones used by the future preservation societies. He predicted the scope of this new motive which had yet to become an operative one. However, he barely reaches the tip of the iceberg, instead of being able to project the depth of this new motive, and the repercussions its prominence would have.

With the appearance of this new fourth motive, the evolutionary pattern of preservation motives is jarred to such an extent that it is as if a second thread of preservation uses evolved. It will become the dominant one, with the previous thread of motives still existing but becoming less significant. The following diagram illustrates the new
Fig. 27 - Full scale replica of the Parthenon, in Nashville Tennessee.

Fig. 28 - The authentic Parthenon
break in the pattern of motives. (See Fig. 29.)

I will explain in this section what Reigl predicted the new motive (D) would be in the 20th c. The following section of the thesis will look at what this new motive would really be like, and how it caused a re-definition of commemorative (A), historical (B), and age (C) to the values of identity (A₁), living history (B₁) and conceptual age (C₁).

Useability Value

Reigl predicted the fourth major preservation value would be useability. By that he meant how practical a building is for human activity, based solely on material criteria. For example, an historic wharf which is no longer needed as a place for commercial shipping can be re-used for housing, and so will increase its useability value.

Just as there is an implicit conflict between those whose
main motive to preserve is historical vs. age related, there is also an implicit conflict between the usable value vs. the age value. Those who value buildings for their functional use might opt to demolish a building regardless of our appreciation of its aging appearance if it has become obsolete, and replace it with a new structure. Similarly, those who value buildings for their age properties might accept a less suitable use, in order to preserve the qualities of the structure which makes us respond to its age; i.e., worn materials, antiquated facade details, etc.

This parallels the conflict between many developers-turned-preservationists and other preservationists today. Often the re-useability of a structure becomes the priority for preservation above commemorative, historical, or age-related motives.

Reigl also considered a fifth motive - art value - as another 20th c. preservation use. I contend that artistic inspiration has always been present as part of the other reasons our past architecture is preserved. Isn't our judgement as to aesthetic cultural taste what dictates which monuments of our material culture will be chosen to satisfy our commemorative, historical and age motives? Instead of it being a separate motive, I believe it is an integral concern of all the previous motives and our 20th c. motives as well.

The places we choose to preserve become a benchmark of what our current aesthetic taste finds most appealing. As our aesthetic taste evolves, so does the content of what we preserve evolve.

The places we preserve also serve as a source for aesthetic inspiration, but not just aesthetic appreciation, as we look elsewhere besides our recent past to inspire our new designs.
Reigl concluded that the prevailing 20th c. motive for preservation was useability, and that despite the fact that it stands apart from the previous three motives because it implies a different level of action, the other three previous motives would still be carried on as they had in the past preservation societies. What he began to hint at is that useability value represented a dramatic shift from honoring the past to manipulating the past. This might be the most instrumental point Reigl makes in predicting the changes that separate the past preservation ages from our own.

We have taken useability to mean that past architecture can be manipulated both functionally as well as conceptually. We now view the remnants of past material culture as maleable as putty, to be physically remodeled as we see fit for our present activities. We can also use the historic qualities of these remnants conceptually, as information to be removed and become inspiration in creating new places which evoke history in a variety of ways. We can use this historic content to create a new architectural style like Post-Modern; to create a past lifestyle like replica villages; or to create visions of historic places for entertainment and sensual pleasure like Epcot Center. (See Figs. 30 and 31.)

We feel comfortable manipulating the past built forms and imagery for our present cultural yearnings.

We have extracted the message of the past from the medium and used it as an active ingredient in re-structuring our experience of history and our built landscape.

Useability comes to mean a lot more than functional use. "Useability" represents both the shift from passive to active
Fig. 30 - Port Grimaud, France - total replica of fishing village - used as a residential resort.

Fig. 31 - Part of the British section of Epcot Center's World Showcase - total replica for entertainment purposes.
preservation motives and implies the separation of object from meaning.

In order to discover what has occurred between the last preservation society of the 19th c., and the preservation society of today to warrant such a major shift, this thesis will go beyond Reigl in determining how this break in the cumulative pattern of motives has occurred. It will also explore how the break represents an "about face" in preservation use, and how we have perhaps permanently altered our mental and physical connections to history.
Part 5 - The Age of American Preservation.

In this section I will first make a short detour and outline what caused the new motive of useability to flourish in today's preservation society and transform the previous preservation motives of commemorative, historical and physical signs of age.

Then I will discuss the new set of preservation uses which we find most fulfilling to our cultural tastes today.

A. America's Unique Relationship to the Past

America has had a different relationship with preservation than her European counterparts. To understand what made our present-day preservation motives diverge so strongly from the pattern set forth by the previous European preservation societies, we must go beyond Reigl and explore the 19th c. and early 20th c. American scene.

Three main points which influenced American culture's relationship to the past may be characterized as:

1. The Frontier mentality of a new culture.
2. The Original vs. the Replica.
3. The Passive role of Public Policy in preservation.

1. The Frontier Mentality of a New Culture

In the world from which Americans came there were strong patterns of human settlements and no frontier to discover. Changes occurred within the context of a slowly evolving status-quo. In contrast, the new continent had few spatial constraints and no human settlements to influence patterns of building. The first settlers copied spatial and architectural patterns of the native American culture but this was quickly replaced by European models.
Instead of an attitude of conserving the status-quo of the built environment as in Europe, the new Americans must have felt a freedom, a shift of the progressive vs. the conservative. As in many aspects of their lives, this new freedom from tradition was not an immediate reaction, as they took with them many cultural preferences from their European heritage. Though much of the infrastructure of the first American towns is copied from British influence, a strong frontier mentality would give rise to the preference for the new vs. the old, long after a material culture had been developed which we could call our own. This frontier mentality began on a geographic frontier, and took until late into the 19th c. to finish discovering. This searching for new "territory" served as the seed of an ideological basis for many aspects of life - architectural as well. This frontier mentality gave impetus to the celebration of innovation - in politics, education, and especially technological innovations.

As far as the built world was concerned, because there was so much undeveloped space, both "out west" and around our new towns, a constant state of expansion existed for hundreds of years. This had to effect how we would value our existing structures. With something newer and better always around the corner, the older part of our towns might appear less valuable. This progress-oriented mentality is still a favored belief in American culture.

This orientation to progress was further adhered to because there was little in built American culture which we valued enough to consciously preserve, so we took advantage of our lack of reverence and used the future as our ideal instead of a past we did not honor. In a sense, our 18th c. and 19th c. reaction to worship the "progressive"
can be seen as a solution to the dis-satisfaction of the past of our own. This begins to explain why our American attitude towards preservation will always be different than our European counterparts. Our strong attachment to the progressive fueled so much activity in looking for a constantly changing ideal, that we neglected to save relics from a period of our past in the same way that Europe did.

2. The Original vs. the Replica.

   a) Revivalism

   The irony is that we did value what the past could offer in the 19th c., as the Europeans in the 19th c. did, but as we had none of the original Antique or Gothic buildings to be proud of, we developed an attachment to the past built heritage by the only means available to us - revivalism. To us, revivalism of European building styles was a way to connect ourselves with a past which was much older than our own, and perhaps more importantly gave us visible connection to the European culture which we valued more than our own. By honoring the past in this way, Americans were really choosing between conserving our own newly "old" architectural heritage of Colonial America, and the European heritage of our ancestors. This wave of Revivalism was the first stage in the process of separating the meaning of the past from the genuine objects of the past - a turning point for our present use of preservation.

   This revivalism seems to have served two purposes - it was using the past as a design precedent for a new style, and it was using the past as a way to re-affirm our identify. Both of these motives are
two of the same ones which preservationists use today. Hence, both revivalism and preservation come out of a common motivation to use the past as inspiration for present culture.

Americans were actually moving in an anti-preservationist direction. Throughout the 19th c. they chose to ignore their own architectural heritage, and build new buildings instead, based on Antique and European styles like Greek Revival, Egyptian Revival, Italianate and Georgian. (See Fig. 32.)

b. Industrial Revolution.

The ability to multiply material goods was developed during the Industrial Revolution and fed into our taste for the Progressive and Revivalism, and perhaps is one of the most significant factors that effected our preservation mentality and activity. This changed the value placed on the original or prototype, and enhanced the role of the replica. Up until the mid-19th c., those who preserved architecture did so because that original structure had some special meaning, whether it promoted a memory of a person, illustrated a particular historic "moment" of a lifestyle or artistic style, or gave some kind of cultural inspiration which the present architecture lacked. Even though the restoration of these originals were often based on supposition, the focus was on the genuineness of the place. The physical signs of age in monuments was becoming a growing motivation in Europe in the late 19th c., and resulted in attempts to treat monuments with as little intervention as possible so that what was considered original could be enjoyed. In a sense, the first generations of revival architecture in America were originals because they were crafted by hand, but they had
already begun to separate historical imagery from the genuine objective context.

After the Industrial Revolution, the desire to re-create past styles and build new architecture was given great help by the machine-tooled architectural elements. People could send away for catalogues through the mail and purchase any style architectural ornament they chose. Also the lumber industry was improved by the Industrial Revolution, and lumber could be produced faster and more efficiently than before.

Because of the new ease of reproduction, people could experience a change in place and time never before experienced. The World's Fair in Chicago epitomized our technological abilities which could re-create another era and style, right in the middle of America. (See Fig. 33.)

One must see this new availability of material culture as a shift in what people could expect their built environments to look like. They were no longer constrained by geographic context, or a chronological context, or availability of materials. This freedom to experience material culture without these limitations to geographic origin or historic origin must have had a drastic effect on one's desire to create a built environment of one's choice, not merely to accept what had been existing before. This triggered an amazing amount of new development. New architecture was being built within towns, and outside in suburbs, to accommodate the population growth. Little by little, the percentage of new architecture was fast rising above the percentage of old architecture. This new balance in the built environment had to effect our perception of the past.
Fig. 32 - 19th McGreek Revival American architecture.

Fig. 33 - World's Columbian Exposition Chicago, 1893
Fitch notes this radical change in cultural attitude towards the origina; "But it is imperative that we also recognize that this new capacity to mass produce the artifacts of material culture has had a profoundly disturbing effect upon culture itself. On the one hand, it has altered both the condition of the artist and the artisan, and their relationship with their audience or clients. On the other hand, it has modified the very properties of the artifact, as well as the circumstances under which it is enjoyed or consumed."28

Americans must have embraced this new way to re-create a much desired past. They placed less value on the "original" not just because they had so few originals of their own that they prized, but because creating replicas was a way to create a long sought after sense of identify, and a connection to a longer past than the Americans could boast. We became fascinated with creating the replica, as we had been with revival architecture, partly because technology allowed us to do such a good job, and partly because it fulfilled some psychological need for a richer and historically connected built environment. A culture from Europe with material evidence dating back a thousand years or so might not be so quick to embrace the ability to recreate a past through architecture.

The repetition of these architectural styles made what originals we did have lose their emotional force, says Fitch. "Over-familiarity reduces its cultural potency and ends up by destroying its capacity to move us."29

For Americans, this loss of emotional force of our originals was a deep one because we already tended to value our own architectural heritage less than the European one, and so the Industrial Revolution
only added to the demise of our original past architecture. Our positive attitude concerning what we gained in return masked what we were to lose - an appreciation for our own originals. Fitch says, "In no other sector of material culture, however, has the means of replicating a prototype and replicating it anywhere in the world been as pervasive as in architecture."30

Our special relationship with the mass-produced revival styles begun in the 19th c. would give rise to a new generation of production of past styles in the mid-20th c.

If the above comment is a sad appraisal of what the ability to reproduce material culture did for architectural preservation, then it must be countered with the argument that some products of 19th c. technology of reproduction, like photography, changed the preservation activities in a positive way. More documentation was possible and so more monuments were saved from being lost forever. Preserved architecture could be photographed and the effects of decay could be documented. This also helped restoration work where some parts of buildings had to be removed but could first be photographed.

The advent of photography not only allowed more accurate documentation, it also gave the monuments a more public exposure, which helped give strength to the preservation movement. Different private preservation groups all around the country could exchange accurate visual communications to each other and to the public, in hope of exposing the plight of many of the landmarks in danger.

How did our cultural attitudes to the progressive and our 19th c. taste for European Revival architecture affect preservation activity? Our continued preference for revivalism especially augmented by the
technical means of the Industrial Revolution gave America a different relationship to responding to the "age" value of built forms that the Europeans had. As we lost more and more 18th c. originals and replaced them with 19th c. revivals, we had less authentic buildings from which to admire the physical passage of time. Instead we appreciated the conceptual passage of time, which our revivals gave us. We liked a past to be expressed, but through stylistic and conceptual ways, not through the signs of real physical aging. This new concept of age value, which did not become significant until later 20th c. was partly due to our lesser appreciation of our own early architecture, but also was due to a distaste for the sensual qualities of the old, the faded, and the incomplete. For some reason our attachment to the past did not include a taste for the picturesqueness or emotional response that other cultures admired from aging architecture. This difference in response to signs of age would be largely responsible for our preservation preferences today.

The American preservation movement in the first half of the 20th c. developed in a particular way due to the American acceptance of creating an appreciation of history through recreation. We have witnessed the 19th c. architecture, and its heavy reliance on revivalism of non-American styles. This pattern of "manufacturing" historic architecture found its way into the mainstream of American preservation activity by the 1920's or so. By then we had come to value our own early architecture and used our experience in historicism in reconstructing our own past in open air museums and museum rooms. Colonial Williamsburg, Deerfield Park and Sturbridge Village are examples of
reconstructed historic towns. (See fig. 25.) In the late 1940's and 1950's, when new housing was greatly needed after the war, another era relied on historic cliches to evoke an appealing built environment for the public. This time the revivals from Europe - Tudor, Victorian, and International Style were joined by American prototypes - the Colonial, the ranch house and the Cape Cod. (See Figs. 34 and 35.)

A transference of preservation motives, the historic and the concept of age was instilled in this new built environment. Suburban houses even imitated the look of old materials and had simulated sagging roof line to go along with their historic image. This might seem like a strange way to honor history, but I believe that it showed that our fascination for the historic and aesthetic properties in original architecture was being replaced by the same response in replicas. Our taste for the replica infiltrated our preservation activities and showed our preference for the recreation of history than for the original remnants of history. This was a result of our aesthetic, cultural, and intellectual tastes. It is a tendency of many preservationists to disregard the validity of this new interpretation of historic meaning, but I believe we must give it credibility as our present preservation society has welcomed this new definition of historic meaning, and incorporated it as a pretext for much preservation activity.

3. The Passive Role of Public Policy in Preservation.

The last characteristic of American society which gave rise to a new relationship to "the past", was the passive role government took in safeguarding our past built heritage.

The Federal Government was foremost concerned with protecting...
Fig. 34 - 20th C. Colonial revival

Fig. 35 - 20th C. Cape Cod revival
America's natural environment. (See Fig. 36.) "Being a relatively new society, we have tended in the absence of a great wealth of architectural treasures, to concentrate on such natural wonders as the Grand Canyon, Yosemite and Yellowstone National Parks, and in past times Niagara Falls."  

When the federal government did become involved with protecting the historic built environment it did so by establishing a national register of historic places to be honored, but unlike its European counterpart the policy did nothing to safeguard these places from the private market. Any historic site owned by the private sector could be demolished or altered without interference by the government.

American preservation action began in the private local realm and the focus of control over our built heritage remained in the hands of the private citizen. What resulted was that land speculators and those interested in progress have been more powerful than those who wanted to preserve our historic built fabric. The built fabric, therefore, was allowed to be perpetually cleared of its old obsolete sections and replaced with new structures. This happened at an increasing rate of change and precipitated our limited experience of living with what was "original."

B. American Style: Preservation Motives - A New Direction.

The main argument in this thesis has been to show that the peak periods of preservation activities in western civilization are linked by their motives for preservation activities. I have given a structure to their evolution by noting an additive pattern.
Fig. 36. The Grand Canyon—considered a national monument in the early 20th C.
Roman Empire contributed A
Italian Rennaissance used A, contributed B
19th c. Europe used A, B, contributed C

commemorative - A
historic - B
physical signs of age - C

We now come to the present American preservation society and suddenly this cumulative pattern goes haywire. What is it that we culturally demanded of preservation activity which could change this established pattern?

I have offered three possible aspects of 19th c. and early 20th c. American culture which gave rise to this break with tradition. To restate, they are: 1. our frontier mentality which instilled in us a lasting taste for innovation, for progress, and for idolizing the new; 2. a simultaneous aversion to our own built past and an attraction to a European built past which induced us to re-create our own version of historical architecture by revivalism, and to form a taste for the replication of historic sites; and 3. a passive public policy regarding historic sites which allowed the gradual disappearance of many "original" historic sites.

These three factors emerged out of our cultural sensibility and from this perspective we stood in a unique position when deciding the direction in which to turn, when a preservation mentality finally became an acceptable one for us in the 1960's.

We, like each preceding preservation society offered a new
motive for preservation activity and this motive is what transformed the previous uses for us. This new motive is the useable value of the past built forms. It can be considered the fourth major "value" of built forms to follow commemorative, historic and age. It represents the shift Reigl predicted from \textit{revering our past} through the designation of moments to \textit{using our past} in a more manipulative way. We have made preservation into an opportunity to \textit{use} both the built objects of the past and the \textit{concept "past"} to suit our present needs.

This extraction of the concept "past" from the objects themselves as a source of using the past for the present was never before done. Our response to the usable value is much more complicated than what Reigl suggested. Our definition of "useable" is not limited to appreciating past built forms for their functional properties, or even how well we can adapt them to present day activities. Though this is a major component of the useability of past architecture and perhaps the most obvious one, it is only the "tip of the iceberg" which Reigl predicted.

What seems most vital in our attachment to the built past today is not the objects themselves but the messages they give us. They communicate to us an impression of past times and evoke for us a much desired sense of identify.

The desire to re-affirm our identity, to fill in the voids where our genuine buildings once were, to dazzle ourselves a bit with our technological creations – all of these motives make our definition of \textit{using} preservation quite different than previous ones. Using the same preservation mentality as more traditional preservation societies used, we have legitimatized the alteration of historic sites, the
we have legitimized the alteration of historic sites, the
duplication of genuine historic sites, and even the creation of
imaginary history to suit ourselves. (See Fig. 37 and 38.) The
same attitude of legitimatizing the manipulation of the past is
what links our motives of adaptive re-use and our fantasy-induced
motives such as the creation of "historic" vacation villages. Both
motives stem from a common cultural imperative. History need not
be seen as untouched remnants but as something to experience.
We also enjoy the fact that our intervention is a visible one,
and that it can be valued as much as the past intervention into the
built world.

This interpretation of useability comes from the same source
that transformed our use of the commemorative, historic and age
properties in historic places.

The following diagram illustrates the bi-polar structure of
motives that has developed for us today due to this radical shift
to useability.

Roman Empire - A
Italian Renaissance - A, B
19th c. Europe - A, B, C
20th C. America - A, B, C → D → A₁, B₁, C₁

A - commemorative
B - historic
C - physical age
D - useability
A₁ - identity
B₁ - living history
C₁ - conceptual age
Fig. 37 - Fort Grimaud, France - total replica of a fishing village - used as a residential resort.

Fig. 38 - Totally restored 'authentic' fishing village off the coast of Yugoslavia - used as a resort village.
The polarity comes because the original set of motives is now offset by the new set of motives, and in some cases imply diametrically opposed responses as with history (B) and living history, (B₁); and physicality of age, (C) and conceptual age (C₁). In another case, one motive - identity - replaces another motive - commemorative - as the base line motive.

\[ A \quad \rightarrow \quad A_1 \]
\[ B \quad \rightarrow \quad B_1 \]
\[ C \quad \rightarrow \quad C_1 \]
\[ D \]

The rest of this chapter will discuss how useability (D) is manifesting itself, and how commemorative has been superceded by identity, historical by living history, and physical age by conceptual age.

1. **Useability "Value" - The Turning Point**

In our early preservation activities many of our historic landmarks, like Mt. Vernon and Monticello, were not valued for their functional useability but instead for their historical and commemorative properties. We in America often perceived of historic places as outside the realm of our regular built environment, instead of using them as functional places and integrating them into our everyday lives. Not until recently have we become significantly interested in the useability of our past buildings which have become potentially obsolete. This new motive is expressed in the wave of adaptive re-use projects prevalent
today and is related to the economic viability which usability value now has in our present culture. Not until recently, say the 1970's, did we question the financial feasibility of building new instead of preserving the old. Regardless of the fact that we ignored the social cost of destroying the old to make room for the new, we found it financially feasible and ideologically appealing to build new architecture. When inflationary times appeared to be a reality and not a passing episode, many studies were completed which compared the financial costs of building new vs. renovating the old, and the data supported the renovation strategy to be as feasible, if not more so, in many cases.

Therefore, Americans began to explore the usability of their past architecture in a significant way when the rising cost of new construction forced them to look for an alternative. However, this new preservation motive for America coincided with a renewed interest in past architecture for social and aesthetic values also. Many buildings of all scales and types, whose original uses had become obsolete, were given structural overhauls and facelifts and were transferred into new building types. (See Figs. 39, 40 and 41). Schools and factories became apartment buildings. Train stations became restaurants and libraries. Carriage houses and barns became luxury residential quarters. Homes became office spaces and office spaces became homes. Some places were renovated and used as they were originally intended to be used.

Some of these renovations drastically changed the original aesthetic concerns; some of these changes are positive and some not so positive. One must realize that some preservationists consider these adaptations of historic places to be wrong both morally and
Fig. 39 - once a train station ... now a motel and restaurant.

Fig. 40 - once a school ... now elderly housing.
aesthetically, and that this is a result of our 20th c. lack of appreciation for the genuine or lack of respect for age. But, if one really thinks about it, Europeans and other cultures have been adapting their architectural treasures for centuries with varying degrees of success. It is the norm to change the structures of a culture when deemed necessary and not to "freeze" them. Perhaps those preservationists today who feel so strongly against re-vitalizing our historic architecture are motivated by the previous tenor of preservation use - the commemorative and the historical, and so require our historic landmarks to remain as artifacts, as pure as possible and unsullied by current culture because they value the past for what it symbolizes, and not for how we can integrate it into our daily lives.

Those preservationists who can accept useability as part of a set of preservation uses that include identity, living history, and conceptual age values prefer to preserve because they want our present and future experience with the built environment to be a more profound experience, make the urban landscape a richer place in which to live, and not to be idolized from afar.

The inclusion of useability represents a schism between two schools of preservationists operating today - those for adaptive re-use, and those for historic integrity. One can certainly understand that this schism is further widened because of those who have joined the preservation bandwagon solely for exploitive reasons - to cash in on a current preference for "historic" architecture. They are partly the cause of many poorly planned restorations, which have caused the preservationists who oppose adaptive re-use to do so.
Certainly many buildings which have been saved from decay or destruction have been brutally renovated and their original value which might have been saved have disappeared.

Instead of blaming the potential for economic gain of the useability value as the villain, we should be blaming the loose policies devised for controlling the re-design of these historic landmarks. I am not necessarily calling for stricter rules, as much as a more potent policy for safeguarding historic sites. We should also be blaming the professionals who are responsible for the re-designs, for not being more aware of the consequences of their actions, and instead try to take advantage of the best "uses" of each site be they historically based, aesthetically based or functionally based.

Preservationists who would rather see all historic buildings set aside as monuments, away from use as much as possible, are as much responsible for the possible extinction of a current preservation mentality, as much as those entrepreneurs who choose to exploit the useable value at the expense of all the other values.

I see the awareness of useability value of our American architectural heritage being the most dynamic "use" operating today. It has the potential to cause the most friction amongst preservationists, to cause the most change in our present built environment, and also have the most power to energize and give life to our past architecture as well as revive the previous preservation motives for cultural taste.

Adaptive re-use is only one component of our discovery of the past's useability factor. It is the functional component. The other component is the infusion of the concept past into our lives -
in our new architecture, our replicas, and our re-creations, and has become the force in finding the following properties in our past built forms - self-identity \( (A_1) \), living history, \( (B_1) \) and conceptual age. \( (C_1) \)

2. The Base Line "Value" - From Commemorative to Identity

The commemorative use had been the base line preservation motive for the three preservation societies previous to our own - Roman Empire, Italian Renaissance, and the 19th c. Europe. Today the emphasis has shifted from commemorative to identification as we shifted from a passive use of preservation to a dynamic one, and from an elite content to a popular content. Confirming our own sense of identity implies a more interactive relationship with the past then simply commemorating it. "To any generation, an identifiable past offers a line of communication with others: between the living, the dead, and those still to be born. It provides a reference to previous experience." 32

Even our intentional monuments became a personal expression of how we felt about the past event or person being honored.

Just as cultures have been interested in keeping the memory of those who died alive through elaborate shrines, we have become interested in "remembering" ourselves by establishing "shrines" to ourselves to convey meaning for our lives, while we are still alive. By consciously designating a place as a monument, we go through the motions of making our own identity a bit more real, more tangible proof of who we are today, through who we once were.
This shift from honoring the past for the past's sake or future's sake to honoring the past for the present is really how we use preservation today. This is a startling shift in preservation mentality, and I believe is the fulcrum of our present preservation mentality.

This might account in part for the current preservation attitude toward accepting more and more recent "pasts" as valuable cultural material. (See Fig. 42.) In past preservation cults a much longer chronological distance had to lapse before a place was considered historically valuable. Is our growing search for identity a result of the increasing mental distance we feel in shorter periods of time because things are changing at a much quicker pace?

The cause for such a shift to occur where the past is most significant for our present use is complex. I hypothesize that it is a result of many human factors in today's society.

Why in this particular time do we search for an identity by retrieving it from the past? Do we lack a satisfactory kind of identity in our present built environment? Has it become so "international style", so sterile, so lacking human scale that we deny the identity it gives us?

Do we lack the geographic stability of past generations who settled long enough in one place to find identity in a locale, and so without a specific personal attachment to place do we become more needy in establishing identity rooted in time? Or for those who do have roots in one place, have we erased so much of its unique built identity that we need to resurrect what is left or
Fig. 41 - Once a tannery... now office space.

Fig. 42 - Part of Art Deco District of Miami, Fla.
re-create it?

Perhaps it goes deeper than our dis-satisfaction with the built world around us. Does this attachment to the past signify a void in our current psychological well being? Have we discarded so many traditional rituals, beliefs, and behaviors that we feel a loss of identity inside ourselves and so look to more tangible reminders of who we are? Does our built fabric become a source of comfort because our social fabric has become less tightly woven? Do we worship the things from the past, because material culture has replaced spiritual culture as the stable predictable force in our lives? Or is it progress in the form of urban renewal and large scale development that we are fighting by making sure at least a part of our built world remains unchanging as the pace of change surrounding these landmarks becomes faster and faster?

Whatever the cause, I sense an urgency in people to make their surroundings their own and historic identification is one way to personalize their world.

The current society is full of examples where past built forms came to personify their inhabitants. People have found gratification in owning and living in places that have pasts and that refer to a different aesthetic and perhaps ideological taste than our own.

We seem to care more about saving some remnants of the past which never before elicited such strong sentiments. For example, the Citgo sign in Kenmore Square, Boston, which was being considered for demolition received hearty response to save it and designate it as a landmark. (See Fig. 43). It was eventually put on the Boston
Fig. 43. The Citgo sign in Kenmore Square, Boston.
Landmark Commission Register because it is considered valuable as reinforcing the identity of Kenmore Square and Boston, to many people. Who can say that the motive to preserve this Citgo sign is any different from preserving the new Boston City Hall which will probably be put in some Landmark Register in the future? Boston landmarks serve to reinforce our own identity by retaining a little bit more of the built world we know.

The motive of identity is a pervasive one, just as the commemorative one was the undercurrent for previous preservation ages. Past built forms now serve as ethnic, neighborhood, city, state or national identities and all are being sought in many preservation societies today.

This motive of identification has especially been operative on a national level and architectural preservation has been a successful source. America had been considered a top world power, and had caused much envy because of our economic strength and our progressive capabilities in technology. We were known in the rest of the world and to ourselves as a promoter of a certain brand of "progressive" attitude and action, which included "helping" other countries to gain this brand of "progress" through political, economic and technological advancement. However, Watergate, severe inflation, the oil embargo, and the Vietnam War were all examples that undermined this national image we had developed. Our moral, economic and political strengths were not what we had anticipated. The Vietnam War revealed that we could no longer assume victory in our promotion of our brand of progress. The fact that we
stubbornly stuck to an illusion of spreading this brand of progress, despite a growing uncertainty for succeeding, disillusioned many who had already rejected America's interpretation of progress. Others who believed we were on the right track, were humiliated when we did concede defeat. In both cases, the American national image had lost face. As a reaction to the idealism of the future thinking, we turned to an idealism of the past. We sought elements of a past identity which could comfort us and make us proud again. Some of this energy was put to the preservation of a patriotic identity which our architecture could provide; some of it was a nostalgic grasp for comfort, so we activated past music, fashion, and also the past material culture including architecture.

Energy was invested in preserving the "old fashioned" values of the past, which were also symbolized in our past architecture. Great emphasis was put into salvaging mainstreets all over the United States. The National Trust for Historic Preservation sponsored a national program to encourage mainstreet commercial rejuvenation. (See Fig. 44.) A return to "small town values" - both in small cities and large cities - was resurrected, as seen in the interest in restoring commercial and neighborhood districts and even signage styles of 19th c. America. This trend towards returning to a stronger sense of community by working together on these revitalization projects and also to return to the visual imagery of the past seems to have been a part of this search for a new source of identity. It seems that this undermining of national identity at the same time during the 1970's
Fig. 44 - Before and after shots of Main St. commercial renovations - which are bringing back 19thc. street imagery.
might have been partly responsible for the surge of public interest in historic preservation.

The combination of losing much familiar imagery of our cities and losing a positive self image on a national scale served to set a foundation for more active preservation legislation.

The Bicentennial Celebration might have come and gone with a lot less fanfare had we not found a preservation mentality so enticing at that time. Added to the "image crisis" was the economic crisis we were experiencing which led to the increased interest in the useability of our past architecture as well. The Bicentennial Celebration was originally planned to be a monumental, centrally located celebration, but as the public became more involved, it was decided that to make it a locally based celebration in every city all over the country would give Americans the spiritual/patriotic as well as the economic boost they needed.

The characteristics of the Bicentennial Celebration were indicative of the new motivations operating the new preservation movement - the anti-monument emphasis; the interest in regional, city and local pride vs. national pride; and the fact that whole cities became living stage sets for the celebration, not single landmarks, and not just one period of history was celebrated. Everyone felt involved because a lot of the emphasis was on ourselves - our celebration of our 200th birthday, not so much just in honor of our forefathers. And lastly, and perhaps most importantly was the emphasis on people's personal identity with historic celebration. The remnants of the Bicentennial are not just memories of
a festival or event, but are the buildings and permanent living "exhibits" which still enrich our architectural and urban heritage today. The remnants are in the form of preservation policies, established walking tours and restored buildings. The Bicentennial for us was an opportunity to manifest our preservation mentality which we had already set in place ideologically. It gave a boost to the action level of preservation by including the public. In the 1980's, we are still living with the effects of the Bicentennial, especially with the public still being more involved than ever before in the preservation movement. We are still living with the tangible remnants not only because they are more tangible, but because we still adhere to a preservation mentality begun in the 1960's.

A contemporary example of a monument which was created to commemorate a past event but is significant in expressing more than just commemoration is the Vietnam Monument in Washington, D.C. (See Fig. 45) What is most evident is that it is not a monument, is not a testimony to war, nor does it imply glory, strength or dignity – all traits which have previously been used in idealizing war. Its simple non-representational form allows the real focus to be on the thousands of names inscribed in the surface which express their personal identities and something about our national identity because of how we chose to signify this event.

One is forced to sense the enormity of lives lost in this war. The "anti-monument" has a conceptual message not necessarily evoked
by imagery of the traditional war monuments, but by the conceptual
acknowledgement of the great loss of lives, best felt by walking
the horizontal path formed by the wall of names. These two aspects
of the "anti-monument" - the desire to express the reality of the
event and the emphasis on a conceptual means of expression vs. a
purely representational one, both indicate two new aspects of the
new preservation mentality. This non-representational memorial
expressed, as the image it leaves us is an information one. It is
a long list of names, and is the same image we faced every night
as we watched the news on television and read the newspapers.

This memorial expresses the one common experience shared by
everyone - both those who were for or against the war and that was
the acknowledgement of all those identities who were lost. The
memorial has as much to do with ourselves in the present, as it will
to the future generations who live with it.

3. How Has the Concept of Living History Come to Replace History
as Artifact?

Historic sites which are preserved for their ability to capture
a "moment" in time usually emphasize the physical state of the building
or site. This attempt to keep the artifact in as perfect form as
possible so it can either express a more convincing story or a more
complete artistic product, prioritizes the value of the object it-
self, over the actual life of the building. This treatment of a
preserved place is based on an appreciation for a passive monument,
one that gives us information whether it is factual, social or
aesthetic. There is little interest in preserving the original
purpose of the building or of giving it any purpose, other than that of exhibited treasure. The physical is separated from the social life of the building. This is how historical "value" of monuments was construed in the past, and still is to an extent today.

Another kind of historical value has developed during the recent 20th c. If historic "value" implies "building as artifact", than living history "value" implies "building as organism."

The concept "living history" accommodates two very different preservation trends today. What might seem like antithetical poles are really the products of one preservation motive.

We have come to realize that when we effect physical preservation, we effect social preservation. This is true from the inhabitant's viewpoint who lives at an historic site, as well as from the outsiders who have found that visiting "live" monuments is a richer experience than observing "dead" ones like museums. Those who live in historic districts like Beacon Hill or the North End have a more pronounced symbiotic relationship with their built environment than the average person. This is because there is more implicit and explicit control operating in very homogenous districts with historical significance. Their social patterns, aesthetic tastes, behaviors, economic status-quo have shaped the particular characteristics of their built world. This is true of both the first generation inhabitants of an historic site as well as subsequent generations of people who have chosen to live in these districts because it appeals to their taste.

Similarly, the spatial patterns and other physical characteristics of the district have affected their lives both individually
and as a social unit. Often if there is a strong social or ethnic unity amongst a district or neighborhood it seems to maintain a like amount of physical environmental unity. Drastic change in the social unity could result in a breakdown of physical environmental unity.

The very fact that these districts remain alive amidst the 20th c. pace of change, gives them an added quality of insulation and identity. Outsiders support the preservation of these places because they enjoy visiting them. It is a novel experience in our fast-paced culture to walk through an entire district of one period of architecture and we react favorably to this "slice of life" scenery, even if we do not choose to live there.

Two motives are operating here. One is the desire to see human activity enliven our historic sites and the other has to do with the issue of scale. By being able to experience a whole street scene, a district or a square of architectural and urban design elements all preserved, we become part of the scene and perceptually and kinesthetically experience a more vivid sense of history.

From this wholistic perspective of preservation has sprouted two seemingly different kinds of preservation activities which involve the preservation motive of living history. One is the interest in preserving living districts such as neighborhoods or downtowns where the historical sites have become part of normal life. The other is the re-creation or renovation of entire districts which evoke a past world for us to experience for enjoyment and education.

In both cases we apply the same basic motivation to preserve architectural and urban design elements of the past to make the
historic site work for us as an experience and not just an artifact. In the former case it is the desire to keep alive the social patterns and the physical patterns. In the latter case, it is the desire to preserve the experience of living in the past or to manipulate the way we want to remember the past. We have both the technological ability and imagination to break away from our actual human relationship to time and space. We can offer ourselves the luxury of mindtripping back to the past through experiencing life-size replicas of these places. I am not arguing for these live stage sets to become substitutes for visiting real historic places, but instead they become a supplementary kind of cultural/fantasy experience.

Some examples of our interest in sustaining the physical past through social preservation are the designation of historic districts which have become a major preservation activity today. The concept of districting - or designating a piece of a city as an historic district - thereby controlling design of existing and new properties within the district, does not necessarily mean that social preservation is the motive or result. Many districting cases have been the result of conscious attempts for increasing property values, for inducing new development, or to find a way to keep out "undesirable" people.

Other district cases have intended to protect the social fabric of the area by controlling the spatial and architectural qualities, only to result in gentrification. This is because of the higher costs of reconstruction, maintenance, taxes or the development of a new economic status-quo from newcomers who are attracted
to the image of the district, and in turn raise the market value.

Despite the above results, there are some communities which have managed to fulfill a motive to preserve social integrity of a place through institutionalizing the control of the built environment. The Half Crescent District, west of Harvard Square in Cambridge, is one example where a neighborhood group took advantage of a local ordinance and with city approval designated themselves as a neighborhood conservation district. Now they will be in control of regulating its appearance.

The other motive to promote "living history" is the enjoyment of the re-creation of real or imaginary historic sites. We have shown in the early 20th c. a great liking in this country for "living museums". Scandinavia began the first generation of open air museums, where some part of the material culture was displayed within a large park. These displays encouraged participation and offered working examples of activities in original settings staffed with real people who performed the activities. One interacted with these scenes and actors in a more lively way than if one were viewing the site without the activities.

This living history concept became very popular in America, with examples like Colonial Williamsburg, Sturbridge Village, and Deerfield Park. Plimouth Plantation is a good example of a totally recreated village near the location of the landing of the first Pilgrims on what is called Plimouth Rock. The village never existed. (See Fig. 46.) It is pure fantasy, but based on accurate knowledge of how a village of that period might have looked. Though each piece
Fig. 16 - Plimouth Plantation - part of a complete replica village.

Fig. 45 - Vietnam War Monument - Washington D.C.
of wood and stone is new, the motivation for such a precise recreation is to preserve a way of life and an architectural setting from the past. This is as much an act of architectural preservation as is the maintenance of an original building, like Paul Revere's house. (See Fig. 11.) The genuineness is obviously lacking, but both places serve to keep history alive for us today. Without some physical reminder we might lose a piece of ourselves, a piece of history. If these recreations serve the same function that preserving originals do, then why are they not really part of the same desire which fuels our preservation mentality?

Besides these urges to re-create the past so that we do not lose it, we also create new "episodes" of the past because people enjoy them so much.

Whatever one calls it, fantasy-fulfilling or phony, to visit a place where one can imagine one is living in another time amongst places and people unfamiliar looking is a thrilling experience. Evidently, many people think so because places like Plimouth Plantation and Sturbridge Village are increasingly popular.

Places like Epcot Center in Disneyworld and World Fairs also fall under this category of perpetuating history by revealing its built forms. Granted they warp the reality of the places they re-create, but they are meant to be valued for what they evoke and not for their genuineness.

I realize the qualms some people have in regarding these places as part of the preservation movement, as they do not deal with the "original" and do become the only reality for some who will never
experience the real historic places. However the imaginative quality these places present do indeed find a large following and seem to be part of the current cultural taste to celebrate our ability to re-create a novel environment.

Perhaps these very same places will be what the next generation feels are the important "monuments" of our time and will save them for future generations to witness a glimpse of the past.

This emphasis on living history has become more prominent than viewing history as a property best expressed from an artifact. Living history value is also used in other contexts. It has become a "perk" for giving a district a new life economically or socially, and has become a widespread strategy of private entrepreneurs everywhere to join the preservation bandwagon and use "historic architecture" both old and new as their basic marketing strategy. This is different from social preservation as it encourages a new social use and not reinforce an old one.

These projects have caused some of the friction I mentioned between historical value (B) and living history value (B₁), because how an historic site is treated has much to do with what motive is used. For example, Faneuil Hall Market Place today looks like a combination of original design and new design to accommodate the new activities of a 20th c. market place. (See Fig. 47.)

Preservation purists, who might rather "use" historic sites as artifacts, might not like to see the addition of the glass arcades. But, the proponents of keeping historical places as living parts of the urban 'fabric' welcome the 20th c. additions
Fig. 47 - Faneuil Hall Marketplace - mixture of old and new designs.
as natural evolution of our built world.

One must understand the preference for "living history" over history as artifact has to do with the experience of the place. How many people do you think would rather walk through Faneuil Hall market as it stood when it was bought, empty of activity, dirty, worn-looking, etc. than walk through a facelifted, cleaned up version with lots of human activity, sights, smells and tastes to give quick gratification, and at the same time give one "the sense of history" without the mustiness or museum guide's boring monologue?

The choice is obvious and speaks for how useability value has come to give just the dosage of history the public wants along with the sugar-coating of fun, food and fantasy. If there are only these two extremes to choose from then the choice is really pre-determined. Perhaps more intriguing choices will emerge later in our preservation age.

4. How Has the Shift to Useability Made Conceptual Age Value \((C)\) a Priority Over the Physical Property of Age \((C_1)\)?

Conceptual Age value for present day 20th c. Americans has become a different value than Reigl's 19th c. physical age value. Where age value previously elicited an aesthetic/emotional response from the physical deterioration of building, it has come to mean more to our present culture as a symbolic quality, but still elicits a similar emotional response. Now, it is enough for us to be given the imagery of this decay over time, or, more often, we do not want to see this decay at all, and instead appreciate the idea
that something is old without the appearance. One example is that during the 1970s' Waterfront Renewal Project in Boston, a genuinely old building, suitable for elderly housing was demolished due to popular opinion, and a new building replaced it that was styled to look like past architecture instead. This notion of perceived age evoke in us a similar emotional/psychological response regardless of the true age of a place. Reigl did not believe this was possible. He also did not experience the rapid disappearance of our older structures and the increasing appearance of new architecture to take its place. No other culture ever lived in a built environment where so much of its architecture was contemporary. Perhaps this transference of aesthetic/emotional response of age value from the authentic to the unauthentic has become possible only because the "original" has lost a dominant role in our material culture. Because of our ideological belief in the progressive, and our technological taste of replacing the obsolete, we look elsewhere to fulfill this attachment to the past.

Some would argue that the places which give us this conceptual sense of age are only legitimate preservation places if the buildings are originals. They would feel that our ability to separate the object from the concept of age itself is to have gone too far to be considered preservation. But since our current mania for preserving the stylistic content of the past and for mimicking "aged" materials is so prevalent, these activities have come to play more important roles in the way mass culture responds to the past than the response to original remnants devoid of facelifts.
The desire for a past, a reaffirmation of self identity, which we find less and less in our present built environment has allowed our tastes to be transferred from the original to the fascimile from the object to the concept of the past.

We now value some objects or buildings for what they evoke of the past, despite the fact that they might be replicas. This is a rather useful solution for a culture who is just now taking stock of the value of its past architecture as a viable source in fulfilling current needs and tastes, instead of building new architecture.

We now value our 19th c. and early 20th c. revival architecture as carries of age value as well as for their artistic merits, despite the fact that they are unauthentic versions of earlier Europe and antique classical revivals. In the same light perhaps in the future we will come to value our present day revivals.

Perhaps another reason we shifted the emphasis from the physical quality of age to the conceptual one is because of our lack or American picturesque "ruins" which European culture had. We lacked places like walled cities, castles and fortresses which were integrated into the newer layers of cities in Europe. The only example I can think of where we find that physical age is picturesque is in old barns in rural landscapes. (See Fig. 48 and 49.)

Perhaps it is that our choice of building materials did not improve with age as they decayed, like the ones of stone and plaster in Europe. Maybe it is a cultural preference of ours for wholeness and neatness that made the "ruined" monument less appealing to our culture.
Fig. 48 - French ruins at Neufies
Age-value European style

Fig. 49 - American rural 'picturesque' old barn-
Age value American style.
I do think that we appreciate some of the physical aspects of age in older districts or buildings as they fade or expose chipped bricks, sagging roof lines, or crooked sidewalks. All of these signs of age and human use are capable of reaching an emotional nerve within us, and add to the environmental quality of an older place which we cannot easily re-create. However, often the fear that the "oldness" of a place will not increase the marketability determines the tendency for facelifting and the "Scrape" school of restoration.

This preservation use of conceptual age is probably the most complex and contradictory one. Because of this it receives the most question as to its legitimacy as a preservation value. I content that response to physical age and conceptual age are related, but I am not saying that the two experiences - of knowingly viewing the genuine and the facsimile - will register the same richness of response. Perhaps if we were more used to seeing genuinely old architecture in our daily lives, we would find the experience of our facsimiles to be less moving. I think this is true for those Americans who have visited other countries where most of the infrastructure is genuinely old and when returning to the States react differently to the conceptual age value of our replicas or revivals.

Despite the qualitative difference of responding to the genuine vs. the facsimile, I believe that both are operative in the American preservation scene today. Some examples which illustrate our preference for conceptual age value are Sturbridge Village; suburban houses which mimic aging materials, or past
styles like Lexington and Newburyport which mix old and new design in one singular style to evoke a particular period in time; and Beacon Hill, which strictly controls every exterior design change so the "spell" is not broken. (See Fig. 50.)

The switch we have made from appreciating the age of place by an aesthetic connection to physical deterioration or the same connection being made by a conceptual message is analogous to our increasing preference for information vs. vision. This has indeed become a major cause for the new kind of orientation to preservation today.
Fig. 50 - Beacon Hill
Part 6 - Translation of Preservation Motives into Preservation Actions

My last goal in the thesis is to use the motivational analysis to understand our present preservation activity. The motives I have described in the previous section form a kind of identification system which has been a useful construct in isolating the many different reasons we have become preservationists. One might even hope that our preservation efforts could become more effective if we could observe how our motives sometimes get fulfilled and sometimes get lost by our actions. Perhaps some kind of analysis such as the one I have developed could be consolidated and incorporated into a review process for deciding what gets saved, or used in a workshop setting to help community groups understand the preservation potential best suited to their needs. Often it seems that the wrong action is taken to preserve a place because the underlying values were misunderstood. To understand this link, it is helpful to look from both vantage points - how motives direct actions, and how actions serve the motives.

The following section will be organized around four main questions, which expose current characteristics of American preservation activity.

1. What are we preserving today?
2. Who participates in preservation today?
3. What kind of policy decisions effect our preservation activities?
4. What are our attitudes about restoration?

This section will illustrate how our current palette of preservation values work together to produce particular actions. Each place
we value as a monument or landmark represents a different blend of values. Given the set of landmarks chosen - aesthetic, intellectual and psychological patterns of taste emerge. These patterns should become more evident as I answer the four questions.

1. What are we preserving today?

Our preservation movement began in the 19th c. by many private historical societies cropping up all over the country. There was no centralized organization which directed the interests of these amateur preservationists, as in 19th c. Europe. Even so, the majority of preservation projects fell under the same category - single landmarks having national significance, as determined by these private groups. "National significance" usually meant the preservation of the birthplace of a famous person or site of a famous event. Lacking royalty we honored famous political figures like Washington and Jefferson and famous battlefields. Later we would honor famous writers, inventors, and families of important social standing. Every site was most significant for its commemorative and historic value.

During the early 20th c. more attention was given to buildings which merited attention for their artistic merits as well as their historic content. Period houses and historic rooms in museums, as well as open air museums had become popular. The emphasis was still on the "monumental", the most famous and the most exceptional examples of historic architecture. Of course, what was preserved also had to do with where the funding was coming from. One critic said, "When if the DAR acts at all artistically, it acts to preserve the shrines of its own eponymous heroes". Much of the interest for architectural
preservation came from the wealthy class. Groups like the DAR who wanted to honor their ancestors, and wealthy industrialists like Rockefeller were the major contributors to the early preservation activities. Their personal values as to which people and events were worthy of rememberance set the precedent for the cultural motives operating at the time - the preference for the historic and commemorative.

19th c. preservationists and early 20th c. preservationists did not represent all classes or ethnic origins of people, and so most of the places granted the special status of "historic monument" were examples of the aesthetic taste and social preference of the elite.

Our present preservation society's beginning is difficult to pinpoint, but I would place its origin somewhere in the 1960's, when two simultaneous movements were occurring, which seem to explain the shift in what we focused our preservation efforts upon. One was the urban renewal movement where government leaders at all levels, professional designers, and planners attempted to renew our cities. Their main goals might have been admirable - to wipe out slums, physical eyesores and obsolete parts of the city to make way for a more healthy, efficient and beautiful landscape. But their strategy was more "urban removal" than "urban renewal". The expected benefits of this strategy enticed many people who were involved professionally in the management of the built environment.

One critic said, "The general tendency of the urban re-development authorities as of dam and highway engineers has been to dismiss as romantic or sentimental the efforts to protect historical
impediments to their special brand of progress". Not until many of these "urban renewal" projects were finished did the consequences become apparent. While much of the slum qualities of cities had been removed like overcrowded areas, decayed buildings, so also much of what we valued in cities got removed. Some of these lost elements were diversity of scale, age, and style of architecture; and unplanned nodes which developed incrementally over time like alleys, courtyards, streetcorners, stoops - the kind of spatial quality between street and building edge which is unpredictable and fulfills visual and social functions. If the new infrastructures had attempted to incorporate some of these urban spatial/visual qualities that we like, perhaps the reaction against urban renewal might not have been so severe.

Instead, people who were aware of the permanent loss of some of the most lively and memorable parts of our cities turned to the only real strategy available - to save what was left. The architecture and urban design of the past became that much more valuable, not necessarily for its intrinsic value but because it was considered an endangered species. As the bulldozers of urban renewal moved forward, backed by much money and power, the new preservationists had to react quickly and save as much as possible. These new preservationists included professional designers and planners, as well as private citizens interested in preserving our cities. Also, the cause enlisted the concern of political figures who were against the urban renewal program. This was the first time that preservationists were successfully bringing lawsuits against anti-preservationists
and winning.

Another wave of concern came from the 1960's interest in the natural environment. The Environmental movement in this country was formed to protect the natural environment, and only as a separate but related interest did the protection of the build environment develop. The public concern which had been awakened for the natural environment had triggered a more aware public for saving the built environment as well. It is interesting that our preservationist tendencies in the early part of the 20th c. also began with an interest in conserving our national heritage, by laws being passed on the national level to protect our parklands and scenic landmarks. In Europe the interest in the built heritage was the first concern; however, their 1960's environmental movement combined interests in the natural and build environments.

Both the concern over urban renewal and concern for environmental quality of our landscape created a platform for a Preservation Society to develop. The level of urgency felt came from the fear of where our progressive-oriented activities were taking us, and gave rise to an awakened perservation mentality. This preservation mentality was motivated by very different values than the 19th c. and early 20th c. American Preservationists. The new preservationists were concerned with the environmental quality of their cities and the loss of identity which was vanishing at a faster pace than the creation of a new identity. Here is where I think we, as American preservationists, re-interpreted useability value, and where identity and living history and conceptual age values came to upstage commemorative,
historical and physical age value.

Because our goal included saving as much of the built environment as possible, the scope and scale of what we thought we should save changed. The following interests changed the nature of what we chose to save.

1. Instead of focusing just on the monumental landmarks, we also began to value the non-monumental places that were important to fewer people - regional, state, city, and neighborhood "monuments". The word "monument" became obsolete, as I discussed earlier in this paper, because the places now being saved did not connote the meaning we had come to associate with the word "monument". We fought to save train stations, bridges, factories, city halls, birth places of local heroes, even gas stations. (See fig. 51.)

2. The period of time which merited the distinction of being old enough to be valued was extended to include a much more recent past. "Old" could mean 25 years old instead of the previous 100 years.

3. Emphasis had changed from the single landmark to the district. Preservationists became aware that the environmental quality of a place had as much to do with the setting as the building itself, so an interest in saving districts developed as a major preservation activity. Districts were saved to promote identity, living history, and useability. New York City supported the preservation of the Theatre District in order to keep some of the old theatres from becoming destroyed. Beason Hill was designed as a district to insure that new development on any scale would not infringe upon the highly insular and so far privately controlled neighborhood.
Fig. 51—Gas stations are one of the building types to be adaptively re-used.
4. We have also interpreted useability of preservation to include the use of past architecture as aesthetic inspiration and sources for aesthetic appreciation regardless of historic significance. Vernacular styles of architecture are now valued as part of the American architecture heritage and have become important to document.

5. A new interest in cultural preservation has instigated new directions in what we choose to preserve in this preservation society. There has been a new interest in preserving places associated with Americans whose landmarks had not been publicly heralded in the past. Some examples are the Harriet Tubman House in Roxbury and the Touro Synagogue in Rhode Island. This interest in cultural preservation also includes the preservation of neighborhoods, as the residential sections of our cities help keep cultural rituals like festivals, and cultural tastes like various social and physical patterns alive through the sense of cohesiveness of districts. Often this cohesiveness is lost if there is major destruction of the architectural makeup of the area.

6. This last aspect of how we have decided what to save refers to our national identity crisis mentioned in the previous section. Mass culture has become intoxicated with a nostalgic attachment to the past as a way to rejuvenate our national identity. This has caused a mass appeal for almost anything that is genuine or architecturally connotes the past.

2. Who Participates in Preservation Activity Today?

Because of the more diverse preservation motives that we acknowl-
edge today, the kinds of people involved in preservation activity have also become more diverse than in the past. A review of some of the preservation motives will identify these newcomers and how they change the recent preservation "scene".

a. Identity

Because the nature of identity value seems so universally appealing to every age group, ethnic group and socio-economic class, the people who participate in preservation today have become as diverse as the "identities" to be found. There are special interest groups which have formed to save particular elements of the built past. Ex-factory workers might become involved in a project to preserve an old mill to be used as a museum - a tribute to American technology and to the people who dedicated their work lives to running it.

Scientists and anthropologists have become involved in Industrial Archeology, a new offshoot of preservation activity, where architectural and other material objects from pre- and post-industrial eras are being studied and saved. These people interested in the scientific and technological aspects of our culture are bringing to the public the identity of our past inventors, scientists, and craftsmen at a time when technology is again taking great leaps forward and is a big part of our current identity.

Identity as a motive has also transcended the mass culture in other preservationist tendencies like the increased interest in antiques and architectural elements salvaged from wrecks. New businesses have developed to sell these salvaged old beams, cornices,
columns, plumbing fixtures and other architectural elements. All of this interest in the settings of our past has to do with the mass appeal for collecting what is old. Part of this is due to our current aesthetic taste, but another part is related to the reinforcement of identity which we find in the past.

b. Historical Value

Historical value is still an operative motive despite the preference for living history value. There are still private historical societies which promote interest in local historic architecture. The shift from valuing only "the exceptional" to valuing "the regular" has brought new interest from the general public. People visit historic museums as a recreational pastime, and tourism in many American cities has been the impetus for much economic growth.

One critic noted that due to the mass reproduction of architectural cliches - colonial, ranch house and Cape Cod - the average Americans who grow up within this superficial historic built world are the same people who "visit in increasing numbers such historic sites such as Deerfield, Williamsburg, and Savannah, for there they can experience the original, the prototype in all its sensuous and associational appeal". 34

The new mass appeal for both historic and living history "values" have meant that the mass culture's taste has become an active ingredient in what we preserve and has involved a new group - the entrepreneurs who want to "cash in" on the marketability of the new mass preservation mentality. The involvement of these entrepreneurs has really changed the quality and quantity
of what has become preserved. This is perhaps one of the biggest points of contention between the preservationists who are primarily market oriented and those who are primarily cultural/humanistic oriented. Fitch says, "It is not that entrepreneurs are more venal than they were in Virgil's or Shakespeare's day, it is rather that they are comparably more strong. Their capacity to manipulate the form in all of its qualitative and quantitative dimensions has been enormously extended by technology".36

These two new groups - the public and the entrepreneurs - have probably changed the direction of the preservation activity today more than anyone else.

All of these preservation projects mentioned above involve new kinds of talent. People with grass roots involvement at the community level have come forth to stabilize neighborhood social fabric through the physical maintenance of the built infrastructure.

Places like Strawberry Banke - a genuine historic district - or Epcot Center require tremendous professional staffs in designing and engineering these major projects. Architects, landscape architects, scientists, engineers and planners are all becoming involved in shaping what gets preserved from the past. Never before has so much technical assistance been required or been available.

These same "players" are present in maximizing the useability of old places like shopping malls and marketplaces. One such place is Georgetown Place, a mixed use project where many years were spent restoring an historic district for shopping and housing.

Another group of people who have become involved during this preservation age is the professional preservationists. There
is enough preservation activity existing in the private and public sectors for people to earn a living as full-time preservationists. These people come from diverse backgrounds - architecture, planning, American studies, science, etc. There are graduate programs offering degrees in Historic preservation. This new curriculum has been the result of the need for specialists in the social and technical domains of preservation activities. It is a statement about our expectations for a permanency of preservation activity in our culture, as well as the acknowledgement of the new complexity of technological intervention available for re-creation and restoration.

3. What kind of Policy Decisions Effect our Preservation Activities?

Preservation action is made up of the actual preserved places it saves, as well as the policies and bureaucratic framework which promote these actions. I previously discussed the passive role of the federal government as a factor in the way the current preservation motives developed.

The most active level of government has been the state since 1966 when the National Historic Preservation Act gave states the power to grant cities the right to set their own ordinances. The city level of government has also played a major role in preservation activity. Many rules governing preservation have become a separate body of legislation and jurisdiction, from the zoning laws. Most towns have come to accept the preservation laws as a form of municipal control to protect a valuable public asset. Many towns have set up Historic Commissions to monitor the maintenance of their historic sites. The shift to local control has done much to help promote more public involvement in preservation, and also to help
select historic sites which represent the choice of local concern.

However, this shift to local control has caused new problems in determining what to save and how to save it. The motivations for preserving an historic place by a city or town become very different, depending on who is going to fund the restoration and maintain the site. If the burden were to be taken by the federal government, then the site may be more likely to be treated as an artifact or museum. However, if the site is to be the responsibility of local government, then there is an obvious concern for the site to carry its own cost or get state aid.

One option to cities which has been used a lot is to designate an historic district as a landmark area. This gives the city the right to control any design changes they see fit. This can be good or bad depending on their motives. If their primary interest is to have the district be rejuvenated so it will raise the revenues, then the city may approve of design changes which endanger the physical or social fabric of the area. Such is the case of the Newburyport district.

Otherwise a city is often forced to allow the site to remain in private control and whatever the owner wants will be the fate of the historic site. There are only a few examples of the state or local government owning historic sites and then leasing them to occupants, therefore controlling the use and design changes of the historic place. The G.S.A. (General Service Administration) has been involved in this type of activity with older office buildings.

The emphasis on local control and local burden has had the effect of our losing many valuable historic sites when cities are not willing to help with the expenses. Cities sometimes find it more economically
advantageous to see the site get cleared or re-developed and become gentrified, to as to increase the revenue. The fact that local government will not get involved with real estate investment as a way to save historic places will keep the private market in the controlling position to decide the fate of our historic built environment. One result is a continual conflict arising between city re-development authorities and Historic Commissions who argue over the use and value of these historic sites.

As the general public becomes more concerned with the environmental quality, more and more attention on the local level is being given to aesthetic concern, which includes the value of historic architecture. In many cases the use of incentive zoning has included the trade-off for a private developer to promise to preserve some element of the built environment in exchange for some kind of variance for his project. The appreciation for the past urban design and architecture will continue to be saved by Preservation policy on these local levels, as more people are being motivated by the useability of our past architecture.

The latest policy issue which has motivated much Preservation activity, but also has been the cause of the major schism between the purist Preservationists and the ones who accept adaptive re-use, is the 1981 Economic Recovery Tax Act. It gives private property owners a tax break if they own historic property and restore or maintain it according to federal regulation. This tax break has done three things. First, it continues to leave the majority of financial burden to initiate preservation to the private property owner. The federal
government has offered to help, but in a passive way without taking the responsibility to help save buildings which are in danger of not getting preserved. Secondly, it has made preservation become more of a marketable enterprise which has given priority to the useability value, sometimes to the detriment of the other values of historic sites.

Thirdly, it puts people who want to preserve their properties but can't afford the initial investment, or people who would be willing to buy an historic property and restore it themselves but can't afford to purchase it, in a position of not being able to gain from this law, and possibly have to let their properties decay, or sell to someone who doesn't care about the tax break.

Despite my criticisms of the kind of aid being offered, the new Tax Act will give added incentive to this generation of Preservationists which will give the next generation more built material with which to work. Perhaps a new stock of historic sites will be saved because of this economically motivated policy. This might affect our preservation mentality which has been some much based on saving a precious entity from extinction. How will the next generation's Preservationists value a larger quantity of historic sites -- many of them altered -- which our tax incentive law has helped to save?

4. What Are Our Attitudes About Altering Past Architecture Today?

A major characteristic of the present Preservation society is the points of conflict amongst the motives which trigger Preservation activity and amongst those who participate in Preservation activities.
A major dialectic in 19th c. European Preservation activity was between those who valued physical age and those who valued history. This difference in values created two camps who disagreed about the method of restoring monuments. Each method highlighted one of the monument values, often to the exclusion of the others. But, regardless of this disparity, the two 19th c. camps had much else in common. They both valued the same kinds of places – mostly famous or exemplary examples of aesthetic masterpieces; they usually valued the same periods of history; they had similar backgrounds – mostly intellectuals or designers who were supported by public and private funds; and they agreed on an emphasis on physical preservation, not social or conceptual preservation. They were also limited to the technical capabilities which made their work more similar.

Now compare the new potential for disparity in our own Age of Preservation where two sets of Preservation motives are operating, which are somewhat philosophically opposed; i.e., living history vs. artifact, physical age vs. conceptual age. Most of these disparities become most obvious when the act of restoration is approached.

The present state of affairs concerning restoring historic sites often relies on public design guidelines based on a Preservation policy. These guidelines are supposed to give direction to designers and planners who will be intervening. The restoration often includes a design review monitored by the regulatory group in charge. The design guidelines are often less than useful. Either they are so general that they become meaningless and freely interpreted by the governing body to suite their needs; or they are too prescriptive instead of
performance based which leaves no room for designer creativity. Each Preservation group is operating according to a set of motives but the motives are not always served best by the guidelines. Often the current motives have not been reassessed openly to make sure they are clearly the aims of the present group who represent the agency. I want to compare two agencies in Boston who have different motives for restoration work. This comparison is based on observations of some of their work and conversations with some of their members. It is not meant as a definite comparison.

The SPNEA - Society for the Preservation of New England Antiquities - is one of the oldest private Preservation organizations in this country. It recently acquired the Gropius house in Lincoln and will be restoring it as a museum house open to the public. Compared to their usual restoration technique this will be a mixture of their traditional policy and some new ideas. Their policy of restoration is to enhance the historic value and so they tend to restore "back" to the original state. However, in this house they are making an effort to leave the interior as closely as possible to the way it was last lived in, instead of restoring it back to when the house and people who lived there were young. This is a shift in their restoration policy - an example of the move from history as artifact to history as organism. SPNEA felt that it was important to get the atmosphere of the living style rather than treat the house as a pure object. Because useability value in the functional sense is not really a concern, the belongings and furnishings of the Gropius family can remain as they were, and so help to elicit an even greater sense of
living history. If the house were to be used as a restaurant this would not be possible. Historic content reigns supreme in this example despite our new emphasis for useability.

In comparison to the SPNEA, the Massachusetts Historic Commission, the state level agency, has a strong predilection towards useability, identity, and living history motives. However they try not to spare historic content at the cost of these other motives. They help communities designate historic districts but can only offer advice and not decisions. They are involved in making decisions only when an historic property, which is on the National Register for Historic Places, is being considered for federal funds. Their aim is to keep the historic sites preserved as living monuments. Therefore they often approve of adaptive re-use, while still taking care to preserve historic and artistic values. When some element of the site must be drastically changed or removed, they hold the developer responsible for a detailed documentation of the site to be kept on file at the public's use. This is the case of the Weeks school in Newton which has been turned into elderly housing. (See figure 52.)

Another example of how restoration policy expresses different motives is the comparison of historic districts such as Newburyport and Lowell. Both were interested in the useability motive to rejuvenate the physical fabric, but the restoration treatments differed as to how they effected the social preservation of the areas. While Newburyport practically ignored the living history potential for the social fabric, and used historic value and identity value as a bait for newcomers and tourists, (see Figs. 53, 54), Lowell seemed to show
Fig. 52.- Weeks Jr. High School - to be renovated for elderly Housing
Fig 53 - 18thc port of Newbury port

Fig 54 - new private residential development in the port of Newbury port
genuine interest in the existing residents' lives and wanted to make Lowell a living museum, a chance to highlight the identity value, living history value and artistic merits to express the maximum useability of the area.

It seems to me that if Preservationists were more expressive about their motives to themselves as well as to the designers involved, then both guidelines and restoration projects might be more in tune with each other. Whether one agrees or not with the motives set out in the guidelines, at least designers could be less restricted as to how they satisfy them if guidelines were more performance based.

For example, the Ben Franklin House Project in Philadelphia is a great example of how useability value is taking advantage of the past. (See figure 55.) It worked to bring alive the experience of an historic house destroyed years ago. I imagine that the designer was given a kind of performance-based guideline and allowed to create something which is a living "monument." The Preservation values that this landmark re-creation included were historic, commemorative, living history, conceptual age and identity. The re-creation gives us a chance to sense the proportions and massing of the genuine house while leaving the site open to be used as an urban park.

A memory is kept alive by this simple conceptual re-creation which is designed to keep a bit of the past alive while giving our built environment a richer quality. The site also contains more traditional historic displays about the life of Franklin to fill in the information the re-creation house leaves out. I am impressed with the imagination and simplicity of this approach to retrieving the past.
Fig. 55 - Ben Franklin Restoration Project, Philadelphia.
The Franklin monument is not only an example of how Preservation values can be incorporated together, but it gives us tangible evidence of our own Preservation mentality by its very design. It will show future generations how we felt comfortable creating our own built versions of the spirit of the past, rather than the mere image.

I do not say that every historic site should be treated in that way, but I do believe that a more open dialogue of specific Preservation motives for a given site should exist between Preservationists and restoration people. Perhaps, then, we will be more satisfied with the range of restoration techniques now open to us, and we could better match our Preservation values with our Preservation actions.

In order to make sure that our restoration contributions do not become something we look back on with shame, more attention should be given to evaluating the potentiality of each individual historic site. Perhaps some kind of classification can be done, so that we realize which places we value the most and which places serve best each of our motives. Then as we have the opportunity for action we can satisfy our motives by being more aware of what we have to work with, instead of demolishing or defacing our connection to the past blindly. Better processes for combining Preservation motives and Preservation actions, like restoration, must be made or we will be sorry for our actions.

Our current Preservation mentality is nowhere better expressed than in our restoration attempts and the preference for our new motives - reinforce identity, living history, and conceptual age, all are expressed in our restoration policy. "Each epoch leaves its
own imprint upon everything it makes, including its version of its own past."\textsuperscript{37}
CONCLUSION

In the beginning of this thesis, I introduced four goals having to do with explaining the uses of preservation. Much of what I first presented had to do with the structure of this process; i.e., which cultural attitudes precipitated preservation motives and how motives were expressed through actions.

The substantive content of the thesis was centered on establishing a theory about the cultures who have taken preservation seriously. I posited that they shared a common mentality and process, but they varied according to which motives and which actions were operative for them. I also supported a theory of Reigl's which postulated a cumulative theory of motives, shared amongst these preservation societies. I wanted to use this historic/motivational framework to support a theory I suspected from the beginning - that our current attachment to preservation is very different from the previous attachments, and we display these differences in our conceptualization of what constitutes "the past", in our treatment of genuine old built forms and in our fascination with re-creating historic places.

The shift in the use of preservation from pre-20th c. cultures and our own is multi-dimensional, and I have discussed many of the aspects of this shift as follows: a. today's active manipulation of past built forms instead of passively honoring of them; b. the appreciation of the "regular" material culture vs. only the monuments; c. the inclusion of mass culture appeal as an influence in how we choose and treat historic sites vs. an elite
appeal; d. our focus on what "history as concept" can give us today - whether it be a richer environmental experience, a chance to re-affirm our identity, a good time, a source of inspiration, and our innovation of separating the concept of history from its genuine material context.

Our appreciation for the message the past gives us, has given rise to our appeal for the replica, and the re-creation. It has also come to mean that preservation for us operates as much in the cerebral realm as the material realm.

This new approach to preservation has produced a schism between those who still carry on the previously established uses of preservation - a. to commemorate past people or events, b. to treat historic content as artifacts to be studied, c. to appreciate the physical signs of age in built forms; - and those who concur that our new orientation to the useability value of past places has given us the following motives to replace the previous ones: a. our own identity is a more vital element to connote from preservation the commemorating past identities; b. to treat historic content as something to live, something that can be infused in various segments of our material culture; c. to appreciate "age" as a concept, not through the physical signs that manifest themselves in material culture.

This schism in motives has produced two poles of actions - the restoration of genuine historic places which are more accurate than past restoration attempts, and the direction which ignores
the need for the "genuine" as the watermark for what can or
cannot evoke the past.

It seems to follow that the same culture who gave credance to
mass destruction of historic built heritage has now given credance
to a mass re-creation of historic heritage in our adaptive
re-use projects and replicas.

What are the results of our legitimizing these new uses of
preservation? Perhaps we have lost the ability to make the quali-
tative distinction between the "original" and the "facsimile". Is this a freeing consequence because the "facsimile" is more available to more people? Is it a chance for us to more freely shape our reminiscences of the past? Or, is this a sign of a loss of aesthetic judgement? Will the built world become a bastardization full of historic cliches?

Perhaps our current technological age of information
which is permeating all aspects of our lives will become even more of an influence in how we perceive the use of the past. Our separation of history as a message from historic objects might be just the beginning. Will we soon be able to visit full-scale holograms of the Acropolis or Mount Vernon in every country and lose interest in seeing the original because it will be less thrilling?

Perhaps instead the increased reliance on technological inno-
vations will send us further into finding solace in the genuine
past.

Will we tire of our relentless alteration of historic sites
and return to the previous preservation legacy, where we will honor the past remnants as monuments to be left untouched?

As we are hot in the pursuit of the motives I have set forth in the thesis, it is hard to say which of the above consequences will come to fruition.

Whatever happens, even if the preservation mentality leaves us, we cannot deny the mark we have left in creating our own version of the past.

Perhaps this desire to acknowledge our own culture in tangible forms is the underlying "constant" throughout all of the cultures who dabble or make great stabs at immortalizing themselves.

The following quote of Walter Benjamin's reveals the intimate relationship between our preservation attitudes and our control in immortalizing our past memories.

"Every image of the past that is not recognized by the present as one of its own concerns threatens to disappear irretrievably." 38

This urge to re-make one's own version of the past is not a new preoccupation. It has transcended every culture in some form or another. In 18th c. Italy there was a tradition of creating "capriccios" - or three-dimensional miniature paper stage sets where artist brought together various components of a city and composed a scene mixing reality and fantasy. Unlikely architectural components were assembled to make "the passage of time and the presence of man more evident." 39 One such example brought together these scenes from Venice - "...a humble little 17th c.
house, ... the little Gothic palace at Piscina Venier,\textsuperscript{40} the portico from one canal and the open space from another locale in Venice.

These miniature 18th c. capriccios were created because of a similar motivation to our preservation mentality today. (See Fig. 69.) We both show fascination for encapsulating the passing of time in a format which is graspable. The juxtaposition of incongruous periods of architecture jolt our recognition of the human presence throughout the otherwise invisible passage of time. We are still motivated by this desire to mark the presence of time but instead we use lifesize "capriccios". Is it more accurate to call our culture the Age of Capricious Preservation instead of the Age of Historic Preservation? Hasn't it become more important to re-make the built world based on our whim than it is to immortalize it unsullied by us? Where will our urge to re-make the environment bring us and what kind of 'history' will future generations respond to in our highly manipulated environments?
Fig. 56: Capriccio of Venice
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