

REBUILDING THE PAST:
A CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF INTERNATIONAL AND U.S. FRAMEWORKS
GUIDING THE RECONSTRUCTION OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES

By

ZOE WATNIK

A thesis submitted to the

Graduate School-New Brunswick

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Master of Arts

Graduate Program in Art History, Cultural Heritage and Preservation Studies

written under the direction of

Katharine Woodhouse-Beyer, Ph.D., RPA

and approved by

New Brunswick, New Jersey

May 2013

ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS

Rebuilding the Past:
A Critical Examination of International and U.S. Frameworks Guiding the
Reconstruction of Historic Properties

By

ZOE WATNIK

Thesis Director:
Dr. Katharine Woodhouse-Beyer

Authenticity refers not only to the physical characteristics of cultural properties, but also to the ways in which collective memories connect with particular environments. Each historic site presents a unique interpretation of authenticity, rooted in a combination of the material, contextual, and cultural realms. Preservation standards have emerged to answer a number of questions regarding the need to develop guidelines for conservation of historic properties. This thesis addresses 90 years of cultural preservation policy through international standard-setting instruments, including the Athens Charter of 1931, the Venice Charter of 1964, UNESCO72, the World Heritage Operational Guidelines, the 1994 Nara Recommendation on Authenticity, and the 2011 Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape, as well as core United States federal preservation legislation, including the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 and the Secretary of Interior's Standards and Guidelines for the Treatment of Historic Properties. These documents are examined for the specific framing of reconstruction actions, and the ways in which major interventions may simultaneously bolster and compromise authenticity of a historic

property. Four case studies, the Lower East Side Tenement Museum in Manhattan, New York; the Ise Temple complex in Japan; the rebuilt Frauenkirche in Dresden, Germany; and the Abu Simbel temple complex located near Aswan, Egypt, contribute to the discussions surrounding authenticity. Each site explored in this paper further illustrates the difficulties emerging from attempts to establish a uniform method of preservation interventions across a range of heritage sites. Modern, flexible preservation tools will establish the groundwork for new approaches to authenticity that accurately reflect the multifaceted significance of the global cultural environment and contribute to contemporary discussions on sustainable development.

Table of Contents

Abstract of the Thesis	ii
Table of Contents	iv
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Chapter 2: International Frameworks	9
Part I: The Athens Charter	9
Part II: The Venice Charter	12
Part III: UNESCO72/World Heritage Convention Operational Guidelines	16
Part IV: The Nara Document on Authenticity	22
Part V: UNESCO Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape	28
Chapter 3: National (United States) Frameworks	33
Part I: National Historic Preservation Act of 1966	34
Part II: Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation	38
Chapter 4: Case Studies	46
Part I: The Lower East Side Tenement Museum	46
Part II: International Case Studies	58
Section 1: Ise Temple Complex	58
Section 2: Dresden Frauenkirche and Elbe River Valley	61
Section 3: Abu Simbel Temple Complex, Egypt	69
Chapter 5: Conclusions	75
Bibliography	80

Chapter 1: Introduction

Cultural preservation policies worldwide hinge on governmental actions and definitions of authenticity and significance. The current practices addressing historic and cultural preservation are derived from the laws and guidelines established by a range of advisory and consulting groups, including government agencies, non-governmental organizations (such as UNESCO), architects, historians, and other scholars. Preservation standards have emerged to address a number of questions regarding sites and the need to develop guidelines for conservation and historic preservation actions. Why is a particular site being preserved? What are the significant qualities or characteristics of a site? How and why does the site become significant to the particular region or culture, and do these values apply on a national or global scale? Are there any sort of interventions (construction, reconstruction, maintenance) required to make the historic property accessible? If major modifications to the historic resource are required (including code compliance, reconstruction, restoration), how are the changes implemented to ensure that the significant features of the historic property are maintained? This last question is central to the critical analysis, as this paper presents the ways in which governmental and international policies establish the guidelines for major work on a site and how these policies change or develop to incorporate a range of vastly different types of reconstruction projects.

This thesis proposes to examine the history and flexibility of frameworks that govern and guide the reconstruction of historic buildings and sites. In order to consider the efficacy of these frameworks for the reconstruction/rebuilding of historic sites, I

present a close analysis of international heritage programming and American federal historic preservation legislation. An examination of several case studies of historic sites in the U.S., Japan, Germany, and Egypt will serve as the lens for discussion of the practicalities of these frameworks. The core sites include The Lower East Side Tenement Museum in Manhattan, New York; the Ise Temple complex in Japan; the rebuilt Frauenkirche in Dresden, Germany; and the Abu Simbel temple complex located near Aswan, Egypt. I will consider these case studies in relation to contemporary historic preservation practices and evaluate the practical application of these documents through the case studies.

Historic sites are valuable in that they allow visitors to connect directly with a tangible representation of human memory.¹ Objects and artistic works may be imbued with historic significance, but historic sites and properties provide the opportunity for interaction on a much larger scale. One integral and complex principle of historic preservation policies is the maintenance of the distinct qualities that set a particular place or site apart as a unique or representative sample of significant features. The methods of determining significance are allocated to various governmental agencies, which implement a uniform means of assessing importance across different types of sites.

One consistent challenge in the cultural preservation field is the shifting meanings of critical heritage terminology. The two terms central to this discussion are “authenticity” and “reconstruction.” For the purposes of this thesis, I will breakdown the practical application of these terms in relation to the core case studies. The discussion of

¹ Bergman, Teresa and Cynthia Duquette Smith. “You Were on Indian Land: Alcatraz Island as Recalcitrant Memory Space”, p. 160-188. In *Places of Public Memory: The Rhetoric of Museums and Memorials*. Edited by Dickinson, Greg, Carole Blair, and Brian L. Ott, The University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa. p.161

individual federal and international statutes, as well as reconstruction practices outlined by the case studies, will further refine these terms and serve to elucidate the successes and failures of these overarching preservation policies.

Authenticity is one of the most difficult terms to define in the cultural heritage field. Returning to the etymology of the term, “authentic” is derived from the Greek meaning “original” or “genuine.”² This reading would imply that an object, site, or cultural practice is guaranteed to be original. Jukka Jokilehto further elaborates on this principle in relation to the creative process, describing authenticity of a work as “a measure of truthfulness of the internal unity of the creative process and the physical realization of the work, and the effect of its passage through historic time.”³ In these terms, the object, historic site, or monument is qualified as authentic by the act of creating the work and by the passage of time. With an emphasis on the work as something true or genuine, it is therefore unreproducible.

Turning to the foundational art theorist Walter Benjamin, he addresses the issue of reproduction of art objects in the twentieth century, focusing on the idea of the authentic. In his seminal 1936 essay, *The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction*, Benjamin discusses the reproduction of photography and film, but incorporates theories regarding the significance of the original work. In the eras proceeding the modern period, the original, genuine work could be copied, but never identically reproduced. The original object develops an accretion of history by passing through time, or a patina. The very act of reproduction “detaches the reproduced object from the domain of tradition, by making many reproductions it substitutes a plurality of

² The term is connected to the reflexive pronoun autos (self) + noun hentes (being).

³ Jokilehto, Jukka. *A History of Architectural Conservation*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann, 1999. p.296

copies for a unique existence.”⁴ This consideration of copies and the connection of the copy to the unique authentic object emerges in the 1964 Venice Charter, one of the earlier attempts to codify an international set of guidelines for the practice of cultural conservation. Within the text of the charter, authenticity is directly linked to the maintenance of original materials used in a monument and site, and the ability of the conservator to preserve those historic materials for the continued benefit of later generations.

Authenticity of “original materials” is considered in tandem with the idea of integrity. Drawing from Jokilehto’s definitions of the term, integrity refers to “the state of being whole” or a “material wholeness or completeness.” This idea plays a major role in the qualification of sites or monuments for consideration of designation as heritage on the national and international levels. Authenticity not only refers to the physical properties of the historic resource, but also to the ways in which particular environments connect with collective memories. Each site presents a unique interpretation of authenticity, whether rooted in the material, contextual, or cultural realms. The case studies explored in this paper further illustrate the difficulties emerging from attempting to establish a uniform method of conservation interventions across a range of heritage sites.

Early preservation endeavors in the West embraced this material-based approach to defining authenticity. This approach to authenticity is derived from a Eurocentric interpretation of significance. Preservation and conservation of the built environment developed as a discipline between the late eighteenth and early twentieth century in

⁴ Ibid.

Europe.⁵ The very approach to authenticity has shifted as preservation efforts have developed over time. Where once authenticity was linked solely to an original site or object, a more expansive interpretation of authenticity and significance has permeated cultural heritage policy. Today, authenticity considers the aesthetic and historical aspects of a site, context in the form of physical, social, and historical development, and the past and future uses and functions of a site.⁶ Recognizing this shift, the case studies presented in this analysis, such as the ritual rebuilding of the Ise Temple complex in Japan, will focus on tangible built environments tied to a discussion of the reconstruction practices as a product of their particular moment in history.

Sophia Labadi, a heritage specialist and consultant for both the European Cultural Foundation and UNESCO, recently published an extensive chapter on authenticity, which she characterizes as “one of the most slippery concepts in heritage conservation.”⁷ Labadi breaks down the history of the evolving treatment of authenticity in international heritage policies. She cites the flexibility and periodic revision of the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention (a document discussed in depth in Chapter 2) as one of the complicating aspects of the discussion of authenticity. All of the documents following the 1977 Operational Guidelines adopt a materials-based approach to heritage conservation until the 1994 Nara Document on Authenticity, which expanded the concept of authenticity beyond original materials.⁸ The conference organized by the Japanese sought to refine the definitions of authenticity and make the Operational

⁵ For more information on the development of preservation prior to the core documents I discuss, see Jokilehto, Jukka. *A History of Architectural Conservation*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann, 1999.

⁶ Jokilehto, Jukka. *A History of Architectural Conservation*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann, 1999. p.298

⁷ Labadi, Sophia. “World Heritage, Authenticity, and Post-Authenticity: International and National Perspectives.” In *Heritage and Globalization*, edited by Sophia Labadi and Colin Long, 66-84. New York: Routledge, 2010. p.66

⁸ Ibid. p.70

Guidelines more relevant to a broader range of cultural practices. She further identifies that, in an international context, authenticity is used primarily to refer to historic sites that retain original materials, despite the expanded definitions in recent decades. Labadi ultimately concludes that we have achieved a state of “post-authenticity,” the very guidelines initially established by the World Heritage Conventions allowed for the reconstruction of sites.⁹

As demonstrated by the Historic Centre of Warsaw, 85% of the historic urban area was lost during World War II, but the reconstruction initiated in 1971 reproduced the city according to exacting scientific standards. Inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1980, Warsaw stands as a testament to reconstructed urban environments as acceptable candidates for recognition as global heritage. The melding of significance, with original material no longer distinguishable from new fabrication, opens new approaches to authenticity. Finally, with the integration of the Nara Document on Authenticity into the Operational Guidelines in 2005, authenticity expanded beyond recognition of original materials, to an acceptance of cultural practices and uses of particular environments to determine significance.

Reconstruction, the second term core term addressed in this paper, unifies the disparate case studies explored in the later chapters. The various examples of reconstruction presented integrate several means of architectural intervention, including reconstruction, restoration, and relocation. Reconstruction deals with the literal “reassembly of a partially or completely collapsed structure on its original site using most, if not all of its original materials,” the most radical form of physical intervention to

⁹ Ibid. p.80

a historic property.¹⁰ Restoration, a similar process, “returns a building, site, or work of art to an appearance it had at an earlier time...and can involve major interventions to part or all of the site.”¹¹ Finally, relocation is the physical disassembly and rebuilding of a structure on a new site, only implemented when there are no means by which to preserve the structure as part of the original landscape.

The case studies to be examined (Lower East Side Tenement Museum, United States; Ise Temple Complex, Japan; Frauenkirche, Germany; Abu Simbel, Egypt) all display some major form of intervention to the sites. The interventions to the examples selected were guided by the preservation recommendations in effect at the time of reconstruction. The shifting interpretation of importance in the cultural heritage and historic preservation fields is in turn reflected by the rationale for particular modes of conservation at each site. Each intervention is implemented for widely different reasons, including reconstruction as an active cultural practice at Ise, rebuilding as memorialization in Prague, reconstruction for educational purposes at the historic site of the Lower East Side Tenement Museum, and complete relocation of Egyptian Abu Simbel temple complex as result of human modification to the environment.

Rather than address the conservation of sites *in situ* through preservation of extant materials (one of the key goals of historic preservation), I seek to examine sites that have been modified significantly at critical points in the development of the goals and techniques of cultural heritage conservation policy. Several of the case studies within this thesis, including the relocation of the Temple of Ramses at Abu Simbel and the development of reconstructed apartment spaces in tandem with the stabilization of

¹⁰ Stubbs, John H., *Time Honored: A Global View of Architectural Conservation*. Hoboken: John Wiley and Sons, 2009. p.126

¹¹ Ibid.

deteriorating apartments within the Lower East Side Tenement Museum, have implemented new techniques in the preservation field. Many sites have and continue to serve as the testing ground for new architectural preservation methodologies.

Conservators and architects working with historic resources are committed to a policy of minimal intervention, or “do no harm.” More involved forms of intervention, such as the relocation of the Abu Simbel temples and the rebuilding of the Dresden Frauenkirche, have a greater impact on the authentic material of a historic site and may be more difficult, if not impossible, to reverse in the future. The reconstruction challenges presented by the Lower East Side Tenement Museum and the international case studies demonstrate the site-specific nature of each preservation project. These groundbreaking examples of preservation illustrated the flexibility of varied approaches to “reconstruction.”

The complex task of who determines what should be preserved and how a preservation plan might be implemented is outlined by the federal and international policies and recommendations addressing the topic of preservation. Explored in the following chapters, the international documents and United States federal policy establish criteria for definitions of authenticity and set the groundwork for formally codified approaches to these multifaceted terms.

Chapter 2: International Frameworks

Cultural heritage policy has emerged as the primary tool for the protection of the built environment. These frameworks put in place by international organizations have established the criteria for determining the significant features of a site, methodologies to document and keep records of significant sites, and most importantly, the tools to ensure the proper care and maintenance of historic buildings for use by future generations. From our twenty-first century vantage point, we can revisit the development of these documents to analyze their strengths and weaknesses by examining their practical application in the preservation field.

Part I: The Athens Charter

The initial modern international approach to a codified set of principles of heritage preservation was implemented in 1931. The First International Congress of Architects and Technicians of Historic Monuments held by the International Museums Office in Athens, Greece gathered to discuss the devastating impact of the first World War on the cultural landscape of Europe.¹² The resulting document, known as The Athens Charter for the Restoration of Historic Monuments, established seven distinct resolutions to ensure the preservation of the built environment. For the first time, an international charter provided guidelines for the protection of monuments of significant value. The charter was formally brought before the League of Nations in 1932, where the assembly agreed to inform member nations of the newly established criteria for

¹² International Council on Monuments and Sites. "The Athens Charter for the Restoration of Historic Monuments – 1931." Updated 2011.

monument longevity. Developed during the interwar period, the document recognizes the dangers of a lack of preservation methodology that could result in the loss of historic resources for future generations.

The Athens Charter categorized the basic principles of preservation and conservation of historic sites, including buildings, monuments, and archaeological sites in seven resolutions, referred to as the “Carta del Restauro.”¹³ In addition, the Congress made seven general conclusions based on the discussions that took place regarding the conservation of historic properties. Five of the seven conclusions directly address the concrete challenges of heritage conservation and the practice of architectural intervention for the maintenance of built heritage.

From this charter, I have selected the most critical resolutions for shaping the reconstruction discussion. The first resolution, “Doctrines/General Principles,” recognizes the need for a regular system of maintenance by each nation “calculated to ensure the preservation of the buildings.” The resolution expands this idea by recommending that when restoration work is required at a site, “the historic and artistic work of the past should be respected, without excluding the style of any given period.” Conclusion Four directly addresses the restoration of monuments, clearly stating that modern interventions should be concealed where possible to respect the nature of the

¹³ Ibid.

1. International organizations for Restoration on operational and advisory levels are to be established.
2. Proposed Restoration projects are to be subjected to knowledgeable criticism to prevent mistakes which will cause loss of character and historical values to the structures.
3. Problems of preservation of historic sites are to be solved by legislation at national level for all countries.
4. Excavated sites which are not subject to immediate restoration should be reburied for protection.
5. Modern techniques and materials may be used in restoration work.
6. Historical sites are to be given strict custodial protection.
7. Attention should be given to the protection of areas surrounding historic sites.

structure, while approving the use of contemporary materials to reinforce or strengthen deteriorating historic buildings. This policy of minimal intervention and adoption of modern technological innovations is the hallmark of contemporary preservation actions. Regarding the techniques of conservation, the sixth conclusion promotes that prior to any reconstruction or consolidation efforts, “a thorough analysis should be made.” Where possible, monuments may be re-erected or reinforced with new materials to ensure their longevity. The final conclusion, “The Conservation of Monuments and International Collaboration,” emphasizes that “the conservation of the artistic and archaeological property of mankind is one that interests the community of the States, which are wardens of civilization.” This final conclusion encouraged the members of the League of Nations to provide technical and moral cooperation in the preservation of the historic environment, ideally achieved by educating the citizens of each member state about the value of historic monuments and the need for guaranteed continued preservation of these significant sites.¹⁴

The Athens Charter of 1931 served as a series of basic suggestions in the development of cultural heritage policy. The document reflects the early stages of heritage conservation, with a distinct focus on the built environment. The emphasis on a scientific basis for preservation actions shifted the global ideals for heritage preservation into a new stage of conservation recommendations. The Getty Conservation Institute (GCI), one of the leading organizations currently studying and establishing professional codes for conservation and restoration practices, has summarized the conclusions reached

¹⁴ The educational goal permeates the language of cultural preservation policies. Compare with the 2011 Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape (Chapter 2, Part V) which emphasizes public education about global cultural values as a necessary component for successful maintenance of the historic environment.

by the committee into three core principles. Briefly, the core guidelines may be reduced to “the idea of a common world heritage; the importance of the setting of monuments; and the principle of integration of new materials,” all themes that will continue to be refined as cultural heritage policy emerges during the twentieth century.¹⁵

It is crucial to remember that the document was an international suggestion, with no legal implications for the members of the League of Nations. While the policies suggested by the drafters of The Athens Charter espoused general policies recognizing the need for functional legislation protecting global built heritage, the document itself lacked the necessary authority for effective implementation. The Athens Charter served as a general guideline for the creation of preservation policies on a nation-by-nation basis, the same model still used for any international heritage document or recommendation made by the current active body, UNESCO. The core of The Athens Charter of 1931 therefore served as an initial basis for preservation in practice. The field saw a significant shift 33 years later with the drafting of the 1964 Venice Charter.

Part II: The Venice Charter

Formally known as the International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites, the document drafted in Venice in 1964 reinforced and refined the goals established by the Athens Charter of 1931.¹⁶ The Second International Congress of Architects and Technicians of Historic Monuments established two critical features for the development of preservation: a series of guidelines for conservation and preservation professionals and the basis for the International Council on Monuments and Sites

¹⁵ Getty Conservation Institute. “General Conclusions of the Athens Conference (1931).” Accessed February 2013.

¹⁶ Known more commonly as the Venice Charter of 1964

(ICOMOS). Held between May 25 and 31 of 1964, over 600 participants attended the session, representing 61 countries and diverse organizations such as the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM), the International Council of Museums (ICOM), and the Council of Europe.¹⁷ The Venice Charter shifted the discussion of conservation and restoration principles from the realm of curators into the field of practicing conservation professionals.

The brief preamble to the Venice Charter introduces the core themes developed through the text. The focus of the document is on the preservation of what are deemed “ancient monuments,” which embody universal human values and serve as the basis for a common heritage. Therefore, the current generation is tasked with “safeguard[ing] them for future generations... [with a] duty to hand them on in the full richness of their authenticity.”¹⁸ This is the first and only use of authenticity in the document, directly linked with the built environment, continuing the established precedent connecting authenticity with original materials.

This invocation to preserve the “authenticity” of ancient monuments as common heritage occurs at the very end of the charter’s preamble. The function and qualities of authenticity, although never explicitly stated, may be inferred from the following text of the document. Michael Petzet, in his critique of international conservation documents in the 40 years following the Venice Charter, teases out the implied aspects of authenticity within the document. Articles Six and Seven indicate the need for conservation of the original context for a monument or object, while Article Five places limitations on the

¹⁷ Jokilehto, Jukka. *A History of Architectural Conservation*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann, 1999. p.288

¹⁸ Venice Charter, preamble

modifications made to a site to ensure accessibility (a theme that poses distinct challenges within the United States regarding the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 requirements).¹⁹ This framework puts in a place a model for considering objects and sites of heritage as authentic in their entirety.

The Venice Charter introduced 16 articles, expanding the definitions and building on the principles established by the Athens Charter.²⁰ The text of the charter can be divided into two core sections, the first half the Venice addresses conservation and the second half deals with restoration. Articles Four through Eight of the Venice Charter emphasize safeguarding structures in their original physical context and limiting major construction interventions that may alter the significant features of a historic resource. Article Seven characterizes a historic site as intrinsically connected to the original context or site, and that the removal of the monument from such a context irrevocably damages the site. Of course, special considerations are made for those sites jeopardized by their continued presence in the original location. For example, the temple complex at Abu Simbel illustrates the striking challenge of ensuring an archaeological site remains *in situ* with the threat of potentially losing a significant site forever.

Articles Nine through Thirteen address the topic of restoration, which unlike conservation, allows for more leeway of interventions to the object or site. Conservation, as presented by the Venice Charter, emphasizes consolidation and direct interventions to prevent continued decay or degradation of the site, monument, or object. Restoration may emphasize the original or authentic aspects of the work by means of revealing original

¹⁹ Petzet, Michael. "Principles of Preservation: An Introduction to the International Charters for Conservation and Restoration 40 Years After the Venice Charter." In *Monuments and Sites, Vol. I: International Charters for Conservation and Restoration*. p. 7-8

²⁰ The Venice Charter is readily available online, therefore, I will only address the articles most relevant to my critical discussion of preservation frameworks.

materials or stripping away of later-period additions. Briefly distilling the most critical points of the document, restoration should be limited to what can be understood from rigorous scientific testing. In addition, any modern changes or additions to the monument must be clearly distinguishable from the original or “authentic” materials. When a traditional technique is insufficient to ensure the conservation and longevity of the monument, modern conservation techniques may be implemented as long as the efficacy “has been shown by scientific data and proved by experience.”²¹ Article Twelve directly addresses reconstruction. Where there are losses, any replacements “must integrate harmoniously with the whole, but at the same time must be distinguishable from the original,” acknowledging the modifications to the original resource. As noted in the Athens Charter, reconstruction should be ruled out, except in the case of anastylosis, “the reassembling of existing but dismembered parts,” with clear differentiation of the original and modern materials.

The principles of the Venice Charter “fossilize” the historic resource in the moment at which the conservation or restoration action is undertaken.²² Significant historic properties are characterized by the development of patina over time and original or shifting uses during the sites’ lifetime. Through the 1960s, heritage continued to be defined by the European nations from which these charters and recommendations emerged. The value of material heritage is identified by the curatorial world, with an interest in preserving the built environment at the moment these heritage frameworks have been drafted. This perspective was revised in 1994 Nara Document on Authenticity, which places the evaluation of significance and authenticity in the hands of each cultural

²¹ Article 10

²² Otero-Pailos, Jorge; Gaiger, Jason; West, Susie. “Heritage Values.” In *Understanding Heritage in Practice*, edited by Susie West. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2010. p.59

group. Restoration actions require the participation of both heritage professionals and cultural representatives to successfully identify and interpret material heritage for future generations. Although this message of conservation for the future is part of the core intent of the Venice Charter, these concepts continue to be revised and reinterpreted to this day.

The Venice Charter emerged as the basis for international conservation and restoration guidelines used by professionals, with an emphasis on differentiation between original and new materials. The document further revised core principles of The Athens Charter, while stressing new issues that emerged as the conservation profession developed. These documents reflect the Western origins of the professionals drafting the texts, with an emphasis on the retention of original material in the built environment as a testament to authenticity, a concept challenged by the 1994 Nara Document on Authenticity.²³ The Venice Charter serves as baseline for the nascent conservation and restoration field. Again, there are no means of enforcing the principles outlined in the document, but the suggestions put forth have become the basis for conservation standards. Despite the limitations of these two pivotal documents, the charters illustrate the developing consciousness among conservation professionals of the impact by conservation interventions, ensuring the utmost respect for the historic sites and objects.²⁴

Part III: UNESCO72/World Heritage Convention Operational Guidelines

The most important standard-setting instrument in the heritage conservation field emerged only eight years following the drafting of the Venice Charter. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) organized a

²³ International Council on Monuments and Sites. "History of the Venice Charter." Accessed February 2013.

²⁴ Ibid

convention to promote the protection and safeguarding of historic and cultural sites. The resulting document, known as the 1972 Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (UNESCO72), established a complex system for documenting and preserving heritage sites. Unlike the Venice Charter, which was organized and drafted by conservation professionals, the 1972 Convention emerged from the needs and desires of member states, already participating in the non-heritage related activities of UNESCO. The resulting document established general policies to be implemented on the national level by individual governments, as applicable to their respective states.

UNESCO72 was fully implemented five years later, in 1977, with the codification of the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention. The Guidelines provide the core definitions used to evaluate sites and establish the means to preserve significant sites for future access. The core achievement of the 1972 Convention is the establishment of the duty of States Parties to identify potential sites of value, and the basic promotion of the individual role in protecting and preserving those sites. As a standard-setting instrument, one of the unique features of UNESCO72 is the ability to return to and continually revise the Operational Guidelines. A living document, the Operational Guidelines can be modified by the World Heritage Committee as needed. Over the past 35 years, there have been fourteen different iterations of the guidelines.²⁵ Additionally, Labadi cites Fancioni's point that as a living document, the meanings of any treaty provisions are not interpreted at the moment of their creation, but

²⁵Ibid. p.67

rather, in the current legal and social context.²⁶ Thus, UNESCO72 continues to develop in tandem with the new approaches to heritage conservation.

The organization of the committee was spurred by the emergence of numerous threats to heritage sites in the years following the end of World War II. Rebuilding of the historic districts of Warsaw, Poland and significant individual sites, such as the Dresden Frauenkirche, challenged the preservation field to reconsider the values of reconstruction projects. New technological developments, including enhanced ability to document heritage resources through photography, established a scientific basis for reconstruction projects. Rebuilding based on tangible evidence of recently destroyed monuments was vastly different from reconstruction projects of ancient archaeological sites based on fragmentary evidence. Labadi discusses the nomination of the Historic Center of Warsaw to the World Heritage List in 1980. The Old Market Place was entirely reconstructed following World War II to serve as an example of “the excellent and careful reconstruction of a group of buildings to its previous appearance.”²⁷ The inclusion marked an expanded definition of authenticity beyond the Athens and Venice Charters, incorporating an entirely fabricated urban environment in a manner that is not reversible.

Returning to the text of UNESCO72, Article Eleven established the core tool of the World Heritage Convention, the World Heritage List. After each nation completes inventories of heritage resources (including monuments, groups of buildings, sites, natural features, geological and physiographical formations, and natural sites), resources which demonstrate “outstanding universal value” in terms of a historical, aesthetic,

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Labadi, Sophia. “World Heritage, Authenticity, and Post-Authenticity: International and National Perspectives.” In *Heritage and Globalization*, edited by Sophia Labadi and Colin Long, 66-84. New York: Routledge, 2010. p.68

scientific, ethnological, or anthropological perspective may be proposed to the World Heritage List.²⁸ The 1977 Operational Guidelines provide six criteria for evaluating outstanding universal value of cultural sites²⁹, requiring nominated sites to demonstrate one of more of these qualities:

- “(i) represent a *unique artistic or aesthetic* achievement, a *masterpiece* of creative genius;
- (ii) have exerted considerable *influence*, over a span of time or within a cultural area of the world, *on subsequent developments* in architecture, monumental sculpture, garden and landscape design, related arts, or human settlements;
- (iii) be *unique, extremely rare, or of great antiquity*; or
- (iv) be among the most characteristic examples of a *type* of structure, the type representing an important cultural, social, artistic, scientific, technological or industrial development;
- (v) be a characteristic example of a significant, *traditional* style of architecture, method of construction, or *human settlement*, that is fragile by nature or has become vulnerable under the impact of irreversible socio-cultural or economic change;
- (vi) be most importantly *associated* with ideas or beliefs, with events or with persons, of outstanding historical importance or significance.”³⁰

The nomination of sites to the World Heritage List involves a lengthy review process by the World Heritage Committee, but admission to the list includes a number of benefits.

The recognition of a site guarantees that it is characterized by a formal acknowledgement of the site’s value to humanity, increases public awareness beyond the home nation of the significance of particular sites, potentially increases tourism, and may encourage financial donations for the continued maintenance and preservation of a site.

Following this listing of criteria is the first use of the term “authenticity” in the Operational Guidelines. As part of the nomination process, “the property should meet the

²⁸ UNESCO. “Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage,” Nov. 1972, Accessed Feb 2013 “Sec. 1, Art. 1-2 Definition of the Cultural and Natural Heritage”

²⁹ With an additional four points for natural sites.

³⁰ Emphasis from the original document. UNESCO. “Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention,” Paris 1977, Accessed Feb 2013. “Article 1, Section 7, Criteria i-vi”

test of *authenticity* in design, materials, workmanship and setting; authenticity does not limit consideration to original forms and structure but includes all subsequent modifications and additions over the course of time, which in themselves possess artistic or historical values.”³¹ By 1977, the World Heritage Committee formally recognized the palimpsest-like quality of historic structures. The object’s passage through time, whether represented by new additions or destruction, is a significant facet of the work. On the nomination form, state parties are required to explain the authenticity of a nominated site. The clear thrust of this section is the exceptional emphasis placed on the genuine nature of the monument or structure and the materials from which it was created, with an emphasis on materials and workmanship.

Labadi provides the most extensive discussion of the use of authenticity in nomination forms in her 2010 article on the concept of authenticity in the decades following UNESCO72. Relying on computational analysis, she sampled 106 nomination dossiers from sites in eighteen nations over the past three decades. Looking at the uses of “authenticity,” “reconstruction,” and “restoration,” she clarifies how state parties have come to interpret these terms in relation to physical sites. As expected, the vast majority of nominations use authenticity in reference to original materials, the form of built sites, and continued original usage of architectural properties. Labadi attributes this focus on authenticity to the role of heritage in building national identity. Heritage, “based on continuity, uniformity and stability helps to construct stable, solid and homogeneous nations.”³² Despite this preponderance of authenticity as original material, the sections of

³¹ Emphasis from the original document. Ibid. Art. 1, Sec. 9

³² Labadi, Sophia. “World Heritage, Authenticity, and Post-Authenticity: International and National Perspectives.” In *Heritage and Globalization*, edited by Sophia Labadi and Colin Long, 66-84. New York: Routledge, 2010. p.75

the dossiers addressing history of conservation present restoration and reconstruction, practices justified by both the Athens and Venice Charters when appropriate. While nominations may espouse authenticity as a significant feature of a proposed World Heritage Site, the majority of the proposals incorporate a range of conservation and extensive restoration interventions over the lifetime of the historic property.

The contradiction of authenticity and restoration indicates confusion about the role of authenticity for the state parties. Labadi takes a critical view of the Operational Guidelines, stating that the nomination dossiers deliberately conceal the majority of interventions in order to present a “hyper-real” site because the Guidelines do not provide state parties with a comprehensive set of working definitions.³³ Authenticity as material originality is the most easily understood approach to heritage preservation for state parties, but does not allow for a more expansive interpretation. Although only the Abu Simbel case study has been designated a World Heritage Site, this confusion about the meaning of authenticity and the role of restoration permeates the sites of national and regional importance, as addressed by the case studies presenting the reconstruction of the Frauenkirche in Dresden, the Ise temples in Japan, and the Tenement Museum in New York.

UNESCO72 and the revised iterations of the guidelines remain locked in the Western construct that identifies cultural heritage with monumental architecture. Cultural World Heritage Sites on the World Heritage List are limited to individual or groups of buildings, monuments, and sites, especially those with an extensive history dating back to antiquity. The text of the authenticity passage indicates that the sites of cultural heritage are viewed primarily as aspects of the built environment. The continuity of materials and

³³ Ibid. p.80

workmanship of a site are privileged over other characteristics. In this earliest broadly implemented example of global cultural heritage policy, the built site and the immediate surrounding context allow for the protection of sites. The establishment of the criteria used to designate potential World Heritage Sites does indicate a move towards a more broad definition of significance for shared human heritage, yet still limits preservation to the type of sites that have always been valued.

Part IV: The Nara Document on Authenticity

The 1994 Nara Document on Authenticity completely revised the discussion of material authenticity of global cultural heritage sites and the role of both reconstruction and restoration. The Nara Document was the result of a conference held in Nara Japan between representatives from UNESCO, ICCROM, and ICOMOS. Herb Stovel, a Canadian heritage conservation expert, examines the application of the document in his 2008 article from the *Association for Preservation Technology International Bulletin*, “Origins and Influence of the Nara Document on Authenticity.” Stovel argues that the conference was held “simply to extend the range of attributes through which authenticity might be recognized in order to accommodate within it mainstream Japanese conservation practices...so that Japan would feel more comfortable submitting World Heritage nominations for international review.”³⁴ The Ise case study examines the cultural practices of site reconstruction and renewal in Japan. Beyond this broadly stated goal aiming for inclusiveness, the meeting was the first effort by these international heritage preservation organizations to provide some mechanism for defining authenticity.

³⁴ Stovel, Herb. “Origins and Influence of the Nara Documents on Authenticity.” *APT Bulletin*, Vol. 39, No. 2/3 (2008), p. 9

The Nara Document marks a change in the attitude towards heritage preservation that Stovel characterizes as a shift “from a belief in universal international absolutes,” as demonstrated by the unspecific language of the Venice Charter and Operational Guidelines “toward an acceptance of conservation judgments as necessarily relative and contextual.”³⁵ In other words, all conservation actions are dependent upon the particularities of each site, object, or work, as well as the values and principles held by the culture that produced the work. Authenticity has moved out of the realm of purely material uses and has entered a conceptual consideration for preservation and potential restoration actions.

The Nara Document marks the change from a material-centric approach to interpreting authenticity of cultural heritage to a culturally diverse understanding that prioritizes the intangible and culturally relative aspects of particular sites. Divided into three sections, the document includes a preamble with broad statements about the intent of the conference, a section addressing “Cultural Diversity and Heritage Diversity” which further expounds on the rationale for an international revision of authenticity interpretations, and the final section “Values and Authenticity” which expands the previously limited international concept of authenticity.

The preamble of the Nara Document on Authenticity opens with an invocation to recognize and respect cultural differences in an age of increased global homogenization. The committee provides a basis for valuing authenticity in the preservation field, the essential contribution made by the consideration of authenticity in conservation practice is “to clarify and illuminate the collective memory of humanity.”³⁶ The core of the

³⁵ Ibid.

³⁶ UNESCO. “The Nara Document on Authenticity,” Nara 1994. Accessed Feb 2013.

document, addressing diversity, shifts the focus into a discussion of regional value. According to Article Seven, “[a]ll cultures and societies are rooted in the particular forms and means of tangible and intangible expression which constitute their heritage, and these should be respected.”³⁷ Therefore, all discussion of preservation of cultural forms, whether tangible or intangible, must respect the culture from which the heritage resource originates. This article promotes increased communication and cooperation with the nations that contain the heritage that is valued, as well as the particular cultural group from which the monument, site, object, or work originates. Only with the participation of the cultural group can others begin to understand and safeguard the significant qualities of a site for the collective memory of humanity.

The final section of the Nara Document provides the most comprehensive discussion of authenticity of the heritage documents addressed. The five articles of this section (Articles Nine through Thirteen) illuminate the changing attitude towards authenticity and the conceptual revisions that have taken place since the 1960s. Article Ten builds on the idea of authenticity of materials set forth in the Venice Charter, characterizing it as “the essential qualifying factor concerning values,” and the basis for scientific study in conservation planning.³⁸ Article Eleven finally expands the tools for evaluating authenticity of cultural heritage, based on the complexities of differing values all human cultures. According to the text of the article, “it is thus not possible to base judgments of values and authenticity within fixed criteria. On the contrary, the respect

³⁷ Ibid. Article 7

³⁸ Ibid. Article 10

due to all cultures requires that heritage properties must be considered and judged within the cultural contexts to which they belong.”³⁹

Articles Twelve and Thirteen expand these sentiments and summarize the ways in which authenticity may be considered in a culture-specific manner, beyond the traditional materials-based approach. Interpretation of authenticity must be broadened, yet linked to the core values held by the cultures that created the works. From the document,

“Depending on the nature of the cultural heritage, its cultural context, and its evolution through time, authenticity judgments may be linked to the worth of a great variety of sources of information. Aspects of the sources may include form and design, materials and substance, use and function, traditions and techniques, location and setting, and spirit and feeling, and other internal and external factors. The use of these sources permits elaboration of the specific artistic, historic, social, and scientific dimensions of the cultural heritage being examined.”⁴⁰

Authenticity is now linked with use, function, tradition, and technique of the site, all core information in the interpretation of the value of the site, now elevated to the role of determining the significance for formal nomination to the World Heritage List. The expansion of the definition also incorporates the “spirit and feeling” of the site, an attempt to qualify the intangible aspects of a particular site. These value considerations are most important for living cultures that continue to interact with important sites. The Document demonstrates a willingness to respect both historic and current use issues, as well as significance outside of the historically materials-focused interests of the Western/European-based World Heritage Committee.

Without providing a functional definition of “authenticity,” the Nara Document on Authenticity expands the approach to authenticity beyond the Athens and Venice Charters. The technical approach to preservation espoused by the practicing restorers

³⁹ Ibid. Article 11

⁴⁰ Ibid. Article 13

gathered for the Venice Charter has given way to the Nara Document. The framers developed it as a tool for expanding the values of collective human heritage to cultural sites that might have once been rejected for nomination to the World Heritage List.

The Nara Document was incorporated wholesale into the 2005 World Heritage Operational Guidelines in a separate annex addressing authenticity.⁴¹ Despite the broadening qualities of the Nara Document, the World Heritage Committee waited eleven years between the adoption and the incorporation into the Operational Guidelines. The Committee has never explained the reason for the lag in the incorporation of the Nara Document. During the intervening period, numerous regional meetings were held internationally, including the May 2000 Great Zimbabwe session, where the Nara Document was stressed as a new tool for understanding significance of potential sites for nomination.⁴² This gap potentially illustrates concerns by the World Heritage Committee that sites fulfilling the conditions for integrity and Outstanding Universal Value, yet lacking original materials, would displace the more traditional heritage sites.⁴³ Returning to Labadi's computational analysis of the World Heritage List nomination dossiers, of the 106 she sampled, only nine refereed to authenticity as a dynamic process, reflective of changes to a site over time.⁴⁴

Despite the lag, Nara is found in all of the following iterations of the Operational Guidelines, including the most recent version from July 2012. Section II.B of the Operational Guidelines, which addresses authenticity, incorporates the ideals espoused in

⁴¹ UNESCO. "Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention," Paris 2005, Accessed Feb 2013. p.91-95

⁴² Labadi, Sophia. "World Heritage, Authenticity, and Post-Authenticity: International and National Perspectives." In *Heritage and Globalization*, edited by Sophia Labadi and Colin Long, 66-84. New York: Routledge, 2010. p.71

⁴³ Ibid. p.72

⁴⁴ Ibid. p.75

the Nara Document, including the significance of cultural relativity as an interpretive tool for understanding non-scientific or technical aspects of authenticity connected to a site. The current version of the Operational Guidelines includes an article connected to the issues of reconstruction. According to Section II.B Article 86, “the reconstruction of archaeological remains or historic buildings or districts is justifiable only in exceptional circumstances. Reconstruction is acceptable only on the basis of complete and detailed documentation and to no extent on conjecture.”⁴⁵ While the inclusion of this addition strives to limit reconstruction as a preservation intervention, this methodology is accepted by the Operational Guidelines where accompanied by thorough research and documentation, or in the case of “exceptional circumstances,” typically interpreted as destruction caused by natural disaster or war.

Stovel’s excellent critique of the Nara Document identifies the long-term practical implications of the recommendation. Most significantly, the Nara Document eliminates what he considers the idea that authenticity is a value “in its own right,” as promoted by earlier documents such as the Venice Charter.⁴⁶ Instead, the Nara Document recognizes that authenticity is relative and this quality is transmitted to the larger human culture by “the material (form, setting, techniques) and non-material (function, use, tradition, spirit)” qualities of the site.⁴⁷ These aspects are what elevates a site, work, or monument to the category of Outstanding Universal Value. The Nara Document eliminates the idea of authenticity as an absolute, instead, consideration is relative and must be based on the values of the culture from which it originates. He considers this an “improved

⁴⁵ UNESCO. “Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention,” Paris 2012, Accessed Feb 2013. p.22

⁴⁶ Stovel, Herb. “Origins and Influence of the Nara Documents on Authenticity.” *APT Bulletin*, Vol. 39, No. 2/3 (2008), pp. 10

⁴⁷ Ibid

understanding of the importance of authenticity.”⁴⁸ The earliest attempts to promote an international conservation model developed from a shared basis of knowledge held by conservation professionals, in the case of the Venice Charter, which in turn shaped the development of the World Heritage Operational Guidelines. Although authenticity is never defined, the means of qualifying the nature of authenticity have expanded beyond the traditional materials-based interpretation.

Part V: UNESCO Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape

New models of heritage conservation are constantly being proposed and developed. On November 10, 2011, the newest non-binding “soft law” recommendation emerged from the World Heritage Committee to address urban development and the preservation of historic cities.⁴⁹ The Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape (HUL) functions as a new standard-setting instrument intended to facilitate sustainable use of urban heritage areas.⁵⁰ The Nara Document on Authenticity introduced a culture-based approach to conservation actions; the HUL Recommendation seeks to balance development and current uses of the urban environment with the historic values of the existing space.

Since the adoption of the first World Heritage Operational Guidelines in 1977, urban areas have been subjected to new developmental pressures, including explosive global population growth and urban redevelopment. Several intervening heritage conservation tools have been drafted, including the ICOMOS Charter for the

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ Bandarin, Francesco and Ron van Oers. *The Historic Urban Landscape: Managing Heritage in an Urban Century*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012. p.xiii-xvi

⁵⁰ UNESCO. “Proposal by the Director-General for the preparation of a revised Recommendation concerning the safeguarding and contemporary roles of Historic Areas.” Accessed March 2013. p.1

Conservation of Historic Towns and Urban Areas from 1987, the adoption of the category of Cultural Landscapes in 1992, the Nara Conference on Authenticity, the European Landscape Convention (Council of Europe) in 2000, and the Convention on Intangible Heritage in 2003. There has emerged a need to regulate development and modernization in historic urban areas, “while at the same time preserving the values embedded in inherited urban landscapes.”⁵¹

Although the international documents addressed at the beginning of this chapter have been examined for their discussion of authenticity, there are significant considerations of the urban environment. The 1964 Venice Charter in Article One emphasizes that conservation cannot only preserve individual monuments, but must include urban and rural settings of cultural activity. Additionally, the 1977 World Heritage Operational Guidelines in Annex Three, paragraph 14 includes urban areas as a “group of buildings,” constituting a class of structures that can be nominated to the World Heritage List. Historic cities are generally listed in three categories: towns no longer inhabited, inhabited historic towns, and new towns of the twentieth century.⁵² While historic urban areas constitute a full third of the sites on the World Heritage List, designation does not provide a methodology for ensuring the conservation of these types of sites in the future.

Sustainable development is the guiding principle of the HUL Recommendation, but the policy has been shaped by the proceeding heritage conservation documents. The World Heritage Committee recognized that the latter half of twentieth century was marked by mass human migration to urban areas “resulting in social fragmentation and

⁵¹ Ibid. p.2

⁵² Bandarin, Francesco and Ron van Oers. *The Historic Urban Landscape: Managing Heritage in an Urban Century*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012. p.40-41

deterioration of the quality of the urban environment.”⁵³ The “historic urban landscape” is an “urban area understood as the result of a historic layering of cultural and natural values and attributes.”⁵⁴ Broadly, this definition recognizes the interplay of the geographical, cultural, and historical qualities of the urban area, and the need to preserve the quality of the environment for continued social and economic development. In order to preserve the unique qualities of each urban area, the Committee recommended that each state party rely on extant tools, especially urban planning policies to protect these sensitive urban spaces.

Mirroring the advances of the Nara Document on Authenticity, the HUL recommendation emphasizes the individual cultural basis for conservation of urban areas. While the World Heritage List serves to identify sites of Outstanding Universal Value, local communities provide the strongest impetus for conservation of traditions.⁵⁵ The Recommendation is in the earliest stages of implementation, but encourages the use of several critical tools for conservation activities, including undertaking comprehensive surveys of the urban resources, using participatory planning to determine what values to protect for transmission to future generations, assessments of socio-economic and environmental stresses, and integrating heritage values into city development through educational programming, regulatory systems, and financial tools.⁵⁶

The new paradigm for urban conservation has moved beyond freezing a historic town center in the period of significance. The Dresden case study will touch on the issue of reconstructing the Frauenkirche to the pre-World War II destruction phase, a singular

⁵³ UNESCO. “Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape, Including a Glossary of Definitions.” Updated November 11, 2011. Accessed March 2013. “Introduction, Part 2”

⁵⁴ Ibid. I. Definition, Part 8.

⁵⁵ Ibid. Part 13.

⁵⁶ UNESCO. “UNESCO Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape.” Accessed March 2013.

monument brought back to an existing state. HUL acknowledges that authenticity is critical to designation of heritage significance, but expands the approach beyond the notion of conservation of individual historic structures.⁵⁷ Instead, the recommendation recognizes the existence of urban transformation as a critical component of authenticity. Conservation of the urban environment cannot be limited to the nomination of individual historic districts. Cities are defined by their layers of significance and change over time, therefore urban planners must begin to understand that preservation actions must not be bound to the false separation of the historic urban center and potential for new development.

Ultimately, HUL expands and introduces a new flexibility in the approach to authenticity in the urban area. New development and changes to cities are not inherently negative; they reflect changes in population and growth over time. The rapid global expansion of cities at the end of the twentieth century marked the moment for a new approach to urban conservation action. As cities continue to change and develop, the concept of authenticity has needed to expand to reflect the dynamic character of the urban environment. Rather than stifling urban growth by limiting change, a model promoted in the Athens and Venice Charters, HUL will ideally shift urban planning towards recognizing the interplay of various stakeholders' priorities.⁵⁸ Moving into the twenty-first century, cultural preservation is not a stagnant set of policies, but has emerged as a delicate balance between socio-economic development and conservation actions. As the newest heritage standard-setting instrument, the impacts of HUL have yet to be determined. The qualities of the "soft-law" implementation, relying on individual

⁵⁷ Bandarin, Francesco and Ron van Oers. *The Historic Urban Landscape: Managing Heritage in an Urban Century*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012. p.68

⁵⁸ Ibid. p.111

national policies already in place, will continue to redefine the approaches to authenticity as conservation expands from a focus on small collections of buildings to the larger, more comprehensive urban environment.

The five documents explored in this chapter provide the core of international heritage preservation actions. The Athens Charter, Venice Charter, and 1977 Operational Guidelines have been selected for their key role in framing discussions and the practical application of preservation during the twentieth century. These documents set the stage for the development of the preservation field on the global scale. The following chapter will address the preservation legislation developed by the United States federal government during the same period. Beginning with the earliest heritage laws in the United States, preservation encourages the protection of historic sites to conserve original materials. Dealing with an individual nation's preservation policies, the legislation addresses the functional practicalities of preservation beyond the broad theoretical values promoted by international discussion.

Chapter 3: National (United States) Frameworks

Preservation legislation within the United States, based on the early international charters, is dominated by the same materials-focused approach. The two documents central to the discussion of reconstruction in the United States are the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 and the Secretary of Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation. The development of frameworks for conservation actions in the United States is directly shaped by the 250-year history of the nation and the types of sites present in the country, including Native American cultural sites, colonial-era historic properties, and a range of cultural sites developed through the present day. Preservation of historic properties, the topic of this paper, developed as a way of ensuring the longevity of tangible resources connected to nation building.

The laws and statutes that will be explored in this section are both influenced by and proceed to influence the international charters that developed out of professional meetings conducted in Europe during the twentieth century. The American federal preservation policies demonstrate an obvious emphasis on conservation of original material and clear differentiation between new and historic materials and construction practices. This material-centric focus continues today to serve as the core component of the legal preservation mechanisms. Furthermore, this section will address the use of federal preservation tools. Each state and region has local preservation policies to address preservation actions within those communities, which will not be discussed during the case study analysis. Generally, state, regional, and local laws across the United States are modeled on the federal policies, adopting a number of similar measures from the

bureaucratic breakdown to the tools for assigning significance of historic sites. Despite the wide scale of these federal tools, they do provide more comprehensive directives than the broadly stated international policies; as such, this content of this section will address many of the actual tools used by practicing preservationists within the United States.

Part I: National Historic Preservation Act of 1966

The critical document for any discussion of preservation in the United States is the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. The Act serves as an example of legislation undertaken by an individual nation to implement the preservation and conservation ideals broadly stated in the Athens and Venice Charters.⁵⁹

Reflecting on the Act almost 50 years later, it established criteria for an official register of properties, a formal process to address the demolition and alteration of a historic property, and created tools to limit the destruction of significant sites. The Act put into place several frameworks that serve as a foundation for the discussion of reconstruction of historic sites. These preservation tools include the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), the official listing of national sites approved for preservation (including buildings, sites, and districts), and the Section 106 Review, used to evaluate the effect federal undertakings may have on a resource that may be eligible for inclusion on the NRHP. In addition to these aspects, the Act also established State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPOs), which oversee and approve interventions to historic resources on a state-by-state basis, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation

⁵⁹ Significant proceeding historic preservation legislation includes the Antiquities Act of 1906, the National Park Service Act of 1916, the Historic Sites Act of 1935. More information is available from the National Park Service at <http://www.nps.gov/history/history/hisnps/fhpl.htm>.

(ACHP), a committee that promotes preservation at the federal level by serving as the premier council to the president and Congress.

The National Historic Preservation Act established the National Register of Historic Places used to identify and protect sites that are deemed significant enough for preservation action.⁶⁰ The National Park Service oversees this list. For a site to be included on the Register, it must be nominated. This process involves completion of a nomination form, which includes information about the location, history, physical appearance of the building or site, and the designation of significance. The nomination is reviewed by the State Historic Preservation Office, which in turn forwards the nominations to the National Park Service. The National Park Service makes the final decision regarding a historic property proposed for nomination.

Properties are nominated under four criteria points, which reflect the evolving nature of historic preservation from a significant person-based approach to a more inclusive process that recognizes that sites may have a range of complex values. According to the statute text, sites are eligible for nomination when

“[t]he quality of significance in American history, architecture, archeology, engineering, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and: A. That are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or B. That are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or C. That embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may

⁶⁰ It should be noted, the National Register only addresses properties that are of national significance, state and local governments may maintain their own lists of noteworthy properties that may not bear importance on the national scale.

lack individual distinction; or D. That have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.”⁶¹

The nomination criteria for the National Register of Historic Places reflect the early emphasis on significant personages and events, recognized by Criteria A and B. Criterion C addresses the material interest in architecture and historic sites by serving as a category for preservation connected to aesthetic and historic values of historic resources. The final Criterion, D, is most commonly used to preserve archaeological sites, including associated artifacts and features underground that have the potential to provide information. Many historic sites within the United States are nominated under several, if not all, of the Criteria.

The text also includes an additional seven (a. – g.) “Criteria Considerations” for properties that may be typically excluded from nomination, including

“cemeteries, birthplaces, or graves of historical figures, properties owned by religious institutions or used for religious purposes, **structures that have been moved from their original locations, reconstructed historic buildings**, properties primarily commemorative in nature, and properties that have achieved significance within the past 50 years.”^{62,63}

These exceptions are significant because they provide for some flexibility within the nomination process, allowing for the recognition of outstanding sites that for other reasons could potentially be excluded.

The NHPA put into action a key legislative tool for the protection of historic sites, the Section 106 Review. The review is was created to evaluate the various effects that any federal or federally assisted undertaking may have on a district, site, building, etc.

⁶¹ National Park Service. “National Register Bulletin: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation.” Revised for Internet 1995, Accessed Feb 2013. p.2

⁶² National Park Service. “National Register Bulletin: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation.” Revised for Internet 1995, Accessed Feb 2013. p.2

⁶³ Emphasis, author’s own

that is either included or eligible to be included on the National Register of Historic Places. Any form of intervention to these resources that receive federal are required to undergo a Section 106 Review. The review serves to minimize potential damage to national historic resources by halting interventions before they can irreparably alter a site.

This multi-step procedure begins with identifying any sites that may be impacted by an “undertaking”, assessing possible adverse effects to the site, and resolving the potential effects through a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA). The SHPO will review the identification of sites and from that point, determine if the proposed project requires modification to protect the historic sites. If the effects of an undertaking cannot be resolved, the SHPO or ACHP may recommend that the undertaking not be approved. Although Section 106 is a federal process, a number of SHPOS base their review procedures on this model to encourage critical evaluation of undertakings. The Lower East Side Tenement Museum is included on the NRHP and has received federal funding for various projects. As a museum institution with authentic historic resources, the planning phases of the museum have been subjected to in-depth Section 106 Review procedures. The institution has experienced a range of complex discussions, presenting the need for both major and minor undertakings and interpretive interventions into the historic resources. The Section 106 Review, while a core tool in preservation, presents a lengthy bureaucratic challenge to the creation of a conserved or restored historic property.

The National Historic Preservation Act established a battery of tools for preservation actions in the United States. Setting the groundwork for historic and cultural preservation, it encourages critical evaluation of the historic environment through the

Section 106 Review and provides and means for broadly determining significance of sites through the NRHP. As a national policy, the Act is enforceable and carries penalties for ignoring the policies. Demonstrated by this brief examination, the National Historic Preservation Act draws from the Athens and Venice Charters to emphasize conservation of the built environment. The Act accomplishes these goals by establishing a number of review processes and tools to qualify significance of properties, through the NRHP nomination and the Section 106 Review.

Part II: Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation

The primary document that addresses conservation interventions to historic resources in the United States is the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation. This code provides detailed definitions of various interventions, as well as a hierarchical ordering of appropriateness of interventions to historic buildings and sites. The Standards emerged as part of the U.S. Tax Reform Act of 1976. This Act introduced a number of federal tax incentives to promote historic preservation by incentivizing rehabilitation and restoration of historic structures in urban areas. To ensure that restoration work was undertaken in a manner that qualified for the new incentivized tax credits or reductions, the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation were introduced. These Standards have served as the basis for discussion of various interventions to historic resources, and continue to shape the process of historic preservation and conservation actions to this day.

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards are, like most of the preservation policies addresses in this paper, based on the early conservation principles of the Athens

and Venice Charters and grounded in the practicalities of working with and conserving historic resources for a future audience. The four treatment categories addressed by the Standards are preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, and reconstruction, ranked from the least to most invasive.

The Tax Reform Act encouraged participation in preservation by several atypical groups. The surplus of available open space in the United States has always encouraged new development over the conservation of old, outdated buildings. Real estate developers, commercial property owners, and other entrepreneurs who might normally purchase a historic resource with the intention of redeveloping the property for profit were presented with financial incentives to maintain older buildings. The Federal government developed the Standards to prevent unscrupulous improvement plans or modifications that might threaten the defining features of a historic building. These guidelines provide a detailed, technical description of acceptable improvements and interventions to a historic resource. The new system of government oversight of historic projects was matched by an increase in preservation actions at the federal, state, and local levels.⁶⁴

The Standards promote what are deemed “responsible preservation practices,” intended to protect the “Nation’s irreplaceable cultural resources” by presenting a philosophical and practical grounding for conservation work.⁶⁵ The document opens with a discussion of the intent of the Standards,

“to set forth standards for the treatment of historic properties containing standards for preservation, rehabilitation, restoration and reconstruction... to all proposed grant-in-aid development projects assisted through the

⁶⁴ Ibid.

⁶⁵ National Park Service. “Introduction to Standards and Guidelines: Choosing an Appropriate Treatment for the Historic Building.” Accessed Feb. 2013.

National Historic Preservation Fund... when property owners are seeking certification for Federal tax benefits,”

a reference to the hierarchy of treatment interventions mentioned at the beginning of this section.⁶⁶ The Standards includes definitions of each term, providing a detailed discussion of each treatment option, ranking them in order from the least impact to the most impact on a historic resource.

Preservation, the first treatment, “means the act or process of applying measures necessary to sustain the existing form, integrity and materials of an historic property.”⁶⁷ Although unstated, authenticity here is prized in the form of the original materials of the historic building. The intent of this treatment methodology is to limit the intervention to the site in order to retain the greatest amount of historic fabric.⁶⁸ This type of treatment reflects the life of the building over time, and is respectful to changes and alterations that made, presenting a diachronic view of the site. Preservation includes eight distinct standards, emphasizing retention of fabric, reversibility of treatments, and stabilization, protection, and maintenance of the resource over major structural intervention.⁶⁹

Rehabilitation is the second treatment methodology promoted by the Standards, refers to “the act or process of making possible an efficient compatible use for a property through repair, alterations and additions while preserving those portions or features that

⁶⁶ National Park Service. “The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for The Treatment of Historic Properties (68.2 Part 68).” Accessed Feb. 2013. 68.1 Intent

⁶⁷ Ibid 68.2.a Definitions: Preservation

⁶⁸ Mills, Michael J. “Design in Preservation Projects,” in *Design & Historic Preservation: The Challenge of Compatibility*, edited by David Ames and Richard Wagner, 3-16. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2009.

⁶⁹ More information, including the complete text of the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, case studies, and in depth discussion of the practical application of each methodology is available through the National Park Service at http://www.nps.gov/hps/tps/standguide/preserve/preserve_index.htm

convey its historical, cultural or architectural values.”⁷⁰ This treatment emphasizes the retention and repair of original materials, with special consideration for replacement or alteration to features where necessary to ensure that the historic value of the resource is retained.⁷¹

Restoration, the second most involved treatment process, “means the act or process of accurately depicting the form, features and character of a property as it appeared at a particular period of time by means of the removal of features from other periods in its history and reconstruction of missing features from the restoration period.”⁷² This process addresses one of the most common forms of preservation in the United States, the presentation of a historic resource at a particular moment in time. To achieve this state, incompatible period features of the historic resource are removed to present a version of the site as it may have appeared during a specific point in time, based on extensive documentary and physical research.⁷³ Reflecting the ideas of the earlier international charters, any new work, while executed relying on construction techniques and craftsmanship characterized by the restoration period, must be physically and visually compatible and distinguishable from the original material. Restoration is the most complicated preservation treatment, incorporating removal and destruction of historic fabric, sacrificing material authenticity in order to present a comprehensive version of the historic period of significance.

⁷⁰ National Park Service. “The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for The Treatment of Historic Properties (68.2 Part 68).” Accessed Feb. 2013 68.2.b Definitions: Rehabilitation

⁷¹ National Park Service. “Introduction to Standards and Guidelines: Rehabilitation” Accessed Feb. 2013

⁷² National Park Service. “The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for The Treatment of Historic Properties (68.2 Part 68).” Accessed Feb. 2013 68.2.c Definitions: Restoration

⁷³ National Park Service. “Introduction to Standards and Guidelines: Restoration” Accessed Feb. 2013

The final treatment is reconstruction, “the act or process of depicting, by means of new construction, the form, features and detailing of a non-surviving site, landscape, building, structure or object for the purpose of replicating its appearance at a specific period of time and in its historic location.”⁷⁴ This intervention retains the least authenticity of the historic materials because the reconstruction is based on documentary evidence using modern material to represent a particular period in history.⁷⁵ Any reconstruction should limit conjecture, relying on the documentary and physical evidence present, especially information yielded by archaeological investigations of a site. The reconstruction must preserve any remaining historic materials and ensure the maintenance of spatial relationships between the features. Returning to the concepts espoused by the international charters, the reconstruction must be clearly identified as a contemporary recreation.⁷⁶

The majority of treatment plans for the restoration of historic resources implement a combination of the four treatment options. The hierarchical rankings promote the conservation of original material above all other considerations, illustrating the materials-centric slant in American preservation methodologies. The case studies presented will demonstrate the challenges of working within these frameworks, and the need to analyze the unique needs of each site as part of the preservation planning process. Even within a single site, different projects may require a variety of treatment options, incorporating standards policies from multiple intervention procedures.

⁷⁴ National Park Service. “The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for The Treatment of Historic Properties (68.2 Part 68).” Accessed Feb. 2013 68.2.d Definitions: Reconstruction

⁷⁵ Mills, Michael J. “Design in Preservation Projects,” in *Design & Historic Preservation: The Challenge of Compatibility*, edited by David Ames and Richard Wagner, 3-16. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2009. p.8-9

⁷⁶ National Park Service. “Introduction to Standards and Guidelines: Reconstruction” Accessed Feb. 2013

One additional consideration raised by the later amendments to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards is the challenge of ensuring that historic sites meet current accessibility, health, and safety codes. The Lower East Side Tenement Museum case study presents a museum space, a unique facility that handles large numbers of the public. As part of the planning process, it crucial to assess the potential impacts that retrofitting for accessibility, energy efficiency, and other codes would present to the historic site. Three federal laws address accessibility considerations for historic structures: the Architectural Barriers Act of 1968, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990.⁷⁷ For some resources, especially historic sites that function as public museums, modifications must be implemented to ensure compliance with the current accessibility code requirements. Ideally, updates to the structure should be carefully planned to ensure that there is limited loss of the "character-defining spaces, features, and finishes," limiting the impact to the historic resources as much as possible.⁷⁸ Certain historic resources may be exempt from these code requirements if the intervention will severely compromise the original materials and integrity of the site.

Similar to the accessibility requirements, health and safety considerations require extensive discussion regarding the impact on a historic resource. Current health and safety codes include a broad range of considerations: public health, occupational health, life safety, fire safety, electrical, seismic, structural, and building codes.⁷⁹ Again, special

⁷⁷ National Park Service. "Introduction to Standards and Guidelines: Accessibility Considerations" Accessed Feb. 2013

⁷⁸ Ibid.

⁷⁹ National Park Service. "Introduction to Standards and Guidelines: Health and Safety Considerations" Accessed Feb. 2013

exemptions and variances may be made for historic structures, but those discussions occur on the state, county, or municipal level during the project-planning phase to ensure that the character-defining qualities of the historic site are maintained in a compatible manner.

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards are the most comprehensive preservation guidelines for practical conservation work. As a component of the Tax Reform Act of 1976, it served to provide a basic framework for four types of conservation actions, encouraging the retention of historic American resources in areas that might be redeveloped. As a set of guidelines for project planning and preservation actions, the Standards elucidate a half century of conservation theory while providing a functional tool for practitioners in the field of historic preservation. The Standards demonstrate a materials-based focus, yet includes enough flexibility within the actual guidelines to ensure the most appropriate treatment is selected for the intended work. Furthermore, the document provides the most comprehensive set of definitions for various treatments options, improving the technical apparatus for federal involvement in the preservation process.

The United States' federal preservation program, effectively cobbled together from a variety of federal programs ranging from tax codes to subsections of other legislation to specific acts implemented with the goal conserving national historic resources, illuminates the complexities of translating international preservation policy into a practical set of tools for managing the goals of cultural heritage conservation. Several key conclusions can be drawn from the discussion of American federal preservation legislation. First, all decisions regarding preservation interventions to a site

must be made on an individual basis. Although the Secretary of the Interior's Standards provide a thorough set of guidelines for preservation, discussions during the planning phase must address the proposed use of the space, financial resources available for preservation, and the need to adapt to modern code requirements. Second, preservation actions in the United States have been promoted through incentivized tax-based programs. Preservation is viewed by some as an inherently financially counterproductive process, to combat this mentality, the Tax Reform Act of 1976 introduced preservation to a new market. Finally, designation of significance and listing on the National Register of Historic Places is a complex, bureaucratic-laden process, yet listing opens new opportunities for conservation actions and public awareness of the significance of our historic resources. The following case study will illustrate the challenges of implementing these federal frameworks, where the most invasive forms of conservation have been required to allow a public audience to fully experience an authentic encounter with a historic resource.

Chapter 4: Case Studies

Part I: The Lower East Side Tenement Museum

The Lower East Side Tenement Museum (Tenement Museum) at 97 Orchard Street is housed within a historic tenement building dating from 1863 in the Lower East Side neighborhood of Manhattan. Now a rapidly gentrifying tourist destination, the district was once *the* center for recent European immigrants between the late nineteenth and the early twentieth centuries. Officially opened in 1992, the museum interprets the history of immigration on the Lower East Side specifically, and to the United States more broadly, through the lens of the physical spaces of the 150-year-old apartment building. The desire of the museum founders Ruth Abram and Anita Jacobson to use the actual building at 97 Orchard as a pedagogical tool presented a number of unique conservation issues prior to the official opening.

Created in the early 1990s, the museum reflects the impact of the preservation framework tools addressed in the opening chapters of this paper. The broadly stated ideals of the Athens and Venice Charters, written by practicing conservators, are embodied here by the U.S. federal tools used to evaluate appropriateness of the preservation interventions. The two tools applied over the course of the development of the Tenement Museum are the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, serving as a guideline for preservation decision-making, and the NHPA Section 106 Review, used to ensure that the changes made to the building are acceptable. As a site included on the National Register of Historic Places as of 1992, any decision that affects the historic fabric of the building, no matter how minor, requires a Section 106 Review

and critical cost-benefit analysis regarding the potential destruction of existing historic elements in order to produce a reconstructed space central to the educational mission of the museum.

Programming at the museum has developed around the unique opportunity to step inside a historic tenement, balancing the visitors' movement through "archaeological ruin spaces" and period apartments, reconstructed to reflect a particular moment in time. The management of the site adopts two core approaches derived from the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, preservation and reconstruction combined with restoration, the least and most invasive treatment methodologies.

The original use of the building, tenement housing, was abandoned in 1935 when 97 Orchard no longer met the housing codes; today, it functions as a museum with extensive public access. Conservation interventions have been implemented throughout the entire building. Prior to providing access to the public, the entire architectural envelope of the building needed to be reinforced to accommodate a large number of museum patrons moving through 97 Orchard. In the conserved ruin spaces, where the friable elements of the apartments, including plaster, wallpaper, paint, and floorcoverings, would be exposed to visitors; measures were taken to prevent additional loss of material.

As Germans fled the 1848 March Revolution, brought on by crop failure, cholera epidemics, and general unrest following political reorganization of the German states, massive waves of German immigrants came into New York.⁸⁰ Only 15 years later,

⁸⁰ Dolkart, Andrew S. *Biography of a Tenement House in New York City: An Architectural History of 97 Orchard Street*. Santa Fe: The Center for American Places, 2007. p.7-14, for further discussion of the development of Lower Manhattan proceeding this period, see chapters 1 and 2. The building tours and

Kleindeutschland was home to the third largest German-speaking population in the world, behind Berlin and Vienna.⁸¹ In the early 1860s Lukas Glockner, a Prussian tailor, purchased the 25 by 87 foot lot at 97 Orchard. Providing inexpensive housing became an effective way for settled immigrants to turn a profit. Glockner, realizing the financial potentials his fellow citizens offered, built the five-story brick tenement that still exists at 97 Orchard. As examples of vernacular architecture, each tenement on the Lower East Side is slightly different, including a range of finishings, architectural moldings, and interior ornamentation. 97 Orchard stands as fine example of this nineteenth century building model found throughout New York City and other American urban centers.

The tenement was occupied from 1863 to 1935, when mandated New York City fire code updates became too expensive to implement. During this 72-year period, almost 7,000 immigrants lived in the apartments.⁸² This type of tenement served as one of the first homes for most immigrants, a brief stopping point for several weeks or months, before new opportunities presented themselves to improve the general quality of life. In 1935, many tenement owners in this area evicted residents and continued to rent out the storefronts on the first floor.⁸³ The upper floors were boarded up while the storefronts continued operate in order to generate a profit.⁸⁴

The founding of the museum in the late 1980s began as a joint project between Ruth Abram and Anita Jacobson to develop a space to explore the history of America's

neighborhood walking tours that comprise the LESTM programming provide an excellent discussion of the background of the building and surrounding area.

⁸¹ Ibid.

⁸² Ibid.

⁸³ Although no longer approved for human habitation, the storeowners used the apartments as additional storerooms.

⁸⁴ The newest installation at the Tenement Museum is the "Shop Life" building tour, which profiles economic and consumer activities on the Lower East Side through the tales of shop owners at 97 Orchard from the initial construction up until the current use of the building as a museum space.

immigrants. In 1988, Abram and Jacobsen rented the storefront of 97 Orchard as a permanent location for their museum, using it as a center from which to base walking tours of the Lower East Side. Abram and Jacobsen's stated goal for the museum was

“not to restore the building to reflect conditions at one specific time, but to explore the experiences of many different immigrant groups over the entire period of the building's occupancy and to relate these experiences of the past with contemporary immigrant issues...to promote tolerance and historical perspective through the presentation and interpretation of a variety of experiences.”⁸⁵

A grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities in 1991 provided the opportunity to use the building itself as the vital feature in presenting the history of immigration.⁸⁶ The building is the key artifact in the museum collection, the centerpiece of all activity and programming. The first historic apartments were opened to the public in 1994 and 97 Orchard was officially purchased in 1996 for \$750,000.⁸⁷

Prior to opening in 1992, the building faced serious structural problems, lacked a secondary means of egress from the upper floors in case of emergency evacuation, and featured narrow halls and flammable materials. In addition to these threats to public safety, there was the challenge of protecting the historic aspects of the building from visitors, including the friable layers of paint and wallpaper, peeling plaster, bulging walls, and fragile finishes.

Following the restoration of the building and the opening of the museum, 97 Orchard was added to the National Register of Historic Places on May 19, 1992. Prior to this date, any conservation and major construction projects were undertaken with the

⁸⁵ Dolkart, Andrew S. *Biography of a Tenement House in New York City: An Architectural History of 97 Orchard Street*. Santa Fe: The Center for American Places, 2007. p.114-115

⁸⁶ Ibid.

⁸⁷ Bruner Foundation. “2001 Rudy Bruner Award: Silver Medal Winner, Lower East Side Tenement Museum.” Accessed February 2013.

approval of New York municipal oversight. Two years later, on April 19, 1994, the site was officially designated as a National Historic Landmark. On November 12, 1998, 97 Orchard was designated as a National Historic Site, and recognized by Congress as an Affiliated Area of the National Park Service.^{88,89} These properties are not owned by the federal government and only receive limited assistance from the National Park Service, including some technical and financial aid. The building is owned privately by the Lower East Side Tenement Museum, but receives federal funding through the National Park Service and is subject to the historic preservation oversight similar to that of a federally managed property, including the Section 106 Review. This affiliation status provides the museum staff with considerable leeway regarding programming decisions, yet ensures that federal preservation standards are met to maintain the historic fabric of the building.

The museum hired Li-Saltzman Architects in 1988, headed by Roz Li and Judith Saltzman, to conserve the space, while balancing the challenges of updating the building where appropriate to meet modern code requirements and the museum's stated mission to explore immigration in the United States. Saltzman outlines her guiding philosophy for daunting task:

“The preservation of 97 Orchard Street is predicated on retaining the palpable sense of history contained within its walls, and on providing both the experience of the tenement as people lived there, and as it was found. To do so, it is critical to identify appropriate ways of treating the building's historic fabric. The philosophy for the treatment of 97 Orchard Street is based on several key goals: to provide safe public access to the historic resources; to respect the contributions of all periods of the site's historic significance (1863-1935); to maximize the retention of the site's

⁸⁸ Ibid.

⁸⁹ Affiliated Areas were officially created by a 1970 National Park System law as “any area of land and water now or hereafter administered by the Secretary of the Interior through the National Park Service for park, monument, historic, parkway, recreational or other purposes.” (National Park Service. “Affiliated Areas.” Accessed February 2013.)

historic character; to minimize the loss of extant historic fabric; and to integrate historic preservation with the interpretive program.”⁹⁰

The challenge of respecting the historic fabric was tempered by the need to ensure that 97 Orchard, a building once abandoned for failure to meet fire safety codes, would be a safe space for museum visitors. The various required additions to the building included a code compliant rear egress, self-closing mechanisms on doors to slow potential fire outbreaks, and a comprehensive sprinkler system throughout 97 Orchard.⁹¹ Li-Saltzman faced the question of integrating these features in an unobtrusive manner to comply with local and national preservation standards.

The conservation interventions for stabilization of the building are expensive, labor-intensive undertakings. The desire to conserve some of the apartments as found, rather than completely reconstruct every space added to the preservation challenges. Stabilization projects have been completed in several phases, undertaken either in preparation for the reconstruction of a new apartment or as weaknesses are detected in the fabric of the building. 97 Orchard, constructed of masonry and wooden elements, successfully withstood thousands of residents passing through the apartments during its operational lifetime, but the introduction of museum visitors presented new obstacles. In order to respect the original fabric of the building, the utmost care was taken to reinforce the elements invisible to the museum visitors by stabilizing the structural components of the architectural envelope. The policy of structural restoration in the museum emphasizes retaining the original material wherever possible.

⁹⁰ Dolkart, Andrew S. *Biography of a Tenement House in New York City: An Architectural History of 97 Orchard Street*. Santa Fe: The Center for American Places, 2007. p.119

⁹¹ Ibid.

While stabilization of 97 Orchard is central to any use of the space, the restored apartments serve as the focal point for the educational mission. Using the historic house museum as a model for the Tenement Museum, the restored apartments represent a moment in the life of the building when one particular family occupied the space. The layout of the apartments reflect the modifications made to tenement housing laws between the opening and condemning of the building. Therefore each reconstructed space is not only uniquely different in terms of furnishings, but there is variation in the floorplans.

The reconstructed tenement apartments are the result of extensive research into the history of the building. The initial NEH grant provided funding to develop the museum; part of that task involved researching records of permits for repairs and alterations from the New York City Department of Buildings, as well as hiring preservation architects to perform structural and finishes analyses.⁹² Planning for each apartment treatment is a lengthy process, involving analysis of finishes in the building, study of period photographs, and research into the various construction phases of the building. The restored spaces are treated to extensive documentation prior to any intervention, as proposed by all of the restoration frameworks addressed in this paper. Extraneous or inappropriate materials are removed, labeled, and placed in storage for future reference. The restored apartments are furnished with both reproduction objects and pieces from the period. The fully furnished spaces give the impression of a patina, yet are completely new fabrications, designed and decorated to suit the mission of the museum. These rooms as currently furnished never existed, but are instead recreations based on the standard historic reconstruction practices of the preservation field.

⁹² The Lower East Side Tenement Museum. "97 Orchard Street FAQ." Accessed February 2013. p.4

The theory of the stabilized ruin spaces straddles a fascinating interpretation of preservation philosophy. Stabilization has been implemented to lock the apartments in the condition at the moment of the museum's founding at the start of the 1990s. These spaces provide evidence of the last period of occupation by the residents. Maintenance and documentation are the priority goals for these interpretive apartments. To retard the surface loss, several preservation methods have been implemented. Non-reactive plastic disks are hammered into papered walls as the edge of the friable wallpaper, to mitigate curling and loss. Where plaster appears to be most fragile and detaching from the walls, modern plaster has been used to bond the crumbling plaster to the lathes, to prevent further degradation. The historic fabric prevents the introduction of a climate control system and as a result, the building is subject to wide fluctuations in temperature and humidity, both threats to fragile finishes.

One of the considerations raised in the Secretary of the Interior's Standards is the Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines. These accessibility considerations would have required measures far too drastic for the historic fabric. The very nature of 97 Orchard is restrictive, with narrow hallways and access by one central stair to the upper levels of the building. As a federally recognized historic resource, 97 Orchard was exempt from installing ADA compliant features.⁹³ The opportunity arose in 2012 to include a handicap accessible elevator that provides access to the "Shop Life" exhibit on the basement level. As NRHP property, the decision for ADA accessibility was made at the jurisdiction of the institution. The elevator, located at the rear of the building, is an isolated unit adjacent to the modern fire-stair egress. The compliant

⁹³ Department of Justice. "2010 ADA Standards for Accessibility Design." Updated September 15, 2010. Accessed February 2013. § 36.405 Alterations: Historic preservation.

elevator does not detract from the historic fabric of the building, but ensures that the museum is able to provide access to a range of patrons.

The critical discussion of authenticity associated with the Lower East Side Tenement Museum emerges from the scripted docent-led tours of the site. Educators usher visitors into a historic building, contextualizing the life of German immigrants in the neighborhood. The building is always referred to as “original” and the “ruin apartments” are referenced as “archaeological spaces.” Conserved spaces present the building as it was found, while the recreated apartments, although based on photographs of contemporary tenements, are carefully crafted representations of the past. The museum remains rooted in the early model of recreated historic houses, with a veneer of scientific authenticity presented to the audience.

Terminology wielded by the educators encourages a reading of the building as an original historic site, with minimal interventions to the ruin spaces. While 97 Orchard is a historic building in an original location, the insistence on using the vocabulary of the archaeological profession shades the discussion of authenticity associated with the site. By carefully controlling the visitor experience, the impression of the 97 Orchard taken away by the audience is that the reconstructions accurately represent the tenement experience.⁹⁴ Those who step into the unrestored spaces are encouraged to believe that have entered a time capsule from the early twentieth century. 97 Orchard, as the primary artifact and core component of the museum, is the subject of interpretation with the history of immigration layered onto the physical structure. The interpretation discourse surrounding the museum highlights buzzwords from the field of conservation without

⁹⁴ Benton, Tim and Watson, Nicola J. “Museum Practice and Heritage.” In *Understanding Heritage in Practice*, edited by Susie West. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2010. p.134

discussing the implication of the restoration treatments to the public.⁹⁵ The museum itself reflects a common approach to historic representation of the architectural environment, the reconstructed spaces based on extensive materials and period research. Questions of authenticity arise when the audience is led to believe that the ruin spaces, aside from minimal interventions, have been left as they were found.

Insistence on referring to the conserved spaces as “archaeological” ruins is one of the methods used to draw in visitors. The term carries a range of associated meanings and conveys a sense of exotic adventure for the layman visiting the museum as part of a tourist experience in Manhattan. The reconstruction process of the historic apartments is not concealed from the audience. Participants in the tours are informed that each reconstructed apartment is the product of extensive historic and architectural research. I question the continued reference to the archaeological ruin apartments as not representative of the intensive reconstruction projects at the museum. The site was nominated to the National Register as a historic property, not an archaeological site. The conservation treatment processes reflect the actions of the architect. Promoting the conserved ruin spaces as “archaeological” site promotes confusion about the role of scholarship and the choice of conservation interventions within the apartments. As a tourist destination and a key attraction within the urban fabric of the Lower East Side, the interpretation of the site presents to the visitor authenticity as the original material fabric of the building.⁹⁶ The “authentic” features of the site are presented as the selling point for visiting. Educators repeatedly emphasize the museum as a unique opportunity to step into

⁹⁵ West, Susie and McKellar, Elizabeth. “Interpretation of Heritage.” In *Understanding Heritage in Practice*, edited by Susie West. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2010. p.179

⁹⁶ Kurtz, Matthew. “Heritage and Tourism.” In *Understanding Heritage in Practice*, edited by Susie West. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2010. p.206

a historic structure, with original architectural features, without delving into a discussion of the significant modifications to the building. For more critical visitors, the information must be sought out independently. The literature associated with the museum, including Dolkart's monograph on the architectural history of 97 Orchard, the information available on the museum's own website, and sources provided by the National Park Service, address the process of reconstruction and architectural study at the museum.

The architectural interventions to the site promote the Lower East Side Tenement Museum's stated mission while presenting the unique qualities of the museum. Examined through the federal frameworks addressing authenticity in the United States, including the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Reconstruction and Rehabilitation and NHPA 1966, the museum has created a unique architectural space. As addressed earlier in this chapter, the museum was faced with updating the structure to accommodate health and safety codes for the protection of visitors, as well as stabilization intervention to preserve the physical structure of the museum. My concern is in regard to the denial of the extensive intervention program during tours. Admittedly, the tours through the space are constrained by time and the number of visitors who can be brought through the space safely. With these limitations, the programming focus is on the history of immigration to the United States, rather than the development of architectural preservation at the site.⁹⁷

97 Orchard combines a range of preservation approaches to create a hybrid conserved-reconstructed building. Ultimately, the duality of the two types of spaces reflects the changes made over time to the building, demonstrating dynamism between

⁹⁷ Within the past 6 months, an after-hours tour addressing the architectural history and conservation of the building has been introduced. The museum has recognized the interest in the architectural processes that have produced the current version of 97 Orchard and responded to this desire with the recent programming additions.

the preserved apartments and the fully furnished restored apartments. The building not only reflects the decisions of the museum management regarding programming and planning, but the preservation actions have been and continue to be directly impacted by the development of preservation legislation in the United States and internationally. The most obvious demonstrations of this influence are the Section 106 Reviews required by the SHPO under the NHPA and the value placed on conservation of original fabric over restoration and complete reconstruction. The formative preservation charters, especially the Athens and Venice Charters, continue to influence the preservation field, emphasizing retention of original fabric, use of modern materials where appropriate, when possible ensuring the reversibility of treatment (impossible in the reconstructed apartments of the museum), use of period-appropriate construction practices, and clear demarcation of the modern materials and historic fabric of the resource.

The development of the Lower East Side Tenement Museum embodies the contemporary models of preservation philosophy, especially those championed by the Nara Document on Authenticity. As explored in the earlier chapters, the Nara Document encourages recognition of the intangible aspects of a place, including the spirit and feeling of the site. The reconstructed spaces of the Tenement Museum, in conjunction with the archaeological ruins, create a unique environment in which it is possible to discuss immigration. The official recognition of the value of the site through the NRHP listing ensures federal attention during the planning process and encourages additional tourism, but also locks any reconstruction into the federal preservation mechanisms. The museum, as a partially reconstructed historic property contributes to the surrounding district in a distinctive manner. While the Lower East Side neighborhood continues to

change and erases the history of immigration, the museum functions as a place of public engagement, not only with the themes addressed by the mission of the museum, but with an authentic historic space. The retention of the historic fabric is one of the critical considerations during the various planning phases of the museum, further reinforcing the awareness of the unique nature of this particular site. Situated in a changing urban landscape, 97 Orchard serves not only as a reminder of the recent past, but emerges as a standard for historic treatment options in a site of national value.

Part II: International Case Studies

Section 1: Ise Temple Complex

The Ise temple complex of Japan spurred a series of changes in the way traditional craftsmanship skills are viewed as part of an authentic architectural monument. The passage of the Nara Document on Authenticity marked a critical change to the preservation approach for sites that challenge the early nineteenth century preservation paradigm. Ise is located in the Mie Prefecture on the island of Honshu, the largest island in the Japanese archipelago. Ise Jingu, the Grand Shrine of Ise in the Mie prefecture, consists of two main shrines, the inner Naiku and the outer Geku, and 14 auxiliary shrine buildings. The site encompasses 65 wooden buildings, plus numerous bridges and fences.⁹⁸ The complex is considered the most sacred place in the Shinto religion, and is characterized by a unique cyclical rebuilding program with completely new materials. Nara is the cult center of the solar goddess Amaterasu-ōmikami, who is considered the ancestor of the imperial family. The site houses an ancient mirror and

⁹⁸ Bock, Felicia G. "The Rites of Renewal at Ise." *Monumenta Nipponica*, Vol. 29, No. 1 (Spring, 1974) p.58

other objects sacred to the solar deity, religious implements that reinforce the significance of the site.⁹⁹

The wooden shrines are reconstructed on a vicennial cycle, in a practice known as *shikinen sengu*.¹⁰⁰ The *sengu* tradition developed out of several different practices that have coalesced into the massive twenty-year rebuilding projects. The earliest building practices erected temporary shrines for festivals that were demolished at the end of the festival rites.¹⁰¹ As festivals expanded over the course of several days, the shrines were left in place for longer stretches of time. The environmental conditions of the sacred groves are not conducive to wooden structures, as the shrines were left in position for longer periods, the upright beams placed directly in the moist soil began to rot and needed to be replaced. In addition to these environmental considerations, large-scale damage by fires or typhoons necessitated reconstruction.¹⁰² In 735 CE, the Imperial family mandated the first officially recorded reconstruction of the site, although the oral testimony places the reconstructions during the period of the mythical “Age of the Gods”, around the 4th century CE.¹⁰³ One argument for the vicennial cycle as the length of time between reconstructions is that during the early historical periods of Japan, generations lasted about 20 years. This span of time would have allowed for the training of new craftsmen and the transfer of shrine architectural knowledge.¹⁰⁴

⁹⁹ Watanabe, Yasutada. *Shinto Art: Ise and Izumo Shrines*. Translated by Robert Ricketts. New York: Weatherhill, 1974. p.27

¹⁰⁰ Ibid. p.29

¹⁰¹ Bock, Felicia G. “The Rites of Renewal at Ise.” *Monumenta Nipponica*, Vol. 29, No. 1 (Spring, 1974) p.55

¹⁰² Ibid. p.56

¹⁰³ Watanabe, Yasutada. *Shinto Art: Ise and Izumo Shrines*. Translated by Robert Ricketts. New York: Weatherhill, 1974. p.23 A period when gods and humans coexisted in Japan.

¹⁰⁴ Bock, Felicia G. “The Rites of Renewal at Ise.” *Monumenta Nipponica*, Vol. 29, No. 1 (Spring, 1974) p.57

The reconstruction of the Ise shrine complex, according to specifically mandated construction techniques, perpetuates the early religious architectural forms. Japanese architectural historians frequently cite the Ise complex as the one site in Japan that is most closely connected to the original types of Shinto shrine architecture.¹⁰⁵ Historically, carpenters and laborers on the site were conscripted from surrounding villages and trained on site.¹⁰⁶ For the past century, the selection of architects and carpenters involved in the rebuilding ceremonies has been exceptionally rigorous. The carpenters must already be successful and demonstrate their functional knowledge of the required skills for shrine construction.¹⁰⁷ Workers are specially selected to represent every region of Japan; demonstrating the cultural and national significance of the reconstruction process, over regional importance. In addition, every worker wears white, a color sacred in the Shinto religion. Normally, white is not worn on a construction site, further emphasizing this practice as religious in nature, connecting the practice to the non-material values addressed by the Nara Document, including use, spirit, and feeling associated with a significant site.¹⁰⁸

According to the principles outlined by the Athens Charter, Venice Charter, and the earliest iteration of the World Heritage Convention's Operational Guidelines, the reconstruction of Ise with completely new material challenges the preconceived Western notion of authenticity of an architectural site. The authenticity and historic qualities of the site are not in the physical buildings themselves, but manifested through the continuation

¹⁰⁵ For more information, see: Tange, Kenzo and Noboru Kawazoe. *Ise: Prototype of Japanese Architecture*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: M.I.T. Press, 1965.

¹⁰⁶ Adams, Cassandra. "Japan's Ise Shrine and Its Thirteen-Hundred-Year-Old Reconstruction Tradition." *Journal of Architectural Education*, Vol. 52, No. 1 (Sep., 1998) p.52

¹⁰⁷ Ibid.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid.

of the traditional architectural skills. The reconstruction process is an active component of the religious ceremonies. Normally, sites that feature extensive reconstruction or rebuilding exclude them from consideration for World Heritage designation, because the modern changes and adaptations of the site are not representative of the original structure. Despite the physical reconstruction of Ise, the preservation of the architectural knowledge sets marks a transition to what Herb Stovel, a Canadian heritage conservation expert (referenced in Chapter 2), argues is a new approach to interpretation of authenticity as a culturally relative quality, not bound by attempts to characterize a static, universal value.¹⁰⁹ Ise is notable because it bridges the concepts of both tangible and intangible through the Shine as the significant object. The Shrine buildings function as the identifiable object, but the skill sets required to rebuild the shrines are considered the authentic aspect of the historic site by the Shinto practitioners themselves.

Section 2: Dresden Frauenkirche and Elbe River Valley

Much like the Ise shrine complex, the site of the Frauenkirche in Dresden, the capital of the state of Saxony in Germany, also challenges the notion that the retention of the original structure is required for consideration of historic architectural authenticity. The Frauenkirche represents the changing religious traditions, such as the introduction of Protestantism, within the city of Dresden. An earlier Frauenkirche church was first built outside the city walls during the 11th century, functioning as an urban religious center. By 1726, the historic center of the city had developed around the church, but the church building was too small for the population. The city of Dresden approved the demolition of the building and commissioned a new church.

¹⁰⁹ Stovel, Herb. "Origins and Influence of the Nara Documents on Authenticity." *APT Bulletin*, Vol. 39, No. 2/3 (2008), pp. 10

George Bahr, the official city architect of Dresden designed the new building, which included a number of features that emphasized the Protestant qualities of the structure. The Frauenkirche was completed in 1743, despite Bahr's death in 1738. The new elements of this Protestant church included shifting the key sacred zones of the church, such as the altar, pulpit, and baptismal font, to a central area directly in front of the enlarged space for the growing congregation.¹¹⁰ The central area allowed over 3,000 people to gather, and the acoustic plan of the central dome allowed the voice of the preacher to reach everyone gathered in the church. The 96 meter high, 12,000-ton dome, known as the *Steinerne Glocke* or "Stone Bell", was the most distinctive element of the structure, dominating the skyline of the city.¹¹¹ The church was eventually considered the most important structure to the Lutheran faith, with its massive space and overpowering beauty. The Frauenkirche actually came to embody the ideals of the Lutheran practitioners, such as the role of the community in major decision-making, as represented by the appointment of a Dresden architect to oversee the project, as well as the tolerance of other faiths, as represented by the Frauenkirche's proximity to other non-Protestant church buildings.¹¹² Eventually, the city of Dresden adopted the Frauenkirche as the official symbol of Dresden. The dome rose up as one approached the city, and all subsequent architectural projects were encouraged to adopt the monumental, yet still elegant and light qualities of the church.¹¹³

The Frauenkirche, which had come to represent the beauty and architectural wealth of the city, also became one of the targets of the Allied incendiary bombing

¹¹⁰ Jager, W. and C.A. Brebbia, ed. *The Revival of Dresden*. Southampton: WIT Press, 2000. Jaeger, H.-J. "The citizens' initiative to promote the rebuilding of the Frauenkirche in Dresden." p.146.

¹¹¹ Ibid.

¹¹² Ibid.

¹¹³ Ibid. p.153

between February 13 and 15 of 1945. In order to end World War II, American and British troops firebombed Dresden, a primarily civilian city. There is still much discussion over the issue of bombing a civilian city with numerous cultural landmarks. The American and British forces cited the fact that Dresden, as an industrial city, produced specialized parts for precision military resources, such as tanks and U-boats. By bombing these industrial centers, the Allies supposedly shortened the length of the war.¹¹⁴ Reports made in October of 1945 indicate that about 25,000 people perished over the course of eight air raids between October 7, 1944 and April 17, 1945.¹¹⁵ The number of deaths was so high because the bombings resulted in massive fires that engulfed the city center and the residential neighborhoods. Over 40% of the housing units in the city were destroyed, 17 of the 19 “points of interest” from historic guidebooks (including art galleries, museums, botanical gardens, and libraries), all five theaters and opera houses, 24 banks, 31 major department stores, 57 large hotels and famous restaurants, 19 movie theaters, and 25 churches and chapels, including the Frauenkirche.¹¹⁶ The church withstood the bombing itself, but the intense heat from the raging fires caused the building to explode on the morning of February 15, scattering stone and materials from the structure.¹¹⁷

After the war, Dresden fell under the control of the Soviets in East Germany. Lacking economic stability, and cut off from the resources of West Germany, living conditions in the city steadily worsened. The site of the Frauenkirche and many of the culturally significant sites in Dresden, including the *Zwinger* art gallery, the *Johanneum* historical museum, the Museum for Animal Science, the Museum for Ethnology, the

¹¹⁴ Jager, W. and C.A. Brebbia, ed. *The Revival of Dresden*. Southampton: WIT Press, 2000. Reichert, F. “The destruction of Dresden.” p.4

¹¹⁵ Ibid. p.5-8

¹¹⁶ Ibid. p.10-13

¹¹⁷ Ibid.

Botanical Garden, the National Arts and Crafts Museum, the *Stadtmuseum* (municipal museum), the *Kreuzkirche*, the *Dreikonigskirche*, and other sites, were left in ruins.¹¹⁸

Although plans were discussed to rebuild the site, because of the prohibitive costs, the ruins of the Frauenkirche were left where they remained after the bombing.¹¹⁹ As early as 1946, the local group “Citizens’ Initiative for the Rebuilding of the Frauenkirche in Dresden” tried to gather and protect original architectural pieces, and began donation campaigns through the proceeds of the sale of small stone fragments from the site.¹²⁰

Commemorative ceremonies were held on the anniversary of the bombings. Dresdeners gathered at the site of the church and lit candles, mourning the destruction of the city in the decades following the bombings.

After the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989, reconstruction efforts began to increase. The “Citizens’ Initiative for the Rebuilding of the Frauenkirche in Dresden” argued for the rebuilding for the church as a way for the city to regain its identity after the decades of Soviet control.¹²¹ The group presented the rebuilding proposal as a way to “restore...an architectural artwork of unique significance” to the world, although ultimately the Frauenkirche would signify the “healing of the wounds of war” and function as “a widely visible monument to the will for peace.”¹²²

The actual reconstruction of the site began in 1993. The original architectural plans by George Bahr were consulted as a primary resource. There were numerous historical records of the Frauenkirche through paintings and drawings, as well as more

¹¹⁸ Ibid.

¹¹⁹ Jager, W. and C.A. Brebbia, ed. *The Revival of Dresden*. Southampton: WIT Press, 2000. Burger, E. “The Reconstruction of the Frauenkirche in Dresden.” p.141-142

¹²⁰ Jager, W. and C.A. Brebbia, ed. *The Revival of Dresden*. Southampton: WIT Press, 2000. Jaeger, H.-J. “The citizens’ initiative to promote the rebuilding of the Frauenkirche in Dresden.” p.149

¹²¹ Ibid. p.152

¹²² Ibid. p.153

recent photographs from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The reconstruction plan was based around three key points: the building would be reconstructed using the original material as much as feasibly possible according to Bahr's plans, the reconstruction would utilize modern advances in physics and structural engineering, and finally, the project would take into consideration any elements required for building use in the twenty-first century (fire codes, handicap access, etc.).¹²³

The reconstruction of the site, led by the "Architekten- und Ingenieurgesellschaft" architectural group, began with a cataloguing of the deteriorating rubble and fragmentary chancel walls that had remained in place after the destruction of the site.¹²⁴ Based on the position of the stone in the pile of rubble and comparisons with records of the building, restorers attempted to gauge the original position of the remaining material. The new material was finished by hand according to the methods available when the building was first constructed.¹²⁵ New techniques, such as 3D modeling were used to visually recreate the space, in preparation for the integration of old material with the new stone.¹²⁶ Of course, as a public church, the Frauenkirche had to comply with public safety codes while maintaining as much as feasibly possible the unique qualities of the original structure.¹²⁷ The Frauenkirche was reconsecrated on October 30, 2005 and now continues in its original role as a Lutheran church.

¹²³ Frauenkirche Dresden. "Frauenkirche Dresden: Reconstruction Guiding Principles." Accessed November 2011.

¹²⁴ Frauenkirche Dresden. "Rebuilding Chronicle." Accessed December 2011.

¹²⁵ James, Jason. "Undoing Trauma: Reconstructing the Church of Our Lady in Dresden." *Ethos*, Vol. 34, No. 2, Special Issue: The Immanent Past (Jun., 2006): p.247

¹²⁶ Jager, W. and C.A. Brebbia, ed. *The Revival of Dresden*. Southampton: WIT Press, 2000. Peter, J. & M. Hertenstein "Reconstruction of the Frauenkirche Dresden: Structural proof-checking using a complete 3D FE-model." p.185

¹²⁷ Jager, W. and C.A. Brebbia, ed. *The Revival of Dresden*. Southampton: WIT Press, 2000. Kluge, B. "The Utilization of the Frauenkirche after reconstruction." p.165.

In some regards, the site of the Frauenkirche and the concept of authenticity associated with the structure are more complex than that of Ise. The Frauenkirche site was politically charged and the reconstruction was used as means to both deny the immense damage of World War II by recreating a nationally and emotionally significant site, as well as to provide a direct break with the former Soviet control of the city. In the case of the Frauenkirche, the marketing of cultural heritage serves as a means for representing Dresden itself globally. The concept of authenticity is linked intrinsically to the site itself. Unlike the Ise shrine complex, which emphasizes the continuity of a distinct cultural practice, the Frauenkirche represents a unique cultural and political decision to use a significant site to convey a message about the physical and cultural continuity of Dresden following the bombings.

The reconstruction is couched in the earlier methodological approaches that emphasize retaining original material. The goal of the project was to retain and recreate a culturally significant resource that had been lost during war. Therefore, the reconstruction is permissible under the exceptional circumstances consideration in the World Heritage Operational Guidelines.¹²⁸ From the practical standpoint, the reconstruction interventions relied on the most up-to-date approaches to conservation, emphasizing the retention of original material wherever possible. New materials were integrated in a manner that respects the historic fabric while the stone was dressed using techniques appropriate to the period of construction. Although wholesale recreation of a site may be plagued by numerous problems, the rationale behind this project was derived from the need to restore cultural unity to the city of Dresden. The church, as a significant identifying feature of

¹²⁸ UNESCO. *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*, Paris 2005, Accessed February 2013. "Section II.B Article 86"

the city, is intrinsically tied to the cultural identity of Dresden. The loss of the building paralleled the massive loss of life at the end of the war. The framing of these preservation guidelines incorporates clauses specifically targeted at approaching cultural resources that have been lost due to trauma.

Since the reopening of the site on October 30, 2005, the Frauenkirche has regained its position as a popular tourist destination. Throughout the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth centuries, it was the hallmark of the Saxony region of Germany. Now, the city continues to stress those aspects of the site while emphatically reinforcing the idea that the Frauenkirche is not merely a reconstruction, but a scientifically-based undertaking that employed every available historic resource. The authenticity of the site is stressed through the concept of rebuilding according to original plans and the integration of original materials. Overall, authenticity is emphasized as a way to accommodate the fact that the original building was lost during the firebombing. To the people of Dresden, the reconstruction helps to undo some of the trauma of World War II by replacing the Frauenkirche in the urban fabric. While the reconstruction of the building cannot undo the trauma of war, for the citizens of Dresden, the original stones and the use of the original plans legitimize the claims of authenticity by the city of Dresden for this rebuilt structure.

Issues of reconstruction and authenticity have a dark history in the Dresden region. Although this section has focused on the reconstruction of one specific building within the city, in 2004, the eighteenth and nineteenth century cultural landscape of Dresden Elbe Valley was nominated to the World Heritage List. The nomination for the landscape emphasized the integration of “the celebrated baroque setting and suburban

garden city into an artistic whole within the river valley.”¹²⁹ As a cultural landscape, the geographical setting, architectural features, and additional aspects together represent the authentic spirit of the place. Controversy over the site arose two years after nomination, with the proposal to introduce a four-lane bridge (Waldschlösschen Bridge) over the Elbe River to mitigate traffic from the city center. In July of 2006, the World Heritage Committee determined that the proposed bridge “would have such a serious impact on the integrity of property's landscape that it may no longer deserve to be on the World Heritage List.”¹³⁰

For the first time in the history of the World Heritage List, the Committee emphasized the serious threat that incompatible urban development posed to sites of cultural heritage. Germany was afforded four months to find an acceptable alternative to the bridge project in June 2007, after which point, the Committee would return to evaluate the project.¹³¹ Bridge construction began in November 2007, despite urging from the World Heritage Committee to consider alternative options, such as bridges with lower profiles or tunnels that would have a less dramatic impact on the landscape. Despite the fact that the Committee continued extending the final date for evaluation, providing the German state with almost three years to develop an alternative infrastructure project, the Elbe Valley cultural landscape was struck from the World Heritage List in June 2009, only the second property removed in the history of the World Heritage List.¹³²

¹²⁹ UNESCO. “Dresden Elbe Valley,” Accessed March 2013. “Justification for Inscription”

¹³⁰ UNESCO. “World Heritage Committee Threatens to Remove Dresden Elbe Valley (Germany) from World Heritage List,” Updated July 11, 2006, Accessed March 2013.

¹³¹ UNESCO. “World Heritage Committee Keeps Dresden on UNESCO World Heritage List But Warns Against Bridge Project.” Updated June 25, 2007, Accessed March 2013.

¹³² UNESCO. “Dresden is Deleted from UNESCO’s World Heritage List,” Updated June 25, 2009, Accessed March 2013.

The rationale behind Dresden's removal from the World Heritage List addresses the cultural heritage interests that have emerged with the UNESCO Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape. Although designated a cultural landscape, the Elbe Valley incorporated features of the geographical and built environment. The World Heritage Committee encouraged addressing the impending removal from the World Heritage List through urban planning tools, promoting alternative projects that could have been more sympathetically incorporated into the site. Nomination of cultural heritage sites should not force urban landscapes to stagnate economically, but the only tool the Committee has is the threat of delisting. The new HUL Recommendation may help to mitigate future loss of significant cultural sites. Unfortunate as the revocation of the World Heritage listing may be, the Committee now has concrete precedent to support threats of revocation of the status for other threatened sites. Although HUL is a brand new policy, the expanded concept of authenticity, which includes urban change as a part of the living city's development, it may help prevent this situation from occurring again in the future. The Elbe Valley remains a significant cultural landscape, but now serves as a case study for the way uncontrolled development detracts from the recognized authenticity of a site.

Section 3: Abu Simbel Temple Complex, Egypt

In terms of the reconstruction aims and methodology, the temples at Abu Simbel differ drastically from both the Ise shrine complex and the Frauenkirche. While the first two examples of reconstructed buildings presented living traditions as well as religious and national groups that actively identify with the historic structures, Abu Simbel is an Egyptian archaeological site dating to 1244 BCE. The site underscores what happens to the major features of an archaeological site when they are physically removed from their

original location. The context of an archaeological site is the key to understanding. Without the context and associated materials, integral knowledge about the site is completely lost. Despite these concerns, the preservation of context and site integrity became the less important issues when without the relocation of the Abu Simbel site, the temple complex would have been lost forever.

The original site of Abu Simbel consisted of two large temples carved from the sides of a mountain along the Nile River. The Egyptian Pharaoh Ramses II commissioned the two temples to commemorate his victorious military campaigns against the Nubians to the south.¹³³ The temples were constructed between 1264 and 1244 BCE at the southern end of the extent of the Egyptian empire, in an area with a limited population that continued to decrease.¹³⁴ During the early 19th century, the site was rediscovered by European explorers and excavated by Giovanni Battista Belzoni in 1817. The two temples became a popular tourist site for Europeans visiting Egypt who wished to travel the extent of the Nile.

The site came under threat in 1954 after the Egyptian and Sudanese governments proposed a joint dam program. The planned dam would extend the irrigation potential of the Nile River into parched regions while simultaneously creating a much-needed hydroelectric plant.¹³⁵ The dam was essentially a humanitarian program, the rapid increase in population in Southern Egypt and Sudan had led to strains on traditional agricultural practices. The expansion of the irrigable areas through the building of the Aswan High Dam would prevent massive starvation and potentially allow Egypt to

¹³³ Save-Soderbergh, Torgny. *Temples and Tombs of Ancient Nubia: The International Rescue Campaign at Abu Simbel, Philae and Other Sites*. London: Thames and Hudson, UNESCO, 1987. p.38

¹³⁴ Ibid.

¹³⁵ Ibid. p.50-52

produce enough food to support its population.¹³⁶ The only problem with the planned dam was that because ancient Egyptian sites were primarily built along the habitable sections of the Nile, the newly created Lake Nasser would flood six different archaeological complexes.

Abu Simbel was the largest and most famous of the sites that could have been potentially lost. An international campaign was initiated in 1955 by French archaeologists, who feared that the irreplaceable human history was about to be sacrificed in favor of the project.¹³⁷ In May of 1956, UNESCO formed an alliance with the Egyptian government, Egypt would provide a center to organize the salvage project and UNESCO would provide experts in the field and materials to support the project.¹³⁸ The campaign began by documenting through photographs and illustrations all of the archaeological sites and materials that would be lost to flooding after the dam was completed. Once that stage was finished, plans were developed to physically relocate several sites out of the range of the new high water marks. Abu Simbel was the top priority.

In 1960, the Documentation and Study Centre for the History of the Art and Civilization in Ancient Egypt in Cairo (referred to as the Centre), formed with support from UNESCO in 1955, began hearing proposals to salvage the site.¹³⁹ The archaeologists involved stressed the fact that the “integrity of the monument” was of the utmost importance, but

“‘integrity of the monument’ [means] the preservation of the original geographic, architectural and cultural position and ambiance of the

¹³⁶ Ibid.

¹³⁷ Ibid. p.65

¹³⁸ Ibid.

¹³⁹ Ibid.

monument including not only the position of the various buildings vis-à-vis each other, but also their original relationship with surrounding physiographic and cultural features in the area.”¹⁴⁰

Some radical ideas were proposed, such as encasing the site in a concrete dome and running elevators from the surface so visitors could experience Abu Simbel as part of the original mountain.¹⁴¹ Despite these efforts to try to maintain the integrity of the site with its original location, the choice was made to sacrifice the original location in order to save the main architectural features. Between 1964 and 1968, the temples were cut into pieces weighing between 20 and 30 tons and reassembled 65 meters above their original location and 200 meters back, set in massive artificial hills to recreate the experience of entering the temple carved out of the mountain.¹⁴²

The massive international campaign tested UNESCO’s ability to mobilize various nations to protect a cultural resource, but also highlighted the difficulties of preserving archaeological resources when pressed for time. Although the campaign had three years to develop and an additional four years to be implemented, it was still a massive challenge to protect and relocate the temples of Abu Simbel. During the planning phases between 1956 and the implementation of the project in 1964, the importance of preserving the site in whole was constantly stressed.¹⁴³ Concern with authenticity of the original site was of the utmost importance for the development of the campaign. For Abu Simbel, reconstruction of the site included not only the architectural features, but also the geographical landscape including the mountain. Instead, as a salvage operation, decisions based on available resources, the timeframe, and feasibility dictated what could be

¹⁴⁰ Ibid. p.100

¹⁴¹ Ibid p.99

¹⁴² Ibid. p.105, 111

¹⁴³ Ibid. p.64

preserved from the Nubian sites, and what would have to be sacrificed to flooding. A series of six preserved temple sites, including the two relocated Abu Simbel temples, salvaged between 1964 and 1968, known as the “Nubian Monuments from Abu Simbel to Philae”, were inscribed on the UNESCO World Heritage List in 1979.¹⁴⁴

Despite the fact that the site was saved and has become one of the most popular tourist destinations in Egypt, if we consider the physical relocation from an archaeological perspective, irreparable damage was done to the site. In order to protect what little authenticity would remain for an archaeological site that was chopped up and transferred, the international archaeologists on the committee review board put forth three key requirements regarding the use of modern materials to reassemble the site:

- “a) they must not disturb the appearance of the temples,
- b) they must not, when used, in any way affect any elements of the temples,
- c) they must not be destroyed by ageing and so endanger the durability of the temples.”¹⁴⁵

Sites were documented as thoroughly as possible during the rapid removal, but invaluable unexcavated archaeological material was lost.¹⁴⁶ Built structures, primarily temples and monuments, were prized over the underground archaeological context surrounding these resources. The associated material has been lost, but the key architectural features of the site were preserved. The salvage program was undertaken with a full awareness that by moving the site, it would become a *mélange* of the original temple structure and the modern modifications made to the site to stabilize it after the relocation. A concerted

¹⁴⁴ UNESCO World Heritage Sites. “Nubian Monuments from Abu Simbel to Philae.” Accessed November 2011.

¹⁴⁵ International Council on Museums and Sites. “The Salvage of the Abu Simbel Temples.” Accessed November 2011. p.52

¹⁴⁶ Save-Soderbergh, Torgny. *Temples and Tombs of Ancient Nubia: The International Rescue Campaign at Abu Simbel, Philae and Other Sites*. London: Thames and Hudson, UNESCO, 1987. p.164

effort was made to ensure that the evidence of the modern modifications did not interfere with the experience of visiting the temples.

The Abu Simbel conservation project occurred during a liminal period in the process of developing conservation methodologies. The UNESCO Operational Guidelines of 1977 had yet to be framed, and the only extant basis for preservation emphasized conservation of authentic materials over all other qualities. The Venice Charter addresses the need for preservation of original context of a site in Article Six, the critical aspect of any archaeological site. The UNESCO conservation project moved beyond the suggested guidelines of the charter, valuing the relocated site over the complete loss to humanity. The inclusion of the site on the World Heritage List presents the opportunity to consider Abu Simbel not only as an archaeological wonder, but also as an example of mid-twentieth century preservation practices.

This relocation project, while an impressive mobilization of public interest and international funds, resulted in a modern revision of the historic structure. The archaeological significance was derived from the original location along the Nile River, which once stripped, leaves the world with a site valued for aesthetic reasons. Massive interventions, such as this one, while resulting in the preservation of the historic fabric, damage it so completely through the deconstruction and re-erection that authenticity and historical significance must be evaluated with special regard for the changes that have been wrought by the preservation intervention.

Chapter 5: Conclusions

The various preservation standards addressed in this paper serve to answer primary one question, what method of intervention is appropriate for a historic resource? The analysis of these documents sets in place an understanding of the philosophical basis of the differences for the practitioners in the field.¹⁴⁷ Cultural, contextual, and technical issues interweave to create a unique assessment situation with every project. Preservation actions must be determined on a case-by-case basis, with each site presenting different theoretical and practical challenges. The international and national guidelines serve to provide a framework for planning and implementing the actions.

The variations in definitions of core terms, or complete lack of explanation as demonstrated in several of the earlier charters, assumed a knowledge basis within the preservation field. Architects, restorers, and conservators, who shared similar training and a similar outlook on the preservation of cultural resources, codified these charters. The shift in the mid-twentieth century, with new models for defining international value, demonstrated by the UNESCO World Heritage Convention and the World Heritage List, forced a reconsideration of the implications of the terms used within international charters. A need for a new set of universally applicable standards emerged that once again provided limited discussion of authenticity or integrity. These terms, while recognized as significant, only receive treatment on the national level, illustrated by the Secretary of the Interior's Standards in the United States.

¹⁴⁷ Bronski, M. B. and Gabby, B. A., "A Comparison of Principles in Several Architectural Conservation Standards," *The Use and Need for Preservation Standards in Architectural Conservation*, ASTM STP 1355, L. B. Sickels-Taves, Ed., American Society for Testing and Materials, West Conshohocken, PA, 1999. p.22

This paper presents not only the reasons for why authenticity is valued in a cultural resource or historic site, but how it may be conserved or presented to the public in circumstances where the historic fabric has been lost or significantly modified by the treatment process. The goal of the Lower East Side Tenement Museum is clearly that of educating the public. The mission statement and museum planning have developed out of a desire to provide the American public to learn about the nineteenth century immigrant population. That space, despite the fact that the period apartments which have been stripped of the historic material, is considered authentic by the museum's educational statements. The methods of preserving the building, shaped by the early international charters, emphasize retention of historic fabric and presentation of that aspect to the public. Interaction between the museum visitors and the space is the primary goal, but what the visitor experiences is a more dynamic space that blends historic resources with cutting-edge preservation techniques. The goal has been to bring a limited selection of spaces within the museum back to their historic status as an educational tool. In order to accomplish that goal, the national and international preservation frameworks provided a basic model to incorporate both conservation and restoration. The required preservation standards at 97 Orchard Street guarantees the thorough documentation of the site; while material might be lost due to reconstruction, extensive archaeological investigation and artifact recovery is performed.¹⁴⁸ Although destructive in nature, the preservation standards provide balance between the retention of the original historic fabric and the reconstructed historic apartments. Without these frameworks for preservation

¹⁴⁸ Mackintosh, Barry. "National Park Service Reconstruction Policy and Practice," *The Reconstructed Past*, Jameson, John H. Jr., Ed., Walnut Creek: Alta Mira Press, 2004. p.72

intervention hierarchically organizing the goals and impacts of each methodology, such a project could not be implemented in the successful manner that we find today.

All three of the international case studies are considered authentic by their respective cultural groups, Ise to the Shinto practitioners, Frauenkirche to the residents of Dresden, and the temples at Abu Simbel have been lent an air of authenticity by the auspices of UNESCO. They all challenge the basic concept that authenticity is limited to the original structure, building materials, or location of a site. It is important to note that all of these sites are considered exceptional, representing premier examples of cultural identities, history, and style. Without these basic criteria, these structures would not have been the subject of massive multi-million dollar rebuilding or relocation campaigns. These sites test the extent of the criteria for determining authenticity of a site. In the universal guiding principle of resources such as the World Heritage Convention's Operational Guidelines, authenticity is a concept that should be promoted through maintaining the original structure and making as few changes as possible to the site; these three sites force a reconsideration of that notion. As the practical field of cultural heritage has continued to evolve, so has the concept of what is authentic and how authenticity can be preserved. Conversations over sites such as Ise led to the Nara Document on Authenticity. The text of the document builds on the ideas of the 1964 Venice Charter, but expands the definitions. In the final section, the Nara Document affirms the Venice Charter and adds the consideration for cultural practices as authentic. A distinct effort has been made to shift away from the Western paradigms of historic preservation to a more encompassing model that accepts the views and approaches to heritage that are disparate from the concepts developed during the nineteenth century.

The preservation frameworks presented in this paper provide a means for discussing the material and intangible aspects of authenticity entwined with the physical historic resources. The shift from a material-centric preservation approach has given way to the more culturally-sensitive methodology. The very practice of defining authenticity has a significant impact on the conservation intervention selected.¹⁴⁹ The replacement of the monumental architectural approach to heritage preservation with the idea of “progressive authenticities” espoused by the Nara Document, reflects the layering of history and adaptations to historic structures most recently addressed by the 2011 Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape.¹⁵⁰ As cultural heritage preservation practices continue to be refined, we need to move beyond an assumed global understanding of critical terms. Authenticity has continued to be refined every several decades as preservation interventions become more intricate and techniques for reproduction of historic resources become more sophisticated. Without a global understanding, which in turn informs the local preservation legislation, there is no way to manage the built cultural environment. The Lower East Side Tenement Museum, Ise, Dresden’s former cultural landscape, and the Abu Simbel complex represent a small sample of historic resources that have been modified by preservation interventions, yet all of these examples are considered authentic through community recognition and official international or national heritage designations. These resources are preserved for the public, and as such, are a basic standard for ensuring the preservation of the historic fabric and the unique human qualities that define these historic properties.

¹⁴⁹ Jerome, Pamela. “An Introduction to Authenticity in Preservation.” *APT Bulletin*, Vol. 39, No. 2/3 (2008) p.4

¹⁵⁰ Ibid.

Conversations at the international, national, and local levels will continue as we struggle with the very concept of authenticity. The current standard-setting instruments, including the Operational Guidelines, the Nara Document on Authenticity, and the recent Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape have shaped the theory of conservation for future policy-makers and preservation practitioners. These flexible new tools will ensure the approach to authenticity accurately reflects the multifaceted significance of the global cultural environment and contribute to contemporary discussions on sustainable development.

Bibliography

- Abram, Ruth J. "Immigrants in America." *The Public Historian*, Vol. 19, No. 1 (Winter, 1997), pp. 45-48.
- Abram, Ruth J. "Using the Past to Shape the Future: New Concepts for a Historic Site." *Museum International*, Vol. 53, No. 1 (2001): 4-9.
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com.proxy.libraries.rutgers.edu/doi/10.1111/1468-0033.00291/pdf>
- Adams, Cassandra. "Japan's Ise Shrine and Its Thirteen-Hundred-Year-Old Reconstruction Tradition." *Journal of Architectural Education*, Vol. 52, No. 1 (Sep., 1998): 49-60.
- Andrew, Dolkart. *Biography of a tenement house in New York City - An Architectural History of 97 Orchard Street*. New York: The Center for American Places, 2008.
- Araoz, Gustavo F. "World-Heritage Historic Urban Landscapes: Defining and Protecting Authenticity." *APT Bulletin*, Vol. 39, No. 2/3 (2008), pp. 33-37.
- Balen, Koenraad van. "The Nara Grid: An Evaluation Scheme Based on the Nara Document on Authenticity." *APT Bulletin*, Vol. 39, No. 2/3 (2008), pp. 39-45.
- Bandarin, Francesco and Ron van Oers. *The Historic Urban Landscape: Managing Heritage in an Urban Century*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012.
- Bergman, Teresa and Cynthia Duquette Smith. "You Were on Indian Land: Alcatraz Island as Recalcitrant Memory Space", p. 160-188. In Dickinson, Greg, Carole Blair, and Brian L. Ott, *Places of Public Memory: The Rhetoric of Museums and Memorials*. The University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa.
- Berke, Arnold. "Lower East Side Story: Tenement Museum to Showcase Immigrant Life." *Preservation News*, September 1, 1989. Accessed February 2013.
<http://prn.library.cornell.edu/cgi-bin/cornell-prn?a=d&d=PRN19890901.2.22&srpos=14&dliw=none&e=-----198-en-20--1--txt-IN-a+look+inside--1001->
- Bock, Felicia G. "The Rites of Renewal at Ise." *Monumenta Nipponica*, Vol. 29, No. 1 (Spring, 1974): 55-68.
- Bronski, M. B. and Gabby, B. A., "A Comparison of Principles in Several Architectural Conservation Standards," *The Use and Need for Preservation Standards in Architectural Conservation*, ASTM STP 1355, L. B. Sickels-Taves, Ed., American Society for Testing and Materials, West Conshohocken, PA, 1999.

Bruner Foundation. "2001 Rudy Bruner Award: Silver Medal Winner, Lower East Side Tenement Museum." Accessed February 2013.

http://www.brunerfoundation.org/rba/pdfs/2001/02_LowerEastSide.pdf

Cameron, Christina. "From Warsaw to Mostar: The World Heritage Committee and Authenticity." *APT Bulletin*, Vol. 39, No. 2/3 (2008), pp. 19-24.

Derek, Bouse. "Restoring the Photographed Past." *The Public Historian*, Vol. 24, No. 2 (Spring 2002): 9-40.

Derry, Linda and Malloy, Maureen, Ed., *Archaeologists and Local Communities: Partners in Exploring the Past*. Washington D.C.: Society for American Archaeology, 2003.

Dolkart, Andrew S. *Biography of a Tenement House in New York City: An Architectural History of 97 Orchard Street*. Santa Fe: The Center for American Places, 2007.

Frank, Karolin and Patricia Peterson, ed. *Historic Preservation in the USA*. Berlin: Springer, 2002.

Frauenkirche Dresden. "Frauenkirche Dresden." Accessed November 2011.

<http://www.frauenkirche-dresden.de/startseite+M5d637b1e38d.html>

Getty Conservation Institute. "General Conclusions of the Athens Conference (1931)." Accessed February 2013.

http://www.getty.edu/conservation/publications_resources/research_resources/charters/charter02.html

Getty Conservation Institute. "The Nara Document on Authenticity." Accessed February 2013.

http://www.getty.edu/conservation/publications_resources/research_resources/charters/charter55.html

Hardy III, Charles. "Lower East Side Tenement Museum." *The Journal of American History*, Vol. 84, No. 3 (Dec., 1997), pp. 1009-1013.

Hertel, Christiane. "Dis/Continuities in Dresden's Dances of Death." *The Art Bulletin*, Vol. 82, No. 1, (Mar., 2000): 83-116.

International Council on Monuments and Sites. "The Athens Charter for the Restoration of Historic Monuments – 1931." Updated 2011, Accessed February 2013.

<http://www.icomos.org/en/charters-and-texts/179-articles-en-francais/ressources/charters-and-standards/167-the-athens-charter-for-the-restoration-of-historic-monuments>

International Council on Monuments and Sites. "History of the Venice Charter." Accessed February 2013. <http://www.icomos.org/venicecharter2004/history.pdf>

International Council on Monuments and Sites. "The Nara Document on Authenticity." Updated November 6, 1994, Accessed February 2013. http://www.icomos.org/charters/nara_e.htm

International Council on Monuments and Sites. "Thirty Years of ICOMOS." In *Scientific Journal*, 1995. http://www.international.icomos.org/publications/JS5_0.pdf

International Council on Museums and Sites. "The Salvage of the Abu Simbel Temples." Accessed November 2011. http://www.international.icomos.org/monumentum/vol17/vol17_2.pdf

International Council on Monuments and Sites. "The Venice Charter." Updated January 12, 1996, Accessed February 2013. http://www.icomos.org/venice_charter.html

Jablonski Building Conservation Inc. "Public Buildings: Lower East Side Tenement Museum." Accessed February 2013. <http://www.jbconservation.com/projects.html>

Jager, W. and C.A. Brebbia, ed. *The Revival of Dresden*. Southampton: WIT Press, 2000.

James, Jason. "Undoing Trauma: Reconstructing the Church of Our Lady in Dresden." *Ethos*, Vol. 34, No. 2, Special Issue: The Immanent Past (Jun., 2006): 244-272

Jameson, John H. Jr., Ed., *Presenting Archaeology to the Public: Digging for Truths*. Walnut Creek: Alta Mira Press, 1997.

Jerome, Pamela. "An Introduction to Authenticity in Preservation." *APT Bulletin*, Vol. 39, No. 2/3 (2008): 3-7 <http://www.apti.org/clientuploads/pdf/JeromePamela-39-2-3.pdf>

Jokilehto, Jukka. *A History of Architectural Conservation*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann, 1999.

Kane, Lauren J. "Rebuilding to Remember, Rebuilding to Forget: The Tangible and Intangible Afterlife of Architectural Heritage Destroyed by Acts of War." MA thesis, Rutgers University, 2011. <http://mss3.libraries.rutgers.edu/dlr/showfed.php?pid=rutgers-lib:33773>

Labadi, Sophia. "World Heritage, Authenticity, and Post-Authenticity: International and National Perspectives." In *Heritage and Globalization*, edited by Sophia Labadi and Colin Long, 66-84. New York: Routledge, 2010.

Layton, Robert and Stone, Peter G. and Thomas, Julian, Ed., *Destruction and Conservation of Cultural Property*. London: Routledge, 2001.

Li-Saltzman Architects, PC. "Historic Structure Reports: Lower East Side Tenement Museum." Accessed February 2013.
<http://www.lisaltzman.com/preservation/2011/06/21/lower-east-side-tenement-museum/>

Lopes, Dominic Mciver. "Shikinen Sengu and the Ontology of Architecture in Japan." *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, Vol. 65, No. 1, Special Issue: Global Theories of the Arts and Aesthetics (Winter, 2007): 77-84.

The Lower East Side Tenement Museum. "97 Orchard Street FAQ." Accessed February 2013. <http://www.tenement.org/docs/97FAQ.pdf>

The Lower East Side Tenement Museum. "About." Accessed February 2013.
<http://www.tenement.org/about.html>

The Lower East Side Tenement Museum. "A Tenement Story: The History of 97 Orchard Street and the Lower East Side Tenement Museum." New York: LESTM, 2004.

Lowenthal, David. *The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 9th ed, 2009.

Mackintosh, Barry. "National Park Service Reconstruction Policy and Practice," *The Reconstructed Past*, Jameson, John H. Jr., Ed., Walnut Creek: Alta Mira Press, 2004.

Matero, Frank G. "The Conservation of Immovable Cultural Property: Ethical and Practical Dilemmas." *Journal of the American Institute for Conservation*, Vol. 32, No. 1 (Spring, 1993): 15-21.

Mills, Michael J. "Design in Preservation Projects," in *Design & Historic Preservation: The Challenge of Compatibility*, edited by David Ames and Richard Wagner, 3-16. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2009.

Mitchell, Nora J. "Considering the Authenticity of Cultural Landscapes." *APT Bulletin*, Vol. 39, No. 2/3 (2008), pp. 25-31.

National Park Service. "Affiliated Areas." Accessed February 2013.
<http://www.nps.gov/nero/affiliated/>

National Park Service. "Antiquities Act 1906-2006." Updated July 16, 2009. Accessed February 2013. <http://www.cr.nps.gov/archeology/sites/antiquities/>

National Park Service. *Federal Historic Preservation Laws: The Official Compilation of U.S. Cultural Heritage Statutes, 2006 Edition*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, 2006.

National Park Service. "Guidelines for Evaluating and Registering Archaeological Properties." Accessed February 2013. <http://www.nps.gov/nr/publications/bulletins/arch/>

National Park Service. "How to Prepare National Historic Landmark Nominations." Accessed February 2013. <http://www.nps.gov/nr/publications/bulletins/nhl/nhlstart.htm>

National Park Service. "Introduction to Standards and Guidelines: Choosing an Appropriate Treatment for the Historic Building." Accessed February 2013. http://www.nps.gov/hps/tps/standguide/overview/choose_treat.htm

National Park Service. "Laws, Executive Orders and Regulations." Accessed February 2013. <http://www.nps.gov/history/laws.htm>

National Park Service. "Lower East Side Tenement Museum." Last updated September, 18, 2012, Accessed February 2013. <http://www.nps.gov/loea/index.htm>

National Park Service. "National Historic Preservation Act." Accessed February 2013. http://www.cr.nps.gov/history/online_books/fhpl/nhpa.pdf

National Park Service. "National Register Bulletin." Accessed February 2013. <http://www.nps.gov/nr/publications/bulletins/brochure/>

National Park Service. "National Register of Historic Places Program: National Register Federal Program Regulations." Accessed February 2013. <http://www.cr.nps.gov/nr/regulations.htm>

National Park Service. "NHL Nomination: Tenement Building at 97 Orchard Street." February 13, 2004. <http://www.nps.gov/nhl/Tenement%20Building.pdf>

National Park Service, Righter, Robert W., "National Monuments to National Parks: The Use of the Antiquities Act of 1906." Updated March 5, 2005, Accessed February 2013. <http://www.cr.nps.gov/history/hisnps/npshistory/righter.htm>

National Park Service. "National Register Bulletin: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation." Revised for Internet 1995, Accessed February 2013. <http://www.cr.nps.gov/nr/publications/bulletins/nrb15/nrb15.pdf>

National Park Service. "National Register of Historic Places Program: Frequently Asked Questions." Revised June 13, 2011, Accessed February 2013. <http://www.nps.gov/nr/faq.htm#contact>

National Park Service. "The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for The Treatment of Historic Properties (68.2 Part 68)." Accessed February 2013. <http://www.wbdg.org/pdfs/36cfr68.pdf>

National Park Service, Lee, Ronald F., "The Story of The Antiquities Act." Last Updated Sept. 13, 2007, Accessed February 2013. <http://www.cr.nps.gov/archeology/pubs/lee/>

Neville, Tove. "Past Threatened by Aswan Dam." *The Science News-Letter*, Vol. 78, No. 5 (Jul. 30, 1960): 74-75.

West, Susie, ed. *Understanding Heritage in Practice*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2010.

Page, Max and Randall Mason, ed. *Giving Preservation a History: Histories of Historic Preservation in the United States*. New York: Routledge, 2004.

Petzet, Michael. "Principles of Preservation: An Introduction to the International Charters for Conservation and Restoration 40 Years After the Venice Charter." In *Monuments and Sites, Vol. I: International Charters for Conservation and Restoration*. p. 7-29.
<http://www.icomos.org/venicecharter2004/petzet.pdf>

Placzek, Adolph K. "Proceedings of the Seminar on Architecture and Historic Preservation in Central and Eastern Europe. New York, New York, 28-30 November 1975." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, Vol. 38, No. 2 (May, 1979), pp. 123-175.

The Pennsylvania Bar Institute. *Historic Preservation and the Law: Then and Now*. Mechanicsburg: Pennsylvania Bar Institute, 2010.

Rizzo, Christopher. "Historic Preservation Law 101 for New York Lawyers." Carter Ledyard & Milburn LLP, 2009.
http://www.nysba.org/AM/Template.cfm?Section=Historic_and_Archaeological_Resources_101&Template=/CM/ContentDisplay.cfm&ContentID=33851

Rowan, Yorke and Uzi Baram, ed. *Marketing Heritage: Archaeology and the Consumption of the Past*. Lanham: Alta Mira Press, 2004.

Ruskin, John. *The Seven Lamps of Architecture*. New York: Dover Architecture, 1989.

Save-Soderbergh, Torgny. *Temples and Tombs of Ancient Nubia: The International Rescue Campaign at Abu Simbel, Philae and Other Sites*. London: Thames and Hudson, UNESCO, 1987.

Shanks, Michael and Tilley, Christopher, Ed., *Re-Constructing Archaeology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Smith, S. George and Ehrenhard, John E., "Protecting the Past to Benefit the Public." *Public Benefits of Archaeology*, Little, Barbara J., Ed., Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 2002.

Steinberg, Florian. "Conservation and Rehabilitation of Urban Heritage in Developing Counties." *HABITAT INTL*. Vol. 20, No. 3, pp. 463-475, 1996.

Stipe, Robert E., ed. *A Richer Heritage: Historic Preservation in the Twenty-first Century*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003.

Stone, Peter G. and Mackenzie, R., Ed., *The Excluded Past: Archaeology in Education*. London: Routledge, 1990.

Stone, Peter G. and Molyneaux, Brian L., Ed., *The Presented Past: Heritage, Museums, and Education*. London: Routledge, 1994.

Stone, Peter G. and Planel, Philippe G., Ed., *The Constructed Past: Experimental Archaeology, Education, and the Public*. London: Routledge, 1999.

Stovel, Herb. "Origins and Influence of the Nara Document on Authenticity." *APT Bulletin*, Vol. 39, No. 2/3 (2008), pp. 9-17.

Stubbs, John H., *Time Honored: A Global View of Architectural Conservation*. Hoboken: John Wiley and Sons, 2009.

Tange, Kenzo and Noboru Kawazoe, *Ise: Prototype of Japanese Architecture*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: M.I.T. Press, 1965.

Timmons, Sharon, ed. *Preservation and Conservation: Principles and Practices*. Washington D.C.: National Trust for Historic Preservation in the United States, 1976.

Thirteen. Limmer, Ruth and Dolkart, Andrew S. "The Tenement as History and Housing." Accessed February 2013. <http://www.thirteen.org/tenement/eagle.html#96>

Tomasson, Robert E. "Orchard Street Tenement Project: A Chronicle of Immigrant Life." *The New York Times*, December 31, 1990. Accessed February 2013. <http://www.nytimes.com/1990/12/31/nyregion/orchard-street-tenement-project-a-chronicle-of-immigrant-life.html?pagewanted=all&src=pm>

Traditional Building Portfolio. Kahn, Eve M. "Poverty Preserved: A 19th-century apartment house is restored as the Lower East Side Tenement Museum." Accessed February 2013. <http://www.traditionalbuildingportfolio.com/projects/residential/povertypreserved.html>

UNESCO World Heritage Sites. "Nubian Monuments from Abu Simbel to Philae." Accessed November 2011. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/88>

UNESCO. *Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage*, Nov. 1972, Accessed February 2013. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/conventiontext/>
<http://whc.unesco.org/archive/opguide77a.pdf>

UNESCO. *Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage*, Paris 2003, Accessed February 2013. <http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/index.php?pg=00006>

UNESCO. "Dresden Elbe Valley," Accessed March 2013.
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1156>

UNESCO. "Dresden is deleted from UNESCO's World Heritage List," Updated June 25, 2009, Accessed March 2013. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/news/522/>

UNESCO. "Historical Background of the Recommendation," Accessed March 2013.
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/activities/706>

UNESCO. "International Mission to Review the Construction of a Bridge at the Cultural Landscape of Dresden Elbe Valley (Germany) from 4 to 5 February," Updated January 31, 2008, Accessed March 2013. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/news/412>

UNESCO. *The Nara Document on Authenticity*, Nara 1994. Accessed February 2013.
<http://whc.unesco.org/archive/nara94.htm>

UNESCO. *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*, Paris 1977, Accessed February 2013.
<http://whc.unesco.org/archive/opguide77b.pdf>

UNESCO. *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*, Paris 2005, Accessed February 2013.
<http://whc.unesco.org/archive/opguide05-en.pdf>

UNESCO. *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*, Paris 2012, Accessed February 2013.
<http://whc.unesco.org/archive/opguide12-en.pdf>

UNESCO. "Proposal by the Director-General for the Preparation of a Revised Recommendation Concerning the Safeguarding and Contemporary Roles of Historic Areas". Accessed March 2013.
<http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0015/001583/158388e.pdf>

UNESCO. "UNESCO Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape," Accessed March 2013. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/activities/638>

UNESCO. "Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape, Including a Glossary of Definitions." Updated November 11, 2011. Accessed March 2013.
http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=48857&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html

UNESCO. "UNESCO Regrets Decision on Construction of Bridge that Threatens Delisting of Dresden Elbe Valley from World Heritage List," Updated November 15, 2007, Accessed March 2013. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/news/396>

UNESCO. "UNESCO Report Recommends the Construction of a Tunnel Instead of a Bridge in Dresden World Heritage Site," Updated March 10, 2008, Accessed March 2013. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/news/414>

UNESCO. "World Heritage Committee Keeps Dresden on UNESCO World Heritage List But Warns Against Bridge Project." Updated June 25, 2007, Accessed March 2013. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/news/355>

UNESCO. "World Heritage Committee Threatens to Remove Dresden Elbe Valley (Germany) from World Heritage List," Updated July 11, 2006, Accessed March 2013. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/news/265>

UNESCO. "The World Heritage Convention," Accessed February 2013. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/convention/>

UNESCO Intergovernmental Committee for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage. *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*, 2005.

Waldhaeusl, Peter. "Photogrammetric Heritage Recording: Standard and Emergency Approaches." *APT Bulletin*, Vol. 26, No. 1, Computers in Conservation (1994): 20-22

Watanabe, Yasutada. *Shinto Art: Ise and Izumo Shrines*. Translated by Robert Ricketts. New York: Weatherhill, 1974.