

Cultural Landscapes and Traditional Cultural Properties:

A Study in Designation and Protection

By

Evan Bradford Robinson

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

Written under the direction of

Dr. Katharine Woodhouse-Beyer

And approved by

New Brunswick, New Jersey

January 2017

Abstract of the Thesis

Cultural Landscapes and Traditional Cultural Properties: A Study in Designation and Protection

By Evan Robinson

Thesis Director:

Dr. Katharine Woodhouse-Beyer, PhD, RPA

This thesis discusses issues concerning the way cultural landscapes and traditional cultural properties are designated by the National Park Service. The field of cultural heritage has grown rapidly since the passage of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 as amended through 1992 (Public Law 102-575) and the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage in 1972. In 1992, the United Nations Education, Scientific, Cultural Organization adopted cultural landscapes in their operational guidelines and the National Park Service created Traditional Cultural Properties as a new means to recognize and protect cultural heritage. Over the past twenty years these protections have not succeeded in protecting cultural heritage sites as they may have been intended. Using examples of Traditional Cultural Properties, cultural landscapes from the Mid-Atlantic Region in the United States and international cultural landscapes recognized by UNESCO as case studies, this thesis will explore the failings of these national and international cultural resource designations.

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----|
| Abstract..... | ii |
| Table of Contents..... | iii |
| List of Tables and Figures..... | iv |
| Chapter I: Introduction..... | 1 |
| Introduction..... | 1 |
| Traditional Cultural Properties..... | 2 |
| Cultural Landscapes..... | 9 |
| Historic Site Cultural Landscapes..... | 10 |
| Historic Designed Landscapes..... | 12 |
| Historic Vernacular Landscapes..... | 13 |
| Ethnographic Landscapes..... | 14 |
| UNESCO Cultural Landscapes..... | 16 |
| National Park Service Cultural Landscape Designation Challenges..... | 18 |
| Chapter Conclusion..... | 24 |
| Chapter II: UNESCO and Cultural Landscapes..... | 27 |
| Introduction..... | 27 |
| Cultural Landscapes Categories in UNESCO..... | 27 |
| Chapter Conclusion..... | 38 |
| Chapter III: Cultural Landscapes and Traditional Cultural Properties in the United States..... | 41 |
| Introduction..... | 41 |
| New Jersey..... | 42 |
| Maryland..... | 52 |
| Washington D.C..... | 59 |
| Virginia..... | 67 |
| Delaware..... | 82 |
| Pennsylvania..... | 83 |
| Chapter Conclusion..... | 89 |
| Chapter IV: Conclusion and Recommendations..... | 92 |
| Appendix A: | 101 |
| Bibliography..... | 106 |

List of Tables and Figures

| | |
|--|-----|
| Table 1. Cultural Landscapes and Traditional Cultural Properties in the Mid-Atlantic Region, United States of America..... | 42 |
| Table 2. Cultural Landscapes of New Jersey..... | 49 |
| Table 3. Cultural Landscapes of Maryland | 53 |
| Table 4. Cultural Landscapes in Washington D.C..... | 61 |
| Table 5. Cultural Landscapes of Virginia..... | 67 |
| Table 6. Cultural Landscapes of Pennsylvania..... | 84 |
| Figure 1..... | 101 |
| Figure 2..... | 102 |
| Figure 3..... | 103 |
| Figure 4..... | 104 |
| Figure 5..... | 105 |

Chapter I: Introduction

At the end of the twentieth century, the field of heritage protection created designations to protect landscapes with which communities interact and, thereby, are important to their culture. Henceforth, the heritage terms of cultural landscapes and Traditional Cultural Properties (TCP) were made as designations, formally defined by the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and the National Park Service (NPS), to legally protect cultural land areas from destruction and development.

Cultural landscapes and Traditional Cultural Properties are extremely similar in the way they are defined. They are also similar in the preservation protections they offer. These similarities raise the question of *whether there should be an overarching regulation enacted to protect cultural landscapes and Traditional Cultural Properties.*

This thesis argues that a more comprehensive policy should be enacted and examines 99 designated cultural landscapes and TCPs in the Mid-Atlantic region, in order to understand the impact of designation policy change. For the purpose of this thesis, the Mid-Atlantic Region is defined as the states of New Jersey, Delaware, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Washington D.C., and Virginia. Although the thesis focuses on the United States, it will make clear that issues of how cultural landscapes are protected are also an international challenge. Using examples of the UNESCO cultural landscape designation, I will demonstrate that the current system of landscape designation is a failure both on the international level and in the United States.

This first chapter begins with a discussion of definitions for both cultural landscapes and Traditional Cultural Landscapes provided by NPS and UNESCO. Each organization has slight variations on the designations which this paper explores. Next, I will provide a literature review of materials on cultural landscapes and Traditional Cultural Properties. My argument is that there is a missing connection between the literature on cultural landscapes and Traditional Cultural Properties because they are rarely discussed together. Ultimately, this thesis bridges that gap and defines how a unifying landscape regulation improves protection of cultural landscapes and other cultural resources, as it effectively streamlines landscape designation and provides greater access to landscape protection for traditional cultural groups.

Traditional Cultural Properties

In 1990, Traditional Cultural Properties (TCP) were recognized by the National Park Service with the publication of National Register Bulletin 38.¹ A TCP is defined as a place that is associated “with cultural practices or beliefs of a living community that (a) are rooted in that community’s history, and (b) are important in maintaining the continuing cultural identity of the community.”²

If they are deemed TCP-eligible, these properties are then qualified as eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, which protects the land from being changed without first undergoing a proper investigation, as per Section 106 of the National Historic

¹ King and Parker, “Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Traditional Cultural Properties”, U.S. Department of the Interior National Park Service, 1998 (1)

² Ibid.

Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966.³ The TCP designation covers a varying range of properties, including places that are associated with Native American belief systems or cultural origins, rural communities that have a group of buildings or an organization that reflects a traditional cultural use, and urban neighborhoods that have a “traditional home of a particular cultural group, and that reflects its beliefs and practices.”⁴ A TCP is not limited to these three examples and can include many other types of cultural and historic landscapes.

A challenge to preservationists is that a TCP may not necessarily include material evidence that archaeologists or historians can identify visually. Lack of material evidence is especially germane for properties that have spiritual significance to Native American communities. For many Native American tribes, there are significant places that appear to be insignificant natural, untouched land, such as Tecate Peak in California, or Nantucket Sound in Massachusetts. There are other TCPs with no written indication explaining or naming the site on the land.⁵ Consultation with local tribe members or local experts in the area is required to understand where these properties are located and to identify the TCP boundaries.⁶ Local tribes’ cooperation is necessary for site identification, but also for all situations that require further exploration through Section 106, such as archaeological sites. There are issues of community trust when attempting to protect these spaces, because for Native tribes, some religious sites are secrets, protected from outsiders; some

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Thomas King and Patricia Parker, *Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Traditional Cultural Properties*, U.S. Department of the Interior National Park Service 1998 (19)

⁶ Ibid.

tribes have even restricted knowledge of the properties' locations to a few members within a community.⁷ This becomes a problem when a boundary must be created to protect and preserve the space, if Native Americans or other groups such as anthropologists, archaeologists, and historic preservation professionals are not able to inform regulatory and protection agencies as to exactly where or what is important within the sensitive landscape.⁸ The property boundary is nevertheless required for any National Register nomination, whether it be a TCP, Historic Property, or Historic District and, therefore, its omission creates added difficulty to identify and protect TCPs when the boundary cannot be clearly articulated.

Since the NPS Bulletin 38 was published in 1990, there has been ongoing discussion within the cultural resource management field about TCPs concerning their definition and protection. In 2012, the NPS wished to rework and rearticulate the TCP designation, with a formal solicitation of public comment from the agency.⁹ Since then, there has been no public release of revised terminology concerning TCPs. As Thomas King points out in *Places that Count*, TCPs are routinely considered as only to be used for Native Americans.¹⁰ This view of TCPs is a constricted view of the designation because it limits the definition to a property only belonging to a single ethnic group or property type.¹¹ The TCP designation is associated with diverse communities that build a

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ National Register of Historic Places Program: Traditional Cultural Properties Request for Comments, Accessed 10/31/16, https://www.nps.gov/nr/publications/guidance/TCP_comments.htm Accessed 10/31/16

¹⁰ Thomas King, *Places that Count: Traditional Cultural Properties in Cultural Resource Management*. Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press, 2003 (6)

¹¹ Ibid.

connection to a surrounding land these can include ethnic or other social and historic groups. The perspective of being connected to the land is shared by all cultures including Chinese, such as San Francisco's Chinatown, Mongolian, and Jewish cultures.¹² In his book *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience*, Yi-Fu Tuan argues that places do not need to be visually beautiful with defined characteristics to feel and be significant.¹³ The TCP designation attempts to protect the feelings and beliefs that communities and groups hold and preserve about land. Since the TCP designation strives to recognize places that can be ephemeral, there have been issues in defining and recognizing them. Within the cultural heritage professional field, there are arguments about whether a TCP must have a community continually use it, as well as how to define changing boundaries over space and time. In fact, this is an issue for nearly all National Register properties, not just TCPs.¹⁴

Challenges in the designation of a TCP are highlighted in the example of the Kuchamaa (Tecate Peak) nomination in California, which is a place of importance to Native Americans. This was one of the first sites to be named as a TCP after the designation was first created in 1990. The site provides a clear example of what a TCP can look like and represent to a Native tribe. Kuchamaa (Tecate Peak) was nominated by

¹² Yi-Fu Tuan: *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience*, University of Minnesota Press, 1977. (157-158)

¹³ Yi-Fu, Tuan, *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience*, University of Minnesota Press, 1977. 1977 (178)

¹⁴ Thomas King *Places that Count: Traditional Cultural Properties in Cultural Resource Management*. Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press, 2003 (107)

the NPS and listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1992.¹⁵ The peak was placed on the NRHP under Criteria A, which is a place that is “associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.”¹⁶ The peak is located in southern California and through ethnographic research of the Kumeyaay tribe it was revealed to be a significant spiritual location.¹⁷ For the Kumeyaay, the peak is a place for many shamanic rituals and is considered to be imbued with power by one of their gods.¹⁸ A long history of continuing religious practices on the mountain makes this place a classic example of a Native American TCP. The standing traditions and their tribal significance leave little doubt that this site, under the current NPS definition, qualifies as a TCP.

The literature on TCPs primarily consists of what qualifies as a TCP, and when historic preservationists and cultural resource management professionals should use a TCP designation. Thomas King has authored multiple books and articles on the subject, including *Places that Count* and *Our Unprotected Heritage*.¹⁹ He has also written numerous editions of *Cultural Resource Laws & Practice*, which also mentions NPS bulletins and issues of property designation and protection. For King, the major concern

¹⁵ Mike Mitchell and Patrick Welch, “Kuchamaa (Tecate Peak) Cultural Landscape” National Register of Historic Places Inventory/Nomination Form. Bureau of Land Management, California, August 25th, 1992 (1)

¹⁶ Patrick Andrus, “National Register Bulletin: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation”, National Park Service: 1995 (12)

¹⁷ Mike Mitchell and Patrick Welch, “Kuchamaa (Tecate Peak) Cultural Landscape” National Register of Historic Places Inventory/Nomination Form. Bureau of Land Management, California, August 25th, 1992 (3)

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Thomas King, *Places that Count: Traditional Cultural Properties in Cultural Resource Management*. Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press, 2003

is that the researcher must work with the community to understand what land is important for them to protect.²⁰ King stresses that performing rigorous ethnography and research of the local area is required to understand the local importance of land and why a community might find it significant to protect.²¹

Reliance on the community, however, can have issues for the protection of landscapes, as preservationists Sarah Palmer, Cheri Shanteau, and Deborah Osborne argue in their article on Native Americans and TCPs, "*Strategies for Addressing Native Traditional Cultural Properties*."²² The authors assert that there may be conflicts between federal agencies and local tribes about the importance of land that could be protected by TCP designation. For example, a federal agency may feel that there is not sufficient evidence to evaluate the landscape as eligible for nomination to the National Register, while a Native tribe may feel that there is enough evidence.²³ In order to solve this conflict, there must be a neutral third party to mediate the issue.²⁴ The lack of trust between these two groups can add years to a multiyear process that produces a Memorandum of Agreement as to how to proceed with the land.²⁵

²⁰ Thomas King, *Places that Count: Traditional Cultural Properties in Cultural Resource Management*. Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press, 2003

²¹ Ibid.

²² Sarah, Palmer. Cherie Shanteau, and Deborah Osborne. "Strategies for Addressing Native Traditional Cultural Properties." *Natural Resources & Environment* 20, no. 2 (2005): 45-50. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40924655>. (45)

²³ Sarah, Palmer. Cherie Shanteau, and Deborah Osborne. "Strategies for Addressing Native Traditional Cultural Properties." *Natural Resources & Environment* 20, no. 2 (2005): 45-50. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40924655>. (45)

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ Sarah, Palmer. Cherie Shanteau, and Deborah Osborne. "Strategies for Addressing Native Traditional Cultural Properties." *Natural Resources & Environment* 20, no. 2 (2005): 45-50. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40924655>. (49)

J. Signe Snortland wrote about TCP issues with regard to how a State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) works with the local communities while being limited by the aspects of NHPA Section 106.²⁶ One of the biggest issues that the SHPO must grapple with for cultural property is where to draw the property boundary.²⁷ Denoting boundary lines of cultural property is always difficult even if the property is not a TCP, however, a TCP designation can add another layer of complexity to the process when it is a sacred site that could be a secret location.²⁸ Historic preservationist Alan Stanfill considers the challenges of Native American TCP designation. To Stanfill, the creation of a TCP designation was done in part to increase Native American involvement in TCP identification and preservation, and to empower them in protecting their land with federal cultural resource compliance legislation.²⁹ The TCP NPS Bulletin 38 was released within two years of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA 1990), which represented an evolution in protecting the Native American historic land and property through the federal preservation process in the way that it requires Native American input.³⁰ Stanfill also highlights that bringing Native Americans fully into all aspects of Section 106 creates a more in in-depth process of identification and protection,

²⁶ J. Signe, Snortland, "Caught in the Middle: The State Historic Preservation Office Role In Federal Regulations." *Plains Anthropologist* 44, no. 170 (1999): 61-64. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25669627>. (63)

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Alan L Stanfill, "Native American Participation in Federal Programs Under the National Historic Preservation Act." *Plains Anthropologist* 44, no. 170 (1999): 65-70. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25669628>. (65)

³⁰ Ibid.

and gives Native Americans the same professional respect and courtesy as other cultural resource management professionals.³¹

Cultural Landscapes

Several years after the 1990 National Register Bulletin focusing on TCP identification and evaluation was released, the National Park Service issued Preservation Brief 36, "*Protecting Cultural Landscapes: Planning, Treatment and Management of Historic Landscapes*" in 1994.³² In this brief, Charles Birnbaum discusses issues of protecting cultural landscapes which are defined as a "geographic area, including both cultural and natural resources and the wildlife or domestic animals therein, associated with a historic event, activity, or person or exhibiting other cultural or aesthetic values."³³ Within this definition, the NPS lists four landscape categories. A historic site is "a landscape significant for its association with a historic event, activity, or person."³⁴ A Historic Designed Landscape is a landscape intentionally designed by a master in field landscape design, architect, gardener, or an equivalent field.³⁵ The Historic Vernacular Landscape is a landscape constructed or designed in such a way that it reflects the cultural ideas, traditions, or customs, so that there is a clear display of interrelationship

³¹ Alan L Stanfill, "Native American Participation in Federal Programs Under the National Historic Preservation Act." *Plains Anthropologist* 44, no. 170 (1999): 65-70. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25669628>. (70)

³² Charles Birnbaum *Preservation Brief 36 Protecting Cultural Landscapes: Planning, Treatment and Management of Historic Landscapes* NPS: 1994 (1)

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ Charles Birnbaum *Preservation Brief 36, Protecting Cultural Landscapes: Planning, Treatment and Management of Historic Landscapes* National Park Service: 1994 (2)

³⁵ Ibid.

between the people and the land.³⁶ Finally, the Ethnographic Landscape is “a variety of cultural and natural resources that associated people define as heritage resources.”³⁷

These specific NPS categories of cultural landscapes and their characteristics are discussed further, below.

Historic Site Cultural Landscapes

The Historic Site as a cultural landscape is the largest deviation from other organizations’ definitions of cultural landscapes and from the other types of NPS historic preservation terminology. The UNESCO World Heritage program and the cultural landscape nonprofit advocacy group, The Cultural Landscape Foundation, do not include Historic Sites in their definition of cultural landscapes.³⁸ For context, the NPS Preservation Brief 36 regarding cultural landscapes was published in 1994, only two years after UNESCO created the cultural landscape designation in the World Heritage Program.³⁹ A Historic Site Landscape is a landscape that is associated with an important event, activity, or person.⁴⁰ The definition does not include reference to the importance of how the land was shaped by a people, or how the land shaped the people associated with it. All of the other definitions and categories of cultural landscapes from NPS and UNESCO require demonstrating more of a relationship between the land and the community to qualify as a protected cultural landscape. With respect to the UNESCO

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ The Cultural Landscape Foundation, Accessed 12/6/16, <http://tclf.org/places/about-cultural-landscapes>

³⁹ Cultural Landscapes, UNESCO, Accessed 12/13/15, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/culturallandscape/>

⁴⁰ Charles Birnbaum, *Preservation Brief 36, Protecting Cultural Landscapes: Planning, Treatment and Management of Historic Landscapes* NPS: 1994 (2)

World Heritage site list, a property cannot be listed due only to association with a person, as there must be additional cultural and historical significance attached to the site.⁴¹ This concept of a historic site as a cultural landscape is the weakest definition within the NPS cultural landscapes categories, because it requires little material evidence of the connection between the land and human use. This is not to argue that these historic site cultural landscapes are not still important historical sites that need to be recognized, but rather, that they are an odd inclusion as a cultural landscape, when historic landscapes and rural historic landscapes are already separate designations recognized by NPS.

The Dorchester Heights in Boston is an example of an historic site cultural landscape recognized by the NPS.⁴² The section of the city was a fortified hill during the Revolutionary War, when the colonial army drove the British out of Boston in 1776.⁴³ It was added to the Boston National Historic Park in 1974 for its importance in the Revolutionary War. The position of the hill and the lack of access to it helped the colonial army defeat the British army, thereby allowing it to be recognized as a cultural landscape.⁴⁴ This landscape is the place of a historic event with little interaction with the land, even though there is no requirement for interaction with the landscape in the NPS definition of a cultural landscape.⁴⁵ This lack of distinction of land use in the NPS definition of a cultural landscape is problematic, because the definition is extremely

⁴¹ The Criteria for Selection, UNESCO, Accessed 3/1/16, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/criteria/>

⁴² Dorchester Heights National Historical Park, National Park Service, Accessed 1/20/16, <http://www.nps.gov/bost/learn/historyculture/dohe.html>

⁴³ Ibid.

⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵ Charles Birnbaum, *Preservation Brief 36 Protecting Cultural Landscapes: Planning, Treatment and Management of Historic Landscapes* NPS: 1994 (2)

similar to those of historic sites or historic districts that were already defined on the National Register.

Historic Designed Landscapes

A second type of cultural landscape defined by the NPS is that of a historic designed landscape. This type of site was created by an important designer, who changed and shaped the land into a work of art that exhibited an important idea or principle from their time period.⁴⁶ An example of a Historic Designed Landscape is Meridian Hill Park in Washington D.C. located within Rock Creek Park. This park has a long history within the city. First, it was grounds for a mansion in 1829; then it was converted into a walking pleasure park; later, it was Union army camp during the Civil War, and finally, in 1910 it became the park that it is today.⁴⁷ It was in 1910 that the land was sold to the United States Government, which then commissioned George Burnap and Horace Peaslee to design the park.⁴⁸ The design, modeled after the Renaissance and Italian gardens from Europe, is intended to be reminiscent of the gardens found in the major capital cities of Europe to prove that the United States and its capital were equal to Europe. This type of designed landscape is more similar to one of the types of cultural landscapes that UNESCO recognizes. Here, the designed landscape demonstrates a greater connection between people that lived in and around the land.

⁴⁶ Charles Birnbaum, *Preservation Brief 36 Protecting Cultural Landscapes: Planning, Treatment and Management of Historic Landscapes* NPS: 1994 (2)

⁴⁷ Meridian Hill Park, National Park Service, Accessed 1/20/16, <http://www.nps.gov/mehi/learn/historyculture/index.html>

⁴⁸ Ibid.

Historic Vernacular Landscapes

A third NPS cultural landscape category is that of the Historic Vernacular landscape. This category is similar to a historic designed landscape, but it is not reliant on the fact that historic person designed it. Rather, it is a landscape that reflects a set of “traditions, customs, beliefs, or values” from a period in history.⁴⁹ These resources are then manifested on the surrounding lands that remain a visible part of the landscape to this day. The Tassi Ranch in the Arizona Mojave Desert represents this particular type of landscape.⁵⁰ The ranch is a rural historic district with buildings, structures, and landscape features that are representative of ranching customs and traditions from the first half of the twentieth century.⁵¹ The ranch still has many intact buildings and structures from the period when it was a functioning ranch, along with the irrigation canals and the tree plantings which provide protection from the harsh desert environment.⁵² The natural systems that were built into the environment and landscape to make the ranch not only more livable, but also more effective, make this site a cultural landscape.

⁴⁹ Understanding Cultural Landscapes, NPS Accessed 1/20/16,
<http://www.nps.gov/subjects/culturallandscapes/understand-cl.html>

⁵⁰ Provencher S and Warner L. Tassi Ranch: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Grand Canyon - Parashant National Monument, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 725387. NPS Pacific West Regional Office. Pacific West Regional Office/CLI Database 2003 (4)

⁵¹ Provencher S and Warner L. Tassi Ranch: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Grand Canyon - Parashant National Monument, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 725387. NPS Pacific West Regional Office. Pacific West Regional Office/CLI Database 2003 (4)

⁵² Ibid.

Ethnographic Landscapes

Of all the NPS categories of cultural landscapes, Ethnographic Landscape may be one of the more difficult landscapes to not only identify and designate, but also to delineate boundaries. This type of landscape is defined by the local stakeholders of the land, who determine which important cultural heritage resources have a symbiotic relationship with the land.⁵³ These landscapes can exist in contemporary communities where their important customs continue in the neighborhood, such as the historic New Orleans neighborhoods, or older sites that have geological features with great importance to the community.⁵⁴ An example of an ethnographic landscape is the Telaquana Trail, which has existed for hundreds of years in the Alaskan Lake Clark National Park and Preserve.⁵⁵ The trail was originally used by Native tribes to travel between villages and to gather food and resources; later, it was used by miners, trappers, and explorers in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.⁵⁶ This trail is important for historical researchers who study how the land influenced the way people traveled and where they needed to travel. The ethnographic landscape designation requires a great deal of research, collaboration, and understanding of the local community in order to be designated and protected. With ethnographic landscapes, however, there is a smaller written and historic record which increases the difficulty of documentary research required for the nomination.

⁵³ Understanding Cultural Landscapes, NPS Accessed 1/20/16,
<http://www.nps.gov/subjects/culturallandscapes/understand-cl.html>

⁵⁴ Ibid.

⁵⁵ Telaquana Trail, Lake Clark National Park and Preserve, National Park Service, Accessed 1/20/16,
<http://www.nps.gov/lacp/learn/historyculture/telaquana-trail.html>

⁵⁶ Ibid.

With regard to the entire NPS cultural landscape category, the locations of designated Cultural Landscapes within the United States are varied in number and in location. While some states, such as California, have over thirty Cultural Landscapes, others have fewer Cultural Landscapes, such as Pennsylvania with only four.⁵⁷ Two states that border Pennsylvania have a similarly low number of Cultural Landscapes, with a total of nine total in New Jersey and none in Delaware (Table 1). In Washington D.C. there are twenty-six Cultural Landscapes, because Washington is designed and groomed extensively for many of the federal memorial areas, including the National Mall and the numerous memorials surrounding the Mall, such as the Jefferson Memorial.⁵⁸ Many of the Cultural Landscapes in the Mid-Atlantic fall into one of the historic types of landscape, whether it is a historic site at Jockey Hollow, New Jersey, or a designed historic landscape, such as the Edison Laboratory Complex, New Jersey (Table 2). This limited scope of cultural landscapes could be attributed to the fact that the United States grew and became a nation when the Mid-Atlantic Region was colonized and occupied by Europeans in the 17th century. While there are many ethnic groups that exist in the region, these same groups are rarely represented in cultural landscapes identification and designation patterns. This lack of representation results in no ethnographic landscapes in the Mid-Atlantic Region. These issues will be explored further in Chapter III.

⁵⁷ Ibid.

⁵⁸ Ibid.

UNESCO Cultural Landscapes

Cultural landscapes were raised as a property and landscape type for preservation and protection concurrently for the United States and for UNESCO. The creation of the cultural landscape category designation occurred in 1992 when the UNESCO World Heritage Committee changed the guidelines to include Cultural Landscapes in World Heritage Convention when it was decided that cultural landscapes should be defined and protected as UNESCO world heritage sites.⁵⁹ This designation category attempts to recognize the connection between humankind and the natural environment, and serves to develop methods that protect both heritage and landscape.⁶⁰ The cultural landscape designation is the culmination of efforts to recognize and quantify the connection between land and humankind, which was often raised in the field of cultural heritage.⁶¹ The guideline change in 1992 was an important step towards the significance of intangible heritage, realized in the creation of the 2003 Convention for Safeguarding Intangible Culture.⁶² As stated earlier, although it may not be physically visible, the landscape can still be important to groups of people. Since 1992, there have been 85 World Heritage properties, including four transboundary properties, recognized as cultural landscapes.⁶³ These 85 cultural landscapes are underrepresented relative to other site types, considering that 1,052 properties are currently listed on the World Heritage

⁵⁹ Mitchell et al. "World Heritage Cultural Landscapes: A Handbook for Conservation and Management" UNESCO, 2009 (19)

⁶⁰ Ibid.

⁶¹ Ibid.

⁶² Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, Accessed 12/14/16, <http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/en/convention>

⁶³ Cultural Landscapes, UNESCO, Accessed 12/13/15, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/culturalandscape/>

List, which include archaeological sites, groups of buildings, and monuments.⁶⁴ There are also archaeological properties added to the World Heritage Sites that could have qualified under the UNESCO cultural landscapes definition, such as the Silk Road a case discussed in Chapter 2. This selective use of the cultural landscape property type for UNESCO results from their Eurocentric definition of cultural landscapes. A limiting view of landscapes discourages Member States from nominating sites as cultural landscapes, due to the view that the protection and recognition will not be the same as simply nominating it as a cultural world heritage site.⁶⁵

This issue of the Eurocentric view of how World Heritage Sites are judged and interpreted has been widely discussed by scholars for over twenty years.⁶⁶ When the initial 1972 World Heritage Convention was written, the term of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) was determined to be the manner judging whether sites were qualified to be World Heritage sites.⁶⁷ Sophia Labadi in her book *UNESCO, Cultural Heritage, and Outstanding Universal Value* examines the concept and issues of OUV and whether it truly is inclusive.⁶⁸ The initial World Heritage Sites were large sites that many considered to be the ‘wonders of the world’ and were focused mainly in Europe.⁶⁹ The inclusion of cultural landscapes in the World Heritage Guidelines in 1992 was widely supported by

⁶⁴ World Heritage List, UNESCO, Accessed 10/25/16, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/>

⁶⁵ Qhapaq Nan, Andean Road. UNESCO, Accessed 12/13/15, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1459>

⁶⁶ Sophia, Labadi, “UNESCO, Cultural Heritage, and Outstanding Universal Value: Value-based Analyses of the World Heritage and Intangible Cultural Heritage Conventions” New York: Altamira Press (15)

⁶⁷ Bernd, Von Droste.. “The Concept of Outstanding Universal Value and its Application ‘From the Seven Wonders of the Ancient World to the 1,000 World Heritage Places Today’” *Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development*. Vol. 1 No. 1 2011 (26-41)

⁶⁸ Ibid.

⁶⁹ Ibid.

academics in the field of Cultural Heritage to be more inclusive of non-European views towards conservation and heritage.⁷⁰

To summarize the above discussion, the NPS and UNESCO specific definitions of categories of cultural landscapes have been criticized since they were created twenty years ago. UNESCO's method of nominating sites receives a great deal of ire from the cultural heritage community due to the politics that control the voting process. Lynn Meskell observed the 2011 World Heritage Committee in Paris, and reported that the fulfillment of actual requirements for site qualification was secondary to the political alliances contributing to the way Member States voted for the nomination of World Heritage Sites.^{71, 72} The cultural landscape definition has also been influenced by the politicking of UNESCO, as discussed in Chapter II in this thesis.

National Park Service Cultural Landscape Designation Challenges

There is considerable literature concerning the criticism of NPS landscapes. The NPS uses vernacular landscapes interchangeably with rural historic landscapes; rural landscapes were established as a separate designation in 1989, by the NPS Bulletin 30.⁷³ Bulletin 30 defines a rural historic landscape as “a geographic area that has historically

⁷⁰ Sarah Titchen. “On the Construction of ‘Outstanding Universal Value’, Some Comments On the Implementation of the 1972 UNESCO World Heritage Convention” *Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites* (1996) vol. 1 (235-242)

⁷¹ Lynn Meskell: “The Rush to Inscribe: Reflections on the 35th Session of the World Heritage Committee, UNESCO Paris, 2011” *Journal of Field Archaeology*, Vol. 37 No. 2: 2012 (147)

⁷² Jukka Jokilehto. “World heritage: Observations on Decisions Related to Cultural Heritage” *Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development*. Vol.1 No. 1 2011 (61-74)

⁷³ Arnold Alanen: “Considering the Ordinary: Vernacular Landscapes in Small Towns and Rural Areas” in *Preserving Cultural Landscapes in America*, edited by Arnold Alanen and Robert Z. Melnick, 112-142. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003 (112)

been used by people, or shaped or modified by human activity... that possesses a significant concentration, linkage, or continuity of areas of land use, vegetation, buildings and structures, roads and waterways, and natural features.”⁷⁴ The rural historic landscape definition can be used interchangeably with the vernacular historic landscape; despite this overlap, NPS Bulletin 30 and vernacular historic landscape designation both exist.

Regardless of the many definitions, vernacular landscapes can be difficult for heritage professionals to identify and delineate. Arnold Alanen’s essay on vernacular landscapes argues that vernacular landscapes are ordinary landscapes, and have been overlooked by historic preservationists for many years.⁷⁵ There is also the difficulty of recognizing the characteristics of an ordinary landscape, which no longer makes it ordinary.⁷⁶ With the vernacular landscape, preservationists must create a balancing act of deciding which ordinary landscapes from a specific point in time must be preserved, and which ones will grow and change over time.⁷⁷

Another challenge for NPS cultural landscape designation is the ethnographic landscape category. As mentioned above, there are no ethnographic landscapes designated for the Mid-Atlantic. Ethnographic landscapes are almost the opposite of a vernacular landscape where, instead of humans putting their mark on the land, the land

⁷⁴ McClelland et al.: 1990 (1-2)

⁷⁵ Arnold Alanen: “Considering the Ordinary: Vernacular Landscapes in Small Towns and Rural Areas” in *Preserving Cultural Landscapes in America*, edited by Arnold Alanen and Robert Z. Melnick, 112-142. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003 (115)

⁷⁶ Arnold Alanen: “Considering the Ordinary: Vernacular Landscapes in Small Towns and Rural Areas” in *Preserving Cultural Landscapes in America*, edited by Arnold Alanen and Robert Z. Melnick, 112-142. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003 (140)

⁷⁷ Arnold Alanen: “Considering the Ordinary: Vernacular Landscapes in Small Towns and Rural Areas” in *Preserving Cultural Landscapes in America*, edited by Arnold Alanen and Robert Z. Melnick, 112-142. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003 (140)

puts its mark on humans.⁷⁸ Like TCPs, there is a sense that these landscapes are associated only with Native Americans. However, the Chinese *fengshui* traditions in California's Chinatown planning and the grid pattern Mormon settlement planning in Utah are both considered examples of ethnographic landscapes.⁷⁹ For the Chinese cultural example, *fengshui* uses cardinal directions and divination as a method to view and understand the landscape.⁸⁰ These concepts help determine where to live and which landscapes will bring good fortune.⁸¹ Historical archaeologist Donald Hardesty's essay, *Ethnographic Landscapes*, argues that these examples demonstrate how nature transforms into culture, where the land affects how a person from one community views and understands the world.⁸² The ethnographic landscape is the most difficult to define and recognize; for this reason it is the easiest property to spark conflicts when another group of people encroach on what may be considered important land, but for which the space does not exhibit visible landmarks.⁸³ This conflict of invisible features to the non-native viewer occurred in Arizona's Canyon de Chelly, where both Navajo and non-Native groups have important ties to the land.⁸⁴

⁷⁸ Donald Hardesty, "Ethnographic Landscapes: Transforming Nature into Culture" 169-185. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003 (169)

⁷⁹ Ibid.

⁸⁰ Donald Hardesty, "Ethnographic Landscapes: Transforming Nature into Culture" 169-185. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003 (171-172)

⁸¹ Donald Hardesty, "Ethnographic Landscapes: Transforming Nature into Culture" 169-185. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003 (172)

⁸² Donald Hardesty, "Ethnographic Landscapes: Transforming Nature into Culture" 169-185. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003 (171)

⁸³ Ibid.

⁸⁴ Ibid.

In an article on the Southern Paiute, Stoffle et al. also discuss the problems inherent in assigning cultural landscape definitions and their relationship with the Grand Canyon in Arizona.⁸⁵ They argue that five different types of Native American cultural landscapes exist: holy landscapes, storyscapes, regional landscapes, ecoscapes, and landmarks.⁸⁶ The holy landscapes are similar to the Western definition of a holy land, where the origin story of humans, or of that tribe, exist.⁸⁷ The storyscape is a section of the holy landscape that is delineated by an origin myth or song.⁸⁸ Regional landscapes also fall within the holy landscapes that are bounded by important geographic features, which is similar to the ecoscape that is also bounded by geographic features.⁸⁹ Finally, there are landmarks which are geographic features that a Native American tribe finds important within a landscape.⁹⁰ Stoffle et al argue that all of these types of landscapes could fall under the category of ethnographic landscapes.⁹¹

Another challenge for NPS designation of cultural landscapes is how to actively protect and preserve a cultural landscape after its formal nomination. Susan Dolan, the current director of the NPS Cultural Landscape Program, addressed this issue of

⁸⁵ Richard, W Stoffle. David B. Halmo, and Diane E. Austin. "Cultural Landscapes and Traditional Cultural Properties: A Southern Paiute View of the Grand Canyon and Colorado River." *American Indian Quarterly* 21, no. 2 (1997): 229-49. doi:10.2307/1185646. (234)

⁸⁶ Ibid.

⁸⁷ Ibid.

⁸⁸ Richard W, Stoffle., David B. Halmo, and Diane E. Austin. "Cultural Landscapes and Traditional Cultural Properties: A Southern Paiute View of the Grand Canyon and Colorado River." *American Indian Quarterly* 21, no. 2 (1997): 229-49. doi:10.2307/1185646.(235-236)

⁸⁹ Richard W Stoffle. David B. Halmo, and Diane E. Austin. "Cultural Landscapes and Traditional Cultural Properties: A Southern Paiute View of the Grand Canyon and Colorado River." *American Indian Quarterly* 21, no. 2 (1997): 229-49. doi:10.2307/1185646. (236-237)

⁹⁰ Richard W Stoffle. David B. Halmo, and Diane E. Austin. "Cultural Landscapes and Traditional Cultural Properties: A Southern Paiute View of the Grand Canyon and Colorado River." *American Indian Quarterly* 21, no. 2 (1997): 229-49. doi:10.2307/1185646. (237-238)

⁹¹ Ibid.

landscape protection in her essay on sustaining historic and traditional uses for cultural landscapes.⁹² For the NPS, this issue mainly applies to historic landscapes and vernacular landscapes, but not to ethnographic landscapes. The NPS is required to conserve the integrity of the landscape through landscape maintenance; NPS standards call for historic properties to be maintained instead of repaired, repaired over replaced, and replaced in-kind over substitution.⁹³ Another issue for the NPS is what form the landscape should take in its restoration. In other words, if the landscape has changed ownership multiple times over the centuries, it has changed in appearance and use.⁹⁴ For example, in the 1930s, the NPS displaced the settlers living on the land in Shenandoah National Park, Virginia to create natural scenery for the park; the settlers themselves had displaced the Native Americans in the 17th century.⁹⁵ In the present day, preserving the landscape for the park requires the NPS to make decisions about how to preserve the landscape, especially on lands with such a complicated land property ownership and use history.

A fourth issue that the NPS must attend to in cultural landscape preservation is landownership.⁹⁶ Not all land is owned by the NPS, or a specific NPS park; in some

⁹² Susan Dolan, "Innovations in Managing National Park Service Cultural Landscapes: Sustaining historic and traditional uses" In *Conserving Cultural Landscapes: Challenges and New Directions* ed. by Ken Taylor, Archer St. Clair, And Nora Mitchell (New York: Routledge Taylor and Francis 2015), 251.

⁹³ Susan Dolan, "Innovations in Managing National Park Service Cultural Landscapes: Sustaining historic and traditional uses" In *Conserving Cultural Landscapes: Challenges and New Directions* ed. by Ken Taylor, Archer St. Clair, And Nora Mitchell (New York: Routledge Taylor and Francis 2015), (253).

⁹⁴ Susan Dolan, "Innovations in Managing National Park Service Cultural Landscapes: Sustaining historic and traditional uses" In *Conserving Cultural Landscapes: Challenges and New Directions* ed. by Ken Taylor, Archer St. Clair, And Nora Mitchell (New York: Routledge Taylor and Francis 2015), (255)

⁹⁵ Susan Dolan, "Innovations in Managing National Park Service Cultural Landscapes: Sustaining historic and traditional uses" In *Conserving Cultural Landscapes: Challenges and New Directions* ed. by Ken Taylor, Archer St. Clair, And Nora Mitchell (New York: Routledge Taylor and Francis 2015), (255)

⁹⁶ Susan Dolan, "Innovations in Managing National Park Service Cultural Landscapes: Sustaining historic and traditional uses" In *Conserving Cultural Landscapes: Challenges and New Directions* ed. by Ken Taylor, Archer St. Clair, And Nora Mitchell (New York: Routledge Taylor and Francis 2015), (256)

cases, land is also leased to Native American communities who still use the land.⁹⁷ At Arizona's Hubbell Trading Post National Historic Site, there is a lease agreement with the local Gando Navajo tribe to farm and live on the land, provided that they use traditional farming methods and irrigation techniques.⁹⁸ In Canyon de Chelly National Monument, the Navajo Nation owns the land, but works with the NPS to accurately preserve the historic landscape.⁹⁹ The challenges for cultural landscapes do not end at nomination or designation as a cultural landscape; rather, nomination raises further demands required after formal designation through property maintenance, restoration, collaborative preservation, and interpretive programs.

In the previous two examples, the Native American tribal groups involved with the NPS were willing parties to protect the cultural landscape. This scenario is not always the case for nominating cultural landscapes; there are examples where local communities are not fully invested in preserving the landscapes. Historic preservationist Brenda Barrett's essay, "*Lessons in Large Landscape Management*," discusses the importance of community involvement when trying to create a cultural landscape designation.¹⁰⁰ For many communities, the identification and designation of a cultural landscape contributes

⁹⁷ ⁹⁷ Susan Dolan, "Innovations in Managing National Park Service Cultural Landscapes: Sustaining historic and traditional uses" In *Conserving Cultural Landscapes: Challenges and New Directions* ed. by Ken Taylor, Archer St. Clair, And Nora Mitchell (New York: Routledge Taylor and Francis 2015), (256-258)

⁹⁸ Ibid.

⁹⁹ ⁹⁹ Susan Dolan, "Innovations in Managing National Park Service Cultural Landscapes: Sustaining historic and traditional uses" In *Conserving Cultural Landscapes: Challenges and New Directions* ed. by Ken Taylor, Archer St. Clair, And Nora Mitchell (New York: Routledge Taylor and Francis 2015), (258)

¹⁰⁰ Brenda Barrett, "Lessons in Large Landscape Management" In *Conserving Cultural Landscapes: Challenges and New Directions* ed. by Ken Taylor, Archer St. Clair, And Nora Mitchell (New York: Routledge Taylor and Francis 2015) (240)

to the economic and social revitalization of a community.¹⁰¹ Barrett explains that it is critical to engage residents, and to tell the story of why it is important to preserve the land around them, in order to help them find common ground with preservation and the community's needs.¹⁰²

Chapter Conclusion

There have been many discussions and articles written about cultural landscape designations and preservation strategies in the United States and internationally. Additionally, there are discussions and articles written about Traditional Cultural Properties in the United States. There is, however, limited information available about the landscape designations relationships to each other and their challenges. As explained in this chapter, the majority of the literature focuses on how these two designations should be used and applied in the field of Cultural Resource Management. Currently, a significant number of heritage professionals are discussing how and when to use TCPs or cultural landscapes in the United States. Thomas King, one of the authors of the initial NPS Bulletin 38, has written a great deal on the topic of protecting landscapes, and he argues that it is simple to define a TCP.

This thesis contributes to the growing preservation field literature on cultural landscapes and their designation as preservation strategies, and aims to bridge the gap between discussion on cultural landscapes and TCPs. Taking a cultural heritage approach

¹⁰¹ Ibid.

¹⁰² Brenda Barrett, "Lessons in Large Landscape Management" In *Conserving Cultural Landscapes: Challenges and New Directions* ed. by Ken Taylor, Archer St. Clair, And Nora Mitchell (New York: Routledge Taylor and Francis 2015) (246)

to cultural landscape preservation, this thesis adds to the literature concerning cultural property law. In the field of law, attorney Naomi Mezey wrote about issues with cultural property law in her essay the *Paradoxes of Cultural Property*.¹⁰³ Her argument is that cultural property law is a static law for an extremely fluid and complex issue, and, therefore, fails to protect and properly recognize inherent changes in cultural icons that are adopted and altered by other cultures.¹⁰⁴ Mezey's argument mainly focuses on the issue of mascots, Native American symbols used by school teams; she argues that because the use of mascots has helped cultures mix, one particular group should not always be the main arbiter of how cultural symbols are used.¹⁰⁵ This argument does raise the thorny issue in the cultural heritage protection field of who should decide what is important, why it is important, and how it should be protected. In the original Bulletin 38 on TCP language, King and Parker make very clear their thinking that it is the community living and interacting with the land around them that needs to make this decision.¹⁰⁶ Conversely, in the cultural landscape Bulletin 30, the language is centered on heritage professionals proving the connection between the land and historical importance.¹⁰⁷ This thesis, with its cultural heritage approach to cultural landscapes, will

¹⁰³ Naomi Mezey, "The Paradoxes of Cultural Property." *Columbia Law Review* 107, no. 8 (2007): 2004-046. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40041756>. (2005)

¹⁰⁴ Naomi Mezey. "The Paradoxes of Cultural Property." *Columbia Law Review* 107, no. 8 (2007): 2004-046. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40041756>. (2005)

¹⁰⁵ Naomi Mezey, "The Paradoxes of Cultural Property." *Columbia Law Review* 107, no. 8 (2007): 2004-046. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40041756>. (2026)

¹⁰⁶ Thomas King and Patricia Parker, *Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Traditional Cultural Properties*, U.S. Department of the Interior National Park Service 1997 (3)

¹⁰⁷ Charles Birnbaum, *Preservation Brief 36 Protecting Cultural Landscapes: Planning, Treatment and Management of Historic Landscapes* NPS: 1994 (2)

address these issues by arguing the need to unify the cultural landscape and TCP designations.

Clearly, many of the different designations and bulletins created by the NPS indicate that cultural landscapes and TCPs overlap a great deal. The following chapters will discuss the overlap in designation and definition of cultural landscapes and TCPs. On the international level, I will examine how cultural landscapes are labeled as World Heritage Sites at UNESCO, and do not use the cultural landscape definition, a separate designation under the general World Heritage definition as stated by the World Heritage Convention Operational Guidelines. These designations were created to protect specific and unique landscapes and properties. If properties are not placed in these designations correctly, the need to have specialized designations becomes moot.

Chapter 2, titled *UNESCO and Cultural Landscapes*, will address how UNESCO nominates its cultural landscapes, in comparison with the way it nominates cultural heritage sites. Chapter 3 pivots to the United States and compares cultural landscapes and TCPs with a focus on Mid-Atlantic case studies. Finally, I will compare how cultural landscapes are protected both in the United States and internationally, and what can be done to improve their protections.

Chapter II: UNESCO and Cultural Landscapes

Introduction

Although cultural landscapes are designated on the global level by UNESCO, the designation process is fraught with issues, from politicking to lack of transparency. This chapter delves into several examples of how properties are nominated as cultural landscapes, but ultimately are designated as World Heritage Sites. This nomination and designation process often occurs without a written public record with documentation to change its designation. In many situations, the nomination file is written for a site to be specifically nominated as a cultural landscape, and not as a World Heritage Site. Ultimately, this chapter highlights the challenges of cultural landscape designation at the UNESCO level. These challenges are an important point of comparison to the United States landscape designation system. In the United States, the NPS uses two terms to designate properties: cultural landscapes and TCP. There are, however, complications with the process that result in which specific designations are used. It is important to compare the two definitions used by the NPS, and how the UNESCO cultural heritage and cultural landscapes designations work in conjunction with each other.

Cultural Landscapes Categories in UNESCO

The 1992 UNESCO World Heritage Committee created the category of cultural landscapes as world heritage sites by adopting new guidelines to include them to the World Heritage List, because it recognized the importance of sites that, “combined works

of nature and of man.”¹⁰⁸ Out of this overarching idea and theme, the World Heritage Committee created three categories for cultural landscapes in the Operational Guidelines. The first category recognizes a “clearly defined landscape designed and created intentionally by man.”¹⁰⁹ This type of site recognizes the man-made gardens and parklands that are designed for aesthetic reasons.¹¹⁰ Kew Royal Botanical Gardens of England are an ideal example; the 18th century English-style garden has multiple greenhouses designed and built by renowned architects such as, Bridgeman, Kent, Chambers, Brown, and Nesfield.¹¹¹ Many important scientific discoveries in botany and plant diversity take place on this site, which has been preserved and protected since it was built so that it still function as a place of research.¹¹²

The second category for UNESCO designated cultural landscapes sites is an “organically evolved landscape which has two sub-categories within.”¹¹³ This landscape is a product of social, economic, administrative, or religious reasons for humans to interact with the landscape.¹¹⁴ Relict and fossil landscapes were shaped and used in the past and are no longer used, however, even after abandonment, material evidence remains in the landscape.¹¹⁵ A continuing landscape is utilized by a contemporary community, in

¹⁰⁸ Mitchell et al. “World Heritage Cultural Landscapes: A Handbook for Conservation and Management”. UNESCO, 2009 (19)

¹⁰⁹ Mitchell et al. “World Heritage Cultural Landscapes: A Handbook for Conservation and Management”. UNESCO, 2009 (20)

¹¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹¹ Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, UNESCO, Accessed 9/1/16, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1084>

¹¹² Ibid.

¹¹³ Mitchell et al. “World Heritage Cultural Landscapes: A Handbook for Conservation and Management”. UNESCO, 2009 (20)

¹¹⁴ Ibid.

¹¹⁵ Ibid.

a similar manner to its traditional use.¹¹⁶ The Philippine Rice Terraces of the Cordilleras is an example of a continuing landscape; rice paddies that have been used for at least two thousand years, still function, with the agricultural tradition being passed down from generation to generation.¹¹⁷ This latter category exemplifies the ability of humans and nature to work together sustainably.¹¹⁸

The third UNESCO category for cultural landscapes is the “associative cultural landscape.”¹¹⁹ These landscapes include sites that have a significant religious, artistic, or cultural association.¹²⁰ They do not require physical cultural evidence to be designated as a cultural landscape.¹²¹ A famous example is the Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park in Australia. Located in Central Australia’s Great Outback, the park consists of 36 massive rock domes protruding from the ground.¹²² Uluru-Kata was originally inscribed as a World Heritage Site, and later changed to a cultural landscape world heritage site after the guidelines changed in 1992. The change acknowledged the importance to Australia’s aboriginals, because of their many religious traditions associated with the landscape.¹²³

While UNESCO lists four types of cultural landscapes, surprisingly few have been nominated or added to the World Heritage List as cultural landscapes, despite fitting

¹¹⁶ Ibid.

¹¹⁷ Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras, UNESCO, Accessed 9/1/16, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/722>

¹¹⁸ Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras, UNESCO, Accessed 9/1/16, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/722>

¹¹⁹ Mitchell et al. “World Heritage Cultural Landscapes: A Handbook for Conservation and Management”. UNESCO, 2009 (20)

¹²⁰ Ibid.

¹²¹ [Ibid](#)

¹²² Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park, UNESCO, Accessed 9/1/16, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/447>.

¹²³ Ibid.

UNESCO's definitions. A precedent of mislabeling cultural heritage sites results from the absence of similar sites on the list. A cultural landscape site that was previously nominated, with similar land use, can lay the groundwork for a new site to succeed in the nomination process.¹²⁴ In both the Silk Road and the Andean Road nomination files, other sites are referenced. For example, the Silk Road nomination file uses the Sacred Sites in the Kii Mountain Range and the Camino Real de Tierra Adentro as references.¹²⁵ Sites that are not considered World Heritage sites and, therefore, not recognized and protected, can instead be considered within the cultural landscape of Outstanding Universal Value. These sites are difficult to recognize for their Outstanding Universal Value because they exist in a liminal space between a natural and cultural type of heritage site. If member states nominating the sites consider the definition of cultural landscapes as ineffective, for either nominating or protecting the sites, then the creation of cultural landscapes as a UNESCO site category has failed.

The Andean and Silk Roads exemplify the problem of properly identifying cultural landscapes; in 2014, both were nominated and added to the World Heritage List as sites, but not as cultural landscapes.¹²⁶ The Andean Road is a famous South American road network built by the Incas during the 14th and 15th centuries.¹²⁷ The road extends through six countries, including Argentina, Perú, Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, and

¹²⁴ 2014 Nomination file Silk Road, UNESCO, Accessed 12/13/16, <http://whc.unesco.org/uploads/nominations/1442.pdf> (529)

¹²⁵ 2014 Nomination file Silk Road, UNESCO, Accessed 12/13/15, <http://whc.unesco.org/uploads/nominations/1442.pdf> (529)

¹²⁶ World Heritage List, UNESCO, Accessed 10/25/16, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/>

¹²⁷ Qhapaq Nan, Andean Road. UNESCO, Accessed 12/13/15, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1459>

Chile.¹²⁸ Unfortunately, the entire network of roads is not completely protected, partly because sections have been destroyed for modern uses, such as agriculture, and modern development, such as housing and infrastructure. As of 2014, six-thousand kilometers of the Andean Road are protected by UNESCO.¹²⁹ This 6,000-kilometer section connects to 273 specific cultural sites along the road that, “highlight social, political, architectural, and engineering achievements.”¹³⁰ These sites range from large archaeological sites, such as the 16th century Machu Picchu, to smaller Incan archaeological sites that are residential sites with farming and storage centers.¹³¹ The Andean Road was not only a route allowing easier travel along the Incan Empire across the harsh Andes Mountains that can range to over 6,000 meters above sea level; it also was a pathway for knowledge and information transmission. There is a distinct style of Incan architecture and farming seen across the entire range of the Andes because the Andean Road connected the Incan empire and facilitated the spread of knowledge and goods.¹³² The distinctive terracing of the mountains to grow crops in the Andes is credited as a uniquely Incan form of agriculture.¹³³ The Andean Road remains functional in the modern world, with locals and tourists using it as a pathway for travel by foot or camelids.¹³⁴ While these physical characteristics of the Andean Road qualified it as a World Heritage Site, it was not nominated as a cultural landscape.

¹²⁸ Ibid.

¹²⁹ Qhapaq Nan, Andean Road. UNESCO, Accessed 12/13/15, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1459>

¹³⁰ Ibid.

¹³¹ Ibid.

¹³² Ibid.

¹³³ Ibid.

¹³⁴ Ibid.

The Silk Road is another case of a long transboundary World Heritage Site that was recently inscribed onto the World Heritage List, but not as a cultural landscape. The Silk Road was originally over 35,000 kilometers long and stretched from China to the Mediterranean nations; however, because of development, in the modern era it extends 5,000 kilometers across China, Kazakhstan, and Kyrgyzstan.¹³⁵ The Silk Road connects thirty-three historical and archaeological sites, from historical cities and trading posts to religious sites and tombs.¹³⁶ The road is also known for its extreme terrain, with elevations ranging from 154 meters below sea level to over 7,000 meters above sea level.¹³⁷ Its importance, not only to the region, but also worldwide, is greater than that of the Andean Road. The Silk Road was originally built in the 2nd century BCE, and was extended and used until the 16th century CE. It linked multiple Asian civilizations, including the Han and Tang Dynasties of China, to Europe not only in trade, but also religion, scientific knowledge, technology, culture, and the arts.¹³⁸ Some of the most impressive Buddhist pagodas and caves in the world are located along the route, for example the Qigexing Temple Ruins. There are also sections of the Silk Road which possess Islamic and Christian sites, such as those in the Kucha Region.¹³⁹ The Silk Road influenced how the land was used, with nomadic tribes establishing agricultural settlements along the route; new settlements brought new infrastructure, like water

¹³⁵ 2014 Nomination file Silk Road, UNESCO, Accessed 12/13/15, <http://whc.unesco.org/uploads/nominations/1442.pdf> (1000)

¹³⁶ 2014 Nomination file Silk Road, UNESCO, Accessed 12/13/15, <http://whc.unesco.org/uploads/nominations/1442.pdf> (1001)

¹³⁷ Ibid.

¹³⁸ Ibid.

¹³⁹ Ibid.

management systems to sustain agriculture, which proliferated along the Silk Road during the 1st century BCE.¹⁴⁰ Like the Andean Road, it was much more than a trade route associated with multiple historical eras and cultural groups; it also served as a nexus for cultural exchange and the spread of both tangible and intangible culture in the form of architecture, arts, and technology. Yet, similar to the Andean Road world heritage site, the Silk Road was not recognized as a cultural landscape despite UNESCO's acknowledgement that the Road was extremely important and influential to how people interacted with the land and created settlements along it.¹⁴¹

Decisions to nominate the Andean Road and the Silk Road as World Heritage Sites alone, and not to nominate them as cultural landscapes, is considerably unusual when compared to other sites that were successfully added to the World Heritage List as Cultural Landscapes. The Wachau cultural landscape in Austria is an example of a successful cultural heritage nomination as a cultural landscape. The Wachau cultural landscape compares to the Andean Road and Silk Road in that it is also a trade route. The Wachau is a section of the Danube river valley in Austria, located between the cities of Melk and Kermers.¹⁴² It was nominated and inscribed on the World Heritage List in 2000 as a cultural landscape for architecture. The landscape includes monasteries, castles, and ruins from as early as the 11th and 12th centuries, as well as its urban design and agricultural history, particularly in wine production.¹⁴³ The Wachau Landscape has been

¹⁴⁰ Ibid.

¹⁴¹ 2014 Nomination file Silk Road, UNESCO, Accessed 12/13/15, <http://whc.unesco.org/uploads/nominations/1442.pdf> (1000)

¹⁴² Wachau Cultural Landscape, UNESCO, Accessed 12/13/15, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/970>

¹⁴³ Ibid.

a habitat for humans for over four thousand years, with people residing in the region from the Neolithic period to the present.¹⁴⁴ Major changes to the landscape of the river valley did not start until 800 CE, when the monasteries started to be built.¹⁴⁵ These monasteries were the first in the area to cultivate the land for viticulture on the hillsides around the river.¹⁴⁶ The level of wine production increased dramatically during the 18th century with climate change and demand for wine.¹⁴⁷ The buildings and farmsteads have distinctive designs that are historically important, with well-preserved structures dating back to the Middle Ages.¹⁴⁸ This landscape is clearly significant on an historical and cultural basis as a World Heritage List Cultural Landscape. Nonetheless, its inclusion raises the question as to why Wachau is considered a cultural landscape and the Andean Road and the Silk Road are not.

To understand why the Andean Road was not nominated as a cultural landscape, it is key to examine the start of the nomination process. In 2001, Peru began the long and difficult process to nominate and create the Andean Road as a World Heritage Site; soon after, Argentina and Chile joined with Peru to include their sections of the Road in the nomination process.¹⁴⁹ By 2003, all six nations (Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, and Peru) asked the World Heritage Centre to take over the coordination of the

¹⁴⁴ Wachau Cultural Landscape, UNESCO, Accessed 12/13/15, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/970>

¹⁴⁵ Ibid.

¹⁴⁶ Ibid.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid.

¹⁴⁸ Ibid.

¹⁴⁹ Main Andean Road, UNESCO, [Accessed 3/1/16, http://whc.unesco.org/pg.cfm?cid=281&id_group=19&s=home](http://whc.unesco.org/pg.cfm?cid=281&id_group=19&s=home)

nomination process for the site.¹⁵⁰ Later in 2003, a World Heritage Centre meeting in Cuzco determined that the Andean Road, in the six nations, would be nominated as one property and began to determine which criteria to use; at this 2003 meeting, the Centre made the initial decision to nominate the site as a cultural landscape.¹⁵¹ In 2006, during a meeting of experts on the nomination of the Andean Road in Pasto, Colombia, the decision was made to nominate the site not as a cultural landscape, but as a cultural heritage site.¹⁵² The argument for nominating the site as a cultural site only, was that it “helps focalize [sic] a selection of segments, and indeed, of territory much more closely related to the functions of the realities of our countries.”¹⁵³ The group of experts, including archaeologists, anthropologists, cartographers, and historians from around the world, maintained that the cultural landscape title would provide the same protection and support as a regular cultural site. Despite the group of experts’ recommendation for the site to be a cultural landscape, and the submission nomination file containing descriptions of the Andean Road as part of cultural landscapes in both Argentina and Chile, it was nominated as only a World Heritage Site.¹⁵⁴

While the nomination file does not state the official reasoning for the nomination category to change the World Heritage Site designation, other categories of designation are mentioned. There is also a nomination file section that presents comparable sites that

¹⁵⁰ Ibid.

¹⁵¹ Ibid.

¹⁵² 2014 Nomination file Andean Road, UNESCO, Accessed 9/18/15, <http://whc.unesco.org/uploads/nominations/1459pdf> (2685)

¹⁵³ Ibid.

¹⁵⁴ Ibid.

are nominated, or are existing cultural landscape sites that have similarities to the Andean Road; sites included in the Andean Road file discuss the Silk Road as a cultural landscape and its importance to humankind in its comparison of sites.¹⁵⁵ There is no written reason explaining why the nomination was changed from a cultural landscape to a cultural site, leaving outsiders to speculate on the committee's reasons for the change.

This change of nomination category from a Cultural Landscape to a World Heritage Site was not an isolated incident. The UNESCO Silk Road nominating group was comprised of three countries, China, Kazakhstan, and Kyrgyzstan, that united in the 2000s to nominate the Silk Road as a World Heritage Site. In their nomination papers, researchers supporting the nomination recognized that the Silk Road could be considered a cultural landscape because trade along this route impacted how civilizations lived on and used the land.¹⁵⁶ Like the nomination committee for the Andean Road, they decided that to nominate the site as a cultural landscape was not ideal; the reasons for this nomination strategy is not detailed in the nomination file. Rather, they proposed that there should be a separate category from cultural landscapes called “cultural routes.”¹⁵⁷ They define a cultural route to be:

...(a) physical or perceived representations of a frequent and repeated movement over a significant period of time, linking places in time and space, over land and/or water, or otherwise and generating, next to an exchange of goods and ideas, a cross-fertilization within or between cultural regions of the world.¹⁵⁸

¹⁵⁵ Ibid.

¹⁵⁶ 2014 Nomination file Silk Road, UNESCO, Accessed 12/13/15, <http://whc.unesco.org/uploads/nominations/1442.pdf>, (1000)

¹⁵⁷ Ibid.

¹⁵⁸ 2014 Nomination file Silk Road, UNESCO, Accessed 12/13/15, <http://whc.unesco.org/uploads/nominations/1442.pdf>, (1001)

The nominating committee, however, recognized that a “cultural route” is a proposed category concept and is not an accepted nomination type for UNESCO’s World Heritage List. The report draws upon other examples of routes or linear resources in the world, including the Camino de Santiago in Spain and Hadrian’s Wall in the United Kingdom; both are also linear resources crossing large swaths of land.¹⁵⁹ Throughout the Silk Road nomination files, cultural landscapes are used in comparison to the Silk Road, like the Sacred Sites and Pilgrimage Routes in the Kii Mountain Range.¹⁶⁰ Yet, despite recognizing that cultural landscapes are part of the Silk Road and that the road connects multiple archaeological and historical sites, the nominating committee nominated the Silk Road as only a cultural heritage site. The definitions of cultural routes are more similar to those of WHS cultural landscapes than to the broader-themed cultural sites. Despite this similarity, the World Heritage nominating committee nominated the site as a cultural heritage site and not as a cultural landscape. There is a problem with the cultural landscape definitions and nomination process if nations and groups of nations choose to nominate cultural landscapes as cultural heritage sites because it would be easier to nominate, control, and protect cultural heritage sites. The World Heritage Committee is setting a precedent that only makes it more difficult for other future cultural landscapes to be nominated to the World Heritage List.

¹⁵⁹ 2014 Nomination file Silk Road, UNESCO, Accessed 12/13/15, <http://whc.unesco.org/uploads/nominations/1442.pdf>, (1003)

¹⁶⁰ 2014 Nomination file Silk Road, UNESCO, Accessed 12/13/15, <http://whc.unesco.org/uploads/nominations/1442.pdf>, (527)

Chapter Conclusion

One of the most emphasized aspects of the UNESCO cultural landscapes definition is that there must be clear and outstanding “combined works of nature and man.”¹⁶¹ Despite this overarching ideal, UNESCO has failed to nominate many sites under the cultural landscapes category. Some critics highlight the failings of the UNESCO cultural landscapes definition for being too narrow.¹⁶² One of the main critiques of UNESCO’s cultural landscape definition is that it is too bound to material culture, such as ruins and artifacts.¹⁶³ Requiring material evidence in the landscape to prove the interaction between humankind and nature reflects a Eurocentric worldview.¹⁶⁴ This worldview essentially discriminates against many indigenous cultures by not valuing non-Eurocentric use of space and place.¹⁶⁵ For many heritage professionals, it is much easier to protect sites with physical evidence of interaction between the land and humans, because they are easier to delineate and manage.¹⁶⁶ This need for material evidence discriminates against the groups that have landscapes without material evidence.¹⁶⁷

¹⁶¹ Mitchell et al. “World Heritage Cultural Landscapes: A Handbook for Conservation and Management”. UNESCO, 2009 (19)

¹⁶² Lisa Prosper, “Wherein Lies the Heritage Value? Rethinking the Heritage Value of Cultural Landscapes from an Aboriginal Perspective.” The George Wright Forum. Vol. 24, Num. 2(2007) (117)

¹⁶³ Lisa Prosper, “Wherein Lies the Heritage Value? Rethinking the Heritage Value of Cultural Landscapes from an Aboriginal Perspective.” The George Wright Forum. Vol. 24, Num. 2(2007) (117)

¹⁶⁴ Lisa Prosper, “Wherein Lies the Heritage Value? Rethinking the Heritage Value of Cultural Landscapes from an Aboriginal Perspective.” The George Wright Forum. Vol. 24, Num. 2(2007) (118)

¹⁶⁵ Lisa Prosper, “Wherein Lies the Heritage Value? Rethinking the Heritage Value of Cultural Landscapes from an Aboriginal Perspective.” The George Wright Forum. Vol. 24, Num. 2(2007) (119)

¹⁶⁶ Ibid.

¹⁶⁷ Ibid.

Currently, the UNESCO definition of cultural landscapes only reinforces the problematic power inequalities between indigenous and Eurocentric cultures. This discrimination continues the power struggle between the underrepresented indigenous peoples and the European conservation community, evidenced by their social and legal treatment within the nations where they reside.¹⁶⁸ The need for material culture narrows the field of sites to be nominated, or even to attempt nomination, as a cultural landscape. For this reason, it is imperative that UNESCO examine its definition and implementation of cultural landscapes. This also explains why there are only 85 cultural landscapes that are currently on the World Heritage List. The idea and concept of cultural landscapes is useful, because cultural heritage is clearly not contained in merely buildings and ruins. It encompasses both time and space, and often the two are intertwined. This makes cultural landscapes all the more important, because it is one of few designations that incorporate both tangible and intangible cultural heritage.

Cultural landscapes can be powerful tools for site and landscape protection and preservation that should be utilized by cultural heritage professionals despite challenges to their implementation on the World Heritage List. Classification of the Andean Road and the Silk Road as cultural heritage sites, and not cultural landscapes, have implications for the nomination of the future cultural landscapes, particularly those which are transnational. When nominating groups' cultural sites are defined as cultural landscapes, like the Silk and Andean Roads, and are not nominated as a cultural landscapes, it

¹⁶⁸ Lisa Prosper, "Wherein Lies the Heritage Value? Rethinking the Heritage Value of Cultural Landscapes from an Aboriginal Perspective." *The George Wright Forum*. Vol. 24, Num. 2(2007) (121)

weakens the concept of cultural landscapes. If sites like the Andean Road and the Silk Road are not nominated as cultural landscapes, other sites may not be nominated as such. This could be the case if a site only qualifies as a cultural landscape, but not as cultural heritage site. All of these cultural sites, including cultural landscapes, intangible cultural, and cultural heritage sites, are important parts of the world's cultural heritage; therefore, they should be properly recognized, managed, and protected.

The UNESCO nation states' under-utilization of the cultural landscape category, and the complications in the nomination of cultural landscapes on to the UNESCO World Heritage List, demonstrate an ineptitude by UNESCO's World Heritage Committee to properly nominate these sites. This is a similar situation that exists in the United States with the classification of TCPs and cultural landscapes by the NPS. Chapter 3: *Cultural Landscapes and Traditional Cultural Properties in the United States*, explores how the U.S. categories of TCP and cultural landscapes are not used to their full potential as tools to identify and protect significant sites. Focusing on the Mid-Atlantic Region of the United States, this thesis suggests that properties are either mislabeled or not designated by either the state historic preservation offices, or the NPS. It is not through malicious intent, but rather, failure to either understand or maximize the potential of TCP and cultural landscape designations.

Chapter III: Cultural Landscapes and Traditional Cultural Properties in the United States

Introduction

This chapter examines all listed cultural landscapes and TCPs located in each Mid-Atlantic state. Further, I will consider several additional sites that could potentially be recognized and designated as cultural landscapes or TCPs in each Mid-Atlantic state. This section highlights several issues concerning the United States cultural landscape nomination process; for example, the large number of cultural landscapes recognized by the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) as compared to the relative dearth of listed TCPs. The chapter also highlights how certain historical and cultural sites are designated and protected, while others are not.

For the purposes of this thesis, the Mid-Atlantic includes the states of New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Virginia, Maryland, and Washington, D.C. The thesis focuses on this region as it has witnessed a long period of both Native American and Euro-American occupation. In addition, historic preservation work started early in the Mid-Atlantic region, with the initial preservation focus on buildings and sites related to historic figures. This chapter reviews TCPs and cultural landscapes that have been designated by the NPS in each state (Table 1). The cultural landscapes in the United States were inventoried by the NPS through the Olmsted Center for Landscape Preservation; in the first decade of the 21st century, the Olmsted Center created the

Cultural Landscape Inventory (CLI) for all cultural landscapes in the NPS.¹⁶⁹ The CLI reports provide the basis of the cultural landscape research for this thesis.

| | TCP | Designed, Vernacular, Historic Cultural Landscapes | Ethnographic Cultural Landscapes |
|-----------------|------------|---|---|
| New Jersey | 0 | 9 | 0 |
| Pennsylvania | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| Delaware | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Virginia | 0 | 35 | 0 |
| Maryland | 0 | 21 | 0 |
| Washington D.C. | 0 | 26 | 0 |

Table 1: Cultural Landscapes and Traditional Cultural Properties in the Mid-Atlantic Region, United States of America¹⁷⁰

New Jersey

There are no TCPs, and only 9 cultural landscapes, identified for New Jersey (Table 1). The fact that there are no TCPs raises concern, because the National Park Bulletin 38 on Traditional Cultural Properties was initially released in 1991, and in New Jersey there are many existing cultural landscapes associated with the Revolutionary War era.¹⁷¹ There are varying reasons to explain the absence of TCPs despite many worthy candidates. For example, there is a property that the Weekpink tribe are preparing to nominate as a TCP in Burlington County that was a former Lenape village before

¹⁶⁹ Olmsted Center for Land Preservation, Accessed 12/6/16, <https://www.nps.gov/oclp/index.htm>

¹⁷⁰ One Cultural Landscape can have more than one landscape designation

¹⁷¹ Ibid.

European colonization.¹⁷² The Weekpink land has not been formally nominated for consideration although background historical research is being completed. Another example of a TCP is the Lena Blackburne area along the Delaware River. This site has been used to harvest rubbing mud for Major League Baseball teams across the nation over the last seventy-five years.¹⁷³ These two examples will be further discussed in detail to illustrate that while there are no TCPs in New Jersey, there are numerous properties with significant potential for Cultural Landscape consideration. Both designations have existed for over twenty years, thereby their absence represents a failure in the process of identifying, nominating, and protecting these landscape properties.

Chapter One notes that the term TCP was created by the NPS to help recognize and protect utilized landscapes in traditional communities that would not normally be protected by the Listing on the National Register. Native Americans were one of the communities to benefit from this new designation. The Lenape Tribe lived in what is present-day New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, and Delaware before the European arrival.¹⁷⁴ After European landing and colonization the landing and colonization during 17th and 18th centuries, the tribe was pushed westward through government acts such as the Indian Removal Act of 1830, and decimated by diseases, such as smallpox and influenza.¹⁷⁵ Before the Indian Removal Act the Lenape migrated into New Jersey as they

¹⁷² Brotherton & Weekpink Indian Communities of NJ, Accessed 2/25/16, <http://brotherton-weekpink.tripod.com/>

¹⁷³ Lena Blackburne Baseball Rubbing Mud, Accessed 2/25/16, <http://baseballrubbingmud.com/index.html>

¹⁷⁴ Jay Miller. 1997. "Old Religion Among the Delawares: The Gamwing (big House Rite)". *Ethnohistory* 44 (1). Duke University Press: 113–34.: 1997 (115)

¹⁷⁵ Ibid.

left Pennsylvania to escape the dangerous Indian Wars of the 1760s. This created a flow of people back and forth in the region and throughout the colonial period.¹⁷⁶ Today, the Lenape Tribal government is located with the Delaware Tribe in Oklahoma, hundreds of miles from their original homeland.¹⁷⁷ Currently, New Jersey has no federally-recognized Native American tribes, however the state recognizes three: the Nantichoke-Lenni-Lenape, the Powhatan, and the Ramapough.¹⁷⁸ As with many Native American tribes, the Lenape had their own social, religious, and political structure. In the early historic era, the tribe organized through a kinship complex system passed through the mother.¹⁷⁹ Their language was a unique dialect of Unami, a subset of the Algonquin language family.¹⁸⁰ The social structure was made up familial units and clans.¹⁸¹ There were three different clans within the Lenape: the Wolf, Turtle, and Turkey.¹⁸² The religious system included beliefs in both the visible and invisible worlds, populated by spirits. In the early colonial era, the Lenape tribe was quickly forced from the land; by the 1750's, their land was greatly limited in western New Jersey, where the tribe reconvened for religious ceremonies in the Weekpink area.¹⁸³

176 Marshall Joseph Becker "A New Jersey Haven for Some Acculturated Lenape of Pennsylvania During the Indian Wars of the 1760s." *Pennsylvania History: A Journal of Mid-Atlantic Studies* 60, no. 3 (1993): 322-44. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27773651>. (322)

177 Official Website of the Delaware Tribe of Indians, Accessed 2/20/16, <http://delawaretribe.org/locations/bartlesville-headquarters/>

178 U.S. Department of Interior Indian Affairs, Accessed 10/31/16, <http://www.bia.gov/WhoWeAre/BIA/OIS/TribalGovernmentServices/TribalDirectory/>

179 Jay Miller. 1997. "Old Religion Among the Delawares: The Gamwing (big House Rite)". *Ethnohistory* 44 (1). Duke University Press: 113-34.: 1997 (115)

180 Ibid.

181 Ibid.

182 Ibid.

183 Brotherton & Weekpink Indian Communities of NJ, Accessed 2/25/16,

The issue that arises for the local community of both Lenape and non-Lenape, is how to properly and best protect the Weekpink land. Considerable information, including historical documentation and material evidence, proves that the land is a Lenape historic site.¹⁸⁴ Proving that there is traditional cultural importance to the land is much more difficult than merely proving that a property is an historic site to the SHPO or NPS. For a site to be considered a TCP, there must be a sizable amount of research conducted within the local community, including in-depth research and consultation to determine if it meets the standards laid out in Bulletin 38.¹⁸⁵

The first issue that must be addressed when nominating a property for a TCP is to determine the property's connection to a tangible place. There is a documentary trail, starting in the 1700's, to provide evidence that the Lenape have a local group with a connection to the Weekpink land.¹⁸⁶ The National Register does not recognize intangible culture alone; listing to the Register requires that it be attached to a property that is a "district, site, building, structure, or object."¹⁸⁷ Then, the relationship to the property must be determined to still have physical integrity. Integrity for a TCP is a twofold process, unlike the process for the other historic properties, because there must have physical integrity as well as demonstrate that the community's connection to the site has temporal

<http://brotherton-weekping.tripod.com/>

¹⁸⁴ Brotherton & Weekpink Indian Communities of NJ, Accessed 2/25/16,

<http://brotherton-weekping.tripod.com/>

¹⁸⁵ Thomas King and Patricia Parker, *Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Traditional Cultural Properties*, U.S. Department of the Interior National Park Service 1998 (11)

¹⁸⁶ Ibid.

¹⁸⁷ Patrick Andrus, National Register Bulletin: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation, NPS: 1995 (4)

continuity.¹⁸⁸ Unfortunately, contemporary development in the Weekpink area weakens the argument for the land as a TCP in terms of integrity. The nominating group still needs to prove that the relationship between the community and the physical property has survived, and that it continues to have ongoing meaning to the tribe. Once the property is determined to have integrity as a traditional cultural property, it must go through the rigor of being assessed by the standard National Register Criteria, which involves nomination under at least one the four nominating Criteria A-D.¹⁸⁹ Although Weekpink has a legitimate argument as a TCP, it has not yet been formally nominated; additional ethnographic work is also needed to demonstrate the tribe's connection to the land. This is merely one example of how difficult it is to nominate a site as a TCP in the Mid-Atlantic, and why there are no TCPs in New Jersey.

TCPs are not exclusively associated with Native American sites and landscapes. Other ethnic groups or historic social groups that are non-indigenous also nominate sites for TCP designation. The Lena Blackburne baseball mud is part of the culture and history of Major League Baseball (MLB). The mud has been used by both Major league and Minor league baseball teams to prepare the balls for over seventy-five years.¹⁹⁰ This mud is exclusively used by the MLB and is only provided by the Lena Blackburne Company. Lean Blackburne discovered the mud in 1938, which is found along the Delaware River,

¹⁸⁸ Thomas King and Patricia Parker, *Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Traditional Cultural Properties*, U.S. Department of the Interior National Park Service 1998 (11)

¹⁸⁹ Patrick Andrus, National Register Bulletin: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation, NPS: 1995 (4)

¹⁹⁰ Lena Blackburne Baseball Rubbing Mud, Accessed 2/25/16, <http://baseballrubbingmud.com/index.html>

in Burlington County.¹⁹¹ When baseballs leave the factory, they have a sheen that makes them too slippery for the pitchers. Many attempts were made to dull the balls before the perfect solution was discovered: the mud from Delaware River banks in Burlington County.¹⁹² The mud is a company secret that has been passed down to a small number of people; it is harvested every summer for the upcoming season. Over a hundred pounds of mud are taken from the banks of the river each year for teams to prepare the baseballs.¹⁹³ This ritual is ingrained in the culture of baseball, and it is important to the sport's existence.

This site of mud harvesting along the Delaware River bank could be argued as a TCP within the current NPS Bulletin 38 definition. The site could qualify as a place where the community traditionally carries out a practice that is culturally, economically, or artistically important, and provides an historic legacy.¹⁹⁴ Despite the fact that the specific area is kept a secret, the mud site benefits the national community; the mud provides an important service to baseball, one of the nation's longest running sports traditions. There should be more direct efforts to conduct ethnography research within the local community in order to understand how the rubbing mud practice affects them if this is considered for TCP nomination. In the twenty-three years since the National Park

¹⁹¹ Ibid.

¹⁹² Lena Blackburne Baseball Rubbing Mud, Accessed 2/25/16, <http://baseballrubbingmud.com/index.html>

¹⁹³ Ibid.

¹⁹⁴ Thomas King and Patricia Parker, *Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Traditional Cultural Properties*, U.S. Department of the Interior National Park Service 1998 (1)

Service released the National Register Bulletin 38 on Traditional Cultural Properties, New Jersey has made no TCP designations.

The lack of TCPs in New Jersey raises the issue: Why is there a failure to designate and protect properties with the TCP designation in New Jersey? There is a long history of occupation of both Native Americans and Non-Native Americans in the state. Many communities have multiple generations that have resided in the same place, thus creating the potential for places to be designated as TCPs. The most obvious issue is the added level of difficulty to nominate an area as a TCP, rather than as a standard historic site under one of the four National Register Criteria. Some level of ethnographic research is required to prove the importance of a site to the local community; however, the time and resources needed for such an undertaking it may deter groups from nominating a TCP site. This is especially true if the community can nominate the site as a historic site on a local level of importance without the work and expense of providing ethnographic evidence. For a community trying to protect their cultural heritage, the path of least resistance to protecting it is compelling. Another reason a community may not nominate a local site as a TCP is that there is no added benefit of site protection provided to a TCP. If the goal is to protect a significant local site, then the community may not care how the government designates it as long as it provides the same protections across the board. Thus, for many sites, it may simply be easier to nominate the site as a historical site and avoid the ethnographic research required for a TCP.

| Name of Cultural Landscape | Historic Site Landscape | Historic Designed Landscape | Historic Vernacular Landscape | Ethnographic Landscape |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Jockey Hollow | X | | | |
| Cross Estate | | X | | |
| Fort Nonsense | X | | | |
| Washington's Headquarters | X | | | |
| Wick Farm | X | | X | |
| Edison Laboratory complex | | X | | |
| Glenmont Estate | | X | | |
| Nelden-Hornbeck (Roberts) Farm | | | X | |
| Fort Hancock | | X | | |

Table 2. Cultural Landscapes of New Jersey

While New Jersey has no TCPs, it possesses several cultural landscapes; the New Jersey cultural landscapes are exclusively sites that have an extensive Revolutionary War era historical record with clear and present changes to the natural landscape. There are two distinct New Jersey areas that are designated cultural landscapes. One of the Cultural Landscapes in New Jersey is Jockey Hollow, which is part of the Morristown

National Historical Park.¹⁹⁵ Jockey Hollow was initially placed on the National Register in 1979 for all four criteria A, B, C, and D. Later, it was also recognized as a Cultural Landscape, under the classification of Historic Site.¹⁹⁶ Cultural landscapes were not recognized as cultural properties until 1988, making Jockey Hollow an addition to an already recognized historic site within the historic district of Morristown.¹⁹⁷ Jockey Hollow is the largest part of the Morristown National Historical Park, with the Hollow covering about 1,320 acres of hilly woodland (Appendix A).¹⁹⁸ Within this woodland there are a number of historic sites, including a Pre-American Revolution farm and remnants of barracks for the Continental Army, led by George Washington (Figure 3).¹⁹⁹ Within the Morristown complex, there is also the Cross Estate that was first inhabited by the Lenape Tribe, and later by settlers, followed by the Continental Army.²⁰⁰ The Cross Estate provided iron ore deposits to the settlers that allowed them to produce steel. These landscapes are all marked as cultural landscapes under the subcategory of historic site. This area within the historic park qualifies as an historic cultural landscape due to the

¹⁹⁵ NPS Northeast Regional Office. 2009c. Jockey Hollow: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Morristown National Historical Park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 650077. Northeast Regional Office/CLI Database (2)

¹⁹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁹⁷ NPS Northeast Regional Office. 2009c. Jockey Hollow: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Morristown National Historical Park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 650077. Northeast Regional Office/CLI Database (7)

¹⁹⁸ NPS Northeast Regional Office. 2009c. Jockey Hollow: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Morristown National Historical Park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 650077. Northeast Regional Office/CLI Database (9)

¹⁹⁹ NPS Northeast Regional Office. 2009c. Jockey Hollow: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Morristown National Historical Park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 650077. Northeast Regional Office/CLI Database (11)

²⁰⁰ Uschold, D and Eleey, P. 2009. Washington's Headquarters: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Morristown National Historical Park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 650011. NPS Northeast Regional Office. Northeast Regional Office/CLI Database (21)

long interactions between the land and people that lived around it. This includes the significance of its use by George Washington as a point of operations for a winter camp, during the American Revolution.

The Edison Laboratory Complex in West Orange New Jersey is completely different in theme and era to Jockey Hollow in comparison, which highlights the broad definition of cultural landscapes for the NPS. This is because that while they are different types of landscapes; they both demonstrate human interactions with the land around them that are historically important. The Edison Laboratory Complex is on the National Historic Register for Criteria A and B.²⁰¹ The Laboratory Complex was nominated for the National Register in 1979 and designated initially as a district.²⁰² The complex was later designated as a historic designed landscape for its national significance of Edison, and the design of the complex to support his experiments and technological developments.²⁰³ The Complex is comprised of large masonry buildings, including Chemistry and Physics Laboratories, as well as metallurgy shops (Figure 4).²⁰⁴ The Complex that housed Edison's company and factory was designed by three architects: Charles Bachelor, Henry Hudson Holly, and Joseph Taft (Figure 5).²⁰⁵ These architects were very involved with

²⁰¹ Commisso, M. 2011a. Edison Laboratory Complex: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Thomas Edison National Historical Park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 975695. NPS Northeast Regional Office. Olmsted Center for Landscape Preservation, Northeast Regional Office/CLI Database (5)

²⁰² Commisso, M. 2011a. Edison Laboratory Complex: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Thomas Edison National Historical Park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 975695. NPS Northeast Regional Office. Olmsted Center for Landscape Preservation, Northeast Regional Office/CLI Database (5)

²⁰³ Ibid.

²⁰⁴ Commisso, M. 2011a. Edison Laboratory Complex: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Thomas Edison National Historical Park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 975695. NPS Northeast Regional Office. Olmsted Center for Landscape Preservation, Northeast Regional Office/CLI Database (3)

²⁰⁵ Ibid.

Edison's work, and influenced the development of technology, such as the phonograph and electrical lighting in the United States. UNESCO would not recognize this property as a cultural landscape because it recognizes a specific person for its nomination under Register Criteria A; UNESCO does not utilize the NPS National Register Criteria in its designation process.

In summary, New Jersey has exclusively recognized historical sites as cultural landscapes. The majority of these landscapes are located in the Edison Laboratory Complex, or are part of the Morristown Historic Complex. Although there is a prehistoric history to the Morristown landscapes, there is nothing mentioned or recognized concerning earlier periods of history in Morristown CLI reports. There are also no TCPs; however, there are potential TCPs that exist within the state such as the Weekpink property and the rubbing mud site.

Maryland

Maryland currently possesses twenty-one cultural landscapes, and no NPS TCPs (Table 3). All of these landscapes fall into three of the four NPS subcategories of landscape definitions: historic sites, historic designed sites, or historic vernacular sites, with the majority of them designated historic sites. The cultural landscapes include numerous historic farmsteads that were used and located at famous Civil War battlefields throughout United States.

| Name of Cultural Landscape | Historic Site Landscape | Historic Designed Landscape | Historic Vernacular Landscape | Ethnographic Landscape |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Four Locks | | | X | |
| Williams Port | | | X | |
| Catoctin Mountain Park | | X | X | |
| Camp Misty Mount | | X | | |
| Joseph Poffenberger Farmstead | | | X | |
| D.R. Miller Farmstead | | | X | |
| Mumma Farmstead | | | X | |
| Roulette Farmstead | | | X | |
| Parks Farmstead | X | | X | |
| Newcomer Farmstead | | | X | |
| Antietam National Cemetery | | X | | |
| Thomas Farm | X | | X | |
| Monocracy National Battlefield | X | | X | |
| Fort McHenry | X | X | | |
| Seneca Lock | | | X | |
| Pennyfield Lock | | | X | |
| Great Falls Tavern | X | | X | |
| Glen Echo Park- Clara Barton House | X | | X | |
| Oxon Cove Park | | | X | |
| Harmony Hall | | | X | |
| Fort Washington Park | | X | | |

Table 3. Cultural Landscapes of Maryland

There are four farmsteads and associated landscapes within the Antietam National Battlefield Park.²⁰⁶ This does not include Antietam National Cemetery that is also located at the battlefield site.²⁰⁷ The Roulette Farmstead is one of the farmsteads with acres of its land used in battle associated with the Antietam Battlefield. It remains well-preserved as a farmstead, and is maintained by historical societies. The farm is also associated with agricultural developments and landscape use from the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.²⁰⁸ These two historical factors qualify the one hundred and eighty acres as a vernacular historical landscape. The other areas included with Antietam Battlefield are the Joseph Poffenberger Farmstead, the D.R. Miller Farmstead, and the Parks Farmstead, formerly known as Cunningham Farm. All three of these farmsteads are designated as vernacular cultural landscapes. The Poffenberger Farm has significance from not only its association with the Battle of Antietam, but also from landscape preservation efforts following the Civil War.²⁰⁹ Like the Poffenberger Farm, the Miller Farm is significant for its association with the Battle of Antietam and post-war conservation efforts.²¹⁰ The Parks Farmstead also is a historic site associated with a battle that has been farmed

²⁰⁶ Paula Reed and Associates, Inc.. 2011. Antietam National Cemetery: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Antietam National Battlefield - Antietam National Cemetery, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600048. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database (2)

²⁰⁷ Ibid.

²⁰⁸ Everett, J. 2009. Roulette Farmstead: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Antietam National Battlefield, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600284. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database (2)

²⁰⁹ Joseph, M and Barrett, T. 2008. Joseph Poffenberger Farmstead: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Antietam National Battlefield, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 975301. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database (2)

²¹⁰ Everett, J. 2011. D.R. Miller Farmstead: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Antietam National Battlefield, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600034. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Region/CLI Database (2)

continuously since the 18th century until it was acquired by the NPS in the 1980s.²¹¹

These farm landscapes are extremely important to the Battle of Antietam because the landscape was shaped by agriculture in a way that influenced battle strategy.

Antietam National Battlefield is not the only Maryland Civil War battlefield associated with farmsteads. The Battle of Monocacy is linked to the Thomas Farm. The Thomas Farm existed long before the Battle of Monocacy, and had its own historical and cultural significance before the battle. The farm, located along an important colonial road, was part of one of the first transportation networks created in the colonial area.²¹² The Civil War battle occurred at the farmland because the road connected Frederick County to Georgetown.²¹³ The farm continued to be actively farmed well after the battle and into the early twentieth century. Unlike the Roulette Farm, the Thomas Farm is a cultural landscape because it is both an historical site and a vernacular cultural landscape.

Another recognized cultural landscape is the Catoctin Mountain Park, which is considered a designed and vernacular landscape. The Catoctin Mountain Park is another park in the Mid-Atlantic that owes much of its significance to a New Deal in the 1930s. The land was first used in the nineteenth century for the iron industry, where developers installed iron furnaces. The landscape's iron furnace industry history is not as well preserved as the landscape structures designed by 1930s NPS architects converted it into

²¹¹ Temkin, M. 2011. Parks Farmstead: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Antietam National Battlefield, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600047. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database (2)

²¹² Temkin, M. 2009. Thomas Farm: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Monocacy National Battlefield, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600294. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database (2)

²¹³ Ibid.

a park; many of those structures and trail designs still exist today.²¹⁴ One of these camp structures is Camp Misty Mount, a designated cultural landscape.²¹⁵ The camp was designed for children in the 1930s and includes sleeping cabins, larger main cabins, and including dining and activities areas.²¹⁶ The camp converted into a barracks in 1942, for the armed services, until World War II was over. After the war, it returned to use as a children's camp, until the middle of the twentieth century. In 1989, the camp was placed on the National Register, under Criterion A and C, for its association with the New Deal programs and the NPS design.²¹⁷

The Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historic Park has four Cultural Landscapes located within the park. Three of the four landscapes are locks, and the fourth is a historic tavern that overlooks the canal. The three locks, the Seneca Lock, Four Locks, and the Pennyfield Lock, are considered to be vernacular cultural landscapes; they were in use beginning in the 19th century until the early twentieth century. These set of locks were placed on the National Register under Criterion A and C.^{218, 219, 220} As a

²¹⁴ Ibid.

²¹⁵ Ibid.

²¹⁶ Ibid.

²¹⁷ Earley, J and Stafford, B. 2008. Catocin Mountain Park: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Catocin Mountain Park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600017. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database. (3)

²¹⁸ Temkin, M. 2010. Seneca Lock: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Chesapeake and Ohio National Historical Park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 975434. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database (2)

²¹⁹ Earley, J. 2009. Pennyfield, Lock: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600289. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database (2)

²²⁰ Stevens, C and Bailey, S. 2008. Four Locks: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600279. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database(2)

cultural landscape, these locks also comprise a canal landscape that was important to the growth and transportation in the nineteenth century. The locks have remained in good preservation and, although not used any more, are still a part of the surrounding landscape. The Great Falls Tavern sits alongside the canal and was built at the same time as the canal, in 1828.²²¹ It is a historic structure that became a part of the canal landscape and was used until the canal was closed, in 1924.

The final three cultural landscapes in Maryland are single cultural landscapes that are not associated with other landscapes. Fort McHenry is located in Baltimore; while east of Washington D.C. is Oxon Cove Park and Fort Washington Park. Fort McHenry was built at the turn of the nineteenth century, and was important in the defense and battle during the War of 1812.²²² In this fort, inspired by a battle in 1814, Francis Scott Key wrote “The Star-Spangled Banner,” which later became the national anthem. The fort still stands today, and was an important historic site, which makes it a cultural landscape according to the NPS. Fort Washington, a designed cultural landscape, which was used as a fort in the nineteenth century, is now a converted recreational landscape with curated open spaces and wooded areas.²²³ The Oxon Cove Park is a vernacular cultural landscape. Used in the early nineteenth century as a farm in the second half of

²²¹ Temkin, M. 2010. Great Falls Tavern: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600271. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI (2)

²²² Davison, M and Foulds, E. 2004. Fort McHenry National Monument and Historic Shrine: Cultural Landscape Report, Fort McHenry National Monument and Historic Shrine, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Report. NPS Olmsted Center for Landscape Preservation. Olmsted Center for Landscape Preservation (2)

²²³ Laird, ML. 2006. Fort Washington Park: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Fort Washington Park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600098. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database (2)

the nineteenth century the land was used to build the first federally-funded mental health facility.²²⁴ The landscapes are cultural landscapes defined by the NPS because they demonstrate agrarian techniques from the nineteenth century, and as examples of early mental health facilities.

In Maryland, like in New Jersey, there is a clear bias in designation in that only historical sites have been recognized as cultural landscapes. Clearly, a wide range of historical eras, from 1812 War battlefields to the New Deal park development, are represented in Maryland. As is the case in New Jersey, there are no ethnographic landscapes, or TCPs, recognized in Maryland. The state has so many national parks and land controlled by the federal government that it is surprising that there is no formal listing of either ethnographic cultural landscapes or TCPs. Maryland has a long history of settlement, from the earliest years of indigenous occupation, to old historic neighborhoods of Baltimore, to the colonial settlements in the rural areas of the state. While there are two state-recognized tribes in Maryland, the Piscataway Indian Nation and the Piscataway Conoy Tribe, there are no recognized TCPs that formally acknowledge continuous tribal use in the entire state.²²⁵

²²⁴ McMillen, F. 2011. Oxon Cove Park: Cultural Landscape Inventory: National Capital Parks-East-Oxon Cove Park. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600093. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database (2)

²²⁵ U.S. Department of Interior Indian Affairs, Accessed 10/31/16, <http://www.bia.gov/WhoWeAre/BIA/OIS/TribalGovernmentServices/TribalDirectory/>

Washington D.C.

There are currently twenty-six cultural landscapes and no TCPs recognized in Washington D.C. (Table 4). There are more cultural landscapes located throughout the city than in the entire state of Maryland. Many cultural landscapes are either historic designed landscapes or historic vernacular landscapes, and are related to the amount of planning that went into the city's layout. The L'Enfant Plan continued to influence city planning and land use patterns into the 19th century. Along with numerous planned and designed monuments and memorials, the majority of the city is a designed cultural landscape. The National Mall Park has seven landscapes designated within it, including multiple monuments. Cultural landscapes located within the National Mall include: the D.C. War Memorial, Washington Monument Grounds, Constitution Gardens, McPherson Square, Farragut Square, Franklin Park, Union Square, Columbus Plaza, and The Mall

itself.^{226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232} All of these cultural landscapes are designed cultural landscapes.

²²⁶ Fanning, K and McMillen, F. 2008. Columbus Plaza: Cultural Landscape Inventory, National Mall & Memorial Parks - L'Enfant Plan Reservations, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600242. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database (2)

²²⁷ Fanning, K and Ryberg, S. 2011. McPherson Square: Cultural Landscape Inventory, National Mall & Memorial Parks - L'Enfant Plan Reservations. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600215. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database (2)

²²⁸ NPS National Capital Regional Office and Fanning, K. 2006. Union Square: Cultural Landscape Inventory, National Mall, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 975261. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database (2)

²²⁹ Donaldson, E. 2009b. DC War Memorial: Cultural Landscape Inventory, National Mall & Memorial Parks - West Potomac Park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 975436. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database (2)

²³⁰ Fanning, K. 2006. The Mall: Cultural Landscape Inventory, National Mall, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600213. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database (2)

²³¹ NPS National Capital Regional Office and Donaldson E. 2010. President's Park South: Cultural Landscape Inventory, The White House (President's Park), National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 975602. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database (2)

²³² Fanning, K. 2011. Franklin Park: Cultural Landscape Inventory, National Mall & Memorial Parks - L'Enfant Plan Reservation. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600228. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database (2)

| Name of Cultural Landscape | Historic Site Landscape | Historic Designed Landscape | Historic Vernacular Landscape | Ethnographic Landscape |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Chevy Chase Circle | | X | | |
| Battleground National Cemetery | | X | | |
| Fort Stevens | X | | | |
| Peirce Mill | X | | X | |
| Linnaean Hill | | X | X | |
| Gibbons Memorial | | X | | |
| Marconi Memorial | | X | | |
| Asbury Memorial | | X | | |
| Montrose Park | | X | | |
| Sherman Circle | | X | | |
| Farragut Square | | X | | |
| McPherson Park | | X | | |
| Franklin Park | | X | | |
| President's Park South | | X | | |

Table 4. Cultural Landscapes in Washington D.C.

| Name of Cultural Landscape | Historic Site Landscape | Historic Designed Landscape | Historic Vernacular Landscape | Ethnographic Landscape |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Constitution Gardens | | X | | |
| Washington Monument Grounds | | X | | |
| The Mall | | X | | |
| DC War Memorial | | X | | |
| Jefferson Memorial | | X | | |
| Lady Bird Johnson Park | | X | | |
| Theodore Roosevelt Island | | X | | |
| Columbus Plaza | | X | | |
| Stanton Park | | X | | |
| Lincoln Park | | X | | |
| Folger Park | | X | | |
| Kenilworth Aquatic Gardens | | | X | |
| Frederick Douglas House | X | | | |

Table 4. Cultural Landscapes in Washington D.C., continued

Rock Creek Park is another large Washington D.C. park that includes eight different cultural landscapes recognized by NPS; however, there are only two cultural landscapes actually located within its boundaries. All of the other landscapes are associated with the park in name only. The two cultural landscapes located within the park are Peirce Mill and Linnaean Hill.^{233, 234} Peirce Mill is designated as an historic site

²³³ Hanna, J and Others. 2009. Peirce Mill: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Rock Creek Park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600108. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database (2)

²³⁴ Brown, N and Others. 2009. Linnaean Hill: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Rock Creek Park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600032. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database (2)

and vernacular cultural landscape for its agrarian history from the nineteenth century, and for land that demonstrates the land use history of the park.²³⁵ Linnaean Hill is a designed and vernacular cultural landscape because it includes the remnants of a nineteenth-century tree park and garden. It was initially designed to be a picturesque landscape in the style of the European Gardens; later, in the twentieth century, it was transformed into a recreation area.²³⁶

The other cultural landscapes associated with Rock Creek Park are varied; two of the cultural landscapes are small parks, such as Sherman Circle and Chevy Chase Circle. Both of these are designed landscapes from the 1880s.^{237, 238} The Chevy Chase Circle was constructed in 1890, but it became a park in 1933; its design reflects the influences of the early twentieth century City Beautiful Movement.²³⁹ The Circle, and the fountain in its center, are prominent landscape features in the cityscape that can be seen by both pedestrians and motor vehicle passengers.²⁴⁰ The Circle also became an important feature for the Chevy Chase Village neighborhood that was also planned with the themes and

²³⁵ Ibid.

²³⁶ Brown, N and Others. 2009. Linnaean Hill: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Rock Creek Park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600032. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database (2)

²³⁷ Pliska, J. 2011. Sherman Circle: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Rock Creek Park - DC Street Plan Reservations. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600165. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database (2)

²³⁸ Joseph, M and Shiflet, K. 2011. Chevy Chase Circle: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Rock Creek Park - DC Street Plan Reservations, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600261. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database (2)

²³⁹ Joseph, M and Shiflet, K. 2011. Chevy Chase Circle: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Rock Creek Park - DC Street Plan Reservations, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600261. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database (17)

²⁴⁰ Ibid.

designs of the City Beautiful Movement.²⁴¹ Sherman Circle located in the Petworth neighborhood, a modern day traffic rotary, is an important early twentieth century landscape design that reflects the old city landscape from the early twentieth century with original design principles from the old cityscape that was designed by L'Enfant in 1791.²⁴²

Also associated with the Rock Creek Park complex, but not located in the park itself, are two memorials to the east of the park. Both the Asbury Memorial and the Marconi Memorial are extremely small sites of less than an acre and are located in the Mount Pleasant Historic District.^{243, 244} The Asbury Memorial Park has a bronze statue of Francis Asbury; around which Irving Payne designed the landscape to accentuate the statue, but not be dominated by it.²⁴⁵ The Marconi Memorial is also a small site that contains a statue with a designed landscape by Joseph Gardner around it, completed in 1941.²⁴⁶ These small sites are interesting examples of small cultural landscapes. Compared to large sites typically associated with cultural landscapes, these small sites contribute subtly to the landscape.

²⁴¹ Ibid.

²⁴² Pliska, J. 2011. Sherman Circle: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Rock Creek Park - DC Street Plan Reservations. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600165. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database (2)

²⁴³ Stevens, C and Simpson, A. 2007. Marconi Memorial, US Reservation 309 A: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Rock Creek Park - DC Plan Reservation, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600265. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database (2)

²⁴⁴ Stevens, C and Simpson, A. 2007. Asbury Memorial, US Reservation 309 B: Rock Creek Park - DC Street Plan Reservations, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 975383. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database (2)

²⁴⁵ Ibid.

²⁴⁶ Ibid.

The other sites associated with Rock Creek Park are Montrose Park, which is a designed cultural landscape, and Fort Stevens, which is an historic site cultural landscape. Montrose Park is historically significant in two time periods. The Park was a private estate in the 19th century with many unique features that still exist today; one example is the Ropewalk, which includes a canopy tree walk, in the early twentieth century, the Park was transitioned into a public park.²⁴⁷ Walkways were added along with the tennis courts.²⁴⁸ Fort Stevens as a cultural landscape is an interesting example of historic preservation in the United States. Initially, the fort was built as part of a ring of forts around Washington D.C., to protect it during the Civil War; it was abandoned after 1965.²⁴⁹ It was not until 1900 that veterans and local residents decided to restore and preserve what was left of the earthworks used in the fort in commemoration of the Civil War.²⁵⁰ The fort contributes to the landscape of the city because people seek to memorialize and remember the Civil War, even one hundred and fifty years later.

Aside from the cultural landscapes that are associated with the National Mall and Rock Creek Park, there are only a few cultural landscapes designated in the greater Washington D.C. area. Three sites are associated with National Capital Parks East: Stanton Park, Folger Park, and Lincoln Park, all of which are designed cultural

²⁴⁷ Joseph, M. 2008. Montrose Park: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Rock Creek Park - Montrose Park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600115. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database (2)

²⁴⁸ Ibid.

²⁴⁹ NPS National Capital Regional Office and McMillen F. 2010. Fort Stevens: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Rock Creek Park - Fort Circle Park - North, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600147. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database (2)

²⁵⁰ Ibid.

landscapes that are part of the National Capital Parks-East system.^{251, 252, 253} There are also cultural landscapes with no broader association with the city. These include the Frederick Douglass National Historic Site, a historic site cultural landscape, and the Kenilworth Aquatic Gardens, a vernacular cultural landscape.^{254, 255}

As with many other states in the region, Maryland's and Washington D.C.'s cultural landscapes are all designed, vernacular, or historic sites. The city has a long history of city planning originating with its founding as a city in the 18th century. This resulted in many designed landscapes that are now recognized by the NPS. The strong emphasis on these three cultural landscape types, with no ethnographic cultural landscapes, is not shocking because there is a similar pattern of omission in the neighboring states. It is, therefore, not a surprise that there are no TCPs in Maryland or Washington, D.C., because the ethnographic cultural landscape definition is extremely similar to the TCP definition.

²⁵¹ Quinn, R and Wheelock, P. 2007. Stanton Park: Cultural Landscape Inventory, National Capital Parks-East-Capitol Hill Parks. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600075. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database (2)

²⁵² Ryberg, S and Fanning, K. 2009. Lincoln Park: Cultural Landscape Inventory, National Capital Parks-East-Capitol Hill Parks. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600072. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database (2)

²⁵³ Fanning, K and Zhang, G. 2011. Folger Park: Cultural Landscape Inventory, National Capital Parks-East-Capitol Hill Parks. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600076. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database (2)

²⁵⁴ NPS National Capital Regional Office and Moss S. 2013. Frederick Douglass National Historic Site: Cultural Landscape Inventory. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600033. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database (2)

²⁵⁵ Donaldson, E. 2010. Kenilworth Aquatic Gardens: Cultural Landscape Inventory, National Capital Parks-East-Anacostia Park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600088. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database (2)

Virginia

Currently, there are thirty-five cultural landscapes in Virginia that are designated as designed, vernacular, and historic landscapes (Table 5). Virginia has no recorded TCPs or ethnographic cultural landscapes a pattern similar to other states previously discussed. There are landscapes that are grouped together by location, such as parks located on the borders of historic battlefields.

| Name of Cultural Landscape | Historic Site Landscape | Historic Designed Landscape | Historic Vernacular Landscape | Ethnographic Landscape |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Appomattox Court House | X | | X | |
| Appalachian Trail - South District | | X | | |
| Appalachian Trail Landscape | | X | | |
| South River Picnic Grounds | | X | | |
| Skyline Drive Landscape | | X | | |
| Lewis Mountain | | | X | |
| Rapidan Camp | | X | | |
| Big Meadows | | X | | |
| Skyline Drive - Central District | | X | | |
| Skyland, Shenandoah National Park | | X | X | |
| Pinnacles Picnic Grounds | | X | | |

Table 5. Cultural Landscapes of Virginia

| Name of Cultural Landscape | Historic Site Landscape | Historic Designed Landscape | Historic Vernacular Landscape | Ethnographic Landscape |
|---|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Shenandoah Headquarters, Shenandoah National Park | | X | | |
| Elkwallow, Shenandoah National Park | | X | | |
| Piney River, Shenandoah National Park | | X | | |
| Skyline Drive - North District | | X | | |
| Skyline Drive Landscape | | X | | |
| Whitham Farmstead | X | | | |
| George Washington Memorial Parkway | | X | | |
| Arlington Ridge Park | | X | | |
| Arlington House | X | | | |
| Fort Hunt | X | | | |
| George Washington Birthplace Landscape | X | X | | |
| George Washington Birthplace Memorial Core | X | X | | |

Table 5. Cultural Landscapes of Virginia, continued

| Name of Cultural Landscape | Historic Site Landscape | Historic Designed Landscape | Historic Vernacular Landscape | Ethnographic Landscape |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Brawner Farmstead | | | X | |
| Memorial Avenue corridor | | X | | |
| Cabin Camp 1 | | | X | |
| Ellwood | X | | X | |
| Sunken Road Landscape | X | X | | |
| Chickahominy Bluff | X | | | |
| Drewry's Bluff | X | | | |
| Parker's Battery | X | | | |
| Grant's Headquarters at City Point | X | X | | |
| Poplar Grove National Cemetery | X | X | | |
| Green Spring | X | X | X | |
| Jamestown Island Area | X | | X | |

Table 5. Cultural Landscapes of Virginia, continued

The Appalachian Trail, a multi-state hiking trail, courses through Virginia; there are multiple cultural landscapes designated within this linear resource. The Appalachian Trail is a designed cultural landscape, with history and design significance from the 1930s, when the New Deal Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) built and cleared the trail.²⁵⁶ It was initially completed in the 1920s, connecting Georgia to Maine on one continuous path; later, it was improved to incorporate the NPS rustic design that was

²⁵⁶ NPS Northeast Regional Office. 2007a. Appalachian Trail Landscape: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Shenandoah National Park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 300129. Northeast Regional Office/CLI Database (2)

iconic in the 1930s.²⁵⁷ The Appalachian Trail design originated from Benton MacKaye, a U.S. Forester, whose original vision is still intact today, despite the tree growth surrounding the trail.²⁵⁸ The sense of wilderness that the trail was meant to convey still exists, though modern development has slowly expanded to areas with proximity to it. The entire 2,178 mile trail is currently eligible to be listed on the National Register.²⁵⁹ The current cultural landscape designation only covers the area within Shenandoah National Park.²⁶⁰ This would provide greater protection of the trail, because the designation would not be limited to the national parks.

Beyond Shenandoah National Park, many of the Virginian cultural landscapes include George Washington properties and sites. There are multiple landscapes designated to his birthplace and the areas surrounding it, such as the George Washington Birthplace Landscape. The importance of the landscape extends beyond the birthplace of one of country's founding fathers, as the landscape was also utilized by the Algonquin during the Woodland period.²⁶¹ The contributing factor that qualifies this birthplace landscape site as a cultural landscape is George Washington's history, along with the region's long agricultural history. Before Washington was born on the land, his family

²⁵⁷ Ibid.

²⁵⁸ Ibid.

²⁵⁹ Appalachian National Scenic Trail Special Report, Accessed 12/6/16, <https://www.nps.gov/appa/learn/management/upload/AT-report-web.pdf>, (4)

²⁶⁰ ²⁶⁰ NPS Northeast Regional Office. 2007a. Appalachian Trail Landscape: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Shenandoah National Park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 300129. Northeast Regional Office/CLI Database (2)

²⁶¹ NPS Northeast Regional Office. 2009b. George Washington Birthplace Landscape: Cultural Landscape Inventory, George Washington Birthplace National Monument, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 300150. Northeast Regional Office/CLI Database (2)

had owned it for multiple generations, beginning with his great-great uncle.²⁶² This land was passed down for generations, with the family continuously farming and living on it. Soon after Washington's death in 1799, a marker was placed on the land in 1815 to commemorate his birthplace.²⁶³ There has been some form of marker and commemorative efforts since that time until the land was purchased by the NPS in 1930. The park currently has several layers of historical importance, which initially had an Algonquin site on it and then was settled and farmed by Washington's family in the 17th century and then in 1896 an obelisk was erected to commemorate Washington.²⁶⁴ Because of the many years of historic significance, and the land's use as a memorial during the contemporary era, the NPS has designated it as a designed and historic cultural landscape.

Another large park that includes multiple cultural landscapes is the George Washington Memorial Parkway. The Parkway, which is managed by the NPS, runs through multiple states and has a total of eight cultural landscapes. Fort Hunt Park in Fairfax County, is a historic site cultural landscape.²⁶⁵ The fort is a designed landscape, which was originally part of a coastal defense system established by the federal government in the 1890s.²⁶⁶ In the 1930s, it was taken over by the Civilian Conservation

²⁶² Ibid.

²⁶³ Ibid.

²⁶⁴ NPS Northeast Regional Office. 2009b. George Washington Birthplace Landscape: Cultural Landscape Inventory, George Washington Birthplace National Monument, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 300150. Northeast Regional Office/CLI Database (29).

²⁶⁵ Fanning, K. 2009. Fort Hunt Park: Cultural Landscape Inventory, George Washington Memorial Parkway - Fort Hunt Park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600177. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database (2)

²⁶⁶ Ibid.

Corps (CCC), and as redesigned for use as a park with picnic and recreation areas.²⁶⁷

Another historic site cultural landscape within the George Washington Memorial Parkway (GWMP) system is the Arlington House. The house is now the Robert E. Lee Memorial, which is located within the Arlington National Cemetery.²⁶⁸ The house was originally part of the Lee family estate during the early 1800s, and then became part of the headquarters for the Army of the Potomac during the Civil War.²⁶⁹ The landscape of the house and the surrounding buildings still evoke the original feeling of the early 1800s homestead.

Arlington also is home to Arlington Ridge Park, another cultural landscape within the GWMP. Two memorials are located within the Park: the U.S. Marine Corps memorial (1954), and the Netherlands Carrillon (1960).²⁷⁰ Both of the park's memorials were built during the middle of the twentieth century. Though the memorials are over fifty years old, the historic landscape design is still maintained and is a heavily used park within the neighborhood. This designed landscape is quite formal, with European-style gardens.²⁷¹ The landscape design and placement of the statues was created to increase the viewshed of the Arlington Cemetery and the National Mall that surrounds the park. Within the GWMP, near Arlington Ridge Park, is a designed cultural landscape, the Memorial

²⁶⁷ Ibid.

²⁶⁸ Moss, S. 2009. Arlington House: The Robert E. Lee Memorial: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Arlington House: The Robert E. Lee Memorial, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600049. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database (2)

²⁶⁹ Ibid.

²⁷⁰ Fanning, K. 2008. Arlington Ridge Park: Cultural Landscape Inventory, George Washington Memorial Parkway - Arlington Ridge Park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600288. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database (2)

²⁷¹ Ibid.

Avenue Corridor. This corridor includes multiple structures and architecture and is part of a major transit system.²⁷² There are two memorial bridges in this landscape in addition to the entrance to Arlington National Cemetery. This mile-long corridor is intended to be a grand memorial main entrance into the city of Washington D.C.; while the corridor project was started in 1901, it was completed three decades later.²⁷³ The Potomac River was dredged to help build the bridges, an action which altered the original landscape. Over the mid-twentieth century, multiple sculptures were added to the road landscape that changed the entrance viewshed of the city and represented historical moments of the city.²⁷⁴

Outside of the D.C. metropolitan area, there are other cultural landscapes, including the Manassas National Battlefield Park. This park possesses two cultural landscapes: the Brawner Farmstead and the Groveton Cemetery. The Manassas Battlefield is a major Civil War battlefield, where two battles occurred. The Groveton Cemetery landscape is a Confederate soldier cemetery where soldiers were buried in shallow graves.²⁷⁵ The landscape importance follows the Civil War, when in 1867 there was an effort to memorialize the lives lost and to rebury the soldiers in proper graves.²⁷⁶ Also at the battlefield park is the Brawner Farmstead, a vernacular cultural landscape.

²⁷² Earley, J and Guenther, D. 2009. Memorial Avenue Corridor: Cultural Landscape Inventory, George Washington Memorial Parkway, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600247. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database (2)

²⁷³ Ibid.

²⁷⁴ Ibid.

²⁷⁵ King, E and Temkin, M. 2011. Groveton Cemetery: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Manassas National Battlefield, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600185. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database (2)

²⁷⁶ Ibid.

This landscape retains significance from both its location at the Manassas Battlefield and its agricultural history; it was actively farmed beginning in 1800.²⁷⁷ The Appomattox Court House National Historical Park also has two cultural landscapes located within it. The Appomattox Court House Village qualifies as an historic site and a vernacular cultural landscape.²⁷⁸ The courthouse where General Lee surrendered to General Grant, ending the Civil War, includes the village surrounding the courthouse, which contributes to the significance and historic integrity of the site.²⁷⁹ Interestingly, the National Park Service separately designates the landscape around the village as a separate cultural landscape due to its historical significance and the political atmosphere that was created in the area when the surrender was signed.²⁸⁰ These two park landscapes, positioned in concentric circles around the courthouse, contribute to the historical nature of the site.

Virginia has many battlefields from the Civil War that are cultural landscapes located within the NPS's historical parks. The Richmond National Battlefield Park includes Drewry's Bluff and Chickahominy Bluff, which are both historic site cultural

²⁷⁷ Donaldson, E. 2009a. Brawner Farmstead: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Manassas National Battlefield, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600182. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database (2)

²⁷⁸ NPS Northeast Regional Office. 2007c. Appomattox Court House Village: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Appomattox Court House National Historical Park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 300120. Northeast Regional Office/CLI Database (2)

²⁷⁹ NPS Northeast Regional Office. 2007b. Appomattox Court House Landscape: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Appomattox Court House National Historical Park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 300089. Northeast Regional Office/CLI Database (2)

²⁸⁰ Ibid.

landscapes.²⁸¹,²⁸² These bluffs were part of the defensive measures that General Lee used to protect Richmond from naval assault.²⁸³ Outside of Richmond, there is the Colonial National Historical Park that is home to multiple colonial landscapes. Both Jamestown Island and Yorktown are designated as historic site cultural landscapes. The Jamestown cultural landscape has a long history of settlement; the Powhatan tribe used the site before the European settlers settled on Jamestown Island and lived there from 1607 onward.²⁸⁴ Yorktown is another historical colonial town that also was a major Revolutionary War site.²⁸⁵ The historic fabric of the land of the Early Jamestown settlement, and of the Revolutionary War battlefield, makes this landscape important to preserve. Other cultural landscapes located within Colonial National Historical Park include Green Spring, an area connecting Jamestown and Yorktown with historical plantations and prehistoric remains.²⁸⁶ This cultural landscape site is designated as a designed, vernacular, and historic site. The Moore House, an old farm house that was

²⁸¹ Sams, C and Brown, NJ. 2008. Drewry's Bluff: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Richmond National Battlefield, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 300098. NPS Northeast Regional Office. Northeast Regional Office/CLI Database (2)

²⁸² Sams, C. 2008. Chickahominy Bluff: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Richmond National Battlefield Landscape, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 300099. NPS Northeast Regional Office. Northeast Regional Office/CLI Database

²⁸³ Ibid.

²⁸⁴ Killion, J and Hilyard, G. 2008. Jamestown Island Area: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Colonial National Historical Park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 300084. NPS Northeast Regional Office. Northeast Regional Office/CLI Database (2)

²⁸⁵ Brown, NJ. 2006. Yorktown: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Colonial National Historical Park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 300085. NPS Northeast Regional Office. Northeast Regional Office/CLI Database (2)

²⁸⁶ Eyring, S and Geyer, D. 2008. Green Spring: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Colonial National Historical Park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 300087. NPS Northeast Regional Office. Northeast Regional Office/CLI Database (2)

used both in the Revolutionary and Civil Wars, is also designated as a historic site.²⁸⁷

Preservation groups such as the Daughters of the American Revolution realized its importance in the early twentieth century and saved the house. Finally, there is the Petersburg National Battlefield, which includes the Poplar Grove National Cemetery, a designed cultural landscape.²⁸⁸ The cemetery was established and used during the Civil War; in the early twentieth century, the federal government bought the land and designed it, along with re-interring many of the bodies, to honor the battle's deceased.

In summary, Virginia's cultural landscapes follow the pattern of other Mid-Atlantic States: all of its cultural landscapes are all designed, vernacular, or historic designations. There are no designated ethnographic cultural landscapes; this is troubling, because there is no protection of properties that are related to Algonquin tribe and other Native American tribes, such as the Powhatan or other tribal groups active in early historic times. Similar to the situation in Maryland and Washington D.C., there is a heavy cultural landscape focus on battlefields and farmsteads of the nineteenth century. These landscape designations focus on properties that are in spatial clusters, with sites designated for their importance due to their association with historic events, such as farmsteads associated with battles, or important individuals who are connected to U.S. history.

²⁸⁷ NPS Northeast Regional Office. 2006. Moore House: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Colonial National Historical Park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 300223. Northeast Regional Office/CLI Database (2)

²⁸⁸ NPS Northeast Regional Office. 2010b. Poplar Grove National Cemetery: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Petersburg National Battlefield - Poplar Grove National Cemetery, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 300216. Northeast Regional Office/CLI Database (2)

Much of the Civil War was fought in Virginia, making it extremely important to the state's history. Nonetheless, it is problematic that the difference between the numbers of cultural landscapes that are designed, vernacular, or historic, compared to ethnographic cultural landscapes, reflects the fact that there are no ethnographic land designations. In Virginia, there is currently one federally-recognized tribe, the Pamunkey Tribe, and eleven state-recognized tribes.^{289, 290} The Pamunkey Tribe has a reservation just outside of Richmond. Its history is intertwined with the contact of Europeans settling at Jamestown, a site that is now part of a cultural landscape. Yet, within the Jamestown cultural landscape designation, there is no mention of the Pamunkey Tribe, which was recognized by the federal government in 2015. It is possible that the tribe has no significant historical connections to the Jamestown's landscape, however, there are many other areas within the region that the tribe could regard as important. Native American tribes are not the only groups of people that have a history with land that could be recognized with ethnographic landscapes. There are unrecognized or unidentified non-Native ethnographic landscapes that could exist within the cityscape and in traditional neighborhoods. It is shocking that within the massive National Parks in Virginia, including those of the Shenandoah and the Blue Ridge areas, that there is not a single cultural landscape that could be designated as an ethnographic cultural landscape, especially given the eleven state-recognized Native tribes.

²⁸⁹U.S. Department of Interior Indian Affairs, Accessed 10/31/16,
<http://www.bia.gov/WhoWeAre/BIA/OIS/TribalGovernmentServices/TribalDirectory/>

²⁹⁰ Historic Jamestown, National Park Service, Accessed 2/29/16,
<http://www.nps.gov/jame/learn/historyculture/virginia-indian-tribes.html>

Whether associated with Native Americans or other ethnic groups, there are currently no TCPs in Virginia. The state is aware of two properties that could be considered as TCPs. Yogaville is home to an important interfaith shrine; however, because it is less than fifty years old, it cannot be nominated as a TCP. Nevertheless, the site is under consideration for a National Historic Register nomination.²⁹¹ The second property is Tangier Island, a small island in the Chesapeake Bay that is home to a small fishing community. Tangier Island was designated as a historic district in 2014, although it was initially considered as a TCP.²⁹² The fact that it became an historic district in 2014, instead of a TCP, is a perfect example of the failings of the current TCP system. Both the Tangier Island and Yogaville cases will be discussed in further detail, below.

Tangier Island is an historic fishing community whose residents have fished in the same traditional manner for over fifty years. Sea shanties were built in the harbor in the early 1970s or slightly earlier for the fisherman to store gear and crabs.²⁹³ The shanties are also used to float crab crates while fisherman watch and wait for the crabs to molt so that they can be harvested as soft-shelled crabs.²⁹⁴ This technique of harvesting soft-shelled crabs was developed in the 1950s; by the 1960s, all of the sea shanties in the harbor were built to accommodate floating crab tanks.²⁹⁵ In addition to the sea shanties, there is a system of canals and channels that connect the island's two harbors and

²⁹¹ Historic Resource Form Yogaville: 2012 (1)

²⁹² NRHP Tangier Island: 2014 (4)

²⁹³ NRHP Tangier Island: 2014 (7)

²⁹⁴ Ibid.

²⁹⁵ Ibid.

marshes.²⁹⁶ The waterway system was primarily developed in the nineteenth and early twentieth century. The shallow waters and the marshes still make these waterways important to transportation on the island, where there still are no cars.²⁹⁷ In the island's National Register Form, there is a significant emphasis on the buildings and cemeteries of Tangier Island because it was nominated as an historic district. The island has a long history of occupancy, which has not changed much over the last century and making it an ideal candidate for a National Register nomination.

Tangier Island deserves recognition as a National Register-listed property; after reviewing the nomination file, it certainly qualifies as an historic district. However, this case raises the issue of nominating a site like Tangier Island as an historic district, and not as a TCP. This site, like many other National Register eligible sites, could qualify as either an historic district or a TCP. The nomination process is not particularly easy, due to the research necessary to prove eligibility; therefore, it is understandable that heritage professionals who nominate sites choose the strongest possible case for listing on the National Register. An historic district requires a high level of historic research and sometimes, archaeological survey, for a nomination. A TCP requires the same historical research, as well as ethnographic research, for the same amount of protection as an historic district. The people who wish to nominate the island must consider how important a TCP nomination is, because the level of effort is greater for nominating a TCP, with no greater preservation gains.

²⁹⁶ Ibid.

²⁹⁷ Ibid.

Nominating TCP-eligible properties as historic properties narrows the definition of a TCP significantly, so that only a few properties qualify. The consequence is to weaken and narrow the designation power of a TCP, if it is losing properties to designations as historic districts. If it is easier for communities to nominate TCP eligible sites as historic districts, there is little point to move through the more intensive process of TCPs. This would be disastrous for the properties that may not be lucky enough to qualify as both historic districts and TCPs. Virginia, like the other Mid-Atlantic States, should nominate properties that qualify as both historic districts and TCPs.

Returning to the example of Yogaville Virginia, it is an interesting case to explore the way in which a TCP is nominated. Yogaville, a district in Buckingham County Virginia, is home to a large ashram and complex that houses residents, as well as places, to practice the teachings of Yogiraj Sri Swami Satchidananda.²⁹⁸ It was built in 1980, so it does not qualify for the National Register list yet because of its young age; however, it is already being considered for nomination when it becomes fifty years old.²⁹⁹ The Virginia SHPO has already evaluated Yogaville as a potential historic district, with the main building, called the Light of Truth Universal Shrine (LOTUS), as an historic building.³⁰⁰ Yogaville is now associated with the flourishing of yoga in the United States; the town helped develop the interfaith movement that began in the 1960's and continues to this day.³⁰¹ The complex of buildings was built in a planned design around the main

²⁹⁸ Founder – Sri Swami Satchidananda, Yogaville Satchidananda Ashram, Accessed 2/29/16, <https://www.yogaville.org/about-us/swami-satchidananda/>

²⁹⁹ Historic Resource Form: Yogaville: 2012 (2)

³⁰⁰ Historic Resource Form: Yogaville: 2012 (3)

³⁰¹ Ibid.

LOTUS building, which was designed to interact with the natural environment and to serve as the focus point for the other temples and shrines around it.³⁰² The SHPO, after evaluating the site, have determined that the shrine's influence on spirituality in the U.S. and the teachings of yoga qualify it for nomination under Criteria A.³⁰³ Criteria C is also being considered for the site's association with Swami Satchidananda, who designed the buildings, and for the buildings' high artistic values.³⁰⁴

When Yogaville turns fifty years old, there will be a decision that must be made as to whether the site should be nominated as a historic district or a TCP. At the fifty year point, there will likely be a community practicing the same traditional practices taught by the Swami Satchidananda. A community of people who reside in the complex year round help further the Swami's teachings and practices. Also, within the next fifty years, these same buildings standing will be eligible to make the area an historic district.

Yogaville could be nominated and designated as an historic district. However, there is an opportunity for the site to be nominated as a TCP, because it also fulfills the designation requirements. If the site is not nominated as a TCP and instead nominated as another designation, or not at all, it raises the question: What is point of having a TCP designation at all?

³⁰² Ibid.

³⁰³ Historic Resource Form Yogaville: 2012 (4)

³⁰⁴ Historic Resource Form Yogaville: 2012 (4)

Delaware

Unlike Virginia and its 35 cultural landscapes, Delaware is unique to the Mid-Atlantic Region because there are currently no cultural landscapes within the state's boundaries. This dearth of designated cultural landscapes is surprising considering the many historic landmarks and historic trails that run through the state, including the Captain John Smith Historic Trail, in Seaford Delaware, and the Chesapeake Bay Gateway and Water Trails, along the Nanticoke River.³⁰⁵ The John Dickinson Plantation house still has a garden surrounding it along with old barns and farm structures that were part of the original plantation, built in 1740.³⁰⁶ This site is similar to the other farmsteads existing in other states, such as the Miller Farmstead in Maryland, that have been designated as cultural landscapes. While there are 692 sites listed on the National Historic Register in Delaware, not one qualifies as either a cultural landscape or a TCP.³⁰⁷ Also, there is no federally-recognized Native American tribe in Delaware, although there are state-recognized tribes, including the Delaware Lenape and the Nanticoke.³⁰⁸

The lack of cultural landscapes in Delaware might be related to the fact that there is little NPS land in Delaware. Yet Delaware has a long history of land use dating to the pre-Columbian era. The Captain John Smith Trail and the Chesapeake Bay Gateway of the NPS are in the state, although these two properties are completely in the waterways.

³⁰⁵ Delaware National Parks, Accessed 2/25/16, <http://www.nps.gov/state/de/index.html>

³⁰⁶ John Dickinson Plantation, State of Delaware, Division of Historical and Cultural Affairs, Accessed 2/25/16, <http://history.delaware.gov/museums/jdp/plantation.shtml>

³⁰⁷ Ibid.

³⁰⁸ National Congress of American Indians, Tribal Directory, Accessed 10/31/16, <http://www.ncai.org/tribal-directory>

This leaves only one National Park, the First State National Historical Park, in New Castle, Delaware. This park is divided into seven different sites, including the John Dickson Plantation House.³⁰⁹ Out of these seven sites, multiple sites are historic, including two historic houses: the John Dickson House and the Ryves Holt House. Additionally, The Green in Dover is a place of public gatherings, troop assembly, and fairs. Beaver Valley is a section in the park that is that over 1,000 acres in area and is preserved to reflect the early Quaker settlement patterns, as well as Native American migration.³¹⁰ This NPS description falls directly into the definition of a vernacular cultural landscape, which describes all of these sites, as they represent a connection to the land through cultural events. For this reason, it is surprising that there is not at least one designated cultural landscape in Delaware.

Pennsylvania

Pennsylvania is not the outlier that Delaware is in terms of cultural landscape designation. Pennsylvania has a total of eight cultural landscapes (Table 1); this number could be misleading, however, because Valley Forge has multiple landscapes designated within the park, similar to the situation of New Jersey's Morristown Historical Park (Table 6). Within the Valley Forge National Historical Park is the Valley Forge Landscape, which has distinctive topography which made it the ideal winter camp for the

³⁰⁹ Ibid.

³¹⁰ Beaver Valley First State National Park, Accessed 12/6/16, <https://www.nps.gov/frst/planyourvisit/beaver-valley.html>

Continental Army in 1777.³¹¹ Rolling hills, combined with meadows surrounded by dense woodland, allowed the military to defend itself against potential enemies, namely the British. There are also farms in the surrounding areas that have been designated as cultural landscapes, including the Valley Forge Farms and the Walnut Hill Farm.³¹²

| Name of Cultural Landscape | Historic Site Landscape | Historic Designed Landscape | Historic Vernacular Landscape | Ethnographic Landscape |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Valley Forge Farms | X | | X | |
| Walnut Hill | X | | X | |
| Valley Forge Landscape | X | X | X | |
| Port Kennedy | X | | X | |
| Clement Redding Farm | X | | X | |
| Eisenhower National Historic Site | X | | X | |
| Gettysburg Landscape | X | X | X | |
| Fort Necessity CCC Picnic Area | | X | | |

Table 6. Cultural Landscapes of Pennsylvania

³¹¹ Eyring, S and Others. 2009. Valley Forge Landscape: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Valley Forge National Historical Park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 300015. NPS Northeast Regional Office. NPS Northeast Regional Office/CLI Database (2)

³¹² Sargent & Lloyd and Brown, NJ. 2009. Walnut Hill: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Valley Forge National Historical Park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 300021. NPS Northeast Regional Office. Northeast Regional Office/CLI Database (2)

The Valley Forge Farms landscape is an historical farming area, with an agricultural heritage during the last two centuries. The farming landscape complements other industry in the area, specifically, the excavating and processing of lime, because the area is situated within a dolomite valley.³¹³ The Walnut Hill Farm is a small farm just west of the main section of the Valley Forge National Historical Park. As with the Valley Forge Farms, it was part of the complex used by the Continental Army, in 1777.³¹⁴ The farm landscape also represents the past two and a half centuries of agricultural development, beginning with the settlement of Europeans, and progressing to the use of slaves, and followed by tenant laborers. There is also archaeological evidence the land was used before the Europeans settled, dating back to the Archaic period.³¹⁵ The landscape is similar to that of the rest of the valley, with rolling hills and meadows; there are also historic farmhouses, adding to the evidence that the farmland has a long history and culture of use.

Other Pennsylvania cultural landscapes are located in Gettysburg, Eisenhower's birthplace, and the area around Fort Necessity. The Gettysburg Battlefield and the Eisenhower birthplace are located extremely close to each other. In addition to the Eisenhower home, the Clement Redding Farm was designated as a National Historic

³¹³ Ibid.

³¹⁴ Sargent & Lloyd and Others. 2002. Valley Forge Farms: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Valley Forge National Historical Park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 300020. NPS Northeast Regional Office. Northeast Regional Office/CLI Database (2)

³¹⁵ Ibid.

Landmark in 1966.³¹⁶ This farm was nominated for its proximity to the Eisenhower home and the Gettysburg battlefield; under the nomination form, however, it only was nominated under Criterion A, for its association with the Gettysburg battlefield.^{317, 318} Its location near the Eisenhower home provides a preservation zone to protect the home from development. The farmstead provides another example of simple eighteenth and nineteenth century farming techniques, though it was farmed until the mid-twentieth century.³¹⁹ Although historic, this farm would not be recognized as a cultural landscape, except for the fact that is located between Gettysburg and the Eisenhower home.

The Gettysburg Battlefield cultural landscape is part of the large Gettysburg National Military Park. As a cultural landscape, it is designated under three sub-categories: designed landscape, historic site, and vernacular landscape.³²⁰ It is considered a designed landscape, because parts of the land were designed and changed for a memorial to commemorate the battle. Following the conflict, it was immediately clear that the battle and the landscape would be historically important, and that the massive loss of life required a memorial to honor the dead.³²¹ The landscape is considered an historic site because of the importance of the battle in the Civil War, as well as many

³¹⁶ NPS Northeast Regional Office. 2009a. Clement Redding Farm: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Eisenhower National Historic Site, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 300005. Northeast Regional Office/CLI Database (2)

³¹⁷ Eyring, S and Pevaroff, S. 2009. Eisenhower National Historic Site Landscape: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Eisenhower National Historic Site, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 300003. NPS Northeast Regional Office. Northeast Regional Office/CLI Database (2)

³¹⁸ NPS Northeast Regional Office. 2010a. Gettysburg Landscape: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Gettysburg National Military Park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 300133. Northeast Regional Office/CLI Database (2)

³¹⁹ Ibid.

³²⁰ Ibid.

³²¹ Ibid.

important figures that visited the battlefield, including Abraham Lincoln and Robert E. Lee.³²² It was designated as a vernacular landscape because the rolling hills and woods surrounding the land affected how the battle was fought.³²³

The final two cultural landscape areas in Pennsylvania, are in the central and western sections of the state; both are projects of the 1930s Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC). The CCC built the Fort Necessity Picnic area and the Appalachian Trail during the Great Depression.³²⁴ Although the Appalachian Trail is over two thousand miles long, and extends along the Appalachian Mountain Range, the section in Shenandoah National Park is designated as a designed cultural landscape because of the CCC work in the 1930s.³²⁵ According to the NPS rustic design guidelines, the CCC designed and built the Shenandoah trail along with retaining walls and shelters.³²⁶ Today the trail is used more than ever, while keeping the same style and main features that were exhibited when it was built, in the 1930s.³²⁷ The Fort Necessity Picnic Area was designed and built by the CCC in the 1930s; it is also significant because it is where George Washington won his first battle, in 1754.³²⁸ In the 1930s, as part of the New Deal, the CCC built and designed many parks within historical areas, including Fort Necessity. The CCC not only built roadways and drainage systems for the park, they also planted trees and designed the

³²² Ibid.

³²³ Ibid.

³²⁴ Sams, C and Others. 2009. Fort Necessity's CCC Picnic Area: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Fort Necessity National Battlefield, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 300169. NPS Northeast Regional Office. Northeast Regional Office/CLI Database (2)

³²⁵ Ibid.

³²⁶ Ibid.

³²⁷ Ibid.

³²⁸ Ibid.

picnic area while enhancing the fort's historic setting.³²⁹ This combination of an historic fort and the use of the NPS rustic designs from the 1930s makes this site a designed cultural landscape.

There are currently no TCPs in Pennsylvania, however, there is one site that has the potential to be nominated. The Seneca Nation could nominate the land around the Kinzua Dam as a TCP. The Seneca Nation lived in the area along the Allegheny River, in Warren County Pennsylvania where the dam was built in the 1960's. Before the dam, the Seneca lived and practiced their way of life here.³³⁰ The Seneca Nation lived on land given to them through the 1794 Canandaigua Treaty, which was signed by George Washington.³³¹ The treaty gave the Seneca Nation complete control and power over the land, so that could not be taken from the Seneca unless they sold it.³³² The treaty was broken by the U.S. government in the 1960s, when it decided to flood the land for the Kinzua Dam construction.³³³

The Seneca Nation challenged this takeover of the land in court system; first, in 1958 when they attempted to get an injunction to stop the construction of the dam, which was denied.³³⁴ This resulted in the forced relocation of 600 residents of the Seneca Nation, who were taken from their homes and watched their houses bulldozed

³²⁹ Ibid.

³³⁰ Ibid.

³³¹ U.S. Department of State, The Canandaigua Treaty of 1749 <http://www.let.rug.nl/usa/documents/1786-1800/the-canandaigua-treaty-of-1794.php> Accessed 2/29/16

³³² Ibid.

³³³ Ibid.

³³⁴ Senca Nation v. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers <https://law.resource.org/pub/us/case/reporter/F2/262/262.F2d.27.14488.html> Accessed 3/1/16

immediately afterward.³³⁵ The land was taken, despite the fact that the Seneca Nation lived there for over a hundred years. This land grab eliminated any land that the tribe controlled in Pennsylvania and forced them to relocate to New York. The areas lost were where they conducted religious practices and funerary rites, and where they hunted and lived off the land.³³⁶ The dam formed land around the lake that the Seneca could potentially reclaim and protect as a TCP. This land could very easily qualify as a TCP, because it was used in a traditional manner when the tribe lived there from 1794 until they were evicted in the 1960s. The land could still be used in many of their traditional practices. Many of their ancestors are still buried there, giving the tribe a deep connection to the land.³³⁷ It is unfortunate that over twenty years have passed since the land has not been nominated as a TCP, or protected in any form.

Chapter Conclusion

There is a complicated relationship between TCPs and cultural landscapes in the Mid-Atlantic. There are significantly more designated cultural landscapes in the Mid-Atlantic compared to TCPs, and there are many factors that contribute to this. The majority of cultural landscapes in the Mid-Atlantic are colonial or post-colonial historical sites. They fall into three of the four categories: historic sites, historic designed landscapes, or historic vernacular landscapes. All of the cultural landscapes are found on

³³⁵ Rose, Christina, "9 Reasons NOT to Celebrate the 50th Anniversary of the Kinzua Dam", Accessed 3/1/16, <http://indiancountrytodaymedianetwork.com/2015/10/07/9-reasons-not-celebrate-50th-anniversary-kinzua-dam-161995>

³³⁶ Ibid.

³³⁷ Ibid.

NPS land, and many of the sites are historic sites that have also been named cultural landscapes. However, it seems absurd that there is not a single ethnographic landscape out of more than 99 cultural landscapes. While there is nothing wrong with recognizing these colonial landscapes, the lack of ethnographic landscapes demonstrates a lack of due diligence by the NPS. It quietly eliminates the history of entire groups of people, and ignores their impact on the land. By not acknowledging and protecting these lands, certain histories are not preserved. This includes, but is not limited to, the indigenous population, as well as the African-American community. This is not to argue that there should be an equal number of landscapes created by indigenous or ethnic communities to the colonial sites; however, there should also be representation for the minority communities, as well. Consider, also, communities like the ethnic Chinese or the Pennsylvania German groups.

The lack of the ethnographic landscapes would be less appalling if there were TCPs designated in the Mid-Atlantic. The ethnographic cultural landscape and a TCP have the most overlapping landscape definitions. There are several states, such as Pennsylvania and Virginia which are trying to nominate sites as TCPs, but those examples are limited. There are many potential factors for why there is a limited representation of indigenous and ethnic communities. Historically, the majority of the local Native tribes were forced out of the Mid-Atlantic region, beginning in the 1830s. The local ethnic communities may or may not be aware of regulations that can be used to protect their local cultural heritage. On the other end, local preservationists may not even be aware of many potential sites or, without the local communities' support, cannot push

for better government preservation protection of cultural landscapes and meaningful places. All of these issues are not examples of malicious intent or one person's failure. Rather, this is an example of the systematic failure of federal regulations to properly protect and inform the public of the importance of the identification and protection of cultural landscapes and TCPs. The TCP and cultural landscape designations should be combined in order to provide a stronger designation, with greater preservation impact, rather than continuing to serve as two separate, albeit similar designations that already lack by recognition.

Chapter IV: Conclusion and Recommendations

The systemic issues for identifying, designating, and protecting cultural landscapes are challenging, though it is not for a lack of designations. Rather, the significant number of designations, on both the international level and within the United States, continually leads to challenges in properly protecting cultural landscapes that have not yet been identified.

There are many different types of property designations that exist in the cultural heritage protection field. On the international level, UNESCO recognizes cultural heritage sites, such as monuments, groups of buildings, or sites nominated to the World Heritage List.³³⁸ Under the umbrella of cultural heritage, cultural landscapes are included with their own separate definition.³³⁹

The World Heritage Committee is now a place of politics, more than a place of heritage preservation, with countries sending their diplomats to Committee meetings rather than relying on heritage professionals.³⁴⁰ The trend of using diplomats, rather than heritage professionals, to determine what should be nominated as a World Heritage site, has led to stretching and bending the Criteria that qualify World Heritage List sites.³⁴¹ This is apparent when sites are discretely changed from nomination as a cultural landscape to nomination as a cultural heritage site. There is no means of knowing for

³³⁸ World Heritage List, UNESCO, Accessed 10/25/16,
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/>

³³⁹ Ibid.

³⁴⁰ Lynn Meskell: "The Rush to Inscribe: Reflections on the 35th Session of the World Heritage Committee, UNESCO Paris, 2011" *Journal of Field Archaeology*, Vol. 37 No. 2012 (146)

³⁴¹ Ibid.

certain why, for example, the Silk Road and the Andean Road changed from cultural landscape designation to only cultural heritage sites; it is possible that this resulted from politicking. Politicking is more evident when the Committee that decides which properties to inscribe to the World Heritage List disregards the majority of the professional opinions provided by the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) research arm of UNESCO.³⁴² Diplomats, nevertheless, continue in the hope that nominating sites for their nations can help them gain favor with other countries and increase favorable relations with each other. This evolution of leveraging cultural heritage sites for diplomacy purposes is not driven by one particular nation or person. It is, nonetheless, the result of a greater systemic failure to protect cultural heritage on the international level.³⁴³

Politicking is not necessarily negative as it pertains to global politics, but it is to the detriment of the quality and inclusiveness of the World Heritage List. If UNESCO wants to continue to create and use sub-categories in order to designate cultural heritage sites, then it should be more transparent with regard to how it nominates these sites; detailed reporting in nomination files and publishing the World Heritage Committee minutes would have a positive impact. Different definitions and types of cultural heritage sites become meaningless if the designations and nominated sites are merely pawns in the geo-political climate. UNESCO's optimistic goal in creating the category of cultural landscape was to recognize and protect worthy properties that may not have been

³⁴²Lynn Meskell: "The Rush to Inscribe: Reflections on the 35th Session of the World Heritage Committee, UNESCO Paris, 2011" *Journal of Field Archaeology*, Vol. 37 No. 2 2012 (146)

³⁴³ Ibid.

considered otherwise. If properties are merely moved between designations for diplomacy reasons, it would be foolish to continue the charade of so many in-depth designations.

This issue of designations as diplomacy is not the same in the United States system of cultural heritage protection, but misuse or lack of designation use does exist. Cultural landscapes defined in the United States and the cultural landscapes defined by UNESCO are extremely similar.^{344, 345} The NPS cultural landscape definitions of a historic site, historic designed, and historic vernacular landscape, are nearly identical to the UNESCO definition of a clearly defined cultural landscape, designed and created intentionally by man and the organically evolved landscape.^{346, 347} The ethnographic landscape, defined by the NPS, and the associative cultural landscape, defined by UNESCO, parallel each other.³⁴⁸ For UNESCO, the associative landscape is a landscape justified by a powerful connection to a religious, artistic, or cultural association that does not rely on physical evidence for association. Meanwhile, the NPS ethnographic landscape relies on the association of “natural or cultural resources” with a group’s heritage.³⁴⁹

³⁴⁴ Cultural Landscapes, UNESCO, Accessed 12/13/15, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/culturallandscape/>

³⁴⁵ Understanding Cultural Landscapes, NPS Accessed 1/20/16, <http://www.nps.gov/subjects/culturallandscapes/understand-cl.html>

³⁴⁶ Ibid.

³⁴⁷ Ibid.

³⁴⁸ Ibid.

³⁴⁹ Ibid

When the majority of subcategories within the cultural landscape definition rely on the site being built, designed, or associated with important historical events, it is not shocking that the majority of cultural landscapes within the United States and in UNESCO are thematically similar. Examples include site categories of monuments, statues, and historic battles. As discussed in Chapter 3, majority of cultural landscapes within the Mid-Atlantic region for the NPS are associated with battlefields, or historic and colonial era farmsteads. The Mid-Atlantic does have a long colonial history; many Native American tribes and communities were forced westwards in the early 19th century with the enactment of the Indian Removal Act in 1830. The complete lack of ethnographic landscapes in the Mid-Atlantic only perpetuates the disenfranchising of the Native American communities that once lived in the region. There is also the issue that ethnographic landscapes are not exclusively associated with Native Americans; any community that has continued use of land and historic connection to an area can be associated with a property that could be evaluated and nominated to the status of a TCP. While the Mid-Atlantic does not represent the entire country, the pattern is noticeable; there are over fifty cultural landscapes within the region, and all of them are designed, vernacular, or historic sites. While these historic landscapes should be recognized and not diminished as unimportant, it is problematic that they are the only landscapes represented in an entire region because their themes and historical perspective are limited. Cultural landscapes should be identified and associated with other ethnic or historic groups throughout the United States, regardless of whether these groups produced tangible heritage. The State Historic Preservation Offices should help diverse communities find

ways to protect land that is sacred or important to their social and cultural identity, such as state-recognized Native American tribes, or a small fishing village that has maintained its way of life over the last century.

Cultural landscapes in the United States are only designated on federal land and are federal designations. This limitation restricts the identification of cultural landscapes and TCPs to these lands and, therefore, their evaluation and recognized significance. The result of cultural landscapes only designated by the NPS on park land or at national monuments is that it limits the dissemination of information about these landscapes and their importance to the public and local communities. One of the many goals of cultural heritage preservation is public education and protecting the heritage for the greater good. If cultural landscape designation is only used by the NPS, and without a broader educational outreach to the local communities, then the program may not be successful in meeting its goals. The opening line of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) states that “spirit and direction of the Nation are founded upon and reflected in its historic past.”³⁵⁰ The original basis for the law is that historical sites should be protected for the public good. For cultural landscape designation to become an important part of heritage protection, it needs to be adopted by the local communities that are involved with cultural heritage protection. Another larger issue at hand is that cultural landscapes, identified and evaluated on federal land in the Mid-Atlantic, result in land that is already protected by the National Park Service; there is simply a new change in title and classification. In fact, all of the cultural landscape designations in the region are part of a larger park system,

³⁵⁰ *National Historic Preservation Act*, 1

under which they are already preserved and protected. Thus, these cultural landscapes appear to be mere additions within parks where they are already protected.

The similarities between cultural landscapes and TCPs are striking, especially when TCPs are compared to ethnographic landscapes. For both TCPs and ethnographic landscapes, there should be an important cultural association with the land for the community that surrounds it.³⁵¹ Given this similarity, it is not surprising that there are also no TCPs or ethnographic cultural landscapes in the Mid-Atlantic region. That sites are not nominated as TCPs stems from multiple issues. For a TCP to be nominated, there must be ethnographic research of the area, in addition to the research needed to prove that the area meets one of the criteria for the National Register and subsequent professional evaluation for the National Register eligibility. This inadvertently handicaps many small traditional communities or social groups that might not have the funds to perform the required research and professional evaluation, thereby punishing them with an inability to protect their cultural heritage. TCPs originated as a preservation tool because, prior to the 1990s, cultural heritage protection failed to acknowledge and protect sites that did not fit into the Western-Eurocentric view of cultural heritage.³⁵² The TCP was created to correct this gap in the heritage protection laws within the U.S.³⁵³

While the initial Bulletin 38 authors and NPS were wise to create the designation of TCPs to include ethnographic evidence to prove a site's importance, it also puts an

³⁵¹ Thomas King and Patricia Parker, *Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Traditional Cultural Properties*, U.S. Department of the Interior National Park Service 1998 (1)

³⁵² Thomas King and Patricia Parker, *Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Traditional Cultural Properties*, U.S. Department of the Interior National Park Service 1998 (2)

³⁵³ Ibid.

extra onus on the group nominating the site. A TCP designation should require either historical evidence *or* ethnographic evidence. This allows traditional cultures to properly protect their important landscapes with oral history and ethnographic research, potentially making it easier for these groups to nominate their sites. Under the current requirements, properties are more likely to be nominated as merely historical sites, rather than TCPs, because the process is relatively easy and more familiar. The extra effort seems superfluous, especially given that a TCP does not result in extra preservation protection for the property.³⁵⁴ If a small traditional community is interested in protecting a property in their community, the path of least resistance makes the most sense, regardless of the designation it receives.

Cultural landscapes and TCPs are important preservation tools and should continue to be used to protect cultural heritage. However, if these designations continue to be used as they are now, their importance and ability to define cultural heritage sites will weaken. If the goal of the cultural heritage field is only to label landscapes as National Register-eligible in order to provide preservation protection, then the current method of designating is barely succeeding. If there are more goals to protecting cultural heritage, such as acknowledging the difference between a Native American religious site and Independence Hall, then there are still issues of creating a distinction between these two sites, without favoring one designation over another. Instead of combining all cultural heritage under one umbrella for definition and protection support, there is latitude to encourage diversity within the field of cultural heritage protection while still

³⁵⁴ Ibid.

making it accessible to all communities. If the field of cultural heritage protection is not careful, it could favor certain historical narratives over more diverse narratives and histories.

There are potential methods to correct for this systemic failure in cultural landscape and TCP designation in order to more effectively protect cultural landscapes. On the international level, it is foolish to think that the politicking at UNESCO will end in the near future; however, that does not mean that accurately designating the cultural heritage sites around the world is impossible. The professional cultural heritage community needs to impress upon World Heritage Committee members that it is just as effective to designate sites as cultural landscapes as it is to designate them as cultural heritage sites. If the professional community does not take a stand to designate sites properly and argue for their importance, then diplomats at the World Heritage Committee meetings have little incentive to reform the politicking at the World Heritage Committee.

In the United States, the issues in protecting cultural landscapes are bigger than politics. Both TCPs and ethnographic landscapes are protecting the same types of land use patterns, yet neither exist in the Mid-Atlantic. There should be a better method to disseminate preservation tool information on what protections TCPs and ethnographic landscapes can offer, especially to disenfranchised communities, whether they are Native Americans or other minority ethnic groups. This responsibility, once again, is on the cultural heritage professionals and the State Historic Preservation Offices to provide information to communities that may not be aware of what property and cultural landscape protections they might receive. Finally, there should be a review of how TCPs

and cultural landscapes are identified and protected by cultural heritage professionals.

The NPS may have begun the internal process of reviewing TCPs designations, but nothing has been publically published on these matters since 2012. The NPS should also consider the need to review their cultural landscape designation process. A formal unification of these two designations should transpire to eliminate competition between them, and to remove the extra layers of bureaucracy created for people who are motivated to protect their cultural heritage. Effectively, unification of Traditional Cultural Properties and cultural landscapes would eliminate debates about whether to take the easier path to nominate sites and landscapes or whether to follow a more rigorous process for nomination. As a result, there would be a more efficient nomination process to protect deserving landscapes.

Appendix A



Figure 1: Paved Road at Jockey Hollow, view north. Photograph by Evan Robinson, February 28, 2016



Figure 2: Field and woods in Jockey Hollow, view west. Photograph by Evan Robinson, February 28, 2016



Figure 3: Rebuilt Barrack in Jockey Hollow, view west. Photograph by Evan Robinson, February 28, 2016



Figure 4: Edison Laboratories facing the entrance, view northwest. Photograph by Evan Robinson, July 16, 2016



Figure 5: Overview of Edison Laboratories, view south. Photograph by Evan Robinson, July 16, 2016

Bibliography

- 2014 Nomination file Andean Road, UNESCO. Accessed 9/18/15.
<http://whc.unesco.org/uploads/nominations/1459pdf>.
- 2014 Nomination file Silk Road, UNESCO. Accessed 12/13/15.
<http://whc.unesco.org/uploads/nominations/1442.pdf>.
- Andrus, Patrick. "National Register Bulletin: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation." National Park Service: 1995.
- Alanen, Arnold. "Considering the Ordinary: Vernacular Landscapes in Small Towns and Rural Areas." In *Preserving Cultural Landscapes in America*, edited by Arnold Alanen and Robert Z. Melnick, Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003.
- Appalachian National Scenic Trail Special Report. Accessed 12/6/16.
<https://www.nps.gov/appa/learn/management/upload/AT-report-web.pdf>.
- Beaver Valley First State National Park. Accessed 12/6/16.
<https://www.nps.gov/frst/planyourvisit/beaver-valley.html>.
- Becker, Marshall Joseph. "A New Jersey Haven for Some Acculturated Lenape of Pennsylvania During the Indian Wars of the 1760s." *Pennsylvania History: A Journal of Mid-Atlantic Studies* 60, no. 3 (1993): 322-44.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/27773651>.
- Birnbaum, Charles. *Preservation Brief 36: Protecting Cultural Landscapes: Planning, Treatment and Management of Historic Landscapes*. National Park Service: 1994.
- Brotherton & Weekpink Indian Communities of NJ. Accessed 2/25/16.
<http://brotherton-weekpink.tripod.com/>.
- Brown, N and et al. 2009. Linnaean Hill: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Rock Creek Park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600032. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database.
- Brown, NJ. 2006. Yorktown: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Colonial National Historical Park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 300085. NPS Northeast Regional Office. Northeast Regional Office/CLI Database.

- Commisso, M. 2011a. Edison Laboratory Complex: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Thomas Edison National Historical Park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 975695. NPS Northeast Regional Office. Olmsted Center for Landscape Preservation, Northeast Regional Office/CLI Database.
- Commisso, M. 2011b. Glenmont Estate: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Thomas Edison National Historical Park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 650002. NPS Northeast Regional Office. Olmsted Center for Landscape Preservation, Northeast Regional Office/CLI Database.
- Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage. Accessed 12/14/16. <http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/en/convention>.
- Cultural Landscapes, UNESCO. Accessed 12/13/15. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/culturallandscape/>.
- The Criteria for Selection, UNESCO. Accessed 3/1/16. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/criteria/>.
- Davison, M and Foulds, E. 2004. Fort McHenry National Monument and Historic Shrine: Cultural Landscape Report, Fort McHenry National Monument and Historic Shrine, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Report. NPS Olmsted Center for Landscape Preservation. Olmsted Center for Landscape Preservation.
- Delaware National Parks. Accessed 2/25/16. <http://www.nps.gov/state/de/index.html>.
- Dolan, Susan. "Innovations in Managing National Park Service Cultural Landscapes: Sustaining Historic and Traditional uses." In *Conserving Cultural Landscapes: Challenges and New Directions* edited by Ken Taylor, Archer St. Clair Harvey, and Nora Mitchell, 251-260. New York: Routledge Taylor and Francis 2015.
- Donaldson, E. 2009a. Brawner Farmstead: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Manassas National Battlefield, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600182. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database.
- Donaldson, E. 2009b. DC War Memorial: Cultural Landscape Inventory, National Mall & Memorial Parks - West Potomac Park, National Park Service. Cultural

Landscape Inventories. 975436. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database.

Donaldson, E. 2010. Kenilworth Aquatic Gardens: Cultural Landscape Inventory, National Capital Parks-East-Anacostia Park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600088. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database.

Dorchester Heights National Historical Park, National Park Service. Accessed 1/20/16. <http://www.nps.gov/bost/learn/historyculture/dohe.htm>.

Earley, J and Guenther, D. 2009. Memorial Avenue Corridor: Cultural Landscape Inventory, George Washington Memorial Parkway, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600247. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database.

Earley, J and Stafford, B. 2008. Catoctin Mountain Park: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Catoctin Mountain Park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600017. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database.

Earley, J. 2006. Camp Misty Mount: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Catoctin Mountain Park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600104. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database.

Earley, J. 2009. Pennyfield Lock: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600289. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database.

Everett, J. 2009. Roulette Farmstead: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Antietam National Battlefield, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600284. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database.

Everett, J. 2011. D.R. Miller Farmstead: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Antietam National Battlefield, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600034. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Region/CLI Database.

- Eyring, S and Geyer, D. 2008. Green Spring: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Colonial National Historical Park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 300087. NPS Northeast Regional Office. Northeast Regional Office/CLI Database.
- Eyring, S and et al. 2009. Valley Forge Landscape: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Valley Forge National Historical Park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 300015. NPS Northeast Regional Office. NPS Northeast Regional Office/CLI Database.
- Eyring, S and Pevaroff, S. 2009. Eisenhower National Historic Site Landscape: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Eisenhower National Historic Site, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 300003. NPS Northeast Regional Office. Northeast Regional Office/CLI Database.
- Fanning, K and McMillen, F. 2008. Columbus Plaza: Cultural Landscape Inventory, National Mall & Memorial Parks - L'Enfant Plan Reservations, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600242. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database.
- Fanning, K and Ryberg, S. 2011. McPherson Square: Cultural Landscape Inventory, National Mall & Memorial Parks - L'Enfant Plan Reservations. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600215. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database.
- Fanning, K and Zhang, G. 2011. Folger Park: Cultural Landscape Inventory, National Capital Parks-East-Capitol Hill Parks. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600076. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database.
- Fanning, K. 2006. The Mall: Cultural Landscape Inventory, National Mall, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600213. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database.
- Fanning, K. 2008. Arlington Ridge Park: Cultural Landscape Inventory, George Washington Memorial Parkway - Arlington Ridge Park, National Park Service.

Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600288. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database.

Fanning, K. 2009. Fort Hunt Park: Cultural Landscape Inventory, George Washington Memorial Parkway - Fort Hunt Park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600177. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database.

Fanning, K. 2011. Franklin Park: Cultural Landscape Inventory, National Mall & Memorial Parks - L'Enfant Plan Reservation. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600228. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database.

Founder – Sri Swami Satchidananda, Yogaville Satchidananda Ashram. Accessed 2/29/16. <https://www.yogaville.org/about-us/swami-satchidananda/>.

Hanna, J and Others. 2009. Peirce Mill: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Rock Creek park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600108. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database.

Hardesty, Donald. "Ethnographic Landscapes: Transforming Nature into Culture." in *Preserving Cultural Landscapes in America* 169-185. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003.

Historic Jamestown, National Park Service. Accessed 2/29/16. <http://www.nps.gov/jame/learn/historyculture/virginia-indian-tribes.html>.

John Dickinson Plantation, State of Delaware, Division of Historical and Cultural Affairs. Accessed 2/25/16. <http://history.delaware.gov/museums/jdp/plantation.shtml>.

Jokilehto, Jukka. "World heritage: Observations on Decisions Related to Cultural Heritage." *Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development* 1 2011 (61-74).

Joseph, M and Barrett, T. 2008. Joseph Poffenberger Farmstead: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Antietam National Battlefield, National Park Service. Cultural

- Landscape Inventories. 975301. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database.
- Joseph, M and Shiflet, K. 2011. Chevy Chase Circle: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Rock Creek Park - DC Street Plan Reservations, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600261. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database.
- Joseph, M. 2008. Montrose Park: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Rock Creek Park - Montrose Park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600115. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database.
- Killion, J and Hilyard, G. 2008. Jamestown Island Area: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Colonial National Historical Park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 300084. NPS Northeast Regional Office. Northeast Regional Office/CLI Database.
- King, E and Temkin, M. 2011. Groveton Cemetery: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Manassas National Battlefield, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600185. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database.
- King, Thomas. *Places that Count: Traditional Cultural Properties in Cultural Resource Management*. Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press, 2003.
- King, Thomas. "Rethinking Traditional Cultural Properties." *Traditional Cultural Properties*: Volume 26, Number 1: 2009.
- Labadi, Sophia. *UNESCO, Cultural Heritage, and Outstanding Universal Value: Value-based Analyses of the World Heritage and Intangible Cultural Heritage Conventions*. New York: Altamira Press.
- Laird, ML. 2006. Fort Washington Park: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Fort Washington Park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600098. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database.

Lena Blackburne Baseball Rubbing Mud. Accessed 2/25/16.

<http://baseballrubbingmud.com/index.html>.

Main Andean Road, UNESCO. Accessed 3/1/16.

http://whc.unesco.org/pg.cfm?cid=281&id_group=19&s=home.

McClelland, Linda. et al. *National Register Bulletin 30: Evaluation and Documenting Rural Historic Landscapes*, U.S. Department of Interior, National Park Service, 1999.

McMillen, F. 2011. Oxon Cove Park: Cultural Landscape Inventory: National Capital Parks-East-Oxon Cove Park. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600093. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database.

Meridian Hill Park, National Park Service. Accessed 1/20/16.

<http://www.nps.gov/mehi/learn/historyculture/index.html>.

Meskel, Lynn. "The Rush to Inscribe: Reflections on the 35th Session of the World Heritage Committee, UNESCO Paris, 2011" *Journal of Field Archaeology*, Vol. 37 No. 2: 2012.

Mezey, Naomi. "The Paradoxes of Cultural Property." *Columbia Law Review* 107, no. 8 (2007): 2004-046. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40041756>.

Miller, Jay. 1997. "Old Religion Among the Delawares: The Gamwing (big House Rite)." *Ethnohistory* 44 (1). Duke University Press: 113–34. doi:10.2307/482903.

Mitchell, Nora. et al. *World Heritage Cultural Landscapes: A Handbook for Conservation and Management*. UNESCO, 2009.

Mitchell, Mike and Welch, Patrick. "Kuchamaa (Tecate Peak) Cultural Landscape." National Register of Historic Places Inventory/Nomination Form. Bureau of Land Management, California, August 25th, 1992.

Moss, S. 2009. Arlington House: The Robert E. Lee Memorial: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Arlington House: The Robert E. Lee Memorial, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600049. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database.

National Congress of American Indians, Tribal Directory. Accessed 10/31/16.

<http://www.ncai.org/tribal-directory>.

National Historic Preservation Act, U.S. Code 89-665 (1966).

National Register of Historic Places, Tangier Island Historic District, Tangier, Accomack, Virginia, National Register #309001.

National Register of Historic Places Program: Traditional Cultural Properties Request for Comments. Accessed 10/31/16.

https://www.nps.gov/nr/publications/guidance/TCP_comments.htm.

NPS National Capital Regional Office and Donaldson, E. 2010. President's Park South: Cultural Landscape Inventory, The White House (President's Park), National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 975602. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database.

NPS National Capital Regional Office and Fanning, K. 2006. Union Square: Cultural Landscape Inventory, National Mall, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 975261. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database.

NPS National Capital Regional Office and McMillen, F. 2010. Fort Stevens: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Rock Creek Park - Fort Circle Park - North, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600147. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database.

NPS National Capital Regional Office and Moss, S. 2013. Frederick Douglass National Historic Site: Cultural Landscape Inventory. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600033. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database.

NPS Northeast Regional Office. 2006. Moore House: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Colonial National Historical Park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 300223. Northeast Regional Office/CLI Database.

NPS Northeast Regional Office. 2007a. Appalachian Trail Landscape: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Shenandoah National Park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 300129. Northeast Regional Office/CLI Database.

NPS Northeast Regional Office. 2007b. Appomattox Court House Landscape: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Appomattox Court House National Historical Park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 300089. Northeast Regional Office/CLI Database.

NPS Northeast Regional Office. 2007c. Appomattox Court House Village: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Appomattox Court House National Historical Park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 300120. Northeast Regional Office/CLI Database.

NPS Northeast Regional Office. 2009a. Clement Redding Farm: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Eisenhower National Historic Site, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 300005. Northeast Regional Office/CLI Database.

NPS Northeast Regional Office. 2009b. George Washington Birthplace Landscape: Cultural Landscape Inventory, George Washington Birthplace National Monument, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 300150. Northeast Regional Office/CLI Database.

NPS Northeast Regional Office. 2009c. Jockey Hollow: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Morristown National Historical Park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 650077. Northeast Regional Office/CLI Database.

NPS Northeast Regional Office. 2010a. Gettysburg Landscape: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Gettysburg National Military Park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 300133. Northeast Regional Office/CLI Database.

NPS Northeast Regional Office. 2010b. Poplar Grove National Cemetery: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Petersburg National Battlefield - Poplar Grove National Cemetery, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 300216. Northeast Regional Office/CLI Database.

NPS Northeast Regional Office. 2011. Cross Estate: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Morristown National Historical Park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 650046. Northeast Regional Office/CLI Database.

NPS, *NPS-28 Cultural Resource Management Guideline: Chapter 7 Management of Cultural Landscapes*, 2002.

Official Website of the Delaware Tribe of Indians. Accessed 2/25/16.
<http://delawaretribe.org/locations/bartlesville-headquarters/>.

Olmsted Center for Land Preservation. Accessed 12/6/16.
<https://www.nps.gov/oclp/index.htm>.

Parker, Patricia and King, Thomas, *Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Traditional Cultural Properties*, U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1998.

Parker, Patricia. "Traditional Cultural Properties: What We Do and How You Think." *CRM* Volume 16, 1:99:3.

Paula Reed and Associates, Inc.. 2011. Antietam National Cemetery: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Antietam National Battlefield - Antietam National Cemetery, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600048. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database.

Pliska, J. 2011. Sherman Circle: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Rock Creek Park - DC Street Plan Reservations. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600165. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database.

Preliminary Information Form: Historic District: Satchidananda Ashram, Yogaville, Buckingham County, Virginia, 2015.

Prosper, Lisa. "Wherein Lies the Heritage Value? Rethinking the Heritage Value of Cultural Landscapes from an Aboriginal Perspective." *The George Wright Forum*. Vol. 24, Num. 2(2007).

Provencher, S and Warner, L. 2003. Tassi Ranch: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Grand Canyon - Parashant National Monument, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 725387. NPS Pacific West Regional Office. Pacific West Regional Office/CLI Database.

Qhapaq Nan, Andean Road. UNESCO. Accessed 12/13/15.
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1459>.

Quinn, R and Wheelock, P. 2007. Stanton Park: Cultural Landscape Inventory, National Capital Parks-East-Capitol Hill Parks. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600075.

NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database.

Rose, Christina. "9 Reasons NOT to Celebrate the 50th Anniversary of the Kinzua Dam." Accessed 3/1/16. <http://indiancountrytodaymedianetwork.com/2015/10/07/9-reasons-not-celebrate-50th-anniversary-kinzua-dam-161995>.

Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, UNESCO. Accessed 9/1/16.
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1084>.

Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras, UNESCO. Accessed 9/1/16.
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/722>.

Ryberg, S and Fanning, K. 2009. Lincoln Park: Cultural Landscape Inventory, National Capital Parks-East-Capitol Hill Parks. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600072. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database.

Senca Nation v. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Accessed 3/1/16.
<https://law.resource.org/pub/us/case/reporter/F2/262/262.F2d.27.14488.html>.

Stoffle, Richard W. Halmo, David B and Austin, Diane E. "Cultural Landscapes and Traditional Cultural Properties: A Southern Paiute View of the Grand Canyon and Colorado River." *American Indian Quarterly*, Vol. 21, No. 2 (Spring, 1997), pp. 229-249.

Sams, C and Brown, NJ. 2008. Drewry's Bluff: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Richmond National Battlefield, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 300098. NPS Northeast Regional Office. Northeast Regional Office/CLI Database.

Sams, C and et al. 2009. Fort Necessity's CCC Picnic Area: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Fort Necessity National Battlefield, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 300169. NPS Northeast Regional Office. Northeast Regional Office/CLI Database.

Sams C. 2008. Chickahominy Bluff: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Richmond National Battlefield Landscape, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories.

300099. NPS Northeast Regional Office. Northeast Regional Office/CLI Database.

Sargent, Lloyd, and Brown, NJ. 2009. Walnut Hill: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Valley Forge National Historical Park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 300021. NPS Northeast Regional Office. Northeast Regional Office/CLI Database.

Sargent, Lloyd, and et al. 2002. Valley Forge Farms: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Valley Forge National Historical Park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 300020. NPS Northeast Regional Office. Northeast Regional Office/CLI Database.

Silk Roads: The Routes Network of Chang'an-Tianshan Corridor, UNESCO. Accessed 12/13/15. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1442/>.

Smythe, Charles. "The National Register Framework for Protecting Cultural Heritage Places." *Traditional Cultural Properties: Putting Concept into Practice*: Vol. 26 No. 1 2009 pp. 14-27.

Snortland, J. Signe. "Caught in the Middle: The State Historic Preservation Office Role In Federal Regulations." *Plains Anthropologist* 44, no. 170 (1999): 61-64. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25669627>.

Stanfill, Alan L. "Native American Participation in Federal Programs Under the National Historic Preservation Act." *Plains Anthropologist* 44, no. 170 (1999): 65-70. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25669628>.

Stevens, C and Bailey, S. 2008. Four Locks: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600279. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database.

Stevens, C and Simpson, A. 2007. Asbury Memorial, US Reservation 309 B: Rock Creek Park - DC Street Plan Reservations, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 975383. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database.

- Stevens, C and Simpson, A. 2007. Marconi Memorial, US Reservation 309 A: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Rock Creek Park - DC Plan Reservation, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600265. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database.
- Telaquana Trail, Lake Clark National Park and Preserve, National Park Service. Accessed 1/20/16. <http://www.nps.gov/lac1/learn/historyculture/telaquana-trail.html>.
- Temkin, M. 2009. Thomas Farm: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Monocacy National Battlefield, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600294. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database.
- Temkin, M. 2010. Great Falls Tavern: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600271. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI.
- Temkin, M. 2010. Seneca Lock: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Chesapeake and Ohio National Historical Park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 975434. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database.
- Temkin M. 2011. Parks Farmstead: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Antietam National Battlefield, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 600047. NPS National Capital Regional Office. National Capital Regional Office/CLI Database.
- The Cultural Landscape Foundation. Accessed 12/6/16. <http://tclf.org/places/about-cultural-landscapes>.
- Titchen, Sarah. "On the Construction of 'Outstanding Universal Value', Some Comments on the Implementation of the 1972 UNESCO World Heritage Convention." *Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites* (1996) vol. 1 (235-242).
- Tuan, Yi-Fu. *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience*, University of Minnesota Press, 1977.

The Lenape Tribe. Accessed 2/25/16.

<http://www.lenapelifeways.org/lenape1.htm>.

The Nanticke Lenni-Lenape. Accessed 2/25/16.

<http://www.nanticoke-lenape.info/history.htm>.

Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park, UNESCO. Accessed 9/1/16.

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/447>.

Understanding Cultural Landscapes, NPS. Accessed 1/20/16.

<http://www.nps.gov/subjects/culturallandscapes/understand-cl.html>.

U.S. Department of Interior Indian Affairs. Accessed 10/31/16.

<http://www.bia.gov/WhoWeAre/BIA/OIS/TribalGovernmentServices/TribalDirectory/>.

U.S. Department of State, The Canandaigua Treaty of 1749. Accessed 2/29/16.

<http://www.let.rug.nl/usa/documents/1786-1800/the-canandaigua-treaty-of-1794.php>.

Uschold, D and Eleey, P. 2009. Washington's Headquarters: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Morristown National Historical Park, National Park Service. Cultural Landscape Inventories. 650011. NPS Northeast Regional Office. Northeast Regional Office/CLI Database.

Von Droste, Bernd. "The Concept of Outstanding Universal Value and its Application 'From the Seven Wonders of the Ancient World to the 1,000 World Heritage Places Today'." *Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development*. Vol. 1 No. 1 2011 (26-41).

Wachau Cultural Landscape, UNESCO. Accessed 12/13/15.

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/970>.

World Heritage List, UNESCO. Accessed 10/25/16.

<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/>.