
ROGER WILLIAMS UNIVERSITY, SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE, ART & HISTORIC PRESERVATION

HP 351/551—History and Philosophy of Historic Preservation**Spring 2015**

9:00 am to 11:50 am, Wednesday; ARCH 142.

Seminar format, 3 credits

Instructor: Jeremy C. Wells, Ph.D. Phone: 401-254-5338; email: jwells@rwu.edu; office ARCH 253

OFFICE HOURS

My office hours are Tuesdays, 1:00 pm to 2:00 pm, Wednesdays, 2:30 pm to 3:30 pm; and Thursdays 10:00 am to 11:00 am. You can expect me to be in my office during these times regardless if you make an appointment or not (see below). Please feel free to stop by ARCH 253 during my office hours, but I would encourage you to make an appointment to make sure that I am not already meeting with a student when you arrive.

To reserve an appointment, go to my appointment calendar at <http://jeremywells.youcanbook.me>. The times and days when I am available to meet are highlighted in blue. You can navigate to different weeks by clicking the arrows on either side of the calendar. Pick a time when you would like to meet and click on it; a booking page will then appear. On the booking page, enter your name, email address, a topic for the meeting you are requesting, and the required "captcha" challenge/response. Click the "Confirm Booking" button to complete the process, which will trigger an automatic email to you to confirm your appointment.

Make sure to cancel your appointment if your plans change; to do this, return to your confirmation email and click the link at the bottom of the email under the words "To cancel this booking, click this link." (Or you can email me indicating that you would like to cancel the appointment.)

CATALOG DESCRIPTION

Historical overview of the variety of philosophical approaches present in the preservation movement from Ruskin to the latest Charters. Explores changes in the values and ethics of preservation and urban conservation to set the framework for judgments and choices that may be made in building projects. Topics include issues related to tradition and innovation, various types of historic preservation, such as "living" museums and private restoration, reconstruction and adaptive reuse, conservation and heritage tourism.

COURSE DESCRIPTION

In this course we will be examining the belief systems of people who are and have been engaged with old buildings, structures, places, and landscapes in some way. We will cover a vast array of human values, from European aristocrats and architectural historians to Native Americans and Australian indigenous peoples. One of the foundational assumptions of this course is that the recognition and treatment of built heritage cannot be solely defined through the objective reality of objects, although many have attempted to do so. From its inception in a Western context in the early nineteenth century, the philosophy of how built heritage should be recognized and treated has been based on cultural and personal values, notwithstanding its occasional description as a "scientific" endeavor.

You may be asking why it is important to understand preservation/conservation philosophy. After all, many people engage in work in the historic environment without any formal training in historic preservation or heritage conservation. There are two answers to this question.

First, a specific stream of heritage conservation philosophy is embedded in laws in the United States and abroad. As a professional working in the built environment, you will need to understand this particular belief system to propose work that has an increased probability of being approved by regulatory processes.

Second, the historic environment has clear benefits to society. The questions about how built heritage is recognized and treated have ramifications that will impact humanity, both negatively and positively. Your decisions as a built environment practitioner on these changes will impact people emotionally and physically for many years.

PREREQUISITES

HP 150 *or* Junior standing.

COURSE OBJECTIVES

Overall objective:

Upon the successful completion of this course, a student will understand the how the philosophy of the identification and treatment of the historic environment developed from the early nineteenth century to the present.

Specific objectives:

Be able to:

1. Explain the overall historical evolution of thought on the value and treatment of the historic environment.
2. Describe what preservation/conservation doctrine is and provide examples.
3. Describe the historical development of the National Register and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and how these documents have become accepted as conservation/preservation doctrine in the United States; critique their overall advantages and disadvantages in application.
4. Differentiate between orthodox and heterodox approaches to heritage.
5. Choose a specific scenario and defend a position on how heritage should be treated.
6. Use evidence to synthesize your own philosophical position on a particular built heritage conservation dilemma.

REQUIRED COURSE MATERIALS

There are no required textbooks for this course. All readings will be supplied as PDF files through Bridges.

COURSE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

This course requires students to use the Bridges collaboration and learning environment (CLE) that is provided, maintained, and supported by Roger Williams University. Bridges is accessed at <http://bridges.rwu.edu> and requires a valid student login name and password. Documentation and training on using the Bridges CLE is available at this site.

REQUIREMENTS

Readings

Approximately 100-150 pages of readings will be assigned each week from provided PDF files on Bridges and from the required textbooks. Your participation grade (described below) will depend on reading *all* of these articles, so make sure to budget your time accordingly. A bibliography of the readings is provided at the end of this syllabus.

Writing well

To succeed in this course, your writing must contain a minimum of grammatical and mechanical errors, be written in a manner that is clear, cogent, and concise, and it cannot exhibit awkward sentence construction. ***Always proof your papers multiple times before submitting.***

For some hints and suggestions on effective proofreading, see:
<http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/561/1/>

If your writing skills do not meet this expected standard, make sure to take advantage of the Writing Center (see below) for assistance.

Writing Center

Students are encouraged to use the Writing Center in the Center for Academic Development (CAD), as needed, for assistance with identifying writing style issues and improving overall writing skills. Info on the center is at <http://rwu.edu/go/writingcenter>.

While the majority of tutorial support offered through the Center for Academic Development is aimed at undergraduates, the center also offers assistance more appropriate for graduate-level students. There are a few basic guidelines and suggestions for graduate students in order to access tutoring:

- The Writing Centers offer faculty tutoring in addition to peer tutoring. Some graduate students prefer to work with a faculty tutor who might have specialized content knowledge, documentation expertise, or thesis experience. Faculty tutors teach in the Math and Writing programs; you must make an appointment (in the CAD or by phone at 254-3219) in order to meet with a faculty tutor.
- Appointments with faculty tutors are typically half an hour; if you have a long document or feel you might need more time, you can request a double block, if available, for a one-hour appointment.
- During high-demand stages of the semester, it may be more difficult (occasionally impossible) to get an appointment with a faculty tutor. Schedule appointments ahead of time!
- When you come in for your appointment (2nd floor Library, within the CAD), you will need to log in at the TutorTrac station on your immediate right inside the CAD.
- Bring all assignment handouts and necessary texts to the appointment, including any recommendations the instructor has provided. Please come prepared with an agenda of what you would like to focus on during the session to maximize efficient use of your time.
- You can contact the Writing Tutoring Coordinator, Karen Bilotti, at kbilotti@rwu.edu if you have any questions or concerns related to accessing the appropriate assistance.
- There is no charge for any tutoring in the CAD.

Assignments

(Further details on these assignments will be provided in class.)

1. Participation – each week, be ready with your question on the assigned readings

Regular and meaningful in-class participation is critical to your success in this course. We will collectively explore the depths of topics based on the assigned readings. It is expected that you will have at least one question ready for your fellow students to discuss when you arrive in class each week. Your question will be evaluated based on its overall quality and direct relationship to the content of one or more readings that have been assigned. On occasion I will also ask you to find specific readings for discussion in class.

2. Symposium on "Is the National Register Ready for the 21st Century?"

Working with your fellow students, you will help to create a symposium to discuss the topic of "Is the National Register Ready for the 21st Century?" The overall format will be based on professional symposia (e.g., conferences), including the submission of an abstract, full paper, and presenting your work. Graduate students in the course will be responsible for creating a poster that represents all the students' work in the symposium. Specific assignments for this symposium are as follows:

- a. Abstract: Your abstract, which is based on a topic relevant to the symposium, describes the topic and problem that you are proposing to address in your paper presentation. It should contain evidence that you have performed an initial literature search on your topic.
- b. Abstract review: You will perform a double-blind review of another student's abstract, offering feedback and comments. The instructor will add additional comments and return the review to the abstract's author.
- c. Symposium paper: This is a research paper that explores your topic, addresses your stated problem area, and offers potential solutions.
- d. Paper review: You will perform a double-blind review of another student's paper, offering feedback and comments. The instructor will add additional comments and return the review to the paper's author. You will then use this feedback to help prepare your presentation.
- e. Presentation of your paper: You will present your work to your fellow students and invited students and faculty from the preservation program.
- f. Symposium poster: The graduate students in the class (i.e., those enrolled in HP 551) will create a poster that represents all the students' work. (Assignment 2f is not required of undergraduate students.)

3. Mid-term exam

This take-home exam will cover all content up to the date of the exam.

4. Grading of your fellow poster team members (graduate students only)

Students enrolled in HP 551 will work as a team to create the symposium poster in assignment 2f. These students will be responsible for giving a grade to each of their fellow members using the rubric, below.

EVALUATION

Students enrolled in HP 351

1. Participation:	20%
2a. Abstract:	10%
2b. Abstract review:	5%
2c. Symposium paper:	25%
2d. Paper review:	5%
2e. Presentation:	10%
3. Mid-term exam:	25%
Total:	100%

Roger Williams University's grading system will be used for this course, which is defined as follows:

93-100	= "A"	77-79%	= "C+"
90-92	= "A-"	73-76	= "C"
87-89	= "B+"	70-72	= "C-"
83-86	= "B"	60-69	= "D"
80-82	= "B-"	Below 60	= "F"

Students enrolled in HP 551

1. Participation:	15%
2a. Abstract:	5%
2b. Abstract review:	5%
2c. Symposium paper:	20%
2d. Paper review:	5%
2e. Presentation:	10%
2f. Symposium poster:	15%*
3. Mid-term exam:	20%
4. Grading of your fellow poster team:	5%
Total:	100%

* 50% of this grade is based on the final poster and 50% is based on your fellow team members' evaluation of your work.

Roger Williams University's grading system will be used for this course, which is defined as follows:

93-100	= "A"	0-79%	= "F"
90-92	= "A-"		
87-89	= "B+"		
83-86	= "B"		
80-82	= "B-"		

For graduate students, the minimum, passing grade for the final course grade is a "B-" (or at least 80%), as described in the course catalog.

Overall grading rubric

Quality of assignment

"A" = All major elements are present; overall characteristics of the assignment are outstanding or very good.

"B" = Some elements are missing, but none that are critical; overall characteristics of the assignment are acceptable.

"C" = Many elements are missing, including some that are critical; overall characteristics of the assignment are minimally acceptable.

"D" = An assignment is present, but most elements are missing and the overall presentation is poor.

"F" = Nearly all elements are missing; overall characteristics of the assignment are unacceptable; no assignment submitted.

Grading rubric for participation

Readings discussion question

- The student is always ready with a readings discussion question when asked.
- The student clearly references the particular reading(s) from which the question is derived.
- The question is clearly articulated.
- The question is directly relevant to the assigned readings and is not tangential.

During in-class discussions the student:

- is respectful of other students' ideas;
- often raises thoughtfully worded questions that are directly relevant to the discussion at hand;
- critiques other students' ideas and offers useful insight on a particular topic;
- references the assigned reading(s) in his/her response;
- is attentive and listening to other students.

Grading rubric for abstracts and papers

Content

- Abstract or paper contains all required sections as described in the assignment.
- Format matches what is described in the assignment.
- There is evidence of a substantial literature search; there are ideas cited from scholarly sources and a bibliography.
- Papers are logically divided into sections that are labeled with headings and sub-headings.
- The central idea, theme, problem, or question is clearly articulated early in the abstract or paper.
- The abstract or paper is well organized.

Communication

- Presentation mode assumes a professional or scholarly audience.
- There are no significant typos or grammar/writing style issues.
- Ideas are clearly communicated.
- No awkward sentence construction.

Grading rubric for paper and abstract reviews

Content

- Review contains all required sections as described in the assignment.
- Format matches what is described in the assignment.
- Student offers thoughtfully, carefully considered feedback and suggestions.
- Student cites ideas from scholarly literature in the feedback.

Communication

- Presentation mode assumes a professional or scholarly audience.
- There are no significant typos or grammar/writing style issues.
- Ideas are clearly communicated.
- No awkward sentence construction.

Grading rubric for oral presentation

Content

- Presentation covers all major areas of the paper.
- Terms are defined, as appropriate.
- Delivery is organized well.
- Presentation is delivered in the allocated time.

Format and communication

- Presentation uses graphic communication effectively.
- Student presents himself/herself professionally with courtesy toward the audience.
- Oral communication is clear.

Grading rubric for symposium poster

Content and format; the poster should:

- contain all required sections as described in the assignment;
- be submitted according to assignment directions;
- be graphics-heavy with appropriate text size and formatting that adheres to the assignment's directions.

Communication

- Presentation mode assumes a professional or scholarly audience.
- There are no significant typos or grammar/writing style issues.
- Ideas are clearly communicated.
- No awkward sentence construction

Grading rubric for evaluation of your work by fellow poster team members

Student made commitments to do task assignments	Student did their fair share of work	Student produced work with acceptable quality	Student actively participated in the team
<i>Weight = 25%</i>	<i>Weight = 25%</i>	<i>Weight = 25%</i>	<i>Weight = 25%</i>
"A" = Always	"A" = Always	"A" = Always	"A" = Always
"B" = Most of the time	"B" = Most of the time	"B" = Most of the time	"B" = Most of the time
"C" = Many times	"C" = Many times	"C" = Many times	"C" = Many times
"D" = Sometimes	"D" = Sometimes	"D" = Sometimes	"D" = Sometimes
"F" = Never	"F" = Never	"F" = Never	"F" = Never

Teamwork evaluation rubric adapted from research performed by Daniel Levi and David Cadiz from the Psychology and Human Development Department of Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, "Evaluating Team Work on Student Projects" (1998), conducted as part of the NASA Multidisciplinary Design and Analysis Fellowship Program.

All evaluations need to be submitted through an on-line survey web site (instructions will be provided in class). The instructor will not share information with you correlating individual evaluations of your work with a particular student's name; this information will be held in confidence. Any outliers will be thrown out and will not contribute to your grade.

Grading rubric for submitting your evaluation of your fellow team member's performance

Each of your evaluations of other students' work within your team will be graded as either an "A" (100%) if submitted by the stated deadline or an "F" (0%) if not submitted, or if submitted after the stated deadline. The grade for each evaluation will then be averaged for the final grade for this section.

OFFICIAL NOTICES AND POLICIES

Use of electronic devices in the classroom

Students may use laptops and tablets/slates for note taking during class. The use of these devices for any other activities, such as surfing the web, texting, or e-mail is not allowed in the classroom. Keep in mind that multitasking on electronic devices will impact your participation grade. At no time is the use of a cell phone permitted during class time for any reason. The volume must be muted on *all* electronic devices in your possession or the device must be turned off. Students found to be in violation of this policy will be asked to leave the classroom and will be marked as absent.

Late assignments

Due dates for assignments are listed in the schedule at the end of this syllabus. Late assignments will be docked 5% for each day they are late. This automatic reduction is non-negotiable unless an exception has been granted by the instructor in advance of the due date.

If there is an upcoming activity that will prevent you from turning in an assignment on time, contact me as early as possible to discuss when you can turn in your assignment, and how I might be able to accommodate your request. Unless there are extenuating circumstances, the default is to arrange for a time to turn in your assignment *early* instead of *late*. You must submit your request by e-mail at least two weeks in advance (and preferably earlier) of a known event to request accommodation.

Unfortunately, there are times in our lives where we may have a personal or family emergency or unforeseen illness. In this case, send me an e-mail as soon as you can requesting an extension. A missed assignment due to an illness requires that you submit a note (scanned image is fine) from a doctor. Note: Activities such as weddings, vacations, and personal conferences are not considered to be extenuating circumstances.

Attendance

Students are expected to arrive to class on time and attend all class meetings. Absences and late arrivals will impact your participation grade. The only exceptions to this policy are if a student presents a proper note from a medical doctor or if he/she is officially representing a university program at a conference or similar event (notification needs to be given in advance of the class meeting). Students are responsible for any missed material.

Instructor's attendance

Students should wait at least 20 minutes before departing should the instructor be late for class. Advance notice will be given of an absence by e-mail with instructions for a make-up meeting and/or assignments.

Academic integrity

From Roger Williams University's Academic Standards (see <http://rwu.edu/academics/academic-affairs/academic-standards>):

Roger Williams University exists to foster the mature pursuit of learning, which is premised upon the exercise of mutual trust and honest practice when representing data, findings and the sources of ideas used in an academic exercise. The University expects students to observe these principles of academic integrity that ensure the excellence of their education and the value of their diploma.

Examples of breaches of academic integrity include but are not limited to:

Cheating: Using or attempting to use unauthorized materials, information or citation in any academic exercise. Examples include, but are not limited to

- Copying from another student on exams or assignments;
- Altering graded exams or assignments and resubmitting them for a new grade;
- Submitting the same paper for two classes without both instructors' written permission.

Fabrication: Unauthorized falsifications or invention of any information or citation in any academic exercise. Examples include, but are not limited to

- Using made-up citations in papers or other assignments;
- Representing collaborative work as the result of individual effort;
- Collaborating on graded assignments beyond the extent authorized by the instructor.

Plagiarism: Plagiarism is best defined as the incorporation of words and ideas of another person in an attempt to claim that person's work as one's own. Thus, plagiarism fails to engage in civil, scholarly discourse. It is sometimes a form of intellectual theft and is always a form of intellectual fraud.

In its worst form, plagiarism may consist of directly copying large or small portions of either printed or online works, or, as frequently happens in schools, written papers of another student, without properly crediting the source(s) from which they came. There are, however, more subtle forms of plagiarism as well. Paraphrasing, which is the process of using alternative expressions to communicate the meaning of another author's words, is also a form of plagiarism, unless the sources of those ideas are acknowledged. Roger Williams University provides resources and advice to students to help avoid plagiarism. See How to Avoid Plagiarism (<http://rwu.libguides.com/plagiarism>) and the Citing Your Sources guide (<http://rwu.libguides.com/citingsources>). Students are encouraged to consult their instructor if they have questions regarding proper documentation of sources and avoiding plagiarism. Examples of plagiarism include, but are not limited to

- Quoting or paraphrasing someone else's work without correct citation;
- Copying work of another and representing it as your own;
- Purchasing a paper, essay or other work;
- Having someone else do your work for you.

Fraud: Altering, forging, or encouraging another person to alter or forge, official records of the institution, or assisting others in such activities. Examples of plagiarism include, but are not limited to

- Taking an exam for someone else;
- Changing the grade on an assignment and representing it as the original.

Willful Damage: Damaging another's creative work or property.

Facilitating Academic Dishonesty: Assisting or aiding someone else in committing a breach of academic integrity. Examples include, but are not limited to

- Allowing another student to copy a paper, problem set, exam or other assignment that is meant to be completed individually;
- Taking an exam or completing an assignment for another student;
- Obtaining a copy of an exam ahead of time for oneself or another student.

Consequences of a Breach of Academic Integrity

Civil discourse and the entire academic project depend on mutual trust among the community of scholars that is Roger Williams University. Even a minor breach of academic integrity diminishes that trust. Accordingly, the consequences of a breach of academic integrity, depending on severity, include:

- Failure on the assignment on which the breach occurred;
- Failure of the class in which the breach occurred;
- Academic probation for one semester;
- Suspension for one semester;
- Separation (dismissal) from the Roger Williams University community.

Disability access statement

Students who wish to receive academic accommodations for this course must first register with Student Accessibility Services (SAS) in order to begin the accommodation process. The SAS office will provide registered students with the specific information they will need to share with each instructor. SAS is located on the second floor of the Main University Library and is open from 8:00 am to 5:00 pm Monday through Friday. Please note Student Accessibility Services was previously known as Disability Support Services. Website: <http://rwu.edu/academics/academic-services/sas/current-students>

Disclaimer

Although considerable effort has been made in developing this syllabus, unforeseen events may require changes to its content and the course schedule. Changes, if required, will be made in light of assuring that the course's learning objectives are met.

SCHEDULE

This schedule is subject to change

Week	Wednesday
1	January 21
Topic/task	Course introduction and expectations
Assignment made	Question from readings for in-class discussion
2	January 28
Topic/task	Treatment of old buildings and places from antiquity to the Enlightenment
Assignment made	Symposium assignments
Readings due	1. "Jokilehto - History of Architectural Conservation (1999).pdf" (Chapters 1-4, pp. 1-100)
Assignment due	QUESTION FROM READING FOR DISCUSSION
3	February 4
Topic/task	Notre Dame and the vexed men of SPAB; a play in two parts.
Assignment made	
Readings due	1. "Hugo - Cathedral of Notre Dame (1831-1888).pdf" (Book 3, chap 1, pp. 143-165) 2. "Ruskin – Lamp of Memory (1849).pdf" (pp. 236-263) 3. "Viollet-Le-Duc - Restoration (1854).pdf" (pp. 195-227) 4. The SPAB Manifesto (1877): http://www.spab.org.uk/what-is-spab/the-manifesto/ 5. "The Architect - The Anti-Restoration Movement (1878).pdf" (pp. 17, 18) 6. "Amer. Architect and Bldg. News - A Plea for the Proper Preservation of Old Buildings (1894).pdf" (pp. 84, 85) 7. "Lethaby - How They Restore (1898).pdf" (pp. 14-20)
Assignment due	QUESTION FROM READINGS FOR DISCUSSION
4	February 11
Topic/task	The sweetness of science makes the restoration pill go down easier
Assignment made	
Readings due	1. "Boito - Restoration in Architecture (1893, 2009 translation).pdf" (pp. 69-83) 2. "Riegl - Modern Cult of Monuments (1903).pdf" (pp. 69-83) 3. "Chandler - Notes [on the 1914 restoration of] the Paul Revere House (1944).pdf" (pp. 15-20) 4. "Athens Charter (1931).pdf" 5. "Kimball et al. - Restoration of Colonial Williamsburg (1935).pdf" (<i>only</i> pp. 363-379, skim rest) 6. "Lockwood - Problems and Responsibilities of Restoration (1937).pdf" (pp. 49-59) 7. "Peterson - How to Restore Mt. Vernon (1951).pdf" (pp. 33-35) 8. "Campioli - Restoration Principles and Guidelines (1964).pdf" (pp. 27-30)
Assignment due	QUESTION FROM READINGS FOR DISCUSSION
–	February 18: No class meeting
5	February 25
Topic/task	This old doctrine: Significance, integrity and the National Register
Assignment made	
Readings due	1. "Lee - Historical and architectural monuments in the United States (1950).pdf" (<i>only</i> pp. 17-22) 2. "Tainter and Lucas - Epistimology of the Significance Concept (1983).pdf" (<i>only</i> pp. 707-709) 3. "Sprinkle - Origins of 50-year Rule (2007).pdf" (pp. 81-103) 4. "Sprinkle – Integrity and Authenticity (2014).pdf" (pp. 45-67) 5. "NPS - How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation (nrb15) (1997).pdf" (<i>only</i> pp. 11-49)
Assignment due	1. QUESTION FROM READINGS FOR DISCUSSION 2. ASSIGNMENT 2A – ABSTRACT
6	March 4
Topic/task	This old doctrine, part 2: The Secretary of the Interior's Standards
Assignment made	Assignment #3 – Mid-term exam
Readings due	1. "Lee - Historical and architectural monuments in the United States (1950).pdf" (<i>only</i> pp. 23-27) 2. Venice Charter (1964).pdf 3. "National Trust - Principles and Guidelines – Restoration (1966).pdf" (pp. 251-253) 4. "Philippot - HP Philosophy, Criteria, Guidelines (1976).pdf" (pp. 367-382) 5. "Hudgins - Interview with Morton Brown (2012).pdf" (<i>only</i> pp. 7, 8) 6. Secretary of the Interior's Standards web site: http://www.nps.gov/tps/standards.htm ; read sections on "Standards for Preservation", "Standards for Rehabilitation", "Standards for Restoration", "Standards for Reconstruction", "History of the Standards". Skim remaining material.
Assignment due	1. QUESTION FROM READINGS FOR DISCUSSION 2. ASSIGNMENT 2B – ABSTRACT REVIEW

—	March 11: No class meeting — spring break
7	March 18
Topic/task	Historical desynchronization: where (when) are we?
Assignment made	
Readings due	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "Alexander - SPNEA history (1970).pdf" (14-19) 2. "Phillips - Philosophy of Total Preservation (1971).pdf" (pp. 38-43) 3. "Fitch - Why Preserve the Prototype (1990).pdf" (pp. 1-12) 4. "Kerr - Pragmatic preservation (1964).pdf" (pp. 36-38) 5. "Lee - Objectives & Scope of the Preservation Movement (1967).pdf" (pp. 1-6) 6. "Domer - Prospects and Problems of Freezing Time in Old Buildings (2009).pdf" (pp. 95-110) 7. "Hare - Exaggerated Reverence for the Past (2009).pdf" (pp. 43-60)
Assignment due	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. QUESTION FROM READINGS FOR DISCUSSION 2. ASSIGNMENT 3 – MID-TERM EXAM
8	March 25
Topic/task	Heterodox heritage as a salve for the doctrine that binds you
Assignment made	
Readings due	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "Wells – Orthodox and Heterodox Approaches to Heritage.pdf" 2. "Wells - Plurality in Truth (2007).pdf" (pp. 1-14) 3. "Lixinski - Relationships between Heritage Studies and Heritage Law (2014).pdf" (pp. 1-12) 4. "Lowenthal - Creative Anachronism (1985).pdf" (pp. 363-412) 5. "Winter - Clarifying the Critical in Critical Heritage Studies (2013).pdf" (pp. 532–545)
Assignment due	QUESTION FROM READINGS FOR DISCUSSION
9	April 1
Topic/task	The anti-hegemonic discourse: Minority and non-Western perspectives on heritage conservation
Assignment made	
Readings due	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "Howe - Women in Historic Preservation (1990).pdf" (pp. 31-61) 2. "Dubrow - Feminist and Multicultural Perspectives on Preservation Planning (1998).pdf" (pp. 57-76) 3. "Campbell - The Socorro Mission (2005).pdf" (pp. 8-27) 4. "Milholland - Incompatible Ideologies in US Environmental Laws and Navajos (2010).pdf" (pp. 103-124) 5. "Aaroz - Preserving heritage places under a new paradigm (2011).pdf" (55-60)
Optional readings	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "Andrews and Buggiey - Authenticity in Aboriginal Cultural Landscapes (2008).pdf" (pp. 63-71) 2. "Chung - East Asian Values in Historic Conservation (2005).pdf" (pp. 55-70) 3. "Nishimura - Authenticity of Wooden Architecture (2007).pdf" (pp. 191-203) 4. "Orbasli - Training Conservation Professionals in the Middle East (2007).pdf" (pp. 307-322) 5. "Lagae - Whose Heritage Congo (2008).pdf" (pp. 11-30)
Assignment due	FIND AN ARTICLE THAT DESCRIBES A NON-WESTERN APPROACH TO HERITAGE CONSERVATION FOR DISCUSSION
10	April 8
Topic/task	How does this place feel?
Assignment made	
Readings due	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "Phillips - Old South Meeting House in Boston (1878 [1876]).pdf" (pp. 3-14) 2. "Sinnott - Historic Harpswell (1903).pdf" (pp. 3-19) 3. "Cram – Old Seaport Towns of the South (excerpt) (1917).pdf" (pp. 114, 115) 4. "ICOMOS - Quebec Declaration on the Spirit of Place (2008).pdf" 5. "Wells and Baldwin - Historic Preservation, Significance, and Age Value (2012).pdf" (pp. 384-400) 6. "Waterton - Whose Sense of Place [in] Community Values (2005).pdf" (pp. 309-325) 7. "ICOMOS – Nara Document on Authenticity (1994).pdf"
Assignment due	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. QUESTION FROM READINGS FOR DISCUSSION 2. ASSIGNMENT 2C – SYMPOSIUM PAPER

11	April 15
Topic/task	Why is this historic place important? Understanding the perspective of most stakeholders.
Assignment made	
Readings due	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "Mason - Theoretical and Practical Arguments for Values Centered Preservation (2006).pdf" (pp. 21-48) 2. "Green - The Social Construction of Historical Significance (1998).pdf" (pp. 85-94) 3. "Wells – Authenticity in More than One Dimension (2010).pdf" (pp.36-39) 4. "Smith - Social Values of the Country House (2009).pdf" (pp. 33-48) 5. "Bagnall - Heritage as Performance (2003).pdf" (pp. 87-103) 6. "Australia ICOMOS - Burra Charter (1979-2013).pdf"
Assignment due	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. QUESTION FROM READINGS FOR DISCUSSION 2. ASSIGNMENT 2D – PAPER REVIEW
12	April 22
Topic/task	Place as process: Cultural landscapes and dynamic systems
Assignment made	
Readings due	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "Cook - Is Landscape Preservation an Oxymoron (1995).pdf" (pp. 2-18) 2. "Melnick - Considering Nature and Culture in HP (2000).pdf" (pp. 22-43) 3. "Zancheti and Loretto - Dynamic Integrity (2012).pdf" (pp. 1-10) 4. "Aaroz - Defining and Protecting Authenticity of World Heritage Urban Landscapes (2008).pdf" (pp. 33-37) 5. "Gibson - Cultural Landscapes and Identity (2009).pdf" (pp. 67-92) 6. "UNESCO - Historic Urban Landscape Approach.pdf"
Assignment due	QUESTION FROM READINGS FOR DISCUSSION
13	April 29
Topic/task	Presentations
Assignment made	
Readings due	
Assignment due	ASSIGNMENT 2E – PRESENTATION
14	May 6
Topic/task	Presentations
Assignment made	
Readings due	
Assignment due	ASSIGNMENT 2E – PRESENTATION

DUE TUESDAY, MAY 12: ASSIGNMENT 2F – SYMPOSIUM POSTER (GRAD STUDENTS ONLY)

DUE WEDNESDAY, MAY 13: ASSIGNMENT 4 – GRADING OF FELLOW STUDENTS (GRAD STUDENTS ONLY)

ASSIGNED READINGS BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aaroz, Gustavo F. "Preserving Heritage Places Under a New Paradigm." *Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development* 1, no. 1 (2011): 55-60.
- . "World-heritage Historic Urban Landscapes: Defining and Protecting Authenticity." *APT Bulletin* 39, no. 2/3 (2008): 33-37.
- Andrews, Thomas D., and Susan Buggiey. "Authenticity in Aboriginal Cultural Landscapes." *APT Bulletin* 39, no. 2/3 (2008): 63-71.
- Alexander, Edward P. "Sixty Years of Historic Preservation: The Society for the Preservation of New England Antiquities." *Old Time New England* 61, no. 221 (1970): 14-19.
- "The Anti-restoration Movement." *The Architect* (July 13, 1878): 17-18.
- Australia ICOMOS. "Burra Charter." <http://www.icomos.org/australia/burra.html>.
- Bagnall, Gaynor. "Performance and Performativity at Heritage Sites." *Museum and Society* 1, no. 2 (2003): 87-103.
- Boito, Camillo. "Restoration in Architecture: First Dialog" (Cesare Birignani, translator). *Future Anterior* 6, no. 1 (2009): 68-83.
- Campbell, Howard. "The Socorro Mission: Culture, Economic Development, and the Politics of Historic Preservation Along the Río Grande/Río Bravo." *Latin American Perspectives* 32, no. 6 (2005): 8-27.
- Campioli, Mario E.. "Restoration Principles and Guidelines." *Building Research* 1, no. 5 (1964): 27-30.
- Chandler, Joseph Everett. "Notes on the Paul Revere House." *The Walpole Society Note Book* (1944): 15-20.
- Chung, Seung-Jin. "East Asian Values in Historic Conservation." *Journal of Architectural Conservation* 11, no. 1 (2005): 55-70.
- Committee on Federal Relations. *Speech of Hon. Wendell Phillips for Aid in the Preservation of the Old South Meeting House*. Boston: Alfred Mudge and Son, 1878.
- Congress in Athens. *The Athens Charter*. Athens: First International Congress of Architects and Technicians of Historic Monuments, 1931. http://www.icomos.org/docs/athens_charter.html.
- Cook, Robert E. "Is Landscape Preservation An Oxymoron?" *The George Wright Forum* 13, no. 1 (1996): 42-53.
- Cram, Mildred. *Old Seaport Towns of the South*. New York: Dodd, Mead & Company, 1917.
- Domer, Dennis. "Old but Not Good Old History: Prospects and Problems of Freezing Time in Old Buildings." *Journal of Architectural and Planning Research* 26, no. 2 (2009): 95-110.
- Dubrow, Gail Lee. "Feminist and Multicultural Perspectives on Preservation Planning." In *Making the Invisible Visible: A Multicultural Planning History*. Edited by Leonie Sandercock. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.
- Fitch, James Marston. *Historic Preservation: Curatorial Management of the Built World*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1990.
- Gibson, Lisanne. "Cultural Landscapes and Identity." In *Valuing Historic Environments*. Edited by Lisanne Gibson and John Pendlebury. Surrey and Burlington: Ashgate Publishing, 2009.
- Green, Howard L. "The Social Construction of Historical Significance." In *Preservation of What, for Whom? A Critical Look at Historical Significance*. Edited by Michael A. Tomlan. Ithaca, NY: National Council for Preservation Education, 1998.
- Hare, Jame. "Exaggerated Reverence for the Past: The Challenge of Design Review in the Charleston Historic District Design." In *Design and Historic Preservation: The Challenge of Compatibility*. Edited by David Ames and Richard Wagner. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2009.
- Howe, Barbara J. "Women in Historic Preservation: The Legacy of Ann Pamela Cunningham." *The Public Historian* 12, no. 1 (1990): 31-61.
- Hugo, Victor. *The Hunchback of Notre-Dame*. Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1888.
- ICOMOS. "Québec Declaration on the Preservation of the Spirit of Place." http://www.international.icomos.org/quebec2008/quebec_declaration/pdf/GA16_Quebec_Declaration_Final_EN.pdf.
- ICOMOS. "Venice Charter." http://www.icomos.org/venice_charter.html (accessed March 19, 2009).
- Jokilehto, Jukka. *A History of Architectural Conservation*. Oxford: Butterworth Heinemann, 1999.
- Kerr, Robert J. "Historic Preservation: A Pragmatic Approach." *AIA Journal* 41, no. 4 (1964): 36-38.
- Kimball, Fiske. "The Restoration of Colonial Williamsburg in Virginia." *The Architectural Record* 78, no. 6 (1935).
- Lagae, Johan. "From "Patrimoine Partagé" to "Whose Heritage"? Critical Reflections on Colonial Built Heritage in the City of Lubumbashi, Democratic Republic of the Congo." *Afrika Focus* 21, no. 1 (2008): 11-30.
- Lee, Ronald F. *Historical and Architectural Monuments in the United States*. Washington, DC, 1950.
- Lee, Ronald F. "Objectives and Scope of the Preservation Movement." In *Historic Preservation Tomorrow*. Washington, DC: National Trust for Historic Preservation, 1967.
- Lethaby, W R. "How They Restore." *The Architectural Review* 5, no. December (1898): 14-20.
- Lixinski, Lucas. "Between Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy: The Troubled Relationships Between Heritage Studies and

- Heritage Law." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* (2014).
- Lockwood, Alice G.B. "Problems and Responsibilities of Restoration." *Old Time New England* 28, no. October (1937): 49-59.
- Lowenthal, David. *The Past Is a Foreign Country*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Mason, Randall. "Theoretical and Practical Arguments for Values-centered Preservation." *CRM: The Journal of Heritage Stewardship* 3, no. 2 (2006): 21-48.
- Melnick, Robert Z. "Considering Nature and Culture in Historic Landscape Preservation." In *Preserving Cultural Landscapes in America*. Edited by Arnold R Alanen and Robert Melnick. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000.
- Milholland, Sharon. "In the Eyes of the Beholder: Understanding and Resolving Incompatible Ideologies and Languages in US Environmental and Cultural Laws in Relationship to Navajo Sacred Lands." *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 34, no. 2 (2010): 103-124.
- National Park Service. *National Register Bulletin: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*. U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1997.
- National Trust. "Appendix: A Report on the Principles and Guidelines for Historic Preservation in the United States." In *Historic Preservation Today*. Washington, DC, 1966.
- Nishimura, Yukio. "Authenticity of Wooden Architecture and Enhancement of Its Craftsmanship." In *Cultural Heritage in the 21st Century: Opportunities and Challenges*. Edited by Monika A. Murzyn and Jacek Purchla. Krakow: International Cultural Centre, 2007.
- Orbasli, Aylin. "Training Conservation Professionals in the Middle East." *Built Environment* 33, no. 3 (2007): 307-322.
- Peterson, Charles E. "How to Restore Mount Vernon." *The Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 10, no. 4 (1951).
- Philippot, Paul. "Historic Preservation: Philosophy, Criteria, Guidelines." In *Preservation and Conservation Principles and Practices*. Edited by Sharon Timmons. Washington, DC: Preservation Press, 1976.
- Phillips, Morgan W. "The Philosophy of Total Preservation." *APT Bulletin* 3, no. 1 (1971): 38-43.
- "A Plea for the Proper Preservation of Old Buildings." *The American Architect and Building News* 45, no. September 1 (1894): 84, 85.
- Riegl, Alois. "The Modern Cult of Monuments: Its Essence and Its Development." In *Historical and Philosophical Issues on the Conservation of Cultural Heritage*. Edited by Nicholas Stanley Price, M Kirby, Jr Talley and Alessandra Melucco Vaccaro. Los Angeles: The Getty Conservation Institute, 1996.
- Ruskin, John. *The Seven Lamps of Architecture*. Leipzig: Bernhard Tauchintz, 1907.
- Sinnett, Charles N. *Historic Harpswell, Harpswell, Maine, and Its Historic Congregational Church and Famous Ministers: 1758-1903*. Haverhill, MA: C. C. Morse & Son, 1903.
- Smith, Laurajane. "Deference and Humility: The Social Values of the Country House." In *Valuing Historic Environments*. Edited by Lisanne Gibson and John Pendlebury. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2009.
- Sprinkle, John H. *Crafting Preservation Criteria: The National Register of Historic Places and American Historic Preservation*. New York, 2014.
- . "'Of Exceptional Importance': The Origins of the 'fifty-year Rule' in Historic Preservation." *The Public Historian* 29, no. 2 (2007).
- Tainter, Joseph A., and G. John Lucas. "Epistemology of the Significance Concept." *American Antiquity* 48, no. 4 (1983): 707-719.
- Viollet-le-Duc, Eugène-Emmanuel. *The Foundations of Architecture*. New York: George Braziller, 1990.
- Waterton, Emma. "Whose Sense of Place? Reconciling Archaeological Perspectives with Community Values: Cultural Landscapes in England." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 11, no. 4 (2005): 309-325.
- Wells, Jeremy C. "Authenticity in More Than One Dimension: Reevaluating a Core Premise of Historic Preservation." *Forum Journal* 24, no. 3 (2010): 36-40.
- Wells, Jeremy C. "The Plurality of Truth in Culture, Context, and Heritage: A (mostly) Post-structuralist Analysis of Urban Conservation Charters." *City and Time* 3, no. 2:1 (2007): 1-13.
- Wells, Jeremy C, and Elizabeth D. Baldwin. "Historic Preservation, Significance, and Age Value: A Comparative Phenomenology of Historic Charleston and the Nearby New-urbanist Community of I'On." *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 32 (2012): 384-400.
- Winter, Tim. "Clarifying the Critical in Critical Heritage Studies." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 19, no. 6 (2013): 532-545.
- Zancheti, Silvio Mendes, and Rosane Piccolo Loretto. "Dynamic Integrity: A New Concept to Approach the Conservation of Historic Urban Landscape (HUL)." In *Textos Para Discussão No. 53*. Olinda, Brazil: Centro de Estudos Avançados da Conservação Integrada, 2012.

