

Preserving Everybody's History

The 1950s and 1960s witnessed a wave of urban destruction in this country.¹ The wrecking ball was obliterating beautiful old buildings that had given character to our cities—structures that meant something to our Nation's history—only to have them replaced with cold monuments to modernism. Since then, attitudes have changed. Although the battle is far from won, the historic preservation movement can take credit for many successes. The public is clearly more skeptical of the value of “newness” for its own sake, and many cities can demonstrate evidence of popular support for preservation, but the movement itself has had to evolve. In this essay, I want to talk about two themes I think have been important in its evolution, themes that were not so evident when it first gained momentum in the 1960s.

The first theme is how historic preservation has learned to weave the old with the new in order to enhance urban dynamism. Many have misinterpreted preservation as an attempt to “freeze” the city. In fact, I think that some of the movement's greatest successes have used preservation as a cornerstone of local economic revitalization. Today many tough-minded developers are able to use history to increase their own profitability while generating new urban jobs.

My second theme is how the preservation movement has responded to concerns about elitism. More than 20 years ago, sociologist Herbert J. Gans charged that New York City's Landmarks Preservation Commission cared only about “the stately mansions of the rich and buildings designed by famous architects,” and pointed out that 105 of the Commission's 113 designated buildings had been designed by prominent architects for wealthy clients.² Gans argued that such a narrow focus had no relevance for New York's working people, the poor, or people of color. Modern historic preservation efforts are doing a great deal to broaden their view to include everyone's history.

Historic Preservation and Urban Dynamism

When I first became Mayor of San Antonio, my highest priority was economic development, not preservation. But I soon found myself negotiating in battles between developers and preservationists, and I had to learn quickly. My most memorable teachers were the members of the San Antonio Conservation Society and other outstanding civic leaders, such as architect O'Neil Ford, who made us

all more sensitive to the design benefits of natural materials, textures and colors, and, above all, *human scale*. I came to understand much more clearly that big investments in new highrise buildings that created canyons devoid of street life were not what our city's economy needed. The keys to the economic strengthening I had been working toward were good design, human scale, and historic preservation.

Acting on this understanding, we found ways to save valuable buildings and spur new investment at the same time. For example, when a bank wanted to demolish a grand old theater to build new offices, we worked out a plan that saved the theater's facade but allowed the bank to build a handsome new building behind it. Our work, however, went beyond saving individual buildings. Another initiative was a "Shades and Shadows" study that used a computer model to determine the appropriate heights for buildings along the banks of the San Antonio River, taking into account the angle of the sun at different times of the day and year. It was an effort to safeguard the essential character—greenery and foliage—of what is without a doubt the city's most precious urban design feature.

Keeping History Alive

The transformation of San Antonio's downtown around the river is one of the best examples of how history can be used to create urban dynamism. The loop of the river flowing through the central city had long been a cause of serious flooding. At one point it was slated to become a paved-over sewer. However, a creative Works Progress Administration project resulted in a remarkably different result. The project constructed a bypass channel with locks that could be opened to divert heavy waters when floods threatened. The result was that the river level in the loop could then be controlled. The river's banks were landscaped, and paths were added to create a beautiful linear park. In the loop, the river's banks were redeveloped to create the River Walk, an attractive and exciting string of stairways, arches, and landscaped open spaces one level below the surrounding street pattern—inviting places where people gather to escape the urban noise and the hot summer sun. The Hyatt Hotel lobby provides a direct link between the River Walk and the Alamo, just a few blocks away.

The structures along the River Walk are a mix of the old and the new, and each new structure was specifically designed to enhance and celebrate the old. The buildings are different from one another, but they retain visual and architectural themes that bring coherence and unity to the River Walk as a whole, and significantly, all of the buildings are actively in use. I think the result has made history come alive more successfully for people than a revitalization plan that focused only on "preserving" the old buildings would have.

Clearly, we can never afford to preserve all old structures as monuments and museum pieces, and it is doubtful that many people would come to see them if we did. But revitalization efforts based on compromise make sense economically. Rehabilitation generally offers a city more benefits than does new construction. Historic preservation is extremely labor intensive, and reusing existing buildings takes advantage of infrastructure systems and locational efficiencies that already exist. One study reported that \$1 million invested in rehabilitation creates five

to nine more construction jobs and keeps \$120,000 more of the value added in the community than would \$1 million if invested in new construction (Rypkema, 1994).

Such tangible benefits are important, but the economic gains from a redevelopment such as the River Walk go far beyond them. The River Walk has become San Antonio's defining characteristic, and it is the key to its success as a tourist center. People gather there, spend money, and support a sizable employment base that simply would not have existed otherwise. The late James Rouse—surely one of the greatest contributors of humanity to the American city in this century—described it succinctly. He once said that what made his projects successful was not architectural brilliance or uniqueness of design but the fact that they provide a magnet for people to come and see other people. The visual incorporation of history often provides the venues for gathering people.

It Works in Many Contexts

Rouse's Faneuil Hall Marketplace is another classic example. By 1956 the elegant buildings of this once-thriving produce market in the heart of Boston were deteriorated and partly deserted. The city had a plan in place to demolish them, but in the early 1970s Rouse offered an alternative concept: Renovate the buildings and turn the area into a vast shopping arcade. The result surpassed all expectations. Bernard Frieden and Lynne Sagalyn note:

For a public with a fresh interest in history, the market presented authentic 150-year-old buildings and cobbled paths rich with historic associations. For a generation that had discovered the sidewalk cafes and bustling piazzas of Europe, the market brought these pleasures home.³

Each of the three market buildings has three levels that together accommodate 160 stores in 220,000 square feet of store space, plus 30 to 40 bull market pushcarts. Food dominates the central building (40 food stores and 10 cafes and informal restaurants). Nine upscale restaurants operate in the North Market building, and the rest of the space is filled with shops offering an incredible variety of merchandise.

The project was fully open in 1978 and had 10 million visitors that year. By the mid-1980s the total was up to 16 million annually. Per-square-foot sales of around \$500 were very high compared with the typical U.S. retail experience, and an equitable arrangement allowed the city treasury to share in the profits with shop owners.

Today, many other cases show how historic preservation can be woven together with new investment to create a new urban dynamism with substantial financial benefits for all participants. Two cases, in which HUD support was critical, help illustrate the range:

Lowell, Massachusetts. In 1975, downtown Lowell was deteriorating. The city had taken over 15 historic buildings for nonpayment of taxes. Nine local banks then established the Lowell Development and Financial Corporation (LDFC) to provide low-interest loans to businesses to restore properties and expand

operations. The banks set up a revolving fund that provided up to 30 percent of a project's appraised completion value. LDFC also used paybacks from HUD's Urban Development Action Grant program to increase its loan operations. The character and location of the old buildings made the difference. Since then LDFC has assisted 85 projects in the area, and its \$3 million in seed loans has leveraged \$15 million in private investment. Jobs in the area have increased by nearly 1,200. Lowell's preservation efforts also extend to the renovation of old mills for use as computer company headquarters—creative reuse showing that front-line technology and historical settings can be quite compatible.

Richmond, Virginia. In the late 1970s, when Richmond was racially polarized nearly to the point of paralysis, the Richmond Renaissance—a public-private partnership with a half African-American and half-white board—was formed. Although its goal is to establish harmony in the city's neighborhoods, its most prominent initiative has been the Sixth Street Marketplace. Sixth Street had long been Richmond's racial dividing line between the central business district and African-American neighborhoods. The project was deliberately designed to bridge that line by its location and by its support for minority businesses, which eventually accounted for 38 percent of its tenants. The project required the renovation of three blocks of historic structures to create an enticing retail mall and included a strong program to encourage minority-owned business startups. Renaissance recruited pro bono financial, legal, and business counselors, and five banks established a \$1.25 million loan pool for higher risk cases. Public investment of \$14.3 million (including \$1.7 million of Community Development Block Grant funds) garnered \$9.7 million in private money for construction, stimulated an additional \$19.5 million in business investment in the area, and generated \$775,000 in new city tax revenues.

The Contributions of Main Street

The idea of history-sensitive renovation has expanded significantly, in part because of an initiative I have long admired: the National Trust for Historic Preservation's Main Street program. The Trust set up its National Main Street Center in 1980 to help cities and towns of all sizes that wanted to "give their aging downtown a prosperous new lease on life." The Main Street process encourages participating communities to rely primarily on local funding, foster historic preservation and good design, use a promotional strategy that involves festivals and coordinated retail events, and offer a wide range of business assistance.

I was most impressed when I learned recently that, since its start, the Main Street process has been initiated in 850 localities in virtually all parts of the country and that it has generated more than \$2.9 billion in physical improvements, yielding 20,389 new businesses and 64,402 net new jobs. Every dollar invested in the operation of a local Main Street program has leveraged a national average of \$22.10 of public and private investment in physical improvements (National Trust for Historic Preservation, 1995).

An assessment of downtown revitalization in the late 1980s, from a survey mailed to 354 cities followed by detailed case studies in 16, concluded that success depended on:

... traditional methods, such as historic districts, design review and zoning, as well as through more comprehensive strategies for revitalization, such as the Main Street approach. . . . The National Main Street Center's revitalization strategy draws clear links between preservation of downtown buildings and the creation of a marketable image for the business district. . . . There is strong evidence . . . that historic preservation, as used by the NMSC's revitalization strategy, contributes to successful downtown revitalization. . . . The program characteristics proved to have a strong, positive effect on success (National Trust for Historic Preservation and The Urban Institute, 1988).

Preservation's Broadening Content and Purposes

Main Street initiatives exhibit the beginnings of a shift in the approach to preservation. To be sure, they have taken advantage of buildings with substantial architectural merit as gauged by professional standards, but many of them have also found ways to celebrate—and thereby enhance—memory of the history of the working people who built our cities and towns and created our urban landscapes. I think the historic preservation movement needs to focus on making its goals relevant to today's working people and, in particular, to disadvantaged groups. Some good ideas are being put forward about how this might be accomplished.

The Power of Place, for Everybody

In an important new book, *The Power of Place: Urban Landscapes as Public History*, Dolores Hayden gives us a framework for understanding both the significance and the potential of a broader approach to preserving history (Hayden, 1995). The book provides a fascinating account of a program Hayden devised and managed that recognizes the histories of multi-ethnic working-class communities in Los Angeles. *The Power of Place* describes principles that I think should be applicable everywhere.

Hayden laments, as I do, that so little attention and resources have been devoted to ethnic history and women's history in the past. She recognizes that, more recently, some steps have been taken at the national level to begin to make amends. Examples include:

- Making a national civil rights museum out of the Lorraine Motel in Memphis, Tennessee, where Martin Luther King, Jr., was assassinated.
- The National Park Service's project to develop a Women's Rights National Historical Park at Seneca Falls, New York, the site of the first women's rights convention in 1848.
- The Black Heritage Trail, where National Park Service rangers guide visitors through the cobblestone streets of Beacon Hill in Boston, noting sites along the way that highlight the important role African Americans have played in the city's (and U.S.) history since the Revolutionary War.
- The first national conference on Preserving Women's History, held in Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania, in 1994, coinciding with the publication of a guide to landmarks of women's history across the Nation, *Susan B. Anthony Slept Here* (Kazickas and Scherr, 1994).

However, recognition at the national level is only a first step. Hayden shows us why we still have a long way to go. There are histories in all of America's communities very much worth remembering:

The power of place—the power of ordinary urban landscapes to nurture citizens' public memory, to encompass shared time in the form of shared territory—remains untapped for most working people's neighborhoods in most American cities.... The sense of civic identity that shared history can convey is missing.... [I]t is possible to enhance social meaning in public places with modest expenditures for projects that are sensitive to all citizens, their diverse heritage, and developed with public processes that recognize both the cultural and the political importance of place.

As an example of what can be done at the citywide level, Hayden tells the story of the Brass Workers History Project in Waterbury, Connecticut. The team responsible included a labor historian, a video producer, a community organizer, and a union education director. In 1982 they published an illustrated history, *Brass Valley: The Story of Working People's Lives and Struggles in an American Industrial Region* (Brecher et al., 1982).⁴ One of the team members, Jeremy Brecher, said the book was “taken as a kind of collective family album in a community where almost everybody has a relative in the brass industry.... One family told me they spent Christmas together going through it.” The project led to a larger community process, including an ethnic music festival that is now a regular event. Project resources have also been used by local teachers to incorporate Waterbury's ethnic history and musical culture into the school curriculum. All of this surely has enriched the lives of today's citizens in Waterbury, but similar efforts can be important at the neighborhood level as well.

Hayden recognizes that participants in neighborhood work still need to overcome some professional biases. Although architects and other design professionals are now giving more recognition to vernacular buildings and spaces than they did in the past, they still tend to focus on physical form without expanding awareness of social and political meaning. Buildings and spaces where important events occurred or that symbolize community lifestyles of the past are given short shrift unless they also are seen as having aesthetic merit.

Conversely, social scientists have tended to give very little emphasis to the physical places where history is made. Hayden points out that historians have become increasingly interested in the historic struggles of racial and women's groups and that recognition of the importance of “social memory” in helping these groups move toward the future is growing. Many projects are now underway to develop oral histories in poor and working-class communities. But Hayden stresses that to reap significant rewards they also need to take advantage of “place memory,” which Edward Casey describes as “the stabilizing persistence of place as a container of experiences that contributes so powerfully to its intrinsic memorability” (Casey, 1987).⁵ That is, stories of your heritage are much more likely to come alive for you, and you will understand and retain their relevance, if you can actually see and experience with all of your senses the places where they unfolded.

Historic Preservation Reaching Out

The traditional preservation movement is beginning to reach out in these directions. To community groups, historic preservation has been most often associated with gentrification; that is, renovation that increases property values and draws in higher income groups that ultimately displace the current residents. Today, a number of established local historic preservation organizations are trying to erase that image. They are turning increasingly to initiatives in poor urban neighborhoods that both renovate historic structures in ways that will keep them affordable to existing residents and see preservation in the context of broader efforts to enhance the livability of older urban neighborhoods for those now residing there.

One of the seminal efforts in this regard is the work of the nonprofit Savannah Landmark Rehabilitation Project.⁶ Savannah, Georgia, has always been a stately city, but by the early 1950s its historic core was badly deteriorated. It comprised handsome, mainly brick buildings with a commercial district along the river and a residential district behind it, laid out in a compact and walkable grid organized around 20 graceful squares. What happened then is one of the legends of historic preservation. A group of prominent local women, often referred to as The Seven Ladies, set in motion the Historic Savannah Foundation, which began by saving individual outstanding townhouses, expanding to tackle groups of buildings and then whole areas. A decade later, the 2-1/2-square-mile area was the largest historic district on the National Register of Historic Places, and a significant share of the architecturally sound buildings had been renovated.

The next stage, however, represented a greater challenge and has become Savannah's second legend in preservation. In 1974 the Victorian District—162 acres of valuable old residential structures just south of the core, largely occupied by low-income African Americans—was also seriously deteriorated. Leopold Adler II, whose mother had been one of the original Seven, felt strongly that the area's architectural heritage had to be preserved, but he also felt that the preservation had to be done for and with the area's existing residents. He built an impressive and dedicated coalition that included bankers, ministers, city officials, and National Association for the Advancement of Colored People leaders and founded the Landmark Project, whose theme has been, "It is far better and cheaper to rehabilitate the sound housing stock that is in the inner cities than to build public housing projects that are antiseptic, impersonal, and give no sense of neighborhood." (Warner, 1988.)

By the early 1980s, 300 housing units had been renovated with Landmark assistance, and another 200 were in process. Rents were maintained at levels affordable to most existing residents, and the change was stimulating additional, nonsubsidized, private investment in the area. A large share of the credit is given to Lee Adler's zeal and tenacity. He kept development costs low; renovation costs not to exceed \$35,000 per unit was a target to which he generally adhered. He aggressively took advantage of every opportunity to secure and leverage resources. The Landmark Project secured support from a number of HUD programs, including the largest allocation of Section 8 Substantial Rehabilitation funding ever made for a scattered-site project. The Project also had the Victorian District listed on the National Register so investors could take advantage of tax credits;

accessed the National Trust for Historic Preservation's Revolving Loan Fund; obtained grants from the Ford Foundation and other philanthropic sources; and reaped the benefits of syndication. Importantly, Adler built solid relationships with residents and involved them in project decisionmaking.

Similar approaches to preservation without gentrification in low-income communities have been initiated in other cities. Some of the traditional historic preservation groups involved are Jubilee Baltimore, the Providence Preservation Society Revolving Fund, the Macon Heritage Foundation, Tampa Preservation, Inc., Hartford Landmarks Conservancy, and the Pittsburgh Historic Landmarks Foundation. Possibly even more important, a number of indigenous community-building groups in minority-populated districts have begun to use architectural history as a theme of their own renewal efforts. These include Landmarks Harlem, the Historic District Development Corporation (Sweet Auburn in Atlanta), the Farrish Street Foundation (Jackson, MS), the Marble Hill Association (Baltimore), the Black Archives, the History and Research Foundation (Overtown in Miami), the Aztec Economic Development and Preservation Corporation (Laredo, TX), and Southtown Main Street (San Antonio).

The National Trust for Historic Preservation has recently started a new program, Community Partners for Revitalization, to give this approach greater momentum (National Trust for Historic Preservation, 1994). The program was developed on the basis of onsite visits to 20 cities to determine the issues community leaders in key historic areas thought could be best addressed through a direct partnership with the Trust. The resulting design incorporates the following four components:

- **Public policy advocacy:** Work with institutions at the Federal, State, and local levels to raise awareness of the importance of history in community building and to press for assistance (including permitting more flexibility under the rules of existing programs) to support it in the field.
- **Real estate advisory services:** Provide technical assistance and training to communities on topics such as feasibility analysis, financial packaging, and real estate business planning; and work to build partnerships with banks to create mechanisms to leverage greater financial support.
- **Capital resources:** Access below-market-rate loan resources to support promising local programs.
- **Demonstration neighborhoods:** Establish broad-based partnerships with local community groups, preservation organizations, city governments, foundations, and State historic preservation offices to put all of these elements together to help demonstrate this new role for preservation in a limited number of mixed- and low-income neighborhoods.

At HUD we are doing what we can to support the Trust's Community Partners program and similar initiatives. The old rules of historic preservation were too restrictive to support this new form of "affordable preservation" that, in my view, warrants the highest priority today.

History, Culture, and Asset-Based Community Building

How relevant are these approaches to the devastating social problems that besiege many of our distressed inner-city neighborhoods? Probably much more so than many social program designers have thought. Some provocative recent research suggests that the most frequently used statistics (for example, poverty rate, family structure, race) are not enough to tell us how well a neighborhood will perform as an environment for nurturing children and youth.⁷ Other factors can also have an important influence. Not enough research has been done to show what factors should be included, but it seems clear that the strength of the neighborhood's social and cultural institutions and networks must be included.

I have no doubt that the benefits of culture in this regard will be affected by how the neighborhood views its history as expressed through *place*. This topic was central at the 1995 Michigan African-American Symposium: Building Our Communities, Preserving Our Heritage, convened by the Detroit Heritage and Community Development Forum. Symposium organizer Nancy Kotting-Williams could hardly have made the point more forcefully when she said:

This is not about fighting over whose heritage this is. We don't have time! Our kids are killing themselves over sources of identity. If kids grow up in a neglected, disrespected environment, they will assume that debilitating identity as their own. If they grow up in an environment where the structures in which we carry out our lives are valued, celebrated, and held in high esteem, the kids will claim this as a part of a positive identity, a reflection of who they are.⁸

This awareness resonates with an approach I pointed out as promising in the fifth essay in this series: *asset-based comprehensive community building*.⁹ As I noted there, the approach is designed to counter directly both the attitude and the reality of dependency. It has three main themes. First, it is driven from the bottom up as a move toward empowerment and self-sufficiency. Community residents organize themselves and play the commanding role in designing and implementing strategies for their own improvement. Second, it is comprehensive. The community develops a strategy that cuts across, and sets priorities among, traditionally separate functional specialties such as social services, crime prevention, education, job creation, and housing. Finally, and most relevant for us here, it is driven by assets rather than needs or problems. The community begins by identifying its own strengths and assets, and these become the basis around which strategies for improvement are built. Assets can range from the skills and entrepreneurial ideas of residents to the strengths of local associations and institutions. But they most certainly include the community's culture and its history.

I believe that more emphasis needs to be given to history, linked to culture, in asset-oriented strategies to strengthen older urban neighborhoods. Historic preservation, in the sense of preserving and renovating valuable structures in ways that help them remain affordable to current residents, is certainly an important component. But traditional preservation should be seen as one part of a program that brings out the history of the community more broadly in ways suggested by Dolores Hayden: heightening awareness of key political and social,

as well as architectural, themes, all in the context of place. Hayden also stressed the value of community public histories as giving “power to communities to define their own collective pasts.” Consistent with the tenets of the asset-based approach, the benefits will not be gained unless community residents do it for themselves—unless they *own* the process—but there is ample room for historic preservation professionals to provide guidance and assistance along the way.

The asset-based approach is closely related to recognizing the importance of indigenous arts and culture in reinvigorating the inner city. Various recent efforts are worth noting. With support from Citibank, Partners for Livable Communities has initiated a Culture Builds Communities program. It has developed a guidebook and is working in several cities to mobilize mainstream arts and cultural institutions and other citywide entities to provide assistance. Its guidebook states that “arts and culture need to be redefined, not as frills or luxuries, but as essential and useful agents for invigorating and restoring character to our communities.” (Booth, 1995.) The Rockefeller Foundation has recently funded The Urban Institute to conduct an 18-month project to assess how arts and cultural efforts strengthen communities.

Reflections on Community

In the communities that are the crucible of our Nation’s cities, the two themes with which I began this essay converge into one. Overtly using history as a bridge to the future—taking advantage of the past as a basis for developing the new—works to enhance life at neighborhood, city, and national levels. Not every neighborhood can develop its own River Walk or Faneuil Hall Marketplace, but each neighborhood that utilizes its own historical assets effectively can motivate participation and collaboration and a sense of unity and excitement that can contribute to both community spirit and reinvigoration of the neighborhood economy.

Could these efforts be divisive? The creation of strong historically based community identities will not lead to a homogeneous society. People can be loyal to their immediate communities and their broader societies at the same time. Many would argue that our Nation’s problems stem from the deterioration of social loyalty at all levels. Developing stronger habits of social linkage responsibility at the community level may be one of the best ways to strengthen such habits with respect to our society at large; that is, in ways that would actually reduce divisiveness.

Sociologist Suzanne Keller offers a fresh perspective on these issues. She reminds us of Ferdinand Tonnies’ two conceptions of society, which have been dominant in her discipline. One emphasized “human association rooted in traditions and emotional attachment” (people strongly bonded to community). The other was “larger, specialized, formalized, impersonal, and pluralistic.” At a time when many Americans were focused on the social limitations of small-town life and moving to cities in part to break free of them, it is probably not surprising that sociologists came to see Tonnies’ two constructs as opposing and sequential. We were moving away from community and toward a more efficient, if impersonal, modern society.

Keller points out, however, that Tonnies originally envisioned the two constructs as eternally *coexisting*. Both offered benefits, and both had a downside. The trick was to find the right blend of them. Keller believes the almost universal adoption of the sequential view has clearly had its costs and that we must now redress the balance: “In the late twentieth century ... [there is a] disenchantment with ... modernity.... Community is resurging as a force.” (Keller, 1995.)

Again, however, balance is the key. Columnist William Raspberry reminds us of the dangers of a sole focus on our immediate community, citing Bosnia as an example, and suggests our vision should be something “between assimilation and tribalism.” He notes Amitai Etzioni’s concept of America as a “Community of communities ... a mosaic [in which] various communities retain ... their cultural particularities, proud and knowledgeable about their specific traditions—while recognizing that they are integral parts of a more encompassing whole.” (Raspberry, 1995.)

This is the sense in which I see preserving history. As I grew up in San Antonio, retaining evidences of my Mexican-American heritage was very important in the development of my own sense of identity, but I have always regarded myself as an American first. That key features of those San Antonio *places* are being preserved continues to mean a great deal to me, even though I no longer live there. And I find that preservation and celebration of places that have been key in my country’s history are vital to my identity as well. I would feel a sense of deep and personal loss if I had to choose between these parts of me. Fortunately, I can gain great value from both.

Notes

1. The Department wishes to acknowledge the contributions of G. Thomas Kingsley, director, Center for Public Finance and Housing, The Urban Institute; and Dr. Suzan Johnson Cook, HUD-Church Liaison, Special Actions Office, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, and senior pastor at Mariner’s Temple Baptist Church, New York, for making this essay possible.
2. This critique is discussed by Dolores Hayden in *The Power of Place: Urban Landscapes as Public History*, Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1995.
3. Frieden, Bernard J. and Lynne B. Sagalyn. 1989. *Downtown Inc.: How America Rebuilds Cities*. Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press. This stimulating book gives detailed accounts of several other successful initiatives that have relied largely on renovation with historical themes to create profitable shopping centers in central cities. It is noteworthy for laying bare the politics and economics of the development processes as well as for its descriptions of the physical designs employed.
4. See also, Brecher, Jeremy. 1984. “How I Learned to Quit Worrying and Love Community History: A ‘Pet Outsider’s’ Report on the Brass Workers History Project,” *Radical History Review*, pp. 187–201.

5. See also, Connerton, Paul. 1989. *How Societies Remember*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
6. The Savannah story summarized here is well documented in: Reiter, Beth Lattimore, Rita S. Jones, Leopold Adler II, and Catherine S. Adler. November 1983. *Preservation for People in Savannah*, Savannah GA: Savannah Landmark Rehabilitation Project; and in Warner, Chris. May/June 1988. "Lee Adler Finds a Way," *Historic Preservation*, pp. 64–66.
7. For example, Furstenberg, Frank F. Jr. 1993. "How Families Manage Risk and Opportunity in Dangerous Neighborhoods," in William J. Wilson, ed., *Sociology and the Public Agenda*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications; and Coulton, Claudia and Jill Korbin. June 1995. "Differential Effects of Structural Factors in the Community on Child-Maltreatment Rates in African-American and European-American Neighborhoods," paper presented to the Society for Research on Child Development. Cleveland: Center for Urban Poverty and Social Change, Case Western Reserve University.
8. Quoted by Jerry Herron in "Preserving Detroit: History Has a Future," *Detroit Metro Times*, October 18, 1995.
9. Cisneros, Henry G. 1996. *Higher Ground: Faith Communities and Community Building*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. I noted in that essay that the asset-based approach has been articulated most clearly by John L. McKnight and John P. Kretzmann in *Building Communities from the Inside Out: A Path Toward Finding and Mobilizing Community Assets*, Evanston: Center for Urban Affairs and Policy Research, Northwestern University, 1993.

References

- Booth, Kathy. 1995. *Culture Builds Communities: A Guide to Partnership Building Putting Culture to Work on Social Issues*. Washington, D.C.: Partners for Livable Communities.
- Brecher, Jeremy, Jerry Lombardi, and Jan Stackhouse, comps. and eds. 1982. *Brass Valley: The Story of Working People's Lives and Struggles in an American Industrial Region*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Casey, Edward S. 1987. *Remembering: A Phenomenological Study*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Cisneros, Henry G. 1996. *Higher Ground: Faith Communities and Community Building*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.
- Hayden, Dolores. 1995. *The Power of Place: Urban Landscapes as Public History*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Kazickas, Juratae and Lynn Scherr. 1994. *Susan B. Anthony Slept Here*. New York: New York Times Books.

Keller, Suzanne. 1995. "The American Dream of Community: An Unfinished Agenda," *Sociological Forum*, 3:2.

National Trust for Historic Preservation. 1995. *Miracle on Main Street: Help for Historic Commercial Areas*. Washington, D.C.: National Trust for Historic Preservation.

———. September 1994. *Community Partners for Revitalization*. Washington, D.C.: National Trust for Historic Preservation.

National Trust for Historic Preservation and The Urban Institute. 1988. *Revitalizing Downtown: 1976–1986*. Washington, D.C.: National Trust for Historic Preservation and The Urban Institute.

Raspberry, William. December 8, 1995. "Between Assimilation and Tribalism," *The Washington Post*.

Rypkema, Donovan D. 1994. *The Economics of Historic Preservation: A Community Leaders Guide*. Washington, D.C.: National Trust for Historic Preservation.

Warner, Chris. May/June 1988. "Lee Adler Finds a Way," *Historic Preservation*.