

1800

1810

1820

1830

1840

1850

1860

1870

1880

1890

1900

1910

1920

1930

1940

1950

1960

1970

1980

1990

2000

PROCEEDINGS
OF THE 2002
CULTURAL
HERITAGE
RESOURCES
SUMMIT

THE GETTY CENTER
LOS ANGELES
NOVEMBER 19, 20, 21





PROCEEDINGS OF THE
2 0 0 2
CULTURAL HERITAGE
RESOURCES SUMMIT

THE GETTY CENTER
LOS ANGELES
NOVEMBER 19, 20, 21



COMPILED AND EDITED BY
JENNIE VERARDO

These proceedings were not produced at State expense.



Sharon Davis
First Lady of California

November 19, 2002

Dear Summit Participants,

Welcome to the California Cultural Heritage Resources Summit. I am pleased you are able to participate in this important and precedent setting event. You have been leaders within the cultural heritage resources movement, devoting lifetimes to the protection of the non-renewable treasures that make up that heritage. On behalf of the State of California, I thank you for your efforts in safeguarding and promoting this legacy.

As you know, there is much work to be done. I urge you to lend your intellect and experience, your expertise and guidance to ensure the treasured legacy of California continues.

Thank you for accepting the challenge and attending this Summit. Your work today will preserve and protect the best of California for tomorrow.

Warm regards,



Sharon Davis



THE FUTURE OF CALIFORNIA'S CULTURAL HERITAGE RESOURCES

THE GETTY CENTER LOS ANGELES NOVEMBER 19, 20, 21

PROGRAM

THE FUTURE OF CALIFORNIA'S CULTURAL HERITAGE RESOURCES

Californians today are vitally interested in their cultural heritage, and in those cultural heritage resources that give them identity, visibility, and a sense of belonging. These cultural heritage resources are our historic sites, structures, and monuments; our art, artifacts, and museum collections; our libraries and archives; our cultural landscapes and archaeological preserves; our folklore and folk life traditions, and our literature and oral traditions. Collectively, these treasured cultural heritage resources form a unique legacy of who we were and are as Californians.

Those of you invited to the California Cultural Heritage Resources Summit are stewards, spokes-persons, and scholars for significant portions of this larger cultural legacy. The Summit will provide you with the opportunity to meet across many disciplines and explore a larger, common agenda for the future of California's cultural heritage resources.

We look forward to your participation.

SUMMIT GOAL

The development of a statewide "common agenda" for the future of California's cultural heritage resources.

SUMMIT ISSUES AND OUTCOMES

The Summit's issues and outcomes revolve around three basic questions, the answers to which will serve as a framework for achieving the Summit goal:

What is the state of California's cultural heritage resources today with regards to the issues of preservation, stewardship, audience, relevancy and diversity, education and interpretation, and funding?

Where do we want to be with California's cultural heritage resources in 5-10 years and what outcomes do we want to achieve?

What do we do to get there?

ANTICIPATED OBJECTIVES

The organizers and sponsors hope that this Summit will inaugurate a continuing dialogue among leaders in the cultural heritage resources field, and guide the beginnings of a statewide common agenda drawn from the diverse perspectives represented at the Summit. Outcomes will be sought that can drive future cultural heritage resources planning and decisionmaking, and meet the needs of our 21st century Californians.

Some additional objectives that may help focus our conversations include:

- Exploration and identification of what is missing from California's cultural heritage resources tableaux, and how filling those gaps might be addressed.

- Exploration and identification of the nature of the partnership and collaborations needed in the cultural heritage resources field.
- Discussion and determination of whether the creation of a high profile roster of California's Most Endangered Cultural Heritage Resources might contribute to efforts and means to preserve them.
- Forging a vision of promise and possibilities for California's cultural heritage resources mindful of the challenging realities faced by many organizations such as the economy, budget deficits, staffing issues, competing priorities, and national and regional crises.
- Exploration and determination of ways by which the visibility and importance of our collective cultural heritage resources may be elevated to the broadest range of Californians.

SUMMIT FEATURES

A gathering of leaders from within and beyond the cultural heritage resources field held at the Getty Center in Los Angeles with opportunities for tours

Keynote speaker, Professor I. Michael Heyman, Chancellor Emeritus of the University of California, Berkeley and former Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution

Provocative plenary sessions introduced by speakers and followed by roundtable discussions and audience questions, answers, and comments

Catered meals and receptions at the Getty and the host hotel to give participants time for informal discussion

Documentation and dissemination of Summit proceedings and plans for Summit follow-up

SUPPORT FOR THE SUMMIT

The following organizations have generously provided financial support for the California Cultural Heritage Summit:

Friends of Hearst Castle
Hearst Castle Preservation Foundation
The J. Paul Getty Trust

THANK YOU TO THE STAFF

Several State Parks staff have contributed to the success of this event. The Event sponsors particularly would like to thank the logistics team for their good work:

Jean Arellano
Tom Domich
Randy Jamison
Donna MacDonald

SUMMIT PROGRAM

All activities will take place at the Getty Center unless otherwise noted.

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 2002

- 10:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m. REGISTRATION
LOBBY OF LUXE HOTEL
- Noon - 5:00 p.m. PRE-CONFERENCE TOURS
OF THE GETTY CENTER
Garden Tour
Architecture Tour
- 6:00 - 7:00 p.m. WELCOME RECEPTION
Speakers:
TIM WHALEN, *Director, The Getty Conservation
Institute, The J. Paul Getty Trust*
RUSTY AREIAS, *former Director, California
State Parks*
KEVIN STARR, *State Librarian*
RUTH COLEMAN, *Acting Director, California
State Parks*
Entertainment
- 7:00 - 9:00 p.m. DINNER
Speaker:
PROFESSOR I. MICHAEL HEYMAN, *Chancellor
Emeritus, University of California Berkeley, and
former Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution*
Entertainment

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 2002

- 7:30 - 9:30 a.m. REGISTRATION AT MUSEUM
LECTURE HALL FOYER
- 8:00 a.m. CONTINENTAL BREAKFAST
- 8:30 a.m. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS
*Setting the Stage: Goals and Objectives
of the Summit*
Speaker: DR. DENZIL VERARDO,
*Chief Deputy Director for Administration,
California State Parks*
- 9:00 a.m. SESSION I
*What is the State of California's
Cultural Resources?*
Speaker: WALTER P. GRAY III, *California State
Archivist and Chief of Archives and Museum
Division California Secretary of State*
- 9:20 a.m. BREAK
- 9:30 a.m. ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSION with
Selected Speakers Representing California's
Cultural Heritage Resources
Participants: *Steade Craigo, Dr. Janet Fireman,
Diane Frankel, Dr. Gerald Haslam,
Kathryn Welch Howe, Felicia Lowe,
Dr. Knox Mellon, Dr. Dennis Power, and
Dr. Marsha Semmel*
- 10:30 a.m. BREAK
- 10:45 a.m. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS
with All Summit Participants

- 11:45 a.m. LUNCH
Speakers: THE HONORABLE GEORGE RADANOVICH,
U.S. House of Representatives, 19th District
JOHN NAU, III, *Chairman, Advisory Council on
Historic Preservation*
- 1:00 p.m. SESSION 2
Where do we want to be in 5-10 Years?
Speaker: L. THOMAS FRYE, *Cultural Resources
Advisor to the Director, California State Parks;
and Chief Curator Emeritus of History,
the Oakland Museum of California*
- 1:20 p.m. BREAK
- 1:30 p.m. ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSION with
Selected Speakers Representing California's
Cultural Heritage Resources
Participants: *Stephen Becker, Lonnie Bunch,
Barry Hessenius, Teri Knoll, Cindy LaMarr,
Malcolm Margolin, and Steve Mikesell*
- 2:30 p.m. BREAK
- 2:45 p.m. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS
with All Summit Participants
- 3:45 p.m. ADJOURN
- 6:00 p.m. DINNER
Luxe Summit Hotel - 11461 Sunset Blvd.
Entertainment
*A Legacy of Treasures: Cultural Heritage
Resources in California State Parks*
Speaker: WILLIAM BERRY, *Deputy Director
for Park Operations, California State Parks*

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 21, 2002

- 7:30 - 9:30 a.m. REGISTRATION AT MUSEUM
LECTURE HALL FOYER
- 8:30 a.m. CONTINENTAL BREAKFAST
- 9:00 a.m. SESSION 3
- 9:30 a.m. ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSION with
Selected Speakers Representing California's
Cultural Heritage Resources
Participants: *Ruth Coleman, Roberta Deering,
Holly Fiala, The Honorable Marco Firebaugh,
Jerry Jackman, Larry Myers, Dr. James Quay,
and Margie Johnson Reese*
- 10:45 a.m. BREAK
- 11:00 a.m. SESSION 3
What do we do to get there?
Speaker: MARY NICHOLS, *Secretary for Resources,
Resources Agency, State of California*
- QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS
with All Summit Participants
- 11:45 a.m. CLOSING REMARKS, NEXT STEPS
RUTH COLEMAN, *Acting Director, California
State Parks*
- 12:15 p.m. ADJOURN



THE FUTURE OF CALIFORNIA'S CULTURAL HERITAGE RESOURCES

THE GETTY CENTER LOS ANGELES NOVEMBER 19, 20, 21

TUESDAY

NOVEMBER 19, 2002

“...OUR COOPERATION WITH ONE ANOTHER IS REALLY
DIFFICULT BECAUSE OUR MEDIA ARE SO DIFFERENT.
SOMEHOW WE HAVE TO JUMP OVER THAT AND SEE
WHAT CONNECTS US AND NOT WHAT SEPARATES US.”

– *Professor I. Michael Heyman*

WELCOME RECEPTION

TIM WHALEN

Director

The Getty Conservation Institute

Mr. Whalen welcomed summit attendees on behalf of Barry Munitz and the Trustees of the Getty Trust. He introduced local dignitaries including Barbara Sandoval, representing Los Angeles Mayor James Hahn; Assemblymember Marco Firebaugh; Los Angeles City Councilmember Jack Weiss; Joan Irvine Smith; Joanne Kosberg; and Elena Samuels. He also extended appreciation to Knox Mellon, Denzil Verardo, and Tom Frye for their efforts in bringing the summit to fruition. Mr. Whalen continued that the Getty was delighted to host the event. He noted that preservation programs have flourished in California in the last quarter century and that partnerships with government have resulted in profound change. He encouraged “new directions and new solutions.”

RUSTY AREIAS

Former Director

California State Parks

Mr. Areias noted that the creation of a Cultural Resources Division in the Department of Parks and Recreation makes this field even with natural resources. The intent is to envision the potential for history, culture, and diversity; and develop that potential to make people more aware. One approach that Mr. Areias suggested was to create a “cultural corridor” from Angel Island to Sacramento — including the town of Locke — to tell the story. He concluded by introducing several people and highlighting some of their efforts:

Joan Irvine Smith — *Art in the Parks at Crystal Cove*

Stephen Hearst — *Restoration of Missions in California*

Clint Eastwood — *California State Park Commissioner*

DR. KEVIN STARR

State Librarian

Dr. Starr focused his initial comments on the idea of “Assembly in California.” He explained that California can be assembled in a new way through the Summit. There is a civilization of high nuances in California that are both light and dark and which are true to the California experience.

RUTH COLEMAN

Acting Director

California State Parks

Ms. Coleman welcomed the leading scholars, thinkers, and historians of the state. She urged participants to discover each other and to develop partnerships. She continued that cultural heritage is the core of what makes us human and she encouraged those attending the Summit to “Think broadly! Think big!” Ms. Coleman concluded by thanking the Getty Trust, the Hearst Preservation Foundation, and the Friends of Hearst Castle for their sponsorship of the summit.

WELCOME DINNER — KEYNOTE

PROFESSOR I. MICHAEL HEYMAN

My task is to get us going by setting the stage for you for tomorrow. I plan to address three principal topics. First: How encompassing is the definition of our topic, “cultural heritage resources?” Second: Why is it of interest to preserve and present them? Finally, a bit about challenges and opportunities.

I will be using a number of examples from my own experience, especially at the Smithsonian. I want you to know I owe much to my wife to the extent that I successfully led that complex cultural institution so full of resources — material and otherwise — with which all of you deal. She has been a curator for many years, chiefly at the Museum of California in Oakland, but also at the Smithsonian. She has been very successful, especially in building a premier photography collection centered on California at the Oakland Museum. I bring this to your attention for many reasons, but I do it now as the prelude to the speaker’s obligatory opening humorous story. As you will see, it exemplifies her success.

This story involves a wreck at sea. The boat was going down and a helicopter came. A rope went down from the helicopter, and eleven people grabbed it and were hanging on as the helicopter went up. There were ten men and one woman. They all decided that one of these people had to get off because if someone didn’t, the rope would break and everybody would die. No one could decide who would go. So finally, the woman gave a really touching speech. She said how she would give up her life to save others because women were used to giving up things for their husbands and their children — giving to men, receiving very little in return. When she finished speaking, the men were enormously moved, and they all applauded. And the morale of this story is “never underestimate the power of a woman.”

What are we focusing on when we are talking about cultural resources? My answer is obviously brief, but begins to define the subject. We are talking about a host of resources that are our collected patrimony, our inheritance. We are talking about their discovery, their preservation and their presentation. They obviously take many forms — natural settings that are woven into how Californians think of nature and others think of California, literature, paintings, prints, photographs, films, folklore, folk ways, material objects of all kinds, structures, places, and undoubtedly other categories that I have omitted. The subjects and media with which we deal differ, but somehow we have to see what connects us, not what separates us, for cooperation to occur.

But why do we care about discovery, preservation, and presentation? Or why do those outside care, or why should they care? Well, first is very pragmatic. It is to help us understand the present. Our attitudes and feelings are shaped in meaningful part by how our forebearers acted and what they believed, often exemplified by what they created, what they preserved, and what they honored. But we also care because these resources help us to guide the future to the extent we can. Human existence depends on dealing with an ever-changing present on the basis of what is and what has been, and what we predict given our understanding of the other two. Unless we know the past in relevant ways, our reactions are shallow and too often solely the product of dimly understood emotions and clichés.

Additionally, we care because we are curious. This seems to be a shared attribute at least in the mammal world — most commonly folklore and observations tell us among cats, but also of course among humans. We seem to be members of a problem solving group who cherish invention and other forms of creativity. I observed, at the Smithsonian, the popularity of exhibitions that explored, for instance, why things fly or the progression in communication from flag and smoke-signal to the Internet, and especially the rapidity of technological innovation in contemporary times. But curiosity went well beyond the technical. It also encompassed natural beauty and natural processes, exemplified in highlighting gems, minerals, tectonic plates, and solar systems. What a progression in a single exhibition!

And cultural history. I remember an exhibition in the Museum of American History, about how the promises of the 19th Century played out for various groups — Jewish immigrants in Cincinnati; laboring classes in Connecticut; and Blacks in South Carolina, before and after the Civil War, both free and slave. It was an exhibition that worried me a bit in its audacity when it was originally planned. We had many conversations about how to present this material, and I was playing a much more active role than Secretaries normally do in debating what this exhibition would be. It turned out to be one of our most sophisticated, intricate, and complex presentations, but was easily understood by those who saw it. You got a rich sense of the tapestry of that history. Not only did you understand the ups and the downs of the time in response to the ideology of that era, but you got a sense of progression to the present. And you got a sense of how in this country, many things improve over time even though they start at a base that creates problems.

My third category of “whys” is “awe” — sensing matters much larger than ourselves. One can find examples of all sorts in our shared resources. A great example is the three historical objects which riveted visitors’ attention in the large Smithsonian travelling exhibition in celebration of its 150th anniversary: the hat Abraham Lincoln wore the night of his assassination; a portable writing desk of Jefferson’s; and George Washington’s sword. Many people seemed especially in communion with Lincoln’s hat, spending ten or fifteen minutes before it just contemplating it — looking at this object. Obviously I don’t know precisely what they were thinking; but they must have been recalling many acquired recollections. The minimalist label surely didn’t help, and I suspect that contemplation of Lincoln’s mythic status provoked many thoughts concerning contemporary problems and how he would have handled them.

Another striking example is the actual “Whites Only” lunch counter from Greensboro, North Carolina where young African Americans demanded service; and, together with Rosa Parks in the Montgomery Alabama bus, played very meaningful roles in the beginning of the civil rights revolution in the ‘50’s and the ‘60’s. These were examples to me that actual, real objects can have enormous power to provoke recollection and contemplation of very pivotal events.

Two other exhibits out of many make the same point. One consists of extraordinary landscapes by Thomas Moran of mountain scenes in the West — Grand Canyon and other sites. They produce periods of contemplation and silence by viewers in the Smithsonian American Art Museum. As do, for instance, actual aircraft of significance in the Air and Space Museum — most prominently the actual plane, The Spirit of St. Louis, that Lindbergh flew to Paris.

What I am trying to communicate is that objects can have great power. And, we are their custodians. Often, we don’t have to talk about them extensively because they are part of a shared cultural fabric.

My fourth category is a bit more complex. I call it a multi-dimensional understanding of people, and stories, and scenes of the past and historical events. They include, obviously, narratives in many forms that tell stories — oral and written histories; reports; various museum exhibitions that are narratively-driven; and places and structures of historical significance accompanied by interpretive communications; archives; paintings; prints; and photographs — examples are legion. An extraordinary exhibition at the Smithsonian called “From Field to Factory” told the story of the African American migration from south to north in the United States prior to the Second World War. When you do some narrative and you mix it with actual objects, the power of communication is extraordinary. The narrative quality is extraordinary. And the

meaning that it communicates is extraordinary. That is the business — or one of the businesses — that we are in.

I will just mention one from the Oakland Museum that I thought was quite powerful. It was called “A Slice of Time.” It highlighted in pairs both landscape paintings and photographs of the same important California scenes over a hundred year period. It was a great *tour de force*. It told so much of the story of California in its natural sense by simultaneously looking at it through two different media.

My final category relates to aesthetic dimensions. These appeal primarily to eyes and ears, but with historical significance. The spectrum is extraordinarily broad. In music, especially jazz — think of the social as well as the musical history in Ken Burns’ production — country, pop, early rock, all relevant to the development of today’s popular music. Film is so extraordinarily important to the world’s picture of California as beautiful, as interesting, as new, as innovative, as unusual. These are values that in our history we have all internalized.

Now I want to turn to my second topic — the challenges and opportunities which are the major subjects of this conference. I have three suggestions for your focus tomorrow and Thursday. My first is the obvious one of inclusion. Demographically, we are the most diverse state in the nation. Yet the chronicle of much of our narrative history is from a single ethnic viewpoint and celebrates conquest and settlement and development from the newcomer’s view. California, of course, is not alone in this. My early time at the Smithsonian was punctuated by pleas and protests from the Latino community which saw itself as excluded from exhibitions as well as employment. This was preceded by a lengthy and somewhat successful campaign for inclusion by African Americans, who still plan on a separate Smithsonian Museum of African American History and Culture; and followed by a similar set of concerns from the Asian American community. Native Americans will be very well represented in the new Smithsonian National Museum of the American Indian, with a present location in New York and a second and much larger one on the Washington Mall planned to be opened in the next year or so.

The opportunities created by these pressures is salutary — appropriate representation of all the constituent parts in our cultural heritage. The challenge too is great. Should we be striving for separate or unified presentation? There is much the tale of conflict in the universities — separate departments and colleges for various ethnic studies on the one hand; or the integration of those who teach and write about ethnic studies into existing departments. I don’t believe that answers come easily, and I put to one side representational politics which might in the end be the greatest driving force. I am not sure that adequate resources will be provided in an amalgamated setting or

that in the museum, for instance, that the story told by exhibitions will adequately reflect the perceptions of those whose history is being told. On the other hand, separate is often unequal. The potentiality of stories focusing primarily, if not completely, on victimization by dominant Whites is not trivial.

Should this potentiality worry us? I am not sure. The predominant view among the younger history curators at the Smithsonian was that faithful rendition of the past will cleanse all our souls to face the future realistically and successfully. My tendency is to treat past injustices, but to focus primarily on common humanity, on similarities of characteristics and aspirations. I preached this at the Smithsonian to a mixed choir. I have never seen much progress made when we characterize and stereotype others — especially folks long-dead — as demons. I would much prefer to stress, in an integrated setting, that we all belong to a common humanity. It can work, as was well illustrated by the Smithsonian's sensitive and sympathetic treatment of World War II interned Japanese Americans in its exhibition, "Towards a More Perfect Union." The title is really very important if you think about it. It speaks injustice, but injustice that is recognized and sought to be remedied. To me, it embodies one aspect of the United States Constitution that I have always respected immensely. Putting aside its legal impact, it is a statement of aspirations which we always seek and we never quite make. But it keeps pushing us in the right direction. That is what to me "Towards a More Perfect Union" means. I think that is a very important insight with regard to our own ideologies.

My second challenge concerns politics and presentation. It won't surprise you that the illustration that I use is again in the context of the Smithsonian — a place where the ultimate fiscal force is the Congress which acts through appropriation and oversight committees. Moreover, the Smithsonian's considerable autonomy is dependent on stature which is amendable. At times in the past, unfriendly amendments have been adopted. In addition, there is the matter of proximity. My office window looked right out on the Capitol. Awareness of Smithsonian undertakings is high in legislative offices, especially those on the conservative side of the culture wars and among those legislative staff of more right-wing legislators who are on the prowl for notoriety and find convenient targets at the Smithsonian from time to time.

I became Secretary in 1994. When I said yes the prior June, I was unaware of the upcoming exhibition at the Air and Space Museum concerning the use of the atomic bomb on Hiroshima. It was dropped by a B-29 [bomber] named "Enola Gay." The plane is part of the Smithsonian collection. It was to be the centerpiece in a exhibition commemorating the end of World War II and the final Allied victory over Japan.

In July 1994, nearly a year before the exhibit was scheduled to open, the political drums concerning the planned exhibit began to beat publicly and loudly. The charge was that the scripted exhibition was unduly critical of President Truman's decision to drop the bomb and presented a slanted and biased view of the gains of its use. A lengthy and negative analysis of the script appeared in the *Air Force Journal*. Soon thereafter, it became the basis of an avalanche throughout the country of radio, television, and news stories and editorials unfavorable to the Smithsonian. It appeared that most of the commentators adopted the journal article as the complete truth. I was shocked when I accompanied the outgoing Secretary to a session with the Publisher and Editorial Board of the *Washington Post*, the paper with the liberal reputation. The session was very negative, and it appeared that none of the interrogators and commentators had read the script at all, but relied completely on the critical article.

Unfortunately, despite what I thought were heroic attempts, we were never able to counter the widespread impression that the exhibition would be biased and unpatriotic. Many in fact thought that the exhibition had already opened.

Part of the problem was in the original script itself. In my view, the script unduly weighted the consequences of the bomb on the ground against an estimate of how many troops would be lost had we in fact invaded the Japanese home islands. Subsequent information showed a level of Japanese war resources and preparation far beyond what was known which would have accounted for extremely high casualties. Moreover, the script contained language suggesting that Japan was fighting to protect itself against American imperialism, while the United States' motive was revenge primarily for the attack on Pearl Harbor which was not chronicled in the exhibition as scripted.

I am choosing out some of what the script said. That did not necessarily characterize the planned exhibition. What was lost was that this was the first script, not the final one. A number of changes were thereafter made that rendered it much more balanced. But this was to no avail.

A new Congress was elected that November. Most of the new Republican power structure was deeply offended by this seemingly unpatriotic exhibition planned by the Smithsonian — "America's Museum" — to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the end of World War II. Please remember, as I hadn't, that there were two million veterans of World War II still alive; and each of them thought they were going to be part of the invasion force, and each of them believed that their lives had been saved by the use of that bomb.

We could get no one of consequence to consider the changes that were being made in the script. I thought that one way out was to counsel in depth with staff at the American Legion as we amended the script. My idea was that if the Legion withdrew its vociferous criticism, others, especially in the new Congress, might pay attention to the changes. The Legion staff members were rational, fair, and helpful. In the last analysis however, the political offices of the Legion found it useful to reject the script, and they launched a very substantial frontal attack in Congress. I finally felt that our only course was to cancel the exhibit as planned and start anew; to put noticeable distance between that which was and where it would be. I ended up as the chief curator of this new exhibition. That was my first and last experience as one!

What did I learn from this and subsequent disputes? This is what might interest you in terms of our collective undertakings now. First, I learned the Smithsonian is more vulnerable than most museums or other cultural centers. It is huge. It is in Washington. It gets most, but not all, of its money from Congress. And, it is an inviting target for politicians with a conservative agenda. Nevertheless, it is quite possible to put forward controversial historical interpretations so long as they are juxtaposed with more conventional ones. Giving an audience a choice rather than imposing a particular contrarian view is both an ethical obligation and well as politically wise.

Museums, it is said in today's vocabulary, are forums and not places where the ill-informed are instructed or the less-cultured exposed to the choices of elites. Forums, however, require opportunity for argument. But exhibitions, unlike university lectures, give little chance for question or dialogue. If typical viewers are to have autonomy, they must be informed of the choices. If they are, in a fair manner, a responsible Secretary in the Smithsonian can successfully withstand any political attacks. Most exhibitions raise few issues of these kinds, but some do.

My advice is don't take the easy way out. Don't eschew controversy. Rather, find ways to show differing views where possible. And, in history museums especially, explore the complexities of the times that are depicted, as well as retrospectively applying principles of contemporary morality. Probably the least wise is solely to be uncritically celebratory.

Finally, let me briefly note the problem of resources, or their lack — a subject that will undoubtedly absorb you considerably in the days to come. Resources — public revenues; admission fees; private contributions; receipts from ancillary activities, for instance restaurants and shops; catalog sales; and endowments — have increased considerably in the past decade in museums and many other heritage organizations. So have the number of such organizations. Whatever the

recent past, we are experiencing much leaner times today. Organizations will disappear. Most, but not all, will cut back their activities. A few new ones will be born. For the majority which will reduce activities, this will be a time for enforced cutbacks. Is it possible to identify the core and discard the peripheral? This is awfully tough, as we all know. But across the board cuts diminish excellence across the board. Tough times should force tough decisions.

In general we compete for funds, audiences, and prestige, although it is rarely unseemly. We don't plan centrally and fulfill niches designated by central authorities. Perhaps however we can cooperate to some extent by pooling some services and agreeing to some specialization with other organizations with which we overlap. Stanford and Cal [University of California, Berkeley] for instance did a very interesting thing in library acquisition during the time I was Chancellor. We agreed that in esoteric areas, Stanford would collect here and Cal there, rather than duplicate. And then we provided opportunity as a matter of course for faculty and graduate students to have access to each other's libraries — and undergraduates who showed special needs. And we, as supposed archenemies, cooperated in many other ways. Normally, we were in competition to hire the same young people in various fields. We got together and shared the costs of their coming to the West Coast to be interviewed at each place.

There were many ways that efficiencies could occur by cooperation. Is this possible for our organizations, for instance, in conservation? In exhibit preparation? We do a pretty good job in lending and borrowing. Can we transfer those habits to other sectors? Are there institutions that can begin to broker such arrangements? We tend to be quite separate. The Smithsonian is a collection of museums, each of which sees itself more or less as a separate entity under some roof that is to some extent disdained. It is a little like the campuses of the University of California and the system-wide administration. We decided that we would have this big Smithsonian exhibition, as I indicated, on the 150th anniversary. We wanted to gather articles and artifacts from all of the museums. None of the directors were happy. None of the curators in the individual museums wanted to cooperate. But the "dictator" at the top said, "We shall do it!" And, by God, we did. We did it in a way that I think most directors and most curators approved of once it occurred. We brought artifacts from all of the museums and we arrayed them in relationship that made sense across the fields. It was a wonderful success and it opened all kinds of vistas for the Smithsonian and its museums around the country. Do we learn something from that kind of an experience? Do we learn that our various organizations ought, in some way or another, to appear on programs together? That we should, in some way, start to cooperate at the bottom rather than at the top and drive towards a consen-

sus at the top? Think about that as you face these problems in these two days.

Finally, can we make our ancillary activities more productive? Museums, for instance, really have become social centers in many ways. The Corcoran in Washington, DC profitably provides a cocktail setting largely for singles once a week when it also keeps its exhibitions open for viewing. Can we become more multi-purpose without losing our souls? Losing our souls, by the way, is not a trivial concern. I think, for instance, the movement from corporate foundations to corporate marketing departments regarding corporate funding of exhibitions creates difficult decisions for us to accept or reject support.

I hope I have energized you rather than exhausted you. Have a first-class experience in a first-class setting.



THE FUTURE OF CALIFORNIA'S CULTURAL HERITAGE RESOURCES

THE GETTY CENTER LOS ANGELES NOVEMBER 19, 20, 21

WEDNESDAY MORNING

NOVEMBER 20, 2002

"WE ARE LEARNING, SOMETIMES TOO SLOWLY,
THAT CALIFORNIA'S CULTURAL HERITAGE
AND ITS RESOURCES NEED TO LOOK MORE
LIKE CALIFORNIA AND ITS PEOPLE."

– *L. Thomas Frye*

WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS

SETTING THE STAGE: GOALS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE SUMMIT

DR. DENZIL VERARDO

Chief Deputy Director

California Department of Parks and Recreation

Welcome to this summit to discuss the “Future of California’s Cultural Heritage Resources.” I am Denzil Verardo, Chief Deputy Director for Administration for California State Parks, and whose honor it has been to Chair the planning committee which formulated our agenda.

- Would the members of that committee please stand, we owe you a debt of gratitude for making this summit possible.
- I also thank the Summit Logistics Team, who were in the white staff shirts during registration, for the behind the scenes hard work necessary to the success of any conference.
- The back of your program lists the co-sponsors of this gathering, without whom our agenda would be poorer. Thank you.
- I especially acknowledge the Friends of Hearst Castle, the Hearst Castle Preservation Foundation, and the J. Paul Getty Trust for their generous financial support of the California Cultural Heritage Summit, and the Getty Museum and Getty Conservation Institute for the use of their facilities.

Thank you for coming to this gathering. We have a remarkable cast, so I am not going to be so bold as to highlight individual participants for special recognition. The day is too short. The participant roster in your program lists the individuals attending so that you will have a record of those attending, as well as a context for the diversity of their organizations with obligations in the cultural heritage resources field. It is a context that, while critically important, inclusively goes beyond historic preservation. You will note that your extensive backgrounds and credentials have been edited down to a couple of sentences. I take full responsibility for the omissions made necessary by space limitations which reduced your incredible lives to the Cliff’s Notes version included in the roster. You represent the stewards, scholars, and spokespersons for our cultural heritage resources; and, as a group, represent the most distinguished gathering of its kind in memory.

Shared Responsibility

There is little argument among professionals that cultural heritage resources bind our peoples together. In their very existence is a spirit of renewal. In their preservation, there is hope. In the

advocacy for their preservation is a bonding to protect a valuable past and evolving present because there is meaning in their existence. In fact, we contemporary Californians will perhaps be judged as a people who cared and endured, or a people who squandered their heritage by letting their cultural heritage resources lie unprotected or uninterpreted.

Visiting museums and historic sites is increasingly popular as a family recreation activity as evidenced in the “1997 Public Opinions and Attitudes on Outdoor Recreation in California.” The survey showed that nearly 75% of all Californians participated in visiting museums or historic sites during the year. Respondents visiting museums and historic sites averaged 10 activity days per year, for an estimated 61.8 million household participation days per year. Also gleaned from the survey were the high, unmet demand for cultural resource related activities and the willingness to pay for such services. These facts allude to the tremendous opportunities which exist for education, public outreach, and economic development in the management, interpretation, and effective use of California’s cultural heritage resources.

However, cooperation and coordination for the statewide management of cultural heritage resources is difficult and complex. Those resources, often fragile, difficult to protect, and costly to restore and maintain, are not renewable and their very diversity and breadth increase the complexity of the management challenge.

Summit History and Background

There are several milestones that led to this conference. The first occurred in 1898, when the Marshall Monument in Coloma was erected and became California’s first State Historic Monument. In 1927-28, the then-eleven state parks and five historic monuments were consolidated into a newly legislated state park system. In 1928, Proposition 4, that is four, not four zero, passed by a four to one margin. This first park bond enabled the purchase of the town of Columbia on the recommendation of the great Frederick Law Olmsted. In the late 1930’s, the Civilian Conservation Corps engaged in work in the state parks, including the restoration of La Purisima Mission which is now a State Historic Park. Today, that work is treasured. In 1973-74, the Office of Historic Preservation was created within the Department of Parks and Recreation, and a California History Plan for the entire state was produced. In 1998, the failure of California’s Sesquicentennial Celebration provided a wake-up call alerting us all that we must think of new ways to excite people about California’s past.

By 2000, State Parks was the caretaker for 13,000 historic properties, 47 State Historic Parks, and 4.5 million artifacts; and had embarked on new urban challenges. These challenges were — and are — unfamiliar territory to State Parks.

It is with that backdrop that the Cultural Heritage Resources Summit itself was organized. Concern over the management and organization of the cultural heritage resources specifically in the care of the California Department of Parks and Recreation — California State Parks — was expressed by former Director Rusty Areias. In May 2000, he received reports from a series of public workshops which collectively were entitled, “A Path To Our Future.” Noted in the workshops was the need for increased cultural heritage focus by State Parks. Internally, Parks staff echoed the need for increased visibility of these resources, the management focus of which should equal the intensity and commitment made to our natural heritage treasures.

To begin the commitment, a Cultural Heritage Division was formed in the Department, which unified and heightened the internal awareness of Parks’ holdings and responsibility. And, a stronger working relationship with the Office of Historic Preservation was established. Concurrently, plans for a Cultural Heritage Summit were developed whereby ideas from the diverse array of cultural heritage stakeholders could be both shared and gleaned to the benefit of not only State Parks, but hopefully of all those stakeholders. Tom Frye, Chief Curator Emeritus of History for the Oakland Museum, was enlisted as Cultural Resources Advisor to the Director. Frye developed several strategies and played a key role in the planning of this conference, which began in earnest in early 2001. With funding secured, co-sponsorship solicited and offered, and your acceptance to this historic invitational event, the beginning of new dialogue and cooperation bears promise.

Setting the Stage: Goals and Objectives of the Summit

We have an ambitious agenda with little “down time.” We hope you will leave wanting more: more camaraderie, more collaboration, and more willingness to support a common agenda to save, conserve, and promote our cultural heritage resources.

The summit’s outcomes and issues revolve around three basic and fundamental questions:

- What is the state of California’s cultural heritage resources today with regard to the issues of preservation, stewardship, audience, relevancy and diversity, education and interpretation, and funding?
- Where do “we” want to be in five to ten years and what outcomes do we want to achieve?
- What do we do to get there?

Summit Format:

- The summit is divided into three sections, each centered on one of these fundamental questions. Each section is preceded by a notable speaker who will set the stage for the session. A panel of representative stakeholders will then present points of view on the subject, after which audience participants are encouraged to ask questions of the panel. Appropriate breaks are scheduled between each portion of the session and you are urged to be prompt returning from the breaks to allow for maximum exchange of ideas.
- During lunch, we will have a presentation from Congressman George Radanovich and John Nau on cultural tourism efforts.
- In addition to presentations, there will be time at dinner for socializing and personal exchange of ideas. We have also allowed time tomorrow morning for such interchange.

While there may be differences among us, let me assure you there is no “hidden agenda” built into this summit. In planning the sessions, the organizers have sought to keep to a moral high ground, accentuating the commonality of purpose of those present, while welcoming divergent viewpoints.

The organizers and sponsors hope this summit will inaugurate a continuing dialogue among the leaders here and elsewhere in the cultural heritage resources field as we begin discussion towards a common agenda for these resources.

Let me define “common agenda” as it is used for the purposes of this colloquium. Common agenda is a collaborative effort by those present which results in unity of purpose to protect and preserve our cultural heritage resources while educating and enlightening our citizenry to the wonders of California’s cultural landscape. Museums, historic parks, buildings and monuments, the arts, historical societies, cultural awareness advocates, archival resources and historic preservation groups — as examples — are all important parts of that agenda. We will seek outcomes that can drive future cultural heritage resources planning and decision-making, and meet the needs of our 21st Century Californians.

SESSION ONE

WHAT IS THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA'S CULTURAL RESOURCES?

WALTER P. GRAY III

California State Archivist

This session is intended to be an introduction, an overview, of the status of cultural heritage in California today. As State Archivist and a recovering museum director who served for many years in state government as an archivist, curator, and museum director, I do have a specific point of view. I make this disclosure not to prejudice the audience or to reduce the value of this presentation; but rather in the hope that my experience in the field qualifies me, at some level, as an informed observer and commentator.

In the spirit of the title of this talk — “What is the State of California’s Cultural Resources?” — my presentation will be primarily retrospective and descriptive, rather than prospective and prescriptive. Even though I have my own views about what we might do in the future, I shall confine my present comments to an interpretation of where we are today and how I think we got there.

My approach this morning is to explore the history of history in California. This is a story without heroes or villains, and is very incomplete given the constraints of time. Fitting it into a half hour means that many details and things of importance will be omitted, and I won’t get to a number of important organizations and individuals. Please don’t be offended if you or your organization are not named. Much of this story may seem negative, but it is ultimately positive in that we can only learn so much from history; and it falls to us, today, to decide our future based on where we want to go rather than where we have been. History should inform our thinking, but must not imprison our ideas or creativity.

We’ll begin with definitions of a few terms that will be used in this presentation, and no doubt in others today and tomorrow. One of the issues we all face is the lack of agreement about things like language and nomenclature. In the often fuzzy and imprecise world of history, culture, and the humanities, language can be as much a barrier as a unifier; and reasonable people can — and do — argue about the meaning of words.

First, we have the phrase “cultural heritage” itself. As Professor Heyman mentioned last night, this is a bit tortuous. It is a term that doesn’t come from the history field, but rather has origins in the parks community. Heritage is “something that has been or may be inherited.” The use of the word here is purposeful, and is a direct reference to the idea of stewardship that is at the

heart of the parks ethic. Cultural is “relating to culture,” and “culture” — in the meaning that doesn’t relate to agriculture, the laboratory reproduction of microorganisms, or the refinement of manners and taste by education and training — is a mid-19th Century word defined as the “intellectual side of civilization.” The phrase cultural heritage was coined as a loftier substitute for “history” as a way of describing the residuum of human activity in a manner that didn’t exclude the products of archaeology (that is, the pre-historical) and in a form that was parallel to the way the manifestations of nature were described in multiple-purpose parks organizations — specifically the National Park Service (NPS).

What NPS ended up with was a descriptive equivalence between the things of nature as encompassed under the heading “natural heritage” and the things of history brought under the rubric of “cultural heritage.” Add “resources” to the phrase and it really does become a tongue twister.

In this presentation, I will do as historians often do and use the words “history” and “historical” to encompass the entire range of past human activity. These include a range of topics and subjects that can be narrowly or broadly constituted depending on your point of view and biases, and include:

- Documentary history collections, including archives, manuscript repositories, historical special collections in libraries, and documentary holdings in museums, historical societies, and private organizations.
- Historical library and bibliographic collections, that is, historic books or books about history.
- Collections of historical, ethnographic, and archaeological objects inside and outside of formal museums; and the exhibition, interpretation and preservation of historical objects in a variety of settings, from museums to historic houses to interpretive programs in parks.
- The built environment — the field called “historic preservation,” implying a broad range of concerns relative to history, but in California commonly reflecting only the issues of historic structures, archaeological and historical sites, landscapes, and similar physical places.
- Cultural/folkway/lifestyle preservation — concern for the traditional, intangible manifestations of culture and tradition: stories, music, poetry, skills and cultural practices, food, etc.

- The recording, analysis, interpretation, and presentation of all these things and more through research, writing, exhibition, presentation (including programming, performance, publication, the Internet), education in the schools, colleges and universities, and so on.
- And many aspects of the humanities — particularly those pertaining to the history, learning, and literature of human societies — are, or should be, considered aspects of cultural heritage, of history. Indeed some of the most interesting historical work being done today is conducted under the rubric of — and with funding from — the California Council for the Humanities. A valid claim could be made that everything mentioned above can comfortably fit into a definition of the humanities. This said, in my estimation there are other more highly contemporary aspects of culture, especially the fine arts and popular culture, that aren't properly within the province of history until they become, well, historical. And the question of when or how that happens will take much more than a morning to explore, so we must leave this matter here.

We tend to further segment these categories by class, type, subject, and audience. There are history museums and art museums, and many of each that have examples of both. And technology museums that may or may not be the same as science centers; and museums of natural history that follow a continuity of chronology from before the big bang to single cell organisms to dinosaurs and saber tooth cats to automobiles and urban development through, well, today. There are history museums for children and children's museums that have history content. Other history museums have active folklore preservation programs and folklife exhibits are filled with historical objects. Some historic structures contain historic objects and are interpreted as "house museums," while others are adaptively used but deemed comparably historic. Art and automobiles and archaeological materials coexist — perhaps uneasily at times — in museums of many kinds. Libraries collect historic manuscripts, archives collect books and prints. Both undertake oral history programs, as do historical societies and Major League Baseball teams. Nearly everyone wants to do something on the Internet. There is no single or even typical format for a cultural resource preservation organization. This variation is a strength and a weakness.

History as an academic and a popular field long ago shifted from an emphasis on politics and great personalities to the concerns of everyday individuals. The new social history of a generation ago — introducing issues such as gender, race, ethnicity, class, religion, geography, labor, and the interactions of technology and society — isn't new anymore. And, as encompassing as social history is, in the eyes of many it still suffers from blind spots and the effects of academic elitism

and politics. The problem here is that history, as an academic pursuit (and here I'm including the work of traditional historical agencies such as museum organizations), was and still largely is practiced by observers rather than participants. This creates questions about authenticity and cultural reliability that are common concerns in anthropology but only now becoming understood in history. As a result, what I would describe as post-modern historical issues are being addressed by the cultural participants themselves rather than by outside "professional" practitioners. The message and point of view of the Japanese American National Museum would not — could not — be authentic unless shaped by Japanese Americans, and the Lavender Archives can only exist because members of the Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, Transvestite community make the effort to locate and organize materials of significance — outsiders, irrespective of academic attainment, wouldn't know where to look.

Finally, there is a level of fragmentation that reflects the fundamental issue of the nature of history itself, and is perhaps the profound reason we are gathered here this week. It is the question of who decides what is "historic;" and, by extension, what is preserved, what is lost, what is transmitted and how, what is funded, and where the money comes from. This issue is the source of enormous and ultimately unproductive competition between and among the keepers of the state's heritage. It is a competition, often genteel and collegial but at other times blunt and roughshod, that tinges every interaction, is suffused with the effects of bad history, distrust, personal and institutional egos, and politics.

There are two primary roots to the problem represented by the questions "who owns history?" and "who pays?" The first is the question of money — or rather the lack of money. Clearly, if there were plenty of money to support everything everyone wanted to do in history and heritage, we probably wouldn't be sitting here today. The lack of money makes heritage a buyer's market — we fawn over donors and grant makers and cultivate legislators in the hope of acquiring money, or the things that would otherwise have to be paid for with money — and this further complicates the already complex problem of who owns history. Because if you pay, do you get to decide what is bought?

This is exacerbated by something that is both a symptom and a cause of an important related issue — the loss of a master narrative for California history.

California's collective understanding of the state's history, and our transmitted sense of what is important in that history, was formerly conceived as a very simple story. It was chronological, uncomplicated, reflective of the idea that the telling of history must demonstrate positive progress and show the

evidence of great achievements through the works of great people, that history as a field of study needed to be socially instructive.

The story went something like this: Indians; Spanish and English explorers; Father Serra and the missions; Mexican independence and the age of the Dons — Ramona and all that; trappers, traders and Americans; land grants; Sutter, Donner, and maybe Bidwell; the Bear Flag revolt; war with Mexico; the Gold Rush; statehood and civic turmoil of the 1850's; the Civil War; the Pacific Railroad, and Chinese; agriculture, economy, social strife; monopoly and oligopoly; the Progressive Movement and political reform; transportation (Pony Express, stages, railroads, electric railways, bicycles, automobiles, airplanes, automobiles again); the Great Depression; the Joads come West; Hollywood; World War II and its aftermath; aerospace economy; water; transportation; education; civil rights; 1963; the end of Camelot; Jan and Dean.

The organizing structure was chronological, and each of the topics contained the drama of the triumph of some group or individual over an obstacle. The Native Americans triumphed over geography and a hostile nature to survive on the land. The Spanish succeeded by Christianizing the Indians and, incidentally, exercising dominion over the Indians themselves. Mexican patriots triumphed over Spain. Explorers triumphed over geography and distance and isolation, as did Sutter, the more fortunate members of the Donner Party and most other immigrants. The United States triumphed in turn over Mexico and received as its reward the golden riches of the same inhospitable land. We all triumphed over distance and time with the Pony Express, the telegraph, the railroad, the automobile, and so it goes. Linear, positivist, uplifting.

But by the mid-1960's, our master narrative ran out. Not only was it considered less appropriate to celebrate the subjugation of nature or other people to our will, but people could see around them aspects of society that clearly weren't laudable or deserving of uncritical praise. It was possible, just awfully possible, that much of history embodied conflict and controversy of the type we lived through during the 1960's and 1970's.

This era brought the civil rights movement, riots, the rise of the counterculture, walking on the moon during the summer of love, the collapse of aerospace, the awakening of Indian rights, concern for the rights of the mentally ill, awareness of the environmental consequences of the automobile, sharpening water wars, FM radio, Barry Goldwater, Richard Nixon, Ronald Reagan, Richard Nixon again. The period prompted a reassessment and reappraisal of earlier events that had been long suppressed — the persecution and near-extirpation of Indians; Chinese exclusion; Black racism; the Port Chicago

Disaster; Zoot Suit Riots; Japanese internment; the exploitation of migrant farm labor; and much, much more.

These are difficult ideas to simplify — schematics — to fit into a simple “story” that everyone can learn and find themselves in. This was a problem recognized by many at the time. But despite sincere attempts to recast the tale in different ways, to present a more textured and nuance set of stories, we still sadly, commonly view California history in a chronological periodization hinging on the experiences of a few bearded, tonsured or mustachioed Spanish or German or English-speaking men — now joined by a few women — and tend to ignore overarching themes, integrative constructs, or alternative perspectives.

This is reflected in school curriculum today. California history is subordinated, really only taught in the 4th grade (much too young, I might observe), and the story quits just after statehood. We don't talk about — indeed we don't even know how to talk about — much that has occurred in the last 150 years. We are content to give our young a glimpse of Native American life, build a mission out of sugar cubes, take a field trip to Sutter's Fort, and perhaps dress like a 49'er. That's about it. The messy, the complicated, the controversial, the troubling things that make us angry or which we fear may make others upset with us. These are things we need to know and understand, but have difficulty discussing for fear of hurt, or anger, or confusion. As a result we — all Californians — practice a species of polite avoidance about much of our history. The corollary to this is that when these challenging subjects do appear in public discourse, the reaction is sometimes one of discomfort and alarm.

California doesn't have any form of integrated historical infrastructure, or even organized means for the disparate elements of the historical community to communicate or interact, to share, plan, argue, to engage in a grand dialectic that could result in a wider discussion of the state's wonderful and messy history; and, eventually, the acceptance of a new collective understanding of the state's history and the means to preserve it — in other words, a new master narrative.

So, digression aside, what is the state of California's cultural resources?

California's cultural resources and the organizations that are responsible for them are fragmented; segmented into a bewildering variety of mutually-exclusive categories that do not communicate very much; and are stratified into several crude hierarchies of importance based on type of organization, subject, location, and budget that compete with one another for attention and funding.

Some organizations are energetic, ambitious, focused, and seemingly well-provided-for, while others seem uncoordinated, easily distracted, and chronically needy. There are many areas of interest where efforts are duplicated; and other areas, some of them very significant, where no one is demonstrating leadership. The field has difficulty speaking with one voice. It is underfunded and under-researched in most respects; and, by and large, unsophisticated politically. It is underappreciated by a public — both audience and policymakers — that doesn't know how much it depends on heritage; and it is without readily accessible sources of guidance, support, and encouragement.

But the situation is not as desperate as my comments may have made it sound. These same cultural resources, public and private, are cared for by people who are for the most part enthusiastic, very committed, hard working, generally underpaid, and sometimes exploited. But above all, they are possessed of a wonderful optimism that allows them, in the face of all the problems I have mentioned, to contribute their time, expertise, and treasure to make most things better; and sometimes to achieve truly great accomplishments.

Indeed it is people, perhaps more than institutions, that sustain and expand the field. That wonderful optimism and a belief that all things are possible causes them to overlook budget challenges and bureaucratic impediments in the administration of heritage. There is a tension, ultimately creative, between individuals and groups who tend to be expansionist and optimistic and institutions that tend to look for stability and resist being drawn into new programs or responsibilities. This tension has been a theme in shaping the state's approach to heritage.

In this latter regard, no single organization has been given, nor has any adopted, the primary role for ensuring the successful preservation and interpretation of the cultural resources under the State's control, to mediate between the conflicting values of expansion and stability. No public agency provides overall leadership or support in this field. And, there is no organization equivalent to a Department of Cultural Resources to provide coordination and general policy oversight for the archaeological, cultural, and historical resources held by state government agencies. Similarly, no private entity has proposed itself, or been recognized, as the coordinated source of guidance, expertise, and financial support available to non-governmental cultural resources or organizations in the state.

California is among the minority of states which does *not* have a centralized state heritage agency. There is no Department of History or Museums; or Cultural Resources Agency; or Bureau of Archaeology, History and Museums; or state-supported Historical Society or History Commission. Not that the existence of an agency in this area is inherently good in and of itself, but I would submit that the lack of such

an entity focused on the concerns of history and heritage has been bad. Bad because the present situation is confusing, has made the matter of heritage more of a contested issue than it should be, and — at least within state government itself — has left us with some considerable level of ambiguity about who does what.

A snapshot of the situation within state government should suffice to explain why people can become confused. The Department of Parks and Recreation controls and operates the great majority of historic sites and historical collections held by state government. In terms of scope of holdings and by virtue of its grant-making programs, it can credibly make the claim to be the state's history agency. There is also a California State Parks Commission that has some policy responsibilities regarding historic park units, and State Parks is also home to the Office of Historic Preservation and its State Historical Resources Commission. The State Archives is part of the Secretary of State's Office. We have the California Heritage Preservation Commission; and, as the State Historical Records Coordinator appointed by the governor, I chair of the State Historical Records Advisory Board. This body administers National Historical Publications and Records Commission grant funds. We also have a formal California history museum, the Golden State Museum, with its own board of trustees. A block away is the State Library in the Department of Education. It has the rich holdings of the California History Section and the Sutro Library, and also has significant grant making responsibilities. In particular, the Library of California Board also sits as the State Advisory Council for Libraries and administers federal Library Services and Technology Act funds. Oh, yes, the Historic State Capitol Commission has advisory responsibilities at the Capitol, and over historical aspects of Library and Courts I, now the Stanley Mosk Building.

The Native American Heritage Commission — which exists to protect Native American remains, objects and sites of cultural significance — and the California Arts Council — with grant making authority — are in general [State] government. The California African American Museum and the California Science Center — formerly the California Museum of Science and Industry — are in the State and Consumer Services Agency. The State Lands Commission and the Department of Transportation both have extensive holdings of historical materials, and the idea of a Caltrans museum surfaces every few years. The California Council for the Humanities, while not a government agency, supports quite a lot of good work in the field, and is listed on the State of California web site as one of California's "History and Culture Agencies."

So, who is in charge of what? How do the various bodies with confusingly similar names, with "history," "heritage," and "museum" in their names, fit together? They don't. Sorting

out the roles and responsibilities at the state level can be mildly confusing even from the inside, and an absolute mystery to constituencies on the outside. This confusion helps make responsibility for heritage at least a vague, and more likely, a contested issue. If it were not, we would not be here today.

Who should be responsible for history? The first time the word “history” was used in California law was in the first act of the first State Legislature which directed that a public archives be established and maintained by the Secretary of State. A few months later, the State Library was created, also within the Secretary of State’s office. California did not then have a formal state historical apparatus or otherwise institutionalize history or heritage as a high level interest of state government.

Groups like the Society of California Pioneers, the Native Sons and the Native Daughters of the Golden West, local and regional historical societies, the Roman Catholic Church, and others shaped California’s initial efforts in historic preservation, with a focus on the Missions, monuments, and sites from the Mexican era, and remnants of the Gold Rush. The California Historical Society came into existence during this same period, and has a history intertwined with that of the Society of California Pioneers. The State from time to time was induced to provide funds for the preservation or marking of sites and some State officials actively participated in the affairs of historical and preservation advocacy groups, but there was no State structure to operate or support historical resources.

On the documentary history side, the void was filled by private collectors and organizations, and the State Library that took it upon themselves to compile the state’s history. Hubert Howe Bancroft began to collect Californiana in 1859 and ultimately amassed a collection that has not been fully explored. Henry Edwards Huntington assembled collections of art, literature, books, manuscripts, government archives, and other evidences of culture. C. Templeton Crocker endowed the California Historical Society with his important collection; and Adolph Sutro’s collection went to the State Library. The collections of private individuals and organizations are the foundation of the West’s great historical manuscript libraries.

The efforts of the Save-the-Redwoods League culminated in the establishment of the State Parks Commission in 1927, with the League taking the lead — and strongly influencing State action — by buying threatened redwood groves that would ultimately become State Park units. Similarly, private groups had promoted the preservation of several historic sites that came into the new State Parks System and influenced the initial surveys of historic, scenic, and recreational resources.

The new California State Park System embraced a broad mandate to acquire and preserve natural, scenic, and historic features; and adopted the philosophy of the generalist park organization pioneered by the National Park Service. History would coexist with nature and recreation in what was intended to be a “balanced” system of park units. But a structural problem soon became evident because historic parks cost considerably more to acquire, develop, and operate than nature parks or recreation units. If the “balance” was to be monetary, heritage would be disadvantaged because money would not go as far in this area. Conversely, if the balance was based on the number of park units or some other criteria, history units could easily consume the majority of the Park System’s budget and place the whole agency at financial risk. The tension inherent in this problem is one that persists to this day.

A hinge in this story occurs with the inauguration of Edmund G. “Pat” Brown as governor in 1959. His arrival coincided with the departure or death of four men who had largely shaped the historical agenda in California — inside and outside of government — for the previous 35 years. Newton Drury retired as Chief of the Division of Beaches and Parks in 1959; his brother Aubrey, Secretary of the Save-the-Redwood League, died in October of the same year. Aubrey Neasham left State Parks in September to work in the private sector. Joseph Knowland, a Republican and one of the fathers of historic preservation in the state, declined to continue on the State Park Commission.

A cornerstone of the Brown administration was the reorganization of California State Government into its modern form during 1961-67. Governmental agencies were revised and reconfigured into many of the now-familiar agencies, and a new Department of Parks and Recreation was constituted. During this process, there is no surviving evidence of a serious discussion about how to reorganize government to combine the state’s historic programs, or to give to the Department of Parks and Recreation a broader and more formal responsibility for heritage and history. It isn’t clear if alternative models were explored or whether the idea of combining archives, history, museums, preservation and interpretation into a single department — Parks or elsewhere — was put on the table.

I have long wondered why this was the case. Why was history left out during the great transformation of California state government in the 1960s? In interviews with people who were involved in the Brown administration’s policy decisions, it becomes clear that Brown, while not hostile to or opposed to history, was unsentimental. Brown was not history-minded — his interests were oriented toward the needs of today and tomorrow. Yesterday was gone, and the concerns of yesterday didn’t interest him. And there was no one in his administration to advocate for these issues. The voices of Knowland,

the Drury, and Neasham were not there to be heard. The outcome is that California was left without a state agency with specific responsibility for the state's heritage, and the place of history remains vague in the structure of California state government that we live under to the present time. If there is a first cause for many of the challenges we are facing today, this is it.

In 1966, the National Historic Preservation Act brought new responsibilities for historic resources onto the state. The new federal mandates were placed in the Department of Parks and Recreation as a matter of logic and convenience, and the then-existing California Historical Landmarks Advisory Committee served as the review board. This has matured into the Office of Historic Preservation.

The next important era in California State Parks was the term of William Penn Mott as Director during Ronald Reagan's administration as governor. Mott was an authentic true believer in the notion of the multi-purpose parks agency — one that could effectively address the needs of natural resources, recreation, archaeological and historical sites, museums, documentary materials, etc. with equal effectiveness and energy in one, single, grand organization. The first volume of California's History Plan, released in December 1973, outlined a broad and, for the time, encompassing range of topics. It clearly envisioned the role of the Department of Parks and Recreation as that of a formal, large-scale history museum agency. Director Mott supported the idea of history as a powerful and important socializing and educational tool and something that warranted support.

Mott believed that State Parks could and should be California's museum and history agency. As an example of how this influenced events, some remember Bill Mott opposing the establishment of a "Department of History" as proposed in drafts of the History Plan during late 1973, and also a similar proposal made in 1972 by an archaeological task force to establish a "California Heritage Department." Indeed, Mott did oppose the creation of a separate agency as proposed, but not because he didn't think the subject was unimportant. Rather, he believed that history and heritage could, and should, be a responsibility of the Department of Parks and Recreation.

Following the election of Jerry Brown as Governor in 1974, and the departure of Director Mott, the Department of Parks and Recreation had two somewhat contradictory responses to the challenges of heritage. Much of Mott's museum vision and agenda — the good, the bad, and the just plain intriguing-but-really-difficult-to-achieve (and those in the audience who knew Bill Mott will understand what this last phrase means) — was discarded. In particular, most of the history

projects, including all the large museums (with the exception of the State Railroad Museum) were abandoned, transferred to other agencies, or deferred. The Department, which had been uncomfortably stretched into the realm of history during Mott's tenure, contracted back into something like its old shape. At the same time, and much more positively, Brown appointed a professional as State Historic Preservation Officer — separating this function from the Director of the Department of Parks and Recreation — and created the Office of Historic Preservation.

This shift in attitude, if not formal policy away from museums, plus the Brown administration's enthusiasm for modest-scale projects, the devastating effects of Proposition 13, a couple of recessions, and the Department's chronic underfunded situation, set State Parks on a path of withdrawal from its aspiration as steward of the state's heritage. Since the late 1970's, history, heritage, and interpretation — and especially museums, which had threatened to consume an increasing proportion of the Department's budget — have become, in my opinion, subordinated to the comparably important needs of natural resource protection and recreation. And all three of these have been horribly stressed by the costs associated with public safety, enforcement, and increased public use.

In the larger world outside of State Parks, several organizations crafted broad missions and assumed regional or statewide responsibilities in the period between the late 1960's and the 1980's. The Oakland Museum of California opened in 1969 as much more than a local, or even regional, museum, with collections and programs that were (and are) diverse and broad. The California Historical Society sought to expand its influence to Southern California, and became designated the state's official historical society. Los Angeles Museum of Natural History reinstalled its history galleries. The State Archives revived the County Historical Records Commissions and initiated a formal exhibit program. There was a surge of interest in establishing special collections at the campuses of the newly-renamed California State University system. And, dozens of local museum, historic site, and heritage projects came into existence.

Much of the emphasis during this period was on smaller historical programs and projects. The lack of a larger, statewide focus or the resources to carry out big plans served to energize smaller, perhaps more manageable programs and projects, and resulted (through the comparable fragmentation of political support and the rise of regional politics) in the empowerment of local, small, and specialized groups — the fragmentation, the particularization spoken of earlier had become the norm.

Organizations or interests seeking support learned that it could be a better strategy to undertake their museum or

preservation program themselves rather than rely on a state or local government entity to do the job. Millions of dollars have flowed from bond acts and other government sources to independent history and heritage projects. But State funding has become a zero-sum game. An unhealthy competition has resulted from the present system whereby the proponents of heritage projects outside of state government seek many of the same funds needed by state agencies to meet their own needs. The question tends to be decided politically on a case basis rather through the application of some larger policy. We have trained two generations of project proponents to go directly to their local legislators for support and to rely on politics rather than need, equity, or public benefit to decide the outcome.

In recent years, State Parks has revived its aspiration to become the state's history and heritage agency. While rhetorically strong about being "in the museum business," the Department has had to spend a lot of time trying to get the resources to address its own huge unmet needs for deferred maintenance funding. As a result, rhetoric aside, not too much happened of benefit to outside groups. Legislative agendas rather than a State Parks' agenda have resulted in much of the money that was available — and I'm speaking about Proposition 40 funds here — being spent on politically important projects in major coastal population centers.

This has created another vacuum. In the eyes of many, the Department of Parks and Recreation seems to have marked its territory, but under-delivered on the responsibility that comes along with that. In all fairness — and lest I be accused of Parks-bashing — the majority of this isn't the Department's doing. The political apparatus that allocates funds has found that you get quicker results with fewer complications and more political advantage by giving the money directly to high-profile programs and organizations.

The present system is dysfunctional. It has encouraged an ad hoc, opportunistic approach to what ought to be the result of thoughtfully made policy decisions. But lacking an alternative structure, there is no one to take the lead, no one with the scope of authority and the suasion to even shape a process, much less provide direction and structure for future actions. Parks, in particular, recognizes this problem. Our gathering here is evidence that the current administration in the Department believes that the status quo is not adequate and that things must change.

So, what is the state of California's Cultural Resources? There is a lot of good work going on; but it is uncoordinated, largely unfocused, and sometimes competitive. The State provides some funds through sources like the Department of Parks and Recreation. But a disconcerting amount is poured out by the legislature rather than invested to meet the highest needs, and

most state and private heritage programs remain chronically underfunded. There are a multiplicity of agencies, commissions, boards, and private bodies that have some degree of responsibility for historical resources, heritage preservation, the arts and the humanities, but there are few opportunities for communication and fewer still for collaboration.

California has no integrated historical infrastructure. There are literally thousands of history and heritage organizations that would all fit comfortably into the definitions mentioned earlier, but nothing serves to link many of the more disparate pieces of this puzzle — the historical manuscript repositories; the history rooms in local libraries and special collections departments in the libraries of every college and university in the state; the State Library; the State Archives; the archives and records centers that ought to — but don't — exist in each of the 58 counties and in another 600 or so municipalities and special districts; the dozens of major history museums and the thousands of local museums and historical societies; the cultural history collections from every group — the Hmong to 1950s automobile enthusiasts and the Friends groups and docent associations; the State Historic Parks and collections held by State Parks; historic sites and structures in yet more thousands; community associations; groups charged with preserving cultural patrimony; religious groups; folklore societies; living history theatrical troupes; and so on.

The present situation is ineffective and subject to exploitation for a variety of purposes — both noble and less-than-virtuous. We all administer pieces of a shared collective heritage — pieces that all require and deserve recognition, financial support, and better forums for interaction.

And, that is my concluding point. These ALL deserve support and attention, connections, encouragement, access to information, money, and sources of generous guidance to gently move them in a positive direction. The present situation is ineffective and subject to exploitation for a variety of purposes — both noble and less-than-virtuous. There must be a better way of organizing ourselves to receive the needed attention and funding, with less competition and greater clarity of priority. I will humbly suggest that if anything is going to improve, we must all be willing to sincerely explore and act on alternatives to the present structure, a structure that tends to be an impediment to achievement rather than a source of objective support to accomplish our collective goals. And, I commend the Department of Parks and Recreation for taking the risk to invite us all here to share what we think, and to build on the optimism inherent in the field. The future is ours to decide.

SESSION ONE

WHAT IS THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA'S CULTURAL RESOURCES?

Roundtable Discussion

DR. KNOX MELLON

California State Historic Preservation Officer

My comments relate to historic preservation, one important aspect of cultural resources. The historic preservation effort in California has come a long way since 1966, that watershed year when the first modern major federal preservation act was passed. Today, there is far greater visibility for historic preservation. In addition, there is a rapid growth of regional advocacy groups around the state, including the Los Angeles Conservancy and Pasadena Heritage. Further, the Coastal Commission and the Coastal Conservancy are both taking an increased interest in the movement. And, of course we have the very important California Environmental Quality Act which puts teeth in the protection of historic resources. Lastly, there is vastly more compliance with preservation laws today than there was when I came up to Sacramento as the SHPO [State Historic Preservation Officer] in 1975. Despite these gains, historical preservation has many weak links.

I want to concentrate on seeing these short-comings discussed at this summit, with the hope that some of the participants might suggest ways in which actions could be taken to correct inequities and to make preservation more relevant. In my judgement, without substantive change, historic preservation will not receive widespread or meaningful acceptance by a broader segment of the American populace. I don't have the answers to my concerns. I am looking for help.

I am uncomfortable with the lack of in-roads that historic preservation has made with important groups of American society and I have questions that I think must be addressed. Why is it that historic preservation is still viewed by many as elitist? Why haven't we developed more preservation programs and objectives that have relevancy for minorities? Why is it that economically-disadvantaged citizens have little interest in, or knowledge of, historic preservation? Why is it that discussion of the issue of ethnic diversity and historic preservation is sadly lacking both professionally and among the populace as a whole? And finally, why haven't we been successful in reducing fear on the part of poor people that historic preservation means displacement?

Additionally, there are action items that must be faced — and the sooner the better. Historic preservation needs to be linked in peoples' minds to advancing the objective of smart growth; addressing decent and affordable housing needs of low income

persons; stimulating interest in heritage among minority communities so that these people feel they have a stake in our collective history and will participate actively.

We need to promote conservation of urban and rural landscapes, not just the built environment. We need to garner a greater share of the heritage tourism industry. We need to get away from the "bad guy — good guy" syndrome between historic preservationists and developers; and instead, foster cooperation to make projects work.

If we can turn our attention to solving these issues, this summit will serve as a preservation catalyst for the early 21st Century in the same sense that the federal Preservation Act did in the second half of the 20th Century. And that will be good not just for historic preservation but the broader parameters of society as a whole.

STEADE CRAIGO, FAIA

Chief, Cultural Resources Division

California Department of Parks and Recreation

One knowledgeable anthropologist observed that "Parks, as stewards of Cultural Treasures, have an essential role in showing how our lives are linked with lives of the past."

However, the remarkable Henry Ford concluded that "history is bunk." Nevertheless, history — in either its tangible form of artifacts, collections, archives, historic structures and properties, or in an intangible form, such as memories and sense of place — holds an immense and extraordinary power to excite and stir emotions, even in our very future-oriented society.

One very succinct definition of cultural heritage that I like defines the term as "those aspects of the past that people preserve, cultivate, study, and pass on to the next generation."

In his book *The Future of The Past*, the author Alexander Stille states that in some ways parks are to nature what museums are to preserving previous cultures — a backward glance at something that is understood as the past. There is an implied understanding that natural resources are threatened just as cultural resources are. And parks are one means to preserve both.

Ironically, the idea of natural resource preservation occurred in the United States at roughly the same period in the middle of the 19th Century as historic preservation is said to have begun. This was a vigorous period when industrialization was

beginning the transformation of our country, foreshadowing the immense changes that were to occur during the following 150 years.

For thousands of years, until the first part of the 19th Century, man could not travel any faster than the fastest horse — about 25 miles per hour. Civilization has been on a technological free-fall ever since. Rapid, accelerating changes are both positively and adversely affecting our cultural heritage.

As technology shrinks our world, the voices of individuals become more profound.

California State Parks is the trustee and steward of an immense, expanding stock of valued cultural resources of every variety and form representative of the people of our state now and in past ages.

The Department's mission statement clearly states the objectives of our agency. They are to provide for the health, inspiration and education of the people of California by helping to preserve the state's extraordinary biological diversity, protecting its most valued natural and cultural resources, and to creating opportunities for high-quality recreation.

The mission statement unmistakably dictates that preservation of cultural resources is not the only core program. Recreation and natural resources are also equally important core programs. For each, there are dedicated and passionate staff members, advocating and working together for the benefit of the whole. This synergy is what causes California State Parks to be a dynamic organization. Very importantly, during the last 18 months, cultural resources for the first time has had its own voice at the parks table, which has meant significant interaction and changes, as well as growing collaborative and collegial working relationship between all the Department staff.

I would certainly not attempt to diminish in any way the challenge that California State Parks has to preserve and conserve its cultural resources. However, very diligent and best practices efforts are occurring to preserve our resources. Substantial sums of money are being spent to maintain and to preserve the archaeological sites, collections, historic structures, and landscapes in state parks, as well as to add to the park system to fill identified gaps in our current cultural properties, such as women in California, the labor movement, ethnic history, agricultural history, 20th Century military history, and arts and literature.

In the past, being able to factually demonstrate and express the funding and staffing needs of State Parks has been a challenge. During the last few years, we have developed electronic tracking programs that provide significant data. Now database

systems monitor the well-being of our collections, buildings, and archaeological sites. We have facts as to the needs of our resources, and we have been successful in arguing for additional funding. However, the money is never sufficient to meet the need. The technology does permit us to better target expenditures where most critical for maintenance and capital improvement.

Technology is expensive, and the cost of preserving of our cultural resources is extremely high, which is an especially difficult aspect during cost-conscious times such as these.

Additionally, I share Knox's [Mellon] poignant concerns regarding the representation of diversity and ethnic history, as well as engaging present and future generations of Californians, as these issues directly impact state parks.

Currently the National Parks, National Trust, and California State Parks are discussing partnering in a joint initiative to commemorate World War II. We sadly know that World War II's "Greatest Generation," those men and women who fought our enemies abroad and at home, is dying out. So are the Japanese Americans who suffered through one of the darkest periods of our country's history. We are losing invaluable human cultural history every day.

Ironically — or paradoxically — park visitor satisfaction surveys indicate that visitors are supportive of historic properties but they seldom recognize them as State Park facilities.

Then there is this great cohort of California's youth. Survey data indicate that this group — numbering in the millions — is the most ethnically-mixed of any generation and the most technically sophisticated and environmentally sensitive, but not that interested in cultural resources or history. This is an immense challenge. How will we engage this important group of citizens? How will parks and cultural heritage become relevant to them?

I have every confidence that the Department will continue to adapt, to grow, and to change to meet future needs. And, although some naturalists would likely disagree, I firmly believe that California State Parks are California's greatest cultural resource, next to its people.

Today, we are planning for 5, 10, 15, 20 years into the future. We have identified a list of possible new acquisitions and park properties that will substantially change the size and nature of California State Parks. Significant land acquisitions which will protect large segments of environmentally-sensitive natural and cultural resources, and culturally-significant properties associated with valued aspects of California history, such as Indian valley mounds, Cesar Chavez, and the Tule Lake

Relocation Camp. State Parks is moving ahead with its Los Angeles Urban Strategy, bringing cultural and natural parks to the inner city of the region; and with the planning for the exciting new California Indian Heritage Center and Museum.

I personally believe that the success of our many endeavors will depend on strengthening our many current partnerships and on developing new partners with mutual goals of preserving the California's cultural heritage. I trust that this will be an outcome of this singularly significant summit.

KATHRYN WELCH HOWE

Principal Project Specialist

The Getty Conservation Institute

With the Getty Conservation Institute, I am heading up a project to develop a city-wide historic resource survey in concert with the City of Los Angeles, the Los Angeles Conservancy, and a very large range of stakeholders drawn from business, real estate, the planning and architecture communities, and the neighborhoods of Los Angeles. My background is in historic preservation. I formerly worked for the National Trust and have been involved in a whole range of public and private sector projects involved in historic preservation.

I am going to take a different tact — a reinforcing tact — to Knox's [Mellon] comments and talk about where historic preservation has been as a piece of the cultural resource environment, and where it is going. One of the key things for those of us who have been involved in historic preservation for many years is that preservation has moved from monuments and museums and art and artifacts to the mainstream. In almost every city, it is now an integral part of the urban conservation strategy; the community development and housing strategy; and the economic development programs of cities and states. It is absolutely part of every real estate development company's investment portfolio. In fact, there are many developers who are fully dedicated to historic preservation. In Los Angeles — and many other cities — it is creating incredibly stable neighborhoods of very affordable housing.

In Los Angeles, we have fifteen Historic Preservation Overlay Zones (HPOZ) which are historic districts. None of them is in an affluent area. They are all in lower to moderate income neighborhoods of high ethnic diversity. There are now 3000 properties in Los Angeles within these HPOZs. There are fifteen more HPOZs in the planning and proposal stage, so that we will eventually have over 20,000 properties in these 30 neighborhoods. Again, all of them are in low and moderate income, highly-ethnically diverse, inner-city neighborhoods. The residents in these neighborhoods have seen that if they can get control of their environment, then safety, security, education, and economic solutions begin to follow.

So preservation is no longer the set-aside activity that it was at one point. It has become integral to planning and community development, and the political world has responded. Not only do they see that projects are attractive and have easy community acceptance, but the economic and fiscal impact to the city is very positive. In connection with the survey project, we did a fiscal and economic analysis of the impact of historic preservation. We found that just in the few areas that we surveyed, over \$200 million per year was being returned to the city coffers. These are meaningful figures to decision makers, whether they are lenders or political decision makers.

Interest and concern has grown from a small elite group to be more ingrained in the mainstream and the thoughts of the population. This weekend, I was struck by a movie that I recommend to all of you by a Los Angeles director/producer and member of the Conservancy's Advisory Council, Curtis Hansen, entitled "8 Mile." In that movie which takes place in Detroit, a rap artist comments before burning a house down that people used to care about these things and we should do that in the future. To me, it was terrific — preservation in a rap movie.

Taking that one step further, how has all this happened? What were the ingredients to take historic preservation from a small, elitist activity to where it is now? First and foremost, I think that it was important to have a protective environment. The California Environmental Quality Act was really instrumental in establishing a platform for the protection and reuse of historic resources. Second, it was important to have state and local private sector nonprofit partners such as those you have heard about — the Los Angeles Conservancy; Pasadena Heritage; and on the public side at a local level, the Riverside Planning Department and preservation program and others throughout the state. It was also important at the state level to have a professional State Historic Preservation Office. California has a history of having a strong, professional, above-the-fray preservation office, and having the California Preservation Foundation, a strengthening private sector partner working on state policy and legislation.

The other key is incentives — catalyzing incentives for funding and tax policy. It is important to recognize that well over 90 percent of historic resources as they are defined by the National Register are held in the private sector. So the use of incentives, both public policy tax incentives as well as funding incentives, is critical.

I would add to that the issue of strategic alliances between state and local groups, but also with other sources of funding. I have frankly been shocked over time at the low funding levels that come from private foundations. Historic preservation doesn't even register as a category within the foundation

world. It is shocking how little foundation money is going into preservation, when in fact it is not only preserving important cultural resources but dealing with housing and the revitalization of historic commercial areas, and the prevention of sprawl.

Today, the challenge centers on what the State's role is in supporting these local and private sector initiatives while addressing statewide needs. It absolutely can be done. The worst thing is when they get put in competition with each other. There needs to be a way to clearly state that this is what we can do to support, strengthen, catalyze, and incentivize the private sector; and these are the resources needed to support the State's interests.

DR. DENNIS POWER

Executive Director

The Oakland Museum of California

When I come to a summit like this, I think of historic property that is not of the real estate kind. I want to offer some things that we have learned recently at my institution, as well as pose some suggestions that we can think about as we try to develop some follow up to this excellent summit.

To echo what I just heard about support for historic sites, we find it extremely difficult to get support for documentation and preservation of collections. We have found that the obvious emphasis is on audience, on programs, on numbers, and very often on the visibility of the sponsor that is providing the support. We have, for example, over 1,200,000 objects. By objects, I mean material from California Indian history, from European history here, archival materials, photographs, works of art that span from the early 1800s to the present-day, and so forth.

We have found that we often don't know how these collections are going to be used, but they are often extremely significant when a project comes up. For example, at the present time we have in research and development an exhibition called, "Next Stop Vietnam: California and the Nation Transformed." We are developing a project that talks about California's role as an epicenter of the American experience during the Vietnam conflict from Reagan and Nixon politics to the military-industrial complex to the counterculture movement to music, film and so forth. We had no idea when we took over the photo archives of the *Oakland Tribune* that we would use that extensively for research for this exhibition. So these collections continue to come back in ways that I think also address some of the new master narratives.

I think that second relative point that we have learned at the museum is that our view of the so-called master narratives is changing. In Walter Gray's presentation, I was taken with the idea that there are certain large chunks of California history that were taught — and still are — in the schools that are gen-

erally linear, uplifting, and positive. In the 1960's and 1970's, that all started to change. We began to realize that everything isn't linear. It is multi-dimensional. Everything is not positive. So our view of these master narratives and of some of the new ones that have to be told has come about largely through diversifying our staff and through the creation of advisory councils. This year, we created an Asian-Pacific Islander Advisory Council. About four years ago, we created an African-American Advisory Council that worked extensively on the presentation and programming for an exhibit that was traveling the nation, and also an exhibit on Ghanaian cloth, called "Wrapped in Pride." We just celebrated the tenth anniversary of our Latino Advisory Council. This group has worked with us extensively on annual programming for Day of the Dead that has turned out to be very cross-cultural. They worked with us on programming for Arte Latino that we have up at the present time, and are also working with us on the design of the reinstallation of our history gallery. We have really learned a lot from these groups. These are community members. These are not scholars. These are people who for example come in and work with high school kids in a Latino history project every year.

Some of the suggestions that I would like to throw out that we might figure into action items for the coming days are:

- It would be good to come together around developing new master narratives for the state. What are some of the big stories we want to tell and can there be support for acquisition, preservation, exhibition, and interpretation with direct funding? We also need to create a mechanism to re-examine those initiatives every three to five years because society changes.
- We need to adopt a public-private partnership model. The State can't do it all, and we need to support those private entities such as museums and historic houses that address the new master narratives of the time.
- Given the current funding situation, it is going to be primarily the State and other government entities that are going to have to take care of collections statewide — property as well as non-real estate. Private support is extremely difficult to get for what is viewed as "back of the house."
- We need to recognize the diverse regions of the state perhaps by creating regional centers. These could be at existing museums, colleges, or history sites — too much good stuff happens at the local level to have this all centralized.
- At the state level, we should perhaps have the equivalent of World Heritage Sites — a few widely-recognized, well-funded, supported sites in California that have a lot of visibility. Of course it won't meet all of our needs, but State Heritage Sites could attract attention as World Heritage Sites do.

MARSHA SEMMEL

*Special Assistant to the Director for Strategic Partnerships
Institute of Museum and Library Services*

Since I have not actually begun my work at the Institute of Museum and Library Services yet, perhaps one of the reasons that I am here was my most recent position as the CEO of the Women of the West Museum. I am going to follow on what Dr. Heyman and Walter Gray have said and talk about some of the realities in cultural heritage — talking a little more about the use of the word “inclusion” and what that means. Then I am going to talk about some structures and what needs to happen given the realities of cultural resources in the state.

To follow up on this point of inclusion, I would like to expand it a little further beyond racial inclusion, ethnic inclusion, class inclusion because one of the things that I have found is that we are in a wonderful time — especially given some of the fruits of the scholarship and environmental history — to look in some new, productive, and powerful ways at the whole relationship between people and place — how people influence place; how place shapes people. We have always done it, but we are now at a fertile moment for doing that in an effective way, including the natural environment, the built environment, and peoples’ stories in new, interesting, and informative relationships that everybody can understand and get involved with. We did that at the Women of the West Museum in creating some history trails — Women’s History Trails.

The second way I would focus on inclusion is to highlight and make use of existing parks, open spaces, museums, libraries, and historical societies to put them under a larger thematic or conceptual umbrella. We created a Women’s History Trail in Boulder County, for example, where the stops on the trail were the existing historical societies, parks, open spaces, and libraries. By doing that, we told a new story — that of the role of women in the county. We also invited people, and encouraged them, to visit the existing sites which didn’t necessarily always get that kind of attention. We called attention to other funders and got national, local, regional, and state support for this project by highlighting the importance and essential quality of those resources that are being conserved and taken care of in those museums, libraries, and open spaces.

The third kind of inclusion I would like to talk about is giving audiences active roles to play in their capacities as history collectors, history makers, historical actors — giving them real work in various kinds of projects; and catering to that notion of discovery and that sense of curiosity that people have. In our projects, especially with young people and school children, the fact that we actually hired them as history detectives and gave them a job to do and put them in charge of their project made a lasting impact. I know that because we have been back to those schools in subsequent years.

If we move to the issue of resources, the current situation in California and everywhere is that we have a proliferation of nonprofits — of all kinds, but especially museums and cultural organizations — all of whom have important and useful missions, all of whom are dedicated to doing good work. But in many cases, we have an overlap of missions. We have a dearth of trustees who are willing and able to give their time and their commitment to our organizations. In many cases because we have so many of them, we have a crisis in funding. I think that one of the things that has to be explored is the range of activities that deal with new kinds of management and organizational structures. Whether these are formal alliances; strategic partnerships; or as in the case of our museum, mergers of organizations that are carefully developed, carefully honed, carefully laid out so that the missions of the institutions are fulfilled and achieved, we should look in different ways to sustain our missions, think long-term, get beyond the caring people whose egos sometimes lead them astray when it comes to what it means to grow an organization, what it means to sustain an organization, and what it means to really serve our audiences in the best possible way.

DR. GERALD HASLAM

Writer

A few months ago, the people at the Great Valley Center sent me the outline of a training program they had for interns. On it were classes or readings in areas like Anthropology and Economics and even Agricultural Economy, but there was nothing on the arts. This from the region that since World War II has arguably produced the finest cluster of writers — everyone from Maxine Hong Kingston to Richard Rodriguez, Gary Soto, Joan Didion. There was nothing on the arts. So I called and asked why, and they said they didn’t have time for that. They had to train these people.

I would suggest to you that our artists are walking archives and we need to view them in that way. The best of our artists will be the introduction to historical exhibits, will be the introduction to museums, because they will show people what life is like in the “living.” They will show people what it felt like to be alive — not how it quantified, but what it felt like — what the heart was feeling. And, that very, very important point must never be ignored.

When I read *The Grapes of Wrath* as a kid a long time ago, it seemed absolutely true to me although I knew it wasn’t factual. I knew many of the facts in it were wrong because my family had been through that. Yet, it was true and it brought to life this whole relationship of art to life — that there is a level of truth that is accessible almost only through non-specific language, through the language that takes you there and gives you the feeling but does not quantify because many human feelings cannot be quantified.

I have always approached art in that way. As it turns out, our collective memories as a society are often based on what art triggers. All of a sudden, “I Heard It Through the Grapevine,” takes you to a place you haven’t been for years and it is as real as it was when you were there. Or again, *The Grapes of Wrath* becomes the entryway to a memory of the Dust Bowl migration for folks. What I would urge is that we don’t forget that in the process of assembling otherwise historical material. I feel it might be the entryway for the folks who do not feel necessarily comfortable with going to a museum or historical exhibit. If the art they love — the popular art that they love — can be used to pry the door open, I think more people will pass through the door.

I talked to a young man at San Francisco State University — actually, he was a young man once — someone who was there during the Strike in 1969. I have been doing some research about a possible book about that and in the midst of the conversation, an odd thing happened. He looked at me and his face changed as he said, “Do you realize that what you writers do, and what the film-makers do, is going to be the only truth about this when we are all dead. There will be no other memory of it — that is all there is going to be.” It was great to see that look in his eyes. He suddenly realized that this was consequential on yet another level.

When I look at these kinds of things and I see the way in which art interacts with collections, I see an intimacy of relationship that we in our society don’t always tend to acknowledge. We sometimes tend to treat art as though it is elite. It is distant. It is ephemeral — no, we are ephemeral. Art doesn’t have to be. Great art doesn’t have to be. We will be gone, but it won’t be if it is really fine stuff. So I hope that we can encourage — through the work that you are doing — more and more young people to give expression to those pockets of experience of the human heart that finally make our lives worth living. I wouldn’t give a hoot about the history of oil in Kern County if I hadn’t fallen in love with a girl from Kern County.

That is really my only plea this morning. I want to finish with a poem by a “walking archive” named Wilma Elizabeth McDaniel that will give you some sense of why I think this is important. Wilma McDaniel is a Dust Bowl migrant who lives in Tulare and she is a wonderful lady. Her poem, *K-Mart Sage*, goes something like this:

Dirty Stetson
Khaki clothes
cane beside him
on a K-mart bench
I heard the old man say

you know
us men don’t have to
look no certain way

like a woman does
or men expect her to look

you take Buck Owens
why he looks just right

if you put that face on
a woman
they’d run her out of town

DR. JANET FIREMAN

Curator

Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County

I have a dream. Hoping to emulate the passions and dedication stirred in our hearts by memories of Martin Luther King’s words, “I have a dream,” I am saying this morning that I have a dream concerning the state and future of California’s cultural heritage resources and how they are presented.

I thought I would tell you about the dream that has been haunting me and some of my colleagues at the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County. A dream that may be realized in the next decade when the ninety year-old institution — and oh my, is it ever showing its age — builds a new museum. The new museum will incorporate historic portions of the current building and it will have a new structure, consolidated operations, and many bells and whistles. Ringing out and tooting a widely-beckoning call will be an integrated treatment of the many disciplines represented in this venerable — and sometimes crotchety — old institution called the Natural History Museum.

That name requires some explanation. As many of you know, the name — Natural History Museum — is a misnomer. Founded as the Los Angeles Museum of History, Art, and Science and operated as such for more than half century, the “M” as I call it, lost sight of itself when the fine art component was detached and established a separate museum as the Los Angeles County Museum of Art, or LACMA. Adopting the name, “Natural History Museum” and thereby officially forgetting the human past, the “M” was doomed to gross error. We all know that mistakes happen. And, in this case, the mistake meant missed opportunities, but not complete failure. The grand old institution kept rolling along, though sometimes its history collections and programs were thrown out on the waves without lifejacket or raft, supported on minimum rations, cut all-but-loose, and then called back to the fold. But the “M”

kept on rolling, pursuing its course into the 21st Century, sometimes with grand design and more than steady-as-she-went; sometimes with less direct forward motion.

With slight variation, this is the story of all institutions. For our purposes today, I am using this institutional history to set the scene for my dream. What I noticed for many years at the “M” was what I came to believe is a foolish division of cultural and natural resources — a misplaced emphasis, a lost horizon. The dream then is to combine, to cross boundaries, to integrate the disciplines for public interpretation by basing exhibitions and attendant programming in the new museum on the logical theme of “California,” which is not just another state and focussing on the Los Angeles region, which is not just every old megalopolis. Thirty-three million specimens in all — one and a half million of those in the history collections — put to work to describe and interpret our place, our world, in a broad model inspired by environmental history.

Some say that I am a dreamer. Dominating the region and the state, located on the edge of the future, Los Angeles has been — and continues to be — mythologized, globalized, and diversified. The megalopolis is a laboratory of past and present, of promises and challenges. In my dream, what I am now calling the Los Angeles Museum encapsulates the themes of change over time, evolution and adaptation, growth and development. A century of expertise in multiple disciplines set the stage for the museum to assume a leading role as the headquarters for research and interpretation of place. Los Angeles — the regional nexus that has become a world force — is our focal point for presenting stories of the planet based on the endless interactions between humans and the natural world.

The dream continues, and in the new museum we will develop the storyline on our place, our world — the core exhibition that we are imagining. This will be a complex, large, and ambitious multi-disciplinary gallery with varied and innovative forms of exhibits, interactives, and artifact and specimen-rich displays. The core of the foundation story goes like this: “Los Angeles is the capital — the gravity force — of southern California, and is recognized by national observers as a region on the edge of the future. Like other places the product of past interaction between people and their environment, the region is distinguished by its continual influx of newcomers, both human and non-human, from all parts of the globe. Just as immigration has created a remarkable cultural diversity, introduction of world-wide species has fostered an unparalleled biological diversity.”

The dream could go on — and will. I hope that the dream will be embraced by others, and that all of you in this summit and your organizations and institutions will have an opportunity to join in the dream and share.

DIANE FRANKEL

Program Director

James Irvine Foundation

I looked back at the goal for this conference — “the development of a statewide ‘common agenda’ for the future of California’s cultural heritage resources” and that made me start thinking about the whole issue of inclusion, which we have heard about from many of the speakers on this panel. I thought about who is going to decide what is historic in this very multicultural state. What is going to be preserved? As we have heard, there are limited funds — and there are always going to be limited funds — for any projects that we undertake. What is supposed to be transmitted? We have master narratives, but it has been suggested that those master narratives don’t capture the experiences of most Californians. What are we going to fund? How are we going to make those decisions? And, who is going to make those decisions? There are multiple agencies throughout the state, but what groups of people are going to be sitting in on those conversations.

I thought to myself that there really have to be lots of people sitting around lots of tables in order to begin to develop a common agenda. This conference is just the first step. The next question is how do you begin to expand it so that other people, who may not care as passionately as those of us in this room do, begin to feel involved.

I think it is important to preserve and articulate the multiple and simultaneous histories that are taking place throughout California. Given the diversity of this state, and how easily artifacts, buildings, and ideas — I think that cultural heritage is not only about things and places, it is often about ideas of those things and places and just ideas themselves — can be lost very easily as collective memories disappear.

I suggest that the issue around resources which we always come back to in all of these conversations isn’t the answer and shouldn’t be the excuse. I would sometimes just like to take “resources” off of the table, because I think it blocks people’s ability to think through what they want to do, even if they don’t have all the resources. What do you do to accomplish?

And, how do we make the case — how do we express the need — not only to policy makers and elected officials, but really to the public? That is the missing component in this conversation. Without the public caring about these things, it is not going to go anywhere. I suggest that a common agenda needs to have major civic engagement component.

In order to include all those who feel they should be engaged, we need to have multiple tables with individuals from multiple disciplines so that they can begin to talk to each other, get

out of their silos, and discuss the commonalities across these disciplines that will allow an agenda to move forward.

I have also found that few policy things happen at the state level. Creating activity at the county level where so much of the decision making occurs and so many of the things take place, will encourage real engagement and involvement. Some counties will take this on and lead by example. From those leaders, amazing tool kits can be built to show other counties how to get involved in cultural heritage. We need to build a pyramid of activities and efforts and make sure there are lots of people at the next summit.

FELICIA LOWE

Board Member

Angel Island Immigration Station Foundation

I am the child and grandchild of former detainees at Angel Island — both my father and my grandfather were detained there. Until I became an adult, I was not fully aware of this information. I became active in the preservation of Angel Island Immigration Station, often called the “Ellis Island of the West.”

As I was listening to the other panel members, I knew that I too have a speaker’s card with the word “inclusion” on it. The scary thing for me about it is that it can become a buzz word and have no teeth behind it. It can be a fashionable thing to say. If I am going to be pitching anything today, it will be to talk about the will of the people who are the policy makers and who can make the change.

Coming up as an independent filmmaker, one of the best things that happened to me was that someone from the National Endowment for the Humanities asked me to sit on a review panel to read proposals. That helped me understand how the system works. I would say that if anyone is interested in having people buy-in to what is going on in the State Parks, they have to feel comfortable in those parks. They have to know how to be, and to talk, and to learn the language. There need to be park staff of color to make people of color feel comfortable. This has to come from all ways and have relevance. Because if there is no relevance, no one will want to participate or make an investment of emotional capital.

What we are talking about is really the “absence of presence.” There is an absence of presence in history of so many other people’s stories that make up the whole quilt of who we are in this country. We do need to look at making a place at the table and also to understand that while “elite” is a colored word, it has a particular language that must be learned if you are to be at the table.

At Angel Island, we wanted to turn a place of forced exclusion into a place of inclusion. To demonstrate that, a short video produced with support from the National Trust for Historic Preservation was shown. A primary message of that video was “lessons forgotten are lessons unlearned.”

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS WITH ALL SUMMIT PARTICIPANTS

I. ANTHONY VEERKAMP: Much of our efforts are going to be undermined unless the preservation community makes inroads with the natural resources community. There seems to be the notion of virgin nature as pristine nature, and humans as somehow violating what is natural and not really being a part of the natural world. Until we are able to reposition cultural environment as having positive and negative impacts on the natural environment and as part of the natural environment, it is going to be hard to have that same “gut” support.

DR. JANET FIREMAN: There is not an easy answer, but it is a fascinating problem. Change over time includes everything. It includes the mindsets of the relationship of peoples and the environment. It seems to be an artificial construct to separate the natural and the historic worlds. What does that mean — that history is unnatural? It is all of a piece.

DR. KNOX MELLON: Anthony’s comment points up the pressing need for historic preservation to learn from the natural environmentalists who are light years ahead of us in terms advocacy, politics, and fund raising. There is a huge gap between the natural environmentalists and the historic preservationists. We need to forge a much closer working relationship. But at the same time, we need to learn what they do well and begin to do much better ourselves.

STEADY CRAIGO: Natural and historic preservation movements started at the same time and I have never quite understood why they never came together because the goals and some of the terminology used are the same. Land conservancies are realizing that they are acquiring lands with historic sites and that there is the need to partner with cultural preservationists. In State Parks, we are looking at how cultural landscapes and historic landscapes relate to the natural side. All parks, whether they are recreational or natural parks, just like historic parks are cultural. Bring the two together. Why not?

MARSHA SEMMEL: In Colorado, a portion of the gambling receipts from casinos in historic mining towns goes to the preservation of historic sites. Lottery funds go to environmental education. I don't know if that is progress or not, but it is certainly generating more funds.

2. **DR. JARRELL JACKMAN:** The “master narrative” idea appeals to me. How one arrives at that is interesting because I think Kevin Starr’s dream metaphor is certainly a master narrative approach in his multi-volume history of California, as are other examples. We may be able to develop these master narratives by beginning with writers and fiction. The Gene Autrey Museum also has some important activities going on which might be helpful in the development of these master narratives.

3. **WILLIAM MUNGARY:** Native Americans have been attributed with having had the greatest respect for their culture, their history, and their tradition; and it was all done orally. There was no documentation. The things documented in petroglyphs and art work was not related to this life. That was to make contact with the other life and the other world. Gerald Haslam succinctly tied in the issue of the arts and literature as internalizing — as American Indians did through oral history — how these inanimate objects fit together; what they really mean; how they were used in real life. That is one thing that Native Americans were always concerned about — how do we get from today to tomorrow. Western education made major inroads into changing all of that for Native Americans, in terms of losing oral history; and a lot has been lost because it was not documented. Fortunately we have had educators, archeologists, ethnographers who have written those things down. People are going back now to research them. We are trying to get our own people into that field to interpret that, to talk to elders, and to identify where lies or misdirection were used to prevent the culture from being stolen. What Gerald said was fitting. Could you say more about that — about the arts and the literature and how one can tie these things together in their own hearts, minds, and souls so that these inanimate objects can mean something to the world?

DR. GERALD HASLAM: While people are busy working for a living, writers, painters, the filmmakers who emerge are really speaking with collective voices. It is in this sense that I meant that writers and artists are walking archives. They don't have to recognize the labels that many of us have to recognize in our fields. They can link things in ways that seem natural to us when we see them, but seem unnatural to our employers very often, or to the granting agencies very often. This is why I think they serve a very important function. The best of them are trying to present life in the living. There may be ways that museums and other centers of cultural preservation can employ

popular culture as a vehicle to bring people in who would not normally come in the door. That might be one possible way of changing the audience — expanding the audience. I see these people and their work as repositories of our culture at the level at which we feel it, not the level we are supposed to or the level historians have outlined it, but at the level at which it has gripped our hearts. There is a sense almost as intense as love involved. That is what the artists have capacity to do, even if they don't always achieve this.

4. **BILL BERRY:** In regard to the issue of inclusion and the idea of bringing the natural and cultural preservation interests together, I thought it was important to mention that that is what State Parks is internally struggling with. We have set up a cooperative team to look at this relationship between natural and cultural preservation advocates. Because of today's environmental laws and historic laws, we are seeing these conflicts and are having difficulty in resolving them. We are at the confrontational stage within our organization of trying to resolve how those issues will come together and getting both sides to look at how things would affect them. Future get-togethers need to include both groups — those stakeholders — so that we can begin to cross that bridge in a more effective way. There is going to be that confrontation before we can actually come to consensus.

5. **BARRY HESSENIUS:** How would the panel define what you think the public's perception is when they hear the words “cultural resources” or “historical preservation?”

DIANE FRANKEL: Those words don't mean very much to the public. They know the museum or exhibit they are going to. We need to put the words in the context of their understanding. I think that it may be very important one on level and unimportant on another level.

DR. DENNIS POWER: I think you are even more removed from “culture” and “history” when you say the words “parks and recreation.” I don't mean that disparagingly. I am just talking about communicating to the average person on the street. I don't know how you capture what you are all about and what you want to be all about with that department name.

DR. GERALD HASLAM: Among the people I grew up with, blue collar people, culture is a moat that must be crossed. It is high culture and it is remote. It has nothing to do with common people. I am afraid that that is the sort of response one gets because, after all these years, I can still go back to my hometown and have people say, “Oh, you got a degree. What do you do with it?” I removed myself from the society by achieving a degree

and I think that that is the same kind of thing that happens in this situation.

KATHRYN WELCH HOWE: In planning for and undertaking the city-wide historic resource survey, we have talked with a number of people. It has been surprising how many people's reaction to the survey of historic resources and the Getty involvement has elicited the question, "Is the Getty going to build another museum? Is it looking for more sites around the city?" That definitely is a first reaction. When they learn it is about properties which may have some merit for just being identified and that the owners of those properties might be aided in maintaining and investing in their properties, they get more interested.

STEADE CRAIGO: This is an excellent question. A lot of people are trying to deal with what to call it. "History" can open the door. Once people are able to go into museums and visit parks or be exposed to history, they begin to understand their culture and that ties into cultural heritage. It's a learning process. That is how it is looked at in State Parks, as part of education and interpretation. It is a means of allowing people to learn what cultural heritage is and how all of us share that cultural heritage together.

6. **LONNIE BUNCH:** I like to raise cautionary note and I hear it often in many of the things we say unintentionally. We suggest that — because groups don't understand our terminology or because their reaction is not the way we expect — somehow these groups are disconnected from history or cultural preservation. The truth of the matter is that groups — community groups, minority groups — have been doing this for generations. And, it is really we who are behind, not those groups. So the real challenge is to think about the conversations we have outside of this room. The truth of the matter is that we have got to expand what we call our historical research — that isn't just what we have done organizationally. It really is having a better sense of how things have happened in other places outside of our own which have been working for years.

7. **DR. CARLOTTA MELLON:** Within the context of some of the other speakers, I want to talk about the process of how you get this common agenda formed and have many tables and many discussions. I think it could be using the central core that exists to tie into those who need to be at the tables. These community groups can begin to organize the dialogue down, which could then come back up. It is complex and there is a lot involved in it, but that may be a way where you pick up on neighborhood groups, like those working with the Getty project, voices of the community that a local museum may be using and then form then millions of stories.

8. **HOLLY FIALA:** One element that seems to be missing from this conversation and perhaps will be raised in subsequent panels is the issue of philanthropy and the lack of private support for preservation. I am not talking about investment but philanthropy. When I work with nonprofits in preservation, I am finding it very difficult to understand why the personal commitment is not being made by board members or individuals. They see it is someone else's responsibility, usually public dollars. We haven't seen as much activity on the foundation side. But I am just perplexed as to why that responsibility to put your own personal dollars down in the private sector with nonprofit organizations seems to be an issue that I have observed over the past few years in California.

STEADE CRAIGO: There is a perception of historic preservation is pretty much house museums. That is the old perception. It is a very dated perception. It is also the sense of elitism — of historic preservation of really being a very "white" effort, especially in communities — which has changed and is changing. Preservation people, even cultural resource people and museums, need to reach out and let people know how historic preservation is working in the communities; how it is providing for affordable housing; how it is providing a better quality of life. I think that by making arguments like that — that historic preservation is good for the community and the economy and there is data showing that — is a way to get support from foundations and board members. At least, it is a start.

WALTER GRAY: I think a related part of this topic is that history is not a good object of philanthropy, generally. Private philanthropy runs in cycles and heritage in general terms has never had its cycle. Right now, for example, most private philanthropy goes to health issues, education, children's issues, at-risk youth. Why? Because there are clear needs that have been explicitly defined, and then powerful advocacy behind those issues. Proponents have demonstrated high levels of organization and integration. Preservationists also don't communicate well enough with each other to collaborate on advocacy. There is an inability to make preservation agenda well enough known and broad enough.

DIANE FRANKEL: Boards are today looking for "impact." What will the impact be on the constituency they are trying to affect. Sometimes, it is just reforming the way you think about what you are trying to do. It is useful to come out with what you are going to change and how are you going to get there. Reframe how you make a statements to make them more compelling and understandable.

KATHRYN WELCH HOWE: The number one issue is that people — the nonprofits — are simply not asking. It is important to ask — and ask big! Organize your programs and package, and position them so that they are clear. There is impact. You know what you are asking from them. You know who else is going to support you.

9. **TOM FRYE:** A little lesson in historic preservation — I live in Oakland which has a lot of old housing stock. About twenty-five years ago as people were trying to repair their old houses, they would often repair them inappropriately, using the wrong materials, modernizing things, taking all of the old features off. City planning staff produced a small volume — *Rehab Right* — that was distributed free to people. It did several things. It told them about the style of house they had and how it came into being, in everyday language. Secondly, it told them where to go to get the materials to restore the property. That democratized historic preservation because it met the real needs of people. When they learned more about their places, they became interested and that led to neighborhood associations. How do we really look to affect the lives of many people. We have to look at the impact of what we do and our language. We have to look at creating something that people can actually need and use. Those little volumes went a long way to accomplish that.

10. **DR. JIM QUAY:** California Council for the Humanities' experience with inclusion/participation is that when we use words like "cultural resources" or "master narratives" or "humanities" that that is language of the Guild. That is not popular language. The Council decided several years ago to use the word "stories" which everyone has. We started out with the notion that "my story is California's story." We did a public survey in which we asked people whether they, or some member of their family, had a story that they thought was part of California's story. Forty-four percent of those surveyed had a story; 99.5 percent of them started telling their story to the surveyor. And, 73 percent of those stories had to do with how and why some member of their family came to California. One of the challenges for historic preservation in this state is that since 1850, there has never been a time when more than 50 percent of the people living in California were born here. In Pennsylvania, for example, 80 percent of the people were born there, so historic preservation has a friendlier reception. "My story is California's story" was shortened to "California's Story." But we were reminded that there are really two California stories. One is the story of how we came to California, and that story tends to be an optimistic story. The native story tends to be one of loss. There is this interesting tension between these two stories. I think that that should be our story. All people are walking archives! They all have stories that need to be preserved. Sometimes they do it in family albums. Ask them to bring their pictures to a library or a museum to put up on the wall as part of an exhibition and all of a sudden their private story becomes validated in some way. There are lots of projects that we could come up with — a common project — that would bring in people for participation and inclusion; add to the larger story; and enable us to contact the public in some way.



THE FUTURE OF CALIFORNIA'S CULTURAL HERITAGE RESOURCES

THE GETTY CENTER LOS ANGELES NOVEMBER 19, 20, 21

WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON

NOVEMBER 20, 2002

"[THE SUMMIT] HAS THE POTENTIAL OF BEING
A DEFINING EVENT IN THE PLANNING PROCESS
OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF A COORDINATED
ARTS AND HISTORY STATE PROGRAM."

– Dr. Lauren Weiss Bricker

LUNCH — KEYNOTES

THE HONORABLE GEORGE RADANOVICH

US House of Representatives

19th District

I would like to thank Ruth Coleman, Acting Director of California Department of Parks and Recreation, for her efforts in bringing together leaders in the Cultural Resources Heritage field to consider the future of historic resources in our state. This is a very important issue in California, and deserves the attention that this meeting brings to preserving and protecting our cultural resources.

I would also like to thank my friend, John Nau, for his leadership in this field. As Chairman of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, John has been designated by our President to lead this effort nationwide. He has a great deal of experience in Texas with historic preservation and tourism; and with his leadership, this experience can be expanded not only to California, but also throughout the country. John, as always, it is a pleasure to share your passion.

It was as a result of my first meeting with John that I began to explore the possibility of helping my home community — Mariposa — to further develop destination tourism.

Mariposa is a small community in the Sierra foothills on the combined Highway 140, the all-weather highway leading into Yosemite Valley, and Highway 49, California's Golden Chain Highway. Mariposa has a very colorful past, as one of the centers of mining during the California Gold Rush. The town was founded in 1850, when Col. John C. Fremont leased his property at the Mariposa Mine to Palmer Cooke and Company, an investment-banking firm. Set at the southern end of the Mother Lode, this mining camp became a town and the county seat of the largest of the original 27 counties — one-fifth the size of California — when California became a state in 1950. Over the next 73 years, the county was divided and divided again to form all or part of twelve new counties of California. This is why Mariposa is known as the Mother of California Counties. The original county ran from Tuolumne County on the north to Los Angeles County on the south, and from the crest of the Coast Range on the west to the Nevada-Utah Territory on the east.

Over a million tourists per year drive through Mariposa on their way to Yosemite Valley or to begin their tour of the Mother Lode. What could this community of 2,000 people do to encourage these tourists to stop, shop, spend the night, and enjoy the wealth of history and beauty of the Sierra foothills?

Serious development of destination tourism in Mariposa was initiated in 1983, when the California State Mineral Exhibit was transferred from San Francisco to Mariposa. To place the collection in its proper perspective, it was transferred to the State Park System and elevated to State Park status. The community, along with state, federal, and private organizations, is currently developing a new, state-of-the-art museum facility in the town of Mariposa.

In addition to the State Mining and Mineral Exhibit, the community's 1854 Courthouse is a classic structure and the oldest courthouse in continuous use west of the Rockies. It still serves as the seat of justice in Mariposa County, a living example of heritage tourism that attracts many visitors to see the continuity and character of our justice system. Mariposa also boasts one of the finest small museums and history centers in the west, with a newly-completed state-of-the-art vault as repository for the documents, photographs, and artifacts of our history. The 1863 St. Joseph's Catholic Church, and 1858 stone jail — now a museum — and any number of other historic homes and commercial buildings are still in use.

Of greatest concern are three of the oldest buildings in downtown Mariposa. Once owned by Mariposa's leading merchant families, these facilities passed to an investor who chose not to protect or restore the buildings. As the consequence of almost 15 years of neglect, these three buildings are desperately in need of restoration and preservation.

The first of these buildings is known as the Trabucco Warehouse. Built in the 1850's, this large brick building housed McDermond and Company, a general store; and over the years, served as a livery stable and warehouse. While all three buildings that I am describing are essentially intact, this building needs serious attention because of a badly sagging wall.

The Fremont Adobe, know previously as the Gold Coin Bar, at first was an adobe building constructed with two commercial spaces. The south space was occupied by Fremont's attorneys, with the second space a Fandango Hall and later a hotel. The back section of this building is a three-story adobe section, said to be the only remaining three-story adobe in California. After the 1866 fire that destroyed over 60 buildings in Mariposa, this adobe building was veneered with brick for further protection. The interior adobe structure still exists and is easily seen. On the interior walls of the building are three large heroic murals painted circa 1900 by Conrad Vejar.

The third building is a two-space brick structure which was constructed in the 1850's for Bogan and Company. It has served many uses over the years, including being the location

of the first Bank of Italy in Mariposa, the Chinese restaurant of Lee Gin, and Mariposa's historic barbershop.

Due to the recent death of the owner of these buildings, they are being placed on the market. Each building requires significant restoration to meet today's historic building codes. These buildings must be held by a group — public or private — which is interested in their welfare or they will disappear, leaving Mariposa, like so many California towns, with little sense of its own history.

To assist this community and the other foothill communities that I represent along the Highway 49 corridor, I have introduced HR 3425, the Highway 49 Heritage Corridor Act. This legislation will require the Secretary of the Interior to study the feasibility and appropriateness of the designation of Highway 49 as a Heritage Corridor where it passes through Madera, Mariposa, and Tuolumne counties. As a designated Heritage Corridor, the affected communities will be encouraged to provide economic development and tourism programs, preservation of historic and cultural values, and other community-identified priorities. Limited federal funds MAY BE made available to assist with such a project. However, we are at least one year away from such designation, which must be followed by the development and approval of community plans. This Corridor will be anchored by the California State Mining and Mineral Museum in Mariposa on the south end and the Columbia State Historic Park in Tuolumne in the north.

Unfortunately, the wonderful historic structures I discussed earlier may soon be sold for private, inconsistent uses; or torn down to make way for new development; or left to deteriorate further. We are working with nonprofit organizations, with John Nau's Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, with the State Historic Preservation Office, and with the State Department of Parks and Recreation to develop plans to avoid these outcomes.

I have outlined the circumstances in Mariposa to highlight the need for coordination of programs to address historic resources on a fast track. Our plea is to those here who are interested in historic preservation for its own value, as well as for the economic development that is brought to communities by the tourism that is created. In a larger sense, this case identifies the urgent need for economic as well as historic incentives for preservation of historic structures.

While the need and opportunity are clearly present in Mariposa, the immediate resources to make it happen are sadly lacking. Mariposa would make an ideal testing ground for preservation efforts and historic tourism development.

In the federal Office of Travel and Tourism Industries' most recent study of inbound travelers, heritage tourism was near the top among activities that travelers do most within our country. Thirty-one percent visited historic sites, 28 percent stopped in small towns and villages, 20 percent toured art galleries and museums, 18 percent sought out cultural sites. Clearly, our economy benefits greatly from heritage and cultural tourism.

Our nation cannot afford to lose its past, not just from the importance that historic structures have to us as a people, but also from the economic value they generate. Travel and tourism is now our nation's fourth largest export — larger than agriculture, consumer goods, or motor vehicles — and it has been generating a travel surplus since 1989. A travel surplus means that international visitors spend more time and money traveling in our country than we spend traveling in their countries. People from abroad visit our nation not just to see its impressive landscape, but to understand our culture and heritage. Increasingly, international travelers are visiting America to more deeply immerse themselves in seeing and understanding our past, whether that be at Colonial Williamsburg, a Greene and Greene craftsman home in Pasadena, a remote California Mission along the central coast, the Chinese Josh House in Weaverville, the Hearst Castle in San Simeon, or — in the near future — the Trabucco Warehouse in Mariposa.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to address such a distinguished group, and I look forward to continuing our efforts together to help my hometown of Mariposa and the rest of California in this important effort.

JOHN L. NAU, III

Chairman

Advisory Council on Historic Preservation

I am honored to join you here today in this magnificent setting — the beautiful Getty Center. We come together here to tackle a very important task — the development of a statewide agenda for the future of California's cultural heritage resources. I comment you all — especially the organizers of this event — on your forethought in organizing this summit to develop a plan for preserving and protecting these resources while also tapping their potential to stimulate the state's economy and educate its citizens and visitors through the vehicle of heritage tourism.

As Chairman of the federal Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) and a businessman, I know such commitment is essential. It is the first step in turning challenge into opportunity.

Many California communities have already begun efforts to develop cultural resources in their area as heritage tourism destinations — efforts that deserve our applause and support. In fact, Congressman George Radanovich is here today and has shared with us the efforts going on in his home district in Mariposa.

Heritage tourism is a win-win opportunity for everyone. Cultural treasures are protected for future generations while communities benefit — economically, culturally, socially, environmentally, and educationally. Significant beneficiaries in Texas and other states are rural areas. Yet, only 26 states have any type of program.

The interest in visiting places that signify our heritage began as the baby boomers became parents. Boomers will become the market for cultural and historical properties. We need to organize to “profit,” integrating assets — national, state, county, and private holdings. We need to give them a reason to come. And, with the events of September 11 [2001], Americans have shown a greater need to connect with places that signify American values.

There are many ways to organize historic preservation and tourism in a big state like California. Many states have chosen to approach historic preservation and tourism on a thematic basis, while others have done so geographically. In a state as large, rich, and diverse as yours, some combination of approaches is likely to be the most successful. Regardless of the approach however, what is being discovered throughout the country is that maximum preservation and economic impact cannot be achieved unless each individual asset is part of an overall plan, one that effectively combines state, local, and federal efforts.

Allow me to share with you a little about the impact of heritage tourism in my home state of Texas — where I have also had the honor of serving as the Chairman of the Texas Historical Commission since 1995. The Texas Historical Commission has promoted heritage tourism through its successful historical marker program since the program began in 1962, and through its Texas Main Street Program, which has revitalized more than 130 downtowns since it began in 1981. But in 1997, the Legislature asked the Texas Historical Commission to begin a statewide heritage tourism program in Texas. Since that time, the Texas Historical Commission has provided regional economic development through its Texas Heritage Trails Program.

Heritage travelers make a particularly strong contribution to the economic vitality of Texas, spending an average of \$29 more per day than non-heritage travelers, and \$1.43 billion annually. Heritage travelers create more than 32,000 jobs for Texans every

year. For every \$1 million expended by Texas heritage travelers, 22 jobs are created and the Gross State Product increases by \$825,000. Economic development and the preservation of historic and prehistoric resources are not the only by-products of the program. Partnerships and an understanding of the power of a regional approach are all outcomes. The travel and tourism industry in Texas is predicted to grow by some 30 percent in the next decade. With care and planning, California could anticipate these kinds of results as well.

The preservation vision of today must be anchored in practical economic reality — there can be no sustainable preservation without it. And, it must be about more than just simply saving quaint old buildings, but also about preserving places and their stories, about preserving the cultures and traditions of regions of the county, and about helping people realize their dreams for a better and economically sustainable quality of life. I hope that such modern preservation tools as National Heritage Areas, Regional Heritage Corridors, Heritage Trails, Scenic Byways, and the National Trust’s Main Street Program can collectively help us achieve those goals.

Since becoming Chairman of ACHP, we have begun to take on a more active role in promoting the public benefits of historic preservation, including heritage tourism, while continuing the critical role of administering the Section 106 Review Process.

As the ACHP turns more of its attention to promoting preservation through federal policy, we are looking to capitalize on partnership opportunities, working with state, tribal, and local governments and the private sector to help people realize the potential of historic properties as national economic assets in addition to their intrinsic values. The ACHP is currently working on options to better recognize and promote such activities. As part of this effort, the ACHP is advocating a new Presidential Executive Order on preserving America’s heritage, emphasizing better care and use of federally-owned historic assets in partnership with others. Given the amount of federal land in the West, I am sure Californians understand this.

Partnerships are the key to successful historic preservation efforts. I urge you to look at all of your resources — whether your local heritage resources are state, county, or privately owned — potential partners exist. Don’t overlook partnerships with federal agencies as a part of your efforts. The National Park Service, Bureau of Land Management, US Forest Service, Department of Defense, and the General Services Administration are all great potential partners for historic preservation projects.

When undertaking any historic preservation project, consider utilizing federal transportation funds. Texas has successfully expanded the definition of what qualifies for TEA-21 fund-

ing. These funds cannot only be used to improve highway infrastructure, but also for things like creating heritage driving trails that move people and stimulate the economy.

In closing, let me remind you that historic preservation is the key to unlocking the economic engine of heritage tourism — yet we know historic preservation alone is not enough — we must reach the public with the story of our treasures. With your help and that of caring citizens in the 49 other states and enthusiastic foreign visitors, we will.

SESSION TWO

WHERE DO WE WANT TO BE IN FIVE TO TEN YEARS?

L. THOMAS FRYE

*Cultural Resources Advisor to the Director
California Department of Parks & Recreation*

*Chief Curator Emeritus of History
Oakland Museum of California*

When in the spring of last year Rusty Areias, Director of State Parks, asked me to help advise and to organize a California Cultural Heritage Summit, little did I imagine the remarkable gathering we are witnessing here at the Getty Center in Los Angeles. Yet Rusty's vision for it to be inclusive; to be representative of California; to be statewide in its breadth; to be multidisciplinary in its focus; to be future-oriented in its charge; and to include major stewards, stakeholders, and scholars of California's cultural heritage resources has been a guiding beacon. That the summit has been heartily embraced and informed by Resources Agency Secretary Mary Nichols, Acting Director of State Parks Ruth Coleman, State Historic Preservation Officer Knox Mellon, and chaired by Chief Deputy Director of State Parks Denzil Verardo, underscores the commitment and importance of this summit at the state level. Yet this is California's summit, co-sponsored by the key heritage organizations in California, shaped by input from many of you, generously hosted by the Getty Trust, and distinguished by your participation over these three days.

When I looked out across this gathering at the stunning Getty Center last evening, I realized how important it is that we have come together. I can't remember when I have been in the presence of the heads of the Resources Agency, State Parks, the State Library, the State Archives, the California Arts Council, the California Humanities Council, the California Historical Society, California Association of Museums, National Park Service, members of Congress and the Legislature, commissioners, trustees, city and county officials, the pre-eminent preservation organization representatives, scholars, funding organization officers, and Clint Eastwood. It is very heartening. There are of course many more who might be here and perhaps should be here, but you represent a very powerful, broadly-based constituency for California's cultural heritage resources. Indeed, given the title of this session, "Where do we want to be in 5-10 years" with California's Cultural Heritage Resources, I cannot imagine that question being answered or implemented without your individual and collective intellect and labors. You will determine, in large measure, the future of California's cultural heritage resources.

My task today is to serve as a provocateur, to offer up some thoughts about where we might go with California's cultural heritage resources in the next five to ten years. It is the task of the roundtable panelists who follow and you as audience to really get to the heart of the matter. I would hope for healthy debate.

Keeping People With Their Heritage

How do we maintain living cultural heritage alongside the much older, tangible historical expressions? Typically, the two become separated; and we end up with historic sites, or monuments, or museums that interpret the past and have little connection to the present. One model challenges that method. The ecomusee or ecomuseum movement, which began on the continent and spread to North America, mostly to Canada and Mexico, serves to strengthen and preserve traditional culture. The resident community itself is a living museum, and remains responsible for what happens there. In this country, most ecomusee-like museums are tribal museums, where living traditions are often represented seamlessly alongside ancient traditions and materials. Ecomuseums are often culturally-specific, although they may also be based on economic factors, such as company towns, or communities formed around an industry. At their center is a dominant ideology of helping the living community survive economically.

This model might apply in California to communities such as Scotia, a company mill town in Northern California where the mill's recent closure is devastating for the community. Here, the ecomuseum model might work. And the living community, utilizing heritage tourism to draw visitors to experience its history and culture, might retain its vitality and residents. Closed military bases, such as the giant aerospace plant in Downey, California, which produced the key vehicles for manned space exploration, might incorporate ecomuseum principles, for there is a large resident population of retired plant employees, and much tangible evidence of the space program remaining at the site. Old Towns, perhaps in such places as Columbia and San Diego, could be explored for ecomuseum components. Rich possibilities exist for important communities connected with farming and farm worker history, ranching, the fishing industry, food processing, outdoor recreation, and still other communities. Working in Sonoma County recently, I was reminded of utopian and counterculture communities, and the influence of places like Morningstar Ranch. Those of you from arts communities will undoubtedly come up with examples from arts and crafts traditions. Our future could be enriched by the development of

community-based ecomuseums, supported by heritage tourism and the opportunity to experience the place with those who made or are descended from those who made history there. Empowering communities to take control and responsibility for presenting the experience of their own story — their history and culture — should be aided and encouraged as we move to the future.

A number of you here have much to teach us about the preservation and interpretation of traditional culture and our living cultural heritage. Filmmakers Felicia Lowe and Paul Espinosa have produced haunting documentary films about the Mexican and Chinese experiences. Folklorists Archie Green and Amy Kitchener have focused on traditional arts and culture — Archie on the lives of working trades people and Amy with her pioneering “Shades of L.A.” project and the Alliance for California Traditional Arts. Writer Gerry Haslam has opened California’s heartland to us with such revealing works as the country music of “Workin’ Man Blues” and “The Great Central Valley: California’s Heartland.” And, I cannot pass up the opportunity to commend writer and publisher Malcolm Margolin for his highly successful efforts to provide bridges of understanding to and from Native California. These are but a few examples.

Our future must also not lose the opportunity to experience traditional skill and technologies first-hand. I think of such places as the water-powered Knight Foundry in Sutter Creek, or the steam-powered Blue Ox Mill in Eureka, or the type foundry and letterpress printing operation of Andrew Hoyem’s Arion Press in San Francisco, or the Angel Flight Railroad in Los Angeles. We must seek to preserve and protect these and other intact skill sets and working technologies for future Californians to experience.

We are learning, sometimes too slowly, that California’s cultural heritage and its resources need to look more like California and its people. California looks quite different today than before the Historic Preservation Act of 1966, a period which SHPO Knox Mellon describes as one of “Missions, Mansions, Monuments, and Museums.” The former remain important. But we now include and embrace such resources as cultural landscapes, sacred sites, heritage corridors — one of which, Highway 49, you heard about from Congressman Radanovich — historic districts, and neighborhoods, resources reflecting the powerful events and influences of 20th Century California and Californians, and our less tangible folklore and folklife traditions. Looking to the future again, an annual California Folklife Festival, for example, would provide a stage for our diverse and vibrant folk traditions, many of which must be performed and experienced to be preserved. The language of Proposition 40, and recently signed AB 716, reflect many of these new possibilities. We must continue to fill in the gaps, for we have a lot of catching up to do in the years ahead.

Gaining Access to Our Heritage

When I first met Rusty Areias and heard his vision for sharing the mammoth resources of State Parks, he waved his arms and shouted, “Let’s get those museum collections out of storage. Put them on our historic trains and send them out all over California! Let’s open up State Parks!” Railroad Museum Director Cathy Taylor needs to weigh in on that scenario, but there is no doubt in my mind that we need to provide public access to those treasures — and anti-treasures — we hold in public trust. I cut my teeth on the vast subterranean collections of the Lowie Museum, now the Phoebe Hearst Museum, at U.C. Berkeley; and went on to work with and expand the cultural history collections of the Oakland Museum of California. Collections of great magnitude and significance exist across the state of California, and most are inaccessible to the public, except through special exhibitions and to “qualified researchers.” Of course, preservation and security issues are critical to collections, but can we not think of a future where they can be shared more widely?

A quick story. Some 20 years ago we did a documentation and exhibition project at Oakland focusing on our founding collections — Native American and pioneer California collections field collected by curator Charles Wilcomb early in the 20th Century. We had intriguing sketchy hints of information about Indian rancherias and communities in California where Wilcomb collected, but often no names or incomplete names. So we took back baskets and other cultural material into the field, to those communities, to try to find living descendants of the makers or anyone with knowledge about them. I remember going to a community in Northern California, and laying the baskets out in a local community hall. A number of Native Americans came to look at the objects. Suddenly one woman picked up a large basket, wrapped her arms around it and hugged it. With tears in her eyes she said, “This is my grandmother’s basket, and I feel I am holding her in my arms.” She was a weaver, and she was able to recognize her grandmother’s weaving. That moment — that reunion — revealed the power of cultural objects to connect people over generations. And, I promise you, we hold the possibility of many such moments of recognition and reunion in our collections.

Should we not make a promise to ourselves and to our constituents to make our subterranean treasures more accessible in the future? How can we do it? I submit there are many ways. One is to get our collection data and images digitized and make them available on the Web. Many museums, archives, and libraries are already doing that. We must continue and encourage this effort. But what about the face-to-face encounters with the real thing — maybe including those critical hugs. Rusty’s idea of putting them on the road is a good

one. If Cathy will put me on the old California Zephyr or the Shasta Daylight, I'll go anywhere with the collections. But there are still other ways. Can we not lend whole collections back to regions where they originated and have the greatest meaning? Local museums, cultural centers, and libraries are prime candidates to display and utilize them. Can we not occasionally consider transferring them back to such institutions on a permanent basis, especially if they are considered out-of-field in our institutions? There is also the possibility of creating regional collection centers, bringing together stored materials bearing on the region, using existing institutions as host, and providing public access to these materials.

We can and do develop traveling exhibitions to serve California. We should aim, in my view, to expand that effort. One example. The Oakland Museum produced three exhibitions for the sesquicentennial of the California Gold Rush, and circulated all of them in California. Dennis Power knows best that it took over well over three million dollars to produce the exhibitions, the books, the programs, and the curriculum material for California's schools. Exhibitions of that magnitude can only occur at infrequent intervals. But it wasn't just dollars that made it possible. The gold rush exhibitions — especially "Gold Fever" — could not have happened without the cooperation and partnership of many of you here. Janet Fireman at the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County opened her storage vaults and her galleries and gave us carte blanche, an astonishingly generous feat. More than 90 other lenders across California and the nation contributed, leading to an exhibition of over 1600 objects and 10,000 square feet. This became California's exhibition, not just Oakland's exhibition, and many people across California could rightfully call it theirs. Indeed, the exhibition is still accessible on the museum's web site. A small version of "Gold Fever" still travels through the California Exhibition Resources Alliance (CERA) traveling exhibition network. Curriculum materials remain available to schools across California. The books can be purchased in many places. And, a consortium of groups and agencies in Sacramento is exploring the installation of a permanent exhibition there based on "Gold Fever." It grew legs. A lesson for the future: by collaborating, partnering, and sharing collection and intellectual resources, we can create and make widely-available important exhibitions and programs on a scale that would be unthinkable attempting it alone. If we partnered to seek and share financial resources, such exhibitions and cultural heritage projects could almost certainly be produced much more frequently for California in the future.

Bigger is by no means better. One model for the future is already here. CERA, a traveling exhibition program serving small and mid-size museums, libraries, art and cultural centers is now, I believe, circulating eight exhibitions with

plans to have twelve in circulation soon. CERA began at the California Council for the Humanities under Jim Quay's direction; and it has recently become an independent non-profit. Guided with great devotion by Joan Irvine Smith and James Swinden, the Irvine Museum is another model for the future. Its stunning exhibitions and publications on California Impressionism are circulated and shared widely with the public, both within and beyond California. Their successful efforts at reaching out to collaborate with other institutions have earned them high praise.

Let me take a moment to acknowledge the key role played by financial supporters of California cultural heritage projects, as many of you are present at this summit. What would we do without the support of the National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities, the Institute for Library and Museum Services, the State Legislature, the California State Library, State Parks, the Office of Historic Preservation, the California Arts Council, the California Council for the Humanities, the James Irvine Foundation, the Los Angeles Conservancy, the Getty Trust, and many other agencies and nonprofits represented here. We also depend on corporate support and that of our friends and patrons. If California's cultural heritage resources are to have a future as well as a past, your collective continued support of them is absolutely critical. Help us build understanding of our cultural heritage resources as vital to the health and well being of our people.

Preservation and "Deferred Maintenance"

Regrettably, the words "deferred maintenance" have become a way of life in California, and our cultural heritage resources have been hit especially hard. The statewide historic sites and structures of State Parks are suffering especially, given the lack of funding. Many agencies and organizations are eager to acquire new sites, structures, landscapes, and museum, archive, and library collections. But once acquired, their preservation and maintenance is not assured, as declining budgets shift priorities to other areas. Yet we are first and foremost the stewards of these resources, keepers of the public trust. Many of you can relate horror stories attributable to deferred maintenance. We have a severe crisis, and what can we do about it as we look to the future? On the plus side, it is fitting that we speak of these threats to our heritage here at the Getty Center, where our welcome came from Tim Whalen, head of the Getty Conservation Institute. Tim and the Getty Conservation Institute have provided us with unstinting commitment to development of new preservation and conservation methods to help safeguard our cultural heritage treasures. The Getty's preservation and conservation research and reports; its support of preservation surveys and treatments; its leadership training of museum administrators through its unequalled Museum Management Institute; and its publications, such as the recent, "Looking for Los Angeles:

Architecture, Film, Photography, and the Urban Landscape,” which focuses directly on cultural heritage expressions in Los Angeles — all this gives us sustenance. Tim, we are very grateful to you and the Getty for your generous assistance. The Getty is a shining beacon of light.

While the Getty provides us with a measure of hope, the bottom-line for the future of many of our cultural heritage resources is very grim. Continuation of existing patterns of deferred maintenance will result in the loss of, or irreparable damage to, many significant cultural resources in the next five to ten years. Many historic structures and collections under our collective stewardship are decaying — literally falling apart. What will we do? What can we do? Let’s first make sure the materials can pass the acid test of importance. And then we must ask ourselves the critical question of whether we are the best repository for the materials. If we are not, and can’t care for them, consider placing them with another institution. Or consider a partnership or joint powers agreement with another agency, such as we find with some historic structures under joint private nonprofit and governmental agency control. I need not tell you here the drill of building public support and advocacy for cultural heritage resources; and seeking gifts, grants, “angels,” in-kind services, and volunteer support to patch together solutions. What I am saying is that we must not let up in these difficult economic times. We must build the cases, the public support, and use our advocacy organizations and our collective voice to find the dollars to protect our resources. If we fail — and failure will occur — we must at least try to “mothball” or “deepfreeze” the endangered resources to protect them until help and new solutions can be found. One tool could help us.

Register of California’s Most Endangered Cultural Heritage Resources

“Here today, gone tomorrow” have become bywords and calls to action for cultural heritage resources threatened with destruction. The National Trust for Historic Preservation publishes a roster of the nation’s most endangered sites, and California, not surprisingly, has found itself on that list. What is needed for the future, I would suggest, is a *Register of California’s Most Endangered Cultural Heritage Resources*, a Register that would include the range of cultural materials that brought us together at this Summit. Whether the Register would list by typology — structures, landscapes, collections, archaeological sites, etc. — or be combined would be determined by further discussion and development of the concept, and through meetings with various stakeholder groups and agencies. Perhaps the Register would have gradations of endangerment. Criteria for inclusion in the Register would need to be developed, and an elected or appointed body would be required to determine additions or deletions to

the Register. The administrators of the Register would require sufficient authority and independence to act in the best interest of California’s cultural heritage resources. Whether such a Register could be located within a governmental agency, the Office of Historic Preservation for example, would depend on a number of factors, not the least of which would be its required independence, and whether its broad tapestry of resources would fit comfortably in the structure and functions of such an agency or office. Perhaps a better home would be with a coalition of nonprofit advocacy organizations, many of which are represented here at this summit. Make no mistake, this Register would not be for passive contemplation. It would almost certainly exist as a clarion call for debate and action, and the posting of a cultural heritage resource on the Register could likely be a source of controversy itself. A newsletter or bulletins could broadcast its findings to a broad public. Could we raise the visibility of our endangered cultural heritage resources and bring about positive outcomes through the Register?

Structuring our Future Leadership

Walt Gray has given us a revealing chronology of California’s efforts to come to grips with its history and cultural heritage. The fragmentation he documents may be discomfiting and unfortunate, but I would submit it follows the larger pattern of the California experience itself. Californians have been characterized as being individualistic, unruly, entrepreneurial, dreamers, willing to try anything, accustomed to failure and starting over, disrespectful of traditions, focused on the good life, hooked on their automobiles and independence, and skeptical of government. Is it any wonder that we have variously tried to split the state, tried to split the state again, tried to annex our neighbors, sought to secede from our neighbors, invited people to move to California, sought to keep people from moving to California, fought with our neighbors who don’t look and speak as we do, and come together in model communities of racial, ethnic, and cultural harmony? We fragment behind different drummers. It’s a California thing. These seeming paradoxes fit the pattern of California, and provide a broader context perhaps for understanding the seismographic chart of heritage efforts described by Walt Gray.

Perhaps more than anything else, what unites us as Californians are our perceptions of the California Dream. Kevin Starr, in his evolving series of books on the California Dream, has held up a looking glass for us to see ourselves. At its core, the Dream is the promise of the good life. The promise is one of opportunity, freedom, health, sunshine, and romance. These promises and expectations keep us going. But how we variously might define them is the stuff of scholarly summits, polite dinner parties, and bar brawls. So if as Californians our approach to our history and cultural heritage

has been fragmented from statehood, if not before, and our character one of paradoxes and divisions, why the hell are we here? Maybe our Humpty Dumpty of heritage is beyond even Tim Whalen's repair. Should we feast on the Getty's marvelous hospitality and go home and forget about the future of California's cultural heritage resources? No, let's take another approach. Let's use this Summit, the polite dinner conversations, even the bar brawls as long as you take off your nametag and avoid the Getty's backyard.

I've outlined a few brief hypothetical scenarios to get some discussion going:

1. We do more of what we've been doing — as much good cultural heritage work in our communities, organizations, agencies, and institutions as we can, competing for scarce dollars and resources, seizing opportunities, and keeping a wary eye on our neighbors.
2. We do the all of the above, but we add to our cosmology and modus operandi the inclusion of some of our neighbors, or colleagues, or even some risky strangers to work with us, hiding our selfish motives in hopes that together we can get more of what we want.
3. We discover that some of our neighbors, colleagues, and the strangers turn out to be more trustworthy than our barber; and that collaborations, partnerships, “share-sies,” and even mergers get the job done much better than we could alone, making (most) everybody happy.
4. We discover that the Big Kahunas like the Resources Agency, State Parks, Office of Historic Preservation, State Library, State Archives, State Arts Council, California Council for the Humanities — fill in the blank of others — all have something to offer us as stand-alone entities; but we get Judge Judy to summon all of them to her courtroom to get them to talk to each other and be grilled on what they might do for California's cultural heritage working in collaboration.
5. Mindful of the threat of being summoned again to Judge Judy's courtroom, we have the Big Kahuna agencies explore with their constituents and with each other the structural, functional, and leadership questions — including money — that would need to be part of any solutions. Hmm, maybe we should have Judge Judy there after all.
6. We celebrate our new unity and join hands with Judge Judy and Judy and Toto and head off down the yellow brick road and live happily ever after.

Well, we have to keep the California Dream alive!

A Prescription for the Future

The declining General Fund public monies for cultural heritage, coupled with periodic

cargo cult bond funding, has led to uncertainty, increased competition, frenzied behavior, and even unseemly squabbles, as Walt Gray has pointed out. Will our future continue to be one of hardscrabble competition? Will restructuring state government and creating a new agency give us more than a costly bureaucracy? Does the current effort of now signed but unfunded AB 716 live up to its substantial rhetoric? Could any one of the existing state agencies effectively assume the mantle of leadership and authority to function as the overarching keeper of California's cultural heritage flame? Could a coalition of state cultural heritage agencies working together constructively and collaboratively, informed by all of us, come up with better ways of delivering the goods and services we Californians need? Believe me, there are bright, committed, hard-working people in these agencies.

It is precisely this need for a common agenda that brought us together. Our failure to produce one will keep us apart. Today, even more than 18 months ago when Rusty outlined his vision, we need to begin a serious dialogue to create that common agenda for the future of California's cultural heritage resources. You here have the right stuff. Leadership is required. If we fail, more and more of our irreplaceable cultural heritage resources will be lost in history's La Brea Tar Pits. It's time to roll up our sleeves and get to work.

SESSION TWO

WHERE DO WE WANT TO BE IN FIVE TO TEN YEARS?

Roundtable Discussion

STEVE MIKESELL

Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer

My vision of where historic preservation should be in ten years has everything to do with partnerships. Partnering is a newly-fashionable term for what the Office of Historic Preservation has done all along. The Office has never preserved anything alone. It has always operated in partnerships to get things accomplished — with our local governmental partners through our California Heritage Fund grant program; with our private partners through our tax incentives for rehabilitation; with our federal partners through the regulatory process; and so forth. My vision then is not to begin partnering, but to find new and more effective types of partnerships.

Let me propose three: a regular source of funding for grants to local entities; a state tax incentive to complement the successful federal tax program; and a state program for promoting heritage tourism.

The first proposal is simply a continuation of our existing work with local government and nonprofits — but with a twist. Grants today are funded episodically, whenever there is a Park Bond approved. My thought is to do what Nevada and a few other states do, and that is to issue bonds that allow for annual or biennial awards allowing local agencies to depend upon this source of money and to begin to program preservation activities accordingly.

The second proposal mimics what is done in dozens of other states; and that is to provide a state tax credit for rehabilitation costs, similar to the existing federal tax incentive. This could be restricted to commercial properties, as is the federal tax credit, in hopes that the double incentives would multiply the pace of rehabilitation for income-producing properties. Or, it could be extended to homeowners as well. They are probably the most numerous custodians of our heritage and literally don't get any credit for that.

The final idea is something that various states are just beginning to explore and which John Nau spoke about in Texas: explore a case for the State taking the lead in promoting heritage tourism. We know that visitors are flocking to our historic sites, as one part of California's massive tourism industry. What is missing is a kind of "Good Housekeeping Seal of Approval" for historic sites. The public yearns for authenticity but doesn't necessarily know how to find it. They need a list

of genuine historic resources. I believe that such a list already exists. It is called the National Register of Historic Places. And, I believe there is also already a list of extraordinary California historic sites. They are called State Historic Parks. My vision is that somehow State Parks, which is the custodian of the great historic parks; the Office of Historic Preservation, which is the custodian of the National Register; and the Travel and Tourism Commission, which is responsible for the entire tourism program, could get together and craft a workable program to promote authentic tourist destinations for the confirmed heritage tourists. This may be the most feasible of my three proposals.

These are new types of partnerships that I see are worth pursuing over the next ten years. Is it ambitious to think we can accomplish all of this in ten years? Yes. Is it feasible? Yes, but only if such proposals were to be supported by a broad array of heritage organizations, not just preservationists.

That brings me to my final point — my vision of a common agenda means that we are all partners in a big cultural heritage field. A common agenda means working together to support the distinctly different needs of each partner — each of us defending the needs of all of the others.

CINDY LAMARR

Executive Director

Capitol Area Indian Resources

I am Pitt River and Paiute from Northern California. I am the Director of a nonprofit agency based in Sacramento for the educational and cultural needs of American Indian community — it is okay to say "American Indian." I know that sometimes we want to be politically correct. I was born an Indian and that's what I am going to be.

I am going to get real specific in my comments. I have heard about generalities and how we need to maintain our cultural resources and historic resources, but I am going to talk about the California Indian Cultural Center and Museum. Steade Craig had a great, different name for it this morning, and I thought that is an idea. He called it the California Indian Heritage Museum. We are still in the planning phase. I guess I could be called someone at the grassroots level, although I consider myself an Indian professional. When the talks about this museum began, I was five years old. So obviously I wasn't one of the ones talking then. It was 42 years ago. The State Indian Museum in Sacramento is in the shadow of Sutter's

Fort. There has always been talk of it being inadequate, too small, insufficient, and in an inappropriate place. We have talked and talked and talked. We have done feasibility studies and have gone on and on. There have been appropriations that have come and gone or have been used. And, 42 years later, we are still talking about it.

Last year, we started talking about doing something about it. The Indian community has heard it before. They have gotten excited. They have gotten discouraged. They just say to wait and see what happens. Things have to happen in their own time and we need to move forward with this. We are fortunate in having gotten legislation in SB 2063, to establish a Task Force for the cultural center. I call it a cultural center because, to me, “culture” is living and “museum” is artifacts behind glass. So we want to make sure that we acknowledge that Indian people are still alive today, even though what has happened in our history. To move that forward, State Parks has been very cooperative.

But there has to be the involvement of the Indian community — without that there won't be a museum or cultural center. If they get discouraged, they will just go away. Indian people do that. We don't rant and rave. You just won't hear from us again. That is part of our culture.

In the next five to ten years, what do we do? I see in five years that we will have the primary building. We will have the siting, with the involvement of the California Indian community. We will move forward — it is the worst financial times, but I think it can be done, if it is the right thing to do. There was talk about involving gaming tribes, but we need to make sure that we do this right. Gaming tribes are where they are because they worked hard for it. We need to make sure that state government keeps involved and helps, as well as private foundations.

We can do this, and it will be the gem of the nation. I travel throughout the country, and I know that people look to California — as all of you do — for what is happening, what movement we are making. California has the largest Indian population in the country. So, we will get this done and we want to make it the best — for us and for our children, the Indian children — to balance the history of what happened to California Indian people and to let children make their own decisions as to what happened. There was some terrible history. How do we acknowledge that without making people feel defensive? I think that kids can make their own decisions in that. We need your help.

STEPHEN BECKER

Executive Director

California Historical Society

I am the grandson of a Socialist-Jewish chicken farmer from Petaluma — that is a different tribe. As a Californian, I was pleased that last night Kevin Starr reminded us that with this group we were in the process, once again, of assembling California — this reference to how we might all be small tectonic plates, colliding, and possibly recreating our own collective consciousness in our own land. The question is can we shape an interesting and dynamic future together. Or, will we experience just another California earthquake in these sessions. The shape will once again define us, but possibly defy us. Or, can we as colleagues join forces and forge something better and something new.

In thinking about the question of where should we end up — where would we envision ourselves in five to ten years — being in the “history game,” I thought that it might be useful to look back a little bit about where we were five or ten or more years ago. Then think about if we were looking forward from that point, would we have seen ourselves where we are today? I think that we were very hopeful ten, fifteen, twenty years ago; and that it is through an examination of our own work and our own collective professional history and our professional memory that we can judge ourselves — take a look at our successes and our too many failures. And, look at our own deferred maintenance for ourselves and our too-busy lives.

I had a memory of a meeting similar to this one some twenty years ago in Santa Barbara of at the time so-called — and we are still calling ourselves this from time to time — public historians. We were concerned about our common future and common agenda. Out of that conference came the California Committee for the Promotion of History, which has changed its name but still lives on today. We thought of ourselves at that time as the “pros,” the stewards of this new public work in history. CCPH still lives on, but I am not sure if we have met the challenge of engaging ourselves continually as leaders from the worlds of archivists, and historic preservation people, and museum people. The fact is that many of us now have abandoned our duty to communicate with one another. This meeting, then, can be very important as a means of reviving us and helping us sustain our energy.

Communication is obviously a real key. We find ourselves in fragmentation or balkanization. We need to work hard on synthetic thinking — on thinking together. The other thing that we have to strive for inside of our lives as Californians is to seek a high stature and high profile for the work. If we can explain what we do to our grandmothers, then we are probably doing okay. If not, we had better think again. I think

that there is a way that we can make that explanation. We have to simplify our language. We have to make our message clear, but there is no denying our core optimism and our core devotion to what we do.

Of course, that troublesome word “funding” comes up. There was a catch phrase a few years ago that stuck with me and still does. It is the phrase “public-private partnership.” It never sat well. It still doesn’t sit well. Now that the economy is sinking and the private end starts to disappear, I worry about why we were seduced by that phrase. I think it was an anti-government kind of thinking. I am in the private sector, but I believe in government. I believe in the kind of agency that pulled this meeting together. And, I enjoy the idea of our pursuing community through what we can do through government.

Government is just another form of using the word “community,” so I worry about that phrase “public-private.” It’s jargon. Let’s dump it. It is a buzz-word from our past and we have to get to another place.

I think what we need to do in California is to engage all kinds of new institutions. One of the ones that has been alluded to is a California version of an IMS — now an IMLS. Diane Frankel is a great resource for us with her experiences at the federal level in pulling it together.

And finally what we need to do of course, is to make sure that our vision is connected with a promise, and that we hold to our promises. We have to make good on those promises and really work harder to finish those priority projects that we have had waiting for so long. I was struck by the last line in the Angel Island video this morning that “lessons forgotten are lessons unlearned.” We have our own lessons that we’ve experienced ourselves. My feeling is that we have to keep our vision, but we also have to keep our promises.

LONNIE BUNCH

President

Chicago Historical Society

There is nothing more dangerous than giving an historian a microphone and a captive audience and asking him to brief. You might ask why the President of the Chicago Historical Society is here? Well the truth of the matter is that it was snowing when I left — but the real reason I am here is in part because I am haunted by California, haunted by the power of the story of this state, haunted by the possibilities that is California. In some ways, I am haunted by the words of W.E.B. DuBois, the great African-American leader who first came to California in 1913. When he traveled around the state, he visited the African-American communities. He went to homes and churches. He went to the University of Southern California to give a lecture. And, when he went back

to New York, he wrote, “out there in that matchless southern California, there is no limit to your possibilities, your opportunities.” I would argue that even today, there is no better place than California to understand what it means to be an American and what it meant to be an American. There is no better lens than the history and culture of this state to view the promise and the pitfalls of American life. And, there is no better culture than California to find the optimism, the edginess, and resiliency that American so sorely needs today.

Let me quickly frame what I think are a few challenges that this group must wrestle with if truly we want to be in a place five or ten years from now where we have fulfilled our promises.

- The first challenge is simply finding value in the past. Everyone in this room believes in the power of history, believes in the power of culture. Everyone in this room can tell stories about the transformative power of history, but not everyone in California believes that. Not everyone in California understands — especially the way we frame it — the importance and the centrality of culture. I would argue that it is crucial that this endeavor start by explicitly wrestling with ways to help all people in this state see the value of these efforts. It is not enough to say that we are doing “God’s work.” It is not enough to say we are good people fighting the good fight. We have to explicitly show why this fight is everyone’s fight. I would argue that one of our goals ought to be to give people tools by using history and culture — tools that allow them to really live their lives more effectively. I would argue that Americans, as a people, revel in simple answers to complex questions. I would suggest that if we use the cultural resources of this state, we can help Americans — help Californians — do two things that are crucial to their success. One is to embrace complexity and second, which is even more challenging, is to embrace ambiguity. In some ways that is what the California story is about. But, ultimately I would argue that our goal ought to be to help people understand the words of James Baldwin. He once wrote, “We must help people remember that history is more about today and tomorrow than it is yesterday.” It seems to me that that ought to be a way that we look at the challenge to create.

- Secondly, we wrestle with the challenge of what I call “integration.” One of the greatest strengths of California as you know is its diversity, but it is also obviously one of the greatest challenges to this endeavor. How do we create a structure — create an opportunity — that allows every culture to be honored, preserved, and visible while recognizing that there is no longer — and I never use this term “master narrative” because it has real meaning for me — the kind of narrative we once had. I would suggest, however,

that it is crucial that this endeavor find the courage not to fall back to the simple solution. The simple solution is to embrace the notion of separate silos, of exploring the multiplicity of cultures in a kind of separate but equal way. In some way, that's the kind of history — that's the kind of interpretation — that was crucially important in the 1950's and 1960's when it was important to say these people "fill in the blank" are here as well. But this is not the 1950's. It is not the 1960's. What we really need is to craft a history that breaks down those silos. One that helps us understand that, yes, there are deep separate stories that we want to know more about; but we also need to know the interaction, the compromises, the cultural barring, the conflict that comes from that. That is what will give people the kind of story that means something to them. In essence, our goal for integration ought to be to make sure that the work we do has a contemporary resonance, that the stories of the past are really the stories of the present and stories of the future. In some ways, our challenge is to move beyond simple acknowledgement and simple discovery to get to a more complex history that really gives people useful stories for the world they live in. I think a great deal about something that happened about twenty years ago. Bill Berry and I worked together up in Allensworth. I was really struck last night thinking about our time together there; and thinking about a conversation we once had. We talked a lot about the importance of Allensworth. It helped us both realize that Allensworth wasn't just an African-American story, but that the history of the Colonel and the history of the colony were quintessential California, quintessential American, stories. It made me realize the power and the possibility we could create if we take those stories like Allensworth and make them accessible, to let people realize that Allensworth has as much meaning for new residents who don't speak English as it does for pioneering families.

- Third, your challenge is concretizing this initiative. By that I mean, that if we are going to find the North Star that we talked about last night, this endeavor really does need a sense of center. It needs to figure out what the framework is, what are the points that people can point towards to say this different. Not that it is rejecting the different institutions that are working on this, but it gives people a target to look at. I would argue that those targets ought to be regional centers or regional collaborations. These regional collaborations should be more than simply clearinghouses. They ought to be beacons of possibility, beacons of change, beacons of opportunity. These regional centers can help with fundraising issues. They can help determine future collaborations. But most importantly, they give a sense of reality to this initiative.

- Finally I would suggest that one of our greatest challenges ought to be the challenge of youth. In my old neighborhood in North Jersey, we always said that when people turned 50, they find God and history. While 50 may not be too late to find God, it's too late find history. I would suggest that we have to develop a layer that invites young people to revel in, to understand, to find useful, to find meaningful the stories of California's past. There are wonderful projects around this country where teenagers are being used in creative ways to explore the history. There are brilliant projects like the Smithsonian Early Enrichment Center that takes preschool kids and helps them revel in the past. So, it's not like we have to invent it from scratch. In some ways, a part of the challenge of youth is for us to recognize that there are a lot of other partners out there that we can work with like the universities.

Let me end by simply saying that you have great opportunity to help people talk about and understand the value the past. That value — that lesson — came for me early in my career when I was not in Southern California but in South Carolina working on a book on the history of slavery. I was on an old rice plantation and I found a ninety-year old man, Mr. Johnson, who had lived in a slave cabin with a slave grandmother. He began to tell me the story as we walked around the cabin. He talked about what the slaves did in the front of the cabin, how they extended their living room outside. He talked on one side about the slaves worried about the chimney catching on fire. As we walked to the back, he talked about how his grandmother and other slaves grew food to supplement what the masters gave them. Then we walked to the fourth side — rather I walked, he wouldn't. I said, "Mr. Johnson, what happened over here?" He said that he wasn't coming over there. I said, "What is it? Is it something special? Tell me about it." He said, "Rattlesnakes over there." After I stopped running, I said to Mr. Johnson, "Why didn't you tell me?" And he said, "Everybody around here knows the history of that spot." And then he said words that I have never forgotten — "Boy, not knowing your history can hurt you."

TERRI KNOLL

Executive Director

California Association of Museums

For those of you who may not know, the California Association of Museums (CAM) is the statewide organization representing the interests of museums in the state of California, which we estimate at over 1300 museums. Museums in this sense are interesting because we overlap into all of these different areas — the art world with art museums, the history world, the preservation world in that many of our museums are housed in historic sites. For the last three years, CAM has been working actively on behalf of museums in

the state to educate public policy makers and opinion makers about the importance of museums and then eventually hoping to assist them in enhancing the services they provide to the citizens of the state. Throughout these three years, it became apparent very quickly that there were some larger issues at stake in addition to trying to get funding for museums. We realized that in our state there is a lack of cultural policy. We have all acknowledged the vital agencies and departments that assist us, but there is no overriding agency or program that is directing us. From the museum point of view, we are interested in a cultural heritage policy; but would also like to push the envelope and widen and broaden that idea to talk about a “cultural” policy in our state — one that would include the arts, the humanities, museums of all disciplines. I would like to see a cultural policy that raises the level of our issues to the forefront in the legislature. And again, I think this is really a political issue.

I do not need to go into the value of culture because that would be preaching to the choir. We all know what essential services we provide to the residents and visitors of our state. The public knows it too, as we recently learned from the California Arts Council public opinion survey. They know it to a certain extent, but we still need to engage our public more, to educate them about how valuable we all are. Certainly, we have not done a good job with our opinion makers and public policy makers and until we get together and do that we won't be able to establish a cultural policy in our state.

It is our responsibility to raise this issue to the forefront. We need end the short-sightedness and begin talking about an all-encompassing, long-term, visionary solution to elevate the importance of California's culture and the institutions that represent it. We need to create a vital infrastructure to support and conserve the diverse cultural traditions and history of California. We need to support culture in a fair and equitable manner with a long-term plan for distribution of State funds — one that will benefit our children and grandchildren over the next forty years and more — not just fast-track spending that we have unfortunately seen over the last few years.

We need a policy in the state that will unify and integrate, not divide and fragment. That is inclusive, not exclusive. One that will lead toward cooperation not fragmentation. The best metaphor is an umbrella of culture under which all of the sectors or disciplines are housed — the arts; humanities; history; cultural heritage; multicultural efforts; film; and museums, some of which are art, others history, science, or technology-related. In Florida, they have a Cultural Affairs Department. We learned today about Louisiana and its Cultural Resources Department. Fragmenting the various agencies and departments has not served us well — or not well enough.

We should try to do better in that area. California, being the large state that it is and having the great number of cultural resources, should a leader in this area.

We cultural enthusiasts have been lacking in the area of advocacy and political organization. We have been fragmented, disunified, often times uninterested, and thus fairly unsuccessful in driving the development of strong cultural policy in our state. This has to change in order for us to go forward. We cannot expect a broad and enveloping policy if we cannot envision ourselves as members of a broader constituency. I challenge all of us to work together to take action as a unified body and work toward developing a cultural policy that reflects the strength and diversity of our service to California. We can seize the opportunity now, especially with Proposition 40. CAM was enthusiastic about the cultural and historical endowment mentioned in AB 716, not so much the specifics about the endowment but the fact that there was some conversation about vision and long-term consideration of our cultural resources. I would challenge all of us to move in a direction of constructing an entity envisioned for the future and not just bring funds and short-term programming to our community.

In five years, we should have a well-defined, pro-active, politically sophisticated, organized, unified, financially dedicated, networked constituency representing all sectors of the cultural community. This unified cultural community will have crafted its message and actively presented it to the state administration and legislature — also engaging the public — and set in place a comprehensive policy that represents, supports, and enhances the services that this cultural community provides to the greater community. This will take a lot of work and consultation, but gatherings like this are the first step. I think that if we can work together this is something that we can achieve.

BARRY HESSENIUS

Director

California Arts Council

Let me summarize a little from one perspective. The arts and the humanities heritage fields — or whatever words I should be using to include the whole agenda that we have been talking about — are very similar. There are some differences. I think in some ways, arts may be a little bit further on the continuum; and in other ways, somewhat behind. But, we both have wonderful products. We are both really part of a larger whole. I think that humanities have a little bit more of an image problem than we do. If the arts are perceived somewhat as elitist, then you are really perceived as elitist. You aren't even classical music, you are a discussion of classical music. No, you are the history of the discussion of classical music, in which case you are perceived as elitist. 99.9 percent

of the public has no idea what the hell you are talking about. They really don't. But in large part, they don't know what the arts are either. You are way beyond them. They have no idea what you are talking about. That is your first issue. In the next five to ten years, that has to be addressed and it has to be addressed on their terms, not on your terms. They have to be shown what many people have been saying this morning that there is value in history and preservation and in heritage of what California is.

I like what Tom [Frye] said about who Californians are — we are entrepreneurs, we are this, we are that — and that is really the essence of what this heritage is all about. Who is a Californian? What is a Californian? In the time that I have been fortunate to travel around the world, California still has a global cache of having a magic image in people's eyes. They have an idea — some of them still think we are cowboys. But to most people, creativity has always been keen in California. That is where you go where new things happen. It is no accident that Hollywood and the high tech revolution — the computer revolution — had their genesis here. It is not an accident that television was invented in California, or that the gay revolution or the hippie revolution or the beat generation all started here. This is a place where people around the world have the idea that it is a magic place. You go here to have your dream come true. It is the California dream.

But the music played behind that dream is the Paul Anka song, "My Way." Californians not only want the dream, but they do it their way — I did it my way here — not someone else's way, not by somebody else's rules. And, that is the image that the history is, how we get to that point. That is what you are selling, but you have to be better salesmen at it. So far, on both levels — as the public relations sense or the selling of the value of what you have, the public value of what you have — you haven't done a great job, any more than the arts have done a very good job. We are trying to do better.

On the advocacy sense, you have done really a very poor job just like the arts. The bottom line is that someone said earlier that money isn't really the issue. Well, it solves the money problem. And, the money problem is one of the real big problems. Just like the arts, you people are — my guess is --understaffed, overworked, and underpaid. Where are the future people who will be sitting in these chairs in your positions going to come from? We can't compete for them with salaries in the arts. I doubt that you can either, and they are not going to get into our fields.

Money is critical in my opinion. For the first time in history, arts and culture are part of the same economic pot. Of the five revenue streams that support arts and culture, which are earned income, government funding, corporate financing,

foundations, and individual philanthropic donors, all five are in decline simultaneously for the first time. It has never happened before — two or three may have been down, but another would pick them up. On the other hand, we have never had such proof of what a great product we have, on anybody's level. The value to kids' education and why the things that heritage and culture and arts impart to them are just as important as skills such as math or science or reading or writing is significant. What is the value of learning to read or write if you can't think? That won't do you any good in the 21st Century world. We have to sell that message.

Let me give you the statistics from the recent economic impact study just as we extrapolate them to be for California. Cultural tourism which includes arts and heritage is a \$17 billion a year industry. One out of every four tourism dollars in California is spent in cultural tourism. That is a big power for us. It is estimated now that California's economic activity generated by arts and culture is at about \$16 billion — that does not factor in the city of Los Angeles which is a billion dollars just in and of itself. We — arts and culture — contribute almost \$900 million to the state and local tax coffers. That is how important we are. Lawyers, legal services, nurses, doctors, correctional officers — put them all together and we are a bigger industry. We account for more jobs. These are numbers that can no longer be ignored by this Legislature, or by this Governor, or by anybody else.

What I would hope is that five or ten years from now that there would be a unified front here. When I first got to the arts, it was the same thing. What I said to the people in the arts community was, "Look, you are like a bunch of hyenas feeding on a wildebeest that has been dead for a week. It doesn't have any more meat on it. What you have to do is behave like a pack of lions and go out and kill yourself a new carcass." That is exactly what you have to do too. If you are going to fight against each other, if you are going to compete for the pork when they dangle in front of you, you are only going to beat yourselves.

The bottom line regarding advocacy is that you have to appeal to the authorizing environments and there may be a hundred of them. You need public support and I agree that it ought to be public funding. Public money ought to be used for arts and culture. There is no more legitimate investment — and it is an investment, it is not a subsidy. But if you are going to be effective advocates then you have got to get beyond the false assumption that we in the arts and in this field to have had for a long time. That is, that key elected officials — whoever we are trying to convince of our worth and value — just don't get it. If they got it — if we educated them and they fully understood how important we are to the economy or to the education and job preparation of our kids or just to civic life

— if they understood, once they got it everything would be okay. Then they would know just like we do and the funding would come. I think that that is absolute nonsense. I think that is a false assumption, because I think that if they were truthful what they would say to you would be “so what?” So is AIDS, so is breast cancer, so is highway infrastructure, they are all good. And, the bottom line is that there is never going to be enough money to give them all exactly what they need. And the bottom-bottom line is that although you are good, you don't give me any money. You don't put any money in my campaign. You don't. You aren't organized. You don't have lobbyists. You don't have professional advocacy, and that is the bottom line.

This group and the arts group must be ready to pony up some money out of your own pockets to be advocates. People in the arts think, “Oh yeah, I'll join an advocacy group. But, I will have to write a grant to get the money to pay the dues, because God-forbid it should come out of my own pocket.” It has to come out of your own pocket. The teachers get docked \$600 a year in the California Teachers Association, everyone of them. That buys them about twenty-one lobbyists. Who do you think gets the grease in Sacramento or Washington when the time comes? Last year although we had a \$20 billion deficit, the correctional officers didn't get one penny of cuts for their programs. It is just coincidental that they happen to be the single biggest contributors to legislative campaigns in the entire state. It is not a coincidence. If you are going to be politically active, be politically active. Do not make the mistake of thinking that what you have to do is convince people that you are valuable and have nice articles about the test results or something that happened and that will work. It won't work. It is like trying to teach a pig how to sing. After a while, it's really frustrating for you and it starts to annoy the pig a lot. So, my advice is don't do that.

The second thing that I think will be important in the next five or ten years is leadership. You have got to take some risks here. You have got to think out of the box in a way and take some real risks. The other thing is, where is the next generation coming from? We have got to have some strategy in arts and culture about where the next generation of leaders is going to come from. Somehow, we have to speak to them in their language and recruit them in some way. And, we are not because you look around — it's the same in the arts — you never see them anywhere. That is a critical issue for the future.

In terms of fragmentation, I don't have to speak on that because I think the panel all has. I agree with what Diane Frankel said about building a pyramid from the bottom up. On the other hand, if you are going to have a lot of pup tents out there, I would hope that all of those pup tents would be under one big tent, so that there would be some

kind of centralization. I would propose that ten years from now — maybe even five, but certainly ten years — we have a Department of Cultural Affairs. Everything that we have talked about, every group is under that department. Somebody is going to have to make the first move and give up the territoriality. Logistical and ego problems can be worked out. It would send a good message if you had one department — and there is movement towards that in Florida and Michigan and other states — of all cultural affairs. You need a governor and legislature that would support that. You need a comprehensive, strategic approach to changing the identity that culture has. We have been trying to use the word “creativity” for a while instead of “arts” because it sounds a little less elitist. “Culture” may not be the word. But something has to change.

The final thing is we have to stop being meek and mild. People have talked about resources and how this is a bad economic time. It is like we are *Oliver Twist* — “Please sir, can I have some more gruel.” We have to stop doing that. We have to say at a time like this when there is no money, “I want double what I had last year. I don't want to just maintain the status quo. I want that money you took out last year back and I want twice that much for next year.” I am in the process now of putting together some numbers — and I think that the heritage field is part of this — that say from this point on that every dollar that arts gets cut next year costs the State a dollar in lost fees, income tax, or sales tax. Don't cut me; because if you cut me, you are accomplishing nothing. Maybe the State would lose even more when we crunch the numbers a little better. Even if it is not more, the bottom line is that this is a state where creativity drives the economy. Creativity is the currency of the future — it is the future here in California. And, you need to invest in this and have a legacy. We are the second choice of everyone in the Legislature. Everybody loves us as second choice. When there is so much money left over that they don't know who to give it to, we will get a lot of it. When there isn't that much money, we aren't going to get anything.

Find some leadership among yourselves. Take some risks. Put away all of the territorialism and create a Department of Cultural Affairs that you can all join. There is strength and power in numbers. You have an outstanding product. The arts should be part of what you do, and you should be part of what we do. As long as I am at the Arts Council, I pledge to work with you in any way we can. And, take heart. Don't let them beat you up.

MALCOLM MARGOLIN

Publisher

Heyday Books

I am Malcolm Margolin. I am a recovering elitist. One thing that has really been helping me in my efforts to be a recovering elitist is listening to Tom Frye. I love the sense of a museum that he brings forth — not the old museum which is a fortress within which are treasures that kept under lock and key, and people are led before cases to see these treasures and then hustled out with proper security. The museum that I keep hearing about is a museum that is far more open, that goes out into the community, that reaches out, that is porous, that lets people in. I thought that whole idea of a folk life festival was just smashing. I just love that openness and that porosity. I would like to take a little of that theme and tug at it and bring it to places that Tom may not be comfortable with — but maybe he will.

Let me see if I can get the right spin on this, because I am pleased to be here and to support whatever efforts there are in increasing the power of museums. If nothing else comes of this, it is a good thing. I grew up in Boston among great museums. I work with museums. If I go travelling, I visit museums. I learn a lot from museum programs, and I would really love to support any effort in making museums stronger and more coherent, and a bigger cultural presence. Outside of the university, this is another institution that captures knowledge and conveys it. It is tremendously important. On the other hand, I don't think that museums equal all culture. Museums exist in a larger world. They are part of a whole ecology of organizations and communities and individuals that maintain objects of cultural value, of cultural heritage. I think as we talk about partnership and we talk about not fragmenting, it is not just a matter of dealing among institutions of like-kind. It is a matter of dealing much more across the board and a whole complex of cultural activities, and organizations, and individuals, and communities.

One of the things that I just can't help but notice is the absence of libraries. Here we have places that objects of cultural heritage and value — not only are there books, but there are archives. There are photos, and there are collections. These are also places of community that are tremendously open to the community, on individual and endlessly creative bases.

There is also the part of our cultural heritage that isn't necessarily locked into material goods. There are the traditional artists that practice things. There are communities. There are labor organizations. There are churches and schools. There is a whole variety of places. I love the California Council for the Humanities effort in pulling out stories from people. A huge part of our cultural heritage is locked in stories. Preserving

and taking these stories is such a valuable and essential piece of preserving cultural heritage.

I am a publisher and if I were to follow a museum model, then everything we would do would be collections of anthologies, of things already published, of material that had already been done. It would be reprints. It would be representing them. We do a lot of this, and I am proud of it and it is valuable. But also to keep yourself alive — and I don't mean financially alive, that is a whole other story — I mean culturally alive and significant and part of the world around you, one does current things. One deals with current poets, current writers, current novelists, people who are thinking things out. It's part of cultural heritage for future, putting it in cultural heritage terms.

I was very moved by Tom's story of bringing the baskets back to the Indian community. That was a beautiful story. I have been part of that kind of thing and I have seen it thoroughly emotional and very gorgeous. Any museum that brings material like that out to the communities from which they originated is to be highly commended. But then when Tom was talking about the listing of endangered cultural heritage resources, I was wondering whether basketry should be included among them. If what we are talking about are physical objects of baskets, maybe not. The Oakland Museum has hundreds, and maybe thousands of them. The Hearst has thousands of them. In terms of having them stored — in terms of having these baskets on hand — there are a whole bunch of baskets out there. I would certainly support funding for preserving them, for exhibiting them, and for all the rest.

What is endangered is the art itself. There are organizations like the California Indian Basket Weavers Association that struggle to keep an art alive within a community. That is where there is an endangerment. It is in the art itself. It's not in the artifact. The same thing is true with California Indian languages. In each language is a whole complex of emotion, of words, of music, of sound systems, of ways of seeing things. As those deteriorate — just the effort of keeping those alive — it is so cheap to institute master apprentice programs and to just keep some of that kind of stuff going as part of our state's cultural heritage.

The final thing is — as Lonnie [Bunch] was talking about — the need to involve young people. I was thinking that — in my vision of five to ten years from now — we are not only working with communities, with individuals, and with keeping these things alive. But we are also working to make certain that we cooperate with the need for school systems to have programs. Not just programs where there is money to visit museums, to visit living history centers, and all of the rest, but to keep alive music programs, art programs, and all of

the other aspects of culture. I think that this is absolutely necessary. I think that to preserve these things — to preserve our cultural heritage — you have to have bodies of people who understand beauty. Whether they understand it through music or through poetry, they will end up transferring it to buildings. They will end up transferring it to historic sites. Without that understanding that they can create beauty, that beauty is created, that they can dwell in it, then we will end up losing it anyway at some point. You cannot have a healthy cultural heritage environment in the midst of a decaying educational system. I think that if we are talking about partnering, we need to partner at a much broader level than people have been talking about.

If you ask a museum person where to be in five to ten years, they'd build a better museum. If you ask a publisher where to be in five to ten years, what do you think he does? He suggests a publication. Namely, I think that California is in bad need of a culture magazine, like the marvelous magazine that the Louisiana Humanities Council does. Something that creates a community of people around it — a community of interest — that gives news about what is going on in the state, that focuses in on particular historic places or historic events, and that goes out to a wide variety of people. I think that in terms of creating public awareness, in terms of creating a body of people, in terms of keeping people in touch with one another, something like that would be of tremendous value. I would love to throw that magazine into the ten-year plan.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS WITH ALL SUMMIT PARTICIPANTS

1. **DR. WILLIAM HILDEBRANDT:** The power and rich diversity of California that we have been talking about goes back deep into the past — at least 10,000 to 12,000 years ago. At the time of the Euro-American invasion, there was more linguistic diversity in California than has ever been recorded elsewhere in the world. That linguistic diversity didn't happen all at once. People have been migrating to California through the millennia. It has been a magical place for a long time. When you are talking about cultural diversity, I think it would be easy to take it back into time and realize that people living one river valley to the west are speaking a language that is mutually unintelligible. When you compare the linguistic diversity to Indo-European, what you find is that the development of that linguistic diversity is really reflecting people migrating from Wisconsin, from Canada, from the Southwest, and doing it at different times. So during that period of time, there was probably a lot of conflict. We can see the conflict in the record. My vision for five or ten years out is when we have people trying to come up with a common agenda, that

the prehistoric record gets more play. I don't think that should be very difficult, because a lot of the same themes that we are all talking about today are applicable to what happened in the past, with respect to California being a great place where there is a lot of creativity and therefore a lot of cultural diversity.

BARRY HESSENIUS: Kids love dinosaurs, so that is a good way to get to them.

DR. WILLIAM HILDEBRANDT: Yes. Most people are intrinsically interested in archeology.

STEVE MIKESSELL: My only comment about that is to apologize to the extent that I was involved in planning these sessions, that we have a very substantial representation of leaders of the archeological community in the audience, but there is not a single panel that has an archeologist on it. I appreciate the comments that you should have been represented at the table.

2. **DR. JIM QUAY:** Instead of thinking about 5 or 10 years out, it would be useful to think about what we would want to bequeath to the people who will be commemorating the bi-centennial of the state in 2050, because we are those people who can remember what we didn't bequeath to the people of the state for the sesquicentennial. We have never asked ourselves what went wrong [with the sesquicentennial]. This doesn't lie at any one commission's door. It would be a very interesting thought experiment. About three years ago, the Center for Arts and Culture based in Washington came here. They were talking about how arts and culture — the community — was about where that the environmental community was in the early 1960's. In the early 1960's with the publication of *Silent Spring*, all of a sudden there was an issue around which the environmental community could rally. I asked the question, "What is the equivalent of "pollution" for the arts and culture community?" That is something that the public understood. There may be a more complex answer to this. In California, I would suggest that it is a kind of societal fragmentation or atomization that is the real problem we keep coming back to. I don't think that a common agenda that is simply the sum of all of our agendas is possible. I think that we are going to have to pick out a selection that is a subset of all of our agendas and really focus on that. I think we can do that as a group of agencies. I think it will lend credibility, especially if we don't seem to be seeking turf or wealth for ourselves, but for a truly common agenda.

TERI KNOLL: I think that that is a good point. I have seen the museum community and the public rally around issues that are crisis situations. It is so easy to get people to react and be active then. But when you are trying to be proactive and promote something, it is difficult.

DR. JIM QUAY: Just to be clear what my original point was, my vision is that when there is an issue that is important to the museum community that the preservationists would recognize that, because we are part of the same family, we should be supporting it even though it is something that isn't directly linked to what we are doing, and vice versa — and so with the archeologists and architects and so forth. That's the idea of a common agenda that I was trying put forth.

BARRY HESSENIUS: There are similarities between us and the environmental movement. The number one is that we — arts and culture — need an ongoing, reliable, predictable revenue stream that is not subject to cyclical cuts because of the economy, and that we don't have to spend 30 to 40 percent of our time focusing on. In terms of the environmental movement, we won't accomplish that ultimately until we are thought of like the environment is thought of, as sacrosanct. That it is simply something that no politician would ever go against. We are a long way from there, and I think that there may be some danger in us trying to find our exact match to the health threat. We have to look in a little different direction because we are not the same in that sense.

STEPHEN BECKER: We are searching for meaning in what we do and how we can connect to social problems. Is there meaning for this other than just a nice "get another school tour for a group of kids off a bus?" In historic preservation, I think that a lot of people understand that if we had *Rehab Right*'ed a few more homes in Oakland in those neighborhoods that Tom Frye was talking about, then maybe if we had done our job — and it would have been cheaper to do it then than what we are going through now — Oakland wouldn't be in the newspapers for as many murders in the neighborhoods where those old houses are. There is meaning in the stuff that we do and if we rehabilitated a few more houses, rehab'ed them right, made people proud of them and proud they live — not made them proud. I don't want to force people to think that we are in there as recovering elitists figuring out what we can do to spread this, but there needs to be that kind of investment. It is going to be so much cheaper to do that than to pull off the kind of recovery that we have to do later when we see things turning and going wrong. It just struck me that that was a great moment in Oakland's preservation history [*Rehab Right*]; and if we had just pushed it a little harder, been a little more gutsy about it, we might have changed a little bit of history.

3. **FELICIA LOWE:** I love everything I have been hearing. I have been very inspired. I am getting a little frustrated and I am fearful that we have these wonderful minds sitting in this room with all of these wonderful ideas and with this presentation format, I am fearful that we are not going to end up coming out with some work. I am ready to roll up my sleeves, but I don't know how we are going to ultimately come up with a plan. I love all the questions on the table and I support everything that has been said, but how can we really make this a workable thing. We could maybe break into smaller groups and really hone down some subject areas and put our minds to it and come up with some suggestions or something. I just want to share that fearfulness that we may not accomplish what we want if we keep on doing it in this format.

BARRY HESSENIUS: I think that the organizers of this event have to do exactly what you said — follow this up immediately with smaller groups to begin to organize in some way, so that it isn't left as just a one-time thing. It would be a shame if that was the end result.

4. **ADRIENNE HORN:** I feel your comments are very appropriate and I think what you are trying to say is that perhaps we should consider having some work groups tomorrow so that all the people in the audience can participate before you let them go. I do think that we have an extraordinary group of resources and before they depart, maybe there is a different way to do tomorrow morning. Having said that, what I want to say goes back to what was being said earlier. I want to say that on a macro-level, the whole idea of some sort of format — some sort of Department of Cultural Affairs or the like — to bring together the different groups is a reasonable recommendation. On a much more micro-level, in looking at our cultural institutions the biggest word that came out came from Tom Frye's presentation, which is all about accessibility. We have to be accessible as heritage organizations. I am someone who works on a day-to-day basis with heritage organizations, history organizations, cultural organizations trying to figure out how to be more accessible and how to make changes. It is about what Barry [Hessenius] was saying. It is about changing the image of what history means, what heritage means. I have to tell you that I do a lot of audience research throughout this country — California or where-ever. The public doesn't have a very good image about what history is or about what their heritage is. And, it is our fault. Yes, we have wonderful resources, rich resources; but we are not telling the stories very well. The models we are using, generally speaking, are old-fashioned models. We aren't doing anything but putting stuff in cases. I know that may offend some of you in this room, but I have had to deal with a lot of heritage history organizations in trying to figure out how to increase their attendance because it has gone down; how to increase

their memberships because people are disillusioned in terms of the way the history — or art — museum is conducting themselves. I think that the challenge for the next few years on the micro-level is really to look at models for interpreting history in a different way, bringing people in the door to better understand what our heritage is about, and help us redefine what that really means. I think that we are all going to need to understand that marketing is a part of this whole thing. Nobody likes to spend money on marketing, but again it's something that if done in a collaborative way in a community can be done successfully. I found that if you have a good story to tell — if you have a fantastic product that people understand and can identify with — usually the investors are there.

BARRY HESSENIUS: I would say that marketing is very important. The arts have just created an Arts Marketing Institute with money that we got as part of a grant to try to elevate the function of marketing within the arts community because studies have shown that that actually makes a difference in audience development. In terms of a follow up — the arts are moving in a small way toward the concept that administrators in the field of nonprofits and government organizations need to spend almost 50 percent of their time in terms of political management, of working with whatever their authorizing environments are, to get what their fields and constituent groups need to grow and progress. The arts certainly aren't doing it, and I don't think that the heritage or humanities fields are either. We all need to.

5. **SUSAN WILCOX:** I thought my task was daunting being out there promoting California as a cultural heritage destination, but I have found out that it is more daunting than I ever imagined. That being said, we do have a huge content in California. Last year, State Parks, the Arts Council, and a number of organizations led by Convention and Visitors Bureaus throughout the state partnering with their arts organizations and cultural tourism heritage organizations, have actually added dedicated staff to their pool of resources to help promote those attributes within their communities which are the unique, diverse attributes that visitors come here to see. California tourism has found out over the course of years that the state needed to be broken up into twelve regions. We market these twelve regions very successfully internationally in that California is still the number one travel destination in the United States. Our tourism industry is actually five times that of the state of Hawaii; two times that of Texas and New York. So we have a big task before us. It is true that there are "many tables." I think that we need to look at being at the tables within our own regions and developing not only the artifacts that are the attributes of the region, but also some of the human interest stories that really bring those attributes to life. Finally, California tourism — even though we are the

number one travel destination — is thirteenth in terms of state funding for marketing as far as overall state tourism budgets go. We try to take that \$14 million and leverage it into a \$40 million campaign. We go to different tables. We put seed funding on the table. Last year, we were able to partner with State Parks, the Arts Council, and five of the major Convention and Visitors Bureaus throughout the state to do a cultural heritage promotion. That entailed special insertion in *Smithsonian* magazine; and the development of a California culture web site (www.culturecalifornia) where any attribute of cultural or heritage history about California can be put on to the Internet and have access by visitors globally. We need to market our attributes here at home. That will help with the whole funding issue. If the people at home understand what the arts and our culture and our heritage mean to our respective local economies, the funding will come.

BARRY HESSENIUS: I think that it is important to remember that 85 percent of all the tourists who come to California are Californians. We are our own biggest tourists. So when you are marketing, market to us. We travel around the state a lot — that is our market.

6. **DANA MCGOWAN:** I am a little confused about two things. Is there data that says that our population does or does not care about cultural heritage? I thought I heard both. That is the first part of my question or comment — which is it? I think if people do not care, then we really do have a problem because there are huge amounts of information and books and television programs and coloring books — an incredible amount of information. But, maybe it isn't the right information to increase or create this appreciation that we are looking for. If data says that people do appreciate the resources and they are going to parks and cultural sites in high numbers, then the question becomes why doesn't somebody who would fund those operations respect that? In the spirit of maybe tomorrow us getting around some of these ideas, I am not sure I understand which problem we are going to be trying to solve.

BARRY HESSENIUS: The public opinion survey that the Arts Council commissioned suggested that the public values arts and culture. The separate issue though is they are not motivated to demand funding of that. That is the issue. We have to somehow move them to be an active player in demanding that this be supported. The support was there in the public for the value and understanding of the arts. There was a willingness to pay more — thought it should be more supported — but are they motivated to do anything about it? No.

LONNIE BUNCH: Let me frame it a little differently. Studies universally from around the country and internationally suggest that the public has a great appreciation

for history, that there is great interest in supporting history. The problem is that often that support is not seen in the areas where we work. It is seen through the popularity of books. It is seen through the popularity of films and television. So part of our challenge as places of history is to figure out how we get into that stream; how it is that the work that we do is seen as interesting, as important, as assessible as book buying. For example, there are very few historians who would have ever thought that a biography of John Adams would be a big seller. If you can tell me that John Adams can be a big seller, then so can just about any story that we want to tell. I think the question really is, “How do we get into the river?”

STEVE MIKESSELL: The marketing data supports strong public interest in visitation of historic sites. It is one of the most popular and one of the most profitable aspects of tourism.

STEPHEN BECKER: Part of the problem is the way we present ourselves. We are in the business of showing off our good stuff, so we don't open up the backroom that has got a problem. We hide it. We don't draw attention to those things maybe that are endangered. We want to put a really pretty cover on it, so that you will buy the ticket or buy the membership or whatever you are going to do. We have to do a better job of explaining those parts of what we do that we are having trouble with. That may be the difference between the environmental movement and the arts and humanities movement. We are out there promoting the good story, the celebration. We haven't spent enough time talking about the kinds of ways we have to preserve some of those things, present some of those things, and what the cost are to do that.

MALCOLM MARGOLIN: Let me just say that any kind of cultural work — if you are going to do it right — is phenomenally expensive. Even if there is a public desire for it, if you end up charging what something actually costs you end up feeling like those Broadway productions which cost you \$100 per seat. The fact is that there is a desire, but the desire isn't quite up to paying the bill.

BARRY HESSENIUS: Public funding ought to be a part of it. It's a lot cheaper than what the military spends on all their stuff.

7. **WILLIAM MUNGARY:** An umbrella group about working together and communicating better — the diversity that is here and the need to do that — hit a real soft spot with me. In another life, as a kid in Baker's Patch who didn't know how to read a newspaper and had nobody around with anything other than a few years of high school, my father insisted that I go to college and take International Relations to learn about the world. The most significant thing that occurred to me in that education at UCLA came through a textbook called, *The Uniting of Europe*. Here is a piece of this world that is not much larger than California. It has many thousands of more years of culture, history, and tradition than California. And, in my lifetime, they are still killing each other by the millions in animosity, and hostility, and division; and not uniting. The question that was being asked in this textbook was, “Why?” Why after all of these years they still speak a different language. Why they all still have different economies and currencies and why were they still killing each other in the millions. It had to do with trust. It had to do with putting everything on the table — with everyone knowing what they were giving up, but not asking what they expected. When they started talking about what they expected and what they were willing to give up to get that and they started finding common ground, a united Europe started happening. It was that same external threat that you are all feeling now about resources and your future — and the future of California history and how do we protect it.



THE FUTURE OF CALIFORNIA'S CULTURAL HERITAGE RESOURCES

THE GETTY CENTER LOS ANGELES NOVEMBER 19, 20, 21

THURSDAY

NOVEMBER 21, 2002

“...THERE IS NO BETTER PLACE THAN
CALIFORNIA TO UNDERSTAND WHAT IT
MEANS TO BE AN AMERICAN AND WHAT
IT MEANT TO BE AN AMERICAN.”

– *Lonnie Bunch*

SESSION THREE

WHAT DO WE DO TO GET THERE?

Note: At the suggestion of participants on Day One, the Summit Planning Committee revisited the agenda and made the following changes for Session Three. The Committee also identified the issues raised in Sessions One and Two for review and agreement by the participants.

REVISED AGENDA FOR SESSION THREE:

9:00 a.m.	REVIEW AND DISCUSSION ON ISSUES IDENTIFIED IN SESSIONS ONE AND TWO
9:30 a.m.	SESSION THREE PANEL AND GROUP DISCUSSION
10:45 a.m.	BREAK
11:00 a.m.	SESSION THREE Speaker: MARY NICHOLS, <i>Secretary for Resources Agency</i>
11:30 a.m.	CLOSING REMARKS, NEXT STEPS
12:00 p.m.	ADJOURN

ISSUE AREAS IDENTIFIED IN SESSIONS ONE AND TWO

These issue areas were reviewed by participants. Additional comments added at that time by participants during the discussion are shown in italics.

■ ACCESSIBILITY AND INCLUSION

Examples:

Audience

Programs

Educational linkages

Using Internet as teaching tool (tech narrative)

(How do we speak this language?)

■ ADVOCACY

Examples:

Funding

Linkages between agencies

Outreach

■ MESSAGE AND PROMOTION AND VISIBILITY

Examples:

Stories (formerly “Master Narrative”)

Terminology – better than definitions

Public recognition of social and economic benefits

Heritage Tourism

Improvements to quality of life (lower crime rates, better neighborhoods)

■ ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE (UNIFYING FRAMEWORK?)

Examples:

Integration of natural and cultural history

Decision-making framework

“Pup tents in the big tent”

Get all three Department of Parks & Recreation

Commissions together

Respect/integration of living culture

Office or Division of Cultural Affairs

■ SUPPORT SYSTEMS

Examples:

Magazine of California cultural history

Regional centers

Endangered sites

Fixes to existing systems

Tax Incentives

Funding priority (well-funded) key

Heritage sites visibility

■ CREATIVE PARTNERSHIPS

■ UNIFYING VISION

WHAT DO WE DO TO GET THERE?

Roundtable Discussion

RUTH COLEMAN

Acting Director

California Department of Parks and Recreation

I am going to be brief because I want to allow more time for the conversation that I think a lot of people want to have. I want to state that my Department is committed to having subsequent meetings. They won't be on this grand a scale because I don't think there will be enough donor money, but we are committed to have additional meetings. We heard the message that we need to do them more regionally. I would like to charge all of you with providing some feedback. I want you to think about which of these [issues] would be the ones to start in on. We would not be able to launch a whole series of meetings dealing with every one of those issues and some of them ought to be lead by others. We would like to have subsequent meetings in different parts of the state. There are two areas I would identify as the most pressing in the immediate term. Bringing in people who are not here now is probably one of the more significant comments we've heard. We are talking to our choir and so the next meeting needs to be with the "non-choir." Then the question is what issues should we be discussing and who should we be inviting? We would need a lot of assistance and guidance from you as to who we should be inviting, the location, and what the subject would be.

The other thing I would like to say is that given the kind of budget stresses we are all going to be facing, developing a broader base of support is going to be key. So looking for ways to connect to these people, and the children particularly, is going to be absolutely essential to our survival. That will be another issue that I think is going to have to be something we do sooner rather than later — identifying ways we can integrate more into the education system so that we starting tapping children. As Secretary Nichols was pointing out to me this morning, a lot of surveys show that people do things that they were taken to as a child. How do we get the kids in? You get them through school groups and you need to get their parents. That is another very immediate term challenge.

You have the universe of what we thought were some of the major themes, but we can't do all of those immediately. I would like to hear what you think are the most pressing. Then what I would like to do is take my staff back and we will regroup and launch meetings to address one or two of those subjects, with a particular focus on doing outreach to those who are not in the room.

HOLLY FIALA

Director, Western Office

National Trust for Historic Preservation

The one thing I would like to emphasize in my brief remarks is that if we are in fact going to build that broader base of support, we need to really concentrate a lot of our energy on the private sector and particularly among the nonprofit organizations that we are looking for partnerships with.

One question that I would like to ask is how many of you are members of a local organization that's represented by the constituency that is here today? And how many at a state level? And how many of you are donors — I'm not talking about memberships where you exclusively give money for membership purposes. I think that it is a very telling comment that you have to put your own money down before you ask others to give, including public agencies. I think that one tangible thing you should come away with is that you can't really cover your costs with memberships, and it is the basic constituency that needs to be developed.

We need some quick, easy wins in whatever we take on as next objectives. I have some ideas about that. One of the things I have really appreciated is the Getty sponsorship of this. I would suggest that if the Getty is going to continue to play a leadership role that it would be appropriate for them to convene regional associations of grantmakers throughout the state to acquaint them with the values of preservation of cultural resources, so that the foundation community is more engaged in this area. Despite the fact that Kathryn Welch Howe said a lot of them had not been asked, I am not certain whether that is attributed primarily to L.A.'s foundations that they were trying to engage in this survey process, but I imagine it would have had some impact because Getty plays such a singular role in the state. But I think that [Getty's involvement] would be helpful. Included in those regional associations of grantmakers should be organizations like the African Americans in Philanthropy and Hispanics in Philanthropy. I think it is important for us to reach as broad a number of grantmakers as possible so that we can be inclusive as we hope to be.

I think another area of opportunity is harnessing the celebrity and entertainment industry. I am taken by the advertising that we see in California "I'm a Californian." It would be fascinating to see if we could find some celebrities, as well as the living legacies that Malcolm [Margolin] talked about, who could say, "I'm a Preservationist," or "I'm preserving the future of California." I think that is an area that we really have not taken advantage of.

The other area that I think needs some real serious attention is that, until we can show the economic benefits of preserva-

tion, tourism, museums, it weakens our case with elected officials. There are many examples in other states where that documentation has been made available. I think it would be worthy of going after foundation funding for that kind of documentation and it might provide partnerships among the various entities that are here.

The last thing I would like to say is that it is interesting to me — and this is just an observation not a value judgement — that we are kind of missing the 800-pound gorilla in this conversation. There has been a lot of undercurrent of the conversation about Proposition 40 here. I am not going to present any kind of position on that, but when you talk about partnerships, partnerships are not usually forged when there is a whole lot of money. They are forged when there isn't a lot of money. I think it is overly ambitious to assume there is going to be any kind of agreement on how those funds ought to be spent among the people that are here. But, if in truth, we are concerned about inclusion, the significant number of earmarks that have happened with that program would suggest — and in some of the conversations I've heard — that in many ways, this is already mired. I would recommend to all of us to think about possibility of making sure there are competitive grants because that is the way that that inclusion will happen. It will not happen if we have each nibbled away at it. It sets the groundwork --evens out the playing field — for really effective programming and I think it needs to happen.

DR. JIM QUAY

Executive Director

California Council for the Humanities

I was pondering the title “What do we do to get there?” and I thought the first question is who is “we?” I for one appreciate — and you're going to hear me preach a little bit — a chance to preach to the choir, because this is my first experience with this particular choir. This choir doesn't get together very often. I do think we need to move beyond the choir; but if we are ever going to sing in harmony, we need some practice. This is a good beginning, it seems to me. I would like to thank Rusty Areias, and Tom Frye, and all the others that made this possible. The second question is “what or where is there?” I woke up in the middle of the night thinking of all sorts of witty titles — “Can we get there from here?” “Is there a there, there?” I came down to two. One is a saying by that sage of baseball Yogi Berra, “When you come to a fork in the road, take it.” It seems to me we are at the fork in the road and are going to take it, one way or another. The second is, “If you don't know where you are going, any road will take you there.” I don't think yet — and it would have been premature probably — that we have decided where it is that we want to go, where “there” is. I'm going to make some general remarks and then some specific recommendations about where “there” is.

My view is certainly affected by my experience at the Council, whose mission is to enrich the state's culture and strengthen its communities through the public use of the humanities. I would say that the California Stories Initiative is designed to do exactly that. The report that I was handing out earlier documents a precursor to that initiative in which we funded seven cultural heritage projects throughout the state. They were co-funded by the Irvine Foundation which enabled us to give out grants larger than we normally do. This report tells you why stories — and the telling of stories — was important to contemporary communities. I want to talk a little bit about why it might be important to the world to do this.

I have for years been noodling around the question of what it mean to be a Californian. California has been called America's America. Wallace Stegner said that California is America, only more so. Samuel Huntington, who wrote *The Clash of Civilizations* — a book which disturbs me at times but always teaches me something — has said of America what I think is also true of California. That is that some people think that California as a lie because of the disparity between the dream and the reality. But California is not a lie. California is a disappointment. But it can only be a disappointment because it is a hope. For better or for worse, California stands for something in the global imagination. I am sure that you have all had the experience — usually it's when you are not in California — “Where you from?” “California.” Boom, the lights go on. They think they know something about you. Most of it is wrong. But there is some notion of California as a place of fundamental hope in this world. We haven't talked about this very much, but since this is the preaching to the choir, I thought that I would raise that. Being a Californian includes being a risk-taker, an innovator, a pursuer of a dream — whether noble or tawdry and we have both in this state — a seeker of Eldorado. But more profoundly than this is what we find when we look around — we risk-takers, innovators, people who have left some place to come here — and find ourselves surrounded by people quite different than we are. That's not taken in by the notion of risk-taker and innovator — California's broad diversity.

We find ourselves in the most diverse society in the history of the world. Representatives of all of the eight or nine civilizations, as Samuel Huntington has described them, are here. His prescription for the world is not a very happy one. He thinks that the new fault lines, now that the larger east-west ideologies are gone, are going to be religious, and there is going to be conflict between those cultures — we call them cultures, he calls them civilizations. Well, they are all here in California. So we have to make it work here. That's a job — not just preservation — but a job for the future. That, it seems to me, is our challenge before the world.

Culture, it seems to me, is absolutely essential to this — and to me arts plus humanities equals culture. Our double responsibility in California is to preserve the cultures of who we have been so we don't forget, as well as to promote the culture of who we are becoming. North Americans, unlike other peoples of the world, have two stories to tell — the story of the place from which they have come, and then the common story of where they find themselves. If you privilege one over the other, you lose something very important. We have a double responsibility and a double privilege that we have been given. But it is a task also because I honestly believe that the whole world is watching California — not just the nation, but the whole world.

What is California doing to preserve the present and promote this special culture that is being born here — this special cultural heritage? What must we do to answer this question? I have four specific notions to present:

- We have to determine the web of responsibilities of these different agencies and organizations that are responsible for cultural heritage preservation, promotion, and education. We need to see where they fit. We are all in this together somehow, but where do we all fit — what piece of the puzzle do we have?
- We need to create an integrated case or mission statement and a vision for California's cultural heritage that is not simply the sum of all of our mission statements. It is something that only we can do together. We need a campaign of some kind that has both urgency and patience. That mission has to have an economic component — for example, how the promotion of cultural heritage affects tourism. It also has to have a civic component — how the dissemination of cultural heritage is crucial in a multi-cultural state like California, crucial, not just nice. This is particularly important since 50 percent of the people living in California never studied California history in school. They don't have the slightest notion and that is true of many adults. That may be what is bringing Californians into the historic State Parks. It should also have an educational component — how cultural heritage needs to be a priority in K-12 curriculum and teacher education.
- We need to create a report from organizations identified in my first point above to determine the state's cultural heritage needs and develop a plan to address those needs. It doesn't need to be elaborate. We need to talk about successes and failures.
- We need to secure funding to execute whatever plan is developed.

Funding solves the money problem, but funding doesn't solve the meaning problem. CCH is gathering people's stories so that they can see themselves as part of larger stories — stories of neighborhoods, cities, regions. It is very validating for people to see that their story is part of a larger story. That, it seems to me, is what we need to do now. We need to see ourselves as part of a story that is larger than CCH, larger than SHPO, larger than Parks and Rec; and part of a story that is telling, and promoting, and preserving what I think is California's culture of hope.

ROBERTA DEERING

Executive Director

California Preservation Foundation

I am not an historian. I am an urban planner, so process is an important component of my remarks. I have five steps that I think we need to take — pragmatically, incrementally, right now. Some of them are steps backwards.

- We need better research on what other states' cultural affairs agencies organizational structures and funding sources are — Illinois, Oregon.
- We need to look at ways to bring together the diversity of the cultural and heritage work that is being done — by public, private nonprofits, and private for-profits. Perhaps use the twelve regions for California that Susan Wilcox mentioned to organize around.
- We need to bring more stakeholders to the table. I don't think we are preaching to the choir because the choir is not all here. We have many voices, but there are gaps that need to be filled — local nonprofits, preservation organizations, historical societies, park districts, redevelopment agencies, city and county planning departments, preservation commissions, educational institutions — from elementary school through universities that have history programs, historic preservation curricula, planning, engineering. One of the things that there is money out there for, because it passed in the proposition this past March, is the after-school program. Why don't we all get an after-school program in our areas, in our communities, doing history, doing architectural history tours? There is money for it. Let's see what we can do with that. There are other state agencies not at this table. Caltrans was mentioned yesterday. They hire more historians than anyone else in California. The California Main Street Program is not here. The State Historical Building Safety Board and other state agencies need to be brought to the table — including the National Park Service.
- We need to create a structure for this "table." At summits, you always hear about the shape of the table being a big

discussion. I think we might want to consider the shape of this table that we are bringing people to as a virtual table — shaped virtually on the Web. There need to be opportunities for this dialogue that has been happening to be put on the Web, and a format for the web site to provide opportunities for those who were not here to have input — not just comments — but input into the dialogue as we all have had the benefit of doing here.

- We need to make sure that there are ways for participants to contact each other. Our contact information should be given out to everyone. We have benefited tremendously just meeting and talking with people that we have heard about a lot but have never met with. We need to make that opportunity more available to more of the people who aren't here.

DR. JARRELL JACKMAN

Executive Director

Santa Barbara Trust for Historic Preservation

Is this serious business we are involved with? That is the first question I would ask. I am married to the “whoopee lady,” Michelle Jackman. She feels like you should always be having a good time. Remember what H. L. Mencken said about Puritans. It is the fear that someone, somewhere might be having a good time. My thought is that we have to bring each other together. I think humor and fun bring people together and we need to unify.

Diversity is the key word. We have heard that throughout this conference. But the question is how to use it in a creative way. First of all — as a historian, to give you some background that you probably know — the human history of this planet is the history of the movement of peoples. Cultural conflict and adaptation have been going on, not just in California, but around the planet for hundreds of thousands of years. I think that California is an international state. I prefer seeing us as the land of cultural interaction rather than the state of diversity. That is not to say that we are not diverse.

Let me give you a few facts. California's uniqueness is maybe uniqueness to the United States, but it's not unique to the world. In Berlin today, 25 percent of the population is Turkish. Fifty percent of the children entering schools in Berlin do not speak German. Spain is a land of many cultures. We have this notion of the monolithic Spain coming to California, but those who have studied Spain and the kinds of Spaniards who came here in the 18th Century know they were Basques, Catalans, a variety of people. Today, it is very diverse. There are a thousand undocumented Moroccans entering Spain every day. So Europe is a very diverse place. The planet is a very diverse place.

The United States has the lowest foreign-born population of any western democracy. So we have to see ourselves connecting. I see this connecting us to the world, not separating us and making unique. I think we get self-obsessed a bit here in California, and we need to portray ourselves — see ourselves — as part of human history. My message here is, “Let's connect.” We have become this world that is segmented and segregated. It isn't not just the diversity of California, but our diversity of thinking in sciences and so forth. Let's look for ways to connect and be together with one another.

One thing I see connecting is this adobe world that I work in. What does this have to do with the grand picture? Well, dirt connects us to the world. I have never seen a more diverse group of people than at the International Earth and Architecture Conference. People come from all over the world to participate in this, and we have an opportunity to bring it to California in the future. I see that as a point of bringing us together.

We need to connect through this diversity. We are forging a new culture here in California. All cultures are forged from multiplicities in the past. We tend to get very judgmental in our way of looking at things. We need to perceive and not judge as much as we can. It is all about critical mass and synergy.

MARGIE JOHNSON REESE

General Manager

City of Los Angeles Cultural Affairs Department

Let me begin what I have to say by giving you some facts that I need to keep in perspective every day as the General Manager of the Cultural Affairs Department of the City of Los Angeles. The operative words are “City of Los Angeles.” In the year 2000, the number of children in the City of Los Angeles was 981,311. In the next five to seventeen years, the birth rate for the city is projected to be between 16,000 and 17,000 per year. In a city with a population of 3.8 million, nearly 1/3 are children. When we trot out our much-used cliché, “children are our future,” we couldn't be more accurate — especially when it comes to the preservation of our historic and cultural landscape. In ten years, many of these children SHOULD be starting to take over the stewardship of the things we have carefully preserved and MAY use or discard the plans we have diligently prepared for “future” generations.

But let me give you another fact. The population of Los Angeles speaks 114 different languages. That means 114 different cultures, all of which have a unique perspective and cultural bias on what is important to preserve. Think about this. In ten years, quite a few of us will be either retired or ready to hand over the responsibilities to younger and more energetic

people — the very people who are children. Will they be prepared to take on the challenge? I wonder if what we do here today will have had any impact on them? Will we have communicated the value set that informs our perspective in dealing with the historic and cultural monuments we passionately preserve today? What are we doing to make sure the stewards who follow us have an equal passion, concern, and interest for preserving cultural resources? What are we doing to ensure they will have the tools to carry on the work we do today and understand how to use them?

Let's think about these children, their diverse heritage, and the need to engage young people in a dialogue about cultural preservation. Initially, the priority of younger children is based on a world of relationships. That feels right to them. They cling to each other and to their teachers, and to the idea of being in a new world of exploration. Somewhere in the third and fourth grades, we start teaching them about differences — and they begin to learn about disagreement. For many, it is difficult to balance two cultures in one place. As their parents teach them cultural traditions, they are bombarded by the media with heroes and power — often counter-cultures of what their parents have brought with them to this new place — California, USA.

Speaking many different languages, they learn to verbalize that you are different because they have a different family and different skin, different color, different color eyes, hair color, and intelligence. And soon, their relationship to power begins to change, and they either retreat or explode on many different levels. Culture, heritage, preservation may not be on their radar screens. Survival, assimilation, and emulating the media heroes may be all they can manage while they struggle through adolescence and public schools, and search for the American Dream.

In a strange way, public parks, outdoor heritage festivals, and an occasional encounter with a historic monument may be a powerful connection that at least gives them some retreat and pause.

The preservation community has done a terrific job in talking to itself. But, how many people — even people with a sense of place, history, and a general preservation ethic — have a clue as to what the Secretary of the Interior's Standards are? Outside the preservation community, I expect that the number is very low. Even the elected officials I work for need to be educated on this one. We develop policies, commission new studies, draw up guidelines, and print reports — but for whom? The question I ask myself is, "Are we preaching to the choir?" Are we merely reinforcing what we know, believe in, and wish to perpetuate without actually preparing future preservationists? Remember the future? Those children? The stewards of our cultural heritage?

So what do we do? Where do we want to be in five to ten years? What do we do to get there? Part of the answer depends on whom "we" refers to. Maybe the answer is just too obvious. You and I need to broaden the conversation — broaden the audience — reach into our educational systems, improve our public information programs, and address these issues in multiple languages. Not just literally — if that's what it takes — but in a more radical change of pace, we need to speak in a language that resonates with our constituencies — in my case, the residents of Los Angeles — and a language that will intrigue and excite the stewards of the future. I am happy to report that our agency has initiated a Preservation Internship program aimed specifically at college age students who are native Angelenos — adding another dimension to their studies that offers a view of cultural heritage preservation for both our staff and for these students.

I am also suggesting that, from where I sit, the picture forces me to think of a broader "we." What you and I do here today and during the remainder of our professional lives is important. Make no mistake. You and I have an important contribution to make to the future. However, there is another "we." And that "we" focuses on the birth statistics I began with. You and I must find a means of communicating the importance of historic and cultural preservation to our successors. If we fail to do that, we have ultimately failed to preserve our historic and cultural heritage. Radical as it may seem, if we merely provide data and studies, and save some buildings along the way, we may have won some battles and lost the war.

And I submit the following suggestion. Even in a time of shrinking dollars for arts, culture, and preservation, California is poised to develop a Cultural Heritage Master Plan that would:

- define vision and strategic directions for our work
- better connect with community needs
- provide programs that develop leadership
- increase public participation
- provide guidance for increased advocacy and public education

Specifically, our charge should be to develop a Cultural Resources Policy. Our first charge may be to develop a cultural policy that is the result of citizen input, budget realities, and professional guidance both within and outside government. It is a policy that has to uniquely address the needs of the citizens of California. The policy should be reviewed and updated at least once every five years. The Cultural Resources Policy might be developed on the basis of the following guiding principles:

- **Access to Cultural Heritage Resources.** Artistic, cultural, educational, and humanistic activities are essential aspects of the life of the state. All citizens should be provided equal opportunities for access to culture and heritage and the means of cultural expression. Cultural expression promotes a bridge of understanding between our diverse cultures.
- **Public-Private Cooperation.** Cooperation between the State, historians, cultural organizations, and the private sector is essential to ensuring the development, maintenance, and stewardship of our cultural resources.
- **Economic Impact.** The economic vitality of the state is enhanced by a healthy cultural and preservation environment.
- **Culturally Distinct and Ethnic Heritage.** The state recognizes the multi-ethnic and distinct heritage of its citizens makes an invaluable contribution to the cultural vitality of California. The State should have an important role in nurturing the preservation of the cultures that contribute to the richness of our distinct cultures.
- **Leadership Development.** The State seeks to foster the development of future leadership as stewards and caretakers of its local cultural resources.

We need a road map. And, I think that those of us who feel so passionately about teaching feel that there is a place for teachers at this table. I would hope that we can expand our thinking to include leaders in the cities of this state in this conversation as well.

LARRY MYERS

Executive Secretary

California Native American Heritage Commission

We don't have a statewide Indian museum. We need a statewide Indian museum. I think the state of California is much too great a state to be without one. The Indian community in the state is very diverse. It is very unique and there is a lot of history and a lot of culture, and a lot of things that need to be shared with the community out there. It needs to be shared with the citizens of California. I really believe that the citizens of California want something like this. They want to be able to come to a statewide museum — they want to be a part of this thing. They want to know who the Indians were where they live. What were they like and what they did? They also want to know the truth about California Indian history. The thought of telling the truth is not to make people feel sad — not to make them feel guilty in any way. But if people can understand what happened to California Indians, they can understand why California Indians react the way we react today about certain

circumstances. If you are familiar with where the reservations are located — and probably many of you are — they are located out in outlying areas, in very bleak and desolate places. Where they were created in the very early 1900's — that location — is having a continuous effect on us today. We really don't have roads. We don't have any railroads. We don't have any airports. Economic development becomes very difficult on the reservation.

With all those difficulties, we still have hope. We have been hoping for 42 years [for a statewide Indian museum]. We go to meetings that people have. We attend planning hearings. We give our input about what we would like to see in a museum, and where we would like to see it. Like Dr. Quay said, I am a Californian and I have hope. Actually, today I have a lot of hope because I really do believe that things are starting to move forward now. Department of Parks and Recreation is starting again to take some very serious steps in developing a plan that can go forward to achieve what I consider a first-class California State Indian Museum that all the citizens of California will appreciate.

This is my own personal opinion. I don't know how legal it is. I don't know how practical it is. I don't know how feasible it is. Just as a thought to fund something like this — because we are always worried about money and it could also fund other issues that people could consider very important — a Native American Heritage Gaming Corporation. I don't know if something like that would work. I don't know if it would be feasible, but we are always looking for different and unique ways to achieve things. It would obviously take the work of the legislature and the administration to say that this is a good thing and should be done and there would be a very good benefit from it. If it did happen, I am sure that there would be sufficient funds to overflow into other areas — to protect other things that are important to all the citizens of California — because all of the people that would be contributing to this.

If anyone has the thought that, because of the gaming issue, California Indians should in fact pay for this statewide Indian museum, that is being very short-sighted. I think it is being short-sighted in the effect of not paying tribute to the citizens of California, because unless the citizens really feel that they own it — that it is part of them — I don't think they would embrace it as much as if they just knew it was a state agency — a state facility — and that they have every right to visit it, bring their children to it, and enjoy it.

Fortunately in the last six months, I was able to — after about four years of very hard work with Dr. Kevin Starr — dedicate two seals on the West Steps of the State Capitol. The idea came to us while we were on the West Steps watching the children when they came up to the Capitol. When they were

going inside, they would stop on the State Seal. They would walk on it. They would touch it. They would be mesmerized by it. The docents would talk about the state of California, about the different images on the seal. Those children, I think really took that message home with them. It was my idea to have a Native American Seal. So we came up with a Native American Seal and an Hispanic Seal, because it is our hope that something like that is going to really reach out. It is going to touch all of the children who come up there. It is going to touch all the tourists who go through there. And, I think it is going to have a really meaningful impact on their lives. If we can combine those seals with the Native American Women's Gallery which is across the street and with a state-wide Indian Museum that would be in the vicinity that would all be top-rated, it could be one part of the Heritage Corridor that we were talking about yesterday.

THE HONORABLE MARCO FIREBAUGH

*Majority Floor Leader
California State Assembly*

I sit before you today of mixed minds. When Secretary Nichols first called and asked me to participate in this program, I initially said that I wouldn't. I rethought that position and I am glad I did. One the one hand, I am extremely pleased that the administration has taken such an active role in elevating the discussions of art, culture, and society. In a lot of ways, I think we have won the debate about the importance of art, culture, and society — the debate about whether or not it is an invaluable educational tool for our kids, about the economic benefits of art and culture, about the ways in which it binds society together in an ever-more disparate and diverse society. Then to organize an summit like this to talk about the State's role — our collective role — in the future of arts and culture, I think is incredibly important, incredibly positive. That's why I am here.

On the other hand, I have been skeptical about this administration's trajectory and posture relative to how we accomplish that important work. That skepticism is borne of a long time in this great state, many years of involvement with state government. I have been involved with state government for a third of my life. It has been a great and wonderful experience — a great learning experience. But it has also been an incredibly frustrating one, and that is not been reduced in more recent days.

Three years ago, I was invited to talk at Asilomar. I was asked to comment on the viability of bond initiatives for investment in parks, arts and culture, and other areas. I said then that I thought that the people of California would embrace a sustained and significant investment in arts and culture, but they wouldn't do so unless it had some direct impact on their lives.

It wouldn't be sustained if it was in fact sporadic, uneven, inequitable — if that investment didn't translate into tangible experiences for people, for average folks, for kids on the east side of Los Angeles many of whom have no real tie to what we do.

Over the past four years since I have been in Sacramento, I have tried to think more deeply about my role, my responsibility in ensuring that there is greater equity in how we spend our finite resources — our limited dollars, our intellectual resources, our attention, and our focus — to ensure that there is some equity in that distribution. In order for Californians to remain enthused about giving us the tools to go forth and to build a vast and effective network of arts programming, cultural enhancement, and resource preservation, we have worked on creating a new way of dispersing State dollars. One of the things that I have been critical of — and I think many of my colleagues in the Legislature have been critical of — is the seeming sporadic and uneven way in which we disperse State dollars. Not to mean that they are not spent in intelligent and effective ways, not to mean that important institutions don't deserve State support and shouldn't receive it; but rather that there should be some systems, some mechanisms, some understandable, discernable process that makes sense to people, that can be clear to everyone who deserves access.

So we went to work on that and enacted a bill last year that created a Cultural Endowment in the state of California. What we were trying to do is respect the existing systems that we have for assessing and investing in our cultural and arts resources, but to offer a somewhat removed system that could have the confidence of the people in the state as independent, based on need, based on historic distribution, based on quality and excellence, based on the kinds of things that I think we each strive for every day. As you may know, that bill made it to the governor's desk and was signed into law. So today, we have a Cultural Endowment in the state of California, headed by the State Librarian, participation from various state agencies and public members as appointments from the governor's office and each of the two houses of the legislature.

Here is where my skepticism comes from. We go out and reach out to the people of the state and ask them to trust us, and invest with us, to trust us that with those resources we will do an intelligent and effective job of dispersing them — that we will spend those dollars in a way that touches their lives. And yet, when offered an opportunity to create a system that could achieve that, that it is undermined. I came here today to say to all of you that there is a great and strong commitment on the part of many members of this legislature to invest despite a time of economic uncertainty and economic difficulty. There is a great commitment to maintain arts and culture investment as a core pillar of what we do in the state

of California. But, there is a similarly strong sentiment that there has to be equity in that system, and that inequity will not be tolerated. We will not be supportive of these efforts unless they really touch people in their homes and in their neighborhoods. The system we have today doesn't work; and to simply go back to the way we have been funding arts programming, arts infrastructure, cultural investment over the last decade is — in my judgement — is to really fail to appreciate the confidence that the people of this state have handed to us.

Over the course of the next few years — while I am a member of this legislature, perhaps longer than that — I am going to continue to fight for a system that is understandable for all of us; that is fair; that is based on merit and quality and diversity and equity and opportunity. I am going to refuse to sign on to any budget that invests Proposition 40 dollars, or any of these kinds of dollars, that doesn't do so in a way that is equitable. I think we owe that to people. I think we owe that to the people of the state. I want to ask each of you to join with us and help us fashion a system that has the confidence of all of us; that works to maintain the confidence of the public; that has the confidence of each of us that it is a fair system that recognizes and respects what each of us brings to this great California of ours.

At the end of the day, I am optimistic. I am optimistic about the quality programming that we have and can have, the equity that we can truly have in our system of distribution. I am confident that this economy is going to turn around soon, and we will again have flush budgets to invest. And, I am confident that, even in these difficult times, we will maintain a commitment to art and culture in this state. I think we will all be better for it. I pledge to you that I will continue working in this area.

WHAT DO WE DO TO GET THERE?

MARY NICHOLS

*Secretary for Resources
California Resources Agency*

If you were here for the panel that preceded me, you have to be wondering, “How is she going to take all of those comments and give us some direction going forward?” Fortunately for all of us, I had a bit of advance warning as to what folks were going to say. I also have been thinking of these issues for quite a while, so I have some thoughts I want to share with you.

First, let me give you some personal perspective. In moving to California in 1971, I was escaping what, for many of my generation, felt like the oppressive cultural environment of the East Coast. California represented openness, diversity, and opportunity. California didn't have all those formal, stuffy old historical and cultural institutions celebrating the dead founders.

I began working in a public interest law firm, and have been in and out of government and advocacy groups ever since. You could say I'm part of the Establishment. Yet I have never forgotten that liberating sense of escape from European history and class identity that I discovered in California over thirty years ago. So I urge you to remember that no matter how we decide to protect California's cultural and historical heritage, it will never look like Boston or Philadelphia or even New York. Whatever we do in California for our history and our culture is going to be uniquely Californian and it will be different, no matter what. And, that is a very good thing. Someone earlier commented that California is an international place. I agree with that. We are a place where cultures meet. We are a place that is constantly inventing itself. We certainly can learn from states and institutions — I am particularly grateful for the insights of those who presented their insights and experiences over the past three days. But it does mean that we should be prepared to reach out, be inclusive and do the hard work of inventing our own institutions and figuring out for ourselves what the culture is that we are celebrating here.

When I was appointed Secretary of the Resources Agency in late 1998, I immediately began working on a plan to raise new bond monies for environmental protection, parks, open space, and also for cultural and historical resources. It did not take a genius to realize that we were not going to be able to do much of anything to advance the state of California's resources — natural or cultural and historical — without an infusion of financial resources. We sat down with Kevin Starr [State Librarian] within weeks of my arrival in Sacramento and talked about how we could put together a bond that would focus on California's history that we could take to the public.

Dr. Starr and I share a boss in Governor Davis who is a person who is an avid student of California history as well as an active supporter of parks and open space. We both felt Californians were becoming more interested in projects to preserve, restore, and educate the public about our history. In communities around the state, groups were coming forward with plans and projects to preserve, enhance, and educate about California's history and culture. All of which needed money.

So we put together a really nifty \$750 million package that highlighted the roles of various ethnic groups in California's history. We took it to some top political pollsters and asked them to take a sounding. To our dismay — this was in flush

times of 1999 — the answer came back, “Forget about it... this will not fly. You can’t get this passed.”

We went back to the drawing boards and we began working on Propositions 12 and 13, which were embraced by the Commission on Building for the 21st Century. They went through the legislative process. They passed. We moved on to Proposition 40, which thanks to the efforts of Senator Burton contained a significant new authorization for funding cultural and historical programs.

We found new allies who supported the bonds, and that support has not flagged, as you heard this morning from Marco Firebaugh. Marco made it clear in helping build support for the bonds in the Latino caucus and in the community, that we need to define our environmental infrastructure — the infrastructure that underpins our quality of life — in a way that includes culture, history, the arts. These things belong together.

Proposition 12 helped a little with grants to some much-needed projects. Then we hit what seemed like the jackpot in Proposition 40. There is still a bag — although a somewhat shrunken bag — of gold sitting out there in the middle of the room. As Dr. Heyman reminded us, museums are not immune to the pressures of politics and it will be difficult for any legislator — any person who has to work as hard as they all do to get elected to office and serve in public office — to resist the opportunity to be the head of a foundation and bestow grants upon worthy recipients. There is a very long line of organizations and institutions — places in this state — that need the money, that deserve the money, that would use the money well. That is hardly the issue. What is at issue is how to create a process that will satisfy the tests of equity, openness, and transparency that politicians — and the public — demand.

I want to talk a little bit about what I am hoping we can work to achieve over the next few years. If it resonates with you, or it is not clear, or you disagree with it, I want to hear that. Hopefully after today, we will have at least some agreement on ways to move forward. But move forward we must.

Let’s start by getting our bearings. Unhappily, we find ourselves in a situation where a new entity called a Cultural Endowment was created in legislation, which the governor decided not to fund. I am not going to read you the whole message that he wrote when he took that action because it is rather lengthy. He did say that he was concerned about creating an endowment which was significantly redundant and unnecessary, given the duties and expertise of the Department of Parks and Recreation, the Office of Historic Preservation, and the State Historic Resources Commission. He was con-

cerned about undermining efforts that were already underway under Proposition 12 to disperse money in a competitive grant process. He said he was directing the Secretary of Resources — me — to go out and conduct a series of stakeholder meetings during the legislative recess for the purpose of discussing the best approaches for funding historical, cultural, and museum projects. Fortunately for me, this summit had already been planned prior to this action on the governor’s part, so we are in a position to take advantage of all of you. And although this is not the only session that we are going to have, it at least in part fulfills the mandate that I was given.

I need to confess that we were not ready with the answer when Proposition 40 passed. We did not have in place what we should have had in place, what all of you in various ways have identified should be there in terms of a structure for receiving and putting the money to work right away. Proposition 40 was not drafted with that component in it. It was left blank as an invitation to do something; and for a variety of reasons, we were not quite ready to engage in that process. But, that does not excuse us from the obligation or the opportunity to take advantage of that invitation to do something creative.

AB 716 was flawed in my view, and in the governor’s view, because it did not bring in all of the entities that need to be involved. It was a partial effort, not a complete effort, to include all the various ‘entities’ within state government itself, some of whom were referred to by Roberta Deering in her remarks. They need to be coordinated; they do not need to be consolidated; they do not need to be ‘muted’; they do not need to be undermined. But they definitely need some body, some entity which will help to coordinate their work and create opportunities for more partnerships that can reach out in a more effective way to the private sector — both nonprofit and profit-making institutions — to help expand the pie.

We know that this notion of pie-expanding works because it has worked in the area of natural resource protection. It has not worked perfectly, and we’re really just beginning. But we have seen real progress, thanks in large part to the challenge that came to the State from institutions like the Packard Foundation. They told us in no uncertain terms to “get our act together” and “plan.” They said to us, “Tell us what your priorities are and we will tell you what our priorities are. We do not expect you to dictate our priorities, but we want to try to work together and see where we can match those priorities — and do more with the resources we have.” Working together we successfully leveraged each other’s resources.

I believe we need to be doing the same thing in the area of historic and cultural resources. I think the idea of the strategic plan that has been referred to by several people — even

though some of us have had experiences with strategic plans that were neither “strategic” nor “plans” — is one way to approach this. It is possible, without spending undue amounts of time and effort, to develop a process that itself helps to build the sense of direction and the sense of momentum. I very much want to see us doing that — moving forward from this summit.

I have been talking with Dr. Starr, and I can report that we are in absolute agreement on two basic principles. One is that we do need to create a permanent entity with responsibilities for protecting and enhancing California’s historical and cultural heritage — something that transcends or expands beyond the specific missions of the Office of Historic Preservation or State Parks or the Cultural Resources Commission or the Native American Heritage Commission. We need to do that regardless of whether we have bond money or not, for the very simple reason that the entity itself needs to attract and generate more money. And, having such a program will enable us to work for funding and develop priority projects that can be funded whenever money becomes available. We need to start now. As Tom Frye noted, the issue of deferred maintenance for many institutions has reached crisis proportions.

The other thing we know we need to do is to find a way to spend at least \$100 million of the Proposition 40 money that doesn’t involve earmarking. Whether it’s the legislative or the executive branch that does it, we know that the “porking” process fundamentally undermines trust. And that trust in turn is what will allow us to develop a common vision that we can use for a variety of purposes — not the least of which is to build the total pot of funding.

I believe there is widespread support for these principles and that AB 716 was a good-faith effort to address them. However, other issues need to be worked through. The transcending entity has got to be inclusive both in its mandate and in its membership. It must operate in a way that the legislature feels ownership. That will undoubtedly mean that there will have to be legislative appointments on it, which, I might add, is not a bad thing — it has worked well in many other areas.

What exactly is this ‘entity’? We can call it an endowment. We can call it a trust. We can call it a conservancy. I don’t care. It needs to have the responsibility and capacity to do some planning when we get the money to do that. And, it needs to be able to run a grant program pursuant to guidelines that it will develop, rank projects, and engage in responsible and trustworthy fiscal management. It needs to get money out the door and put it to work effectively and promptly. The governor has signed legislation creating similar grant programs for other purposes and is comfortable with the process. California’s historical and cultural heritage will be honored if we can develop the right entity.

Here is what I cannot recommend, and this may be a little bit more controversial. It is reflected in the governor’s signing message on AB 716. It simply does not make sense to create a new bureaucracy — now or in the future — that is not anchored to the resources and the expertise that we already have. We do not need to reinvent. We need to build on what we already have. We do not need to create parallel universes when our current universe just lacks money and staff. Dr. Starr fully concurs that although we would both love to be able to bring in more people, to hire more consultants and to expand on our efforts within State government, to plan, to build, to create, it is not going to happen — not just this year or next year or possibly ever.

The good news is that we already have the kinds of expertise that we need in order to improve our stewardship of California’s cultural resources.

Sitting here today and back in offices in State government, we have the Historic Preservation Office. We have archeologists. We have architects. We have cultural resources experts. They are there and we need to be using them, and taking advantage of their knowledge and experience, and building on what they have in order to make this new entity work. So, when I say that I am putting down a “flag in the turf,” it is true. I am. But the turf that’s at stake here is the turf that defines what it means to be a Californian.

Just as we in the Resources Agency are working to give every Californian a sense of place — we want every child in the state to know their watershed address as well as they know their street address, to know what ecosystem it is that they are living in, and what cultural heritage they come from—my colleagues and I within the government also need to be modeling the kind of behavior we want to see others have — namely, to use the assets and the resources that we already have, and to use them better.

So as we talk about the design of a new cultural entity — how many governing board members; what the process is for making grant recommendations and whether there is one grant pot or two or whether there is a set-aside for small grants; and all of the other things we could do in legislation or through regulations or guidelines — I want to embrace this new entity within the Resources Agency making full use the assets of State Parks and the Office of Historic Preservation. That is where we already have the critical mass of the kinds of resources that it takes to do the job in government. We have the people who know how to make the systems work. The goal of enhancing and protecting cultural resources, after all, is at the heart of what we do at the Resources Agency. About a year after I began this job, we developed a new Mission Statement for my Agency that is worth repeating: “To restore,

protect and manage the State's natural, historical and cultural resources for current and future generations by using creative approaches and solutions based on science, collaboration and respect for all the communities and interests involved.”

So now you have the gist of my recommendation to the governor for a proposal that we could bring to the legislature. We could use it as a vehicle with the idea that over a period of time – and I believe we need to move quickly — we will end up with something like a master plan, a set of firm policies for preserving and distributing California historical and cultural heritage. I am confident that once we develop those crucial elements, they will be as inclusive as the vision of the people in this room, and equally responsive to the needs and challenges of this great State of California. I invite your comments — and your collaboration — in this important effort.

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS WITH ALL SUMMIT PARTICIPANTS AND MARY NICHOLS

1. **HOLLY FIALA:** I really appreciate your comments about working with what we have, really capturing the intellectual capital that already exists. That really is an economic engine. It also is a creativity engine and that is one of the great benefits of bringing this kind of group — it is no longer your private intellectual capital, your private cultural capital but it is a much greater piece by thinking of it as something that belongs to all of us.

2. **ROBERTA DEERING:** I need to bring up this up because I think we need to address it — Marco Firebaugh's use of the word “arts” and our discussion yesterday about the arts as part of this whole effort. How do we incorporate arts that are not necessarily arts heritage? If they are, are all “arts” arts heritage? Do we look at just history, heritage, preservation organizations? How do we get our hands around that whole issue of how the arts are part of this discussion?

MARY NICHOLS: I am a lawyer, so I am trained in the art of splitting hairs, and redefining, and repackaging things into different categories. Personally, I would like to see the Arts Council as a member, and included within, the new entity whatever it is called, because I think that it is so hard to draw a line. History isn't just about what's dead. History is something that gets reinterpreted by the living. The arts aren't just about the people who are making them today. They are also about the things that we have from the past that were objects of art. I just don't think it is going to be helpful to exclude and therefore it makes sense to include. But I recognize that there are

issues in terms of the funders, the practitioners, the institutions. I did note with some pleasure that in Los Angeles county in this last election, we had the Natural History Museum partnering with the Museum of Art because the two of them had critical needs that they needed to go to the voters for. Unfortunately, their measure didn't pass because it needed a two-thirds vote. It did at least show that what brings people together isn't having enough resources. It is having not enough resources. Fortunately for all of us, we don't have a problem with too many resources, so I think we will be compelled to find ways to work together.

3. **DR. BILL HILDEBRANDT:** Could you go into a little more detail on how this new entity would be staffed. How many people? What the range of disciplines would be?

MARY NICHOLS: As I said before, we don't have the ability to create new positions and to hire new people this year. I don't think we are talking about creating a whole new group. I think that we are talking about bringing people together and I think it may happen by some overarching appointment of a council and then just drafting staff people from existing operations to make it work. Its agenda may be very limited until there is some money coming into the system. One of the things I am already thinking about is how can we go to some of our friends in the funding community and seek funding to do the planning work that will supplement the very limited amount that the State will be able to contribute to this. We will find a way to do it if we can get some common direction, and if it is the kind of thing that has enough consensus from those who care about what we are doing that they are willing to put some resources into it.

4. **WILLIAM MUNGARY:** I want to give Larry [Myers] a hand on his comment about how to fund the State Indian Museum. I am constantly asked why the existing gaming tribes fund the museum. Trying to answer that, I can only get myself into trouble with all those state tribes that have casinos. But I think the answer to it lies behind why the oil companies in Kern County, which control three of the five largest oil reserves in the United States, can't fund an Oil Museum in Kern County. And, they can't. They have gone to the County to fund it. What is now being done as far as a museum for the families that made their living in oil to display who they are and their culture and their history is that the Superintendent of Schools is doing it with the kids' money. Oil companies aren't doing it. I think that when you answer those kinds of questions, you can answer why the tribes can't do it.

MARY NICHOLS: In reviewing notes from the previous sessions, I found Dr. Michael Heyman saying at the very

beginning that his advice was don't take the easy way out. Other people have said that "we are fragmented, segmented, and stratified. We compete with each other. The present system is dysfunctional. Without substantive change, there won't be substantial progress. We need to talk inclusion. We need to have multiple tables in the room. We need to move from a "hands out" position to a handshake position as we seek partnerships to get this done. We can use this summit to seize the opportunity to begin collaborations and partnerships. Our vision must be connected to a promise to get this done. We want a unified, well-planned entity with clear goals and objectives. It is time to stop being meek and mild. We need to demand twice as much as before." My reason for reading a few of those out to you is to say that I do think that if the vision is bold enough, we can demand of ourselves and of the public more resources to help us do it. There is no question that we are all attracted in part to work together because we know we need more, and we are not getting it by slicing the pie thinner and thinner. So having something big that we want to go to the public and ask for support for is a much better position to be in — to ask people to join us in a bigger vision. Whether it is through some new form of tax or fee, or through some new mechanism that we haven't even thought of yet, this is a time — because of the budget crisis — when ideas about fees and other ways of funding things are on the table. Even if we don't get there immediately, there is nothing wrong with beginning to talk very explicitly about what some of those mechanisms could be. Looking at the oil industry or other resources are things that need to be part of the discussion — part of the planning we are doing for the cultural and historical program for the state of California. It's — at least in part — not only about what we want to say and what do we want to tell people about, but how do we get the money to do it. The way we spend the Proposition 40 money will be a very important part of that message. That is one of the reasons why I am absolutely in agreement with Marco [Firebaugh] that we have to do it with a process that the public will have confidence in.

5. **ANTHONY VEERKAMP:** I am curious if you see any opportunities, either over the middle distance or the longer haul, to fund our efforts by other mechanisms than bond funding. With what little money we have gotten out of bonds — and the more significant monies in Proposition 40 seem to have scattered to the four winds quicker than I ever imagined possible — many of our needs have not been capital needs. Many of our needs are planning needs, and many of our needs are pretty modest. Yet we can't seem to grasp those monies out of the bond proposition, and we have no where else to turn.

MARY NICHOLS: First of all, one of the things we have learned from the iterative process of going through Propositions 12 and 13, and then Propositions 40 and 50, is that if you can draft bonds carefully you can get somewhat more specifically-directed money for planning. Still the bulk of it — the vast majority of it — has to go for capital expenditures. Considering that when you build a bridge there is years worth of work in the planning and the design before you actually put any metal in the ground, there is no reason why we cannot define some of what we are doing in this area in a way that would include somewhat more of the intellectual capital that we need to be investing in. Having said that, that still isn't going to be satisfactory for what we need. So we will have to look for new funding sources for it. Competing for General Fund resources — as I think we have all learned — is a dicey business. And we are still not through with the business of carving out set-asides of the General Fund for people's pet projects which sound good and the voters are willing to go for that as they did this year for the after-school programs and have done in the past for other things. There are other states that have tried other funding mechanisms. At least at the community level, depending on how people feel about their historical and cultural resources, they have been willing to come up with mechanisms that can raise very large sums of money without being that costly at the individual level. I am all in favor of doing some serious research about what could possibly work in California. Again harking back to the somewhat bitter experience of our bond campaigns where we found out that much as we love parks, the public wouldn't vote for a park bond. They voted for a clean water bond. The case for the historical and the cultural may take even more work to determine how to package.

FURTHER DISCUSSION OF THE IDENTIFIED ISSUES BY ALL SUMMIT PARTICIPANTS

6. **ARCHIE GREEN:** Everyone has talked about the children, but how about the senior citizens? We have plenty of time. We don't get paid to stay home. We don't go to meetings. We don't have budgets to meet. We have time. Anytime we are invited to a meeting, it is wonderful. I have a modest proposal that won't cost any money; won't change any agendas; but will gradually alter our work. We should have had among the invited speakers three or four veterans of the building and metal trades who physically built the Getty Center. We ought to know from them their experiences and thoughts about building the room we are in. I have lived long enough to see a social transformation in my trade. We want someone to talk about that who has experience. Just look around you — what

kind of wood is in those panels? Does it come from Japan, from Finland? Was it milled here? How is it fastened to the wall? Is it glued, snapped on, toe-nailed? Why is it eight feet by two feet? Who put in these chairs? If we are not conscious of our physical environment, how can we act intelligently about our natural environment? How can we get our communities to support preservation causes if we don't understand the buildings in which we work? And the basic understanding starts with the guys and gals who leveled the ground here and brought all of these fountains into a desert spot that never should have been. This is like the Hanging Gardens of Babylon or the Colossus of Rhodes. It's a wonder of the modern world that is doomed to destruction. Those issues are important to preservationists and conservationists, but they are equally important to the people whose labor built this building. Never have a meeting like this again without inviting some of the people who worked on the building. Even if you meet in a motel in Fresno that is made out of stucco, invite a stucco worker.

7. **MARGIE JOHNSON REESE:** I am curious to know whether there is a role for the leaders of the various agencies that we are all pointing our fingers to come together and have some interaction and respond to what we are discussing here. As a group, do they come together? [I am] proposing that they do come together before the next meeting of this group. I am interested in hearing their feedback on a new structure, on accessibility. I think we need to give people a chance to talk about the strengths of the agencies that exist.

8. **DR. LAUREN BRICKER:** In terms of inclusion and a number of the other points, I think one of the issues that seems to be looming in a very strong way this morning is the whole issue of education and the future — the median age of all of us has been pointed out. There are two ways that that issue might get played out:

- More of a coordinated effort with the universities — UC as well as CSU, the Community Colleges, and the public schools. I think one of the points that can be thought of with the recent election is that schools do have a strong play in terms of the public. To have some sort of coordinated effort with regard to physical resources, material resources, historic preservation, there needs to be a very strong encouragement of education efforts along the lines of preservation in the state.
- Preserving resources associated with the modern movement. We tend to define history being pretty far back in time, and clearly one of the primary directions that preservation is going in California and nationwide is dealing with the recent past — 50 years in age or less. This is very much a direction that younger people feel invested in. I think we really need to encourage this.

9. **PAT MURKLAND:** I like the ideas about the organization and getting a plan together. My only concern is the big timeline and the time element because our living cultural heritage and our elders are diminishing by the minute. We are in an emergency state as far as saving and sharing this culture and languages. If this whole thing turns into a glacial movement, we are going to lose out in sharing this and preserving California's story. So I would just like to think about deadlines.

10. **DR. JARRELL JACKMAN:** I would like to think about the ends — where we will end up. Using television as a metaphor, my fear would be that we will end up with an MTV version as our end product and I would prefer a CSPAN version. I think when you are dealing with the complexities of California, you have the risk of ending up with an MTV version that gives you three or five seconds; whereas CSPAN still gives us the variety, but gives us depth. As we are going out there in the world trying to create something, it is good to think about where you want to end up.

11. **DANA MCGOWAN:** It would be safe to say that each and every one of these things [the issues that have been identified] is going to be incredibly important to reach the goal, once the goal is defined and decided upon. It is part of the process. Having been involved in a few conversations very similar to this, it seems to me that the place to start is to develop your idea of what your leader is going to look like. Is your leader going to be an individual, or is your leader going to be an agency with staff? I would argue that finding that leader and getting that person to bring the disparate other groups and agencies together to define the goal, to give people jobs that they would be responsible for, to fill out all those blank white pieces of paper, is key to the beginning. I see that it will be very difficult to get to the middle which is where you are without defining who your leader is going to be.

12. **WALTER GRAY:** I think that Assemblymember Firebaugh and Secretary Nichols have shared with us that the administration has created an ambiguous situation. The governor signed a bill establishing a structure while vetoing the funding and directing the Resources Agency to do some things. A key, high priority is to resolve that issue of organizational structure. The leadership must be defined. Once there is leadership, once there is some clarity about structure or what the nature of this unifying framework might be, there will be "followership." We are all looking for ways to participate in developing the solutions. The ambiguity should to be dealt with relatively rapidly. That is in part a statement, but it is also a call to try to prioritize that foundational issue of who is doing what and then move forward.

13. **MALCOLM MARGOLIN:** With regard to the turf-issues raised and Walter's [Gray] identification of the ambiguity, in terms of short-term goals this might be a good place to take the accessibility and inclusion seriously; and get a broader constituency in working out exactly what happens to that money — to go outside of the State government to the various people that are engaged in cultural work throughout the whole state. This is something that is not just a matter of which department gets power and how it is structured. This is something that is of concern to everybody. Public power.

14. **AMY KITCHENER:** This conversation needs to go beyond an agency structure and more toward what the cultural needs are. I think it would be very useful if, as part of the planning process, we could convene different domains to talk about needs and broaden the picture. I think the groups would need to meet separately and then come together to find a common ground, to craft a common language of culture. That is really critical for the sustainability of this field over time.

15. **HOLLY FIALA:** I would discourage that separation. I think one of the catalytic aspects of this gathering is that I am able to hear different voices than I hear all of the time. I can see so many opportunities where we have mutually interlocking benefits and interests that I think it would be a disservice to each of those entities to have officially sanction separate meetings. The other aspect of this is trying to encourage Getty as a leader in this field to build other resources that are non-governmental. Without that, we are going to consistently be looking for that pot. We want to find a lot of pots of money. There have been a lot of creative ideas for doing that, but we wouldn't know that if we weren't all representing different interest groups. My last observation is that I am thinking a lot about the composition of that cultural trust. I don't have any squabbles over whether it is appointed or whatever, but I do think that definition of what kinds of backgrounds — what kinds of networks or spheres of influence — these people ought to represent should be given to the legislature and the governor. Without that, it could be tilted in so many different ways. I think that there is an underlying lack of trust that there won't be that balance. There are a lot of opportunities for partnerships and the cultural trust could create that.

16. **TOM FRYE:** This gathering is turning out to be even more important than I thought it would. It seems to me that the presence of the people who have come here and what I have heard hear is a movement toward resolution in terms of structure, in terms of how government can work with respect to this. I heard that there has been separation, but I also heard that there is movement toward solutions. And, I think that's a very, very good thing. That is a very encouraging sign. I don't think we practitioners should allow ourselves to be diverted

from the kind of things we have been talking about here. I think these are very important issues, and it seems to me that there are two tracks that are going to be pursued. The structural solutions would seem to be moving along in a more positive way. In order not to be diverted, we may want to set what can be accomplished in another meeting because you can't deal with all of the issues that have been brought up and try to resolve them here. But, you can lay out a next step. You can come back together again. You can today try to narrow down what you want to discuss at the next meeting. You also need a bit of time to reflect, to read the Proceedings, think about what you heard. Then you can come back together again with a focused view and take it to the next step.

17. **MARIA ACOSTA:** I am from the arts field. I am so happy to be here because we have such commonalities that I would say twelve hours ago I would not have suspected but would have thought we were in different camps. I would have thought of a preservationist as someone I might have to fight with, but now I can see we have immense opportunities and possibilities facing us. We have similar challenges facing us in terms of our public. In the arts field, we are grappling with what is the public for what we do. We consider ourselves the constituents. We consider ourselves those who should be recipients of public funding. But if we can't get the public to support a park bond and if we have children in East Los Angeles who are not going to our state parks, if we have children or their parents who are not going to theater performances regularly, then we have not created public value in what we do — whether it is in the arts, in culture, in historic preservation — and I think that is an essential question. What is the public value of what we do? If over time we can change the perception of the public value of what we do so that ten years from now we could have people saying — as they currently do when they get in an elevator and someone lights up a cigarette — my god, how can that happen? No art? No history? No culture? It becomes something that is anticipated, expected — therefore valued — therefore money will come. The funding will come. I don't want to fight over money and I see that looming. We need to expect more for all, not more for some.

ISSUES AS AGREED TO FOLLOWING DISCUSSION:

ACCESSIBILITY AND INCLUSION

Examples:

- Audience
- Programs
- Educational linkages
- Using Internet as teaching tool (tech narrative)
(How do we speak this language?)
- Awareness of our physical environment
(who built, creative process)
- Coordinate with academic environment
(UC, State Universities, collections)
- Deal with modern issues
- Get broad constituency together to help resolve ambiguity
and empower them to find solutions.

ADVOCACY

Examples:

- Funding
- Linkages between agencies
- Outreach
- Define needs in arts and humanities

MESSAGE AND PROMOTION AND VISIBILITY

Examples:

- Stories (formerly “Master Narrative”)
- Terminology – better than definitions
- Public recognition of social and economic benefits
- Heritage Tourism
- Improvements to quality of life (lower crime rates, better
neighborhoods, etc)
- CSPAN vs. MTV messages
- Collective mission statement
- Creating public value in arts and humanities
(change expectations/ anticipation on part of public)

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE (UNIFYING FRAMEWORK)

Examples:

- Integration of natural and cultural history
- Decision-making framework
- “Pup tents in the big tent”
- Get all three Department of Parks & Recreation
Commissions together
- Respect/integration of living culture
- Office or Division of Cultural Affairs
- Group meetings of agencies and organization heads
- Develop timeline for implementing ideas and initiatives.
(Time of essence and deadlines)
- Define leader who can bring everyone together
- Narrow down what will be discussed at future gatherings as
follow up item.

SUPPORT SYSTEMS

Examples:

- Magazine of California cultural history
- Regional centers
- Endangered sites
- Fixes to existing systems
- Tax Incentives
- Funding priority (well-funded) key
- Heritage sites visibility
- Resolve ambiguities created by AB 716
(structure vs. funding)

CREATIVE PARTNERSHIPS

- Encourage Getty as leader to help bring groups together
- Build trust and balance

UNIFYING VISION

CLOSING REMARKS AND NEXT STEPS

RUTH COLEMAN

Acting Director

California Department of Parks and Recreation

I'd like to share with you my experience as a legislative staff person. I worked for the legislature for nearly 10 years and during that time, I worked on several park bond efforts. One of the things that I had observed was the lack of political organization on the part of historic preservation, parks, arts, culture, in contrast to the land trust groups who are extraordinarily organized. As we worked park bonds through the legislative process, we never were visited by anybody representing any of the interests in this room. So, it was a sheer stroke of luck that there was \$10 million put into Proposition 12, because that was actually modeled on one of the bonds that I had worked on. The only reason that we had put \$10 million in our version was because the district staff person for the Senator I worked for in Eureka had expressed an interest in historic preservation in downtown Eureka.

So, one of the things that we wanted to accomplish in this summit was to start bringing folks together so that you discover each other, so that you learn to become politically active. The only way this will work is for people to first meet each other and next discover a common agenda. From that, we can determine what kind of issues are going to unify us.

I would argue that as we move on, you are going to be unified by a few significant events in the next year. One event will be the discussion that Mary Nichols just launched. It will be a political discussion. My Department is working with the Secretary. We are going to be having several meetings — we have already had some meetings, we have to have several more — and they will keep going on over the next year as legislation gets developed. We need to have conversations with you and many others who are not in this room on what that bill, what that structure, should look like. My expectation is that the administration will come out with a modification of SB 716, not a complete rewrite. In our view, it was not inclusive enough and there was not enough public dialogue in the development of that bill. It is the right idea, but not quite enough of a public process. So, there is a unifying event that you should all watch closely and participate.

The summit was a unifying event. We need to have subsequent meetings that can unify this group more and expand the group. We can publish rosters of everybody who is here and put together a compilation of all the different organizations so that you can discover the array of groups working in areas of common interest.

Another unifying event that I want to draw your attention to is going to be the [State] budget because this will be the real test of what Marco Firebaugh said when he told you that you had won, that the public and the legislature cares about cultural heritage. You will see that put to a test in the coming months when the budget comes out. I worked for the Chair of the Budget Committee. I worked for the Legislative Analyst. I have been doing budgets now for about 13 or 14 years. And, I can tell you that I have never seen anything of this magnitude. This is the “perfect storm.” You could close all of California State Universities and our entire Medi-Cal program and you will still not fill that gap.

I have a challenge to you — pay attention to what happens in the budget; pay attention to what happens to State Parks, what happens to the Arts Council, what happens to those different entities that deal with the issues you care about. The legislature's job will be to evaluate and debate the governor's budget. There will be a lot of discussion about taxes or no taxes. Those are going to be the kinds of issues for which you are going to have to get politically organized. I remember what it was like when we were cutting billions of dollars in the mid-1990's when I worked in the Senate. The noise level was deafening. At some point, the staff in the legislature and the members just shut down and you do not get through any more. You have to start getting your message out now while they are still listening. You have a lot of freshman legislators. You have a lot of legislators who have never done anything but give out money. We do not have long-term Senators and Assemblymembers this time around. So, it is a very scary time. But, remember we have talked a lot about hope. The hope, I think, is that we do have an extraordinary common agenda that needs to find a voice.

My hope is that there will be a voice when the public realizes it might lose something. Take a page out of the environmentalist playbook. When they are pushing for park bonds, they are not showing what they have protected in the past. They put out pictures of a landscape that is threatened by a housing development. That is their organizing tool — if you do not vote for this, if you do not go along with our agenda, you will lose this “fill in the blank” picture in perpetuity. That speaks to people, that potential loss. We could be facing those kind of potential losses in the next few years. The message is to say our cultural and historical resources are not renewable. It is not that we want to have a negative message, but if you want to start getting close to the “clean water” message, it has got to be something more powerful than “this matters.” It has got to be that if you lose it, you have lost your heritage and who you are forever.

I do not want to leave on a negative note. I want to leave you on a challenging note to pay attention to the budget, pay attention to the legislature, and pay attention to the legisla-

tive process that we are going to be going through. We will come up with an additional meeting — a subsequent meeting. I have not heard enough specifics to tell you what it is yet. So we are going to have to go back and reflect as Tom [Frye] advised us, to think through which of these kinds of issues would make the most sense for us to have a subsequent meeting. Maybe what we need to do is have a whole bunch of regional meetings that deal with a variety of issues and then by being regionalized, you can bring in a broader array of folks. There are going to be different ways of trying to accomplish this. I do not think that we have consensus other than we certainly want to continue our role at State Parks of trying to help unify all of you — if nothing else just bringing you together in a venue where you discover each other.

We could not have done this program without our sponsors, and in particular, The Friends of Hearst Castle, Hearst Castle Preservation Foundation, and the J. Paul Getty Trust. I have no doubt that we will try to discuss further with them for future efforts. I think there are other foundations that we ought to bring into the mix. The staff of the Getty has been extraordinary and we could not have done it without them. I am particularly proud of the State Parks staff who worked incredibly hard — the logistical people and the planning team. And most importantly, I want to thank all of you, because you are very busy people and you have spent a lot of time and intellectual capital in the past day and a half. I hope that you found it valuable and we do look forward to all of your comments.

Thank you very much, and we will continue the conversation.



THE FUTURE OF CALIFORNIA'S CULTURAL HERITAGE RESOURCES

THE GETTY CENTER LOS ANGELES NOVEMBER 19, 20, 21

POST SUMMIT COMMENTS

“WE CULTURAL ENTHUSIASTS HAVE BEEN
LACKING IN THE AREA OF ADVOCACY AND
POLITICAL ORGANIZATION.”

– Terri Knoll

COMMENTS SUBMITTED FOLLOWING SUMMIT

SUSAN WILCOX

Director of Marketing

California Trade and Tourism Commission

California Tourism promotes the cultural heritage attributes of California... A daunting task in this State with the “embarrassment of riches” that we have to promote. Of 200 million adults in the US, 143 mil took trips of 50 or more miles in the last year — 93 % (92.7 million) of those included arts, culture, history or heritage during their trips.

- Nearly 30 million of those travelers added extra time to their trip because of cultural/heritage activities, adding tax revenues at both the state and local levels.
- Cultural/Heritage Travelers also do more and spend more than other travelers.
- Travelers are motivated to travel by discussions with their peers, knowing that there are people of their demographic are in the destination.
- Travelers want to learn about the people and the history as they tour destination venues and view artifacts. Narratives of the Humanities Council to tie into the artifacts of the destination.

California is the number one travel destination in the United States. Our travel industry is two times the size of Texas and New York and five times the size of Hawaii. California Tourism Industry is a \$75 billion industry (second or third behind Health Services and High Technology depending on the state of the economy), contributing nearly \$5 billion in tax revenues to the State’s General Fund. The tourism industry employs over one million Californians. California Tourism receives \$7 million in State General Fund support each year to promote travel to California. The tourism industry passed the California Tourism Marketing Act in 1997 which allowed for a self-assessment of the industry which now matches the General Fund allotment. That \$14 million puts California fourteenth overall in statewide tourism office budgets. California Tourism works hard to leverage that \$14 million into a \$40 million campaign in order to keep market share.

We have an opportunity to build upon the partnership started last year with California Trade and Tourism Commission; State Parks; the California Arts Council; and the San Diego, San Francisco, Sacramento and Los Angeles Convention and Visitor Bureaus working together with their Arts Councils; and the California Cultural Tourism Coalition. The California

Cultural Tourism Coalition took \$250,000 in funding and turned those funds into a \$2.2 million marketing campaign consisting of a cultural heritage web site, a print piece in partnership with *Smithsonian* Magazine to drive consumers to that web site, and a “Best of California” half-hour television program. This promotion reached over two million consumers and has resulted in over one million hits to the www.culturecalifornia.com Web site. The 2003 program will expand the 2002 program by implementing the following strategies:

- The Coalition will partner with Custom Marketing Group, *Smithsonian* Magazine, and *Esence* Magazine to develop, promote, and distribute a 16-plus page insert for the Celebration of the African American Heritage of California. Custom Marketing Group will also distribute the publication to American Express cardholders with a high propensity to travel to cultural venues. The 2003 promotion will build upon the 2002 promotion by adding in distribution and back-end analysis provided by American Express.
- The Coalition will add the “African-American” print piece above to the web site content developed last year as well as continue to add cultural heritage attributes to the web site. This year we will also add a “Press Room” so that organizations can download their immediate activities on this content rich Web site. This site is also a direct link from the www.visitcalifornia.com site, which receives 5.7 million hits per month. The www.culturecalifornia.com site allows consumers and travel trade alike to search by region, city, destination, cultural discipline, or key words.
- The Coalition will participate in several added value promotional activities with *Smithsonian* and *Esence* magazines including, but not limited to, two African American Celebration weekends at Smithsonian Affiliate museums and participating in *Esence* Magazine events in California.
- The Coalition will develop with participating partners’ cultural heritage promotional packages to promote on-line as well as an on-line sweepstakes to encourage additional consumer participation. The Coalition will also work with the executive producer and *Sunset* Magazine to produce a half-hour television program focusing on the African American heritage of California to further drive consumers to engage in cultural heritage activities. This program will also drive consumers to the “Best of California” sister web site being developed where consumers may book cultural heritage travel packages.

- The Coalition will work with all partners' public affairs directors to further publicize cultural heritage attributes through their collective media outlets.

Finally, if we entice the consumer to participate and experience our cultural activities from the state and local levels public support will follow.

SUSAN WILCOX

Director of Marketing

California Trade and Tourism Commission

Dear Ms. Coleman:

I would like to thank you for the opportunity to participate in "The Future of California's Cultural Heritage Resources" Summit at the Getty Center in Los Angeles this past week.

There are several opportunities to expand upon what we learned at this conference and move forward with tangible results in place at your next meeting. The first opportunity is to provide a "list serve" or communication tool for the cultural heritage community by building on the invitees and participants at the conference. The second opportunity is to build upon the partnership started last year with California Tourism, State Parks, the California Arts Council, and the San Diego, San Francisco, Sacramento and Los Angeles Convention and Visitor Bureaus working together with their Arts Councils. The third opportunity will result from the first two, that being a network of state and local advocates for the promotion and preservation of cultural heritage attributes.

1. The "list serve" will provide an ongoing networking and information-sharing tool for statewide cultural and heritage tourism coordinators. Recognizing the communication needs of this extensive group and constraints on travel dollars for many, an on-line communication network should be developed to increase statewide electronic communications between stakeholders.

(NOTE: The California Arts Council has nearly 10,000 arts organizations receiving their weekly newsletter. California Tourism has a mailing list of over 1,000 destination-marketing organizations.)

STRATEGIES

- Work with existing World Wide Web portal providers to determine the best "off the shelf" software that will provide access to information about cultural heritage issues and efforts both at the state and local levels.
 - Given a "\$0" Budget, an online workgroup could either rollout the first phase of a functioning virtual community using existing software or
2. The California Cultural Tourism Coalition took \$250,000 in funding and turned those funds into a \$2.2 million marketing campaign consisting of a cultural heritage web site, a print piece in partnership with *Smithsonian Magazine* to drive consumers to that web site, and a "Best of California" half-hour television program. This promotion reached over two million consumers and has resulted in over one million hits to the www.culturecalifornia.com Web site. The 2003 program will expand the 2002 program by implementing the following strategies:
 - The Coalition will partner with Custom Marketing Group, *Smithsonian Magazine*, and *Essence Magazine* to develop, promote and distribute a 16-plus page insert for the Celebration of the African American Heritage of California. Custom Marketing Group will also distribute the publication to American Express cardholders with a high propensity to travel to cultural venues. The 2003 promotion will build upon the 2002 promotion by adding in distribution and backend analysis provided by American Express.
 - The Coalition will add the "African-American" print piece above to the web site content developed last year as well as continue to add cultural heritage attributes to the web site. This year we will also add a "Press Room" so that organizations can download their immediate activities on this content rich Web site. This site is also a direct link from the www.visitcalifornia.com site, which received 5.7 million hits per month. The www.culturecalifornia.com site allows consumers and travel trade alike to search by region, city, destination, cultural discipline, or key words.
 - The Coalition will participate in several added value promotional activities with *Smithsonian* and *Essence* magazines including but not limited to: two African American Celebration weekends at *Smithsonian* Affiliate museums and participating in *Essence Magazine* events in California.
 - The Coalition will develop with participating partners' cultural heritage promotional packages to promote on-line as well as on-line sweepstakes to encourage additional consumer participation.
 - The Coalition will also work with the executive producer and *Sunset Magazine* to produce a half-hour television program focusing on the African American heritage of California to further drive consumers to engage in cultural heritage activities. This program will also drive consumers to the "Best of California" sister Web site being developed where consumers may book cultural heritage travel packages.

- The Coalition will work with all partners' public affairs directors to further publicize cultural heritage attributes through their collective media outlets.

(NOTE: The cost of the program will be \$217,000 to implement a \$2.5 million dollar campaign designed to encourage Western States Residents to participate in California Cultural Heritage travel. To date the Coalition has not yet received verification that State Parks will participate in the 2003 program.)

3. Finally, through implementation of the first two opportunities, advocates from all areas of cultural heritage will want to participate and be more motivated to ask for support from not only their traditional funding partners but from state and local government agencies. Through our continued discussion and implementation of successful collaborative programs at the state level, many local programs will follow.

Both Caroline Beteta and I welcome the opportunity to meet with you and key state representatives to further discuss these issues and develop a cohesive statewide program to address the issues discussed during your conference.

DR. ARCHIE GREEN

*Secretary/Treasurer
Fund for Labor Culture*

Thanksgiving for our family is a quiet day with equal portions of good food and reflective thought. This holiday, I kept winding the summit tape backwards in my mind trying to understand the meeting, its issues and personalities, and asking myself what I might do to help as the future agenda materialized.

To begin – I had never been to the Getty Center and was overwhelmed by the architectural grandeur, the construction detail, and the elegant gardens growing in their chaparral setting. I have yet to sort out my contradictory feelings about the meaning of such largesse.

I attended all sessions; sat down front; absorbed all talks. It took some time for me to realize that I was the oldest person in attendance. Not only was I ancient, but I had grown up across town from the Getty.

Boyle Heights, an immigrant enclave east of the Los Angeles River, was home in childhood. Literally, in my early teen years, I would walk across the First Street Bridge through downtown to the LA Public Library. My sisters and I also explored wonderful galleries at the Southwest Museum at the Arroyo Seco Park and the County Museum in Exposition Park.

Nearly every summit speaker reminded me of some aspect of my youth (although this was hardly the conference purpose).

For example – with the meeting's focus on heritage problems, I asked myself when had I become conscious of preservation and conservation as related activities. The Santa Anita area above Sierra Madre in the Angeles National Forest made its mark very early. I felt quite brave after climbing every trail to Mt. Wilson. I liked hiking and camping; began to read nature books; to be a forest ranger became my career choice.

During Roosevelt High School years, I sold the *Times* on Saturday night. A crew of Eastside kids would meet in the afternoon to be driven by truck to "corners" in Hollywood. The old granite-block Times Building served as our assembly point. While awaiting the truck, I would study the bronze plaque embedded in the building wall commemorating the men killed in the bombing of the *Times*, 1911.

I have no memory of seeing any historic marker before this bronze. Its message, virulently anti-labor, reflected the position of publisher Harrison Gray Otis. Our family held to working-class creeds; the plaque symbolized all I opposed.

In 1934, forestry was still my ambition. I could not anticipate that I would end up preserving old ballads/blues/buildings. In this year 2002, I have helped Tim Kelley and others place a plaque on the Garcia and Maggini Warehouse (at the San Francisco Embarcadero), a marker quite unlike the *Times* plaque so long ago. The Getty Summit evoked powerful memories, one of which recalls college days at Cal when I had joined the Young Democrats. Irene and Henry Erdman (he held the Chair of Giannini Professor of Agricultural Economics) were our faculty sponsors. As firm New Dealers, they often hosted in their home prominent political individuals then visiting the campus: Jim Farley, Henry Wallace, Mordecai Ezekiel, John Collier, as well as a sprinkling of Sacramento officials from the EPIC wing of the Democratic Party.

Students assisted at receptions and gatherings. This activity helped us to social and political maturity. Irene Erdman guided us in manners as well as in distinguishing between pragmatists and visionaries, technicians and reformers. The Summit strangely transported me to Berkeley, 1936-30. Knox Mellon reincarnated as a FDR enthusiast: intelligent, humane, sophisticated. Knox would have been at ease in the Erdman's parlor. It took some doing to switch back from the Cal campus to the Getty.

Of course, I knew that its planners had dedicated the summit to cultural heritage resources. Why did I have trouble making the transition from distant past to future? In posing this question, I sensed something not often articulated at the conference. Conservationists and preservationists today face different and difficult challenges from Washington. The President brazenly defies environmental partisans; he trumpets hostility. By

contrast, administration spokesmen cloak their policy towards historical/cultural preservation. If a site brings tourist dollars, step ahead; if this site fails in the market...

Beyond this unstated challenge lurking in the wings of our meeting, a Liberian/Bahamas/Swiss/Russian/Greek tanker broke in two off the northwest coast of Spain some 6000 miles from the Getty. The *Prestige* spilled twice as much oil as the *Exxon Valdez*. Do we judge this only as an environmental disaster? What of the living culture of fishermen? Did the spill affect the Gehry-built museum at Bilbao? If the tanker had ruptured off Malibu, would it have altered our agenda?

One of the recurring laments at the summit was the victory of the clean water proposition over "our" cultural heritage measure. This puzzled me. Don't we deserve both? Can't we champion clean water, historic sites, and strong rules on maritime oil transport? In short, I pictured the rust bucket *Prestige* as always sailing (intruding) into waters of our Getty meeting.

To close on a down-to-earth note – I enjoyed the summit very much. Thank you again, Tom [Frye] for inviting me. Everyone was super kind from the moment I arrived at the Luxe Hotel. You'll be pleased to learn that before departing LA, I took in the Boyle Heights exhibit at the Japanese-American National Museum. From there, I made a hop, skip, jump across the First Street Bridge to my childhood home on Echandia above Pleasant. It is not a landmark but it is well preserved.

THE HONORABLE LAUREN W. BRICKER, PH.D.

Vice Chair

State Historical Resources Commission

Exceptional experience. Extremely well-organized. Has the potential of being a defining event in the planning process of development of a coordinated arts and history state program.

Please include consideration of historic preservation as an educational opportunity for the State. We are training our future population. This needs support (administrative, policy, funding) from the State. The arts are supported at the university level, though not at the secondary and elementary levels. Preservation has a minimum place in the educational system statewide. I would be pleased to be involved with changing that situation, especially at a university level.

UNSIGNED COMMENTS FROM EVALUATIONS

- *Excellent* staff support prior to and during the event. Congrats to the planners and workers; everything went smoothly.
- Keep the momentum going; continued communication.

- Great assemblage of people representing wide range of expertise and interests.
- Thanks to our generous sponsors and hosts.
- Terrific food.
- Networking opportunities wonderful.
- Mike Heyman's talk was very thought provoking as was Tom Frye's.
- Next venue: more pedestrian friendly?
Spend ½ day in small work groups
Give us assignments, projects
What is schedule, critical path?
Iterative process leading to what?
- Fair and open competition for Proposition 40 dollars – members of summit (some) should develop priorities, selection criteria and proposal review which State would administer. Use CALFED model which had a panel of scientists, agencies, non-profits, public that came up with priorities. Pick 10-12 members from the Summit – archaeologist, historian, Native American, DPR, CPF, NTHP, NPS. This group comes up with way to rank proposals and reviews them.
- Education: The Director of DPR should meet with the Department of Education to develop curriculum. Use State college system with teaching certificates. Train teachers at K-12 and provide teaching materials such as textbooks, fieldtrips and send us into classrooms.
- Need to build trust among organizations/Summit participants.
- Regional accessible collections facilities are a high priority along with the back log of maintenance and repair solutions.
- Natural and heritage conservation issues often play out in planning departments, real estate development process, public works projects, and transportation projects. We may have issues of policy and practice in other sectors of state and local government, other than the Resources Agency. In the next five to ten years we can also examine how the missions and objectives of other sectors support or hamper cultural resources objectives.
- One very specific issue: Why does not state planning *require* counties and cities to include cultural resources as part of the local "general plans?" If general plans do not accept cultural resources as a basic element of policy, then resources will not be well identified, protected and celebrated.



THE FUTURE OF CALIFORNIA'S CULTURAL HERITAGE RESOURCES

THE GETTY CENTER LOS ANGELES NOVEMBER 19, 20, 21

PARTICIPANT ROSTER

MARIE ACOSTA

Director, Latino Arts Network

Marie Acosta, Director of the California Latino Arts Network was also Executive Director of the Mexican Museum, served as a Special Assistant to the Director of the California Arts Council, and was a member of the San Francisco Mime Troupe. She currently serves on the Citizens Advisory Committee, Grants for the Arts in S.F.

RICHARD AMEIL

President, California Missions Foundation

Richard Ameil has worked in the nonprofit sector for the past 28 years. He founded the California Missions Foundation, a non-sectarian, nonprofit organization of civic-minded citizens dedicated to the preservation, protection and maintenance of the California 21 missions. The Foundation is currently leading a statewide campaign to raise \$50 million to repair the missions. Mr. Ameil has a B.A. in political science from California State University, Sacramento.

JOHN "RUSTY" AREIAS

Former Director, California State Parks

Rusty Areias is a former six-term Assemblymember, whose term ended in 1994. Areias was appointed the following year to the California Coastal Commission, where he later served as Chair. In February 1999 Rusty Areias was appointed Director of California State Parks by Governor Gray Davis, a position he held until leaving to run for the California State Senate in 2002.

SUSANA BAUTISTA

Executive Director, Mexican Cultural Institute

Susana Bautista is Executive Director of the Mexican Cultural Institute, a non-profit organization that presents Mexican art and culture located in Plaza Olvera in downtown Los Angeles. Ms. Bautista is also an art historian and curator of Latin American art with over 15 years experience in Los Angeles, New York, and Europe.

STEPHEN BECKER

Executive Director, California Historical Society

Stephen Becker was born in Redwood City, California in 1951. Educated in public schools in San Mateo, California he received his B.A. in anthropology from U.C. Berkeley and his M.A. in folklore & museum studies from Indiana University. Mr. Becker has had a career of 30 years in museums and historical organizations in California and New Mexico.

BILL BERRY

Deputy Director, Park Operations, California State Parks

Bill Berry was recently appointed as Deputy Director of Park Operation for the California Department of Parks and Recreation. Bill is a 33 year park veteran who started in 1969 as a seasonal lifeguard in Santa Barbara County. Bill is a graduate of the University of California, Santa Barbara and is also a graduate of the FBI National Academy in Virginia.

CLAIRE W. BOGAARD

Member, State Historical Resources Commission

Claire Bogaard helped to create Pasadena Heritage, a local historic preservation organization with 2,500 members. She also continues historic preservation work with Heritage Housing Partners which buys, rehabilitates and sells historic homes in affordable price ranges and has created an advocacy group to support the City of Pasadena parks.

DR. LAUREN WEISS BRICKER

Vice Chair, State Historical Resources Commission

Lauren Bricker is an assistant professor of architecture at California State Polytechnic, Pomona. As an architectural historian and a historic preservation consultant, she has written on subjects that include California architecture, architecture of the United States, and issues related to the preservation of historic resources.

LONNIE G. BUNCH

President, Chicago Historical Society

Lonnie G. Bunch is the president of the Chicago Historical Society — one of the nation's oldest history museums — a position that he assumed in January 2001. For more than a dozen years, Bunch worked in various capacities at the Smithsonian Institution. He was the Associate Director for Curatorial Affairs at the National Museum of American History from 1992 through 2000 and served as the senior Curator of Political History from 1989-1991. Before coming to the Smithsonian, Bunch was the Founding Curator of the California African American Museum in Los Angeles.

DAVID S. BYRD

Past President, California Council for the Promotion of History (CCPH)

David Byrd received his M.A. in Public History at California State University, Sacramento in 1994. Currently employed by Jones and Stokes, he has worked in the field of cultural resources management for over eight years. Mr. Byrd has served on the Board of CCPH for six years, including two as president.

RUTH COLEMAN

Acting Director, California State Parks

Ruth Coleman is currently the Acting Director for State Parks. Prior to joining State Parks, she worked as Policy Director for Assemblywoman Helen Thomson and had served as Legislative Director for State Senator Mike Thompson. Before coming to Sacramento, she served three years as a Peace Corps volunteer in Swaziland, Southern Africa. Ms. Coleman received her Master in Public Administration from Harvard University, and a B.A. in Economics from Occidental College.

STEVE CAPPS

Assistant Deputy Director, California State Parks

Steve Capps was appointed by Governor Gray Davis as the Assistant Deputy Director, Communications for California State Parks in February of 2000. Before that, he spent 25 years as a newspaper reporter, most of that as a political reporter based in Sacramento. He was the Capitol Bureau Chief for the San Francisco Examiner, and later a staff writer in the Sacramento Bee's Capitol Bureau.

STEADE R. CRAIGO, FAIA

Chief, Cultural Resources Division, California State Parks

The Cultural Resources Division oversees archaeological sites on State parklands, the Department's museum and archaeological collection and services and its historic structures. Mr. Craigo was formerly with the State Office of Historic Preservation as its senior restoration architect and Acting State Historic Preservation Officer.

ROBERTA B. DEERING

Executive Director, California Preservation Foundation

A professional and active volunteer with over twenty years of experience in historic preservation planning, advocacy, consulting and administration, Roberta was appointed California Preservation Foundation's Executive Director in 1999. She currently serves on the Board of Preservation Action and on the Advisory Board of the National Alliance of Preservation Commissions. Roberta earned a Bachelor of Arts from the University of California, Davis and a Masters of Urban Planning from the University of Oregon.

RAQUELLE DE LA ROCHA

Member, California State Park and Recreation Commission

Ms. de la Rocha has 14 years of experience as an attorney specializing in labor and employment law. Her career has included positions at private law firms as well as at the California State Bar Office of Trial Counsel, where she served as a Senior Litigator and Trial Counsel from 1990 to 1991. She was named Hispanic Woman of the Year in 1996 by the Mexican American Opportunity Foundation and Woman of the Future by Commission Feminil de los Angeles in 1995.

BILL DEVERELL

Chair, California Council for the Humanities

Mr. Deverell teaches American History at Caltech, specializing in the history of California and the American West. He also serves as the 2002-03 fellow of the Hayes Foundation in Los Angeles.

LINDA DISHMAN

Executive Director, Los Angeles Conservancy

The Los Angeles Conservancy is a non-profit historic preservation organization of over 7,400 members. The Conservancy's mission builds on a strategy that combines action, assistance and awareness to make preservation a vital part of the life of every Angeleno.

ARTHUR E. ECK

Deputy Regional Director, National Park Service

Art Eck began his government career in the U.S. Senate in 1968, joining the National Park Service's Office of Legislation in 1977. Since 1983 he has been a park manager serving in Missouri, Wisconsin, Arizona and California. In November, 2001 he was appointed Deputy Regional Director.

PAUL ESPINOSA

Independent Filmmaker, Espinosa Productions

Paul Espinosa, an award-winning independent filmmaker, has been involved with producing PBS films for over 20 years including "The U.S. - Mexican War," "The Hunt for Pancho Villa," "The Border," and others. His company, Espinosa Productions, specializes in documentary and dramatic films focused on the U.S.-Mexico border region.

HOLLY HARRISON FIALA

Director, National Trust for Historic Preservation, Western Office

Ms. Fiala joined the National Trust's regional office in November 1999, relocating from Chicago, Illinois where she was the former founding Executive Director of Inspired Partnerships (IP). Prior to her work with religious properties, she served in a variety of positions in the National Trust's Midwest Office. She received her B.S. in Education from Northern Illinois University and an M.A. in Art History from the University of Pittsburgh.

HOYT FIELDS

Chief Curator, Hearst Castle

Mr. Fields has worked at Hearst Castle for 32+ years. He is currently Chief Curator responsible for 25,000 artifacts.

MARCO ANTONIO FIREBAUGH

Majority Floor Leader, California State Assembly

As Assembly Majority Floor Leader Firebaugh is responsible for all matters that are relevant to the order of business in the Assembly and serves as one of the chief negotiators for Assembly Democrats. In 2001, Firebaugh was unanimously elected Chair-Elect of the California Latino Legislative Caucus. Firebaugh holds a B.A. in political science from U.C. Berkeley and a law degree from U.C.L.A. School of Law.

DR. JANET FIREMAN

Curator, National History Museum of L.A. County

Janet Fireman is Curator for the Natural History Museum of L.A. County and Editor for *California History*. Receiving her B.A., M.A. and Ph.D. specializing in Western history and Spanish borderlands, Fireman taught at California State University, Fresno prior to her current work. She is, "crazy for California and its impact on the nation and the world."

DIANE B. FRANKEL

*Program Director for Children, Youth and Families,
The James Irvine Foundation*

Prior to her work with The James Irvine Foundation, Ms. Frankel was appointed Director of the Institute of Museum Services by President Clinton (1993). She is currently on the National Board of ArtTable, and a member of the Women's Forum of S.F., among others. Ms. Frankel holds a B.A. from U.C. Berkeley and an M.A. in Museum Education from George Washington University.

L. THOMAS FRYE

Cultural Resources Advisor to the Director, California State Parks & Chief Curator Emeritus of History, The Oakland Museum of California

Frye, a California native, museum curator, and cultural historian, assists museums, historical organizations, preservation groups, governmental agencies, and old friends. He has been collecting and interpreting the California experience for some 35 years. He can often be found exploring the main streets and back roads of California and the West in his old VW camper.

WALTER P. GRAY III

State Archivist, California State Archives

Walter Gray is the California State Archivist and Chief, Archives & Museum Division for the California Secretary of State. He is a former Museum Director with 21 years experience at California State Parks. Mr. Gray is also an author and consultant.

DR. ARCHIE GREEN

Secretary/Treasurer, Fund for Labor Culture

For many decades, Archie Green has explored the expressive life of working people. As a shipwright in the maritime and building trades, a life-long unionist, teacher, author, and citizen, he has devoted himself to understanding culture in and of labor. Green received a B.A. from U.C., a Master's in library science from the University of Illinois, a Ph.D. in folklore from the University of Pennsylvania, and an L.L.D. from the University of North Carolina.

KATHLEEN D. GREEN

Member, State Historical Resources Commission

Kathleen Green is also a member of the State Historic Capitol Commission. She sits on the committee for the rehabilitation of the Stanford Mansion Project. A former Board of Trustee of the CPF, she has also served on several local boards and organizations.

PAULINE GRENBEAUX

Manager, Museum Services Section, California State Parks

Pauline Grenbeaux is the head of California State Parks Museum Services Section which handles statewide policy, programs, and long-term planning affecting museum collections throughout the park system. Pauline has an M.A. in Art History from U.C. Davis.

PEYTON HALL, AIA

President, California Preservation Foundation

Peyton Hall is President of California Preservation Foundation and Past Chairman of Pasadena Heritage. Hall is a practicing preservation architect and a Principal of Historic Resources Group, LLC, in Hollywood. He holds degrees from the University of Virginia and Yale University, has completed diverse projects such as the restoration of Angels Flight and a Historic Structure Report for The Gamble House.

DR. GERALD W. HASLAM

Independent Writer

An Oildale native, he is author or editor of twenty-six books, including: *Workin' Man Blues*, *Coming of Age in California*, *Straight White Male*, and *The Great Central Valley: California's Heartland*.

STEPHEN HEARST

*Vice President & General Manager, SF Realties,
Sunical Hearst Corporation*

Steve Hearst is the great grandson of Hearst Corporation founder, William Randolph Hearst. Steve is responsible for managing Hearst's extensive ranching, timber and property operations in California. He is also the Chair of the Board of Directors of the California Missions Foundation.

BARRY HESSENIUS

Director, California Arts Council

Barry Hesseinius was appointed Director of the California Arts Council by Governor Gray Davis in March 2000. Mr. Hesseinius was previously the President and Chief Executive Officer of the California Assembly of Local Arts Agencies. Mr. Hesseinius has also been an advisor to the National Policy Committee of Americans for the Arts and the President's Committee for the Arts & Humanities.

PROFESSOR I. MICHAEL HEYMAN

Keynote Speaker, Chancellor Emeritus, University of California Berkeley, and Former Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution (see vitae at the end of this section)

DR. WILLIAM HILDEBRANDT

Member, State Historical Resources Commission and Principal, Far Western Anthropological Research Group

Bill Hildebrandt earned a Ph.D. in Anthropology from the University of California in 1981. He has over 25 years experience in prehistoric archaeology throughout California and the Great Basin. He has been the Principal Investigator on numerous large-scale projects associated with transportation, military, and energy-related undertakings. He regularly published the results of these cultural resource efforts in both professional and public educational outlets.

ADRIENNE HORN

President, Museum Management Consultants, Inc.

Adrienne Horn has served as a consultant to museums for the past twenty-five years. She has extensive experience in the areas of leadership issue, organizational development, and educational program planning for youth and adults. She is particularly adept at analyzing organizational issues and strategizing with leadership to enhance institutional performance.

KATHRYN WELCH HOWE

Principal Project Specialist, The Getty Conservation Institute

Kathryn Welch Howe heads the Getty Conservation Institute's research concerning a citywide historic resource survey in Los Angeles. She is a specialist in preservation planning and adaptive use development and a co-author of the forthcoming graduate-level textbook on historic preservation, *A Richer Heritage*.

HUELL HOWSER

Producer/Host, "California's Gold"

Huell Howser is a journalist whose philosophy of life is reflected in the stories he reports. The half-hour feature program, "California's Gold with Huell Howser," is now in its 12th season and is seen regularly on all 13 PBS affiliates

throughout the state. Howser has a B.A. from the University of Tennessee, and served on the staff of Senator Howard Baker.

LUIS G. HOYOS, AIA

Member, State Historical Resources Commission

Luis Hoyos is a practicing architect, member of the SHRC and the Board of the Los Angeles Conservancy. He is also a lecturer at CalPoly University, Pomona.

DR. JARRELL C. JACKMAN

Executive Director, Santa Barbara Trust for Historic Preservation

Dr. Jackman is Executive Director of the Santa Barbara Trust for Historic Preservation, a position he has held since 1981. He oversees the development and reconstruction at El Presidio SHP. During this time he has been the author and editor of various historical studies and was the recipient of the 2001 Norman Neuerburg Award from CA Mission Studies Association.

AMY KITCHENER

Executive Director, Alliance for California Traditional Arts Association

Amy Kitchener is Executive Director of the Alliance for California Traditional Arts (ACTA), a statewide organization she co-founded in 1997 to "ensure that California's future holds California's past" by supporting the state's living cultural heritage. She is a public folklorist who has worked in California since 1989, first as project coordinator for the Los Angeles Public Libraries "Shades of L.A." project, then as Folk Arts Program Director at the Fresno Arts Council. She holds a M.A. in Folklore and Mythology from UCLA.

TERI KNOLL

Executive Director, California Association of Museums

Teri Knoll has worked as a museum and cultural administrator for over twenty years. Currently she is the executive director of the California Association of Museums where, in addition to overseeing the general management of the association, she serves as an advocate for museums on local, state and national level.

FELICIA LOWE

Immediate Past President, Angel Island Immigration Station Foundation

Felicia Lowe is a veteran television producer, director, and writer. Her award-winning documentaries include "Chinatown", "Carved in Silence", and "China: Land of My Father." She has taught film production at San Francisco State University and Stanford University. Lowe is the immediate past President of the Angel Island Immigration Station Foundation.

CINDY LA MARR

Executive Director, Capitol Area Indian Resources

Cindy LaMarr is the Executive Director for Capitol Area Indian Resources, in Sacramento, California. She is from the Pit River and Piute Tribe in N. California and also serves on the National Indian Ed Association Board.

MALCOLM MARGOLIN

Publisher, Heyday Books

Founder and publisher of Heyday Books in Berkeley, California, Mr. Margolin is also the publisher of two magazines, *News from Native California* and *Bay Nature*. He is the author of a number of books, including *The Ohlone Way*.

JOHN MCCAMMAN

Chief of Staff, Congressman George Radanovich

John McCamman has been Chief of Staff to Congressman George Radanovich since 1994. He previously was the County Administrator in Shasta County and pioneer County Administrator in Mariposa County.

DANA MCGOWAN

President, Society for California Archaeology

Dana McGowan is a Principal with an environmental consulting firm and has twenty years of experience in CRM for state, federal and private enterprise.

DR. CARLOTTA MELLON

Executive Director, Sam & Alfreda Maloof Foundation for Arts and Crafts

Dr. Mellon was Appointment Secretary to Governor Jerry Brown; Director External Affairs, Pacific Bell; Special Assistant to Chancellor Tod Hullar, U. C. Riverside; Assistant Vice Chancellor, External Affairs, UCLA; and Chief of Staff to Ron Loveridge, Mayor of Riverside.

DR. KNOX MELLON

State Historic Preservation Officer, Office of Historic Preservation

Knox Mellon was appointed SHPO by Governor Jerry Brown in 1977 and headed the state office of Historic Preservation until 1984. He was re-appointed SHPO by Governor Davis in 2000. Prior to that time he had a private Preservation consulting firm (Knox Mellon & Associates, Inc.).

STEPHEN MIKESELL

Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer, Office of Historic Preservation

Mr. Mikesell was appointed Deputy SHPO in 2001. He has worked and published professionally in historic preservation since 1980, for the state and as an owner of a private consulting firm.

SEDRICK V. MITCHELL

Deputy Director, California State Parks

Sedrick Mitchell is the Deputy Director of External Affairs, for the California Department of Parks and Recreation where he is responsible for overseeing the general operations of the Office of Grants and Local Services, and the Office of Community Involvement. Prior to joining the Department of Parks and Recreation, Mitchell worked for 15 years with the California Legislature.

WILLIAM MUNGARY

Chair, Native American Heritage Commission

PAT MURKLAND

Malki Museum Press Editor, Malki Museum, Inc.

A journalist for more than 25 years, Pat Murkland recently became the editor of Malki Museum Press. The museum, the first Indian run museum on a reservation in the United States, has been working since 1964 to save and share the cultures and languages of the Native Americans of Southern California. The press has published more than 30 titles.

LARRY MYERS

Executive Secretary, Native American Heritage Commission

In 1987 Mr. Myers, a Pomo Indian from the Pinoleville Reservation, was appointed by Governor Deukmejian as the Executive Secretary to the Native American Heritage Commission. This has afforded Mr. Meyers the opportunity to work closely with the diverse Native American communities in an effort to protect and preserve California Native American sacred, ceremonial, and burial sites.

EDWARD NAVARRO

General Manager, City of Los Angeles, El Pueblo de Los Angeles Historical Monument

Ed Navarro began July 1, 2002 as General Manager of El Pueblo under Mayor James Hahn. He previously worked for 25+ years for California State Parks. He is a board member of the National Hispanic Environmental Council.

JOHN L. NAU, III

Chairman, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP)

John Nau was appointed Chair of ACHP by President George W. Bush in 2001. He also serves on the President's Transportation Infrastructure Streamlining Task Force, as Chair of the Texas Historical Commission, on the Board of The Civil War Preservation Trust, on the Advisory Committee for the Texas State History Museum and is a Charter Member of the Monticello Cabinet.

JAMES D. NEWLAND

State Park Historian III, California State Parks

Jim Newland is a Senior Historian and supervisor of the Cultural Resources Section for California State Parks which oversees projects and staff for the Department's cultural resources program. Newland previously served as a historic resources consultant. He received his M.A. in Public History from San Diego State University.

MARY NICHOLS

Secretary, California Resources Agency

Mary D. Nichols brings to the Davis administration a 30-year legacy of public service that has been instrumental in helping forge the nation's approach to environmental issues. As the State's Secretary for Resources, Ms. Nichols serves as the Governor's chief advisor on issues related to California's natural and cultural resources. Ms. Nichols' leadership also extends to overseeing the implementation of Propositions 12, 13 and 40. A graduate of Cornell University, Ms. Nichols received her law degree from Yale Law School. She now lives in Los Angeles.

CAROL L. NOVEY

Member, State Historical Resources Commission

Carol Novoy was appointed by Governor Davis as a public member. Carol Novoy became involved due to concern over rapid decline and destruction of California historical resources.

PATRICK O' DONAHUE

Interim Executive Director, The Mexican Museum

Patrick O'Donahue's professional background demonstrates his extensive experience as an attorney, counselor and business executive with emphasis on design, development and construction as well as representing minority-owned business enterprises, not for profit corporations and governmental entities.

PILAR ONATE

Deputy Director for Legislation, California State Parks

Pilar Onate is the Deputy Director for Legislation for California State Parks. Prior to her appointment she served as Assistant Director for Legislative Affairs for the Office of Statewide Health, Planning and Development.

DR. SANNIE KENTON OSBORNE

Past President, Society for California Archaeology

Sannie Osborn is Past President and Executive Board member of the Society for California Archaeology. Sannie has a Doctorate in anthropology from the University of

Wisconsin-Milwaukee, and is a registered professional archaeologist working for the Presidio Trust at the Presidio of San Francisco National Historic Landmark District.

DR. DENNIS M. POWER

Executive Director, Oakland Museum of California

Born in Pasadena, California, Power has a B.A. and M.A. from Occidental College, Los Angeles and Ph.D. from the University of Kansas. He has been Curator at the Royal Ontario Museum, Toronto; Director of the Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History; and Executive Director of the Oakland Museum of California since 1994.

DR. JAMES QUAY

Executive Director, California Council for the Humanities

Jim Quay is executive director of the California Council for the Humanities. Prior to joining CCH in 1983, he taught writing at U.C. Santa Cruz and was a producer for California Public Radio. He holds a master's and doctorate degrees in English Literature from U.C. Berkeley. He's lived in California since 1970.

THE HONORABLE GEORGE RADANOVICH

U.S. House of Representatives, 19th District

George Radanovich has been a Member of Congress since 1994 from California's Central Valley and Southern Sierra Foothills. He is Chairman of the National Parks, Recreation and Public Lands subcommittee.

MARGIE JOHNSON REESE

General Manager, City of Los Angeles, Cultural Affairs Department

Margie Johnson Reese serves as General Manager for the L.A. Cultural Affairs Department which has oversight for cultural, and preservation programs. Margie is noted for her ability to initiate partnerships among unlikely collaborators. She holds a Master of Fine Arts in Theater and Costume Design from Trinity University, San Antonio, Texas.

ERIN SABERI

Assistant Director, California State Parks

Erin Saberi is Assistant Director for the California Department of Parks and Recreation. Her duties include cultural resource and heritage issues and urban park matters. Erin came to the Department from Governor Davis' office, where she served as a senior aide to the Chief of Staff.

DR. MARSHA L. SEMMEL

*Special Assistant to the Director for Strategic Partnerships,
Institute for Library and Museum Services*

Prior to her appointment to the Institute for Library and Museum Services, Marsha Semmel served as CEO of the Women of the West Museum, which merged, in April 2002, with the Autry Museum of Western Heritage. She has also been CEO of Conner Prairie, a living history museum near Indianapolis, and Director, Division of Public Programs, for the National Endowment for the Humanities.

SUSAN SMARTT

President, California State Parks Foundation

Susan Smartt was elected President of the California State Parks Foundation in June of 1998 after having served two years as its Executive Director. A resident of Oakland, Smartt is a Certified Public Accountant, with a degree in accounting from San Diego State University. She also has a master's degree in public administration from the University of San Francisco.

JOAN IRVINE SMITH

President, The Irvine Museum

Joan Irvine Smith is the great-granddaughter of James Irvine, who formed the 120,000 acre Irvine Ranch. Mrs. Smith became a director of The Irvine Company in 1957, a position she held for 25 years. In 1991, she founded The Irvine Museum, a public museum dedicated to California Impressionism. Through its exhibits, shows and publications, the Irvine Museum has become the most active institution in the country educating people about this genre.

DR. KEVIN STARR

The California State Librarian

Dr. Kevin Starr is the seventh State Librarian of California since the turn of the century. Dr. Starr has an M.A. degree from Harvard University as well as Ph.D. in American Literature. He also holds a Master of Library Science degree from U.C. Berkeley. The author of numerous works, Starr has written nine books, six of which are part of his *Americans and the California Dream* series.

ROY STEARNS

Deputy Director, California State Parks

Appointed by Governor Davis, Roy has served as the Deputy Director for Communications for California State Parks for the past 2-1/2 years. Prior to his appointment he was a reporter with KCRA, Channel 3, Sacramento.

JAMES IRVINE SWINDEN

Vice-President, The Irvine Museum

James Irvine Swinden is owner of A.R.C. Properties and is the Vice President and Chief Financial Officer (CFO) of The Irvine Museum. He is also the Vice President and CFO of the Joan Irvine Smith & Athalie R. Clark Foundation and is a member of the U.C. Irvine Foundation Board. Mr. Swinden earned a B.S. in economics from the Wharton School of Finance, University of Pennsylvania and a Juris Doctor from Loyola Law School in L.A.

CATHERINE TAYLOR

Museum Director, California State Railroad Museum

Cathy Taylor is Director of the California State Railroad Museum in Sacramento. Cathy has a BA in History, is a graduate of the Museum Management Institute sponsored by the Getty Leadership Institute, and has been in the Museum field for 20 years. She is President of the Sacramento Association of Museums for 2002-03.

ANTHONY VEERKAMP

Senior Program Officer, National Trust for Historic Preservation

Anthony works on public policy, legislative, and parks-related issues in California. He recently helped form the California Heritage Coalition, organizing a successful effort seeking voter approval of Proposition 40, a \$2.6 billion resources bond. Anthony is a graduate of Boston University's Masters Program of Preservation Studies, and holds a B.A. in Economics and Art History from McGill University in Montreal.

DR. DENZIL VERARDO

Chief Deputy Director, California State Parks

A 32 year career employee, Denzil has written eight books and more than 200 articles on a variety of historical and management subjects. His educational background includes a B.A. and M.A. in history and a Ph.D. in management. He served as a Regional Vice President of the Conference of California Historical Societies and in 1997 received the national "Excellence in Government Leadership Award," among others.

JENNIE VERARDO

Proceedings Editor, California Cultural Heritage Resources Summit

Jennie Verardo holds a BA in history from U.C. Santa Cruz and an M.P.A. from Golden Gate University. She is the author of eight books and numerous articles on local history; has edited proceedings of professional conferences; and served as a member of the Monterey County Historic Resources Review Board.

TIM WHALEN

Director, Getty Conservation Institute (GCI)

Tim Whalen has been director of the GCI, a program of the L.A. based J. Paul Getty Trust, since 1998. Through its research and educational activities, the GCI seeks to solve critical problems about the conservation of objects, collections, buildings, and sites. Trained as an art historian at the University of Southern California, Mr. Whalen's professional association with the Getty dates to 1983. He currently serves as an advisor from California to the National Trust for Historic Preservation.

BARBARA WHITNEY

*Associate Director for Administration and Public Affairs,
J. Paul Getty Museum*

Associate Director for Administration and Public Affairs, The J. Paul Getty Museum since 1983; Management Associate at the Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco from 1979-1983; M.B.A. from UCLA's Anderson School; B.A. Art History from UC Irvine; former president of the California Association of Museums and former board member of the California Confederation of the Arrowmont School of Arts and Crafts in Tennessee.

SUSAN WILCOX

*Director of Marketing, California Travel and Tourism
Commission*

In July 2000 Susan Wilcox became the first Marketing Director of the new industry-led California Travel and Tourism Commission, a nonprofit organization created to market California as a desirable travel destination. Her oversight of the California Cultural Tourism Coalition has led to a partnership with Smithsonian magazine promoting the new website, culturecalifornia.com, which is a collection of cultural/heritage venues and events.

Also attending the keynote address and opening ceremonies were:

CLINT EASTWOOD

Member, California State Park and Recreation Commission

JOANN KOSBERG

President, The Music Center of Los Angeles

ELANA SAMUEL

Assistant Director of the Museum of Tolerance

& other dignitaries from Los Angeles area government and community organizations.

PROFESSOR I. MICHAEL HEYMAN

Ira Michael Heyman received an A.B. in government from Dartmouth College and a J.D. from Yale Law School where he was Editor of the *Yale Law Journal*. After service in the United States Marine Corps, Heyman worked as a law clerk for the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and later as Chief Law Clerk for U.S. Supreme Court Chief Justice Earl Warren. In 1959 I. Michael Heyman became Acting Associate Professor of Law at U.C. Berkeley and in 1961 was made a Professor of Law at that institution. He was also a Visiting Professor of Law at Yale and Stanford Law Schools, and was appointed Vice Chancellor of U.C. Berkeley in 1990. From 1980 to 1990, Professor Heyman served as Chancellor at the University of California's Berkeley campus.

In 1993 Heyman was Counselor to the Secretary and Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy at the U.S. Department of the Interior. In 1994 he accepted the position of Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, where he served until 1999. From 2000-2002 I. Michael Heyman was Interim Director of the Center for Studies in Higher Education at U.C. Berkeley where he is today the Chancellor Emeritus and Professor Emeritus.

Professor Heyman is on, or has served on, the Board of Directors of the Presidio Trust, the National Film Preservation Foundation, the Berkeley Community Fund, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, and as a Member and Chair of the Board of Trustees of Dartmouth College. He is a Regent of the Smithsonian Institution and was Chairman of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, as well as serving on the Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee for the U.S. Postal Services and as Chair of the Bay Vision 2020 Commission.

In addition, while teaching, Professor Heyman consulted actively with the United State Commission on Civil Rights and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare; the department of Housing and Urban Development; the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (drafting most of the agency's ordinances through 1974); American Samoa; the Government of the Virgin Island; and the County of Kauai, Hawaii. In each of the last four he drafted basic land use ordinances and worked closely with planning staffs and legislatures.

Professor Heyman has published numerous journal articles, papers, and legal documents in the areas of civil rights, constitutional law, land planning, metropolitan government and housing, environmental law and management, and affirmative action.

Professor Heyman and his wife, Therese, live in Berkeley, California.



EDITOR'S NOTE:

Invited speakers had the opportunity to provide their comments in writing for inclusion in this document. Presentations of those who did not provide written transcripts and all other comments reflected in these Proceedings were transcribed from recordings made of the sessions. They were lightly edited for readability and grammar.

