

**'RED LISTING' HERITAGE:
ENDANGERMENT AS POLICY
AND COLLECTIVE ACTION**

Scott Goodwin

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree
Master of Science in Historic Preservation

Graduate School of Architecture, Planning, and Preservation
Columbia University

May 2020

I gratefully acknowledge Erica Avrami who heard my ideas, gave them shape, and inspired me to turn them into my work. I also thank Chris Neville and Will Reynolds whose perspectives and insight grounded this project. Special thanks to Yiannis Avramides of World Monuments Fund and Sarah Kautz of Preservation Long Island who gave their time to talk “heritage endangerment” and showed me the critical connection between concept and action. And to Jessie Wilson was an irreplaceable partner throughout.

ABSTRACT

Scholarship is increasingly critical of *endangerment* as a sensibility and a discursive device that shapes cultural heritage and its preservation. But recent academic calls for abandoning endangerment- and loss-oriented heritage practice have tended to overlook the complex ways that endangerment functions as a tool, and one that is used by institutions and publics alike. Endangerment listing programs for heritage have emerged over the past half-century as a distinct policy tool and one of the key ways that categories of endangerment are defined and reproduced. By moving beyond analyses of these programs as rhetoric or discourse, and by reframing recent discussions of “heritage at risk” in terms of policy and collective action, so-called heritage “red lists” become recognizable as mechanisms through which institutions and multiple publics dynamically construct endangerment to achieve varied outcomes in practice. Using red list programs as case studies, this paper explores the ways that contemporary list facilitators and list users negotiate and mobilize endangerment, and to what particular ends. It argues that endangerment as heritage policy functions not only as a tool of institutions, experts, and heritage professionals, but also as a means through which communities define and redefine notions of themselves. Despite a growing suspicion of endangerment within critical heritage discourse, this research suggests how endangerment might serve productive roles in policy and practice.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE:

Introduction: The State of Heritage Endangerment.....1

CHAPTER TWO:

Framing the Inquiry: Endangerment Listing as Preservation Policy.....13

CHAPTER THREE:

World Monuments Fund's "World Monuments Watch".....26

CHAPTER FOUR:

National Trust for Historic Preservation's "America's 11 Most Endangered Places".....42

CHAPTER FIVE:

Preservation Long Island's "Endangered Historic Places Program".....53

CHAPTER SIX:

Synthesis and Conclusions: Endangerment, Policy, and Collective Action.....57

TOP 10
ENDANGERED
PLACES LIST

We're looking for Canada's
most endangered places.
#10endangered



Figure 1. Promotional image for the National Trust for Canada's "Top 10 Endangered Places List," 2018.

Introduction: The State of Heritage Endangerment

"11 Most Endangered Historic Places," "List of World Heritage in Danger," "Places in Peril," "Heritage at Risk Register," "Most Threatened Sites," "Seven to Save," "Watchlist for Endangered Buildings and Landscapes"...

Endangerment lists are ubiquitous in heritage preservation. These kinds of lists are most familiar to us as they relate to species threatened with extinction, or even languages falling out of use. But over the past half-century, endangerment listing—the process of producing inventories of entities deemed “under threat”—has been taken up by institutions across the heritage domain. Compiled and mobilized to action through structured institutional programs, these so-called heritage “red lists” have come to represent a distinct preservation policy tool – one that is used to varied effects by institutions and publics alike, and in ways that go beyond simply “saving threatened sites.” Given their pervasiveness and their ability to shape how preservation happens in the material landscape by directing urgent attention and realizing collective actions among a range of engaged parties, heritage red listing programs are an understudied aspect of the heritage fields. These lists also are fundamentally intertwined with a key concept and an emerging point of contention within academic heritage discourse.

In recent years, scholarship has recognized that endangerment listing programs for heritage are just one expression of something even more ubiquitous than the lists themselves: the perception that heritage is often, if not always, at risk of being lost. This perception is not only apparent in the ways that we talk about heritage, it is also reproduced across heritage policy and practice, from the language of national legislation to the techniques of risk assessment used in conservation and site management. As a growing body of academic literature broaches questions about the centrality of “loss anticipation” and “loss aversion” to heritage and preservation, there is also a growing consensus that “heritage relies to a large extent on notions of endangerment and attempts to arrest or reverse processes of loss and change.”¹ But in light of critiques that paint the concept of endangerment as a tool of “authorized discourse”² and as a counterproductive or unsustainable frame for heritage practice, there has been a rush to shift the conversation away from exploring endangerment’s operations and effects towards defining alternatives to endangerment-oriented ways of doing heritage and preservation.

This thesis is about endangerment listing programs for heritage, but it is also about the concept of endangerment that is at their core. The idea is that a study of heritage “red lists” in practice might shed further light on the nature of endangerment – but specifically, endangerment understood as something that does political, social, and cultural work for people, institutions, and communities through heritage. As academic literature internalizes critiques of endangerment as discourse, rhetoric, and as framework, this thesis proposes that a renewed interrogation of endangerment with a focus on negotiation, consensus, and collective action might contribute to a more complete understanding of how the concept is being put to use in practice. The thesis takes endangerment listing programs, a key way that notions of endangerment are reproduced and acted on, as its focus. It does so because such programs, as opposed to deployments of endangerment rhetoric that have been critiqued in the past, operate in complex ways that have not yet been fully explored. With this in mind, the thesis asks: What might a better understanding

¹ Caitlin DeSilvey and Rodney Harrison, “Anticipating loss: rethinking endangerment in heritage futures,” *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 26, no. 4 (2020): 1.

² Laurajane Smith, *Uses of Heritage* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2006).

of the heritage red list policy tool and its uses in practice contribute to our understanding of endangerment more broadly, and the work it does through heritage?

This introductory chapter aims to situate the thesis and the kinds of heritage endangerment lists that are its focus in relation to an evolving network of ideas and observations about what endangerment is, means, and does. Key concepts, theorizations, lines of research, and criticism are reviewed before moving to an exploration of the endangerment list as a preservation policy tool (Chapter 2), and case studies of how heritage red listing functions in practice (Chapters 3, 4 and 5). The final chapter (Chapter 6) considers what a clearer view of the red list policy tool's operations and effects can contribute to our understanding of endangerment and the work it does for people, institutions, and communities through heritage and preservation.

Introducing Endangerment

It has been noted that “heritage is no stranger to the prospect of loss.”³ But the heritage fields, in taking the view that heritage is something irreplaceable or “nonrenewable,” have largely failed to develop ways of dealing with loss, whether by damage, destruction, or decay, and even when conceived as an inevitability or as a consequence of ongoing change. This has left heritage in a precarious position, and one important result is that we tend to perceive it as essentially vulnerable. Inasmuch as heritage is valued for its contributions to the present, loss has become a kind of *anti-value* for heritage – something that practitioners and preservationists safeguard against.⁴ Practices of protection have been aided by a set of interrelated concepts that characterize the prospect of loss. This thesis makes use of three of these concepts, used somewhat interchangeably, but with slightly different meanings: *threat*, referring to a medium of danger, something that imperils heritage; *risk*, understood as the possibility of danger; and *endangerment*, defined as the state or condition of being imperiled, or faced with loss. Endangerment, a concept that centers us on the entity that is “at risk” or “threatened,” will be the focus throughout.

Endangerment denotes a condition of threatened things. But *endangerment* can also be understood as both a process that occurs over time and a result of endangering actions. As a process, endangerment unfolds over time with seeming momentum and unidirectionality: without interference it advances towards an entity's destruction, extinction, or loss as its endpoint. As the product of endangering actions, endangerment can result from any number of known or unknown actions or actors that jeopardize an entity's persistence. In this way, endangerment does not just name a quality or characteristic of certain heritage things; it describes a dynamic state of affairs, and in a way that also reaches out to notions of urgency, agency, and intervention.

Given heritage's perceived vulnerability, the notion of endangerment is central to how we conceptualize heritage and practice its preservation. The concept is also central to a variety of other cultural and natural entities that are seen in a similar light. As an awareness of the concept's influence grows, endangerment has become a subject of interdisciplinary academic study, producing key insights into its nature. Among the most consequential is that endangerment, when recognized, can create or enhance value. Within the heritage domain, this has been observed for some time. As David Lowenthal noted: “We value heritage most when it seems at risk; threats of

³ DeSilvey and Harrison, “Anticipating loss,” 1.

⁴ Fernando Vidal and Nélia Dias, “The Endangerment Sensibility” in *Endangerment, Biodiversity and Culture*, eds. Fernando Vidal and Nélia Dias (Abingdon: Routledge, 2016): 1.

loss spur owners to stewardship.”⁵ Others have explored this phenomenon in practice, finding that endangerment’s recognition reinforces a sense among heritage practitioners that endangerment rhetoric (the language of risk and potential loss) can be a useful tool for enhancing public engagement with heritage, even where threats may not be severe.⁶ It has been suggested that the anticipation of loss is fundamentally emotional, and that because emotions are a vehicle for values, endangerment’s ability to enhance heritage value is unsurprising.⁷ But interlaced with the emotional and value-producing capacities of endangerment is also its ability to inspire the desire to preserve. Across nature and culture, endangerment not only prompts preservation actions, but serves as rationale for policy instruments and modes of practice, making it central not only to our understanding and personal engagements with heritage things, but also the formal structures and techniques tasked with safeguarding them.

Explicating Endangerment

If we’re to take Fernando Vidal and Nélia Dias’s view that the notion of endangerment “stands at the heart of a network of concepts, values, and practices dealing with entities considered threatened by extinction and destruction, and with the techniques aimed at preserving them,” then how did endangerment come to be so central to our anticipation of change and loss for both nature and culture?⁸ And how is it that endangerment is so intertwined in particular with heritage and the systems and practices that we dedicate to its preservation?

In defining the concept of an “endangerment sensibility,” Vidal and Dias have recently argued that our current ways of apprehending and managing both culture and biodiversity derive from a cultural complex based in an acute perception that large parts of the human and non-human world are under threat. That complex—which is also constitutive of the “diverse emotional, moral, political, cognitive, and institutional imperative to preserve”—can be understood in historical terms.⁹ In contrast to the acceptance of loss and forgetting supposedly typical of the pre-modern era, Vidal and Dias’s endangerment sensibility is born out of a late-modern (ie. mid-twentieth-century) societal sense that existing natural and cultural systems are fragile, influenced by a growing awareness of human impacts to natural environments. By their account, the contemporary pervasiveness of endangerment discourses, practices, and policies for both nature and culture (including heritage) represents the ongoing materialization of late-modern extinction anxieties, enhanced by a sense of guilt and responsibility in our awareness of the Anthropocene.

Interest in historicizing the notion of endangerment is not new. Vidal and Dias’s endangerment sensibility parallels the notion of a modern “risk society” formulated in the 1980s by Ulrich Beck, a sociologist who saw a pervasive sense of threat as being inherent to the experience of modernity. For Beck, modern threats differed from pre-modern dangers in that they were created and reproduced globally by modernization itself. Beck defined “risk” as a “systematic way of dealing with hazards and insecurities induced and introduced by modernization,”¹⁰ a social

⁵ David Lowenthal, *The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1996): 24

⁶ Cornelius Holtorf and Oscar Ortman, “Endangerment and Conservation Ethos in Natural and Cultural Heritage: The Case of Zoos and Archaeological Sites,” *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 14, 2008: 14-90.

⁷ Vidal and Dias, “The Endangerment Sensibility,” 1.

⁸ Vidal and Dias, “The Endangerment Sensibility,” 1.

⁹ Vidal and Dias, “The Endangerment Sensibility,” 2.

¹⁰ Ulrich Beck, *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity* (London: Sage Publications, 1992), 21.

strategy that relied on institutions, technical expertise, and expert systems to define, assess, and mitigate threats towards greater public security.¹¹ However, he noted that the unidirectionality of threat assessment and risk agenda-setting creates a potential for conflict between experts and lay publics, particularly where differences in knowledge and institutional distrust were present.¹²

Some authors have seen Beck's theories of risk as providing insight into the specific historical development of modern institutions for heritage, as well as the development of heritage preservation as a profession. Rodney Harrison, building on Beck, has argued that risk and a modern preoccupation with uncertain futures were catalytic to the development of systems for heritage preservation and the concomitant rise of heritage as a technical and managerial field.¹³ For Harrison, a growing sense of international responsibility emerging out of two World Wars was a key driver of the first internationally-collaborative campaigns for safeguarding heritage (eg. UNESCO's Nubia Campaign, 1959-1980 and the international response to flooding in Venice, 1966), the development of international expert bodies for preservation, and ultimately the establishment of the World Heritage system in 1972.¹⁴ By his view, that international system from which we assume many of our expert practices and normative notions of heritage value was built on perceptions of threat and responsibility – a manifestation of the endangerment sensibility.¹⁵

For evidence that endangerment is a key rationale for preservation policy at an international scale, we need only to look to the current UNESCO World Heritage system. The 1972 World Heritage Convention set out clearly in its preamble that the "increasingly threatened" status of heritage at a global scale was the primary motivation for that international agreement.¹⁶ This justification is not limited to the World Heritage arena. In the context of the United States, the 1966 National Historic Preservation Act, which serves as the backbone of American heritage policy today, articulated a similar rationale: "properties significant to the Nation's heritage are being lost or substantially altered... with increasing frequency."¹⁷ In these and other doctrines structuring contemporary preservation internationally, endangerment has been invoked as the *raison d'être* for new policy frameworks.

However, that the notion of heritage endangerment also underpinned the rise of preservation as a professional and technical field is less certain. While policy frameworks of the 1960s and 1970s made explicit reference to heritage's increasingly endangered status, foundational charters that were integral to preservation's professionalization lacked a pronounced threat-orientation. The 1964 Venice Charter that created the International Council of Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS), for example, promoted among experts a common responsibility to safeguard heritage through the application of scientific techniques and standardize practices, but one that was framed in terms

¹¹ Ulrich Beck, *Ecological Politics in an Age of Risk* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1995).

¹² Beck, *Risk Society*, 4, 28-30.

¹³ Rodney Harrison, *Heritage: Critical Approaches* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2013).

¹⁴ Rodney Harrison, "World Heritage listing and the globalization of the endangerment sensibility," in *Endangerment, Biodiversity and Culture*, eds. Fernando Vidal and Nélia Dias (Abingdon: Routledge, 2016) 195-217.

¹⁵ Harrison, "World Heritage listing," 195-217.

¹⁶ United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). *Convention Concerning Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage*, Adopted by the General Conference at its seventeenth session, Paris, 16 November 1972: 1. Accessible online from: <https://whc.unesco.org/archive/convention-en.pdf>

¹⁷ The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. Public Law 89-665; 54 U.S.C. 300101. Accessible online from U. S. National Park Service: <https://www.nps.gov/history/local-law/nhpa1966.htm>

of preserving authenticity and not of mitigating threats.¹⁸ Similarly, the establishment in 1956 of the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM) was driven by an expressed commitment to developing technical expertise “towards raising the standard of restoration work” without mention of pervasive threats or endangerment.¹⁹ These developments occurred slightly prior to (and somewhat in parallel with) policy instruments that used threat as a rationale for collective action – something considered in greater depth in Chapter 2. Still, endangerment undoubtedly did come to inform the preservation profession and its technical expertise: ICOMOS since at least 1973 has taken up the language of endangerment,²⁰ and both ICOMOS and ICCROM have concerned themselves with risk identification, preparedness, and mitigation for World Heritage since the system’s creation.²¹ More recently, ICOMOS inaugurated its own “Heritage@Risk” program for monuments and sites beyond the World Heritage frame.²²

Regardless of chronology or potential causality, with an understanding that the notion of heritage endangerment is tied broadly to our modern experience and the development of the contemporary heritage fields, some authors have sought to assess the particular ways that endangerment informs contemporary heritage and preservation policy and practice. Trinidad Rico has proposed that “heritage at risk” has become a dominant heritage discourse, driving us to see endangerment as an innate quality of heritage things, and to act accordingly.²³ She also posits that the ubiquity of “at risk narratives” has driven the proliferation of systems and methods for identifying, assessing, and mitigating threats to heritage. The importance of technical risk assessment to contemporary heritage preservation and management, for example, is indicative of the ways that we’ve encoded endangerment in our policies and professional methods. For Rico, heritage at risk functions as both a rationale and an operational paradigm for preservation.

As an operational paradigm, Rico also finds that the particular shape of policy instruments and professional tools used to mediate threats also reflect the at risk discourse. Such frameworks typically adopt a scientific or technical view of how heritage should be protected, and are interwoven with networks of experts. The World Heritage Convention, for example, established “an effective system of collective protection... in accordance with modern scientific methods,” supported through advisory relationships with ICOMOS, ICCROM, and IUCN (International Union for the Conservation of Nature).²⁴ In this way, both policy instruments and professional networks have reproduced not only at risk narratives, but also particular methods of systematizing and

¹⁸ International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites (The Venice Charter 1964), 2nd International Congress of Architects and Technicians of Historic Monuments. Adopted by ICOMOS, 1964. Accessible online from ICOMOS: https://www.icomos.org/charters/venice_e.pdf

¹⁹ International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM). Adopted by the General Conference of the United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization, December 5th, 1956. Accessible online from UN: <https://treaties.un.org/doc/Publication/UNTS/Volume%201321/volume-1321-I-22032-English.pdf>

²⁰ ICOMOS (International Council of Monuments and Sites). “Message from the President.” ICOMOS News-Letter 1, September 1973. Accessible online from ICOMOS: <https://www.icomos.org/newsicomos/news1eng.pdf>

²¹ See for example: Herb Stovel, *Risk Preparedness: A Management Manual for World Cultural Heritage*. ICCROM, 1998; ICOMOS, “Threats to World Heritage Sites 1994-2004: An Analysis,” May 2005.

²² ICOMOS. “ICOMOS World Report 2000 On Monuments and Sites in Danger,” 2000. Accessible online from ICOMOS: https://www.icomos.org/risk/world_report/2000/riskindex_eng.htm

²³ Trinidad Rico, “Heritage at Risk: The Authority and Autonomy of a Dominant Preservation Framework,” in *Heritage Keywords: Rhetoric and Redescription in Cultural Heritage*, eds. Kathryn Lafrenz Samuels and Trinidad Rico (Boulder: University of Colorado Press, 2015): 147-162.

²⁴ UNESCO, *Convention* 1972: 1.

mitigating threats across heritage practice. One such way that endangerment has been translated across policy and practice is through systems of classifying and ordering threatened entities — or in other words, endangerment listing.

Listing Endangerment

Our recognition that something is endangered most often materializes by way of its inclusion on a list: the IUCN's Red List of Endangered Species, UNESCO's Atlas of the World Languages in Danger, and the range of heritage endangerment lists that concern this thesis are all examples of lists through which we come to regard entities as having endangered status. Beyond the ubiquity of heritage-specific red lists noted at the beginning of this chapter and explored in greater detail in Chapter 2 and beyond, these lists undergird our understanding of endangerment across subjects and contexts. In nature conservation alone, approximately 109 countries operate national lists of threatened species.²⁵ But more than just communicating information about what things are "at risk," endangerment lists function dynamically as systems of classification, ordering, and documenting that reflect both scientific and institutional logics; listing also embodies its own response to endangerment even as it directs further action. Returning to Beck, if our risk society relies on institutions, technical expertise, and expert systems to identify and mitigate threats, it is perhaps no wonder that these lists play an integral part in our coping with endangerment.

Lists name, classify, document, and simplify complex states of affairs; and they are structured to delineate boundaries, produce authority, and focus awareness.²⁶ Endangerment lists specifically classify entities in terms of their perceived proximity to loss. Some endangerment lists categorize and rank: the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species has three "Threatened Categories" within seven categories of "Extinction Risk," and Historic England's "Heritage at Risk Register" grades threatened sites according to significance criteria (ie. Grade I and Grade II). But by nature of the endangerment list, exclusion implies that non-inscribed entities within a given context are in comparatively-stable or unthreatened states. Therefore, even endangerment lists that do not rank do set priorities for preservation through inscription alone.

Listing can be seen as a diagnosis of endangerment, and many lists draw on expert or scientific assessments, or utilize inscription criteria, to make such determinations. In this sense, listing is an outcome of processes and events that led something to be confronted with danger or potential loss. But as Vidal and Dias have pointed out, "listing is itself both a diagnostic tool and a way of anticipating the failure of the cure."²⁷ If the inscribed entity is lost, it will persist through the list as a record. As documentary devices, endangerment lists do not just communicate states of threat, they undertake an anticipatory preservation response. But beyond that intrinsic documentary response, endangerment listing is often a beginning, or the catalyst, for associated processes (eg. publicity campaigns) or responses (eg. fundraising, documentation, or conservation initiatives). In this way, the endangerment list is also a preservation tool that is used to mobilize action and produce preservation outcomes.

²⁵ Irus Braverman, "Anticipating endangerment: The biopolitics of threatened species lists," *BioSocieties* 12 no. 1 (2017): 132.

²⁶ Irus Braverman, "En-listing life: Red is the color of threatened species lists," in *Critical Animal Geographies: Politics, Intersections and Hierarchies in A Multispecies World*, eds. Kathryn Gillespie and Rosemary-Claire Collard (Abingdon: Routledge, 2015): 189.

²⁷ Vidal and Dias, "The Endangerment Sensibility," 2.

However, it is important to recognize that listing does not simply respond to endangerment as a diagnosable state of affairs; it is also an act constructive of endangerment. By indexing entities as endangered, publicly-broadcast and institutionally-backed lists produce, promote, and authorize ideas about what is threatened, which are then acted upon by publics. This idea parallels J. Mark Schuster's observations that lists, as purposeful collections, are not neutral catalogs but "a form of argumentation."²⁸ Certainly, lists can carry biases and values, and can also be vehicles for advancing agendas and asserting influence.²⁹

There is little published literature so far on how heritage endangerment lists are compiled or mobilized in practice. But there have been at least two studies of the UNESCO List of World Heritage in Danger (considered at greater length in Chapter 2) that also warrant mentioning here. Lynn Meskell has found that the List in Danger—an endangerment list within the World Heritage Convention—is a tool put to use by UNESCO member states in complex ways: it is at once a vehicle for international fundraising towards the realization of large-scale conservation projects at World Heritage sites, and "a political tool for nations to bolster their sovereign interests" through heritage and preservation.³⁰ A closer investigation of the List in Danger by Nicholas Brown et al. has shown that inscriptions on that list are the result of complex decision-making processes and political negotiations, informed by expert and public opinion and shaped by formal inscription criteria.³¹ Indeed, within the listing instrument, before formal ascriptions of "endangerment" are settled on the publicized list, the endangered status of World Heritage sites crystalizes as an agreement among states parties, and has a kind of transactional value. In other words, endangerment operates as a collective resource within the World Heritage system through which states-party actors realize various outcomes. However, what both sets of authors ultimately conclude about this case is that, despite the collective nature of the tool's use, powerful states parties tend to wield the most authority in decision-making processes and guide how endangerment is defined—as well as the outcomes that listing (or not listing) produces—in their favor.

Beyond the case of the List of World Heritage in Danger, authors have often interpreted endangerment lists as modes of governing and as tools of authority, given that they tend to be produced by institutions. Irus Braveman, for example, has even argued that the appearance of scientific objectivity in endangered species lists disguises them as the authoritative basis for controlling how species conservation is done towards the creation of regulated environmental futures.³² Ideas about the authority not only of endangerment lists but endangerment generally are also prevalent in a growing body of criticism around the subject of heritage endangerment.

Critiquing Endangerment

Emerging out of and constituting a significant portion of the literature on heritage endangerment are critical analyses that take issue with the concept's centrality to heritage and preservation.

²⁸ J. Mark Schuster, "Making a List and Checking it Twice: The List as a Tool of Historic Preservation." Harris School of Public Policy: University of Chicago, Working Paper, 2003.

²⁹ See for example: Tony Bennet et. al. *Collecting, Ordering, Governing: Anthropology, Museums, and Liberal Government* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2017).

³⁰ Lynn Meskell, "States of Conservation: Protection, Politics, and Pacting within the UNESCO's World Heritage Committee," *Anthropological Quarterly* 87 no. 1 (2014): 221.

³¹ Nicholas E. Brown, Claudia Liuzza, and Lynn Meskell, "The Politics of Peril: UNESCO's List of World Heritage in Danger," *Journal of Field Archaeology* 44 no. 5 (2019): 287-303.

³² Braverman, "Anticipating Endangerment," 132-157.

Some lines of criticism question the application of endangerment rhetoric to culture, seen as victimizing and paternalistic; others have found that the concept of endangerment (and loss, generally) is fundamentally incongruous with what heritage is and does. Still others argue that endangerment deals in politics and power and is a vehicle for authorized agendas that go unchecked, and thus can be unproductive if not harmful for some communities. This body of critical literature has provided important insights into endangerment and some of the work that it can do, particularly as discourse and as rhetoric. As we'll see, it has also steered the conversation around endangerment in a particular direction.

Dominant theorizations of endangerment frame it as discourse, rhetoric, and as a cultural sensibility. Similar conceptions are also central to criticisms of endangerment as it relates to heritage, as well as culture generally. Outside of heritage studies, there is a rich literature on the topic of language endangerment that predates most heritage-specific criticisms, and grapples specifically with questions about the use of endangerment rhetoric and its ties to authority. At its most essential, that literature has found that endangerment rhetoric can be problematic if not dangerous given that arguments about “endangered languages” are hierarchical and pseudo-Darwinian, and pronouncements about the precarity of supposedly “endangered indigenous people” are fundamentally colonialist.³³ Pumla Dineo Qquloo has argued that endangerment rhetoric applied to both people and culture is victimizing and paternalistic, but in a particular way that naturalizes the very real impacts of colonialism (eg. racism, poverty, etc.).³⁴ In this way, the language of endangerment can become a self-serving justification for intervention and control disguised as protection or preservation, and which can have material consequences for communities.³⁵

Through this lens, who controls the discourse and uses the official rhetoric of endangerment (ie. the classification as developed and used by authority) is critical. While real dangers to people, communities, or heritage places or things may be present, it is often the ascription of endangerment that brings resources to bear, for better or worse. This idea has been demonstrated by Daniel Münster who found that communities in rural South India whose livelihoods were jeopardized by statist agrarian development projects harnessed the officialized rhetorics of endangerment (ie. casting themselves and their ways of life as “endangered”) as a cultural tactic and a way of asserting identities and political positions.³⁶ For Münster, this meant that endangerment had been incorporated into a kind of cultural “tool box” that could be used to meet the “practical, political and situational needs of the agent,” perhaps regardless or in spite of entrenched power dynamics.³⁷ As this particular body of literature has shown, although there may be intersections, there can be distinct differences between endangerment experienced in reality and the attribution of endangerment – the latter being bound to ideas about rhetoric and who has the authority to command it and to what ends. As Graham Huggan has stated,

³³ Graham Huggan, “Introduction” in *Perspectives on Endangerment*, eds. Graham Huggan and Stephan Klasen (Hildensheim: George Olms Verlag, 2005): 5.

³⁴ Pumla Dineo Qqola, “A Question of Semantics? On *Not* Calling People “Endangered,” in *Perspectives on Endangerment*, eds. Graham Huggan and Stephan Klasen (Hildensheim: George Olms Verlag, 2005): 51-61.

³⁵ Iris Schmeisser, “‘Mission Civilsatrice’, Endangerment and Colonial Art in Paris in the Era of Modernism,” in *Perspectives on Endangerment*, eds. Graham Huggan and Stephan Klasen (Hildensheim: George Olms Verlag, 2005):161-171.

³⁶ Daniel Münster, “Of Spirits and Hybrids: Discourses of Endangerment in Rural South India,” in *Perspectives on Endangerment*, eds. Graham Huggan and Stephan Klasen (Hildensheim: George Olms Verlag, 2005): 110-120.

³⁷ Münster, “Of Spirits and Hybrids,” 120.

“endangerment is real, and yet there are fictions of endangerment.”³⁸ Nevertheless, that endangerment is real for *heritage* is less certain in some critical literature.

Among the most provocative and influential criticisms of heritage endangerment emerging from the field of heritage studies is that endangerment rhetoric (and ideas about “losing” heritage generally) are fundamentally misapplied to heritage. Cornelius Holtorf has championed this view, building on an understanding that heritage is not essentially constitutive of material objects, but instead comprises social and cultural processes of valuing and engaging the past in the present.³⁹ He argues that heritage, as a creative process that happens through growth and change, is neither endangered nor lost when material objects are threatened with alteration or destruction.⁴⁰ Drawing on the familiar point that endangerment and loss can be constructive of heritage value, Holtorf has suggested that the idea of heritage in danger and practices of seeking to stave off loss or change may be counterproductive, and that new ways of doing heritage and preservation are needed that look beyond it.

In an adjacent line of criticism, Trinidad Rico has provided a kind of bridge between rhetoric-based critiques emerging from language preservation and Holtorf’s view of heritage endangerment as counterproductive. In her articulation of the “at risk discourse,” Rico finds that the language of endangerment pervades and shapes the ways we see and do heritage and preservation. But fundamental to her view is the idea that the dominance of the at risk discourse also reproduces dominant (ie. Western, elite, material-centric) visions of heritage, and compels material and expert-oriented interventions through the rhetoric of catastrophism.⁴¹ For Rico, endangerment is “an instrument of rationalization for the dominant politics of identification and construction of cultural heritage,” and which “acts as a rationalizing vehicle for other agendas that go unchecked.”⁴² In other words, endangerment rhetoric can be seen to serve as a kind of operational arm of Laurajane Smith’s “Authorized Heritage Discourse,” which constructs heritage in the image of authority, ultimately to the exclusion or assimilation of alternative or non-dominant ways of understanding heritage and doing preservation.⁴³ In other research, Rico has argued specifically that state-propagated ideas about heritage at risk and endangerment have led to the misdirection of attention and resources in disaster contexts, leading to the destruction of valued community heritage.⁴⁴

Other authors have pursued similar critiques. Harald Fredheim has argued that institutions use the language of endangerment to encourage volunteering at heritage sites in the United Kingdom, but in ways that create exploitative relationships between authorities and participants.⁴⁵ For

³⁸ Huggan, “Introduction,” 5.

³⁹ Cornelius Holtorf, “Is the Past a Non-Renewable Resource?” in *Destruction and Conservation of Cultural Property*, ed. Robert Layton, Julian Thomas, and Peter Stone (London: Routledge, 2001): 286-297.

⁴⁰ Cornelius Holtorf, “Averting Loss Aversion in Cultural Heritage,” *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 21 no. 4, 2015: 405-421.; Cornelius Holtorf, “Why Cultural Heritage Is Not ‘At Risk’ (In Syria or Anywhere),” 2016. Published online: <https://heritagefortransformation.wordpress.com/2016/04/04/why-cultural-heritage-is-not-at-risk-in-syria-or-anywhere/>

⁴¹ Trinidad Rico, “Heritage at Risk,” 147-162.

⁴² Trinidad Rico, “Heritage at Risk,” 147, 158.

⁴³ Smith, *Uses of Heritage*, 2006.

⁴⁴ Trinidad Rico, “The Limits of a Heritage at Risk Framework: The Construction of Disaster Cultural Heritage in Banda Aceh, Indonesia,” *Journal of Social Archaeology* 14 no. 2 (2010):157-176.

⁴⁵ L. Harald Fredheim, “Endangerment-Driven Heritage Volunteering: Democratisation or ‘Changeless Change’,” *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 24 no. 6 (2018): 619-633.

Fredheim, endangerment is a disguise for neoliberal governmentality, whereby heritage participants are engaged through crowdsourcing and manipulated to work to state and professional agendas. Thereby, endangerment rhetoric produces a body of participants to undertake collective actions that are directed by the institution, but it also ensures that particular procedures are followed while publics engage with heritage. Fredheim, like Holtorf, concludes his study with a call to move beyond endangerment-oriented heritage practice in order to create more democratized approaches to heritage participation and increase heritage's value to society.

Despite the variety of argumentation, recent critical literature in heritage studies has largely coalesced around a singular view of endangerment: heritage and preservation are better off without it. Academic calls for reorienting the field and decentering the anticipation of loss has prompted a new line of research that seeks to define alternatives to endangerment-oriented heritage practice. Sarah May, in an attempt to ground endangerment critique and ideas about alternative heritage practices in empirical investigation, recently undertook a study of endangerment-motivated public (ie. citizen and civil society) participation in the United Kingdom's Lake District historic national park. In that study, May finds that the responsible heritage authority uses endangerment rhetoric to catalyze public engagement, but that it achieves only short-term and not long-term participation.⁴⁶ Taking a view of heritage practice as a kind of "future-making," she argues that endangerment-motivated participation makes "anxious futures," but suggests that other another participatory heritage practice at the site that is not motivated by endangerment (fell shepherding, specifically) "creates a future from patient care in the present."⁴⁷ By her view, this kind of participation suggests a mode of heritage practice that "can strengthen communities and allow for real political movement not based on the anticipation of loss but on the patient nurturing of complexity and collaboration."⁴⁸ Beyond May's work, other research has continued to probe alternative modes of heritage practice and ways of valuing heritage things that are not solely determined by endangerment.⁴⁹

Reconsidering Endangerment

The lines of criticism outlined above offer important insights into endangerment, the way it interfaces with certain conceptualizations of heritage, as well as some of the work that it does as discourse and rhetoric. Clearly, some revelations here are cause for concern. Most troubling is the understanding that endangerment rhetoric can be and has been used by authorized actors, like government bodies, as a vehicle of influence, manipulation, and control, and in ways that deny authority or agency to others by way of heritage. In light of the fact that endangerment has been theorized as a discourse, there seems to be a sense in the literature that these kinds of uses are endemic to endangerment itself because heritage discourse is wielded from a position of authority. This understanding, compounded by the idea that endangerment applied to heritage is always fictitious, has put the proverbial nail in endangerment's coffin for critics. But as academic critiques call for "freeing heritage from discourses of endangerment,"⁵⁰ and as the conversation turns towards identifying alternatives to endangerment-oriented heritage practice, we might pause to ask: Do we really know enough about how endangerment is put to use in practice to abandon the concept altogether?

⁴⁶ Sarah May, "Heritage, Endangerment, and Participation: Alternative Futures in the Lake District," *International Journal of Heritage Studies*. Published online 24 June 2019: 1-16.

⁴⁷ May, "Heritage, Endangerment, and Participation," 13.

⁴⁸ May, "Heritage, Endangerment, and Participation," 13.

⁴⁹ DeSilvey and Harrison, "Anticipating loss," 1.

⁵⁰ Harald Fredheim as paraphrased by May in "Heritage, Endangerment, and Participation," 13.

Emerging from this critical literature, our understanding of the work that endangerment does on the ground is based on observations of how “heritage at risk” is brought to bear unilaterally, and often as rhetoric, on heritage contexts and publics. In both Fredheim and May’s research, for example, heritage authorities invoke endangerment as a way of generating citizen-participatory engagements and collective preservation actions, but in ways that control or restrict how those actions take place. This affirms for the authors that endangerment operates as a tool of authority. But another line of research touched on earlier suggests that there is still more to understand about how endangerment operates.

Lynn Meskell and Nicholas Brown et al.’s research on the List of World Heritage In Danger has demonstrated that decisions about what World Heritage sites are inscribed on that endangerment list are made by a singular decision-making body (the World Heritage Committee) often to the political benefit of powerful actors on the committee.⁵¹ But importantly, they’ve also shown that the listing instrument creates space for endangerment to be *negotiated* among diverse States Parties before an agreement is reached and a site is inscribed on the list. These negotiations are often transactional, transforming endangerment into a kind of collective resource within the World Heritage frame that is put to use by various actors before any official endangerment rhetoric is deployed. In this case, these negotiations and agreements are not solely a result of an endangerment ascription – in a way, they are *constitutive* of it. This recognition recalls Vidal and Dias, who noted that endangerment “not only refers to states of the world that the sciences may identify and describe, but also names an individual and collective resource for apprehending the world at the level of symbols and action.”⁵² Ultimately any site’s inscription on the List in Danger is meant to produce preservation outcomes on a collective basis; but this case suggests endangerment’s construction, direction, and its uses in practice might be more complex than previously thought, and in ways tied not just to rhetoric but to both individual and collective action.

Meskell and Brown et al. ultimately found that the List in Danger fits the pattern of use established in endangerment criticism: endangerment, ascribed unilaterally, produces collective actions that benefit an authorized actor (a conclusion considered at further length in Chapter 2). But their presentation of the endangerment list as a complex instrument that brings together multiple actors to construct endangerment through negotiation, and as a vehicle for both individual and collective actions, raises a number of important questions: If negotiation is central to the construction of endangerment and its uses through the List in Danger, is it necessarily the case that endangerment ascriptions are unilateral and self-serving for authorized actors as criticism would suggest? Could other endangerment lists that incorporate similar processes use endangerment differently – perhaps in ways that are more productive of collective notions of value and endangerment, or that realize benefits for multiple parties? And more generally, what might the centrality of negotiation and collective action to this endangerment list tell us about how endangerment functions by way of heritage generally?

In this introductory chapter, and through a review of the literature, we’ve come to know endangerment in a number of lights: Endangerment is a *process* that unfolds over time in relation to our perception of threat. Endangerment is an *outcome* of processes, events, and actions that lead us to perceive an entity as being threatened, often through formal devices like a list. Endangerment is also a *beginning*, such that its ascription (or inscription in an inventory) inspires action. Endangerment is a *diagnosis* of states of affairs, but it is also a *construct*. Endangerment itself is a form of *action* taken against perceived threats, and it is an *argument* about what is

⁵¹ Meskell, “States of Conservation,” 217-243; Brown et al., “The Politics of Peril,” 287-303.

⁵² Vidal and Dias, “The Endangerment Sensibility,” 2.

valuable and warrants our urgent attention. Endangerment is also a *tool* or a *resource* through which actors can achieve outcomes in practice. But perhaps most overlooked is that endangerment is an agent of *negotiation* and *consensus*. Indeed, when endangerment is assigned it is intended to carry a message to some broader collective. But only by inspiring negotiation and galvanizing consensus does the very notion that something is in danger ultimately transform into an agreement to act.

Chapter

2

Framing the Inquiry: Endangerment Listing as Preservation Policy

As we saw in the last chapter, our recognition that something is endangered often materializes by way of its inscription on a list. We also know that endangerment lists for heritage are pervasive, but that there is little research about how they operate in practice or their material effects. Still, what research there is on one foundational heritage endangerment list, the UNESCO List of World Heritage in Danger, shows that they are complex instruments comprising formal structures and decision-making bodies through which endangerment is negotiated and thus constructed by a range of actors prior to inscription. Moreover, we can observe that inventories engage broader publics in their published form (whether that's citizens, governments, or other institutions), which also influences listing's effects. With these points in mind, it is clear that an examination of heritage red lists can provide insight into an understudied preservation tool while informing questions about the nature of endangerment and the work it does in practice through heritage.

The aim of this chapter is to frame the thesis inquiry by providing background and analysis that demonstrates not only that heritage endangerment lists are helpful for understanding the concept of endangerment and its uses by way of heritage, but also that their investigation prompts the application of a useful analytical lens for viewing endangerment listing and endangerment that is currently absent from the literature. When considering endangerment through listing programs, ideas about public policy and policy instrumentation come to the fore, which in turn can provide critical insights into how the tool of the red list and its core concepts developed over time and are being put to use in practice by both institutions and the multiple publics that they serve. In shifting our view from the discourse of endangerment to the "policy" of endangerment, the red list becomes recognizable not just as a preservation tool but as a preservation *policy tool* – in other words, a means through which institutions seek to provide public services and meet public problems. Looking closely at heritage endangerment lists and conceptualizing them in policy terms produces key questions that guide the thesis research into the chapters that follow.

"Red Lists" for Heritage

In 1973, the World Heritage Convention established a pair of inventories that gave shape to the new international World Heritage system: the World Heritage List and its complement, the List of World Heritage in Danger. These lists were not intended to be simple documentary devices. Instead, the distinct programs were created to meet different kinds of preservation challenges, even while both were underpinned by the same endangerment rationale. The World Heritage List, an inventory of all sites safeguarded through the Convention, offered protection to inscribed properties through expert monitoring missions with the added incentive of international prestige

for affiliated States Parties.⁵³ By contrast, inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger was meant to address “serious and specific dangers” to World Heritage properties by encouraging major conservation operations as emergency response.⁵⁴ Through the Convention, the act of listing took on a dual role. In a manner that had long been deployed within heritage preservation, listing was a way to position sites as valuable and worthy of protection against the specter of loss. But through the List in Danger, listing also became a way to define and to call attention to perceived critical states of threat, and a vehicle for galvanizing large-scale preservation actions at World Heritage sites that could only be achieved—both in terms of financing and expertise—through international cooperation.⁵⁵

Widely seen as the foundational example of a dedicated “endangerment list” for heritage, the List in Danger was created with three objectives in mind: to support national efforts towards safeguarding the integrity of World Heritage properties; to demonstrate to the global public the reality of the threats faced by endangered World Heritage properties; and to garner international funding for mitigative conservation projects.⁵⁶ In short, the list was a way to help States Parties to the Convention secure international aid from other member states for emergency preservation. By definition, listing on the List in Danger was an exceptional action and one with a limited duration, as inscription was valid only insofar as serious and specific threats persisted. But conceived of as a “short list,” it also took into account the capacity of the international authority and the international community to act. Given the scale and cost of the major conservation undertakings required to successfully counter threats and thus remove sites from the List in Danger, the quantity of sites selected for inscription by the World Heritage Committee was to be restricted “to a reasonable number.”⁵⁷ Ultimately, it was the costly reality of preservation combined with the goal of motivating a sense of shared responsibility among member states that shaped the list. Indeed, it has been observed that the List in Danger in many ways epitomizes the World Heritage project, representing a vehicle for collective stewardship and conservation among nations.⁵⁸

Even as an innovation within the heritage realm, the List of World Heritage in Danger, with its particular public format and action-oriented agenda, was not at the time of its creation without precedent. The endangerment list as a form had in fact been developed at an international scale a decade earlier by the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN). IUCN, an organization of governments and private entities founded in 1948 in close association with UNESCO, created in 1964 “The Red List of Threatened Species.” The IUCN Red List was an inventory of endangered wildlife that included definitions and assessments of degrees of threat.⁵⁹ But as a published and regularly-updated catalog its objectives were multiple: Beyond being a

⁵³ Nicholas E. Brown, Claudia Liuzza & Lynn Meskell, “The Politics of Peril: UNESCO’s List of World Heritage in Danger,” *Journal of Field Archaeology* 44 no. 5 (2019): 287-303.

⁵⁴ United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). “Convention Concerning Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage,” Adopted by the General Conference at its seventeenth session, Paris, 16 November 1972: 1. Accessible online from UNESCO: <https://whc.unesco.org/archive/convention-en.pdf>

⁵⁵ Michel Batisse and Gerald Bolla, *The Invention of World Heritage* (Paris: Association of Former UNESCO Staff Members, 2005).

⁵⁶ UNESCO, “Report of the Rapporteur, World Heritage Committee, Sixth Session, Paris 13-17 December 1982,” CLT-82/CH/CONF.015/8. Annex II. 3.1. 1982. Accessible online from UNESCO: <https://whc.unesco.org/archive/1982/clt-82-conf015-8e.pdf>.

⁵⁷ UNESCO, “Report of the Rapporteur,” Annex II. 3.2-3.5. 1982.

⁵⁸ Brown et al., “The Politics of Peril,” 287-303.

⁵⁹ N. J. Collar, “The reasons for Red Data Books,” *Oryx* 20 no. 2 (1996): 121-130.

source of grounded information about the changing natural environment, the list, devised as a “conservation tool,” was also meant to promote the value of threatened species and their protection while influencing conservation actions and government policies at an international scale.⁶⁰ Through the deployment of categories like “Critically Endangered,” “Endangered,” and “Vulnerable,” the IUCN Red List constructed a framework for understanding species and thus set conservation priorities globally through what amounted to an institutionally-backed public call to action.

Parallels between the 1964 IUCN Red List and the 1973 UNESCO List of World Heritage in Danger were not coincidental. As an Advisory Body to the World Heritage Convention, IUCN in partnership with ICOMOS was largely responsible for developing guidelines for the List in Danger.⁶¹ As a vehicle of conservation advocacy, the endangerment list had already achieved success on the international stage – for example, IUCN galvanized endangered species policy in the United States and elsewhere through 1973.⁶² Moreover, as a way of generating international attention that was grounded in expert assessment, the endangerment list model was naturally transposed to the arena of natural and cultural heritage preservation within the World Heritage system, which was associated with and promoted expert bodies and techniques. By adopting inscription criteria like “Ascertained Danger” and “Potential Danger” to be assessed by heritage professionals prior to inscription, the List in Danger was constructed not as an institutional wishlist of the World Heritage Committee, but rather as a Red List for world heritage that brought an appearance of objectivity to bear on a program meant to engage public opinion and diverse states actors.

Following the establishment of the List of World Heritage in Danger—and particularly since its first effective deployments on the international stage around 1980—a variety of institutions for heritage preservation have taken up the Red List model. World Monuments Fund, a private international non-profit, first began publishing its biannual “World Monuments Watch” (formerly the “World Monuments Watch List of 100 Most Endangered Sites”) with global scope in 1996. Meanwhile, national preservation entities with more focused agendas also took up the practice of endangerment listing. The U. S. National Trust for Historic Preservation established its annual “America’s 11 Most Endangered Places” in 1988, and Historic England, the non-departmental public body of the British government, initiated in 1998 its annual national “Heritage at Risk Register.” Elsewhere in the anglophone world, the National Trust of Australia began a now-defunct “Endangered Places Programme” in 1998, and the National Trust for Canada inaugurated its ongoing “Top 10 Endangered Places List” in 2005.

Today, red listing is ubiquitous across heritage preservation. In the United States, statewide preservation nonprofits in 37 of the 50 states currently operate annual or biannual endangerment listing programs for heritage.⁶³ Even more common are regionally- or locally-focused heritage red lists. One statewide nonprofit in Indiana, for example, estimated in 2001 that 30 of its local

⁶⁰ Jonathan Baillie and Brian Goonbridge, eds., *1996 IUCN Red List of Threatened Animals*. The IUCN Species Survival Commission, Intro, 10. Accessible online from IUCN: <https://portals.iucn.org/library/sites/library/files/documents/RL-1996-001.pdf>

⁶¹ UNESCO, “Report of the Rapporteur,” Annex II. 1982.

⁶² Ana S. L. Rodrigues et al., “The value of the IUCN Red List for Conservation,” *TRENDS in Ecology and Evolution* 21 no. 2 (2006): 71-76.

⁶³ Count developed by the author based on the 2019 or 2020 activity of state-wide endangerment listing programs.

affiliates operated endangered historic places lists.⁶⁴ Even as new heritage organizations are being established today, the endangerment list remains a standby program for preservation, particularly in the United States where the model has found broad adoption.

As we've seen in Chapter 1, heritage studies discourse in recent years has provided useful frames through which we might interpret the vitality of these types of lists as a now-established part of the preservation landscape. For example, we recognize: that endangerment as a discourse can help to validate the preservation enterprise in ways that support the field's current professional orientation and its focus on materiality, aesthetics, and cultural values; that as rhetoric, the language of endangerment holds a certain power both to create heritage value and to evoke emotional responses that make it an effective vehicle for advancing preservation agendas; and that as inventory, the red list is a medium of influence that allows for collecting, managing, and potentially exploiting heritage places and things, even from a distance. But these insights leave important questions unanswered. Critically: given that the heritage endangerment list was conceived of and popularized as a tool of institutions and citizens, precisely how and to what ends are such lists being used "on the ground," and by whom? And furthermore, how might the common heritage endangerment list help us to better understand the ways that endangerment as a concept is being mobilized in practice within the heritage realm?

Toward answering these questions, the example of the World Heritage List in Danger both points to and helps to conceal an important clue. As noted earlier, the World Heritage system incorporates both the List in Danger and the World Heritage List within its programmatic framework because these inventories meet different kinds of challenges posed by heritage at risk. And given the complexity and expense of large-scale conservation measures, the List in Danger was designed—including its inscription criteria, public presentation, and decision-making stratum—to shape public opinion and garner international funding as well as to direct and realize collective preservation actions.⁶⁵ Together these characteristics indicate that the List in Danger's usefulness does not stem uniquely from its inventory format or from its associated endangerment rhetoric, nor is its use in practice limited to "preserving threatened sites." Instead, this case reveals that the List in Danger functions as a complex mechanism used by institutions and various other actors for multiple purposes – and, indeed, that it's within the particular mechanics of that tool (eg. inscription criteria, decision-making processes, etc.) that endangerment is ultimately constructed, directed, and mobilized to action.

Some recent studies of the List in Danger have rightly focused their attention on that program's structure and inner workings as a way to better understand how the tool is used and its "politics of peril."⁶⁶ Lynn Meskell, Nicolas Brown et al., and others have explored how decision-making processes, program technicalities, and even definitions of endangerment formally adopted within the List in Danger serve specific agendas and produce particular outcomes. But a key takeaway from this research is that the list, once intended as a vehicle for collective action within the World Heritage system, has been co-opted by powerful States Parties and transformed into a punitive diplomatic device.⁶⁷ Precisely because the listing program confers decision-making power to member states who are also stewards of potentially-endangered sites, and because criteria for endangerment are notably vague, the list is subject to manipulation, often in ways that reproduce hierarchies and particular visions of heritage conservation within the World Heritage frame. This

⁶⁴ Mary Humstone, *Threatened Treasures: Creating Lists of Endangered Historic Places* (Washington D.C.: The National Trust for Historic Preservation, 2001).

⁶⁵ UNESCO, *Convention*, 1972; UNESCO, "Report of the Rapporteur," Annex II. 1982.

⁶⁶ Brown et al., "The Politics of Peril," 287-303.

⁶⁷ Meskell, "States of Conservation" 217-243; Brown et al., "The Politics of Peril," 287-303.

understanding of the List in Danger reinforces a view of the endangerment list as a tool of collecting, ordering, and governing that is wielded from a position of power, and often to the subjugation or exclusion of those who lack it.⁶⁸ And it's here where we're tempted to return to interpreting the red list as simply an expression of an "at risk discourse," which inherently serves as a rationalizing device for the dominant politics of heritage and the preservation of elite cultural and expert values.⁶⁹

While the approach used to evaluate the List in Danger yields important insight into that particular case, extrapolating its diagnosis to heritage red listing on the whole importantly bypasses critical questions that emerge when other cases are considered. In reality, the List in Danger is a singular example of a red list in practice: As part of an international treaty, the List in Danger put to use across a network of signatories and designated World Heritage sites – sites already determined to meet that system's standards of "Outstanding Universal Value." While aided by expert affiliates and influenced by public opinion, the list effectively operates through a closed circuit of heritage places and state actors who are at once decision makers and audience, de facto stewards and potential collaborative actors. In contrast, the red list model more commonly found outside of the UNESCO frame tends to operate differently: Most heritage red listing programs active today are officiated by institutions that compile their lists from pools of heritage sites generated by public nomination processes.⁷⁰ And through publication and publicity, these lists invite contributions from institutional partners, experts, and site owners as well as the general public for preservation actions. Although these distinctions may be a matter of technicality, their implications for understanding are significant. While the List in Danger may function within the World Heritage system as a tool of powerful institutional actors influenced by international publics, the heritage endangerment list more commonly is a tool, though wielded by institutions, that is also used by multiple publics (from citizens to communities, and from governments to corporate actors) and within broader contexts of heritage.

By looking closely into the World Heritage List in Danger's structure, processes, and key actors, researchers have clearly demonstrated that heritage red lists are complex mechanisms through which endangerment is constructed and operationalized to varying ends. But by comparing the types of structures, processes, and actors that comprise the List in Danger with other heritage red lists active today, it is also clear that the World Heritage example is not a wholly representative case. Even though that example gives evidence to familiar critical interpretations of red listing and its uses of endangerment, if we're to more fully understand how heritage red listing is being used in practice and how the concept of endangerment is being used through the red list, we need to look beyond analyses of the List of World Heritage in Danger and begin to consider more closely other formulations of this pervasive way of doing preservation – something that is absent so far from heritage studies and preservation literature. This recognition is made more significant in our awareness—perhaps in contrast to prevailing visions of heritage endangerment—that red lists are tools used not just by institutional actors but also by multiple publics, and in ways that do not solely draw on public opinion, but that leverage endangerment towards collective action and the realization of various intended outcomes.

⁶⁸ Bennet et al., *Collecting, Ordering, Governing*, 2017.

⁶⁹ Rico, "Heritage at Risk," 147-162.

⁷⁰ All of the heritage endangerment listing programs identified in this chapter incorporate a public nomination process except for two: the UNESCO List of World Heritage in Danger and Historic England's Heritage at Risk Register. Public nomination-based programs include all 37 of the endangerment listing programs run by statewide nonprofits in the United States.

Seeing red lists not just as static inventories but as dynamic institutional programs reveals how certain operational paradigms, like incorporating a public nomination process, could create significant (or not so significant) differences in the ways that endangerment is defined, directed, and put to use. In turn, these differences could affect not only how we perceive threats and threatened heritage within the landscape, but how, when, and for what heritage places and things preservation ultimately happens. Certainly, red lists do not simply collect and categorize; they are mechanisms through which actors set preservation priorities and realize tangible results. While they represent a class of institutional programs unto themselves, individual endangerment lists can also have distinguishing characteristics, include different actors, operationalize different decision-making processes, and yield different outcomes.

This understanding points to the value of exploring in further detail the kinds of red listing programs that are most commonly used today by both institutions and publics. But it also points to an important alternative frame for analyzing heritage red lists and considering how endangerment functions within heritage preservation: As a type of program adopted by institutions and tailored to achieve results on a collective basis since its earliest manifestation in the List of World Heritage in Danger, the heritage red list is perhaps best viewed not just as a preservation tool, but as a preservation policy tool. A policy perspective can bring into sharper focus histories of endangerment's materialization as a core concept within the preservation domain and the development of the red list model. But most importantly, the policy frame shifts our attention from endangerment conceived as something that operates solely at the level of discourse and rhetoric, to something to which intentions and outcomes are integral, and in ways that are fundamentally tied to public and collective action.⁷¹ Examining heritage red lists specifically as policy instruments anchors analyses to the types of programmatic objectives, structures, actor relationships, and operations that already have illuminated uses of the List of World Heritage in Danger. Moreover, it raises new questions about how the red list tool used elsewhere might serve as a vehicle not only through which endangerment is constructed and put to use, but as a mechanism through which ideas about endangerment and heritage value are negotiated between institutional and public actors.

The Policy Perspective

Our ability to view heritage endangerment listing through a policy frame is dependent on an understanding of policy and policy instrumentation. For our purposes, "policy" can be defined as a system of principles that guide institutional decision making towards intended outcomes, while "policy instruments" (or tools) are the means through which institutions pursue aims, address public problems, or provide public services. "Institutions" here can be defined as any formal organization (state or otherwise) formed with a social or public purpose.⁷² While heritage studies discourse has tended not to consider endangerment or heritage red listing in these terms, a policy

⁷¹ Here I do not mean to claim a firm distinction between "discourse" and "policy." As others have pointed out, the language of policy and even the choice of policy instrumentation can produce specific representations of the issues they purport to confront, thus constructing particular realities (see Lascoumes and La Gales 2007). Moreover, discourse can be both reflective and constitutive of social practices (See Smith 2006). However, a policy perspective does bring with it a certain set of established foci (eg. public actions and actors, procedure and instrumentality, intentions and outcomes) that may be disguised by focusing on endangerment as discourse.

⁷² For further definition of policy instruments see: Lester M. Salamon, "The New Governance and the Tools of Public Action: An Introduction," in *The Tools of Government: A Guide to the New Governance*, ed. Lester M. Salamon (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002): 2-3.

perspective and its associated tools of analysis are a useful, if not a natural, fit. Indeed, not only heritage endangerment lists, but the emergence of heritage endangerment as a core concept within heritage and preservation might be best understood in relation to the development of policy instruments that used threat as a rationale for collective actions.

As explored in Chapter 1, the language of endangerment that permeated the heritage fields during the second half of the twentieth century was clearly manifest in the 1966 U.S. National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and the 1973 World Heritage Convention; but it was largely absent from authenticity-oriented professional charters, like the 1964 Venice Charter, that gave shape to the professional field slightly prior and in parallel with the development of national and international policy instruments. While perhaps not essential to (or elevated by) the professionalization of preservation as a field, the concept of heritage endangerment was clearly fundamental to the *institutionalization* of heritage preservation as something deemed valuable to public life. As a public policy rationale, heritage endangerment was situated in opposition to preservation conceived as a common good – a public benefit to be achieved through collective action. Identified as a public problem, heritage endangerment came under the purview of institutions who sought to address it through policy instruments, like the World Heritage System, NHPA, or a heritage endangerment list. Thus the proliferation and specification of endangerment listing programs can be seen in relation to a perceived need for delivering preservation as a *public service*.

Seeing the heritage red list as a preservation policy tool is significant because it highlights the institutional character of endangerment listing, and thus the model's fundamental public orientation. Heritage red listing programs are almost always operated by public-facing institutions, because they necessarily draw on communities or publics as agents of collective action, and thus as ways of achieving intended preservation outcomes.⁷³ We've already seen that red lists are complex tools through which outcomes are sought and realized by various actors. But the policy perspective lays bare that such lists function as public programs, and thus in relation to notions of public benefit. To illustrate: A red list like the List in Danger may operationalize public opinion towards collaborative action among institutional (ie. government) actors who represent the public interest. Or, as we'll see elsewhere, a red list program may utilize an open nomination process to source directly from multiple publics ideas about where collective action could be taken to deliver a public service. In the later case, the policy tool may channel public values and intentions through the listing program towards the actualization of collectively-wrought outcomes.

Nevertheless, that policy tools operate in relation to notions of public benefit and public action does not mean that they are not operated from a position of authority – policy tools, whether wielded by governments or nongovernmental institutions, are by definition vehicles of governing. Even though policy instruments are often thought to be pragmatic or technical approaches to solving public problems, they inevitably carry with them values, agendas, and power dynamics that may be inherent to the operating institution or the tool itself, and could change over time. This idea underscores an important point to consider in relation to heritage red listing and its use in light of existing criticisms of endangerment: collective action wrought through policy does not necessitate collectively-held intentions or collectively-sought outcomes. Moreover, policy tools inherently guide action in terms of the principles of their institutional operators. To further complicate the policy instrument view, as Pierre Lascombes and Patrick Le Gales have pointed

⁷³ All endangerment lists identified during this research are operated institutionally, including by governments, non-governmental organizations, or private non-profits. Others are operated institutionally by universities (eg. University of Nevada, Las Vegas and Preserve Nevada's "11 Most Endangered") or media outlets (eg. Historic Hawaii Foundation and HONOLULU Magazine's "Most Endangered Places") in collaboration with non-profit organizations.

out, policy tools are not neutral devices: they “produce specific effects, independently of the objectives pursued (the aims ascribed to them), which structure public policy according to their own logic.”⁷⁴ This idea is clearly manifest in the case of the List of World Heritage in Danger, which, as found by Brown et al., actually inhibits fundraising and devalues institutional endangerment claims, despite being devised as an international fundraising vehicle for emergency interventions.⁷⁵ Certainly, though the policy perspective clarifies the tool’s essential purported aim (addressing heritage endangerment defined as a public problem and realizing preservation as a public service), it also reinforces the need for any evaluation to carefully consider the multiplicity of values and intentions involved in a case, which may or may not correspond to the tool’s use in practice and could change over time.

That endangerment listing constitutes a preservation policy tool is not uncontroversial. As Irus Braverman has shown, controversy around this subject is particularly common within nature conservation, where “the mantra of the scientists involved in the listing project is that the list merely lists.”⁷⁶ Through numerous interviews Braverman has found that scientists often reject the idea that endangerment listing programs are a policy tool—or that they set priorities intentionally and carry agendas—in light of their views that such lists derive from scientific consensus, and thus are value free. Nevertheless, conflicting interpretations abound, and some are even visible within literature produced by IUCN on its own Red List program. While the IUCN Red List Guidelines (2019) state that that the list should “not be interpreted as a means of priority setting,”⁷⁷ IUCN publications since the Red List’s founding have made explicit that the program seeks to promote the value of endangered species research and conservation, motivate the development of international expert networks, and influence national and international conservation policies – all institutional priorities and objectives (ie. policy aims) of the IUCN.⁷⁸

The view that “a list is just a list” also often prevails in heritage preservation, and particularly so for endangerment lists, which are similarly associated with objective assessment in the heritage context. Still, there is broad acknowledgement within the heritage fields that the act of listing carries with it both values and intentions, something that might stem from preservation’s long history of creating lists. Though underrecognized, there is also an appreciation that listing itself is a preservation policy tool. Mark Schuster has made the case that listing exemplifies one of five tools of public and private institutions for pursuing preservation policies: namely, “the tool of information.”⁷⁹ He observes that when we consider listing as a preservation tool we tend to think of what results from being listed (eg. recognition, access to resources, physical intervention), but

⁷⁴ Pierre Lascoumes and Patrick Le Gales, “Introduction: Understanding Public Policy through Its Instruments—From the Nature of Instruments to Sociology of Public Policy Instrumentation,” *Governance* 20 no. 1 (2007): 1.

⁷⁵ Brown et al., “The Politics of Peril,” 287-303.

⁷⁶ Irus Braverman, “Anticipating endangerment: The biopolitics of threatened species lists,” *BioSocieties* 12 no. 1 (2017): 140.

⁷⁷ IUCN Standards and Petitions Committee. 2019. Guidelines for Using the IUCN Red List Categories and Criteria. Version 14. Prepared by the Standards and Petitions Committee. Accessible online from IUCN: <http://www.iucnredlist.org/documents/RedListGuidelines.pdf>

⁷⁸ Richard and Maisie Fitter, eds., *The Road to Extinction*, Symposium held by the Species Survival Commission, Madrid 7-9 November 1984. Accessible online from IUCN: <https://portals.iucn.org/library/sites/library/files/documents/1987-001.pdf>

⁷⁹ According to John de Monchaux and J. Mark Schuster, the five tools for preservation action used by governments and non-governmental institutions are: ownership and operation; regulation; incentives (and disincentives); establishment, allocation, and enforcement of property rights; and information. See: J. Mark Schuster with John de Monchaux and Charles A. Riley II, *Preserving the Built Heritage* (Hanover: University Press of New England, 1997), 100-123.

overlook the list as an intervention itself, something that can realize programmatically institutional policy goals (eg. promoting heritage preservation, developing professional networks, or influencing other government policies).⁸⁰ For him, the listing program and the act of listing both serve as ways of guiding action and realizing intended outcomes for both the listing organization and publics. Schuster also finds that information (eg. listing) as a policy tool, unlike regulatory tools that require legal authority for example, is uniquely suited to institutions outside of government (ie. quasi-governmental, non-governmental, or private nonprofit organizations) that, he notes, are increasingly important to the field of heritage preservation.⁸¹ Here, without mentioning the endangerment list model specifically, Schuster offers an important insight into the heritage red list's historical development and its uses of endangerment as they relate to a broader policy context.

Certainly, listing is a familiar tool of government heritage policy. In the United States, national preservation policy is replete with lists; the 1966 National Historic Preservation Act alone established two listing programs (the National Register of Historic Places and the National Historic Landmarks system) as well as State Historic Preservation Offices each tasked with creating statewide "historic resources inventories."⁸² The heritage endangerment list, however, is a tool much less frequently used by governments. Instead, its ubiquity is owed largely to widespread adoption by non-governmental nonprofit organizations, sometimes referred to as the "third sector."⁸³ This notable characteristic of the red list model that is visible from the policy perspective has multiple interrelated explanations. Perhaps most fundamental is that public resources for heritage preservation are often limited, and policy tools that directly prompt not only individual but collective actions can realize preservation outcomes through resource pooling and political leverage that might otherwise not be possible. As the List of World Heritage in Danger demonstrates, the heritage red list's ability to realize collective action is key to why a non-governmental institution might choose that policy tool.

Other factors also can be seen to have influenced the red list's skew towards non-governmental non-profit operation – and particularly the public-nomination-based model that has proliferated beyond the UNESCO frame. As Lester M. Salamon has argued, such non-governmental nonprofit institutions have increasingly replaced governmental agencies as the directors and providers of public services in the late twentieth century, and policy tools—like the heritage endangerment list—are the primary means through which these institutions address public concerns.⁸⁴ Salamon also finds that while this process is underway globally, it is particularly developed in the United States, where distrust in government has forced the expansion of public programs "to proceed in a highly circuitous way," often through policy instruments that rely on interdependencies between non-profit institutions and public actions (eg. citizens, corporate, and state actors) to achieve aims.⁸⁵ This interpretation aligns with the prominence of endangerment listing in the United States.

⁸⁰ Schuster, "Information as a Tool," 103-105.

⁸¹ Schuster, "Information as a Tool," 120.

⁸² Dating back to the establishment of a National Monuments system in the 1906 Antiquities Act inventories have been a critical component of the U. S. heritage preservation policy. See also: The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. Public Law 89-665; 54 U.S.C. 300101.

⁸³ In the United States, the only heritage endangerment listing program operated even in part by a public body at the national or state level is Alabama's Places in Peril program, a joint undertaking between the Alabama Trust for Historic Preservation (private nonprofit) and the Alabama Historical Commission (the Alabama State Historic Preservation Office).

⁸⁴ Salamon, "The New Governance," 2-3.

⁸⁵ Salamon, "The New Governance," 2-3.

Still, other authors have seen the proliferation of policy instruments within the nonprofit sector as being related to a concurrent shift in democratic governance wherein “the definition of the common good is no longer the sole monopoly of legitimate governments” – in other words a shift towards more citizen-participatory policy frameworks, wherein multiple publics shape and take part in public actions and the provision of public services that were traditionally carried out by a state.⁸⁶ Writing on preservation policy in particular, Schuster observed this shift in relation to the increasing calls for citizen- and community-participatory policy approaches, as well as for tools that “foster the supply of information, consultation, and cooperation” as part of collective preservation actions done by institutions and in partnership with publics.⁸⁷

In the past few decades there has been increasing importance placed within the heritage fields on the politics of identity, and questions about who has the authority to define or assert their identity through or in relation to heritage. These questions are often framed in terms of universalizing heritages policies (eg. the World Heritage System’s operating notion of Outstanding Universal Value) and the notion of the Authorized Heritage Discourse, which reproduces beyond policy Western and elite cultural values and conceptions of heritage while delegitimizing others.⁸⁸ In response to these criticisms, and in addition to assertions from communities that existing structures do not account for their or their values’ recognition and representation, institutions have increasingly instituted policies for greater community participation and social inclusion. It is not a surprise, then, that heritage endangerment listing programs, which typically include multiple public actors in their operations through nomination processes or otherwise, have continued to proliferate among institutions since the model’s inception in the 1970s, and particularly in the 1990s and 2000s, also informed by broader shifts towards “new public governance.” Moreover, as we’ll see later, certain institutions have also furthered policies within their endangerment listing programs for deeper community participation and greater social inclusion.

However, as Laurajane Smith has pointed out, “these policies too often tend to be assimilationist and top-down in nature rather than bottom-up substantive challenges to the [Authorized Heritage Discourse]” and the dominant politics of heritage.⁸⁹ While laudable, inclusionary policies are often framed in terms of how excluded groups can be recruited (ie. assimilated) into existing structures, and established, comfortable, professionally-oriented ways of defining and “doing” heritage. Smith finds that “community consultation undertaken without any active sense of negotiation between community understanding and values and those of practitioners can simply become gestural politics.”⁹⁰

This understanding is significant to our ongoing examination of heritage endangerment listing. In the previous section, the recognition that heritage red lists are complex tools used not only by institutions but also multiple publics raised the possibility that recent academic criticisms of engagement has overlooked how a dominant model of endangerment listing might be used in practice: specifically, in ways whereby citizens or communities assert ideas of endangerment and social and cultural value towards realizing their own intended outcomes through the list, and not just those of the authorized or the operating institution, specifically through collective action. While

⁸⁶ Lascoumes and Le Gales, “Introduction: Understanding Public Policy,” 1-21.

⁸⁷ J. Mark Schuster, “Information as a Tool of Preservation Action,” in *Preserving the Built Heritage*, eds. J. Mark Schuster with John de Monchaux and Charles A. Riley II (Hanover: University Press of New England, 1997), 102.

⁸⁸ Smith, *Uses of Heritage* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2006).

⁸⁹ Smith, *Uses of Heritage*, 37.

⁹⁰ Smith, *Uses of Heritage*, 38.

that possibility remains and will direct further investigation throughout this thesis, the policy perspective has added a critical layer of nuance and confirmed a needed focus on the inner working of the list as a tool. Endangerment listing programs are clearly complex mechanisms through which endangerment is constructed, directed, and mobilized to action by both institutions and multiple publics. However, what remains to be seen is how these specific functions play out in practice and in terms of what actors. Responding to Smith's provocation, for example: are endangerment listing programs in fact spaces where actors not only construct, direct, and mobilize endangerment, but also meaningfully negotiate its application and use? Conceptualizing the red list as a preservation policy tool grants important insight that prompts a reformulation of the key questions that remain to be answered about this pervasive feature of the heritage landscape:

In light of our understanding that the heritage endangerment list was conceived of and popularized specifically as a preservation policy tool, how and to what ends are such lists being used on the ground by institutions, citizens, and other publics? What are the characteristics of the heritage red list policy tool as understood through its intentions, programmatic structures, guiding principles, and decision-making processes? And finally, given that the red list policy tool ultimately functions through collective action, what is the nature of listing programs' inherent actor-relationships? The remainder of the thesis will seek to answer these questions and illuminate the characteristics and uses of the heritage endangerment list policy tool through a series of case studies.

Methodology

The central premise of this thesis is that *endangerment*, as a key concept in heritage preservation, operates in ways that are underappreciated and underexplored. While recent research has granted important insight into the concept's historical origins and the influence of its discursive and rhetorical registers, critiques of endangerment have led some scholars to call for all-together abandoning the concept as part of the way that we think about heritage and undertake preservation. However, these assertions bypass important questions that remain about the ways that endangerment itself informs heritage practice. For example, if our recognition of endangerment can create heritage value, set preservation priorities, direct resources, and create effects in the physical and social landscape, then how are we coming to recognize heritage endangerment, and how are its effects unfolding? As a key part of heritage and preservation policy and practice, what is the "work" that endangerment does by way of heritage and for whom?

In response to these questions, scholarship has often answered that endangerment is a tool of authority that reproduces dominant politics and perceptions of heritage. But if we're to understand endangerment and endangerment policy as a tool, is it necessarily a tool wielded by those in positions of power alone? And is it necessarily used in ways that reproduce authority or dominant conceptions and practices of heritage? This thesis proposes that by looking closely at heritage endangerment lists as one of the key ways that endangerment is produced and acted upon in the heritage fields we can begin to answer these questions with more clarity. It also proposes that by exploring how heritage endangerment lists operate we might come to better understand the particular roles that the concept of endangerment plays within listing programs, and thus within heritage preservation writ large. Put simply, the thesis proposes that an awareness of the characteristics and uses of heritage red lists can contribute to and nuance our understanding of the work endangerment does by way of heritage overall.

These questions and propositions that frame the inquiry broadly are in dialogue with a growing body of literature on heritage endangerment, risk, and loss, which is also the origin point for this

research. A review of the literature stemming from heritage studies and adjacent language preservation and ecology discourses yielded a number of theoretical concepts and lines of criticism that are explicated in Chapter 1, and continue to inform and underpin research and analysis throughout. While this literature focuses primarily on theorizing and historicizing endangerment as a concept, in pursuit of an understanding of how endangerment functions in practice the heritage red list emerges as an important subject of analysis. This chapter (Chapter 2) expands on prior research into the history of the UNESCO List of World Heritage In Danger as the foundational listing program of its kind, and examines its relationship to its predecessor, the IUCN Red List. It also explores the red list model's later proliferation and its key characteristics through a survey of contemporary listing programs, including state-wide red lists in the United States. As we've seen, a view of heritage red lists as dynamic programs that function for both institutional and other actors (ie. citizens, communities, corporations) suggests a potential oversight in past analyses of endangerment and points to a gap in the literature. It also advances a new frame for analysis that clarifies aspects of the history of heritage endangerment as a concept, and through which key research questions are derived.

Towards answering these questions, this thesis investigates the inner workings of three heritage endangerment listing programs as case studies. Drawing on operational and promotional listing-program materials and interviews, these case studies aim to build a history for, and to illuminate the types of intentions, programmatic structures, guiding principles and decision-making processes that characterize, the red list policy tool that is commonly at work across the preservation domain. The case study approach also seeks to elucidate how listing programs are being put to use and by what actors. To this end, vignettes or sub-cases are examined that offer insight into listing program's uses in practice. Given our understanding that endangerment is ultimately constructed, directed, and mobilized to action through different program processes and by various participants, a case study approach may also serve to inform our understanding of endangerment's uses more broadly in heritage practice.

The case selection is informed by a number of key considerations that emerge from investigating the historical development of the red list and its institutional and geographic distribution. As we've seen, heritage endangerment lists are operated from the international to the local scale by a range of actors. However, these types of programs are most often taken up by non-governmental institutions, and for interrelated reasons are most common to the United States. With the intent of moving beyond existing analysis of the World Heritage List in Danger towards a more characteristic view of the heritage endangerment list policy tool, the cases selected reflect a diversity of scale, but coincide with the general distribution of such programs. Chapter 3 will consider the case of World Monuments Fund's "World Monuments Watch," an international-scale listing program launched in 1996 by that international private non-profit. Chapter 4 will consider the case of the National Trust for Historic Preservation's "America's 11 Most Endangered Program," a foundational and often replicated example of a national-scale heritage red list founded in 1988. Chapter 5 will consider the case of a regional-scale heritage endangerment listing program operated by Preservation Long Island, founded in 2006.

The case study approach applied in this thesis is not intended to be normative: I do not seek to identify or promote better heritage endangerment lists. Instead, the objective is to examine critically each case in order to construct a more complete understanding of what characterizes the common heritage endangerment list and its use, and thus to inform a more complete understanding of the functional roles that endangerment plays within preservation and the heritage fields. While comparisons will be drawn, the final chapter (Chapter 6) will synthesize the information produced through each case study towards a characterization of the heritage endangerment list policy tool and its uses in relation to the key themes of negotiation, consensus,

collective

action,

and

endangerment.

World Monuments Fund's "World Monuments Watch"

Whether or not World Monuments Fund's "World Monuments Watch" today constitutes a heritage endangerment list is an open question, even within the international non-profit that operates it.⁹¹ Founded in 1995 and launched in 1996, the World Monuments Watch revolves around a "biennial selection of at-risk cultural heritage sites" – a published inventory and associated programming known simply as "The Watch."⁹² For the first seven of the program's cycles (1996-2008) the inventory was known as the World Monuments Watch "List of 100 Most Endangered Sites." But since 2008, the Watch has taken steps to decenter endangerment from how the list is compiled and presented to the public. Increasingly, World Monuments Fund frames the Watch as an inventory not only of heritage at risk that preservation can save, but of sites that present "compelling opportunities for positive change" to which preservation can contribute.⁹³ This repositioning puts forward ideas about "timeliness" and identifying opportunities for preservation to have a social impact and into a listing program once firmly anchored to urgency and identifying heritage endangerment. Nevertheless, risk, threat, and the anticipation of loss—surely, endangerment—remain core to the list's public presentation, and thus to the program's functionality as a preservation policy tool.

This chapter examines the World Monuments Watch as the first of three case studies into heritage red-lists in practice. It posits that the example yields important insight into the policy tool, and the roles that endangerment plays in its operation, not despite but because the Watch's status as a heritage endangerment list is somewhat ambiguous at present. As a prominent list for "heritage at risk" operated at the international scale, exploring the Watch contributes to our understanding of how contemporary red listing programs are structured and mobilized to action. Moreover, as one of the longest-running programs of its kind, the Watch informs our view of the historical and ongoing development of the red list policy tool. This case study seeks to make visible the programmatic structure and processes that comprise the Watch, as well as some of the key actors and intentions that drive its use by World Monuments Fund and multiple publics. It also seeks to highlight the extent to which these processes prompt negotiation or marshal collective action. In reviewing the listing program, this chapter builds a framework for analyzing heritage red lists in operation that is carried into the following chapters.

Realizing The Watch: Origins of the Red Listing Program

Although World Monuments Fund first launched the Watch in the mid-1990s, many of the ideas that shape the program have familiar historical origins. The World Monuments Fund was founded originally as the International Fund for Monuments in 1965 at a critical moment for the developing notion of universal heritage and the internationalization and institutionalization of heritage

⁹¹ Some of the ideas in this case study are derived from an interview with the director of the World Monuments Watch by the author, March 2020.

⁹² World Monuments Fund, "The World Monuments Watch: A Beacon for Heritage," <https://www.wmf.org/watch> (Accessed April 14, 2020).

⁹³ World Monuments Fund, 2018 World Monuments Watch Nomination Guidelines (2018): 1. Note: Many of the materials from past cycles of the Watch, including public nomination forms and submission guidelines, are accessible through digital web archives, like the Internet Archive's Wayback Machine, in current and past World Monuments Fund websites including: wmf.org, worldmonumentswatch.org, and worldmonuments.org.

preservation. Established in the same year as ICOMOS, the International Fund for Monuments was born out of early international preservation campaigns and entangled with the emergence of endangerment as a rationale for collective action. The International Fund for Monuments, achieved much of its initial notoriety as a contributor to the second large-scale international campaign for safeguarding heritage following the Nubian Campaign: the response to the 1966 flooding of Venice catalytic to the development of the 1972 World Heritage Convention.⁹⁴

In 1965, the American founders of the International Fund for Monuments grounded their new non-profit in the “relatively recent... concept of a universal cultural heritage that is the collective responsibility of all mankind,” a concept they attributed largely to efforts of UNESCO.⁹⁵ But the organization was devised as a direct response to UNESCO’s failure up to that point to organize a dedicated program for heritage preservation to act on that very concept. Finding that UNESCO was “unable to carry out actual preservation work of any magnitude” largely due to its intergovernmental structure, the International Fund for Monuments was formed as a nonprofit initiative for aiding governments with preserving imperiled heritage of world interest – an initiative capable of soliciting funds “from all sources on an international basis... unburdened by political considerations” and with “freedom of action denied to UNESCO and other governmental agencies.”⁹⁶ In its earliest iteration, the fund was deployed through selections by its board of trustees of sites that expressed international value and an urgent need. Over the next two decades, the International Fund for Monuments developed into a professionally-focused preservation organization, changing its name in 1985 to World Monuments Fund to reflect its “expanded activities that today include such concerns as standards of practice, work-force training, documentation, strategic planning, technical surveys, fundraising, public-private partnerships, education, and advocacy.”⁹⁷

In 1995, World Monuments Fund (WMF) launched the World Monuments Watch as a major new program aimed at “identifying and preserving the world’s most important and endangered cultural landmarks.”⁹⁸ The Watch was intended to direct WMF’s resources and expertise towards targeting certain sites for immediate preservation action and to call attention to a need for innovative preservation approaches.⁹⁹ In this sense, the program represented a continuation of the work that the organization had done since 1965 in fulfillment of its original mission to advance preservation, safeguard globally-significant sites, and promote a sense of international stewardship.¹⁰⁰ But the instrument through which these and other institutional goals were furthered was new. At the heart of the Watch was its biennial list of endangered sites, an inventory that WMF called at the time of its inaugural 1996 cycle “a first ever ‘endangered species list’ of imperiled cultural heritage.”¹⁰¹ In

⁹⁴ For a review of these early international campaigns and their role in advancing the notion of “World Heritage” see: Rodney Harrison, *Heritage: Critical Approaches* (Abingdon: Routledge 2013): 55-67.

⁹⁵ James A. Gray (Executive Director, International Fund for Monuments, Inc.), “Working to Preserve Mankind’s Heritage,” *New York Times* (June 13th 1965).

⁹⁶ Gray “Working to Preserve Mankind’s Heritage,” 1.

⁹⁷ Marilyn Perry, “A Salute from the Chairman,” in *World Monuments Watch 100 Most Endangered Sites 1996*, World Monuments Fund, Watch Catalog (1996): 6.

⁹⁸ World Monuments Fund, *Milestones: The Newsletter of the World Monuments Fund* (Fall 1995). Accessible online from World Monuments Fund:

https://www.wmf.org/sites/default/files/article/pdfs/Milestones_1995_Fall.pdf

⁹⁹ World Monuments Fund, *Milestones* 1995, 1.

¹⁰⁰ Gray, “Working to Preserve Mankind’s Heritage” 1.

¹⁰¹ World Monuments Fund, *Milestones: The Newsletter of the World Monuments Fund* (Winter 1996-1997), 1. Accessible online from World Monuments Fund:

https://www.wmf.org/sites/default/files/article/pdfs/Milestones_1996_1997_Winter.pdf

its original form, every two years the Watch would produce a list of 100 at risk sites from across the world that also highlighted specific strategies for response. Unlike the List of World Heritage in Danger, for which there is a formal process for removing a site from the list, the Watch was conceived as a temporary list generated anew every cycle.

As the core of the newly-founded Watch, the endangerment list was largely inseparable from the broader structure and functions of the institutional program. On its own, the published inventory served WMF as an international call to action – a way of raising awareness about heritage at risk, advocating for preservation, setting priorities, and fundraising for preservation on the ground, all while advancing the nonprofit itself. But the processes of compiling the list also dictated the structure of the program and represented important ways of realizing intended effects. For example, the Watch solicited nominations of endangered sites from the public through an open call, generating an application pool from which an expert advisory panel selected each biennial list. Like the list's cyclical publication, these processes required certain program capacities and served multiple functions: From soliciting nominations to including external experts, they gave the program shape while contributing public value and legitimacy; through them the list was not only the result of the organization's own outlook, but of public concern and expert valuation. Still, these processes also served to extend the institution's professional networks, and further its advocacy, while “periodically taking the pulse” of the field.¹⁰²

Another key feature of the program was that it offered financial awards and operational support in select cases across each cycle. Through those awards WMF worked with nominators or other local parties to devise and implement preservation actions for sites on the list. These activities, and indeed the establishment of the World Monuments Watch itself, were made possible by a \$5 million sponsorship in 1995 by the American Express Company.¹⁰³ This partnership, which also exists today, was an expression of mutual interests. Common goals shared by the preservation non-profit and the tourism-oriented corporation extended not only to identifying and preserving significant cultural sites at risk, but also spurring government action through seed funding, and attracting investment from the public and private sectors for heritage preservation.¹⁰⁴ For World Monuments Fund, the new red listing program represented in its totality “a classic private sector initiative—a creative new approach in filling an unmet need for the public good.”¹⁰⁵

In its earliest form, the Watch reflected a particular vision of “world heritage” and its preservation – something especially recognizable within the framework that structured the list's development. As noted earlier, for each cycle the Watch made a public call for nominations, producing applications that were then evaluated by staff or outside professionals and selected for inclusion by an external expert panel. Initially, that selection was based on three criteria: *urgency*, due to past physical damage, ongoing material impacts, or apparent potential dangers; *viability*, the feasibility of remedies proposed, or an indication that an “appropriate plan could be constructed”; and finally, *significance*, as the “intrinsic artistic and/or historic importance within its cultural context,” which for the 1996 cycle was to be confirmed by some prior historic designation.¹⁰⁶ While the nomination process was open to the public, these particular criteria and their evaluators ultimately shaped the listing pool and final selection. The directionality of the Watch's open call

¹⁰² World Monuments Fund, *2010 World Monuments Watch*, Watch Catalog (2010): 11.

¹⁰³ World Monuments Fund, *Milestones* 1995, 1.

¹⁰⁴ World Monuments Fund, *World Monuments Watch 100 Most Endangered Sites 1996*, Watch Catalog (1996): 8.

¹⁰⁵ Marilyn Perry, “Dimensions of Success: From the Chairman,” in *World Monuments Watch One Hundred Most Endangered Sites 2000*, World Monuments Fund, Watch Catalog (1999): 2.

¹⁰⁶ World Monuments Fund, *Milestones* 1995, 2.

also influenced the character of its first lists. WMF reported after its inaugural cycle that participating nominators included experts, ordinary citizens, and a diverse array of public and private organizations.¹⁰⁷ But early guidelines also “strongly recommended” that nominations be completed, or at least advised, by preservation professionals, and that “definitions used by the UNESCO World Heritage Convention in preparing their nominations” be consulted.¹⁰⁸

All together, this frame contributed a red list that reflected—somewhat unsurprisingly—the non-profit’s own vision of what significant and endangered world heritage was, and what appropriate methods were for its preservation. Undoubtedly, this vision was informed by the organization’s own technical expertise and its institutional mission to “safeguard the heritage of mankind by encouraging the conservation and preservation of culturally and historically significant works of art and architecture worldwide,” as articulated at the time of the first listing cycle by the organization, and rehearsed by some of its sponsors.¹⁰⁹ The 1996 List of 100 Most Endangered Sites was composed of monumental, artistic, architectural, and archeological sites significant as “great works” of aesthetic or historical value; proposed preservation responses almost universally constituted conservation, documentation, management, or site maintenance.¹¹⁰ But beyond listing, the particular vision of heritage and stewardship that was reflected in the list was also manifest in the program’s operational support projects that realized preservation initiatives jointly between WMF and nominators. In telling commentary, WMF’s executive director wrote during the Watch’s first year: “These partnerships become vivid demonstrations of how preservation works, because they grow to the point that a community takes over the project, and the great building becomes something important and necessary. When a community realizes the magnitude of the human vision that created its great buildings, then the buildings can be saved.”¹¹¹

After its first cycle, the Watch started to express a somewhat different understanding of how preservation works. An article written by WMF staff entitled “Lessons from the First Cycle,” for example, highlighted nominators’ concern for sites “that shaped the identity and development of the communities that created and sustained them.” Where notions of international responsibility had predominated, ideas about how heritage was intertwined with the lives of local communities also joined. By the third cycle (2000), Watch literature promoted the use of monuments as part of “responsible development” initiatives that would guarantee heritage sites productive community roles.¹¹² In 2004, emphasis on “how ways of life and their setting are often intertwined” was accompanied by the arrival of “social context” and “social value” to the listing program’s significance criteria.¹¹³ Soonafter, the Watch promoted sites included on the list that sought not only stabilization or management, but community support, educational outreach, and long-term

¹⁰⁷ World Monuments Fund, Watch Catalog 1996: 8.

¹⁰⁸ World Monuments Fund, World Monuments Watch Nomination Guidelines 2002, 3. See also: World Monuments Fund, *World Monuments Watch 100 Most Endangered Sites 1998-1999*, Watch Catalog (1997): 7.

¹⁰⁹ World Monuments Fund, *1997 Annual Report, Milestones: The Newsletter of The World Monuments Fund* (1997): 2.

¹¹⁰ World Monuments Fund, Watch Catalog 1996.

¹¹¹ Bonnie Burnham (Executive Director of World Monuments Fund), “What Is a World Monument?,” in *World Monuments Fund: The First Thirty Years*, World Monuments Fund (1996): 9.

¹¹² World Monuments Fund, *World Monuments Watch One Hundred Most Endangered Sites 2000*, Watch Catalog (2000): 2.

¹¹³ World Monuments Fund, *World Monuments Watch 2004 100 Most Endangered Sites*, Watch Catalog (2004): 4

planning.¹¹⁴ And after 2008, the contemporary World Monuments Watch began to take shape, conceived as a “grassroots effort” and as a way to “bring governing authorities and the public together, building consensus, and saving important places.”¹¹⁵

The Contemporary Watch: Operating Framework and Institutional Intentions

For its 2010 cycle, WMF launched a revised Watch, marking its intention to evolve “beyond a list of sites into a more robust program that fosters dialogue between heritage constituents and the wider public.”¹¹⁶ Changes included a set of updated core objectives, complementary shifts in key instruments and processes, a reduction in the number of listed sites, and the abandonment of “endangerment” from the inventory’s title. Central to this shift was the program’s reframing of heritage concerns as being integral to community contexts – a shift that reflected an institutional awareness that “the costs and benefits of conservation are increasingly considered within a broader agenda of community needs and priorities.”¹¹⁷ To that end, the Watch reinvisioned its aims as: encouraging community engagement in preservation through open nominations and public outreach; drawing international attention to local issues to promote collective action; advancing innovation in the field by highlighting emerging issues; building professional capacity through collaborative projects; and leveraging resources through cooperative project support.¹¹⁸ Today’s Watch largely reflects the continued evolution of these stated objectives. Although new intentions brought some changes to how the program works, ultimately its structure across each cycle—as a tool for meeting these objectives—has remained intact since its founding.

Cyclical list development today begins with (as the first of five key phases highlighted in red) **program advertising and soliciting applications** with an open call. That open call is one framed since 2010 as a “participatory process that can bring to the fore diverse and often lesser known sites and the issues they face.”¹¹⁹ Towards generating international participation, WMF has traditionally relied on its professional network to get the word out, which can be seen to shape the nominator pool.¹²⁰ The nomination instrument itself is a cycle-specific application form. During the Watch’s early cycles, that form prompted nominators to describe site significance, threats, and urgency of action, and to propose a preservation response.¹²¹ But more recent forms forgo ideas of risk, threat, and urgency entirely, instead prompting nominators to describe “challenges” faced

¹¹⁴ World Monuments Fund, *ICON World Monuments: Special Issue World Monuments Watch 100 Most Endangered Sites 2006*, Watch Catalog (2005): 15.

¹¹⁵ Bonnie Burnham and W. L. Lyons Brown, “From the President & Chairman,” in *World Monuments Watch 2008 List of 100 Most Endangered Sites*, World Monuments Fund, Watch Catalog (2008): 3

¹¹⁶ World Monuments Fund, *2010 World Monuments Watch*, Watch Catalog (2010): 7.

¹¹⁷ World Monuments Fund, Watch Catalog 2010: 7.

¹¹⁸ World Monuments Fund, Watch Catalog 2010: 4.

¹¹⁹ World Monuments Fund, Watch Catalog 2010: 4.

¹²⁰ For programs like the Watch, soliciting applications from the public also raises important questions about language accessibility, and how differential access to preferred languages can shape nominator pools and make for uneven participation. For the first few cycles of the program, nomination guidelines called for nominations to be submitted in English, French, or Spanish (see nomination guidelines 2002-2008, for example). In recent years, although nomination forms are presented in English, guidelines prompt nominators who seek to apply in a language other than English to make arrangements with WMF staff.

¹²¹ Nominations through 2008 also included a list of man-made and natural threats that a nominator could select (eg. “Insect/Animal Damage,” “Armed Conflict,” “Dam Construction/Flooding,” “Lack of Public Awareness”). For example, see: World Monuments Fund, *2008 World Monuments Watch List of 100 Most Endangered Sites*, Nomination Form (2008): 7.

by stakeholders, and “opportunities” that could have community benefit, warranting timely action.¹²² Nominators also are asked to propose a plan of action, and specific to the 2020 nomination, to describe how such proposals contribute to themes of “improving community resilience,” “enhancing social inclusion,” and “building new capacities.”¹²³ As a matter of institutional policy, these changes to the nomination seek to open up the Watch to a greater diversity of nominators and proposals, while advancing community-based visions of heritage as well as the instrumental value of preservation. The 2020 Watch provides its own evidence that the institution compiled a diverse list. Whether or not the nomination pool includes a more diverse set of nominators or proposals from prior cycles is less clear.¹²⁴

Once nominations are received, the Watch undertakes **application evaluation and selection**, first through a review process before the culled nomination pool is passed on for final selection by an expert panel. Some of the initial evaluations are done by WMF staff. But for each cycle the program also enlists outside professionals from ICOMOS to conduct desk reviews for the Watch. As expected, this process also serves multiple institutional goals: The addition of ICOMOS reviewers expands the capacity of WMF to evaluate nominations, and adds further expertise and objective distance to the evaluation process. This contribution is reciprocated with an honorarium for each reviewer by WMF, which is ultimately donated to an ICOMOS fund or program by nature of the arrangement. This process advances a beneficial relationship between the two institutions; but it also offers an opportunity for advocacy and agenda-setting on the part of WMF.¹²⁵ Reviewers evaluate based on Watch guidance, as with the 2020 cycle in accordance with the program’s focus on resilience, social inclusion, and building capacities.¹²⁶ Final selection is conducted by an external panel, who bring independence expertise to the selection process. Still, selections are informed by the program’s own criteria and focus, which for the recent cycles has been pairing historical significance with contemporary social impact.¹²⁷ Also informing selection is an attention to diversity, understood in a certain light: the Watch tries to incorporate noteworthy sites that can generate media attention, pairing them with lesser-known sites; one result is that lower-profile sites and their projects can benefit from attention by association.¹²⁸

With the list compiled, the Watch moves to another core operation: **publication and publicity**. While list development itself realizes a variety of effects—from public engagement to network building and advocacy—communicating the list to international publics is essential to how the Watch functions as a tool, both for WMF and nominators. As made clear by WMF since the program’s launch, “the goal of the [Watch] and the list are, first and foremost, to heighten public

¹²² World Monuments Fund, 2020 World Monuments Watch Nomination Form (2020).

¹²³ World Monuments Fund, Watch Nomination Form 2020.

¹²⁴ In 2004, the Watch published an audit of its nominators and their proposed action plans from cycles between 1996 to 2004. That data showed that a significant majority (70-90%) of all nominator’s proposals for each cycle were conservation-, management-, documentation- or maintenance-oriented. Data provided by WMF to the author on the 2020 Watch shows that while some nominators for that cycle had “non-expert” (9%), community development (8%), and social justice/human rights (2%) missions, a majority of nominators (63%) still proposed conservation/management, architectural, or archeological interventions. See: World Monuments Fund, World Monuments Watch 2004 Nomination Guidelines (2004).

¹²⁵ Interview with World Monuments Watch director, March 2020.

¹²⁶ ICOMOS, “2020 World Monument Watch nominations - ICOMOS reviewers: call for volunteers,” Accessed April 1st 2020: <https://www.icomos.org/en/member-area/57238-2020-world-monument-watch-nominations-icomos-reviewers-call-for-volunteers>

¹²⁷ World Monuments Fund, *World Monuments Watch*, *Watch Magazine* (2020): 5.

¹²⁸ Interview with World Monuments Watch director, March 2020.

awareness by raising the profile of threatened sites beyond the local level.”¹²⁹ This is the case especially given that international awareness also catalyzes other effects, from fundraising and the realization of preservation actions, to advocacy and agenda setting. In part, publicity is facilitated by WMF: In 2010 the Watch estimated that the biennial announcement reached “more than a quarter of a billion people through print, radio, television, and internet.”¹³⁰ Nominating parties also conduct their own publicity, aided by a press package provided by WMF. Beyond the list’s announcement, the Watch also produces other media about each cycle’s sites, their history and preservation. An often-mentioned institutional aim for the Watch is to provide “learning and education” about cultural heritage and preservation at an international scale.¹³¹

Notably, publicity remains one core function of the program that still relies on risk rhetoric to a significant extent, even after “endangerment” was cut from the Watch’s title and its operational instruments after 2008. Recent publications and communications materials incorporate alternative ideas that have come to define the Watch in past cycles (ie. opportunities, challenges, timeliness, impact). However, endangerment, urgency, threat, and risk are often prominently—if not dominantly—featured in Watch-related media. For example, the press release for the 2020 Watch noted in its opening lines: “The list’s 25 sites are facing daunting threats such as encroaching urbanization, political turmoil, natural disaster, and violent conflicts, or present compelling conservation opportunities.”¹³² Offering its own answer as to why, the WMF has noted in the past that part of the Watch’s power as tool of collective action stems from the fact that “images and stories of treasured places contending with the challenges of urban development, battling the ravages of time, or struggling to recover from disaster or armed conflict provide a compelling public narrative.”¹³³

The list’s publication and publicity can pave the way for preservation actions, enhancing nominators’ ability to leverage funding or other resources. But as noted, the Watch also provides **operational support** through collaborative project development and implementation. During early listing cycles, such projects were undertaken for select sites out of the 100 total through awards. But as the program has intentionally decreased the number of sites (from 100 in 2008 to 25 in the 2020 cycle), WMF now works with the nominators or associated stakeholders to “jointly design and implement strategic interventions that align” with the initial proposal.¹³⁴ The way project design and implementation unfold varies project to project. Nominator proposals are even optional on the 2020 nomination, meaning that while many outline project intentions prior to listing, some projects are formulated entirely in dialogue with WMF during the listing cycle. Still, Watch literature emphasizes the collaborative and community-based nature of these projects and WMF’s role as a supporting party and bearer of available resources and expertise.¹³⁵ Precisely how

¹²⁹ World Monuments Fund, *World Monuments Watch Nomination Guidelines 2004* (2004): 2.

¹³⁰ World Monuments Fund, *2010 World Monuments Watch*, Watch Catalog (2010): 2.

¹³¹ World Monuments Fund, *World Monuments Watch One Hundred Most Endangered Sites 2000*, Watch Catalog (1999): 7.

¹³² World Monuments Fund, “World Monuments Fund Announces 2020 World Monuments Watch,” (October 29, 2019). Press Release. Accessible online from World Monuments Fund: https://www.wmf.org/sites/default/files/press_releases/pdfs/2020_world_monuments_watch_press_release.pdf. Other press releases from past Watch cycles since 2010 offer further examples and are also available on wmf.org.

¹³³ World Monuments Fund, *2010 World Monuments Watch*, Watch Catalog (2010): 4.

¹³⁴ World Monuments Fund, Watch Nomination Form 2020.

¹³⁵ In 2012 the Watch also launched a biennial sub-initiative called “Watch Day,” a funded day of “celebratory and educational events” planned by nominators and stakeholders, meant to encourage community participation and engagement with heritage and preservation at listed sites, no matter what

collaboration and decision-making unfolds in practice at this phase is an important question that will remain unexplored in this case study due to a lack of accessible information. However, what is clear is that the process deployed does (formally) create space for nominators and stakeholders to assert heritage values and a vision for preservation, as well as to negotiate its shape and implementation across a listing cycle.

The contemporary Watch, through list development (ie. the nomination solicitation, and selection and evaluation processes), publication and publicity, and operational support, brings together various actors to realize a range of institutional objectives across each cycle. Through public nomination, evaluation and selection, and collaborative project implementation, WMF constructs its program with both public value and the appearance of institutional neutrality in mind, informing its credibility and thus effectiveness as a tool of international preservation. The listing program realizes preservation actions for sites by raising awareness and mobilizing resources; at the same time, each process furthers the institution's advocacy agenda and sets priorities and standards for the field, influencing how preservation happens at an international scale. Additionally, the Watch enhances WMF's professional networks through partnerships with international experts, and maintains relationships with sponsors like American Express that fund its operations and heritage preservation at an international scale. Undoubtedly, all of this also serves to build up the profile, capacity, and influence of the institution itself.

As is clear from the founding of the International Fund for Monuments and through the development of the Watch, a notion underpins both the preservation nonprofit and its red listing program: the idea that these private initiatives are meeting unmet public needs and responding to public problems. By that view, the institutional intentions realized through the Watch as outlined above are ultimately in service of that public project. As stated by the WMF Chairman during the first Watch cycle: "For WMF, the establishment of the World Monuments Watch program has significantly increased both our presence in the field and our capacity to respond... As an international mechanism, the program has also demonstrated the essential advantages of private sector leadership—the capacity to identify problems, to activate concern, and to facilitate solutions. WMF must now enlarge its effectiveness by increasing its visibility, its recognition, and its funding."¹³⁶ Today, a similar vision of the Watch exists along with the view that for that instrument to work more effectively and meet public needs (ie. provide an improved public service), it needs to grow resource networks, build capacities, and reach more publics.

But as we've seen, while the fundamental shape of the Watch has remained the same over time, changes have been made to how the program operates. Changes are indicative of its undertaking periodic **program evaluation and recalibration**, responding to or influenced by the nominations that it receives, which in turn can reflect changing attitudes about heritage and preservation within the profession and the communities that engage the program. For example: Receiving nominations that represented an "expanded, pluralistic view of site significance" was a key "lesson learned" from the Watch's first cycle that informed criteria in the cycles that followed.¹³⁷ A shift

project was proposed or is under implementation. Like other program instruments, Watch Day achieves multiple intended effects. WMF promotes Watch Day as a vehicle of sustainable preservation, helping to ensure that preservation is community-based. Watch Day also serves as a tool of publicity and advocacy, which may promote participation and community use, as well as particular preservation techniques or heritage values. See: World Monuments Fund, "World Monuments Fund Launches 'World Monuments Watch Day,' Celebrating Heritage Sites Across the Globe," Press Release (August 29, 2012).

¹³⁶ Marilyn Perry, "From the Chairman," in *World Monuments Watch 100 Most Endangered Sites 1998-1999*, World Monuments Fund, Watch Catalog (1997): 5.

¹³⁷ Calame, "Lessons Learned," 58.

towards socio-economic issues across the heritage fields also was expressed in Watch nominations, driving WMF to make additional revisions to account for proposals that looked beyond technical and aesthetic issues alone. Later, the Watch likewise recalibrated in response to a broader shift in philanthropy towards more rigorous metrics for demonstrating impact, which shaped the types of projects it sought.¹³⁸ And while the removal of “endangerment” from the Watch’s title in 2010 may have reflected a changing view of the term within the institution,¹³⁹ introducing alternative frames for nominators to justify their proposals (ie. “opportunities,” “challenges,” and “timeliness”) likely was informed by nominations themselves, which often may not have expressed clear threats beyond lack of funding.

On one hand, these recalibrations could be seen as reactive, reflecting amendments meant to keep the Watch apace with a changing preservation field or respond only to operational necessities. On the other hand, recalibration could be seen as iterative, representing revisions that build on the institution’s engagement of multiple publics, responding to emerging needs and values expressed through the program toward a more robust use of the policy tool. While it is known that World Monuments Fund undertakes periodic audits of its program, it is perhaps safest to say that this final phase of the Watch’s cyclical operation is characterized by some of both.

Given how the Watch has changed in the past, an argument still could be made that even if the program does undertake a kind of “meaningful” reevaluation based on the expressed needs and values of participating publics, that any program recalibration simply reflects the ongoing evolution of a dominant heritage discourse – that changes ultimately boil down to the institution’s negotiation of values, policy meaning, and relationships primarily with its expert and professional networks, elite donors, and nominating participants that (in light of the program’s particular reach and foci) are also likely to reproduce dominant visions of heritage. It also could be said that, even with its increased efforts around inclusion and with its shift away from projects set on safeguarding materiality alone, that the tool itself still results in assimilating non-dominant perspectives within that dominant discourse.¹⁴⁰ Nevertheless, as a policy tool that directly seeks to identify needs and deliver services through voluntary participation, nominators who do choose to engage the tool almost inevitably play a role in negotiating how the tool is shaped, in part for their own use (a point explored further in Chapter 6). In this sense, it is important still to consider the ways not only that the institution but other actors are engaging and acting through the Watch and to what ends. This can help us not only to better understand the red list as a policy tool, but the way endangerment is put to work through it.

The Watch in Practice: Uses and “List Users”

In considering historical development and program structure, this chapter so far has anchored discussion of the Watch’s operation to World Monument Fund’s intentions and uses of its red listing program. But as we’ve seen, other participants are also key to how the program “works.” Ways in which the Watch functions for its directing institution are perhaps more readily characterized than it is for the range of other actors that engage it across each cycle. Still, in concluding this case study, it is important to highlight how the red list functions as a tool not just

¹³⁸ For a discussion of this shift in philanthropy see: Mark Elliott, *Philanthropy, Outcomes, & Impact*, Economic Mobility Corporation, November 2019.

¹³⁹ Interview with World Monuments Watch director, March 2020.

¹⁴⁰ For further presentation of this argument regarding another policy apparatus see Laurajane Smith, “Class, Heritage and the Negotiation of Place,” Conference paper presented to the ‘Missing Out on Heritage: Socio-Economic Status and Heritage Participation’ Conference, English Heritage, March 2009.

of the institution that produces it, but also by multiple publics. Core to the Watch is its ability to mobilize action at an international scale, including the actions of donors, experts, and site stakeholders who engage projects directly; media engagement and simple recognition among international audiences can also constitute kinds of action that yield material results. Surely, in each of these cases, it could be said that the Watch is being “put to use” to some end. However, one group of actors has particular agency in how the red list is produced and deployed: the nominators that seek certain effects by getting their sites on the Watch.

Nominators vary from cycle to cycle. But since the program’s inception, some continuity has existed in who engages the open call. For the most recent Watch and throughout its early cycles, nominators most often are (in order of frequency): nonprofit organizations, experts or academics, and government bodies; less frequent are individual non-experts.¹⁴¹ Nominator types, like individual nominations, may seek different kinds of outcomes through the program. For example, how a state nominator might wield the Watch as a tool may differ from a community group or an individual non-expert. But given the scale of the red listing program, there are some essential similarities that cut across types: one is that inclusion on the list always directs attention internationally. This can mean that the Watch gets used by nominators in particular ways, which are best understood through an example of red listing in action.

Mind’s Eye, Cayman Islands (2012 World Monuments Watch)

Among the 67 sites included on the 2012 World Monuments Watch was the Cayman Islands home of visionary artist Gladwyn K. Bush (1914-2003), who was known as “Miss Lassie.” Gladwyn Bush, who was born on Grand Cayman Island and lived as a nurse and a shopkeeper, began to make art at age 62 inspired by experiencing Christian religious visions. Her artworks, which depicted biblical scenes and utilized imagery of Caymanian life, were painted on canvas, but also on the surfaces of her home – from its walls and ceilings, to windows, doors, and furnishings. During her life, Bush achieved notoriety as an artist, exhibiting her artworks on Grand Cayman and being collected by museums internationally; she also received national honors for artistic achievement and contribution to Caymanian culture.¹⁴² However, in 2004, shortly after her death, a hurricane damaged her former home, and thus a sizable body of her artistic work. The damage prompted a local preservation response, ultimately leading to its nomination to the Watch.

In 2007, the Cayman National Cultural Foundation (CNCF), a government-backed nonprofit, announced that it was leading an effort to purchase and preserve the house as “an important cultural monument,” and that it was “in negotiations with various parties and hope[d] to secure the house for future generations to enjoy.”¹⁴³ The “Save Miss Lassie’s House” initiative, which was also supported by other national institutions for culture, including the Cayman Islands National

¹⁴¹ An audit of the program published in 2004 identified that nominators since the program’s first cycle were primarily nonprofit organizations (36%), governments (35%), academics and professionals (20%), with a minority representing non-professional nominators. In the most recent (2020) cycle, despite a decline in the percentage of governmental nominators (14%), distribution was similar with “institutional/NGO/civil society organizations” (ie. nonprofits) in the majority (43%), followed by experts and academics (28%), and individual non-experts (10%). Percentages based on: World Monuments Fund, *World Monuments Watch Nomination Guidelines 2004*, and data provided by WMF for 2020 cycle.

¹⁴² David Gonzalez, “Cayman Woman Paints Visions; the World Sees Art,” *New York Times*, February 18, 2002: A6.

¹⁴³ “Protecting Miss Lassie’s House,” *Cayman Compass*, July 13, 2007. Accessed online April 2020 from: <https://www.caymancompass.com/2007/07/13/protecting-miss-lassie-s-house/>

Trust and the National Gallery of the Cayman Islands, saw an initial victory in 2008 when the national government purchased Bush's home for \$1 million, and conveyed the site to CNCF for its management. This support in fact reflected a continuation of a national investment in Bush's legacy: the CNCF had purchased more than 100 of her moveable paintings through a government grant prior to Bush's death.¹⁴⁴ But the purchase of the residence marked a shift from earlier art acquisitions for national collections. Following the site's purchase, the CNCF set about enacting plans to restore the house and conserve its artworks as a part of a historic house museum, art gallery, and cultural center – in other words as a national heritage site.

The ongoing "Save Miss Lassie's House" initiative gave particular life to the notion that the paintings and home of Gladwyn Bush were valuable not only as works of artistic merit, but as an expression of Caymanian cultural and national identity. The Artistic Director of CNCF Henry Muttoo championed this view, finding that Bush in both her life and art managed "to harness the singular elements of Caymanian cultural tradition, leaving her people a defining cultural iconography."¹⁴⁵ Seen as both extraordinary and representative of the community and culture of the Cayman Islands, Bush's home was thought to have the potential to "serve as a place to learn about and experience a very Caymanian way of life,"¹⁴⁶ while her visions were seen to have the potential "to be the particular consciousness of what it means to be Caymanian."¹⁴⁷ Muttoo promoted the importance of the site as a way of defining a national identity, noting about the preservation campaign: "What we're dealing with here is the creation of the mythology of this country."¹⁴⁸ Muttoo and the CNCF Board pushed forward the restoration project, finding support from volunteers and some financial backing from private donors; they also enlisted building conservation and art restoration experts to participate in site assessment as reconstruction began in 2009.¹⁴⁹ By May of 2011, the preservation campaign had raised \$275,000 (\$100,000 in monetary donations, and \$175,000 in donated and volunteered materials and services). Still, CNCF's restoration plan called for raising \$900,000. At the time, officials acknowledged that \$500,000 was likely enough to allow them to complete the project and open the site as a cultural destination to be known as "Mind's Eye."¹⁵⁰ But the organization struggled to find large-scale donor support to match the proposal.

In 2011, Bush's house was nominated to the Watch for its 2012 cycle. Although WMF does not make past nominations available to the public, a written interview conducted with Henry Muttoo published three months after the Watch nomination deadline, which largely follows the format of that nomination, can be seen to offer insight into the particular justification and proposal.¹⁵¹ In that

¹⁴⁴ Patrick Brendel, "Mind's Eye on Global Endangered Sites List," *Cayman Compass*, October 14, 2011. Accessed online from <https://www.caymancompass.com/2011/10/14/minds-eye-on-global-endangered-sites-list/>

¹⁴⁵ "Work presses on to preserve Miss Lassie's House," *Cayman News*, November 24, 2009. Comment by Henry Muttoo, November 25, 2009. Accessed online April 2020 from <http://archive.caymannewsservice.com/2009/11/24/work-presses-on-to-preserve-miss-lassie-s-house/>

¹⁴⁶ "Miss Lassie's House Put on International List," *Cayman iNews*, October 14, 2011. Accessed online April 2020 from: <https://www.ieyeneews.com/miss-lassie%E2%80%99s-house-put-on-international-list/>

¹⁴⁷ Brendel, "Mind's Eye on Global Endangered Sites List," 2011.

¹⁴⁸ Brendel, "Mind's Eye on Global Endangered Sites List," 2011.

¹⁴⁹ "Dart helps Miss Lassie's House," *Cayman Compass*, May 19, 2009. Accessed online April 2020 from <https://www.caymancompass.com/2009/05/19/dart-helps-miss-lassie-s-house/>

¹⁵⁰ Brendel, "Mind's Eye on Global Endangered Sites List," 2011.

¹⁵¹ Michael Klein, "Mind's Eye: A tour of Miss Lassie's Home with Henry," Interview with CNCF Artistic Director Henry Muttoo, *The Cayman Island Journal*, June 1st, 2011. Accessed online May 2020 from: <https://www.journal.ky/2011/06/01/minds-eye-a-tour-of-miss-lassies-home-with-henry/>

interview, Muttoo anchored the Mind's Eye site's significance to the story and artistic work of Bush, but also to the architecture of her home, together said to reflect an authentic portrait of Caymanian identity extending back to the nineteenth century. But he noted that the site had been threatened by the 2004 storm, and that it remained endangered, subject to hurricanes and earthquakes, as well as potential loss to encroaching development. He affirmed: "It is the duty of organizations such as CNCF (with assistance from everyone who cares about the Cayman Islands) to step in and save some of the past that is necessary for defining the future."¹⁵² Towards defining a future for the site, Muttoo relayed plans for restoring the house to the period when Bush was "at the height of her creative powers – ca. 1992," conserving its interior artworks, and opening it to both local and overseas visitors.¹⁵³ As a cultural destination, visitors could learn about Bush's personal history and the history of the house, reflect on her artworks, and enjoy ocean vistas, "while partaking of Caymanian traditional teas and cakes."¹⁵⁴ Beyond serving as a visitor destination, Muttoo laid out plans for the site as an educational center and art gallery focused on the creative production and display of intuitive art.

In October 2012, WMF announced that its biennial Watch included Mind's Eye, publicized as the home of "a visionary artist who left an important mark on the cultural history of the Cayman Islands" where a preservation campaign was "bringing together government agencies, private organizations, local businesses, and school children to assist with these efforts."¹⁵⁵ Even though the site had opened to visitors around the time of the interview noted above, the Watch reported that considerable resources were still needed for long-term preservation and interpretation. Listed alongside such well-known cultural sites as the Nasca Lines geoglyphs in Peru, Mind's Eye was framed in Watch publicity as part of a group of sites that illustrated the potential for preservation to have positive impact on local populations by "promoting community cohesion and pride," as well as "through employment and the development of well-managed tourism."¹⁵⁶

Only one week after the 2012 Watch was announced, the Cayman Islands' Premier announced that the national government would commit \$500,000 to the restoration of Mind's Eye – the same number noted a year earlier by CNCF as being required to complete the project. In that announcement, the Premier noted with direct reference to the listing that: "The importance of the site is a matter of pride for all Caymanians. Mind's Eye was being considered with sites from all around the world for this recognition."¹⁵⁷

In response, Muttoo of the CNCF was not veiled about what precisely it was that listing had done for the site in the wake of the government's announcement, stating:

The listing on the World Monuments Watch gives us the leverage so that we can say: 'Look they're a major organization behind us, so if you didn't take our word for it before, here it is.' We have been telling people how critically important her life and work are. When the Government heard it was on the Watch list, [the Premier] came forward because he felt it was important. With half a million dollars over a period of four years, this money is

¹⁵² Klein, "Mind's Eye: A tour of Miss Lassie's Home with Henry," 2011.

¹⁵³ Klein, "Mind's Eye: A tour of Miss Lassie's Home with Henry," 2011.

¹⁵⁴ Klein, "Mind's Eye: A tour of Miss Lassie's Home with Henry," 2011.

¹⁵⁵ World Monuments Fund, *2012 World Monuments Watch*, Watch Catalog (2012): 8.

¹⁵⁶ World Monuments Fund, "World Monuments Fund Announces 2012 Watch, Encompassing 67 Threatened Cultural-Heritage Sites Across the Globe," Press Release, October 5, 2011.

¹⁵⁷ Wilson, "Premier Expresses Support For Miss Lassie's House," 2011.

going to be used for conservation and preservation of the house and to complete all the work that is necessary.¹⁵⁸

Clearly for Muttoo and the CNCF, the Watch served to influence the government to commit to supporting the site, not only through its initial purchase of the property in 2008, but now in its investment in a cultural destination, museum, and educational center, ultimately to affirming their vision of the site's national significance. In another context, Muttoo refined this point, finding that "people always want a higher authority, and preferably from outside the country, to tell them how great [sites and the artworks] are."¹⁵⁹ The Watch listing offered "an international seal of approval" that, beyond leveraging public funding and contributions from additional private resources, could also make it more likely for experts to render assistance to the Mind's Eye project.¹⁶⁰

At the time of listing, WMF only provided operational support for projects through awards within the Watch, which Mind's Eye did not receive. Instead, in the years after 2012, the CNCF continued to make progress on restoring the house and conserving its artworks by enlisting international experts, local businesses, and more volunteers. Together, these contributors undertook construction and renovation as well as art conservation and interpretation. Volunteers, for example, were enlisted to conduct interpretive repainting of damaged or replaced portions of the structure in the intuitive style of Gladwyn Bush. The renovation, which was largely completed by 2018, was funded primarily by the 2012 national government's commitment, and augmented by other sponsors that followed; in 2014, the Premier joined CNCF in unveiling a new Sponsor's Plaque at the cultural site that recognized these contributions.¹⁶¹ Today, the property is open to the public for guided tours, and CNCF conducts regular educational and cultural programming on-site.¹⁶²

The case of Mind's Eye offers a number of insights into the Watch's use in practice, particularly from the perspective of the nominator. Notably, it exemplifies how the program was used as a way of leveraging international recognition and public opinion towards achieving outcomes. At the surface level, Mind's Eye's inclusion on the Watch gave the site and its proposal a kind of validation that afforded new access to resources, which in turn brought the project to fruition. But international recognition of the site's significance circa its "at risk" status also had more complex cultural meaning. Essential to the Mind's Eye project was the idea that the property was not just an artwork, but a place important to producing Caymanian national identity. While the site's value was affirmed in this way by community support for preservation, there was also notable reticence—specifically within the government—about the project. Bush was a beloved member of the Cayman community and an acclaimed artist; but her story being intertwined with experiences of religious apparitions, and her artwork's canonization within the realms of "outsider" and "intuitive" art, gave pause to some about the cultural value of her work and legacy – certainly, such qualities did not completely mesh with dominant notions of heritage and Cayman cultural

¹⁵⁸ Wilson, "Premier Expresses Support For Miss Lassie's House," 2011.

¹⁵⁹ "CNCF Miss Lassie's House Painting Conservation," Interview with Henry Muttoo, CIG Television, Uploaded to Youtube January 15, 2013. Accessed online March 2020 from: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tx9I1DAApdA>

¹⁶⁰ Brendel, "Mind's Eye on Global Endangered Sites List," 2011.

¹⁶¹ Jewel Levy, "Sponsor's Plaque unveiled at Miss Lassie's House," *Cayman Compass*, July 14, 2014. Accessed online March 2020 from: <https://www.caymancompass.com/2014/07/14/sponsors-plaque-unveiled-at-miss-lassies-house/>

¹⁶² See: Mind's Eye - The Visionary World of Gladwyn K. Bush, "Miss Lassie," Official Website: <https://www.artscayman.org/minds-eye/>

identity.¹⁶³ What being included on the Watch contributed, then, was the leverage in ongoing negotiations over the site, the project, its cultural value, and national identity, including with the state itself. In this sense, red listing was a means to galvanize consensus towards the preservation project's realization on collective terms, and thus the creation of Mind's Eye as a prominent and public site of national heritage.

That World Monuments Watch offered recognition in this case where the Cayman government initially did not is perhaps surprising, although political distance may have played a part – the decision-making leading to this site's selection for the red list remains largely out of view. Still, while Mind's Eye represents a somewhat atypical notion of what constitutes heritage for WMF, the project itself—a conservation intervention—is very typical of projects undertaken through the Watch. This can also be said of the attributes wherein the nominator located the site's significance (ie. architecture and painted surfaces). But with significance tied to Bush home and its paintings, the nominator's attribution of endangerment (also defined in ways typical of the Watch, eg. threats by development and natural disaster) became a critical point of agreement – something that undoubtedly shaped understandings of the site's value and gave a sense of urgency to action across the parties involved. While the nominator ultimately used the red listing program to leverage results, the attribution of endangerment was also instrumental in negotiations about value and whether or not action should be taken, and in the political and cultural work that was done through this case.

Case Conclusions

In this case study, we've seen how the origins of the World Monuments Watch as a policy tool can be traced to the founding of its operating institution – a nonprofit born out of new concepts of world heritage and international stewardship in the 1960s, devised to meet heritage endangerment as a global public problem through collective preservation actions. We've also seen that the Watch has worked since 1995 by sourcing ideas from international publics about where preservation is urgently sought, and mobilizing response via its published list and through its institutional network. By looking closely into the program, we've established a framework for understanding its operations and effects consisting of five phases across each cycle: program advertising and soliciting nominations; application evaluation and selection; publicity and publication; operational support; and program evaluation and recalibration. Emerging from our view of these phases is the awareness that each process stands to marshal collective action or to prompt negotiation between multiple publics and the operating institution to some degree or another – whether that negotiation regards heritage values, endangerment's acription, the character of an intervention, or even the shape of the policy tool itself. This recognition complicates our critical understanding of the heritage red list. Still, the extent to which diverse publics are represented within the program's operations, or the extent to which meaningful negotiation occurs, often remains unclear, even while the program actively takes steps to ground its tool in collaboration and inclusive practice.

Beyond the characteristics of the Watch as an institutional policy tool, this case study also illustrated some of the tool's uses in practice. For example, the Watch serves WMF as a vehicle of preservation advocacy, agenda setting, and education; it also builds its professional and donor networks, maintains key relationships, and raises the institution's profile. For nominators, the case

¹⁶³ Gonzalez, "Cayman Woman Paints Visions; the World Sees Art," 2002. See also: "Mind's Eye - Two Sides to the Story," No Big Ting Cayman, Accessed online March 2020 from: <http://www.nobigtincayman.com/minds-eye-two-sides-to-the-story/>

of Mind's Eye shows that "list users" beyond the institution may participate in the program in order to leverage international opinion towards gaining access to new resources, and in ways that might be political in nature and tied to assertions of community and national identity. In Mind's Eye, it is also clear that endangerment and its ascription plays an important role in how the red list tool works in practice, and in ways also intertwined with negotiation, the production of consensus, and collective action.

In sum, the case of the World Monuments Watch demonstrates how the red list policy tool can be dynamic in the way it seeks to identify "public problems" and deliver preservation as a public service, and in ways not always grounded in notions of threat. As we've seen, changes to the Watch have even raised questions about whether or not the inventory is a heritage endangerment list at all. Surely, beyond the case of Mind's Eye, there are an increasing number of listings on the Watch that are not bound to "heritage endangerment." For example, one project listed in 2020 sought to revitalize traditional water management systems through preservation actions to enhance sustainable public access to that vital resource.¹⁶⁴ Indeed, there are a range of other examples. But even as the program shifts away from operating solely in terms of endangerment—in part prompted by nominators' implicit assertion that preservation's provision as a public service is not always tied to threat or anticipated loss—endangerment remains located within the program in two important places: Endangerment is still ascribed to heritage by many nominators who choose to use the Watch to various effects, unprompted by the institution's nomination framing. Furthermore, the Watch still relies on largely endangerment rhetoric in communicating the list to the public as potential participants in collective actions. These places where endangerment still finds use suggests that even in the presence of alternative ways of conceptualizing and "doing" heritage and preservation, endangerment remains something that does work for both the institution and multiple publics in practice via the World Monuments Watch.

¹⁶⁴ "Historic water systems of the Deccan Plateau" project listed in 2020. See: World Monuments Fund, *World Monuments Watch 2020*, Watch Catalog (2020): 18. Accessible online from World Monuments Fund: <https://www.wmf.org/2020Watch>

Chapter 4

The National Trust for Historic Preservation's “America’s 11 Most Endangered Historic Places”

The President of the National Trust for Historic Preservation announced that organization’s first list of “America’s 11 Most Endangered Historic Places” in 1988 on the floor of the United States Congress. Read as testimony in a congressional hearing during a preservation battle over a National Park Service property, the announcement itself was nothing short of political lobbying. For the National Trust, which at the time was a federally-funded nonprofit, the case at hand showed that the government and its policies were unable to protect valued national heritage even under federal ownership. For that reason, the Trust’s president testified, “new mechanisms are required to renew an ethic of national stewardship that puts emphasis on protecting heritage sites through a partnership between all levels of government and the private sector.”¹⁶⁵ For the National Trust, an endangerment list for national landmarks was both the medium and the message.

Since 1988, the National Trust has continued to publish its “11 Most Endangered” list on an annual basis. Announced eight years before the first cycle of the World Monuments Watch, the rationale for the National Trust’s red list echoes the International Fund for Monuments’ statement of purpose from decades prior. Still, the format and function of the 11 Most Endangered list provides a contrast to the previous case study, while giving further shape to our understanding of the red list policy tool over all. This particular study considers the National Trust’s 11 Most Endangered list as an example of a national-scale heritage red list, reviewing both its origins and its contemporary structure and operations. The National Trust’s red listing program, as the earliest of its kind to operate at a national scale in the United States, also became the standard-bearer for many of the state and local endangerment lists that took up the model in the years after, due in part to its promotion by the National Trust. For this reason, this case study also undertakes a close reading of an advisory publication on “Creating Lists of Endangered Places” produced by the National Trust for use by other preservation nonprofits.¹⁶⁶ This reading seeks to inform our understanding of the National Trust’s intentions for its own listing program, and to explore its influence in today’s national network of localized heritage endangerment lists.

America’s Most Endangered: Origins of the National Trust’s Red List

Even though the National Trust’s red listing program was not established until the late 1980s, the notion of “heritage endangerment” was at play within that organization for some time prior. The National Trust was established by congressional charter in 1949, born out of a period of post-war development when preservationists saw a need for nation-wide coordination. The emergence of local preservation ordinances in the early 1930s had inspired the federal government to assert

¹⁶⁵ J. Jackson Walter, President, National Trust for Historic Preservation, *Manassas National Battlefield Park Amendments of 1988*, Hearing Before the Subcommittee on Public Lands, National Parks and Forests, One Hundredth Congress, Second Session on H.R.4526. September 8, 1988 (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1989): 186. Note: While absent from the original testimony “and the private sector” was added in quotations published by the National Trust, and is also included here. See: *Preservation News* (September 1988): 3.

¹⁶⁶ Mary Humstone, *Threatened Treasures: Creating Lists of Endangered Historic Places*, A National Trust Publication (Washington D.C.: National Trust for Historic Preservation, 2001).

new authority through its administration of heritage sites (ie. 1935 Historic Sites Act) and launch new national programs for preservation (eg. the Historic American Buildings of 1933 and Historic Sites Survey of 1935). But with the advent of World War II, federal preservation activity receded, and “a major part of the responsibility for preserving national heritage fell to the private sector.”¹⁶⁷ Seeking an activated national program post war, preservationists saw nongovernmental organization as advantageous for marshalling voluntary participation and serving as a public-private intermediary.¹⁶⁸ In 1947, members of heritage-minded organizations from across the country formed the National Council for Historic Sites and Buildings,¹⁶⁹ and sought a charter for a national trust, obtained two years later.¹⁷⁰ These interrelated organizations—one an advocacy-driven membership organization, and the other a legal entity with the ability to acquire and administer properties and funds—merged to become the contemporary National Trust for Historic Preservation in 1953.

As historian of the National Trust David Finley has noted, the organization made use of publicity early on to advocate for preservation and increase its membership. “One of the most valuable Trust services” was the publication of *Historic Preservation* – a periodical that began as a plea for membership and funding by the National Council in 1949, but that grew into a full-fledged magazine for “the preservation movement” by 1952.¹⁷¹ In its first issues, the National Trust introduced the earliest predecessor to its 11 Most Endangered list: a regular feature entitled “In Danger” that reviewed historic sites at risk.¹⁷² As part of a sequence published in each issue encompassing “Proposed Preservation,” “Active Preservation,” “In Danger,” and “Passing Parade” (later “Destruction”), the magazine presented its “In Danger” notes as a call to action for individual sites and as preservation advocacy writ large. In constructing a kind of natural order for the preservation field, notes on sites “In Danger” within that sequence read as both points of distress for a national heritage and as opportunities for preservationists to intervene. This particular series was abandoned from the magazine by 1961. But heritage in danger (increasingly “endangerment” into the 1960s) remained an important theme in Trust literature, only to be adopted into a new tool of institutional policy in the late 1970s.

The National Trust had operated as a private nonprofit since 1949. But in 1966 the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), introduced federal funding for the National Trust in addition to a range of new programs for preservation. With the arrival of NHPA, the Trust’s particular private-sector role can be seen to have focused, even as its ties to government were tightened, effectively becoming a quasi-governmental entity. As the Trust reported, federal backing helped it to grow its constituency and solidify its role as a “leading private-sector partner,” with efforts targeted along four lines: acting as a “cost-effective steward” for sites of national interest; stimulating

¹⁶⁷ David E. Finley, *History of the National Trust for Historic Preservation* (Washington, D.C.: The Preservation Press, The National Trust for Historic Preservation): 10.

¹⁶⁸ Finley, *History of the National Trust for Historic Preservation*, 10.

¹⁶⁹ National Council for Historic Council for Historic Sites and Buildings, News Release, October 1947. Accessible online from the National Gallery of Art:

https://www.nga.gov/content/dam/ngaweb/research/gallery-archives/PressReleases/1949-1940/1947/14A11_43664_19471020.pdf

¹⁷⁰ Congressional Charter of the National Trust for Historic Preservation in the United States. Act of October 26, 1949, P.L. No. 810-408 Stat. 927, as amended. Accessible online from the National Trust: https://nthp-savingplaces.s3.amazonaws.com/2017/09/07/09/19/04/659/NTHP_Charter_2015_Recodification.pdf

¹⁷¹ Finley, *History of the National Trust for Historic Preservation*, 15-16.

¹⁷² For early examples see: *National Council for Historic Sites and Buildings*, Quarterly Report, 3 no. 4 (December 1951); and *Historic Preservation* 4 no. 1 (Spring 1952).

private investment in heritage through multiple grant and loan programs; providing education through technical and advisory guidance; and developing “innovative efforts to meet the special needs of specific resources.”¹⁷³ One such specialized program, launched in 1979, was an “Endangered Properties Fund,” set up for loans and direct awards in order to “provide ‘last ditch’ temporary safeguards for nationally significant historic properties.”¹⁷⁴ As a pool of both private and public funds distributed by application, the National Trust emphasized its innovation as “the only source of emergency money to protect... properties from immediate threats.”¹⁷⁵ While “endangerment” was already part of the organization’s lexicon, this was the first time that the notion was translated into an instrument of institutional policy – something that happened again in a new form a decade later.

In the late 1980s, the National Trust and its membership were briefly embroiled in a campaign to preserve the Manassas National Battlefield Park in Virginia, the site of early Civil War battles, owned and operated by the National Park Service (NPS). The National Trust advocated for stopping the construction of a regional shopping mall on private property adjacent to the park. The preservationist position was that the development threatened the site’s visual integrity, and that increased traffic congestion threatened visitor experience. Preservationists also argued that the mall site, though outside park bounds, was an important part of telling the story of the Civil War. On the opposing side, proponents of the mall, including county and municipal authorities, saw an opportunity for economic development. There also were broader issues at play having to do with perceived blindspots in federal heritage policy that drew the National Trust to the case as an advocacy organization. Recognizing that the Manassas issue was “not a new problem,” and that “there is nothing in federal law that can protect properties outside of [park and historic site] boundaries,”¹⁷⁶ the National Park Service acknowledged that their typical approach to dealing with encroaching development “is to enlist the aid of both national and community groups to pressure local governments” and try to convince them of the benefits of preservation versus its tax base.¹⁷⁷ That approach had effectively failed for Manassas by 1988, and it was in this context that National Trust enlisted its members to petition Congress for action.

There was a sense within the National Trust that there were few landmarks that could not be threatened by development in the same way as Manassas unless new tools of protection were created.¹⁷⁸ When a congressional hearing on the battlefield controversy was announced, the President of the National Trust, Jackson Walter, testified in support of a proposal to purchase the mall site to protect the integrity of the park.¹⁷⁹ But Walter also used the opportunity to make the case that other nationally-significant sites were similarly at risk to development, and were unprotected by current law. Central to that case was his announcement of a new National Trust initiative, a list of “The 11 Most Endangered Historic Places,” on which he provided the following commentary: “We can neither afford to protect all these parks and historic places through federal purchases nor would acquisition be good public policy in all cases. At the same time, we cannot allow uncontrolled development to compromise their integrity. New mechanisms are required to renew an ethic of national stewardship that puts emphasis on protecting heritage sites through a

¹⁷³ National Trust for Historic Preservation (NTHP), “Editorial: Preservation is a National Trust,” *Preservation News* 1 (April 1982): 4.

¹⁷⁴ National Trust for Historic Preservation, “Trust launches \$1 million Endangered Buildings Fund,” *Preservation News* 19 no. 1 (January 1979): 1, 3.

¹⁷⁵ NTHP, “Editorial: Preservation is a national trust,” *Preservation News* 1 (April 1982): 4.

¹⁷⁶ NTHP, “Battle of Manassas Builds” *Preservation News* (April 1988): 13.

¹⁷⁷ NTHP, “Va. Developers Victorious in Un-Civil War,” *Preservation News* (April 1987): 17.

¹⁷⁸ NTHP, “Battle of Manassas Builds,” 13.

¹⁷⁹ Walter, *Manassas National Battlefield*, 186.

partnership between all levels of government and the private sector.”¹⁸⁰

The Trust’s inaugural red list included Manassas National Battlefield Park and ten other sites, chosen to “illustrate how landmarks are menaced doubly—by incompatible development and inadequate protection.”¹⁸¹ Importantly, all eleven on that first list were “endangered” by some form of development. Beyond representing a site-by-site call to action, the list was clearly meant to argue for new legislative protections.¹⁸² Made explicit by the National Trust’s *Preservation News*, the endangerment list was part of a “campaign to dramatize the plight of Manassas battlefield and other threatened landmarks,” as part of lobbying for “comprehensive legislation for national landmark protection” geared specifically towards heritage endangerment – something that the National Trust had hoped to advise Congress in developing.¹⁸³ However, the list itself also stood on its own as a vehicle of response, and one that played to the Trust’s own perceived advantages as a nongovernmental body to marshal participation and be an effective intermediary across sectors. Ultimately, Congress voted to purchase the land at Manassas and add it to the park, but it did not work with the National Trust to draw up the new national legislation it had lobbied for. Nevertheless, with the 11 Most Endangered List as a new institutional tool, the National Trust turned to developing its red list into a program that could realize the kinds of actions it thought were necessary to meet heritage endangerment seen as a public problem at the national scale.

The Contemporary “11 Most Endangered Historic Places” Program

Soon after 1988, the National Trust introduced a formal nomination process to its 11 Most Endangered Historic Places, turning the list into a full-fledged institutional program. By the time the Trust again became an independent nonprofit when its federal funding ended in 1996, the 11 Most Endangered program had significant presence within the organization’s operations and messaging. In 1998, the Trust celebrated the program’s ten-year anniversary by having the First Lady of the United States announce that year’s endangerment list in a televised event hosted by the program’s sponsor, The History Channel.¹⁸⁴ With national notoriety and a strong resource network, the Trust also saw the program’s public participation to be robust; as the organization’s president noted, “Every year we receive far more nominations for our list of America’s 11 Most Endangered Historic Places than we can possibly accommodate... It’s an indication that people know that inclusion on the 11 Most Endangered list can be a positive step towards a secure future for a landmark in peril.”¹⁸⁵

Since its founding, public participation in the program has been encouraged by an established media presence. The Trust also has an extensive professional network, operating nine regional offices. As a result, soliciting nominations for the red list takes place both through media and professional channels, as well as through the Trust’s own nation-wide membership, consisting of citizens and organizations. Sites are nominated to the 11 Most Endangered list through a standard application form that’s approach has remained fairly consistent over time. In the most recent

¹⁸⁰ Walter, *Manassas National Battlefield*, 186.

¹⁸¹ NTHP, “The Endangered Eleven: Landmarks Near the Edge,” *Preservation News* 1 (September 1988): 3.

¹⁸² NTHP, “The Endangered Eleven,” 3.

¹⁸³ NTHP, “The Endangered Eleven,” 3.

¹⁸⁴ NTHP, “List of Endangered Sites Highlights America’s Heritage at Risk: National Trust Sends Wake-up Call to Save America’s Treasures on the Eve of the New Millenium.” *Preservation Frontline*, June 15th, 1998.

¹⁸⁵ Richard Moe, “From the President: Landmark List,” *Preservation*, 49 no. 4 (1997): 6.

application (2020), nominators are prompted to describe: the *significance* of the nominated site, including its historical value, community importance, and why it “would be of interest to the public or media;” the *threat* facing the site, including a description of its urgency, and a potential response; *advocacy solutions*, including the types of organizations that can take the lead in advocating for the site; and *media potential*, meaning the identification of “key issues associated with the site, its threats, or solutions that are potentially newsworthy.”¹⁸⁶ Nominations for the list are evaluated by National Trust staff members, and a final selection is made by “senior executive staff.”¹⁸⁷

In addition to a particular focus on media potential, one stand-out feature of the Trust’s nomination instrument is that it specifically prompts applicants to define concrete advocacy steps that can be taken by preservationists or the general public on behalf of the site beyond financial contribution. Past application forms have asked nominators to define clear steps for directing collective actions, specifying examples like “sending a letter, signing a petition, volunteering, making donations, or taking a poll.”¹⁸⁸ These simple actions play a key part in how the program works for the sites that make the final list. For example, the 2019 list and related publicity material urged interested members of the public for nine out of the eleven listed sites to sign petitions or send letters to relevant authorities (eg. lawmakers, historical commissions) in support of preservation.¹⁸⁹ Indeed, the final presentation of the 11 Most Endangered list is simple and concise, typically providing a brief description of the site (only a few sentences in most published materials) and presenting a call for action in line with one of the commitments outlined above.

Media attention and advocacy of this kind are largely what the National Trust offers to nominators through its red listing program. While additional operational support may be provided outside of public view, the Trust has specified that nominators should expect only the following from listing: promotion on its website; inclusion in a feature story in *Preservation Magazine*; support in planning a local media event and contacting national press; support in “developing and implementing an advocacy plan and action steps that the public can take;” and the provision of a press toolkit and a press release.¹⁹⁰ These operations, which focus primarily on publicity, advocacy, and mobilizing the Trust’s networked constituencies, point to some core institutional uses for the red list.

Since its founding, the 11 Most Endangered has been a tool of preservation advocacy, often in the form of raising awareness about “emerging threats” and lobbying for relevant changes to national policy. One revealing example of the program’s use in this way can be seen in the 2007 list, which was meant in part to draw attention to the “enormous, widespread, and unfortunately growing threat to historic places within energy transmission line corridors.”¹⁹¹ That year the Trust

¹⁸⁶ National Trust for Historic Preservation, *America’s 11 Most Endangered Historic Places, 2020 Application* (2020). Accessed online April 2020.

¹⁸⁷ National Trust for Historic Preservation, “Apply for 2020 America’s 11 Most Endangered Historic Places,” Accessed online April 2020 from: <https://savingplaces.org/11-most-nominations>

¹⁸⁸ National Trust for Historic Preservation, *2010 America’s 11 Most Endangered Historic Places Nomination Questions* (2010).

¹⁸⁹ The Trust’s website currently facilitates such actions, allowing members of the public to sign petitions or send standardized letters through their online platform – but only by registering their information with the National Trust. See the 2019 11 Most Endangered Historic Places List on the National Trust’s website: <https://savingplaces.org/stories/11-most-endangered-historic-places-2019>

¹⁹⁰ NTHP, *2010 11 Most Guidelines*.

¹⁹¹ Note: The 2007 list was announced by the president of the National Trust, broadcast on C-SPAN 2, a national television network focused on the U. S. Senate. See: Richard Moe, President of the National

listed “Historic Places in Powerline Corridors” as one of its 11 Most Endangered Places, a thematic nomination meant as a response to a new national energy policy that had given authority to the federal government to designate interstate regions for expedited energy transmission development – something that many preservationists objected to on a variety of grounds. The Trust contended in that year’s endangerment list announcement that such corridors would bring “blight to historic landscapes and usurp private property rights.”¹⁹² But the nonprofit was also concerned with how such designations could possibly circumvent cultural resource and environmental reviews, thus depriving preservationists of key tools afforded by national policy for influencing the outcomes of such land use projects.¹⁹³ In this case, the Trust used the list to leverage public sentiment and engage its constituencies in a lobbying campaign – one that the Trust later brought directly to Congress and to court.

In addition to advocacy, the National Trust uses its 11 Most Endangered program as a vehicle for expanding its own institutional network. For example, the Trust has managed to effectively link its annual endangerment list to its own push for membership. This is in part baked into the listing process, as the program specifically seeks sites that have media potential, a quality that can realize outcomes for nominators, but that also raises the profile of the program and the institution. The endangerment list is also a way that the Trust engages preservation organizations around the country, whether by requesting letters of organizational support by way of nominators or simply by engaging sites in certain geographies. Building these relationships serves a range of goals for the National Trust. Such connections expand the reach of programming like the 11 Most Endangered, but having state and local preservation nonprofits as part of its institutional network is also an important way that the Trust influences government preservation policy across the country. Moreover, it extends the institution’s ability to set priorities within the field and standards for practice. Sure enough, one of the main drivers for the red list policy tool’s proliferation across the American preservation arena was the influence of the National Trust and the success it found with its 11 Most Endangered program after 1988.

As we’ve seen, the National Trust operates its annual red listing program in a way that produces a media-ready heritage endangerment list – one that realizes effects by engaging the public and the Trust’s constituencies on a national scale, and by directing accessible collective actions. The format of the list, its nomination instruments and selection procession, as well as its institutional uses remain largely unchanged since its inception in the late 1980s. Still, our view of the 11 Most Endangered program remains somewhat opaque. Towards clarifying further how and why the program operates in the way that it does, and towards illustrating the role of different actors in producing the list and its effects, the rest of the case study considers a single publication produced by National Trust on the very subject of endangerment listing. This publication, which also contributes to our historical understanding of the red list’s proliferation among state and local organizations, offers critical insight into the case at hand even as it looks outward to other red lists at different scales. Furthermore, its examination also starts to point to some of the key roles that endangerment itself plays in the National Trust’s model of red listing.

Trust for Historic Preservation, Announcement of “Endangered Historic Sites,” aired on C-SPAN 2, June 14, 2007. Accessible online from C-SPAN :<https://www.c-span.org/video/?199100-1/endangered-historic-sites>

¹⁹² “Sites on the 2007 list of most-endangered historic places designated by the National Trust for Historic Preservation,” *New York Times* (June 13th, 2007).

¹⁹³ David A. Lewis, “Identifying and Avoiding Conflicts Between Historic Preservation and the Development of Renewable Energy,” *New York University Environmental Law Journal* 22: 274-360.

A “How To” Guide for Heritage Endangerment Lists

In 2001, the National Trust published *Threatened Treasures: Creating Lists of Endangered Historic Places*, a “how to” guide for heritage red listing in the model of the 11 Most Endangered Historic Places.¹⁹⁴ Meant for use by state and local organizations developing or “fine tuning” their institutional programming, *Threatened Treasures* promoted one of the Trust’s “most effective tools” and reflected on its successful adaptation by a growing number of preservation nonprofits that “have followed the Trust’s lead in developing their own lists.”¹⁹⁵ The guide offered rationales for why an organization might want to develop a red listing program, and provided step-by-step suggestions for soliciting and evaluating nominations, developing selection criteria, publicizing the list, and providing follow-up assistance. Indeed, the manual’s breakdown of program operations for instructional purposes invites us to apply the operational framework established in Chapter 4 towards analyzing the particular considerations that shape the tool, the roles various actors play as imagined by the Trust, and its uses in practice.

At the publication’s onset, the National Trust laid out in plain fashion the answer to a fundamental question about its intentions for the red list model that it championed: “Why Have an Endangered Historic Places List?”¹⁹⁶ To that end, the institution defined four goals: “Goal 1–Saving Historic Places,” “Goal 2–Publicity,” “Goal 3–Advocacy,” and “Goal 4–Education.”¹⁹⁷ While we’ve already seen some of these play out in the case of the 11 Most Endangered, descriptions in *Threatened Places* provide further clarity into how the Trust envisioned the list and its usefulness for other nonprofits.

As a tool of “saving historic places,” the Trust saw the red list first and foremost as a vehicle for galvanizing action by raising awareness and rallying resources. Given the typical dynamics of preservation efforts in the United States, it could enhance grass-roots initiatives and “finally attract the attention of officials” with authority to intervene.¹⁹⁸ Critical to meeting that initial goal of “saving places” is publicity (“Goal 2”) – but publicity also is an aim on its own, since public attention could benefit both a project and the organization by increasing name recognition, members, and volunteers. Endangerment lists tell stories about people and places, which is naturally appealing to the media. But for the National Trust “the threat takes the list... from the features page to the front page.”¹⁹⁹ Regarding advocacy as a distinct goal (“Goal 3”), the Trust saw the red list as a way to focus organizational efforts to reflect priorities and values in a concrete and digestible way that gave urgency and force to the cause.²⁰⁰ This was important because “heritage can be a difficult concept to grasp... [but] an endangered places program can put a face on preservation and make it more understandable and appealing to the general public.”²⁰¹ As a final goal for red list programs, education (“Goal 4”) meant effectively telling stories about national (and local) history and culture.

¹⁹⁴ Mary Humstone, *Threatened Treasures: Creating Lists of Endangered Historic Places* (Washington D.C.: The National Trust for Historic Preservation, 2001).

¹⁹⁵ Humstone, *Threatened Treasures*, 1.

¹⁹⁶ Humstone, *Threatened Treasures*, 1.

¹⁹⁷ Humstone, *Threatened Treasures*, 1-3.

¹⁹⁸ Humstone, *Threatened Treasures*, 2.

¹⁹⁹ Humstone, *Threatened Treasures*, 2-3.

²⁰⁰ Humstone, *Threatened Treasures*, 2-3.

²⁰¹ Humstone, *Threatened Treasures*, 1

Prior to discussing the red list in operation, *Threatened Treasures* highlighted some considerations that might shape program conception. Emphasizing that “the list is really a program” and not just a list, it found that the tool should be tailored to the institution itself, including its capacities, expertise, and values.²⁰² Thus, decisions about the breadth, direction, and public image were among the first an organization needed to make when developing such a program. Reminiscent of the List of World Heritage Danger as reviewed in Chapter 2, the National Trust suggested that if a key institutional goal is “saving sites” through concrete action (as opposed to broader advocacy) the list should be kept to “a manageable number.”²⁰³ But the publication also draws attention to the importance of a program name, noting: “Putting a positive spin on seemingly negative news might work best for your community, but keep in mind that the media thrives on the negative. If you talk about “treasured heritage sites,” you might get buried on page D-19, whereas something that is “ENDANGERED” is more likely to grab front-page headlines.”²⁰⁴ The Trust asserted that words like “threatened” and “endangered” were more effective in galvanizing the media and the public, “judging from the results of existing red listing programs.”²⁰⁵

Moving from program conception to operation, *Threatened Treasures* considered the nomination process and initial outreach, corresponding to the first phase in our established operational framework: program advertising and soliciting applications. The National Trust promoted the use of a standard nomination form largely in line with that used for 11 Most Endangered – an application based on site significance, threat, and response. The publication placed importance on those forms being simple enough to be accessible for non-professionals, but complete enough to render clear information for decision-making. Regarding outreach and solicitation, the National Trust recommended that organizations get the word out about the program and its open call through established networks (eg. newsletters). Still, it found that directly cultivating nominations may be necessary. A local organization provided a quote: “Someone has to drum up nominations... They don’t come in on their own.”²⁰⁶ While the Trust emphasizes the importance of diversity and community action in the list selection phase that follows, its vision of program advertisement and nomination solicitation, along with its view of “pre-picking” sites, largely anchored these processes within the institution’s professional networks and the institution itself.

In *Threatened Treasures*, curation and visibility—but also fairness and caution—emerge as driving considerations for how red lists are produced during the application evaluation and selection phase. On formal processes, the publication suggested that organizations use a dedicated selection committee to pick lists, with an understanding that that organization can always “substitute” or “slip in” sites if the committee doesn’t quite make an interesting- or varied-enough selection.²⁰⁷ The Trust noted that it frames its own selection process for the 11 Most Endangered list with “maximum visibility” in mind. From this perspective, selection is clearly a curatorial endeavor. But, the publication also emphasized the need for a fair process so as not to “risk being accused of being arbitrary, elitist, or single-focused.”²⁰⁸ A mentality of institutional self-preservation reads clearly in the publication, particularly around this issue of list selection. In grappling with the political and contested nature of heritage, the National Trust entreated organizations to develop a process for evaluating all possible political ramifications and

²⁰² Humstone, *Threatened Treasures*, 5.

²⁰³ Humstone, *Threatened Treasures*, 4.

²⁰⁴ Humstone, *Threatened Treasures*, 5.

²⁰⁵ Humstone, *Threatened Treasures*, 5.

²⁰⁶ Humstone, *Threatened Treasures*, 7.

²⁰⁷ Humstone, *Threatened Treasures*, 9.

²⁰⁸ Humstone, *Threatened Treasures*, 3, 6.

determining “how much you’d be willing to risk to list a controversial project.”²⁰⁹ Most notably, it recommends that such organizations contact local or state government officials to get feedback on selections before the list is approved so that political implications can be factored into decision-making.²¹⁰ Although *Threatened Treasures* recognizes that “the importance of a resource [may] outweigh potential negative political consequences,” its approach introduces powerful new decision makers at a key phase of the process, impacting the potential for nominators, the institution, and multiple publics to undertake meaningful negotiation of heritage values, endangerment, and shape of preservation at this and later stages of the policy tool’s operations.

While the National Trust defined publicity as a goal of any red list, publicity and list publication also represent key functions of such a program in operation. As we’ve seen across this chapter, the Trust places particular value on publicity, informing the way it structures its 11 Most Endangered program. Towards “Maximizing the Media,” *Threatened Treasures* offered a key piece of advice to other preservation organizations: “If it bleeds, it leads.”²¹¹ The Trust went on to explain:

Lists of endangered historic places, or “bleeding buildings” are classic examples of this old media adage. Your local newspapers and radio and television stations are going to love this new controversy. They’ll quickly send out their favorite muck-raker to dig deep into the issues of why these places are threatened, who owns them, and what’s going to happen to them. You have only one change to make this event stand out. The release of your endangered historic places list should be a media coup.²¹²

Tools recommended for generating this kind of media attention include a highly-public press conference (as we’ve seen the Trust employ), and a press release distributed to a range of media outlets. *Threatened Treasures* also made the mentionable observation that a different kind of publicity can also benefit a red listing program: publicizing the failure of the list to “save” a site resulting in its destruction can also promote engagement because “the loss of a historic building elicits an emotional response from people that often results in more effort being applied to the next preservation challenge.”²¹³

Operational support in the case of the National Trust’s 11 Most Endangered program, as we’ve seen, is largely restricted to assisting “developing and implementing an advocacy plan and action steps that the public can take.”²¹⁴ How and to what extent the Trust works collaboratively with nominators to improve measures proposed in the initial nomination form, like those discussed in the previous selection, remains unclear. Beyond the frame of the 11 Most Endangered, *Threatened Treasures* recognized that state and local programs may choose to provide different levels of technical or advisory support, which may include on-site consultation, advising for grant applications, community engagement, or a range of other services. Some of these kinds of support are explored in greater detail in Chapter 5. But what the publication makes clear is that the Trust’s national-scale program has opted to focus specifically on producing effects for sites and the institution by raising public awareness through its network and thus achieving a critical mass of public support and resources in order to realize preservation results, which are likely not

²⁰⁹ Humstone, *Threatened Treasures*, 4.

²¹⁰ Humstone, *Threatened Treasures*, 4.

²¹¹ Humstone, *Threatened Treasures*, 12.

²¹² Humstone, *Threatened Treasures*, 12.

²¹³ Humstone, *Threatened Treasures*, 12.

²¹⁴ National Trust for Historic Preservation, *2010 America’s 11 Most Endangered Historic Places Nomination Guidelines* (2010).

to require additional support through the program.

Threatened Treasures provides details that had been missing from our analysis about how the National Trust chooses to configure its 11 Most Endangered Places program, and how it envisions the red list as a useful tool for the preservation field. Much of our new understanding comes from the publication's explanation of the program's core functions. But by matching our own operational framework to that established by National Trust, a final point emerges: In Chapter 3, clear changes to the World Monuments Watch over time prompted our identification of "program evaluation and recalibration" as a core function of red listing programs; however, the National Trust's guide makes no suggestion that adjustments to the program overall might be necessary to improve its operation as a policy tool. As has been noted, the 11 Most Endangered program has remained largely unchanged since its inception. Still, a review of past nomination forms and guidelines shows that regular recalibrations do happen, but that they represent the streamlining of an established process as opposed to any substantive reconsideration of the concepts or strategies at play.²¹⁵ This suggests that the National Trust has found a model that works in accordance with its vision of the public need and its objectives of saving places, publicity, advocacy, and education.

Case Conclusions

Drawing further comparison between the two case studies explored so far can offer insight here. In retrospect, World Monuments Fund has positioned the Watch as a tool for delivering preservation as a public service in such a way that the definition of the public need and public problems are largely within the purview of nominators, forcing the program to be dynamic as new notions are introduced that are untethered to endangerment or urgency. By contrast, the National Trust's red listing program is concerned specifically with delivering preservation as a public service in order to meet heritage endangerment predefined as the public problem at a national scale. As a result, the extent to which the 11 Most Endangered ultimately serves to reproduce its own vision of the public need through this policy tool is an important question. As *Threatened Treasures* illustrates, the National Trust's vision of red listing does place particular importance on the institution's roles as collector of threatened sites and curator of the endangerment list. We also saw the National Trust suggest specific steps to avoid contested, "political," and dissonant places within red listing programs, which suggests an aversion to engaging notions or uses of heritage beyond the dominant frame. Still, this does not mean that the listing program itself—and the notion of heritage endangerment at its core—is not being *used* in ways that warrant our attention, and extend to both the institution and its nominators.

In this case study we've seen how the National Trust's 11 Most Endangered program was born out of a political lobby for new policy mechanisms to meet heritage endangerment as a nationwide problem, seen as unmet by the government in the late 1980s. We've also seen how the National Trust has continued to use the tool in often political ways that are tied to "saving places," but are also about mobilizing public awareness and collective actions towards getting a seat at the negotiating table in government decision making. While largely unexplored in this chapter, we've also seen in passing how the 11 Most Endangered and other lists that follow its model might be used by nominators to mobilize grassroots efforts, to get the attention of authorities with power to intervene, or to realize resources for preservation efforts, in ways likely akin to the case of Mind's Eye presented in Chapter 3. To these ends, the National Trust has developed a red list model

²¹⁵ For example: Between 2000 and 2003, the National Trust specified the language of its application question in response to past nominations through the addition of certain qualifiers (ie. "Please specify beyond"...). Between 2007 and 2010 the nomination form added new prompts for identifying stakeholders, etc.

that is largely centered on generating media attention, and consciously utilizing endangerment rhetoric as a way of producing public engagement and galvanizing collective response. This and other characteristics of the National Trust’s endangerment listing program leave it open to familiar criticisms, and rightfully so. Still the characteristics of the 11 Most Endangered program and its uses of endangerment contribute important understanding to our portrait of the policy tool and the work it does in practice.

Chapter 5

Preservation Long Island’s “Endangered Historic Places” Program

Although the National Trust played an influential role in popularizing the red list model taken up by state, regional, and local institutions during the 1990s and 2000s, precisely how that model was configured and put to use depended on the aims of organizations and the needs of their constituencies. Founded in 2011, the “Endangered Historic Places” program of Preservation Long Island is one example of a program that found the visibility that red listing offered to be useful not only for site-specific advocacy, but for extending the reach of its technical and advisory support and educational programming in order to effect regional change. Preservation Long Island focuses its red list program on helping communities identify and use technical preservation tools and to negotiate the legal and political landscape of New York’s Long Island region, with the goal of “empowering people to do their own advocacy and civic work.”²¹⁶ The non-profit organization sees its Endangered Historic Places program, which is operated on a two-year cycle, as a focused version of its ongoing advisory and technical services program – but one directed towards realizing community-based solutions when preservation actions are deemed urgent.

This chapter takes Preservation Long Island’s Endangered Historic Places program as its third and final case study, providing insight into the structure and use of a red list operated at a regional scale. The most recent of the three red lists examined, the program provides a contrast to both prior cases given the list’s focus on direct and ongoing technical assistance, even extending far beyond the end of each two-year cycle. Still, both the program’s operating structure and the historical origins of the list and its founding institution demonstrate important continuities, contributing further to our understanding of the red list policy tool. Preservation Long Island and its Endangered Historic Places program are briefly reviewed in historical perspective, moving to an examination of the program’s contemporary operation and uses in practice. One ongoing local preservation effort supported by the program is considered in detail.

²¹⁶ Interview with the director of Preservation Long Island’s “Endangered Historic Places” program, March 2020.

Origins of and Operations of Preservation Long Island's Endangered Historic Places

Preservation Long Island was founded as the Society for Preservation of Long Island Antiquities (SPLIA) in 1948, holding its first annual meeting in 1949, the same year of the founding of the National Trust. SPLIA was organized towards the preservation of historic documents, artworks, and memorabilia that told the story of Long Island, its development, and its early families. But it was also devised with the intent of preserving historic houses. As one early member noted: "Too many old fashioned societies save little things which were placed in cases for display, but the larger items, such as houses were lost;" an organization dedicated to preserving historic homes was, though, "an answer to a modern need."²¹⁷ Like the National Trust, SPLIA was organized out of concern in the post-war era about new development as potential threat to historic properties. But in absence of any preservation legislation from the national to the municipal scale to provide for preservation, SPLIA necessarily took a grass-roots approach, which reflected its operational scale. The nonprofit organized its first meeting by direct-mailing 1,500 invitations to members of the Long Island community, followed by an additional 5,000 mailings for the following meeting.²¹⁸

In its early years, the SPLIA concerned itself with the administration and restoration of property gifted to the organization for its stewardship. In 1955, the SPLIA organized a Committee on Buildings to Be Saved charged with "visiting threatened buildings and generating public interest."²¹⁹ But the Committee found that getting the needed expert advice proved difficult and that the undertaking was somewhat hollow, given that SPLIA lacked the resources it took to "save" a house through direct purchase. As the committee chair said, it was "embarrassing to ask architects and committee members to travel distances to look at buildings and make reports, and then find it necessary to tell them that the SPLIA had no money and so nothing can be done."²²⁰ The Committee on Buildings to Be Saved was ultimately short lived, and in the 1960s, the organization instead grew its membership and operations through a focus on education and advocacy, turning also towards producing publications and public outreach with periodicals and newsletters. By the 1990s the organization had developed a preservation services program that offered advising and technical support for members of the Long Island community seeking to undertake preservation actions, dovetailing with its advocacy and educational work.

A key concern of SPLIA's preservation services program, as part of a regional organization, was providing support for citizens and communities in navigating the variety of policies and legal instruments framing historic properties and preservation across municipalities and counties in Long Island, in addition to state and national mechanisms. Technical and advisory services today are meant to provide an inroad to that landscape of tools by providing "consultation and strategic guidance for Long Islanders supporting local preservation projects, including historic resources surveys, local landmark designation, National Register listing" in addition to guidance on navigating tax credit programs, local preservation ordinance design guidelines, among other concerns.²²¹ With its organizational focus on advocacy and providing preservation services, certain instances emerged where the organization saw a need for more intensive or focused

²¹⁷ Hardinge Scholle, quoted in: Society for the Preservation of Long Island Antiquities (SPLIA), *History of the Society for the Preservation of Long Island Antiquities, 1948-2012*. Self-published. 2012. Accessed online 02/10/2020 from https://preservationlongisland.org/wp-content/uploads/woocommerce_uploads/2018/10/SPLIA-History-1948-2012-ebook.pdf.

²¹⁸ SPLIA, *History of the Society*, 8.

²¹⁹ SPLIA, *History of the Society*, 13.

²²⁰ SPLIA, *History of the Society*, 13.

²²¹ Preservation Long Island, "Support & Resources," Accessed online March 2020: <https://preservationlongisland.org/services/>

technical and advisory support given an urgency or a particular potential to have an impact. Out of this perceived need, the organization built a red listing program, with a focus on providing operational support. The organization changed its name to Preservation Long Island in 2017.

The Endangered Historic Preservation Program in Practice

Formally established in 2010, Preservation Long Island's biannual *Endangered Historic Places* list, is marketed as a vehicle for raising public awareness and generating support for saving threatened places that may be confronted with demolition, neglect, or development. The program operates through a nomination process whereby selected sites receive "priority access" to the organization's advisory services and are publicized through a variety of outreach activities.²²² Through advising, technical support, and public outreach, the list helps to generate preservation outcomes for historic and cultural sites in Long Island. The program, according to its director, has over the past decade taken up a particular view itself as a vehicle for empowering individuals and communities to engage with heritage and preservation. It does this by providing technical and advisory support, but also through helping the nominator to facilitate community organizing around preservation actions.

Cedarmere, Village of Roslyn Harbor (Listed 2017)

Cedarmere is the nineteenth-century estate of poet William Cullen Bryant, a residence with extensive grounds, landscaping by Frederick Law Olmsted, and gardens that together are said by Preservation Long Island to be "one of most picturesque spots in Nassau County."²²³ The property was gifted in 1975 by Bryant's family to Nassau County for "public recreation and cultural purposes." Beginning in 1994 the home was opened to the public as a museum operated by the nonprofit steward organization Friends of Cedarmere that featured exhibits and offered tours and was host to regular programming. The site was well used by the community and the regular programming at the site well-attended by many accounts. However, in 2009 Nassau County due to financial constraints closed the property to the public and stopped maintaining the site and its grounds, deferring custody by the existing steward group. After years of closure, the County in 2014 leased a single floor of the main house as office space "in exchange for maintenance and renovations to stabilize the structure," on that leased floor.²²⁴ However, the building and the property remained closed to the public.

In 2017, Preservation Long Island listed Cedarmere on its Most Endangered Places. An undisclosed nominator brought the case to the attention of Preservation Long Island, who then began a relationship with the Friends of the Cedarmere steward group. The object of the listing was to use the program's operational support to develop a strategy for negotiating with the county towards regaining public access to the site. A co-equal goal was to use the publicity generated by the listing to provide leverage in negotiating with the county. The site itself was in good condition, so the listing was controversial – the director of the program recognized the nominator's

²²² Society for the Preservation of Long Island Antiquities. 2016. *Preservation Notes*. Newsletter Vol. LI, Nos. 1 and 2, Fall 2016.

²²³ Preservation Long Island, "Cedarmere, Village of Roslyn Harbor, Nassau County: IMPROVED," Accessed March 2020: <https://preservationlongisland.org/cedarmere-village-of-roslyn-harbor-nassau-county/>

²²⁴ Preservation Long Island, "Cedarmere, Village of Roslyn Harbor, Nassau County: IMPROVED," Accessed March 2020: <https://preservationlongisland.org/cedarmere-village-of-roslyn-harbor-nassau-county/>

expressed understanding that it was public access and heritage practices that were “endangered” by the county's actions. Publicity also brought to the fore a number of other public sites owned by the county that had been shuttered, indicating that this was a “systemic” problem. The Friends of Cedarmere steward group supported by Preservation Long Island mobilized a broader campaign including stakeholders of the other sites to lobby the county for reopening, but particularly through a revision to a Hotel & Motel Occupancy Tax to provide dedicated funding to Nassau County heritage sites. In 2018, the Friends of Cedarmere were able to lease the ground two floors of the site, but are today still seeking a long-term custodial agreement. The revision to the Hotel & Motel Occupancy tax is still pending.

Synthesis and Conclusions: Endangerment, Policy, and Collective Action

In this concluding chapter, we return to some of the key questions that framed the thesis from the outset. With an understanding that heritage endangerment listing is both an understudied facet of the preservation field and an inroad to better understanding of how heritage endangerment “works” for people, institutions, and communities, the three preceding chapters have sought to produce a more complete portrait of heritage red listing as it is commonly found across preservation today. Towards representing that new understanding, case study evidence is synthesized along three lines: defining the “common” heritage red list as a policy tool; characterizing that policy tool through its operations, intentions, and key actors; and illustrating some of the ways that the tool is put to use in practice. In Chapter 1 and Chapter 2, the red list policy tool’s potential to facilitate collective action and meaningful negotiation among actors emerged as key points of interest in light of recent scholarly criticism. As a result, this chapter foregrounds these notions in our consideration of the policy tool, leading to a reconsideration of the concept of heritage endangerment as informed by our view of the heritage red list.

Defining the Heritage Red List as a Policy Tool

History shows us that the heritage endangerment list was conceived as a tool of public policy. In each of the three cases reviewed in the preceding chapters, endangerment lists were devised by institutions whose programming was intended to fulfill a public need seen as unmet by government. The National Trust for Historic Preservation launched its endangerment list in 1988 in response to a perceived failure of government to uphold its responsibility to safeguard national heritage against threats posed by development nationwide; instead of relying on federal policy to deliver preservation as a public service, the list was a tool for galvanizing action across publics and sectors by raising awareness and rallying resources. The World Monuments Fund, an organization founded with the mission to uphold an international responsibility to safeguard “world heritage” in absence of an intergovernmental mechanism, created its own red list in 1995 to realize preservation for endangered sites of international significance beyond the UNESCO frame. And Preservation Long Island, an institution established to facilitate preservation regionally prior to the advent of national or local heritage legislation, launched its red listing program in the 2000s as a way to help citizens and community groups find and mobilize tools of preservation action within an increasingly-complex government policy landscape.

In Chapter 2, the case of the UNESCO List of World Heritage in Danger demonstrated how that foundational heritage endangerment list also was devised as a policy instrument – one specifically intended to galvanize international collaboration and pool resources for large-scale preservation actions. Indeed, that example has been the focus of past research into heritage endangerment listing. But the three case studies explored in this thesis represent a way of constructing public policy that differs from the List in Danger in important ways, even as key similarities remain. The List in Danger was part of an intergovernmental initiative that sought to meet emerging notions of international heritage stewardship through the collective action of state parties within a formal framework of recognized World Heritage sites. But in contrast, the heritage red list model that proliferated after 1972 was taken up specifically by nongovernmental nonprofits who sought to realize preservation for a given constituency (eg. an international community, nation, region, or

locale) by facilitating collective actions among public participants who were both integral to identifying public needs and delivering preservation as a public service.

Our recognition in Chapter 2 that there was an important difference between the List of World Heritage in Danger and other heritage red lists—marked by the presence of a public call for nominations—is now more readily contextualized from the policy perspective. The emergence of endangerment as a central concept in the heritage fields, as argued in Chapters 1 and 2, was tied to the institutionalization of heritage preservation and related policy instruments that used threat as a rationale for public action in and around the second half of the twentieth century. This has now been illustrated not only through (intra)governmental examples (eg. 1966 NHPA and 1972 World Heritage Convention), but also through the establishment of nongovernmental nonprofits like the International Fund for Monuments (1965), the National Trust for Historic Preservation (1949), and the Society for the Preservation of Long Island Antiquities (SPLIA) (1948) that justified their organization by way of “heritage at risk.” These organizations developed endangerment-oriented programming like SPLIA’s “Committees on Buildings to Save” (1955) and the National Trust’s “Endangered Properties Fund” (1979) in order to bring resources to bear on preservation projects collectively after their initial founding. However, the endangerment list as a tool of institutional policy was only popularized later on.

With the List of World Heritage in Danger representing both the origin of the concept and the exception to the rule, the heritage endangerment list model most commonly found across preservation today emerged in tandem, if not as part of, a broader shift in ways of doing public policy writ large. As briefly noted in Chapter 2, scholarship has identified the rise of what has been called the “new public governance” and the “new tools of public action”: a paradigm of governing and conducting public policy that materialized in the late twentieth century, and that is characterized by “third sector” (ie. nongovernmental nonprofit) provision of public services. Writing on this shift in governance, Lester Salamon found that in practice the emergence of this model typically looked like “private institutions... taking the initiative... rather than waiting for the government to act” – something familiar to our own discussions.²²⁵ But moreover, such initiatives required new ways of realizing public services that gave shape to a particular kind of participatory policy instrument. Surely, with our view of the heritage red list policy tool now largely established through case studies, by understanding how these “new tools of public action” are defined, we might tie the emergence of the tool more concretely to a broader process of governance and policy change.

By Lester Salamon’s definition, echoed by others writing on the subject,²²⁶ a “tool of public action” in accordance with this governance shift “is an identifiable method through which collective action is structured to address a public problem.”²²⁷ In absence of government, such third sector tools of public policy rely on networks of interdependent actors to allocate resources and deliver public services, making public participation and collective action elemental to their operation. Public participants making up the “policy network” are also critical to identifying public needs as part of effectuating and legitimizing the policy tool. This structuring effectively institutionalizes the actor relationships that the tool fosters, defines who is involved in the operation of the public program,

²²⁵ Lester M. Salamon, “The New Governance and the Tools of Public Action: An Introduction,” in *The Tools of Government: A Guide to the New Governance*, ed. Lester M. Salamon (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002): 2-3.

²²⁶ For example, see also: Stephen P. Osborne, “Introduction: The (New) Public Governance: A Suitable Case for Treatment?,” in *The New Public Governance?: Emerging Perspectives on the Theory and Practice of Public Governance*, ed. Stephen P. Osborne (London: Routledge, 2010): 9.

²²⁷ Salamon, “The New Governance,” 21.

what their roles are, and how they relate, shaping how policy implementation ultimately occurs.²²⁸ By comparison, the case studies in the preceding chapters have led us on our own to an understanding of the key process that structure the red list policy tool in practice (as explored in greater detail in the following section) and confirmed the critical role of collective action among networked actors in identifying public needs, allocating resources, and producing outcomes. Certainly, the red listing programs that proliferated among nonprofits after 1972 fit within this particular framework.

Recognizing that the “common” heritage endangerment listing program found across preservation today is representative of this particular late-twentieth century mode of third sector governance and public policy is useful in that it allows us to further define the red list policy tool. But it is also particularly useful because the literature on “the tools of public action” also corroborates and helps us to tease out nascent ideas in our analysis about how heritage endangerment listing “works” – at least in theory. This literature, which is largely concerned with developing an understanding of how such third sector policy tools operate towards practical application, has focused on how collective action is realized within dispersed and heterogenous “policy networks” of interdependent actors. An emerging point is that such action can only occur when there is *consensus* within the network, and thus an agreement to act. How this comes to occur is critical, and a defining part of the tool: Salamon has argued that “given the pervasive interdependence that characterizes such networks, no entity... is in a position to enforce its will on the others over the long run. Under these circumstances *negotiation and persuasion* replace command and control as the preferred approach, not only in the setting of policy but in carrying it out [emphasis original].”²²⁹ Stephen Osborne has added to this idea that negotiation here should not be understood superficially – in fact, such policy tools necessarily facilitate the negotiation of values, relationships, and the meaning of the policy itself.²³⁰

These ideas about the inherence of collective action, negotiation and consensus building, and now *persuasion* that emerge from the policy literature have important bearing on our continuing analysis of the red list policy tool. Indeed, as will be discussed in closing, these ideas also have important bearing on our understanding of heritage endangerment writ large. Still, in applying this framework we have essentially only injected a useful theory of how our subject functions. Towards grounding our discussion again in the evidence gathered from heritage red lists in operation today, we’ll return to the project of characterizing the red list policy tool and its uses in practice.

Characterizing the Policy Tool and its Uses

With an understanding that existing analyzes of the List of World Heritage in Danger could not offer a complete picture of heritage red listing as found across preservation, a guiding question for the thesis emerged: What characterizes the “common” red list policy tool? The three case studies reviewed—each representing a different scale of red list operation—were meant to provide a representative view of the tool and its operations in practice. Despite clear differences in each case, the three listing programs all are characterized by a common operating structure and functionality, which can provide a framework for understanding the tool across contexts.

As has been underscored across the thesis, a heritage endangerment list is a central piece of a broader institutional program. While such lists are typically generated along annual or biannual

²²⁸ Salamon, “The New Governance,” 19.

²²⁹ Salamon, “The New Governance,” 19.

²³⁰ Osborne, “The (New) Public Governance,” 10.

cycles, following the program's initial conception its structure is unchanged, with core operational phases reiterated across each cycle. As first articulated in Chapter 3, the red list policy tool thus can be understood in terms of an operating framework that follows from program conception across each cycle. That operational framework comprises: **program advertising and soliciting applications; application evaluation and selection; publication and publicity; operational support; and program evaluation and recalibration.** These phases play out differently for different institutions: The National Trust operates a red listing program that puts most of its energy into publication and publicity; Preservation Long Island is geared almost entirely towards providing operational support; and the World Monuments Fund has undertaken the most regularized program evaluation and recalibration. Still, these phases tend to incorporate similar sets of actors, utilize different processes, and "structure" collective action to similar effects. Moreover, similar concerns about equitable processes have also emerged across cases at similar phases.

Red listing programs invariably utilize an open call for nominations to source sites and projects to be included on the list. In all three case studies, the nomination instrument is a standard application form that prompts the nominator to describe the site's significance, a proposed preservation project, and why preservation is pressing or opportune. In order to generate nominations, the public must be aware of the program and its open call, requiring program advertising and soliciting applications as a first operational phase. To have legitimacy as a tool of public policy, the institution needs to be able to source nominations that are representative of its constituency. However, what's clear in every case reviewed is that advertising and solicitation takes place through established networks of institutional affiliates (often professional in nature) and in ways (eg. using a single-language application) that construct a policy constituency largely in the image of the institution itself. Once nominations have been sourced from the public, the program turns to application evaluation and list selection, wherein some program staff or affiliates undertake an initial evaluation before the culled nomination pool moves to a dedicated selection panel or committee for final choice. Legitimacy is also a concern at this phase and some programs choose to use the opportunity to bring outside experts into the policy network (eg. WMF Watch and ICOMOS). Selection is often intertwined with some curatorial intent on the part of the institution that may wish to construct a list that speaks to a certain agenda, that has particular media appeal, or that plays sites' public recognition off of each other to achieve distributed impacts.

A critical point for the program and its network of participants is the list's publication and publicity, which moves site listings—and with them notions of value, endangerment, and action-potential—into the public view. The most significant revelation to emerge from the case studies regarding this phase is that in all cases publicity relies to a notable extent on endangerment rhetoric and ideas of loss in communicating the list to the public – this is the case regardless of whether or not the program itself employs notions of endangerment in its instruments of list development (ie. WMF Watch). Some programs wield risk rhetoric to the point of overt public manipulation, as seen through the National Trust's how-to guide for endangerment listing. In other cases, the public attribution of endangerment alone is seen as enough to operationalize the list by raising public awareness and galvanizing resources (eg. PLI). Following and concurrent to list publication and publicity is the directing institution's provision of operational support to the nominator, often in the form of advising or collaborating in action-plan development and implementation. Operational support is often conceptualized differently and given different emphasis. Preservation Long Island sees operational support as a means of empowering people and communities to undertake their own preservation actions. World Monuments Fund undertakes operational support jointly in collaboration and partnership with heritage stakeholders communities. And the National Trust finds operational support largely to be an extension of the publicity phase.

The final phase of program evaluation and recalibration emerges from the case studies as the most enigmatic and perhaps most consequential phases of the tool from the policy perspective. Identified first through the case World Monuments Watch, program evaluation and recalibration in that context demonstrated that the Watch had shifted aspects of its operations based on the nominations that it had received, which in turn were informed by broader shifts in the heritage fields. In probing that case, questions emerge about the institution's intent: was the organization acting reactively, or were its recalibrations iterative, revising to meet emerging public values and needs? The other lists, while confirming that recalibration was in fact a phase across cases, presented only minor changes by comparison, which appear more clearly to reflect changes in the field or changing institutional interests. In our awareness of the red listing program as a public policy tool, the variability of this operational phase across cases is a potential point of dissonance between how the tool works in theory and how it works in practice. In accordance with Osborne's view of third sector governance, the policy network is always undergoing negotiation not only of how services are delivered, but also the meaning of the policy itself. World Monuments Fund appears in retrospect to be fulfilling its role as the network facilitator to some degree – and one of the changes in policy meaning it has reproduced by way of the policy network is that heritage endangerment is not the sole public problem to be met in the provision of preservation as a public service. Still, this has not meant total dissolution of endangerment, as it still seems to emerge regularly out of the nomination pool.

In sum, the operational framework allows us to characterize the structure of the common red list policy tool across each cycle. Still, the structured operations are only one part of the bigger picture. Central to our inquiry are also questions about how the tool is *used* in practice. This can be understood specifically in relation to how institutions and nominators, as two central actors within the policy network, mobilize the tool to achieve effects. Institutions, for example, have aims and uses for their red listing programs which do not necessarily intersect with those of other actors. Across all three case studies, the directing institutions had similar core aims for their programs, which can be understood as characteristic of the policy tool writ large: advocacy; expanding and sustaining networks; agenda- and standard-setting; and education and capacity building. Advocacy extends beyond for the preservation of listed sites to advocacy for preservation itself. One prominent expression of this kind of advocacy is an institution's use of the red list as a platform for advocating changes to government heritage policy, something we've seen in the cases of both the National Trust and Preservation Long Island. In addition to advocacy, red listing programs are a way for institutions to expand and sustain their constituencies and their resource networks. Networks are critical to operating the red listing program, but also for expanding the institutions reach and influence. The National Trust has used the publicity its red list generates to build its membership, while World Monuments Fund has used the list's evaluation process as a way of building a relationship with the expert body ICOMOS for mutual benefit. Both the National Trust and WMF have also used the red list to sustain relationships with major corporate sponsors and other donors.

Beyond advocacy and network expansion, the directing institution also uses its red list to set agendas for the field and standards for practice. Public lists provide a platform from which institutions can elevate particular issues of concern. All three red listing programs reviewed have made use of thematic nominations or thematic list cycles to that end. Red list programs also set standards for how preservation is done by promoting particular kinds of interventions by listing certain proposed projects or by employing certain techniques in carrying out a project through the program. World Monuments Fund also serves as an example of how an organization might set standards by introducing new concepts to its framework for list development, like its 2020 focus on driving “social inclusion” and “community resilience” through preservation. Finally, red listing programs also serve as a way for institutions to build capacities and educate. The National Trust

and World Monuments Fund both place emphasis on the list as a tool for educating the public about cultural heritage. Part of Preservation Long Island's mission for its program is to extend the reach of its technical and advisory support in order to build capacities and thus empower communities to engage with preservation on their own.

We've also seen that the ability to "use" a red listing program is not restricted to its directing institution. Because the content of these lists ultimately originates with public nominators, a range of parties beyond the institution mobilize the policy tool to achieve outcomes in practice. Nominators vary in each case across each list cycle. As reviewed through the Watch program in Chapter 3, nominators are often nonprofits, experts, governments, community groups, and citizens. This spread is common also across the two other programs reviewed. How lists are mobilized by these nominators also varies case to case, and with some different uses being informed by the scale of the red listing program. Towards a better understanding of how such lists were being used by publics outside of the directing institution, this thesis reviewed particular instances. In the case of Mind's Eye, listed by the World Monuments Watch in 2012, we saw a nominator use the list to leverage international recognition and public opinion towards gaining access to new resources – specifically, resources that had been withheld because of a disagreement between the community and the national government about the national cultural significance of the site and the value of its preservation project. In this case, the listing gave the nominator leverage in ongoing negotiations about the site and thus about a community's assertion of a cultural identity.

In the case of Cedarmere, included in Preservation Long Island's Endangered Historic Places program in 2017, a community used that listing program as a way to assert its right to access a public heritage site that had been closed to the public by its owner, the county government, years prior. The listing raised eyebrows within the Long Island preservation community, since the site was not "at risk" in a traditional sense. But the listing served the nominator as a way to access advisory support towards negotiating an agreement with the county, and to realize publicity that could add additional leverage in those negotiations. In the wake of the listing, the project revealed that county closures of heritage sites were a more widespread issue, leading to a grassroots campaign for policy change that could reopen sites. Beyond Cedarmere, we've also caught a glimpse through the case study of a number of other uses of the policy tool. Some included on the World Monuments Watch in particular are not tied to notions of endangerment at all, but instead reflect a 'timely opportunities for preservation to contribute to social, environment, or other community or public aims.

Unpacking the Red List

Regardless of the particular "use" of an endangerment list, what is clearly recognizable through the cases explored is that the red list policy tool functions as a vehicle for negotiation and consensus-building around issues involving heritage that are seen as urgent or timely. As we've seen through both our discussion of "third sector" tools of public policy and our review of red lists in practice, this is true *necessarily* because red listing programs only function by engaging networks of interrelated actors and realizing actions on a collective basis. To ground this point in

the previous discussion of list uses, that red lists are vehicles of negotiation and consensus is particularly clear with regards to nominators engaging a red listing program: For example, a nominator may identify an endangered site for potential listing with the goal of gaining access to or leveraging resources to some end. But in all cases, outcomes are achieved only if consensus is reached—first among institutional actors, then among potential public contributors—that a site and its proposal warrant attention, resources, and timely action. Within this process, the negotiation of heritage value, endangerment, and the validity of interventions is implicit, and is facilitated both within the listing program and by way of the public listing.

While a nominator's use of the red list achieving intended effects requires that consensus is reached about the value of a site and project within the program's directing institution, this process can also be seen to happen, as it were, in reverse. With its own uses for the red listing program, the operating institution ultimately relies on the same network of interrelated actors in order to achieve outcomes in practice through the policy tool – actors that only participate in the program if they see it as having value. By this understanding, the institution's solicitation of diverse public nominations and fruitful partnerships with nominators and communities, for example, become a critical part of its ability to sustain the red listing program and to meet its own goals. This is true not just because the institution needs site nominators to value the program, but also because its ability to identify endangered sites and to facilitate preservation in partnership with nominators and community stakeholders is critical to other actor's (eg. the general public and sponsors) investment, and thus ongoing participation, in the program. In this sense, the negotiation and consensus building that the red list facilitates can be seen to go both ways.

The institution/nominator binary constructed here and utilized across the thesis, however, is somewhat antithetical to the red list policy tool in our understanding. As we've seen, but explored to a lesser extent, a range of other actors are also part of any red listing program's policy network, and include members of the general public, sponsors, preservation professionals, and members of the media, among others. As participants, these actors are also integral to how listing and its effects unfold – and from the policy perspective, how preservation is delivered as a public service. These actors have their own reasons for participating, and as participants they also are part of the negotiation and consensus-building intrinsic to red listing.

Nevertheless, the idea that negotiation happens in all directions and with equal weight suggests a vision of nonprofit programming that is somewhat detached from reality. Surely, the extent to which networked actors wield power and have agency to negotiate at different phases of the tool's operation varies in practice. Writing on the tools of public action, Salamon recognizes this as a characteristic trait of third sector policy instruments, which he called "asymmetric interdependencies."²³¹ Osborne similarly observed that "policy networks are rarely alliances of equals but are rather riven with power inequalities."²³² These power inequalities are also material in our own case studies, typically recognizable around the influence of the institution. For example, the power of the directing institution over the list selection process might go so far as to negate the agency of other actors involved in selection, as seen through the National Trust's suggestion in the red listing how-to manual that an institution might choose to override its own external selection committee to replace ("slip in") nominations after the list was selected. In other

²³¹ Lester M. Salamon, "The New Governance and the Tools of Public Action: An Introduction," in *The Tools of Government: A Guide to the New Governance*, ed. Lester M. Salamon (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002): 2-3.

²³² Stephen P. Osborne, "Introduction: The (New) Public Governance: A Suitable Case for Treatment?," in *The New Public Governance?: Emerging Perspectives on the Theory and Practice of Public Governance*, ed. Stephen P. Osborne (London: Routledge, 2010): 9.

cases power inequalities can be less explicit, as with the World Monuments Watch, where the institution goes to lengths to bring in outside experts to ensure a more equitable process, but sets the terms of negotiation by providing parameters for evaluation and selection.

While these kinds of dynamics play out between the institution and a variety of other actors in the policy network, potential inequity often seems to exist most often between the institution and the nominator – and in this sense, the binary is real. Whether expressed through the nomination solicitation phase wherein nominators (and potential nominators) appear beholden to the institution’s operating frame, or during the operational support phase wherein collaboration might appear set in on the institutions terms, the institution’s interests and the nominator’s interests suggest the potential for conflict more than between any other actors. Nevertheless, issues of “asymmetric interdependence” can also play out within the policy network through groups of actors that share similar values or visions of policy meaning, which may not be shared across the policy network. Indeed, in this particular formulation we’re prompted to consider familiar criticisms within the heritage context.

Heritage red listing programs, operated from within institutions for preservation, rely to a large extent on professional and expert judgements to build the lists they present to the public. Moreover, these lists are framed specifically in terms of their value to an envisioned heritage community (ie. “international stewardship of world heritage,” “national heritage,” “Long Island’s heritage,” etc). Both of these facts suggest that heritage endangerment lists might necessarily reproduce dominant ways of understanding and doing heritage and preservation. For example, it could be argued that red lists reflect dominant conceptions of heritage – and especially so given that these lists rely on notions of “heritage at risk,” which inevitably privileges materiality to the exclusion of other kinds of heritage. Evidence for this argument can be collected from across past World Monuments Watch catalogs, National Trust press releases, and from Preservation Long Island’s website. Surely, it’s the case that most sites that end up being included in these programs do not diverge from familiar and comfortable visions of what constitutes heritage. Nevertheless, that this inherent to the tool is less certain. And as we’ve seen through our case studies, the example of Mind’s Eye in fact provides some counterevidence. While that site was recognized as heritage by members of its local community, the former home of visionary artist Gladwyn Bush did not sit comfortably with the national government’s vision of national heritage. In that case, while the value of the site as heritage was contested, endangerment became a point of consensus around the value of that heritage place, first by the committee of the World Monuments Watch, and then recognized by the Cayman national government. This case suggests that because red listing programs receive public nominations there remains the potential for heritage value to be negotiated through the list program, which in turn can establish recognition for a place of contested value that can build further consensus around its value.

It could also be said that red lists also reflect the dominant politics of heritage, and that as a result these programs restrict the types of actions that people and communities can take who seek to use heritage to do certain kinds of social, cultural, and political work. Clearly, our case studies have provided some evidence to this point as well. Returning to the *Threatened Treasures* guide to endangerment listing, the National Trust implored preservation organizations to develop processes for evaluating all possible political ramifications of red listing a potentially controversial site before making a selection, even suggesting that they make a practice of reaching out to state and local government officials during the selection process to check against any negative political consequences. But again, a case study reveals a counterpoint. Preservation Long Island has in recent years has defined its endangerment listing program as a vehicle for civic empowerment, and has not shied away from political projects where there is a community of support. Even in the case of Cedermare, the Preservation Long Island program became a way to galvanize grass roots

action to assert a right to public access where it had been denied by the government, representing in at least some form the use of the tool to build political agency in negotiations with authority. Indeed, to the last prompt, this case also demonstrates how the notion of risk and loss for heritage may not necessarily be tied within such contexts to materiality, but can also reflect a community's ideas about valued heritage practices.

Regarding these potential lines of criticism, it is clear that there is sufficient evidence to make the case that heritage red lists reproduce dominant ways of understanding and using heritage. And given that they tend to operate in relation to notions of urgency, their priority-setting and accumulation of scarce resources within this dominant frame makes them particularly egregious offenders. Still, through our exploration of the red list as an institutional program and public policy tool, we seem to have come upon another way of framing these criticisms. As a dynamic public policy tool, the heritage red list is not intrinsically bound to one vision of heritage or another, or one politics of heritage or another. Nor is the tool used unilaterally to achieve outcomes in practice. As we've seen both through analysis of public policy and in our own case studies, because these tools are structured and operate only through collective action, negotiation and consensus building are inherent across the processes of the listing program.

Conclusions: What Does This Mean for “Endangerment”?

The premise of the thesis is that heritage red lists can help us to better understand "endangerment" and the work it does for people, institutions, and communities by way of heritage. We began with a growing body of literature that has taken issue with endangerment conceived as discourse and rhetoric – a literature that recently has called for a reorientation of the heritage fields away from their focus on loss, having found that endangerment conceptualized as discourse and rhetoric tended to reproduced and be reproduced by authority. Moving beyond an analysis of discourse and rhetoric alone, the thesis sought to ground an understanding of how endangerment works in policy and practice, where the concept appeared to operate in more complex ways than previously thought. To this end, the heritage red list offered an inroad for exploring endangerment from the policy perspective.

Through our examination of heritage red listing, and the application of the policy perspective to its analysis, we've come upon a few key realizations regarding this concept at work. We've established, for example, that the notion of heritage endangerment historically is tied to the development of policy tools that used it as a rationale for collective action. In pursuing an understanding of the red list as a policy tool, we've also found that that tool itself is defined by collective action. This recognition has particular bearing on our past analysis, but also our understanding of the concept of heritage endangerment. As noted in Chapter 1, endangerment most often materializes by way of its inclusion on a list. And if we're to understand lists in terms of collective action, then endangerment becomes something largely inseparable from the negotiation and consensus building that takes place among the various actors who thus construct endangerment through a red list. In other words, because collective action can only be realized through consensus, endangerment's ascription within the tool is also predicated on consensus. What we can extrapolate from this understanding is that also beyond the list endangerment functions in relation to negotiation and consensus building – as something that exists and is used by people in practice, perhaps, in relation to building a consensus to act.

With this in mind we might posit that “heritage endangerment” is best understood in terms of its role in negotiation, consensus building, and collective action – indeed, as something that exists,

and thus can be utilized, primarily in relation to consensus and negotiation among actors. We could say, for example, that heritage endangerment constitutes a kind of Foucauldian “transactional reality” – something that is not a “natural-historical given,” but that emerges out of negotiation among actors, and within hierarchies of power, and which have material effects. For Foucault, transactional realities, “like civil society, madness, and so on, which although they have not always existed are nonetheless real, are born precisely from the interplay of relations of power and everything which constantly eludes them, at the interfaces, so to speak, of governors and governed.”²³³ Surely, to invoke this particular terminology at this stage introduces an entirely new set of subjects, questions, and lenses for analysis that have gone unexplored in this thesis. But the concept gives language to something that has broadly been revealed through this exploration of heritage endangerment through listing and the policy perspective.

Even as this concept opens up a new frame for analysis, our own understanding of heritage endangerment and its role in endangerment listing leaves a number of important questions also unanswered. Even though we’ve established that the heritage red lists and the concept of heritage endangerment that is at their center are “used” by a range of actors to various ends, we’ve largely looked past the role that endangerment plays as rhetoric in galvanizing emotions – something clearly apparent throughout the case studies. As was explored in Chapter 1, one well-accepted but not well-understood aspect of endangerment is that it has the unique ability to provoke an emotional response and simultaneously inspire an urge to preserve.²³⁴ Within our view of heritage red listing, these persuasive emotional capacities of endangerment are extended to the whole range of actors within the policy frame who seek to mobilize it. But to what extent might endangerment be, in this sense, “rigging” consensus just by using the tool? Still, a better understanding of heritage endangerment, and particularly an understanding of how its affective registers might interface with or influence how processes of consensus building happens, is a necessity for considering further the operation and effects of heritage red lists as tools of policy and collective action.

²³³ Foucault, Michel. *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978–1979*. New York: Picador, 2010.

²³⁴ Vidal and Dias, “The Endangerment Sensibility,” 2.

Bibliography

Batisse, Michel and Gerald Bolla. *The Invention of World Heritage*. Paris: Association of Former UNESCO Staff Members, 2005.

Baillie, Jonathan and Brian Goombridge, eds., *1996 IUCN Red List of Threatened Animals*. The IUCN Species Survival Commission, Intro, 10. Accessible online from IUCN: <https://portals.iucn.org/library/sites/library/files/documents/RL-1996-001.pdf>

Beck, Ulrich. *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*. London: Sage Publications, 1992.

Beck, Ulrich. *Ecological Politics in an Age of Risk*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1995.

Bennet, Tony, et. al. *Collecting, Ordering, Governing: Anthropology, Museums, and Liberal Government*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2017.

Brendel, Patrick. "Mind's Eye on Global Endangered Sites List," *Cayman Compass*, October 14, 2011. Accessed online from <https://www.caymancompass.com/2011/10/14/minds-eye-on-global-endangered-sites-list/>

Burnham, Bonnie. "What Is a World Monument?" In *World Monuments Fund: The First Thirty Years*, World Monuments Fund, 1996.

Burnham, Bonnie and W. L. Lyons Brown. "From the President & Chairman." In *World Monuments Watch 2008 List of 100 Most Endangered Sites*, World Monuments Fund, Watch Catalog, 2008.

Collar, N. J. "The reasons for Red Data Books." *Oryx* 20 no. 2 (1996): 121-130.

Congressional Charter of the National Trust for Historic Preservation in the United States. Act of October 26, 1949, P.L. No. 810-408 Stat. 927, as amended. Accessible online from the National Trust: https://nthp-savingplaces.s3.amazonaws.com/2017/09/07/09/19/04/659/NTHP_Charter_2015_Recodification.pdf

Braverman, Irus. "Anticipating Endangerment: The Biopolitics of Threatened Species Lists." *BioSocieties* 12 no. 1 (2017).

Braverman, Irus. "En-listing life: Red is the color of threatened species lists," in *Critical Animal Geographies: Politics, Intersections and Hierarchies in A Multispecies World*, edited by Kathryn Gillespie and Rosemary-Claire Collard. Abingdon: Routledge, 2015.

Brown, Nicholas E., Claudia Liuzza, and Lynn Meskell. "The Politics of Peril: UNESCO's List of World Heritage in Danger." *Journal of Field Archaeology* 44 no. 5 (2019): 287-303.

DeSilvey, Caitlin and Rodney Harrison. "Anticipating Loss: Rethinking Endangerment in Heritage Futures." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 26 no. 4 (2020).

Elliott, Mark. *Philanthropy, Outcomes, & Impact*, Economic Mobility Corporation, November 2019.

Fitter, Richard and Maisie, eds. *The Road to Extinction*. Symposium held by the Species Survival Commission, Madrid 7-9 November 1984. Accessible online from IUCN: <https://portals.iucn.org/library/sites/library/files/documents/1987-001.pdf>

Finley, David E. *History of the National Trust for Historic Preservation*. Washington: National Trust for Historic Preservation, 1965.

Foucault, Michel. *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978–1979*. New York: Picador, 2010.

Fredheim, L. Harald. "Endangerment-Driven Heritage Volunteering: Democratisation or 'Changeless Change.'" *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 24 no. 6 (2018): 619-633.

Gray, James A. "Working to Preserve Mankind's Heritage." *New York Times* (June 13th 1965).

Gilder, Cornelia Brooke, and Jessica Fisher Neidl. *SPLIA The Society for the Preservation of Long Island Antiquities, 1948–2012*. Edited by Diana S. Waite. Cold Spring harbor, NY: The Society for the Preservation of Long Island Antiquities, 2012.

Gonzalez, David. "Cayman Woman Paints Visions; the World Sees Art." *New York Times* (February 18, 2002).

Harrison, Rodney. *Heritage: Critical Approaches*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2013.

Harrison, Rodney. "World Heritage listing and the globalization of the endangerment sensibility," in *Endangerment, Biodiversity and Culture*, edited by Fernando Vidal and Nélia Dias, 195-217. Abingdon: Routledge, 2016.

Holtorf, Cornelius. "Why Cultural Heritage Is Not 'At Risk' (In Syria or Anywhere)," 2016. Published online: heritagefortransformation.wordpress.com

Holtorf, Cornelius. "Averting Loss Aversion in Cultural Heritage." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 21 no. 4, 2015: 405-421.

Holtorf, Cornelius. "Is the Past a Non-Renewable Resource?" In *Destruction and Conservation of Cultural Property*, edited by Robert Layton, Julian Thomas, and Peter Stone, 286-297. London: Routledge, 2001.

Holtorf, Cornelius and Oscar Ortman. "Endangerment and Conservation Ethos in Natural and Cultural Heritage: The Case of Zoos and Archaeological Sites." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 14, 2008: 14-90.

Huggan, Graham. "Introduction" in *Perspectives on Endangerment*, edited by Graham Huggan and Stephan Klasen. Hildensheim: George Olms Verlag, 2005.

Humstone, Mary. *Threatened Treasures: Creating Lists of Endangered Historic Places*. Washington D.C.: The National Trust for Historic Preservation, 2001.

International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM). Adopted by the General Conference of the United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization, December 5th, 1956

International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites (The Venice Charter 1964), 2nd International Congress of Architects and Technicians of Historic Monuments. Adopted by ICOMOS, 1964.

ICOMOS (International Council of Monuments and Sites). "Message from the President." ICOMOS News-Letter 1, September 1973.

ICOMOS. "ICOMOS World Report 2000 On Monuments and Sites in Danger," 2000.

ICOMOS, "2020 World Monument Watch nominations - ICOMOS reviewers: call for volunteers," Accessed April 1st 2020: <https://www.icomos.org/en/member-area/57238-2020-world-monument-watch-nominations-icomos-reviewers-call-for-volunteers>

IUCN Standards and Petitions Committee. 2019. Guidelines for Using the IUCN Red List Categories and Criteria. Version 14. Prepared by the Standards and Petitions Committee. Accessible online from IUCN: <http://www.iucnredlist.org/documents/RedListGuidelines.pdf>

Klein, Michael. "Mind's Eye: A tour of Miss Lassie's Home with Henry." Interview with CNCF Artistic Director Henry Muttoo, *The Cayman Island Journal*, June 1st, 2011. Accessed online May 2020 from: <https://www.journal.ky/2011/06/01/minds-eye-a-tour-of-miss-lassies-home-with-henry/>

Levy, Jewel. "Sponsor's Plaque unveiled at Miss Lassie's House," *Cayman Compass*, July 14, 2014. Accessed online March 2020 from: <https://www.caymancompass.com/2014/07/14/sponsors-plaque-unveiled-at-miss-lassies-house/>

Lewis, David A. "Identifying and Avoiding Conflicts Between Historic Preservation and the Development of Renewable Energy." *New York University Environmental Law Journal* 22: 274-360.

Lascoumes, Pierre and Patrick Le Gales. "Introduction: Understanding Public Policy through Its Instruments—From the Nature of Instruments to Sociology of Public Policy Instrumentation." *Governance* 20 no. 1 (2007).

Lowenthal, David. *The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

May, Sarah. "Heritage, Endangerment, and Participation: Alternative Futures in the Lake District." *International Journal of Heritage Studies*. Published online 24 June 2019: 1-16.

Meskell, Lynn. "States of Conservation: Protection, Politics, and Pacting within the UNESCO's World Heritage Committee." *Anthropological Quarterly* 87 no. 1 (2014).

Moe, Richard. "From the President: Landmark List." *Preservation*, 49 no. 4 (1997).

Moe, Richard. Announcement of "Endangered Historic Sites," aired on C-SPAN 2, June 14, 2007. Accessible online from C-SPAN :<https://www.c-span.org/video/?199100-1/endangered-historic-sites>

Münster, Daniel. "Of Spirits and Hybrids: Discourses of Endangerment in Rural South India." In *Perspectives on Endangerment*, edited by Graham Huggan and Stephan Klasen, 110-120. Hildensheim: George Olms Verlag, 2005.

National Council for Historic Council for Historic Sites and Buildings. News Release, October 1947. Accessible online from the National Gallery of Art: https://www.nga.gov/content/dam/ngaweb/research/gallery-archives/PressReleases/1949-1940/1947/14A11_43664_19471020.pdf

National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. Public Law 89-665; 54 U.S.C. 300101.

National Trust for Historic Preservation. "Editorial: Preservation is a National Trust." *Preservation News* 1 (April 1982).

National Trust for Historic Preservation. "Trust launches \$1 million Endangered Buildings Fund." *Preservation News* 19 no. 1 (January 1979).

National Trust for Historic Preservation, "Battle of Manassas Builds" *Preservation News* (April 1988).

National Trust for Historic Preservation, "Va. Developers Victorious in Un-Civil War," *Preservation News* (April 1987).

NTHP, "The Endangered Eleven: Landmarks Near the Edge," *Preservation News* 1 (September 1988).

National Trust For Historic Preservation, "List of Endangered Sites Highlights America's Heritage at Risk: National Trust Sends Wake-up Call to Save America's Treasures on the Eve of the New Millennium," *Preservation Frontline*, June 15th, 1998.

National Trust for Historic Preservation, *America's 11 Most Endangered Historic Places, 2020 Application* (2020). Accessed online April 2020.

National Trust for Historic Preservation. "Apply for 2020 America's 11 Most Endangered Historic Places," Accessed online April 2020 from: <https://savingplaces.org/11-most-nominations>

National Trust for Historic Preservation. *2010 America's 11 Most Endangered Historic Places Nomination Questions* (2010).

Osborne, Stephen P. "Introduction: The (New) Public Governance: A Suitable Case for Treatment?" In *The New Public Governance?: Emerging Perspectives on the Theory and Practice of Public Governance*. Edited by Stephen P. Osborne. London: Routledge, 2010.

Perry, Marilyn. "A Salute from the Chairman." In *World Monuments Watch 100 Most Endangered Sites 1996*, World Monuments Fund, Watch Catalog, 1996.

Perry, Marilyn. "Dimensions of Success: From the Chairman." In *World Monuments Watch One Hundred Most Endangered Sites 2000*. World Monuments Fund, Watch Catalog, 1999.

Perry, Marilyn. "From the Chairman." In *World Monuments Watch 100 Most Endangered Sites 1998-1999*, World Monuments Fund, Watch Catalog, 1997.

Preservation Long Island. "Cedarmere, Village of Roslyn Harbor, Nassau County IMPROVED." Preservation Long Island, November 20, 2018. <https://preservationlongisland.org/cedarmere-village-of-roslyn-harbor-nassau-county/>.

Qqola, Pumla Dineo. "A Question of Semantics? On Not Calling People 'Endangered.'" In *Perspectives on Endangerment*, edited by Graham Huggan and Stephan Klasen, 51-61. Hildensheim: George Olms Verlag, 2005.

Rico, Trinidad. "Heritage at Risk: The Authority and Autonomy of a Dominant Preservation Framework." In *Heritage Keywords: Rhetoric and Redescription in Cultural Heritage*, edited by Kathryn Lafrenz Samuels and Trinidad Rico, 147-162. Boulder: University of Colorado Press, 2015.

Rico, Trinidad. "The Limits of a Heritage at Risk Framework: The Construction of Disaster Cultural Heritage in Banda Aceh, Indonesia." *Journal of Social Archaeology* 14 no. 2 (2010): 157-176.

Rodrigues, Ana S. L. et al., "The value of the IUCN Red List for Conservation." *TRENDS in Ecology and Evolution* 21 no. 2 (2006): 71-76.

Salamon, Lester M. "The New Governance and the Tools of Public Action: An Introduction." In *The Tools of Government: A Guide to the New Governance*, edited by Lester M. Salamon. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Schmeisser, Iris. "'Mission Civilisatrice', Endangerment and Colonial Art in Paris in the Era of Modernism." In *Perspectives on Endangerment*, edited by Graham Huggan and Stephan Klasen, 161-171. Hildensheim: George Olms Verlag, 2005.

Schuster, J. Mark. "Making a List and Checking it Twice: The List as a Tool of Historic Preservation." Harris School of Public Policy: University of Chicago, Working Paper, 2003.

Schuster, J. Mark. "Information as a Tool of Preservation Action." In *Preserving the Built Heritage*. Edited by J. Mark Schuster with John de Monchaux and Charles A. Riley II. Hanover: University Press of New England, 1997.

Smith, Laurajane. *Uses of Heritage*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2006.

Smith, Laurajane. "Class, Heritage and the Negotiation of Place." Conference paper presented to the 'Missing Out on Heritage: Socio-Economic Status and Heritage Participation' Conference, English Heritage, March 2009.

Society for the Preservation of Long Island Antiquities. 2016. "Preservation Notes" Newsletter Vol. LI, Nos. 1 and 2, Fall 2016.

"Support & Resources." Preservation Long Island, March 2020.
<https://preservationlongisland.org/services/>.

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). *Convention Concerning Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage*, Adopted by the General Conference at its seventeenth session, Paris, 16 November 1972.

UNESCO, "Report of the Rapporteur, World Heritage Committee, Sixth Session, Paris 13-17 December 1982," CLT-82/CH/CONF.015/8. Annex II. 3.1. 1982. Accessible online from UNESCO:
<https://whc.unesco.org/archive/1982/clt-82-conf015-8e.pdf>.

Vidal, Fernando and Nélia Dias. "The Endangerment Sensibility." In *Endangerment, Biodiversity and Culture*, edited by Fernando Vidal and Nélia Dias. Abingdon: Routledge, 2016.

Walter, J. Jackson. *Manassas National Battlefield Park Amendments of 1988*, Hearing Before the Subcommittee on Public Lands, National Parks and Forests, One Hundredth Congress, Second Session on H.R.4526. September 8, 1988. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1989.

World Monuments Fund, "The World Monuments Watch: A Beacon for Heritage,"
<https://www.wmf.org/watch> (Accessed April 14, 2020).

World Monuments Fund. "2018 World Monuments Watch Nomination Guidelines," 2018.

World Monuments Fund, *Milestones: The Newsletter of the World Monuments Fund* (Fall 1995). Accessible online from World Monuments Fund:
https://www.wmf.org/sites/default/files/article/pdfs/Milestones_1995_Fall.pdf

World Monuments Fund, *Milestones: The Newsletter of the World Monuments Fund* (Winter 1996-1997). Accessible online from World Monuments Fund:
https://www.wmf.org/sites/default/files/article/pdfs/Milestones_1996_1997_Winter.pdf
World Monuments Fund, *2010 World Monuments Watch*, Watch Catalog (2010).

World Monuments Fund, *World Monuments Watch 100 Most Endangered Sites 1996*, Watch Catalog (1996).

World Monuments Fund, World Monuments Watch Nomination Guidelines 2002.

World Monuments Fund, *1997 Annual Report, Milestones: The Newsletter of The World Monuments Fund* (1997).

World Monuments Fund, *World Monuments Watch One Hundred Most Endangered Sites 2000*, Watch Catalog (2000).

World Monuments Fund, *World Monuments Watch 2004 100 Most Endangered Sites*, Watch Catalog (2004).

World Monuments Fund, *ICON World Monuments: Special Issue World Monuments Watch 100 Most Endangered Sites 2006*, Watch Catalog (2005): 15.

World Monuments Fund, *2010 World Monuments Watch*, Watch Catalog (2010).

World Monuments Fund, 2020 World Monuments Watch Nomination Form (2020).

World Monuments Fund, *World Monuments Watch*, *Watch Magazine* (2020).

World Monuments Fund, *World Monuments Watch Nomination Guidelines 2004* (2004).

World Monuments Fund, *2010 World Monuments Watch*, Watch Catalog (2010): 2.

World Monuments Fund, *World Monuments Watch One Hundred Most Endangered Sites 2000*, Watch Catalog (1999): 7.

World Monuments Fund, "World Monuments Fund Announces 2020 World Monuments Watch," (October 29, 2019). Press Release. Accessible online from World Monuments Fund: https://www.wmf.org/sites/default/files/press_releases/pdfs/2020_world_monuments_watch_press_release.pdf.

World Monuments Fund, *2010 World Monuments Watch*, Watch Catalog (2010): 4.

World Monuments Fund, *2012 World Monuments Watch*, Watch Catalog (2012): 8.

World Monuments Fund, "World Monuments Fund Announces 2012 Watch, Encompassing 67 Threatened Cultural-Heritage Sites Across the Globe," Press Release, October 5, 2011.

"Protecting Miss Lassie's House," *Cayman Compass*, July 13, 2007. Accessed online April 2020 from: <https://www.caymancompass.com/2007/07/13/protecting-miss-lassie-s-house/>

"Work presses on to preserve Miss Lassie's House," *Cayman News*, November 24, 2009. Comment by Henry Muttoo, November 25, 2009. Accessed online April 2020 from <http://archive.caymannewsservice.com/2009/11/24/work-presses-on-to-preserve-miss-lassie-s-house/>

"Miss Lassie's House Put on International List," *Cayman iNews*, October 14, 2011. Accessed online April 2020 from: <https://www.ienews.com/miss-lassie%E2%80%99s-house-put-on-international-list/>

"Dart helps Miss Lassie's House," *Cayman Compass*, May 19, 2009. Accessed online April 2020 from <https://www.caymancompass.com/2009/05/19/dart-helps-miss-lassie-s-house/>

"CNCF Miss Lassie's House Painting Conservation," Interview with Henry Muttoo, CIG Television, Uploaded to Youtube January 15, 2013. Accessed online March 2020 from: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tx9I1DAApdA>

"Mind's Eye - Two Sides to the Story," No Big Ting Cayman, Accessed online March 2020 from: <http://www.nobigtingcayman.com/minds-eye-two-sides-to-the-story/>

"Sites on the 2007 list of most-endangered historic places designated by the National Trust for Historic Preservation," *New York Times* (June 13th, 2007).

