

212 STATE GOVERNMENT • SUMMER, 1965

years, and it operates today on a modest annual budget of approximately \$170,000, or \$3,400 for each of the fifty states. (For \$3,387.52 the New Haven, Connecticut, Preservation Trust recently conducted an inventory which identified 750 buildings, and from these selected 150 New Haven landmarks.) An HABS request for a budgetary increase to \$260,000 has been made since 1960 but this has never been allocated. Because of the lack of funds HABS is reduced principally to giving advice and aids to others undertaking surveys, keeping records, and assigning several summer measuring teams to areas and buildings of national importance.

STATE-LOCAL-PRIVATE TASKS

This highly regarded federal program, in my view, should be strongly augmented financially. But to achieve the needed goal—surveying of all historic American buildings—the task will have to be divided with the states. I would suggest that the states investigate the technique developed over the past thirty years in the federal work, for use on the state level. After evaluating the needs, each state should initiate, reactivate or extend a state survey program, delegate an appropriate agency within its system to take the responsibility, and coordinate and direct related private programs.

In 1964 the state-financed Maryland Historical Trust and the Association for Historical Societies of Maryland asked for HABS assistance to develop a comprehensive program in the state and coordinate county projects. HABS cosponsored an especially arranged workshop—"A Survey of Historic Maryland Buildings and Sites;" two HABS staff members spoke at the conference. They presented a list of all Maryland buildings already recorded and surveyed, displayed a selected photographic exhibition, distributed survey forms, bibliographies, manuals, etc. Similar assistance is being given to the newly organized Massachusetts Historical Commission and to all states requesting such aid.

States should share the financial burden of the surveys and induce the counties to participate with matching funds in order to undertake programs and complete others. A dramatic illustration of the need is a New York City sur-

vey. When this six-year project was concluded in 1957, with 300 buildings designated worthy of preservation in the city's five boroughs, it was also noted that nearly a third of the buildings scheduled for the listing had been torn down while the survey was being made. After three years of study, New York City adopted preservation measures this spring, but during this period, as one summary put it, "her buildings continued to fall like leaves."

Public funds effectively managed will generate several times the appropriated amounts in new private support, as they have done in business, science and agriculture. Just as private and public support exists for libraries, health services, education, scientific research and the performing arts, it is appropriate that public support be available for the preserving arts—broadly known as historic preservation.

Many groups and individuals are available to assist in such work, and many have conducted surveys—historical societies, preservation groups, universities, the American Institute of Architects Preservation Committee and its local chapters. Many efforts, however, have floundered in well-meant attempts, frustrated because of the extent of the work and its complexities of research and identification. When the Joint Landmarks Committee of the National Capital Planning Commission and the Commission of Fine Arts set out to inventory Washington, D.C. landmarks in the spring of 1964, it had to coordinate fifteen lists resulting from that many earlier attempts.

In addition to being culturally significant, these historic and architectural landmarks are the gold-bearing ore of the tourist industry—both domestic and international. They must be mined on the basis of a professional, orderly, systematic study, as any natural resource.

PRESERVATION LEGISLATION

As the survey is the first essential in a successful preservation program, the second is legal protection which can be obtained through state enabling legislation and local ordinances. Historic preservation legislation was upheld nationally by the United States Supreme Court in *Berman v. Parker* in 1954. But, although