

Advocacy Coalition for Historic Preservation in the U.S.: Changes in Motivations

Hyojung Cho

Texas Tech University, Lubbock, Texas

As the policy discussions of historic preservation have become complicated in recent years, the advocacy for the use of heritage is now even more important, and the number of coalitions for promoting the economic value of heritage has been on the rise. This research provides a historical view of the development of advocacy coalition networks that actively pursue the benefits of heritage resources. Through this context, the article then examines a case study of the Wheeling National Heritage Area. The case exemplifies the framework of how coalition networks can provide the structure necessary to push preservation policy in government.

Keywords *advocacy coalition, heritage management, historic preservation, national heritage area*

INTRODUCTION

Historically, the advocacy in historic preservation reveals considerable passion yet it lacks an organized institutional effort. The usual pattern consists of a temporary and voluntary group of patriotic citizens mobilizing in response to a publicized development plan that negatively affects immovable heritage, such as historic sites, buildings, and structures. These groups would then emphasize the multifaceted community-wide, as well as national, significance of the endangered historic property, utilizing the media to popularize their mission. The solicitation of sympathetic public opinion has saved countless historic properties in American history. However, preservationists soon realized the need to strategize their advocacy efforts. This collective advocacy effort in the preservation field has been distinguished more visibly as diverse interests emerged.

The motivation to save the material evidence of the nation's legacies has been one of the strongest characteristics in American historic preservation movements. "George Washington Slept Here" has become the most self-explanatory phrase for preservation. The political values of historic properties, such as national identity and patriotism, have led such collective movements, and grassroots efforts have been important in American heritage conservation. Local and state governments soon joined the efforts and started to exercise policy tools for preservation, such as the designation of historic districts, as the economic benefits from preservation have been an immense motivation (Barthel 1996; Murtagh 2006). The motivations for applying heritage

resources towards multiple uses have been known early on in the policy discussions and frequently result in organized efforts for influencing policy decisions in historic preservation.

This research will provide a historical overview of the development of advocacy coalition networks in the U.S. historic preservation movement and study the diversified goals in collective efforts over time. Advocacy coalition is the public movement that tries to achieve a set of goals and reflect their values in public policy or programs. Therefore, the advocacy patterns of historic preservation reveal the dynamics of various stakeholders and projected values of heritage resources, which identify problems and future directions of the heritage industry. After reviewing the early history of coalition efforts for historic preservation, it will focus on the advocacy efforts for National Heritage Areas (NHA) to delineate the changes in the belief system and the value promotions of advocacy coalition in the field.

The policy objective for NHAs goes along with and even furthers the policy direction of historic preservation of the country. More importantly, this shows the advocacy dynamics of pro-market preservation, which have largely remained at the local level, and an observation of the policy dynamics of NHAs visibly displays characteristics of the Advocacy Coalition Framework. For a closer assessment, the advocacy coalition for the Wheeling National Heritage Area (WNHA) Act of 2000 (Public Law 106–291; 114 Stat. 967) will be examined as a case. Wheeling, West Virginia, is chosen since its economic and social situations represent the challenges of American small cities that lost their major industry due to structural changes in society. In addition, its heritage resources were not actively developed before the coalition effort for legislation.

ADVOCACY IN EARLY HISTORIC PRESERVATION

Hosmer (1965, 21) summarizes the American preservation movement as “a truly grass-roots effort,” since enthusiastic individuals and nonprofit cultural organizations have formed voluntary preservation efforts and encouraged governments to commit to historic preservation, which together have built the field of historic preservation. Advocacy efforts in historic preservation have been predominantly oriented by a particular historic landmark or property. The early preservation of Independence Hall shows the role of individual enthusiasts and local government in saving the nation’s treasures. In 1816, citizens and the city government of Philadelphia saved the Old State House, now Independence Hall, from destruction when the State of Pennsylvania attempted to sell it for building lots. Several individuals in the 1820s and the city government in the 1950s contributed to the restoration of Independence Hall.

Another famous historic site, Mount Vernon in Virginia, is generally considered as being the most successful and representative case of historic preservation in the nineteenth century. Ann Pamela Cunningham organized the first national organization for preservation in America, the Mount Vernon Ladies’ Association, to save George Washington’s plantation from an attempt to make it into a hotel, when federal and state governments neglected it (Hosmer 1965). With her leadership, the association successfully raised the funds to buy the estate and has kept its mission to preserve this historic site to this day. In addition, many groups in historic preservation, such as the Daughters of Revolution, modeled themselves on the organizational structure of the Mount Vernon Ladies’ Association (Hosmer 1965). More importantly, it positioned private citizens as “proper advocates for preservation” and set the tradition of voluntary movements in historic

preservation, which has been its most visible characteristic from the beginning and a compelling workforce in preservation (Murtagh 2006, 30).

Grassroots movements in preservation quickly became more organized. Although American advocacy efforts for historic preservation legislation predate the nineteenth century, a true coalition of scientists, academics, federal agencies, preservation organizations, and enthusiastic citizens did not materialize until the early twentieth century, resulting in the Antiquities Act of 1906 (34 Stat. 225, 16 U.S.C. 431–433) to protect historic landmarks, historic and prehistoric structures, and other objects of historic or scientific interest on federally owned or controlled lands. The Great Depression opened another rare policy window, and coalition efforts led to the passage of the Historic Sites Act of 1935 (49 Stat. 666; 16 U.S.C. 461–467), the national policy to preserve historic sites, buildings, and objects of national significance. The legislative body tested heritage policy formation in cases of natural heritage and archaeological resources, planting the seeds for the conservation of built heritage.

After similar stirrings in the 1950s failed at generating support from Congress and state and local governments for additional preservation legislation, the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966 (Public Law 89–665; 80 STAT.915; 16 U.S.C. 470) was finally enacted. Although the Antiquities and the Historic Sites Acts were already in existence at that point, no national policy or guidelines guarded against the loss of historic properties until the mid-1960s. As the post-World-War-II US economy developed rapidly, two major development projects—the Department of Transportation’s interstate roads program and the Department of Housing and Urban Development’s urban renewal program—resulted in the widespread destruction of historic properties and changes to the nation’s cultural landscape. The NHPA was the Congressional response to the loss of the nation’s historic properties. The enactment of the NHPA institutionalized the policy network, and key members in historic preservation appeared: the Advisory Council for Historic Preservation, the National Park Service (NPS), State Historic Preservation Officers, Tribal Historic Preservation Officers, and the National Trust for Historic Preservation. The Act effectively decentralized the field by establishing players at federal, state, and local government levels, and a partner in the private sector, all of which shaped constituencies in preservation.

HERITAGE FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

State and local governments have also provided significant support for the protection of valuable historic properties throughout the nineteenth century and, since the 1930s, have been using and developing historic districts as a part of urban planning (King 1998). In 1931, the first municipal preservation ordinance of the nation was passed, and Charleston, South Carolina, became the nation’s first historic district. The initial historic districts in the 1930s did not have strong regulatory provisions but, in the 1950s, the regulations to structure a culturally coordinated community for a historic tourism market became strict and direct specific architectural details and streetscapes. The selection of a special zone cannot happen without both the likelihood of economic profitability and evidence that it will generate sociological change (Murtagh 2006). It is rather obvious that historic districts are expected to bring economic benefits to the community, a practice emphasizing both community revitalization and tourism development.

In the late twentieth century, the most widely promoted benefit of historic preservation was community revitalization, assuming that historic preservation is to solve the old inner-city slum

problems and develop the nation in a more balanced way. Some federal policies reflect such expectations. The Public Buildings Cooperative Use Act of 1976 (Public Law 94–541, 40 U.S.C. 601a) encourages the federal use of historically, architecturally, or culturally significant buildings, and this idea was highlighted again in Executive Order 12072 by President Carter in 1978 and has been more actively promoted in the past two decades.¹ In particular, the historic preservation tax breaks have been one of the most powerful motivations in promoting preservation.² Combined with rising construction costs and historic tourism, the tax benefits created the optimal environment to make preservation profitable and worthy of investment (Greenfield 2004).

This “pro-market preservation” invites the participation of for-profit preservation firms, real-estate businesses, in addition to historians, preservationists, and cultural institutions (Greenfield 2004, 166). It is an ambitious endeavor to save historic buildings by increasing their property values in the real-estate market. This approach became dominant in preservation in the 1970s and 1980s, heavily inspired by the nation’s successful and restrictive historic city management (Greenfield 2004). To make it work, municipal governments and preservationists had to control the actions of private property owners and direct public opinion. It heavily depends upon regulations such as zoning, and the designation of historic districts, which is a well-known strategy of the pro-market preservation movement.

Prior to 1990, economic redistribution through historic preservation was subtly addressed in the NHPA; however, the Act does not specify the nature of reuse or adoptive use of built heritage, nor its relationship to community revitalization. That being said, the 1992 Amendment expanded federal agencies’ responsibilities, calling for their leadership in administering and utilizing historic properties for the social and economic benefits of present and future generations, regardless of the property ownership. In addition, presidents have encouraged federal agencies’ commitments in advancing economic values of historic properties. In 1996, President Clinton further emphasized this position in Executive Order 13006, stressing the federal government’s responsibility to “utilize and maintain, wherever operationally appropriate and economically prudent, historic properties and districts, especially those located in our central business areas.”³ The George W. Bush Administration consistently promoted the economic value of heritage, establishing the White House initiative, *Preserve America*, under the auspices of the Historic Preservation Fund. This significantly increased interest in these benefits, which has been reflected in both existing policies as well as new ones.

New Policy for Broad Partnership

NHA has presumably come to be more inclusive in terms of conserving diverse types of heritage beyond historic preservation—the conservation of tangible immovable heritage—coordinating natural and cultural heritage and placing emphasis on elements of intangible heritage, still focusing on efficient federal governance. An NHA is: “a place designated by the United States Congress where natural, cultural, historic and recreational resources combine to form a cohesive, nationally-distinctive landscape arising from patterns of human activity shaped by geography” (National Park Service n.d.). It is an effective way to conserve heritage while respecting the existing culture of a community as well as embracing the diverse values of heritage that have been underappreciated. For example, in 1996, the National Coal Heritage Area in West Virginia was designated for the celebration of coal mining heritage (Public Law 104–333, Division II, Title II; 110 STAT. 4243), and the Silos and Smokestacks National Heritage Area (Public Law 104–333, Division II, Title

VII; 110 STAT. 4264) in Iowa was designated with the purpose of preserving and promoting the contribution to the nation's as well as to global agriculture.

The NHA system tries to answer the contentious issues in historic preservation; it emphasizes intergovernmental relationships with limited federal support and ensures protection of private ownership rights. Congress has consistently searched for ways to minimize federal spending and efforts on historic preservation while expanding the roles of state and local government and the private sector by providing guidance and limited financial support. The federal government has not altered its approach to historic preservation in promoting NHAs, but it has reinforced them. In developing NHAs, the federal government does not acquire any historic site or property. NHAs do not require the harsh regulations that historic districts typically employ. The federal government promises only limited assistance in the form of financial and technical support lasting generally between ten and fifteen years, and the designation guarantees neither permanent funding nor support from the federal government. The NPS supports NHAs as a future direction of heritage conservation in the nation, since they are collaborative options in saving historic properties, while still promoting the federal leadership position (Stevenson 2001).

The increase of NHAs indicates Congressional support of community development through converting previously active industry sites to resources for heritage tourism. While an important question to consider is whether cultural heritage as a development resource is a winning strategy for heritage conservation, heritage areas have become a popular development strategy nationwide to promote tourism and obtain federal aid without severely regulating required housing or urban development.⁴ In contrast to the popularity, the designation and management of NHAs have been highly criticized as being disorganized and inconsistent, due to the absence of both criteria and an established systematic process for more than two decades.⁵ Nonetheless, this legislation has played a primary role in the conservation effort and energized advocacy efforts, which led to forty-nine individually designated NHAs from 1984 to 2009.

ADVOCACY COALITION FOR NATIONAL HERITAGE AREAS

Sabatier (1999) developed the Advocacy Coalition Framework (ACF) to account for policy change, emphasizing subsystems or policy networks and combining the top-down and the bottom-up models. In the ACF, the concepts and the roles of actors are broadened, and the iron triangle of policymaking relationship disappears. Policy subsystems involve not only actors from all levels of government, but also interactions with actors from relevant outside institutions that keep tabs on and seek to influence governmental policy decisions. This network includes the traditional actors from the iron triangles as well as journalists, researchers, policy analysts, and actors at every level of government active in policy formulation and implementation. Sabatier (1999) believes that basic shared beliefs bring actors from a variety of public and private institutions together at all levels. The initiation for a change is assumed to come from the public, as governments are often reluctant to interrupt their stasis. Moreover, government agencies themselves can become obscured in the process of decentralization or collaboration. Therefore, this framework is useful in explaining grassroots movements in heritage conservation, when such efforts are strategically organized.

The legislative process to get an NHA title displays strong advocacy coalition that is driven by the goal of successful heritage tourism and the resulting economic benefits. The constituency for heritage conservation has expanded widely and municipal governments, politicians, cultural

organizations, and businesses have collaborated through the legislation process to build resources for economic rehabilitation through heritage tourism. Developers are keen to discover even underrecognized heritage and revamp it from the forgotten or destroyed part of the past to historic charms for financial returns, and they have played major roles in National Heritage Area legislations. The Automobile National Heritage Area (Public Law 105–355; 112 Stat. 3252), for example, was made possible by the collective effort of various interest groups, including local government, corporations, labor unions, cultural and educational groups, preservation groups, and environmental organizations. These disparate players came together through their common goal of urging Congress to acknowledge the automobile industry as a symbol of American industry that changed the world and should be recognized on a national level. Congressman John Dingell led the legislation, acting as a central force for collaboration during the process. Emphasis on economic value has been the most persuasive means of generating diverse constituency; economic benefits have raised the profile of historic preservation and facilitated the expansion of constituency and collaborations for the legislative success.

In focusing on the developmental aspects of the policy process, theories on policy change recognize the role of the media. Most frequently, the media has become involved in fights to save individual landmarks; rarely does the press agitate in favor of the field as a whole. Many policy development theories, including the ACF, pay attention to the media's role in policy initiation and issue mobilization (Berry and Berry 1999; Jones and Baumgartner 2004), and it is undoubtedly influential in advocating for historic preservation. Media can certainly accelerate the pressure for policy change momentum and raise the probability of major policy innovations, both supporting and resisting a policy change. Berry and Berry (1999) note that the media plays an important role through its participation in the diffusion process by introducing successful programs or policy initiatives to the general public, which creates pressure on a state's public officials. The media can report to move a particular issue forward in a specific direction by publicizing a new policy in other states or introducing successful cases. It can also be used to maintain stability or policy monopoly.

THE CASE OF THE WHEELING NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA

The city of Wheeling encompasses approximately 11.2 square miles of land and is located along the Ohio River between Ohio and Pennsylvania in the Northern Panhandle of West Virginia. Founded in 1769 and established as a town in 1795, Wheeling grew to become Virginia's popular frontier town by the early 1880s and was the most important avenue of commerce, known as the "gateway to the west."⁶ Wheeling was the capital of the newly formed state, West Virginia, from 1863 to 1870. From the early twentieth century onward, Wheeling desperately needed new economic sources. The previously prosperous industries were now gone, and the declining and aging population had contributed problems for the city. In the absence of active commerce or industry, utilizing historic resources became an attractive option on many levels. In its urgent need for economic rehabilitation, the city chose heritage as a substitute source of economic sustenance and heritage tourism as the industry to save.

Therefore, heritage became a strategic means of community development for the city of Wheeling. The Wheeling National Heritage Area Act (WNHAA) of 2000 recognized Wheeling as "a transportation and manufacturing hub during the nation's westward expansion."⁷ The development plan had started long before the designation of the Act. Interests in utilizing historic

resources were already growing in the mid-1980s, but an ambitious economic rehabilitation plan to improve heritage tourism and create attractions has been visible since the end of the 1980s. The challenge was to expand the tourism market through attracting visitors from the Wheeling vicinity and encouraging them to extend their stay in the city. Planning for the WNHA aimed at maximizing the visitor's continuously fluidic experience, linking separate historic districts and natural resources.

For a long time in Wheeling, the cultural or historic value of heritage resources was rarely translated into economic value, and historic preservation was seldom prioritized, although the intrinsic values of many historic properties were recognized enough to be listed in the National Register of Historic Places. Many were conserved by neglect, but there were cases of destruction as well. For instance, the Ohio County Courthouse, the four-story Romanesque building that was built in 1876, was architecturally exceptional and politically important, as it served as the state capital, but was demolished without much consideration of historic preservation in 1958.⁸ However, by the end of the twentieth century, heritage had become a powerful resource to attract visitors, and the label "National Heritage Area" can work as the federal endorsement of its historic and cultural significance to validate the quality of the resource.

The city of Wheeling, the Wheeling community, and the State of West Virginia formed the Wheeling Heritage Area Task Force in 1990 in an effort to identify and conserve cultural resources in Wheeling (US Congress 2000). As a result, the WNHA comprises impressive numbers of nationally recognized historic properties: two National Historic Landmarks and thirty-four National Register listings that consist of twenty-one historic buildings, two historic bridges, and eleven historic districts (ICON Architecture 2004). The effort was started with the development of the 1990 Concept Plan for the Wheeling area (Stevenson 2000). Indeed, approximately half of the National Register listings in the Wheeling area by 2004 were done after 1990.

The initial ten-year plan was completed in 1992, and provided an inventory of the area's resources, recommended policies for resource management and interpretation, and set forth a program for plan implementation (Stevenson 2000). For effective management of the heritage resources, they were identified, selected, and classified into five themes—The River and the Land, Transportation, the Union, Commerce and Industry, and the Landscape of Culture—in five time periods from pre-European settlement to the present (ICON Architecture 2004). The Council selected a major theme for each time period for diversified presentation. Affirmation of diverse heritage and historical importance in various aspects raised the value of the site as an attractive tourism destination and made it appeal to a broader range of people. The federal legislation approved it in 2000 (US Congress 2000).

Such heritage planning is legally mandated to be submitted to the NPS, and the coalition of the legislative process is closely related and paralleled. One of the most distinctive characteristics of advocacy coalition for an NHA is the strong support and representation by elected officials. As commonly observed in other cases of NHAs, Wheeling sought the advocacy coalition for the legislation. Representative Alan Mollohan and Senator Robert Byrd sponsored bills in 1993.⁹ Senator Byrd submitted a bill again in 2000 (US Congress 2000). The senator was an enthusiastic supporter who sponsored the bills to establish the Wheeling National Heritage Area. He appropriated about \$5 million to the WNHA for downtown building rehabilitation,¹⁰ and also supported the plan to locate the Civil War memorial in Wheeling.¹¹ The officials not only represented the legislation before Congress, but also endorsed and legitimized the use of heritage for community development.

As the administrator of NHAs, the NPS's financial and technical support as well as supervision was fundamental in the establishment of the WNHA. The NPS supported the Wheeling Heritage Area Task Force (US Congress 2000). Wheeling was already established as an NHA and had received support from Congress for a decade through annual appropriations before the formal legislation in 2000. The NPS has provided technical and financial support since the early 1990s and, remarkably, ninety percent of the WNHAC's funding came from the bureau during the establishment period.¹² The legislative attempts in the 1990s did not succeed due to a serious deficiency in the financial and technical support capacity of the NPS. In 1994, the NPS had a multi-billion-dollar shortfall at existing park units, and could not support legislation that authorized spending an additional \$6.5 million in Wheeling.¹³ Although it was supportive of the Senate bill S. 2247 in 2000, the NPS maintained its bureaucratic standpoint and suggested some technical changes as well as a revision of the plan, emphasizing the standard fifty percent matching requirement for the fund (US Congress 2000).

The role of municipal government has been consistently crucial in the history of US historic preservation, and likewise, the city of Wheeling has shown leadership in the development of the WNHA, which led the legislative success. Since the mid-1980s, the city prepared to develop heritage tourism and conducted a strategic study, and the heritage promotion became the center of city management and planning. It was primarily responsible for the operation and maintenance of the Wheeling Heritage Trail system (ICON Architecture 2004). The city of Wheeling has been actively involved in the rehabilitation of historic buildings. For instance, a city-owned building was permitted for renovation as the Artisan Center and allowed a long-term lease for the Wheeling National Heritage Area Corporation (WNHAC) for the annual lease price of only one dollar. Sensitive to historic preservation, the Wheeling Housing Authority made sure that the housing development would be consistent with existing Victorian architectural-style historic houses in north Wheeling. In another case, the authority funded the local group, "Hopeful City," for community-based revitalization on the east side of Wheeling (ICON Architecture 2004).

Equally as important as the local government, the WNHAC was established by the 1992 initial ten-year plan as the management entity to implement the plan and serve as a facilitator among diverse stakeholders (ICON Architecture 2004). An NHA is mandated to have a nonprofit management entity that organizes coalition efforts and implements an approved plan. Therefore, WNHAC became responsible for implementation of the 1992 plan and also revised it in 2004. Its management responsibilities include communication with the NPS, and the WNHAC is responsible for reporting progress to the NPS. Although the WNHA apportions considerable autonomy to the community in managing the heritage area, the federal agency is able to monitor and control the use of federal funding.

As a manager of the NWHA, the WNHAC employed corporate business strategies to deliver the stories of Wheeling to visitors and promote heritage tourism (ICON Architecture 2004). In order to build recognition for the regional heritage, the WNHAC developed a comprehensive identity program that was implemented through the promotion and interpretation of heritage resources, such as signage, the media, websites, and tourism-promotion activities. For effective image marketing, the cultural icon of Wheeling, the Wheeling Suspension Bridge, was developed as a logo for the WNHA.¹⁴ In order to communicate effectively with the public, it used educational signage throughout the trail and an exhibit in the Artisan center that features a restaurant, gift shops, and a multi-purpose banqueting space. The various programs aim to transform cultural resources to revenue-generating resources, as the vision of the Corporation is: "Wheeling's

economic future is enhanced, providing new employment opportunities and economic revitalization through preservation and utilization of the Wheeling National Heritage Area's natural setting and historic resources" (ICON A 2004). The partnership between the city and the WNHAC was the enforcement of the planning and implementation of the WNHC.

In contrast, the activities of cultural organizations, including museums and historic sites, were less visible in the coalition. The cultural heritage sector is often vulnerable to social and economic changes caused by tourism and lacks the power to resist the destruction or misuse of heritage; in particular, governments and the tourism industry view cultural resources as economic resources that produce profits (McKercher and du Cros 2002). Cultural organizations were neglected in the management and marketing of the WNHA, and one historic site was even closed. The Capitol Music Hall was the home to Jamboree USA, which broadcasted since 1969 and featured live country music, Broadway touring musicals, Las-Vegas-style acts, and the Wheeling Symphony Orchestra (ICON Architecture 2004). Its closing in February 2006 prompted the Wheeling government and business leaders to step up meetings and to draft a plan to buy, restore, and operate the downtown landmark that helped to ensure Wheeling's place on the national stage. They could not come up with the necessary \$3 million, so the Capitol Music Hall was closed in May 2007.

However, the economic value of the Capitol Music Hall saved itself. It was considered important due to its cultural value as well as prime location, and was therefore included in the downtown economic rehabilitation plan in 2008. Again, the city of Wheeling demonstrated leadership with a pledge of \$2.5 million for renovation, and the WNHAC was actively involved in the effort.¹⁵ The coalition of citizens and local government to save a historic property facing demolition, which is a recurring case throughout the history of the US, occurred to save the music hall. Even so, the dynamics of coalition display the dominance of governments and the tourism industry, as the major workforces are related to tourism and economic development in the hope that the music hall would bring economic revitalization.¹⁶

Expectations for economic revival invited for-profit businesses and, among them, recreational industries were considered important and even included in the management plan for the WNHA. Oglebay Park, the 1,650-acre resort with golf courses, a zoo, a botanical garden, and a museum, was considered as one of the prime attractions. The Wheeling Island Racetrack and Gaming Center, which cost \$150 million, were expected to become important revenue- and job-creating recourses. The gambling center features video slots, poker, blackjack, and keno. The Racetrack center offers greyhound racing and dining. The facilities have appealed quickly, and the annual visitor number reached two million in the early 2000s from 658,000 in 1990 (ICON Architecture 2004). However, as it is a quick fix for community development, it hardly delivers educationally or culturally meaningful business.

The most consistent factor involved in all of the different advocacy coalitions is local journalism. In the promotion process from the WNHA, Racetrack and Gaming Center to the revival of the Music Hall, the local television channel and newspaper delivered related efforts, wrapped with expectations for economic development, and therefore helped to sustain the excitement. The initiatives, including the WNHA, were economic rehabilitation plans that named *heritage*, as the newspaper quoted the local attorney and former U.S. Attorney Bill Wilmoth, who served as the chairman of the WNHC, as saying: "the idea is to fundamentally remake our downtown."¹⁷ Through the local media, the efforts by the city and the elected officials were delivered, and public support was pledged. The Music Hall was publicized as a chance for economic rehabilitation, and

the gaming facilities were marketed as a form of economic development, promising increased employment in the economically depressed communities. The media projected the purpose and direction of the WNHA clearly to the diverse stakeholders and the public and solidified them under one goal, which strongly supported the advocacy coalition for the WNHA.

The media is one of the biggest influences on constructing policy images in both empirical information and emotional appeals. To distinguish the particular aspects of a complex policy environment and to deliver the “signal” to broad audiences—both policy makers and the public—the role of the media is undoubtedly influential, but the issue needs to be initiated by other actors. In addition, technological advances facilitated relatively inexpensive means of affording wide support for conservation initiatives. For the city of Wheeling, heritage has become important for economic development and helped to create unique identity and marketing tools for the city. The adoption of heritage as a development policy grew out of the ambitions of city boosters, who were eager to attract tourists and improve their city images through association with the Wheeling National Heritage Area.

CONCLUSION

The early US historic preservation movement was largely motivated by political values of heritage resources, such as the promotion of patriotism and national identity. Citizens’ advocacy saved countless historic landmarks in the country. Preservation of historic properties collectively as a historic district has a long history since the 1930s, and had already become widely popular by the 1970s. In such efforts, the political and aesthetic values of historic properties transfer to economic values of the resources to sell. Throughout the legislative history of historic preservation, advocacy patterns have been motivated differently, which attracted different participants in the coalition. Significantly increased economic interest in heritage conservation expanded the constituency of heritage conservation and boosted the collaboration of diverse interest groups that are related to the tourism industry and community development.

Until the appearance of NHAs, advocacy efforts to pursue the economic benefits of historic preservation rarely surfaced to the level of being part of policy discussions and legislation at the federal level and it has been difficult to observe the dynamics of stakeholders and the policymaking process. Importantly, the value priority in policy making for historic preservation has been clearly demonstrated through the advocacy coalition for NHAs. The strategically organized efforts display involvement from all levels of government to achieve specific policy goals, although the role of municipal governments is still critical. The collective economic values of historic properties have induced the expansion of stakeholders in the preservation field for the purpose of regional development. Stakeholders in tourism and development soon become dominant forces for advocacy and policy discussions in historic preservation. The advocacy efforts for NHAs have shown how the constituencies work together to reach collective goals and how their political dynamics change depending on the heritage issue.

Intergovernmental and intersector partnerships in historic preservation have been heavily emphasized in policy making; therefore, the expansion of players in the field and their cooperation is a positive indication. The crucial aspect to evaluate is the quality of cooperation, and one way to do this is to observe the relationship of the players. Although the collective efforts have drawn the participation of diverse players in policy discussion for heritage conservation and have expanded

constituencies in the field, how such efforts benefit heritage conservation in the long term is still uncertain, since advocacy coalitions for economic interests consider heritage conservation as a tool for community development. Advocacy coalition efforts for an NHA tend to end when they reach a clear goal in policy making—the achievement of Congressional designation—and hardly continue to secure and formulate long-term advocacy for heritage conservation. The coalition derived by mutual benefits from the use of heritage became common, but stnon-heritage and heritage-related players were largely separated. The balanced power relationship among the players in advocacy coalition through policy making to implementation should be the next step to promote meaningful collaboration in the field. Full cooperation means true partnership for the mutual benefit of for-profit and nonprofit in diverse sectors throughout the policymaking, implementation, and evaluation processes, and therefore policy and programs in preservation need to balance interest and satisfaction of both conservation and economic development.

NOTES

1. Executive Order 12072, August 16, 1978. *Federal Space Management* 43 FR 36869.
2. Tax incentives for rehabilitation of historic properties have been developed as a series of tax laws since 1976: the Tax Reform Act of 1976 (Pub. L. 94-455), the Revenue Act of 1978 (Pub. L. 95-600), the Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981 (Pub. L. No. 97-34), and the Tax Reform Act of 1986 (Public L. 99-514).
3. Executive Order 13006, May 21, 1996. *Locating Federal Facilities on Historic Properties in our Nation's Central Cities*, 61 FR 26071.
4. Tuckwiller, Tara. 2004. "Group wants more state heritage areas." *Charleston Gazette*, January 7.
5. Vincent, Carol Hardy and David Whiteman. 2004. *Heritage Areas: Background, Proposals, and Current Issues*. CRS Issue Brief for Congress. Order Code IB10126. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service.
6. City of Wheeling. n.d. Information for Visitors. <http://www.cityofwheelingwv.org/visitors.htm#top> (accessed June 7, 2007).
7. AP. 2004. "Wheeling Discusses 10-year Revitalization Plan." *The Associated Press State & Local Wire*, September 7.
8. Smith, Vicki. 2002. "Ohio Courthouse Lacks Personality But Gets the Job Done." *The Associated Press State & Local Wire*, March 11.
9. H.R. 2843 and S1341.
10. Finn, Scott. 2002. "Wheeling Nonprofit Gets Sweet Deal from City Group Repaying Government for the Money it Misspent." *Charleston Gazette*, March 24.
11. AP. 2006. "Wheeling Planners Want to Build National Civil War Memorial." *The Associated Press State & Local Wire*, January 2.
12. Hohmann, George. 2002. "Park Service Wants New Plan Agency Says Funds Will be Held Pending Revision." *Charleston Daily Mail*, July 3.
13. US Congress House Committee on Natural Resources. 1994. *Wheeling National Heritage Area Act of 1994*. 103rd Congress, 2nd Sess April 12.
14. It is recognized as a National Historic Engineering Landmark (1969) and a National Historic Landmark (1975), and listed in the National Register of Historic Places (1980).
15. WTOV9. March 19, 2008. "Wheeling Council Approves Revitalization Financing: Capitol Music Hall Included In Plan." <http://www.wtov9.com/news/news/wheeling-council-approves-revitalization-financing/nJDk2/> (accessed December 16, 2012).
16. WTOV9. 2009. "Capitol Music Hall Hoping to Revitalize Downtown." February 5. <http://www.wtov9.com/videos/news/capitol-music-hall-hoping-to-revitalize-downtown/vDSpF/> (accessed December 16, 2012).

17. Stirewalt, Chris. 2002. "Wheeling Shopping Center Proposal May Revive Downtown." *Charleston Daily Mail*, January 15.

REFERENCES

- Barthel, Diane. 1996. *Historic Preservation: Collective Memory and Historical Identity*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Berry, Frances S., and William D. Berry. 1999. "Innovation and Diffusion Models in Policy Research." In *Theories of the Policy Process*, edited by Paul A. Sabatier, 169–200. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Greenfield, Briann. 2004. "Marketing the Past: Historic Preservation in Providence, Rhode Island." In *Giving Preservation a History: Histories of Historic Preservation in the United States*, edited by Max Page and Randall Mason, 163–84. New York: Routledge.
- Hosmer, Jr., Charles B. 1965. *Presence of the Past: A History of the Preservation Movement in the United States Before Williamsburg*. New York: Putnam.
- ICON Architecture, Inc. 2004. *Management Plan for the Wheeling National Heritage*. <http://www.wheelingheritage.org> (accessed October 23, 2006).
- Jones, Bryan D., and Frank R. Baumgartner. 2004. "Representation and Agenda Setting." *The Policy Studies Journal* 32 (1): 1–24.
- King, Thomas. F. 1998. *Cultural Resource Law and Practice: An Introductory Guide*. Lanham, NY: Altamira Press.
- McKercher, Bob, and Hilary du Cros. 2002. *Cultural Tourism: The Partnership Between Tourism and Cultural Heritage Management*. New York: The Haworth Hospitality Press.
- Murtagh, William J. 2006. *Keeping Time: The History and Theory of Preservation*, 3rd ed. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- National Park Service. n.d. *What is a National Heritage Area?* <http://www.cr.nps.gov/heritageareas/FAQ/INDEX.HTM> (accessed October 14, 2005).
- Stevenson, Katherine. May 18, 2000. "To Establish the Wheeling National Heritage Area in the State of West Virginia," testimony. Legislative Hearing before the Subcommittee on National Parks, Historic Preservation and Recreation, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. <http://www.nps.gov/legal/testimony/106th/wheeling.htm> (accessed December 20, 2012).
- November 1, 2001. Testimony. Legislative Hearing before the Subcommittee on National Parks, Recreation, and Public Lands of the Committee on Resources. U.S. House of Representative, 107th Congress., 1st sess.
- US Congress. 2000. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. *Wheeling National Heritage Area Act of 2000*. 106th Congress., 2nd sess., July 12.

Copyright of Journal of Arts Management, Law & Society is the property of Taylor & Francis Ltd and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.