Past Meets Present

Archaeologists Partnering with Museum Curators, Teachers, and Community Groups

Past Meets Present

Archaeologists Partnering with Museum Curators, Teachers, and Community Groups

Edited by

John H. Jameson, Jr.
National Park Service
Tallahassee, Florida
USA

and

Sherene Baugher
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York
USA

Springer

John H. Jameson, Jr.
Southeast Archaeological Center
National Park Service
2035 East Paul Dirac Drive
Tallahassee, FL 32310
USA
john_jameson@nps.gov

Sherene Baugher
Archaeology Program
Cornell University
261 McGraw Hall
Ithaca, NY 14853
USA
sbb8@cornell.edu

Library of Congress Control Number: 2006939060

ISBN-10: 0-387-47666-0
ISBN-13: 978-0-387-47666-7

eISBN: 978-0-387-48216-3

9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

springer.com

Contents

Contributors

Patricia Allen, Archaeological Services/Services d'archéologie, Parks Canada, Fredericton, New Brunswick, Canada

Madeline Augustine, Metepenagiag Heritage Park, Red Bank, New Brunswick, Canada

Whitney Battle-Baptiste, Africana Studies & Research Center, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, USA

Sherene Baugher, Archaeology Program, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, USA

Dorsey Bodeman, Historic St. Mary's City Commission, St. Mary's City, Maryland, USA

George Brauer, Baltimore County Center for Archaeology, Oregon Ridge Nature Center, Cockeysville, Maryland, USA

Lisa C. Breglia, Anthropology Department, Wheaton College, Norton, Massachusetts, USA

Julia Clark, Port Arthur Historic Site Management Authority, Port Arthur, Tasmania, Australia

Pamela J. Cressey, Alexandria Archaeology, Alexandria, Virginia, USA

Lu Ann De Cunzo, Department of Anthropology, University of Delaware, Newark, Delaware, USA

Dena Doroszenko, Ontario Heritage Trust, Heritage Programs and Operations Branch, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

Carol J. Ellick, SRI Foundation, Rio Rancho, New Mexico, USA

Lance M. Foster, Helena, MT, USA

Jonathan Fowler, Anthropology Department, Saint Mary's University, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada

Bruce Fry, Fortress of Louisbourg National Historic Site of Canada, Louisbourg, Nova Scotia, Canada

Pedro Paulo A. Funari, Department of History and Center for Strategic Studies (NEE/UNICAMP), Campinas State University (UNICAMP), Campinas, Brazil

Brooke Hansen, Department of Anthropology, Ithaca College, Ithaca, New York, USA

Denise Hansen, Parks Canada—Atlantic Service Centre, Historic Properties, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada

Silas D. Hurry, Historic St. Mary's City Commission, St. Mary's City, Maryland, USA

Greg Jackman, Port Arthur Historic Site Management Authority, Port Arthur, Tasmania, Australia

John H. Jameson Jr., Southeast Archeological Center, National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior Tallahassee, Florida, USA

Patrice L. Jeppson, Historical Archaeologist and Independent Scholar, Philadelphia, PA, USA

Joseph Last, Archaeological Services, Ontario Service Centre, Parks Canada, Cornwall, Ontario, Canada

Ann-Eliza H. Lewis, Massachusetts Historical Commission, Boston, Massachusetts, USA

Dorothy Lippert, Repatriation Office, National Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC, USA

Henry M. Miller, Historic St. Mary's City Commission, St. Mary's City, Maryland, USA

Stephen F. Mills, Aardvark Archaeology Ltd, St. John's, Newfoundland, Canada

Harold Mytum, Department of Archaeology, University of York, York, UK

Nanci Vieira de Oliveira, Human Anthropology Laboratory (LAH), Rio de Janeiro State University (UERJ), Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

Janet L. Pape, Office of Cultural Resource Studies, California Department of Transportation, Oakland, California, USA

Elisa Phelps, Collections/Library Division, Colorado Historical Society, Denver, Colorado, USA

Peter E. Pope, Department of Anthropology & Archaeology, Memorial University of Newfoundland, St. John's, Newfoundland, Canada

Jack Rossen, Department of Anthropology, Ithaca College, Ithaca, New York, USA

Jody Steele, Historic Heritage Section, Parks & Wildlife Service, Hobart, Tasmania, Australia

Gaynell Stone, Suffolk County Archaeological Association, Professor, Suffolk County Community College, Wading River, New York, USA

Elizabete Tamanini, Center for Strategic Studies (NEE/UNICAMP), Campinas State University (UNICAMP), Campinas, Brazil

Dirk Van Tuerenhaut, Houston Museum of Natural Science, Houston Texas, USA

Richard Tuffin, Port Arthur Historic Site Management Authority, Port Arthur, Tasmania, Australia

Christopher Turnbull, Archaeological Services, Heritage Branch, Parks Canada, Fredericton, New Brunswick, Canada

Nina M. Versaggi, Public Archaeology Facility, Binghamton University (SUNY), Binghamton, New York, USA

Natalie Vinton, NSW National Parks and Wildlife Service, Sydney South, New South Wales, Australia

Pamela Ward, Enkatasik Wetepecksultik, Metepenagiag Heritage Park Incorporated, Red Bank, New Brunswick, Canada

Patricia (Pam) Wheat-Stranahan, Texas Archaeological Society, Fulton, Texas, USA

Part 1
Historic Sites and Museums

Public Interpretation, Outreach, and Partnering: An Introduction

John H. Jameson, Jr. and Sherene Baugher

> If we open up a quarrel between the past and the present, we shall find that we have lost the future.
>
> —Winston Churchill

> Just as a tree without roots is dead, a people without history or culture also becomes a dead people.
>
> —Malcolm X, African American activist

> In our greed and self-absorption, we have pushed our old ones to a forgotten past and our young ones to an uncertain future. We must again fuse past to future. Through an early understanding of the human continuum and condition, youth learns reverence, respect and responsibility, to wonder, to be sensitive, to feel important, and to hope.
>
> —Navajo Musician, Silent Witness Videotape, National Park Foundation

Background

In the first decade of the new millennium, many archaeologists have come to realize that they cannot afford to be detached from mechanisms and programs that convey archaeological information to the public. In conjunction with efforts to instill a greater awareness and appreciation of archaeology, both in and out of formal classroom settings, many archaeologists and cultural resource specialists are devising new approaches to public interpretation in a variety of settings. The venues for these activities can include visiting an excavation, a reconstructed site, stabilized ruins, museum exhibits, or a site treated as an open-air museum. Archaeologists bring archaeology to public schools through traveling exhibits, lectures, teacher and student workshops, and hands-on activities with artifacts. In the face of an increasing public interest and demand for information, archaeologists are collaborating with historians, educators, interpreters, museum curators, exhibit designers, landscape architects, and other cultural resource specialists to devise the best strategies for translating an explosion of archaeological information for the public. In turn, some communities are partnering with archaeologists to become active players in the excavation, interpretation, and preservation of their heritage.

The last decade has witnessed numerous applications of public interpretation and outreach models and an increased interest in establishing partnerships between professional practitioners in public interpretation and educational institutions such as museums and schools. The lessons to be derived from these modestly funded projects are that *attitudes and initiatives of people* make the difference. These developments have occurred in the context of a realization that community-based partnerships are the most effective mechanisms for long-term success.

In the context of our international discussions and case studies on public interpretation and outreach, with an expected diversity of readers, some clarifications in terminology are appropriate. What we mean by "community," "target audience," "values-based management," and "public stewardship," for example, needs to be defined within the framework of our discussions.

Emphasis on Partnerships and Community Involvement

In the 1980s, having a commitment to public outreach was a major step forward beyond merely presenting and sharing the results of research among colleagues. However, these early archaeological outreach efforts often involved archaeologists working in isolation from community groups. It was the archaeologists who decided, without substantive input from community members, what type of archaeological outreach and what messages the public needed and wanted. The public lectures, tours of sites, exhibits, films, brochures, pamphlets, and articles were based on what the archaeologist wanted to say and the information that the professional archaeologist felt was most important. Questions such as, who is the target audience, and what questions do they want answered were often not on the archaeological radar screen. However, slowly, archaeologists started to move out of the isolation model and partner with non archaeologists to develop more meaningful public programing. Archaeologists study communities as part of their research agenda, but now community members are moving from the category of "research subject" into "partner in outreach."

Who are these new community partners? "Community" has become a buzzword that is often used without a clear definition. Is it simply a local community or a community in a clearly defined geographic area? Is it a descendant community? Or is it something larger and more complex? Webster's Dictionary (1984: 288) provides six definitions of "community," but the three definitions that are applicable to our use of the word "community" in this book are as follows:

1. A group of people residing in the same locality and under the same government;
2. A group or class having common interests, as in academic community;
3. Likeness or identity.

We are using the word "community" in the broader definition rather than limiting the term to the first definition. All the authors in this volume have partnered with a community group, but the groups differ. The communities include educational, professional, academic, governmental, descendant, and local. These communities are not discrete and they can and do overlap. For example, members of a descendant community may also be part of the educational and the professional communities. When we discuss the educational community we include teachers, principals, superintendents, school boards, parents, and children to develop innovative programs in archaeology. In the governmental community, officials can and do address and represent the concerns of members of diverse communities. The professional community can include people in allied disciplines such as history and preservation, or design professionals such as graphic designers, architects, and landscape architects, or people in very diverse professions from medicine to engineering. Each author notes the specific community with which he or she is partnering and the nature of the partnership. The members of the diverse communities discussed in this book have one thing in common: they have partnered with archaeologists in creating meaningful outreach projects.

The authors discuss the lessons learned from interaction with, and involvement of, the community. Results and measures of success are expressed qualitatively rather than quantitatively. What type of feedback did they receive from the community? How did working with, rather than for, a community change their project? How did including "other voices" change the project planning and/or management? The case studies demonstrate that there is no single "right way" to carry out successful public outreach.

Some theoreticians believe that only one approach should be adhered to in order to accomplish successful community partnerships. For example, some sociologists believe that community work must be "participatory action research" (PAR). This approach requires that the community members be equal partners in all phases of the project. The reality is that many archaeological outreach projects have evolved with community involvement changing over time. One must ask: Why would a community initially become involved with an archaeologist who they do not know? Why would community members trust this person? Why would community members invest their time to help in an archaeological project? The various case studies in this book demonstrate that trust, friendships, and partnerships evolve over time. Moreover, mistakes are made, and archaeologists must learn from these mistakes. Community partnerships do not just happen because that is the way the theoretical model is supposed to work. The case studies clarify that true partnerships involve years of work with both partners learning from each other. And most importantly, the case studies in this book demonstrate that there are many diverse ways for archaeologists to be involved in public outreach and also different levels of community involvement. The goal of our book is to give the readers many different successful models for community engagement, but in the end, the readers must decide for themselves what level or type of community partnership is appropriate for their project.

The international scope of this book has resulted in uses of terminology from the culturally diverse authors. "Target audience" is a term often used synonymously (and in some contexts, interchangeably) with "public," "select public," "publics," "community," "audience," "constituency," and "visitor(s)." It usually refers to a particular group of listeners, readers, or other defined audience types. The term is derived from market analysis and demographics terminology where a "target audience" is a profiled group for which an advertising campaign, promotion, or sales pitch is specifically designed. It is generally not used in the context of participatory education and public interpretation where members of a community actively participate in developing, carrying out, delivering, or otherwise producing the program or elements of the program or interpretive product. The U.S. National Park Service uses the term when referring to specifically defined audiences according to categories such as background, ethnicity, age, gender, education, and media delivery technique. For example, the 2006 Web site for Yellowstone National Park was designed by park staff to appeal to a variety of "target audiences" of Internet users encompassing local, regional, national, and global perspectives on resource management, conservation, education, recreation, and economics. They also targeted younger audiences with "Kids' Stuff" Web pages designed with simultaneous entertainment and educational goals tied to perceived cognitive capabilities and needs of pre teens and younger audiences. This is similar to the concept of layering in exhibit theory where varying aspects of presentation and modes of delivery are designed to appeal to a variety of "target" audiences according to age, educational level, ethnicity, impaired (handicapped) access, and other factors. In most personal services presentations, such as interpreter talks and demonstrations, as well as nonpersonal services, such as museum and wayside (outdoor) exhibits, members of the intended (target) audience have not directly and actively participated in molding the interpretive presentation/ product.

When we discuss "partnering" we mean participation, dialogue, and exchange of ideas. The traditional academic or institutional hierarchy is gone. In partnerships colleagues work together and respect each other. Each side has something to bring to the table. In some of our case studies, the project began without community input, but as the project evolved, the insights, commentary, and suggestions from community members helped it to change over time. Some of our case studies were partnerships from the start. However, the one thing that all the case studies share is the lessons learned from those partnerships.

Values-Based Heritage Management and Public Stewardship

In many recent discussions on public interpretation and education standards, the term “heritage” is used synonymously with “cultural resources” and the old acronym “CRM” has become “cultural heritage management” or “CHM.” This is especially the case in international forums where heritage is an emotionally charged term that connotes cultural inheritance from the past, which is the evidence of human activity from Native or First Nation peoples. “Cultural heritage” commonly refers to both Native and non-Native places and objects, and associated values, traditions, knowledge, and cultures. “Heritage” in the broader sense includes natural resources and the environment: it is a particular version or interpretation of the past that belongs to a person or group. Concepts of heritage play important roles in shaping group or community identities and political ideologies. Heritage attracts the attention of visitors to a location or site by providing a sense of place, a sense of purpose, and a sense of uniqueness for the community or group. Heritage also provides education about the results of research. Heritage offers distinctive experiences, fascinations, and forms of entertainment that are out of the ordinary.

“Values” relate to tangibles and intangibles that define what is important to people. In all societies a sense of well being is associated with the need to connect with and appreciate heritage values. An understanding of how and why the past affects both the present and the future contributes to people’s sense of well being. In heritage management, we articulate “values” as attributes given to sites, objects, and resources, and associated intellectual and emotional connections that make them important and define their significance for a person, group, or community. Site managers should strive to identify and take these values into account in planning, physical treatments, and public interpretation efforts. In heritage tourism, we harness people’s fascination and sense of connection to the past and turn it into a commodity. Those of us whose primary goals and interests are conservation should be determined that our values and standards in this scenario are not compromised or diminished.

It is important for those of us who manage, study, and present the past to be aware of how the past is understood within the context of socioeconomic and political agendas and how that influences what is taught, and how it is valued, protected, authenticated, and used. We must understand the philosophical, political, and economic forces that affect how sites and parks are managed. We know that archaeological resources, as well as the built environment, are being affected. Dwindling budgets and reductions in personnel are exacerbating the problem. Political currents are threatening to weaken long-standing principles, standards, and commitments to public stewardship. Heritage tourism pressures have become important elements of interpretive messages at parks, historic sites, and museums.

The Challenges of Heritage Tourism

One of the most serious threats to effective site management and public interpretation, and consequently for outreach and educational programs, is the juggernaut of heritage tourism. By definition, heritage tourism is collaboration between conservationists and commercial promoters. It is often an uneasy association because the motives of these respective groups are not always compatible. While there is general recognition that heritage tourism can work to promote preservation of communities' historic and cultural resources, and also educate tourists and local residents about the resources, the resulting effects are not always viewed as beneficial, especially from those of us on the conservationist side of the fence. Nevertheless, because heritage tourism is a growth industry in almost every part of the world, the issues it conjures up, good and bad, must be addressed.

Globalization is changing our world in ways that we are just beginning to understand. Heritage tourism, with its ties to the currents of rapidly evolving global economies, is causing increasing needs and demands for crosscultural and international communication and interdisciplinary training. Emphasis is on transferable skills such as the application of interdisciplinary approaches, writing for both academic and nonacademic audiences, oral presentation, and experience with multimedia packages.

Public interpretation and outreach, by delivering conservation, education, and stewardship messages, are among the most important activities that occur at a cultural or historic site. In the U.S. National Park Service, interpretation is seen as instrumental in carrying out the agency mission of preserving America's cultural and natural heritage in that it instills a sense of public appreciation and resource stewardship. Interpretation is therefore a key component of the conservation side of the conservation/tourism partnership.

Purpose of this Volume

It is clear that there is a need for a volume that addresses these latest trends and provides case studies of successful partnerships. Moreover, although professional archaeological organizations have been more actively promoting outreach to the public, only short editorial or commentary articles on public archaeology have been published, usually in "gray literature" such as newsletters. Despite the fact that sessions on outreach work have been presented at professional conferences, they are rarely published. Exceptions include the *Presenting Archaeology to the Public: Digging for Truths* volume (Jameson, 1997) and a more recent book on public outreach efforts published by the Society of American Archaeology (Derry and Malloy, 2003). These conference presentations, newsletter editorials, and newsletter commentaries have created a need and demand for published information on public interpretation and outreach topics. With tighter budgets for archaeology and archaeology interpretation, project planners would benefit from examples and models of successful projects, especially those with modest budgets.

This volume is a logical sequel to Jameson's 1997 book that presented theories on public interpretation of archaeology, including case studies. Among the purposes of that book were to provide theoretical approaches to public interpretation and outreach and to address various perspectives in the debate on the validity and need for public outreach by archaeologists. However, we have moved beyond these theoretical debates. The strong international response to *Presenting* from professional and academic audiences, including archaeologists, interpreters, educators, museum curators, as well as the general public, testifies to the relevance, importance, and demand for detailed and exemplary case studies and models for effective interpretation. Readers have inquired about the logistics and problems of doing outreach, and the big question many raised was of the affordability of outreach projects. Most archaeologists now agree that public interpretation and outreach are important and crucial parts of their work; i.e., the theoretical debates are no longer needed. The publication of recently edited volumes such as Little (2002), Shackel and Chambers (2004), Jameson (2004), and Merriman (2004) attests to this. A big stumbling block, however, has been affordability. Archaeologists want examples of case studies of projects that were done without big budgets and examples of projects that they can afford to do in their own communities. Because of these inquires we started looking out for projects that could serve as case studies for other communities.

Since the mid-1990s, when the articles for *Presenting Archaeology to the Public* were compiled, we have witnessed numerous international applications of the original models from *Presenting* and an increased interest in establishing partnerships between professional practitioners in public interpretation and educational institutions such as museums and schools. These developments have occurred in the context of a realization that community-based partnerships are the most effective mechanism for long-term success.

The need for a second volume that addresses these latest trends and presents case studies of successful partnerships became obvious. As an initial testing ground for the idea of a second book, Jameson organized a symposium at the 2000 Society for Historical Archaeology (SHA) conference in Quebec City, Canada, entitled "Giving the Public Its Due: Public Interpretation and Outreach in Archeology," with a largely North American focus. The editors of this proposed volume (Jameson and Baugher) evaluated the papers from the SHA symposium and discussed what could be accomplished in a new volume. As a result of editors' evaluation, this volume carries forward revised versions of selected symposium papers (one-third of the articles in this book), plus additional articles from the United States and international contributions from Australia, Brazil, Canada, Great Britain, and Mexico to enhance topical variety and international application. Similar to the *Presenting* volume, the intended audience includes archaeologists, resource managers, professional staff at traditional and site museums, interpreters, public administrators, preservationists, as well as high school and middle school social studies teachers, elementary school teachers, and all students of archaeology and resource management.

Volume Organization and Subject Matter Diversity

Topical Grouping of Chapters

We have divided the book into five parts that represent different topical thrusts of public interpretation and outreach; historic sites and museums, ethnic communities, colleges and universities, public schools, and public agencies and professional organizations. However, as we noted, these categories are not discrete areas of outreach. Many of the articles could be placed in more than one section. For example, Hansen and Rossen are university archaeologists and their chapter could be in the section on university outreach, but the main focus of their paper is on partnering with Native American communities, therefore we placed their article in the section on ethnic communities. The following introduction to each section addresses some of the common problems facing outreach efforts. Each article addresses how the archaeologists dealt with outreach work and the partnerships that were formed.

Historic Sites and Museums

Historic sites, and to a large extent, historic-site archaeologists, have been at the forefront in engaging the public. They have probably been decades ahead of other institutions in active public outreach programs for both children and adults. A number of the interpretative programs at our historic sites have enabled the past to come alive. Books such as Freeman Tilden's *Interpreting Our Heritage* (1977) have served as guidelines for interpretative programs. Outdoor education programs, especially ones that involve diverse senses beyond just seeing and hearing, can help visitors relate to another time and place. The challenge for archaeologists has been to make archaeology "come alive," to present archaeology as the dynamic field we know it to be. This has been especially challenging when archaeology is within the setting of an historic site. Do other programs overshadow it? Does it simply get relegated to just a small exhibit in the orientation museum explaining how archaeological discoveries provided important data for both the reconstructions at the site and the interpretations of daily life? How can archaeology be successfully integrated into the visitor experience? The authors in this section have successfully met these challenges.

Bruce Fry looks at 40 years of archaeological work at the Fortress of Louisbourg on Cape Breton Island, Nova Scotia. Louisbourg was more than a military fortress, it was a fortified village. Because it is the archaeology of a whole community, there were craft shops, stores, taverns, homes, gardens, a church, plus all the military buildings found at a fort. The Louisbourg project was the largest major undertaking of Parks Canada. It has been called the "Williamsburg of Canada." It was a model for archaeology and preservationists. Fry discusses 40 years worth challenges, set backs, and successes.

Henry Miller provides a broad overview of the historic outdoor museum, St. Mary's City, the first capital of Maryland (1634–1695). While the first archaeological excavations were undertaken in the 1930s, systematic, long-term excavations began in 1970 and continue today. For over 35 years archaeologists have been continuously excavating the whole community, interpreting the diverse sites to the public, and endeavoring to preserve the remains. Miller's chapter discusses the variety of ways the archaeologists have engaged the public, how they confronted challenges, and practical insights gained from their experiences.

While Henry Miller provides a broad overview of the work at St. Mary's City, Silas Hurry and Darcy Bodeman provide the reader with an in-depth view of the issues related to one site and one museum exhibit. St John's site, the home of John Lewger, the first secretary of the colony, existed from 1638 to ca. 1715. The site was excavated for many years and the foundations survive. A new museum building surrounds and shelters the foundations and provides a permanent exhibit space. Hurry's chapter discusses the long process of exhibit development and building design and how archaeology actually "drove the development process." The chapter analyzes how archaeologists working in partnership with specialists in diverse fields produced an innovative museum building and interpretative space.

Jody Steele, Greg Jackman, Julia Clark, and Richard Tuffin take the reader from the North American examples to Australia. Port Arthur historic site is located in Tasmania. Unlike the seventeenth-century community of St. Mary's city, or the eighteenth-century fortified Louisbourg, nineteenth-century Port Arthur was a prison settlement. It is one of Australia's popular cultural tourism destinations. The penal settlement was self-sufficient with a variety of trades and industry. After the prison closed, it became a historic site in 1915. The archaeologist faced many of the same challenges faced in North America. The authors describe the challenges of how archaeologists integrated their work into the over-all public interpretation and educational programs.

Ethnic Communities

Heritage tourism is not only a catch word in archaeology and preservation, but it is also becoming a major source of money for local communities. When archaeologists engage in work connected to heritage tourism are they really providing a service? Is it civic engagement? Lisa Breglia challenges these assumptions in her case study on a Mayan community. The Maya were proud that they had been able to finally achieve ownership of their land. They wanted to remain as farmers. But the archaeological and heritage tourism development of the local Maya site would mean a transformation of the cultural landscape. Roads would be built. Hotels and restaurants would be constructed for the tourist industry and new jobs would emerge. However, land for the roads and hotels would be taken from Maya farmland. Is this what the community wanted? Did they have a say? Was this a partnership project or yet another example of archaeologists making assumptions without input from the community? Breglia raises the question of whether archaeologists should be partnering with cultural anthropologists to better understand the values in a non-western community.

Within western descendant communities there certainly are differences of opinion regarding the importance of community history. Charles Orser (2004) contrasted the strong interest among Irish Americans in his archaeological excavations of sites of the "Great Famine" of the 1840s versus the lack of interest in his work among the Irish in Ireland. Carol McDavid (2004, 2003) has noted the problems she had in getting African-American community members to discuss their enslaved past or even being interested in archaeological work on a plantation site. In this book, Whitney Battle-Baptiste, an African-American archaeologist, discusses the challenges and rewards she faces in working with descendant communities.

In 1997, the Society of American Archaeology book, *Native Americans and Archaeologists: Stepping Stones to Common Ground* (Swidler *et al*. 1997), presented diverse Native American perspectives on archaeology and historic preservation, including articles emphasizing the need to consult with tribes at various levels of archaeological work. This book was an important first step. Native American Joe Watkins (2000, 2003) has written at length about the long-standing ethical, religious, and scientific problems and conflicts between archaeologists and Native American communities. Lance Foster's commentary continues that dialogue. He provides the reader with some background on the negative experiences he has had as an American Indian who is also an archaeologist. He describes terminology still used commonly by archaeologists in the twenty-first century that have negative connotations for Native Americans. Finally, he suggests ways to reach out to Native American communities.

The rest of the articles in this section provide positive examples of community outreach. In the post-NAGRPA world, where museums legally are required to inform American Indian Tribal governments if they have any objects of sacred or cultural patrimony in their collections, there is still a reluctance among many museums to include Native Americans in exhibit or program planning. The Houston Museum of Natural Science is one of the exceptions. Pam Wheat-Stranahan, Dorothy Lippert, Dirk Van Tuerenhout, and Elisa Phelps describe how the Houston Museum of Natural Science has moved into successful, innovative partnerships with Native Americans.

How do archaeologists become involved in civic engagement? When does archaeology become public anthropology? What are the personal and professional risks and sacrifices that might have to be made? Brooke Hansen and Jack Rossen address these questions. Hansen and Rossen have developed a true partnership with Cayuga Chiefs, Clan Mothers, and other members of the Haudenosaunee (Iroquois) in a contested homeland in central New York. Their innovative outreach partnership with the Haudenosaunee has also involved college students, public school children and their teachers, and non American Indian community members.

Finally Madeline Augustine, Christopher Turnbull, Patricia Allen, and Pamela Ward describe how the Metepenagiag Mi'kmaq Nation of New Brunswick, Canada has involved archaeologists in excavating their cultural sites. This has been a true partnership that has been continued since the early 1970s when the late Joseph Michael Augustine, a former Chief of the Metepenagiag Mi'kmaq First Nation discovered a 2,500 year old burial mound and contacted archaeologists to work with him to investigate the mound. Chief Augustine also introduced his community to archaeology. At a time when there were strained relationships between archaeologists and Native American communities, this project was and still is a very positive example of people working together, respecting each other, and learning from each other.

Colleges and Universities

While museums and government agencies have taken the lead in outreach efforts, archaeologists in the academy are stepping up to the challenge. Archaeologists Peter Pope and Stephen Mills describe the innovative outreach program at Memorial University in Newfoundland. Archaeologists have worked with community members and government agency staff to help archaeology become a key issue in community economic development. Impoverished former fishing communities have benefited financially and educationally from this partnership.

Sherene Baugher explains how a national college-level community service initiative known as "service-learning" can easily be integrated into an archaeological curriculum. Service-learning provides opportunities for college students to become involved in public archaeology and public partnerships but within the context of college courses. She suggests ways to integrate outreach efforts into more than just a summer field school.

Nina Versaggi describes an innovative program known as CAP (Community Archaeology Program) in which college students, work with both public school children and adults in preserving and protecting sites. Community members are involved in lectures, discussions, and excavations. CAP has promoted grassroots preservation in Central New York.

Pedro Funari, Nanci Vieira de Oliveira, and Elizabete Tamanini describe three diverse case studies from Brazil. In some ways reflecting issues raised in the section on community partnerships, they described the mixed success they have had with community outreach. They have faced the challenge of "whose history is it" and the dilemma of dealing with a divided community.

Public Schools

At the twenty-first century, we find negative changes in public school education where innovation and creative teaching are becoming more difficult with state mandated tests and curriculum changing to simply "teach for the test." How do you integrate archaeology into a public school curriculum? Patrice Jeppson and George Brauer provide wonderful, successful examples of how archaeology can survive in twenty-first-century public schools. One of the key ingredients is partnering archaeologist with educators. Without a thorough knowledge of social studies curriculum and new state mandated requirements, archaeologists are simply working in the dark. Archaeologists are not trained in educational philosophy or child development; therefore, the partnership with educators can ensure age appropriate programing.

Not all education takes place in a formal school classroom. Educator and historian Freeman Tilden (1977: 47) noted: "Interpretation addressed to children . . . should not be a dilution of the presentation to adults, but should follow a fundamentally different approach. To be at its best it will require a separate program."

Carol Ellick not only acknowledges the different programing needs for children versus adults but more importantly she addresses the different strategies for both formal (classroom) and informal (museum or site related) outreach programs for children. She provides useful guidelines and examples of outreach programs.

Both Dena Doroszenko in Toronto, Ontario and Gaynell Stone on Long Island, New York have had multiple years experience with partnering with local educators and providing outreach programs for school-age children. Both discuss how their programs, including visits to archaeological sites and an excavation component, have evolved over time. Both stress how their programs benefited from planning and input from educators.

Ann-Eliza Lewis provides examples from a museum/historical society perspective on outreach programs for children. The "Big Dig," a multi year cultural resource management excavation in Boston, unearthed diverse sites spanning almost a 10,000-year history of the cultural landscape now known as Boston. Artifacts and research from the excavation have been used in educational outreach programs, traveling exhibits for elementary schools, and museum exhibits. The design and content of these programs resulted from a collaboration with educators.

Public Agencies and Professional Organizations

Denise Hansen and Jonathan Fowler present a Canadian perspective on outreach by Parks Canada. Their work with educators mirror some of the successes discussed in the previous section on educational outreach. John

Jameson of the National Park Service describes that agency's long history of providing education programs for the public and gives examples of successful educational partnerships and programs as well as other national and international initiatives.

Joseph Last, from Parks Canada, describes how CRM work can be positively linked with public outreach. He provides examples of the archaeological public programing at Parks Canada's military sites in Ontario Province. The archaeological outreach has involved site tours, on-site laboratories, hands-on workshops, and short-term exhibits.

Janet Pape from the California Department of Transportation agrees that successful public interpretation programs have been linked to CRM work. She describes successful community participation in exhibits and a film that resulted from a major highway project in Oakland. Pamela Cressey in Alexandria, Virginia and Natalie Vinton in Sydney, Australia describe the value integrating archaeology directly into government laws. However, it is not just the letter of the law that makes for a successful program. They demonstrate how archaeologists partnering with community members make preservation goals become a reality.

James Deetz (1996) has discussed gravestones as above-ground artifacts. These historic cemeteries are archaeological sites that need preservation and protection. Harold Mytum describes how archaeologists might work with churches, private cemetery managers, and community members to engage the public in an awareness and appreciation of historic cemeteries and community history.

The final article in this section and in the book brings the issue of outreach back to the professional community. What steps, however painful, must professional organizations take to make public outreach more visible within the professional community? Lu Ann DeCunzo and John Jameson describe the Society of Historical Archaeology's 10-year saga in bringing the project known as "Unlocking the Past" to fruition.

Commonality in Diversity

The authors in this volume address a wide range of developments and standards for effective public education and interpretation of archaeology. The chapters also represent a cross section of case studies from both the United States and abroad. Fifty percent of the case studies are from outside the United States (including First Nations Indigenous groups): Australia, Brazil, Canada, Great Britain, and Mexico. The diverse articles from Canada and Mexico demonstrate that, although these are all case studies from "North America," the political, social, economic, and cultural backgrounds make them noticeably different from the projects in the United States. For example, readers from other countries in the Commonwealth (such as Australia and New Zealand) find common ground with the Canadian challenges to outreach. The diverse case studies may apply to particular places, but we believe the approaches and lessons learned are applicable to many countries. They provide the reader with models for implementing public education and outreach programs with an emphasis on collaborative partnerships. The contributors, who have all been involved in long-term public outreach programs, bring their wealth of experiences to share with the reader. The chapters provide diverse examples in successful collaborations that can help project planners avoid reinventing the wheel.

The authors share their successes and problems; they discuss what was redesigned and why, what did not work, and what was beneficial. In these times of decreasing funding and support to humanities and social sciences, program directors are reluctant to undertake outreach projects that they assume require large budgets. Therefore, we have selected case studies that reflect modest start-up costs, demonstrating that success need not be tied to big bankrolls. To reiterate, we believe that the main lesson to be derived from these modestly funded projects is that attitudes and initiatives of people are what make the difference.

Only when archaeologists are willing to reach out to people in other professions and work with and learn from the community can successful partnerships be formed. This book describes effective models of collaboration that enable the archaeology of the past to meet the educational and interpretive needs of the present.

References

Deetz, J., 1996, *In Small Things Forgotten*. Expanded and Revised Edition (original 1977). Doubleday, New York.

Derry, L. and Malloy, M., editors, 2003, *Archaeologist and Local Communities: Partners in Exploring the Past*. Society for American Archaeology, Washington, DC.

Jameson, J.H., Jr., editor, 1997, *Presenting Archaeology to the Public: Digging for Truths*. AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek, California.

Jameson, J.H., Jr., editor, 2004, *The Reconstructed Past: Reconstructions in the Public Interpretation of Archaeology and History*. AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek, California.

Little, B.J., 2002, *Public Benefits of Archaeology*. University Press of Florida, Gainesville, Florida.

McDavid, C., 2003, Collaboration, Power, and the Internet: The Public Archaeology of the Levi Jordan Plantation. In *Archaeologist and Local Communities: Partners in Exploring the Past*, edited by L. Derry and M. Malloy, pp. 45–66. Society for American Archaeology, Washington, DC.

McDavid, C., 2004, From “Traditional” Archaeology to Public Archaeology to Community Action. In *Places in the Mind: Public Archaeology as Applied Anthropology*, edited by P.A. Shackel and E.J. Chambers, pp. 35–56. Routledge, London.

Merriman, N., editor, 2004, *Public Archaeology*. Routledge, New York.

Orser, C.E., Jr., 2004, Archaeological Interpretation and the Irish Diasporic Community. In *Places in the Mind: Public Archaeology as Applied Anthropology*, edited by P.A. Shackel and E.J. Chambers, pp. 171–191. Routledge, London.

Shackel, P.A. and Chambers, E., editors, 2004, *Places in Mind: Archaeology as Applied Anthropology*. Routledge, New York.

Swidler, N., Dongoske, K.E., Anyon, R., and Downer, A.S., editors, 1997, *Native Americans and Archaeologists: Stepping Stones to Common Ground*. AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek, California.

Tilden, F., 1977, *Interpreting Our Heritage*. Third edition. The University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill.

Watkins, J., 2000, *Indigenous Archaeology: American Indian Values and Scientific Practice*. AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek, California.

Watkins, J., 2003, Archaeological Ethics and American Indians. In *Ethical Issues in Archaeology*, edited by L.J. Zimmerman, K.D. Vitelli, and J. Hollowell-Zimmer, pp. 129–141. AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek, California.

Webster's Dictionary, 1984, *Webster's II: New Riverside Dictionary*. Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, Massachusetts.

1
Reaching Out to the Bureaucracy and Beyond: Archaeology at Louisbourg and Parks Canada

Bruce Fry

Two centuries after its destruction and abandonment, Louisbourg emerged from its long slumber to become Canada's largest historical reconstruction and best-known national historic site. Originally a thriving seaport and capital of the short-lived French colony of Ile Royale (1713–1759), the fortified town on the east coast of Cape Breton Island, which forms the northeastern part of what is now Nova Scotia, was, from the day it was founded, at the center of the protracted struggle between Britain and France for control of the Atlantic seaboard, and ultimately the entire North American continent. Besieged and taken in 1745 by militia from New England, supported by the British Navy, only to be returned to France in 1749 after the warring nations signed a peace treaty, Louisbourg was finally taken by British forces in 1758 as a prelude to the capture of Quebec and New France. Ironically, despite its strategic location athwart the trade routes from Europe to the Americas and its proximity to the vast riches of the Atlantic fishing banks, Louisbourg ceased to be of interest to the British government; its fortifications were systematically demolished in 1760 and what was left of the town after the siege gradually fell into ruin, occupied by only a few discharged army veterans and their descendants over the years. For their centers of commerce and government, the British concentrated on the port city of Halifax they had established in 1749 as a counterpoint to Louisbourg in Nova Scotia. Even the subsequent fishing community that grew to become the modern-day Louisbourg shifted from the original townsite and began anew on the more sheltered northeast shore of Louisbourg Harbor.

In short, the abandoned town and its fortifications became transformed into an ideal archaeological site: Apart from some local quarrying for building materials, a few scattered smallholdings, and sporadic attempts in the early years of the twentieth century to stabilize some of the more prominent ruins, the site lay undisturbed beneath a thin cover of topsoil and vegetation. The surrounding countryside, too, was relatively pristine—a terrain of low hills covered by dense woods of fir and spruce interspersed with peat bogs. In these hills and along the coastline around Louisbourg were visible traces of the last conflict: French entrenchments and outlying artillery positions, British encampments, and siege trenches.

In 1926, Louisbourg was designated a National Historic Site, and in the 1930s, the federal government built a museum within the ruined walls so that the few visitors who arrived could have some information about the site; beyond this and a caretaker role, the Canadian Parks Branch, later to become Parks Canada, did nothing. All this changed in 1961 when the federal government, driven by political and socioeconomic imperatives, along with a surge of patriotic fervor as the country's centennial celebrations drew closer, embarked upon the ambitious program of reconstructing the French town. Louisbourg was not the first historic site in Canada to be excavated archaeologically (Kidd, 1994: 49–65), and was only one of several that the newly formed Historic Sites Service began to investigate (Rick, 1970: 10–44). It was, however, by far the largest. The actual townsite, including the remains of its fortifications, covered 65 acres, but with the decision to reconstruct came another significant development: Areas of the surrounding countryside and coastline that bore evidence of outlying defenses and siege activity were expropriated and became part of the larger entity that covered approximately 25 sq. miles. Subsequent investigation has identified over 500 sites within the expanded perimeter, the majority associated with the siege of 1758 (Burke, 1989). Louisbourg thus became comparable to a small National Park in terms of its administration of an extensive land area, and acquired commensurate infrastructure and organization, including a permanent staff of researchers and conservators. This was a radical departure at a time when the professional activities of the National Historic Sites Service were still centralized in Ottawa. Even after the establishment of regional offices in the 1970s, Louisbourg remained the only site with a substantial in-house research and conservation capacity, a distinction that holds to this day.

As expressed in a government-commissioned study to recommend ways of relieve chronic unemployment in the area, the long-term vision—to recreate an authentic eighteenth century French fortified town, complete with furnishings and costumed animators, that would become an international tourism attraction—was consciously modeled on the Williamsburg example, but in the short term, the objective of rebuilding was considered an engineering exercise; researchers were present simply to provide structural plans and details according to a rigorous and unrealistic schedule that would culminate in the completion of the project in the year of Canada's Centennial (1967). Responsibility for the project therefore went to the Engineering Division of the Canadian Parks Branch, not the Historic Sites Service, and the first manager appointed was an engineer, who, along with his construction team, had no knowledge of nor little sympathy for the niceties of historical and archaeological research. Pleas for more time to excavate and analyze research results were rejected. Nevertheless, as the full costs of reconstruction became more evident, the initial proposal to rebuild the entire town was discreetly scaled back. Henceforth, although the same tight schedule would apply, only an area representing roughly one-third of the site was to be reconstructed—an unintended benefit to future archaeologists, if not the ones then on staff.

Clearly, the archaeologists needed to raise awareness within the organization responsible for the reconstruction, and among the general public, who were ultimately footing the bill, of the intrinsic heritage value of the buried ruins and the artifacts they contained. Archaeology at that time was not a widely popular subject and historical archaeology was barely recognized, even within academic circles. In Britain, the discipline had a much greater appeal, thanks in large part to the endeavors of Sir Mortimer Wheeler, whose much publicized excavations on Roman and Iron Age sites drew crowds while earning derisive comments about "circuses" from more academically straight-laced colleagues; he was a pioneer in producing film documentaries as well as books that popularized his work, and became one of the first television academic "personalities." This determination to make archaeology interesting and accessible to a wide audience crossed the Atlantic in the person of Ivor Noel Hume, who had worked with Wheeler on Roman sites in and around London, and assumed direction of the archaeological program at Colonial Williamsburg in 1957. Noel Hume's public lectures and erudite but popular publications dealing with life in Colonial America, together with his introduction of that mainstay of British archaeological tradition, the society of local amateurs, brought a wide range of people into immediate contact with the past: "He knew how to simplify archaeology and make it understandable" (Kelso, 2002).

One of Wheeler's most famous sites was Verulamium, a Roman town 25 miles northwest of London, which he excavated in the early 1950s. In the same year that Noel Hume came to Williamsburg, the curator of the Verulamium museum, John Lunn, came to Canada, joining the curatorial staff of the Royal Ontario Museum. When the Canadian Government began the Louisbourg reconstruction project, Lunn was designated the first superintendent once the reconstruction was complete. In the meantime, he was appointed during the construction phase as head of interpretation. Although the politicians and bureaucrats responsible for the Louisbourg development had used Williamsburg as their model, and envisaged the completed product as one that would offer the same sort of "journey through time" with fully reconstructed buildings and animators in period costume bringing the past to life, Louisbourg boasted no intact structures and no inhabitants save for a few subsistence fishermen–farmers who had built new dwellings amid the ruins of the fortifications. Located on a remote region of the east coast, the site received few visitors and offered them little in the way of interpretation. There was the museum, built in the 1930s, that offered some explanation of Louisbourg's significance, a random sampling of artifacts recovered from various make-work programs of ruins stabilization, and a scale model of the town and its fortifications, painstakingly built in great detail by the volunteer curator from archival documents. Apart from this museum, only the ruins of the fortifications and major buildings, some of them stabilized in the 1930s, were available to assist the visitor to comprehend the history and significance of what had been the largest French town on the eastern seaboard.

The planning sequence for the reconstruction project followed what was then standard practice for park development: Engineers would build the infrastructure—work compound, headquarters offices, access roads, visitor reception center—and at the same time begin the reconstruction of major components of the French town; these were identified as the King's Bastion complex, the fortification front extending from the bastion to the main gate, and various government buildings, a selection of private residences and commercial establishments within the town. As Louisbourg was first and foremost a port, and most people, goods and supplies arrived by sea, the quay and its wharves were also essential to the reconstruction. Researchers would supply the necessary details.

The newly appointed head of interpretation would meanwhile begin assembling a team of specialists who would prepare plans for furnishing the completed buildings in authentic detail and make costumes for the animators who were to portray the various aspects of eighteenth century life, military and civilian. It was very much a production-line model, orchestrated by the engineers, everyone else working on their components and placing them in the approved sequence on the assembly line until finally the completed product could be handed over to the superintendent and the visitors would start to arrive. The only problem was that the simplistic unilinear approach did not work.

The difficulties of carrying out archaeological and historical research within the constraints of a predetermined construction schedule have been discussed elsewhere (Fry, 2004: 201–214). Problems also arose in interpreting the site to the public. The political and bureaucratic proponents of the project had not given any thought to anything but the finished product, and were taken unawares when, in response to the publicity the Louisbourg project generated, the numbers of visitors began to increase alarmingly. Of course, many were from the immediate area, curious to see the radical changes taking place in their own backyard; but as the federal government proclaimed its achievement in job creation and tourism in a region of chronic unemployment, Louisbourg became a frequent subject of coverage in national newspapers and other media. Vacationers from Ontario and elsewhere, drawn to the Maritimes by the unspoiled scenery and beaches, now had an additional destination. Faced with this unforeseen interest, Lunn had to devise plans for visitors immediately as well as for the future.

Drawing upon his experience of the Wheeler excavations at Verulamium, Lunn recognized the potential that the site offered, even in its undeveloped condition: People are innately curious about any signs of unusual activity involving excavation and construction. If visitors could not at this juncture journey back through time to a French equivalent of Williamsburg, they could at least observe a work in progress and feel as if they had been allowed to see the story behind the eventual finished product. To this end, Lunn arranged for walkways around the archaeological excavations; visitors were kept away from the trenches by barriers of snow fencing, but were able to observe the archaeological crews in action. The artifact conservation building was located off-site, within the project headquarters compound about a mile and a half away, and here, too, the more determined visitors were able to observe conservators and assistants washing and treating artifacts as they came in daily from the site. The single-storey building had been designed with one wall almost entirely consisting of windows beginning 3 ft from the floor so as to provide a good source of natural light, so installation of a wooden viewing deck along this wall was a simple addition that gave visitors an unobstructed view into the building. At first somewhat self-conscious and reserved about their roles as "performers in cages," crews on-site and at the laboratory soon adjusted to their situation.

Because of the danger, visitors could not get as close to the construction work that was already underway. The area to be reconstructed, however, represented only about one-third of the original site, the rest remained as grassed-over ruins. To provide some sense of the size and layout of the original town, Lunn and the archaeologists identified the alignment of the streets and town blocks on the ground; maintenance crews carefully mowed the grass short along the streets so that visitors could wander them at their leisure. At each intersection, signs identified the names of the streets assigned by the French and by the occupying New England forces who held the town from 1745 to 1749. Where ruins were visible, such as those of the hospital—an imposing building that took up an entire block—additional interpretive signs provided information on the features. And finally, to convey the extent of the French occupation in the surrounding area, as well as the wide-ranging nature of the siege campaigns, viewing kiosks or "belvederes" were placed at significant locations throughout the park beyond the fortification walls: at the sites of the landings, the army encampments, the Royal Battery and the lighthouse, as well as outside the Dauphin Gate, the entranceway through which all visitors had to approach the site at the time. Inside these were interpretive displays using detailed models and photographic enlargement of historical maps and plans.

Driven by the necessity of having to respond to increased interest in Louisbourg, this was an innovative solution that focused on aspects of the undisturbed archaeological features of the site as well as the work in progress. In contrast to the direct contact with the public that archaeologists at Williamsburg and in the US Park Service took for granted, however, Parks Canada relied upon a formalized structure in which dealing with the public was a job for guides and interpretation specialists: If archaeology was being explained, it was not considered the role of the archaeologists to do the explaining.

There were organizational reasons for this: Parks Canada was a highly centralized branch of government, divided into two very unequal parts. Its public image was as the guardian of the nation's unspoiled natural wilderness areas—vast tracts of land set aside for future generations to enjoy and in which no resource exploitation was permitted. The national parks were akin